CHAPTER 2

Manuscript Profiles

1 From Enoch through Abram

4Q201, Enoch a (Ena)/4Q338, Genealogical List?
[ed. Milik, BE, 139–63; Stuckenbruck, DJD 36:3–7 (frags. 2–8); Drawnel, ABE, 59–142]1

Content synopsis and significance: This manuscript preserves portions of the Enochic Book of Watchers, in which the story of the descent of the Watchers from heaven and its consequences is recounted (cf. Gen 6:1–4–8). Along with the other copies of Enoch from Qumran, of which 4Q201 is apparently the earliest, this scroll is by far the oldest physical witness to the book. It also shows clearly that at least most of Ethiopic 1 Enoch was first composed in Aramaic. 4Q201 i–v and Stuckenbruck’s frags. 4–7 contain material corresponding to chapters 1–9 in the later Ethiopic version: Enoch’s introductory words and description of the constancy of the created order, parts of the list of wayward angels, an account of the angels’ offenses, and notice of their resulting condemnation. In addition, 4Q201 iv–vi and Stuckenbruck’s frags. 2–3 and 8 preserve text that does not seem to correspond to other known versions of 1 Enoch, suggesting that the Aramaic Book of Watchers may have contained material not found in later versions of the book. Drawnel (ABE, 68) raises the alternative possibility that these fragments may belong to another manuscript. As part of the literature focused on Enoch, 4Q201 testifies to the active development of Enoch’s very important role as a primordial wisdom figure during the Second Temple period, a role that continued to exert influence through a variety of later Jewish and Christian writings. The myth of the Watchers, their transgressions, and their judgment, also became popular subjects in subsequent literature (e.g., Jubilees and the Damascus Document). Among the Aramaic literature from Qumran, the story of the Watchers figures prominently in the Book of Giants and the Genesis Apocryphon, both of which were almost certainly influenced directly by the Book of Watchers.

Material remains: Combining the materials published by Milik and Stuckenbruck, Drawnel counts twenty-four fragments of 4Q201 in total. The largest fragment by far is labeled by Milik as 4QEna iiic and iiie, and by Drawnel as 4Q201 iiii and iiii (pictured below). This fragment, though badly damaged, preserves significant portions of two columns and a considerable amount of text. The first of its columns contains parts of seventeen lines, some of which are over thirty letters in length, and the second contains parts of twenty-three lines. Milik concluded that 4Q201 preserved parts of six consecutive columns, three on one sheet and three on another (BE, 139), though this is based heavily on his extensive reconstructions. A few of the remaining fragments are nearly the size of a standard playing card, though most are much smaller than this. 4Q201 overlaps directly with other copies of the Book of Watchers (4Q202 [Enb] and 4Q204 [Enb]) at the following locations: 4Q201 iii.1–2//4Q202 iii.6–7; 4Q201 iii.10–15//4Q202 iii.15–19, 4Q201 iii.1–7//4Q202 iii.1–8, 4Q201 iv.1–11//4Q202 iii.10–14, 4Q201 iii.1–3//4Q204 iv.1–22, and 4Q201 iii.5–11//4Q204 iv.24–30. While the recto side of 4Q201 contains the Book of Watchers, the manuscript is an opisthograph, and the otherwise unknown text of the verso was designated by Tov as 4Q338 (Genealogical List?).

Notes on provenance: Milik mentioned in several publications that some of the Enoch fragments were discovered in Cave 4 by the Bedouin in 1952, while others were excavated by him and de Vaux as part of the official excavations of Cave 4 in the same year (Milik, “Hénoch,” 70; Milik, BE, vi; Mébarki and Grenache, “Milik,” 132). Unfortunately, in most cases it can no longer be determined to which of these groups a manuscript should be assigned. At least the large frag. 2 of 4Q201 was recovered in the official excavations, being included on PAM 40,985 in the “E series” plates.

1 The various editors of this manuscript have numbered the fragments differently. This and the other profiles for the Aramaic Enoch manuscripts were created using Milik’s original numbering system, which is based heavily on reconstruction. Nevertheless, Drawnel’s updated numbering system is very useful, and should form the basis of future discussion. For a helpful chart comparing the different numbering systems for 4Q201, see Drawnel, ABE, 59.
**Profile of Physical Layout**

**Scroll dimensions:** Approx. 23 cm h. (Milik's reconstruction)  
**Margins:**  
**Upper:** Approx. 1.1–1.5 cm (with considerable variation where preserved)  
**Lower:** Approx. 2 cm (frag. 2)  
**Intercolumnar:** 1.4–1.7 cm; 7–8 mm between vertical column lines on frag. 2  
**Column dimensions:** Approx. 12.5–13.5 cm w.  
**Lines per column:** Approx. 27  
**Letters per line:** Approx. 37–48  
**Scribal guidelines:**  
**Horizontal script lines:** None visible  
**Vertical column lines:** Yes, both sides of column (see esp. frag. 2)  
**Average medial letter height:** 2–4 mm  
**Space between lines:** 6–10 mm  
**Space between words:** 0.5–1.5 mm (though see the wider spacing in frags. 1h and 1l)  
**Vacats:** No indisputable cases (though see Milik on 1b; Drawnel proposes several possible vacats)

**Material:** Skin  
**Script:** Hasmonaean semi-cursive (Milik) or semi-formal (Langlois); several affinities with semi-cursive 'Idumaean' bookhand (Drawnel)  

**Proposed paleographic date:** 200–150 BCE (Milik, who speculated this copy was made from an exemplar dating to the third cent. BCE); ca. 225–175 BCE (Drawnel)  

**Special traits and general comments:** This manuscript stands out for its relatively low levels of quality and scribal execution when compared to other Qumran copies. It is also the only opistograph identified among the Aramaic Qumran scrolls, with the Book of Watchers written on what remains of the recto (hair side of the skin) and another, poorly-preserved Hebrew text on the verso (flesh side of the skin), designated 4Q338 (Genealogical List?). It is virtually certain that 4Q201 was the text first written on the manuscript, to which 4Q338 was later added. As in other Qumran opistographs, 4Q338 was written as if the manuscript was flipped toward the reader from top to bottom, so that the top margin and beginning of the text on 4Q338 are located where the bottom margin of 4Q201 is located on the recto (Milik 139; Tov DJD 36:290). Little of the text on 4Q338 is now legible, but the word מַלְכֵי (Malkei) suggests that it was at least in part genealogical, with Milik and Tov entertaining whether this might have been a list affiliated with the patriarchs of Genesis, and so tangentially related to the Book of Watchers. The evidence is, unfortunately, too meager to have any confidence in this idea. The scribe of 4Q201 was competent, but the spacing between words and lines is tight and erratic, often giving the visual impression of being written scripta continua, an unusual trait among the Qumran scrolls. The scribal hand is untidy, and there is no clear use of vacats to indicate sense divisions in the extant text. Medial and final letter forms are occasionally exchanged. One may also note the many mistakes and confused readings, discussed by Milik and Drawnel, such as the initial writing of מַמְתָּן (corrected to מַמְתִּים) in iii.10, giving the impression that the care and expense invested in this manuscript do not match that of many others from Qumran. It is notable that this is considered among the earliest scribal hands for the Aramaic Qumran scrolls, if we accept Milik's and Drawnel's early second cent. BCE date, and that the text could therefore have been written at a different location (social and/or geographical) than the later manuscripts (note, for example, the absence of horizontal scribal lines). Also of importance is the fact that the verso side of at least part of the manuscript was later reused to copy another text, and was badly blotted with ink. This manuscript was apparently not handled with the greatest of care as it aged. There are several scribal habits that set this manuscript yet farther apart from most others at Qumran. Milik had already noted the general tendency to assimilate the aleph in words such as מַלְכֵי (Malkei) (iii.21) and מַמְתָּן (Mamteim) (iii.13). Samek is regularly preferred over sin for etymological /s/, though the words מַלְכֵי (Malkei) and בֶּשָּׁר (Besar) (iii.21) retain the sin. This scribe had an unusual, heavy preference for marking the emphatic state with aleph, while aleph was often used for final /e/ vowels. (It should be noted, however, that Milik's reading of מַמְמָן for the direct object marker in 4v.5 מַמְמָן is probably incorrect.) The spelling is markedly...
more defective than the norm in Qumran manuscripts, illustrated poignantly by תִּל for יָהַשׁ אֲרֵי in iii.14, a spelling otherwise known only from later manuscripts. The percentage of the relative pronoun in the shortened, prefixed form -ד (rather than -ד) is very high in comparison with the rest of the Qumran Aramaic corpus. According to Milik, this scribe used an idiosyncratic method for marking insertions, placing a vertical strike below, and perhaps also above, the line at the point of an addition (iii.13). However, the method is not as clearly discerned as Milik suggests (BE, 140, 150, n. c) and Langlois and Drawnel have read these marks instead as letters. This seems the more plausible option, since such marks were not used elsewhere for insertions. The above factors led Milik to propose that this manuscript was copied from an earlier one, “dating from the third century at the very least” (BE, 141). One wonders, however, whether some of the above factors are better attributed to the lower quality and more shoddy execution of the manuscript, which seems to be written in a relatively condensed and cost-efficient manner. Whatever the case, this manuscript is somewhat conspicuous among the Qumran Aramaic scrolls, and may well derive from a different scribal setting than most others. Milik thought that it may be “a school-exercise, copied by a young scribe from the master’s dictation” (BE, 141), though this is sheer speculation.

Original manuscript quality: Fair

Select bibliography: Beyer, ATTM¹, 225–58; Langlois, Le Premier; Stuckenbruck, 1 Enoch, 44–47.

Script sample:

Representative sample of corrections and scribal features:

(a) Supralinear insertion (iii.1):

(b) Supralinear ayin added to correct עָרֶר to עָרֶר (i.iii.10)

(c) Supralinear insertion with what Milik considered sublinear and supralinear scribal marks indicating placement of corrected content (i.iii.13): רַבְרִי יִתְנָהוּ קַס [d) Supralinear insertion (i.iii.21): בַּשְּׁמֹת יָהָשׁ אֲרֵי יָהָשׁ אֲרֵי
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Language

Syntax:

Subject-verb (verb early in clause):
- iii.7 [SOV], iii.11, iii.12, ivv.1, ivv.4, ivv.8

Subject-verb (verb later in clause):
- ii.4

Subject implied (verb early in clause):
- iii.6, iii.1, iii.2, iii.6, iii.13

Subject implied (verb later in clause):
- iii.8

Verbless clause:
- iii.13

Direct object marker (if present):
- ל: iii.1 (?), iii.2, iii.6, iii.16, iii.19

Use of יד to mark genitive relationship:
- iii.11

Double כחדא construction:
- iii.4, iii.9 (?)

Periphrastic construction (past/future continuative action):

Finite form of הוה + participle:
- iii.16, iii.17

Lexical items:
- כחדא: iii.14
- בהר: iii.5 (?)

Morphology:

Double כחדא construction:
- iii.4, iii.9 (?)

Periphrastic construction (past/future continuative action):

Finite form of הוה + participle:
- iii.16, iii.17

Lexical items:
- כחדא: iii.14
- בהר: iii.5 (?)

Orthography/Phonology:

ס for /s/:
- iii.5, iii.15, iii.9 (3x), iii.10 (2x), iii.11 (2x), iii.12, iii.13, ivv.7, 2.2

ש for /s/:
- iii.11, iii.21, ivv.4

Other notable features:

Proposed Hebraisms:
- יד (lexical; ii.6) [H]

Content synopsis and significance: Like 4Q201 (Ena), the fragments of this manuscript preserve parts of the Enochic Book of Watchers corresponding to some verses of 1 Enoch 5–10, 14, and 22. These chapters include Enoch’s notification of the errant Watchers’ deeds, a list of the Watchers’ names, the reaction of the four archangels, the Lord’s subsequent instructions to them, and Enoch’s angelically-guided tour of the cosmos. Milik extensively reconstructed portions of five columns, though his reconstruction is often based on very scanty remains. Nevertheless, the general identification of the contents is not in doubt. Along with 4Q201 (Ena), this

Hasmonean-period manuscript provides our earliest attestation of the Book of Watchers, and proves that it was composed in Aramaic.

Material remains: This badly damaged manuscript comprises thirty-one small fragments. The largest ones (e.g., iiia, iibi, iii, iiii, and ivii) preserve between four and eight lines, but even these do not contain much running text. Most of the fragments are tiny scraps with only partial words or phrases remaining. There does appear to be evidence of horizontal and vertical ruling, as both Milik (BE, 164) and Drawnel (ABE, 145) observed. However, as Milik noted, these lines are now “barely visible” (BE, 164).

A few of the fragments preserve intercolumnar and lower margins, but the manuscript’s poor state of preservation prevents us from saying anything with confidence about the original size of the scroll or its columns (see also Drawnel, ABE, 146). Milik attempted an extensive reconstruction, though his proposals are often hypothetical.

2 The various editors of this manuscript have numbered the fragments differently. This and the other profiles for the Aramaic Enoch manuscripts were created using Milik’s original numbering system, which is based heavily on reconstruction. Nevertheless, Drawnel’s updated numbering system is very useful, and should form the basis of future discussion. For a helpful chart comparing the different numbering systems for 4Q202, see Drawnel ABE, 143–93.
and quite speculative. 4Q202 overlaps directly with other copies of the Book of Watchers (4Q201 [En²] and 4Q204 [En³]) at the following locations: 4Q202 iii.6–7//4Q201 (En²) iii.1–2, 4Q202 iii.15–19//4Q201 (En²) iii.10–15, 4Q202 iii.1–8//4Q201 (En²) iv.1–7, 4Q202 iii.10–11//4Q201 (En²) iv.10–11, and 4Q202 iv.9//4Q204 (En²) iv.16.

Notes on provenance: At least two fragments of 4Q202 are included on the “E series” plate PAM 40.967 (Milik’s frags. 1u and 1i’; Drawnel’s frags. 32–33), with Tigchelaar identifying a possible third fragment on PAM 40.970 (not identified by Milik or Drawnel). One fragment (the right piece of Milik’s 1w; Drawnel’s frag. 20) was also photographed as part of the “G series” plate PAM 40.613, showing that fragments of this scroll were found by both the Bedouin and those conducting the official excavations in 1952. The origins of the remaining fragments of 4Q202 were not clearly documented, though they most likely were also discovered in Cave 4 by the Bedouin.
Material: Skin

Script: Early Hasmonean semi-cursive (Milik); archaic or early Hasmonean semi-formal (Drawnel)

Proposed palaeographic date: 200–150 BCE (Milik); 175–100 BCE (Drawnel)

Special traits and general comments: This scroll is written in a well-trained, steady scribal hand, and its layout (relatively large margins and spacing between lines, vacats, etc.) indicates considerable care and high quality. It is, therefore, surprising to find a high number of corrections: eleven supralinear additions in only thirty-five fragments, at one point with a rare two lines of supralinear text (see below). Milik described the manuscript as "rather careless, unless it is a question of a defective archetype" (BE, 165).

Additionally, the scribe did not distinguish between medial and final forms of the letters kaph and pe. The script and technical execution itself, however, is far from careless, and it may well be that the manuscript was compared with a better archetype after copying, as Milik (followed by Drawnel) suggested. Milik noted that the corrections were made in the same hand as the main text, which appears to be correct, meaning that the corrections were made in relatively close chronological proximity to the original copying.

Despite Milik’s extensive reconstructions, very little actually remains of the text, limiting our ability to gain an accurate sense of its linguistic contours. Aleph-prefix forms in the causative and reflexive-passive stems seem to have been preferred, and aleph is also used for the definite article and other endings, as expected. An exception is found with the paal infinitive לגליה (1iii.5). A unique orthography may be used in 4Q202 for the compound form of the number ten (עשרי; cf. ii.15–17 [Drawnel’s frag. 5], though the context is very fragmentary and a full occurrence of the word is not preserved). Syntactic arrangements may often be guessed at, but remain obscure in most cases.

Original manuscript quality: Good–very good

Select bibliography: Beyer, ATTM1, 225–58; Stuckenbruck, 1 Enoch, 47.
Representative sample of corrections and scribal features:

(a) Excerpt of two added lines of supralinear text (iii.25a–25b):

(b) Supralinear additions (iii.2):

(c) Supralinear addition and probable erasure by scraping (iii.15):
Language
Syntax:
Verb-subject (verb early in clause):
 sci.6(?)
Subject-verb (verb early in clause):
 sci.4, sci.5
Subject-verb (verb later in clause):
 sci.25(?)
Subject implied (verb early in clause):
 sci.2, sci.7(?), sci.8(?), sci.18(?), sci.26–27(?)
Verbless clause:
 sci.16, sci.17, sci.18(?), sci.14, sci.15
Use of יד to mark genitive relationship:
 sci.26(2x?)
Periphrastic construction (past/future continuative action):
 Finite form of והי + participle:
 sci.1(?)

Lexical items:
 יד: sci.26(2x?), sci.15, iv.9, ivi.8
 יד: sci.2(?)

Morphology:
 אָמָל form:
 iv.8(?)
 אָמָל form:
 sci.4, iv.9
 Object suffix on verb:
 sci.27(2x)

Other noteworthy features:
 Proposed Hebraisms:
 נָא̄ כ (lexical; sci.27, cautiously following Beyer’s reading) [H]
 ידֵי̄ לֶצָּמ (morphological; sci.27) [H]

Content synopsis and significance: This manuscript contains portions of the Enochic Book of Watchers, Book of Dreams, Epistle of Enoch, and the Birth of Noah appendix. The fragments of 4Q204 correspond to chapters from across Ethiopic 1 Enoch, including 1–3, 6, 10, 12–15, 18, 30, 35, 89, and 104–106. This wide variety of chapters from the later Ethiopic book is significant, since it suggests that 4Q204 contained a large number – if not all – of the major sections of the later 1 Enoch. Milik proposed that 4Q203 (EnGiants®) belongs to the same scroll as 4Q204, which, if accepted (it is rejected by Drawnel, ABE, 3, 196), would mean that the Book of Giants was also included with the portions of 1 Enoch listed above. Milik further suggested that, along with the Astronomical Book, the contents of 4Q23/4204 may have formed what Milik deemed an “Enochic Pentateuch” (with the Book of Giants later being displaced by the Parables/Similitudes), though this hypothesis is speculative and has not gained wide acceptance. From the Book of Watchers, 4Q204 preserves parts of the initial description of creation and its majestic constancy, the list of names for the leaders of the fallen Watchers, the announced doom of the Watchers, the promise of a renewed, abundant creation, and a dream-vision in which Enoch is told the fate of the Watchers after they had petitioned the Lord for mercy. Parts of Enoch’s cosmic journey in the latter section of the Book of Watchers are also extant. From the Book of Dreams we find remains of the Animal Apocalypse, which symbolically recounts and foretells human history through vibrant animal imagery. Finally, a very small portion of the Epistle’s conclusion is preserved, followed by parts of the story of Noah’s birth as preserved in 1 En. 106–7. The latter is found in an alternate, probably earlier form in IQ20 (apGen) 2–5. It may also be echoed in other Aramaic Qumran texts (4Q534–536 [Birth of Noah®]) and the Hebrew text 1Q9 (Noah).

Material remains: 4Q204 is the most extensively preserved of the Qumran Enoch manuscripts. It comprises twenty-nine fragments, some of which can give us a sense of the manuscript’s original dimensions, and those of its columns. Outside dimensions of the largest fragments (e.g., 1g, 1h, 5b) exceed those of a standard playing card, while roughly half of the fragments are about the size of small coins. Milik’s reasonable placement of frags. 1g, 1h, and 1i imply that 4Q204 contained columns of at least thirty lines. On the basis of this reconstruction, he concluded that the written columns were about 20 cm in height,
the entire scroll around 24 cm in height (Milik, BE, 182; so too Drawnel, ABE, 196). Milik’s frag. 5b, the widest preserved, has lines of over forty letters. Drawnel estimates that the column in this fragment originally contained lines of over fifty letters, and was roughly 11 cm wide (ABE, 196). Nevertheless, 4Q204 is still a relatively poorly-preserved manuscript with few segments of sustained, running text. Several fragments preserve parts of two columns (e.g., 1c, 1g, ii, 1m, and 1n) and some contain the remnants of seven or more lines, but most fragments are very badly damaged. The reconstructions of Milik, Drawnel, and others rely on parallels with the Ethiopic Enoch manuscripts. 4Q204 overlaps directly with four other Qumran copies of Enoch (4Q201 [Ena], 4Q202 [Enb], 4Q205 [End], and 4Q206 [Enf]) at the following locations: 4Q204 ii.20–22/4Q201 (Ena) iii.1–3, 4Q204 ii.24–30/4Q201 (Ena) iii.5–11, 4Q204 iii.24–29/4Q201 (Ena) iii.5–11, 4Q204 iv.16/4Q202 (Enb) ivi.9, 4Q204 xii.28–30/4Q206 (Enf) ixxvi.14–17, and 4Q204 4.1/4Q205 (End) xii.30

Notes on provenance: 4Q204 is one of several copies of Enoch that can confidently be assigned to the group of fragments excavated by de Vaux’s team in 1952. This can be seen in Milik’s first-hand accounts (see Milik, “Hénoch,” 70; Milik, BE, vi; Mébarki and Grenache, “Milik,” 132), and especially by the fact that many fragments of 4Q204 were photographed as part of the “E series” plates on PAM 40.963 (5g), 40.965 (1g, ii, and m), 40.975 (1d, 1g and 1h), 40.978 (1g), 40.979 (1g and 5h), and 40.982 (1c and 1e). While some of the fragments coming from the Bedouin discoveries cannot be ruled out absolutely, it is clear that a significant portion of the scroll was recovered in the official excavations.

Sample image: 4Q204 ixii–xiii
Material: Skin

Script: Early Herodian, the same scribe as 4Q203 (EnGiants⁸) (Milik); early Herodian formal, with some early Herodian round semiformal features (Drawnel)

Proposed palaeographic date: 33–1 BCE (Milik); 33–1 BCE (Drawnel; “toward the end of that period, the turn of the century,” ABE, 200)

Special traits and general comments: The scribe who wrote this manuscript was highly trained and relatively consistent, using, as Milik observed, a somewhat “broken” form of early Herodian period script recalling styles known from Syria and Palmyra. Though the script itself is petite, the layout and execution of the manuscript is very generous in terms of margins, spacing, and the frequent, sometimes capacious use of vacats. Milik drew attention to a very interesting distinguishing feature of this scribe: the practice of “justifying” the left-hand margin of columns, occasionally causing the last word of a line to be separated from the preceding one by more than the expected distance (see frags. 1g, 5–8, 11, 2–8, 5a, 4). This also appears to take place in 4Q203 (EnGiants⁸) 7ib, 3–5, and Milik noted the same practice in other epigraphic sources from outside of Qumran. There are very few corrections in this manuscript, and those present are limited to the supralinear addition of single letters by the original scribe. Milik’s proposal of a crossed-out and corrected aleph in 1i.24 (אא) appears tenuous based on the available photographs. I also see no grounds for his suggested “scrapping out of a word” at 5ii.26 (אא). In its overall quality, this manuscript comes close to that of 1Q20 (apGen), though it was probably slightly smaller than that Cave 1 scroll. Except for the left-margin justification in 4Q204 (and 4Q203 [EnGiants⁸]), the manuscript preparation and scribal practices are very similar in this scroll, 1Q20 (apGen), and similarly-executed manuscripts like 4Q37 (Jacob). In Milik’s “fairly definite conclusion,” this copy “was made from an old manuscript, doubtless belonging to the last quarter of the second century BC” (BE, 183).

The orthography of the scribe is fairly full and somewhat varied, with a tendency to retain or insert etymological and non-etymological alephs for marking vowels that are to be pronounced at the middles or ends of words (e.g.,ו, ו). On two occasions, he marks the definite article (both in 5ii.28), but these are exceptions. He is also used to mark endings of perfect verbs with a weak third radical, derived infinitives, and the feminine noun endings. In most other cases, aleph is preferred, such as in the causative and reflexive-passive verb forms. Milik detected a tendency to use the shortened form of the relative pronoun (–) before nouns. The “heavy” 3ms pronoun form of מחים is used once (5ii.30), alongside which we should note the longer 2ms pronominal suffix נ— used in 4Q203 (EnGiants⁸). For further discussion of the relationship between 4Q203 (EnGiants⁸) and 4Q204 see the detailed examination of Tigchelaar, cited in the bibliography below.

Original manuscript quality: Very good–excellent

Select bibliography: Beyer, ATTM¹, 225–58; Stuckenbruck, 1 Enoch, 47–51; Tigchelaar, “Notes.”
Script sample:

Representative sample of corrections and scribal features:

(a) Supralinear letter added (ii.25):

(b) Vacat in list of names (iii.26):

(c) Vacat (5ii.29) and supralinear letter added (5ii.30):
Language

Syntax:

Verb-subject (verb early in clause):

Subject-verb (verb early in clause):

Subject-verb (verb later in clause):

Subject implied (verb early in clause):

Subject implied (verb later in clause):

Verbless clause:

Direct object marker (if present):

Use of י to mark genitive relationship:

Double נב construction:

Verb of movement + על + animate object:

Verb of movement + הד + inanimate object:

Periphrastic construction (past/future continualative action):

Finite form of הד + participle:

Participle + finite form of הד:

Lexical items:

Adin:

בadin:

ברא (מן:

די:

–ד:

כדי:

כחדא:

כען:

קובל:

תמן:

Morphology:

Aפעל form:

אתפעל form:

Object suffix on verb:

Dissimilated nun/nasalization:

Orthography/Phonology:

2ms (pro)nominal suffix כא/כה:

Other notable features:

Proposed Hebraisms:

Content synopsis and significance: This manuscript preserves small portions of Enoch’s cosmic journey in the latter part of the Book of Watchers, and the Animal Apocalypse from the Book of Dreams. The fragments of 4Q205 correspond to verses from Ethiopic 1 Enoch 22–23, 25, and 89. In the extant passages from the Book of Watchers, Enoch is transported to different parts of the earth, where he is shown incredible aspects of creation, attesting to the Lord’s power, order, and justice. In the Book of Dreams Enoch recounts for his son, Methuselah, a dream-vision premised on animal symbolism, which reveals what has been and what is yet to come in human (and specifically Israel’s) history. Symbolic dream-visions
as a mode of revelation are quite common in the Aramaic Qumran texts, also being found, for example, in the Book of Giants, the Genesis Apocryphon, the Daniel court-tales, and Four Kingdoms. For some thematic affinities between the Animal Apocalypse and 4Q245 (psDan⁶), see the profile for the latter scroll.

Material remains: Only eight small fragments remain of this manuscript, none preserving more than nine partial lines of text. Drawnel recently suggested that some of the fragments originally belonged to columns with more than fifty letters per line (ABE, 310), but little else can be said about the original size of the manuscript or its columns. There are clear traces of horizontal script guidelines, along with a vertical column guideline preserved on 2a. Some of the fragments have upper and intercolumnar margins (1a, 1d, and 2a). A few direct textual overlaps occur between 4Q205 and other copies of Enoch (4Q204 [En⁶] and 4Q206 [En⁶]): 4Q205 2ii.30//4Q204 (En⁶) 4i.1, 4Q205 2ii.26–29//4Q206 (En⁶) 4ii.12–16, and 4Q205 2ii.27–29//4Q206 (En⁶) 4iii.19–21.

Notes on provenance: Fragment 1a of 4Q205 is found on an early PAM “G series” photograph (PAM 40.624), meaning that it was among the many fragments discovered by the Bedouin in 1952 (Strugnell, “Photographing,” 124, 131–32).
Material: Skin

Script: Early Herodian (Milik; “fairly similar to that of En” [4Q204]); early Herodian formal, with some letters having early Herodian round semiformal features (Drawnel; “the hand is similar to the one used in 4Q204”)

Proposed palaeographic date: 33–1 BCE (Milik)

Special traits and general comments: Though there is little left of this manuscript, it is obvious that it was of very high quality, both materially and in terms of its scribal execution. It has upper and intercolumnar margin sizes comparable with 1Q20 (apGen), though the lines of 4Q205 are spaced more closely together than in that manuscript. The hand is exceptionally uniform and meticulous, whatever one makes of Milik’s somewhat disparaging remark (BE, 217) that it is “less assured and less firm” than the scribal hand of 4Q203 (EnGiants)/4Q204 (En). Milik considered the scripts of these manuscripts to be closely related, as did Drawnel. Of further note are the well-regulated line spacing of the columns, the absence of mistakes in the available fragments, and the liberal use of vacats. If Milik’s reconstructed vacats are even approximately correct, this scribe employed remarkably large blank spaces between relatively minor sense divisions within literary units (e.g., within the same dream-vision). Based on most other manuscripts, we would instead expect vacats of this size to indicate a major transition (e.g., between two completely different dream-visions, or different Enochic works). This also speaks to the care and expense invested in this copy.

The orthography and language of 4Q205 is similar to that of 4Q203 (EnGiants)/4Q204 (En), as already observed by Milik. Aleph is preferred to he in the usual cases of variation, and is used in full spellings such as רָם (2ii.27) and לַשׁוֹנָי (2iii.28). Etymological sin is retained in the few occurrences left to us. I also note in passing the many probable subject-verb syntactic constructions of the Animal Apocalypse fragments.

Original manuscript quality: Excellent

Select bibliography: Beyer, ATTM1, 225–58; Beyer, ATTM2, 117; Beyer, ATTM3, 153; Stuckenbruck, 1 Enoch, 51.
Script sample:

Language

Syntax:
Verb-subject (verb early in clause):
1xi.2
Subject-verb (verb early in clause):
2i.25–26(?), 2i.28–29(?)
Subject implied (verb early in clause):
1xi.1, 1xi.2, 1xi.3, 1xii.8
Verbless clause:
1xi.5–6(?), 1xii.5, 2ii.29
Use of דִּי to mark genitive relationship:
2i.26, 2iii.29
Verb of movement + ל + inanimate object:
1xi.3

Lexical items:
אָהַדְּי
: 1xi.5(?)
די
: 1xii.1, 1xii.2, 2i.26, 2iii.29
קָובָל
: 1xii.1(?), 2ii.29(?)
תַּמִּנ
: 1xi.3
הָנָה
: 1xi.1(?)

Morphology:
אָפָעָל form:
1xi.3

Orthography/Phonology:
ש for /s/:
2i.27, 2i.29(?), 2iii.28

4Q206, Enoch* (En*)/4Q206a, Enoch Giants* (EnGiants*)

Content synopsis and significance: Milik considered 4Q206 to be a scroll (along with 4Q203 [EnGiants*]/4Q204 [En*]) that contained both an early form of parts of 1 Enoch and the Book of Giants, thus forming the basis of his argument that the Book of Giants originally constituted part of an “Enochic Pentateuch.” Stuckenbruck observed that 4Q206 2–3 (Milik’s suggested Book of Giants fragments) cannot be placed definitely with the rest of the manuscript, though he deemed such a connection plausible based on their very limited contents, including a direct mention of Enoch in 2.2. Because of the uncertainty of associating frags. 2–3 with the rest of the 4Q206 fragments, the former are often designated as 4Q206a in recent publications (e.g., Tigchelaar, “Notes”). Puech considered frags. 2–3 to belong instead to 4Q533 (EnGiants*; DJD 31:111–13), Tigchelaar expressed similar doubts about their association with 4Q206 (“Notes,” 191–92), and Drawnel does not include them in his re-edition of 4Q206 (see ABE, 341). Based on the cautiousness of these scholars, it seems best to treat Milik’s 4Q206 2–3 as not belonging with the remaining fragments of this scroll.

Aside from frags. 2–3, which do not have any unambiguous, direct parallels with other copies of the Book of Giants (though see Stuckenbruck, DJD 36:46–48), 4Q206 contains fragmentary portions of the Book of Watchers and the Animal Apocalypse from the Book of Dreams. Most of the material from the Book of Watchers comes from Enoch’s tour of the cosmos in the Book’s latter part, after the account of the Watchers’ rebellion and the Lord’s judgment. These fragments correspond to various verses of 1 En. 21–22, 28–29, and 31–33, though one fragment appears to contain a few words from the throne room vision in 1 En. 14. The majority of the extant text comes

5 The various editors of this manuscript have numbered the fragments differently. This and the other profiles for the Aramaic Enoch manuscripts were created using Milik’s original numbering system, which is based heavily on reconstruction. Nevertheless, Drawnel’s updated numbering system is very useful, and should form the basis of future discussion. For a helpful chart comparing the different numbering systems for 4Q206, see Drawnel ABE, 340.
from the Animal Apocalypse, the best representative of this part of 1 Enoch among the Qumran manuscripts. We find portions of the Apocalypse that tell symbolically of Noah and the great flood, and the generations of Joseph and Moses. In general, the visionary genre of these parts of the Enochic corpus in 4Q206 invites comparison with many other Aramaic compositions from Qumran, on which see Perrin, Dynamics. More detailed connections with other Aramaic works also exist, such as the mention of שומקא [םמקא] (“the Red Sea”; 1xxvi.20), also found, with the same spelling, at 1Q20 (apGen) 21.17–18.

On PAM 43.204, among the other fragments considered by Milik belong to 4Q206 (which he at that time labelled “Hénochd”), are two small fragments that he did not include in his later edition. Drawnel included these in his re-edition of the scroll as possibly, but not certainly, belonging to it. However, he does not seem aware of Tigchelaar’s earlier treatment (Tigchelaar, “Notes,” 198–99), in which Tigchelaar proposed that Drawnel’s frag. 15 belongs instead to 4Q59 (Isa*).

Material remains: If we included all of the fragments that have, at various times, been associated with 4Q206, they would total eighteen (for an overview that does not include Milik’s frags. 2–3, see the helpful chart in Drawnel, ABE, 340). However, it seems best to remove from this list at least frags. 2–3, the fragment identified by Tigchelaar as belonging to 4Q59 (Drawnel’s frag. 15), and perhaps Milik’s frag. 1a, based on Tigchelaar’s reasoning. This leaves us with fourteen fragments belonging to 4Q206 with a reasonably high degree of confidence. The two largest fragments are 1b and 4a–b, each containing significant portions of multiple lines of text. Roughly half of the fragments are much smaller and preserve only a few words or broken phrases, including the three fragments not present in Milik’s edition (Drawnel’s frags. 14–16; Drawnel’s frag. 16 is Puech’s 4Q206 frag. 5). Fragment 4a–b preserves parts of two columns with traces of horizontal script lines, and there are upper, lower, and intercolumnar margins on several fragments. A few textual overlaps occur between fragments proposed to belong to 4Q206 and other copies of Enoch (4Q204 [En*] and 4Q205 [En*]) or the Book of Giants (4Q533/4Q556 [EnGiants*/Prophecy*]): 4Q206 1xxvi.14–17//4Q204 (En*) 1xii.28–30, 4Q206 4ii.12–16//4Q205 (En*) 2i.26–29, 4Q206 4iii.19–21//4Q205 2i.27–29, and perhaps 4Q206 3i.5–6//4Q533/4Q556 (EnGiants*/Prophecy*) 4.1–2.

Provenance: A large piece of Milik’s frag. 4b is found in an early PAM “G series” photograph (PAM 40.602), meaning that this fragment was among those discovered by Bedouin in 1952 (Strugnell, “Photographing,” 124, 131–32). In addition, Tigchelaar identified another part of frag. 4b and frag. 4f on the “E series” PAM image 40.978, connected with the official excavation of Cave 4 led by de Vaux in 1952. As a result, we can see that some fragments of this scroll were found by the Bedouin, and others by the official excavation team.
Material: Skin

Script: Late Hasmonean semi-cursive (Milik, Stuckenbruck); late Hasmonean or early Herodian formal bookhand (Drawnel)

Proposed palaeographic date: 100–50 BCE (Milik, Stuckenbruck); 75–25 BCE (Drawnel)

Special traits and general comments: Milik’s initial identification of the fragments belonging to this scroll has been repeatedly scrutinized, most notably by Stuckenbruck, Puech (DJD 3:12, 16, 111–12), Tigchelaar, and Drawnel. Based on the combined results of their enquiries, we should now consider frags. 2–3 to belong to a different manuscript, designated by Puech and others as 4Q206a (all those after Milik also reversed the order of the fragments). Tigchelaar further argued that even these two fragments exhibit differences, and may not belong together. He also made the plausible claim that Milik’s frag. 1a should be distinguished from the main group. All of this leaves us with 4Q206 1b–g, 4a–d as part of a single manuscript. Of course, this discussion should be kept in mind when using the “Profile of physical layout” section for this profile, since some of the variation there is, in fact, likely due to differing manuscripts.

As noted by Milik, the layout and dimensions of this manuscript appear aimed at economy, and are not as lavish as some of the other manuscripts in the Aramaic Qumran corpus. He observed that the lines in columns became “progressively more closely crammed together” (BE, 225), though it is clear that for the fragments where this appears to be case, the leather has become shrunken and puckered. It seems that this physical degradation better accounts for the apparently tight spacing than scribal dereliction. The scribal execution is, in fact, of quite high quality, and Milik probably made too little of the preserved vacats (so too Drawnel, ABE, 341), which are relatively generous for the minor nature of the sense divisions that they mark.

The script is slightly less meticulous than in the best Aramaic manuscripts (e.g., 1Q20 [apGen], 4Q529 [Words of Michael], 4Q537 [TJacob?]), and average in terms of neatness and consistency. Some letters are formed with a more “rounded” Hasmonean style. It is noteworthy that both the earlier ת and later, prefixed ד are present in this manuscript, something not found often in the Qumran Aramaic texts. This probably represents some vacillation between preservation (or oversight) of older spellings and updating on the part of the scribe making this copy, or those on which it depended. When the subject of a clause is supplied, it regularly precedes the verb, which is somewhat unusual, and may be a compositional characteristic of the Animal Apocalypse. The aleph-prefix causative verb is typically used, though the single preserved occurrence of the passive-reflexive is a התפעל form. On the expression עלא מן in 1xxvi.20 and 4i.20, see the profile for 2Q26 (EnGiants), and the relevant section of Chapter 3, on language.

Original manuscript quality: Good–very good

Select bibliography: Beyer, ATTM1, 225–58; Stuckenbruck, Giants, 191–96; Stuckenbruck, 1 Enoch, 51–52; Tigchelaar, “Notes.”
Script sample:

Corrections and scribal features:

(a) Supralinear letters added on two successive lines
   (ixxvii.20–21): [םנ[ה] / [ו]ומ[ה]

Language

Syntax:

Verb-subject (verb early in clause):
   4ii.3(?), 4ii.16, 4ii.21(?)

Subject-verb (verb early in clause):
   3i.20, 4i.18, 4i.20, 4i.21, 4ii.2, 4ii.15, 4ii.18(?), 4iii.15, 4iii.17

Subject-verb (verb later in clause):
   1xxii.3, 1xxii.4

Subject implied (verb early in clause):
   1xxii.3, 1xxvi.18, 1xxvi.19, 1xxvi.20(2x), 1xxvi.21, 1xxvii.1, 1xxvii.21, 4i.12, 4i.13, 4i.17(2x), 4iii.18

Verbless clause:
   1xxii.1, 1xxii.6, 4i.16, 4i.18, 4i.19, 4iii.14

Direct object marker (if present):
   –י: 4ii.18, 4ii.14

Use of מ to mark genitive relationship:
   1xxii.1

Use of מ to mark genitive relationship:
   1xxii.2, 4ii.13(?), י

Periphrastic construction (past/future continuative action):

Finite form of הוה + participle:
   3i.21, 3i.22, 4i.16(?), 4i.18

Lexical items:

די: 1xxii.2(2x), 1xxii.5

זי: 4ii.13, 4iii.16(?)

–ד: 1xxi.6(2x)

ת(ו)ש: 4ii.17

ם: 1xxii.3, 1xxvi.18

Morphology:

منظمات form:
   1xxvi.19, 1xxvi.20(2x), 1xxvii.21, 1xxvii.1, 1xxvii.21

רמל form:
   1xxvi.18(hofal)
Content synopsis and significance: The single fragment of 4Q207 preserves just over a dozen words identifiable as part of the Animal Apocalypse, from the Enochic Book of Dreams. The fragment corresponds to portions of the later Ethiopic 1 En. 86:1–3, which recounts the fall of the heavenly Watchers using symbolic astral and animal imagery. This is one of four copies of the Animal Apocalypse from Qumran, making it one of the best-attested portions of 1 Enoch among the Qumran scrolls (the Book of Watchers is also preserved in four copies). Of special note in 4Q207 is the common dream-vision idiom “Behold, then [I] saw[...” (תְּפֻלָּה), line 2), found much more widely among the Aramaic writings from Qumran (see Perrin, Dynamics, 102–3).

Material remains: Only one small fragment remains of this scroll, containing segments of five lines from which some of the writing has flaked off. The fragment comes from the right edge of a column of text, with a small part of the intercolumnar margin preserved. According to Milik’s and Drawnel’s reconstructions, the lines would once have been between fifty and fifty-five letters long (ABE, 395).

Notes on provenance: The single fragment of 4Q207 is not found on the early “E series” or “G series” PAM plates. While its discovery in Cave 4 is assured, the mode of that discovery was not documented.
Material: Skin

Script: Early Hasmonean (Milik, Drawnel); Milik (BE, 244) suggested that the same scribe wrote 4Q214a–b (his 4QTestLevi b)

Proposed palaeographic date: 150–125 BCE (Milik, Drawnel)

Special traits and general comments: Though there is not much remaining text by which to judge this fragment, it is clear that the scribal execution was of high quality, with small, consistent letters and generous spacing between lines. Nevertheless, where we might expect a small vacat in other manuscripts (midway through line 2, before הָא באדין), we find none in 4Q207. Milik notes the “fairly archaic” script in this manuscript, which according to his proposed date makes it one of our earliest preserved Aramaic scrolls at Qumran. He also asserted (BE, 5, 244) that the scribe who wrote this scroll also wrote what he called 4QTestLevi b, by which he meant 4Q214a–b (“Fragment,” 95, n. 2). Stone and Greenfield (see Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel, Aramaic Levi, 4) later complicated the situation by dividing this Levi manuscript into three, based on palaeographic analysis and what they saw as minor overlaps between the fragments’ contents: 4Q214 (Levi d), 4Q214a (Levi e), and 4Q214b (Levi f). Drawnel (Aramaic Wisdom, 21) agreed with this division, but noted that one could dispute the division of 4Q214a and 4Q214b (Aramaic Wisdom, 27; see also the profiles for 4Q214a [Levi e] and 4Q214b [Levi f]). Despite the small amount of writing preserved on 4Q207, the striking similarity of the preserved letters with the forms in 4Q214a–b confirms Milik’s original opinion, whether we consider 4Q214a–b (Levi e–f) one or two manuscripts. If it is the latter, it seems to me likely that they all were written by the same scribe. The script of 4Q541 (apocrLevi b?) also bears a strong resemblance to 4Q207 and 4Q214a–b (Levi e–f), though the orthography of 4Q541 (apocrLevi b?) varies in some slight ways from the other two manuscripts. In my opinion, there is a high likelihood that 4Q207 and 4Q214a–b (Levi e–f) were written by the same scribe, with a possibility that 4Q541 (apocrLevi b?) should be added to the list.

Original manuscript quality: Very good

Select bibliography: Stuckenbruck, 1 Enoch, 52.

Script sample:

Language

Lexical items:

מַיְנָא: 1.2

Orthography/Phonology:

ψ for /s/:

1.4
Content synopsis and significance: This manuscript preserved a highly formulaic computational treatise on the waxing and waning of the moon in its various phases, reckoned according to a system of “sevenths” (שבעים) and “gates” (שער). The treatise is both temporal and spatial, specifying the timing of the moon’s different phases, with its attending location on the horizon (see the excellent explanation in Ratzon, “Reconstruction”). A few references to the sun (e.g., frag. 10a) led Milik to include the manuscript as part of what he called a 364-day “synchronistic calendar,” coordinating the movements of the sun and moon over the course of “full” (30-day) and “hollow” (29-day) months. Drawnel, however, stressed the predominantly lunar character of what remains of this text, and so objected to the label “synchronistic calendar” as a misnomer (AAB, 32). Scholars have repeatedly drawn attention to a strong affinity between the contents of 4Q208 and 4Q209 (Enastrb), with the latter scroll also preserving parts of a calendar that works on the same basic principles as the former. There are no direct textual overlaps between 4Q208 and 4Q209 (Enastrb), though we do find shared formulaic phrases such as מנהרה שביעין חמשא (4Q209 15.2) and ובציר מנהורה שביעין חמשא (4Q209 [Enastrb] 71.6). Ratzon (“Reconstruction”) argued, based on very detailed comparative analysis of the two scrolls, that 4Q208 represents a slightly earlier stage in the development of the “synchronistic calendar” than 4Q209 (Enastrb) does, with the latter scroll incorporating some innovations based on observation of the calendar in actual practice. Nevertheless, Ratzon (“Reconstruction,” 109) maintained that the two scrolls are slightly different editions of “one and the same composition.” Although little text actually remains of 4Q208 – which must once have been a large scroll – significant portions of its contents can be reconstructed with a reasonable degree of confidence, based on how repetitive and formulaic the extant fragments are. Given the size of the scroll that would have been required for the “synchronistic calendar” represented by 4Q208, scholars have typically assumed that the Aramaic Astronomical Book of Enoch must have originally circulated independently of other Enochic writings (i.e., on its own, separate scroll), such as the Book of Watchers and the Epistle of Enoch.

Beginning with Milik, 4Q208 was closely associated with the astronomical chapters of Ethiopic 1 Enoch (72–82), a section often called the Astronomical Book or the Book of the Luminaries. The fragments of 4Q208 actually attest to a fuller, much more detailed calendar than is found anywhere in 1 Enoch, though 1 En. 734–8 and 786–17 have extremely truncated, essentialized extractions that use terminology clearly dependent on a calendar like that in 4Q208 (e.g., 1 En. 734–8 has both “sevenths” and “gates”). VanderKam (1 Enoch 2, 357) observed that, “[t]here is no doubt that something drastic happened between the Aramaic and the Ethiopic form of the Enochic astronomical work.” Unlike the related 4Q209 (Enastrb), all of the extant fragments of 4Q208 belong only to the “synchronistic calendar,” with no other parts of the later Ethiopic astronomical work attested. Based on the size of the scroll presumably required for the calendar of 4Q208 and the absence of any non-calendrical material in the scroll analogous to other parts of 1 Enoch 72–82, Tigchelaar expressed serious doubt about the strength of the relationship first suggested by Milik. In Tigchelaar’s opinion (“Remarks,” 145), “4Q208 was not a copy of the Astronomical Enoch, but only a Synchronistic Calendar.” Most others have taken a more restrained view, noting that Tigchelaar makes an argument from silence, and that the balance of probability favors some sort of literary relationship between 2Q208 and the later 1 Enoch (see, e.g., Nickelsburg and VanderKam, 1 Enoch 2, 342).

Whatever the precise relationship of 4Q208 to the Astronomical Book of Enoch, the scroll attests to Jewish calendrical interests during the Second Temple period, and to the promulgation of a 364-day calendar. As many scholars have noted, rival Jewish calendars seem to have been a cause of serious social divisions among Jews at that time.

Material remains: Thirty-seven fragments have been assigned to 4Q208 (Ratzon, “Reconstruction,” counts thirty-six fragments), of which the majority are very small, containing only a handful of words and phrases on three or fewer broken lines of text (e.g., frags. 2–4, 6–9, 10b–13, 20–22). A few of the larger fragments preserve parts of five to ten lines, but even these are very badly damaged and contain little running text (e.g., frags. 10a, 15–17, 19, 24). The largest fragments are 10a and 24, the outside measurements of which are slightly smaller than a standard playing card. Fragments 10a, 14, 24, and 35 have intercolumnar margins, and there is a lower margin on frag. 35. Evidence of stitching can be found on frags. 10a, 31, and 35. There are no signs of vertical or horizontal scribal guidelines. Drawnel has suggested that the manuscript’s poor state of preservation makes it difficult to...
reconstruct the original size of the manuscript or its columns (Astronomical, 71–72), though see now the extensive discussion of Ratzon (“Reconstruction”) on this topic. 

Notes on provenance: The fragments of 4Q208 are not found on the early “E series” or “G series” PAM plates. While their discovery in Cave 4 is assured, the mode of that discovery was not documented.
Material: Skin

Script: Archaic Hasmonean semi-formal (Milik, García Martínez and Tigchelaar, and Drawnel)

Proposed palaeographic date: Ca. 225–175 BCE (Milik, García Martínez and Tigchelaar, and Drawnel)

Radiocarbon date (1-sigma calibration): 166–102 BCE (see Van der Schoor, “Radiocarbon”)

Special traits and general comments: There are several noteworthy attributes of this manuscript. The scribe used only medial letters, including in final positions, and exhibits an unusual variation in the spacing of both lines and words, eliciting Milik’s remark that the “orthography is extremely variable and unusual” (BE, 273). He noted the striking variation in spelling the word “day” (יוממ, יומם, ויומים, ויומא) to which we could add “night” (ليل, לייל, לאיל, לילא, and לילא). There are several corrections that seem due to scribal mistakes at the point of copying, rather than later additions or variation in the available versions. Fragment 33 has considerably smaller script than in other fragments, despite a general correspondence in the type of content. One of the lines (33.2) appears to be supralinear. The shorter form of the demonstrative pronoun (דנ) is always used in the extant fragments. Two basic frameworks for reconstruction have been proposed, of which Ratzon’s (“Reconstruction”) seems more likely based only on the size and shape of her columns compared to the broader corpus of scrolls found in the Qumran caves.

It is somewhat difficult to compare the syntax and general style of this manuscript with other Aramaic texts (apart from 4Q209–211 [Enastrb–d]) because the list-like content entails a highly repetitive, formulaic recurrence of syntactic structures. The presumed subject of all verbs is the moon or its light, but the subject is almost always implied, not stated explicitly (though in a great many cases we have the verb directly preceding a break in the text). The one exception to this, based not only on 4Q208 but also 4Q209 (Enastrb), is the verb שוה, which regularly takes the noun נורה (“light”) as its subject (cf. 4Q208 19.5, 4Q209 [Enastrb] 11.6). For this reason, I have included all occurrences of נורה under “Verb-subject (verb early in clause)” in the syntax section below, even when the text is fragmentary and the subject not physically preserved. A similar rule applies for the verb יאש, which, judging from 4Q209 (Enastrb; e.g., 2ii.7, 6.7), belongs to a set phrase where the verb is typically placed later in the clause. The word הביא (never יאש) is repeatedly used to begin a new thought expression, or progression in the computation. Of the nine places where we seem to have הביא beginning a new sub-section, only one appears to be preceded by a small vacat of 4 mm. This contrasts with what appears to be a more frequent use of vacats in the comparable lists of 4Q209–211 (Enastrb–d).

Original manuscript quality: Good

Script sample:

Representative sample of corrections and scribal features:

(a) Medial nun in final position and tav written over another letter, possibly nun (so Drawnel; 5.2): תרינ

(b) Mem written over another letter, possibly qoph (so Drawnel; 15.4): בימימא

(c) Cancellation dot (16.4): יֵל

(d) Cancellation dots above letters (18.2): יֵל
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4Q209, Astronomical Enoch\(^b\)

[ed. Milik, BE, 273–97; Tigchelaar and García Martínez, DJD 36:132–171; Drawnel, AAB, 134–208]
twelve gates: "the sky in their completeness, and their division [I] have shown ..."
The word שְׁמוֹא signals that the Aramaic Astronomical Book of 4Q209 had a visionary narrative framework in which Enoch is the speaker and his son Methuselah the recipient, as we find in the later Ethiopic version. This narrative framework is also evident in frags. 25–26, the latter of which contains the phrase "And now I am showing you, my son ..." (cf. 1 En. 79:1). 4Q209 23–26 provide clear evidence that, in this scroll, the "synchronistic calendar" was combined with other parts of the Aramaic Astronomical Book that stand in a clear literary relationship to the later Ethiopic version. The same fragments show that the calendar in the Enochic Astronomical Book was once the extensive "synchronistic" one found in the Aramaic copies from Qumran – 4Q308 (Enastr) and 4Q209 – but that this calendar was abridged (and became somewhat confused) at a later stage of transmission, leading to the form now found in Ethiopic 1 Enoch.

Material remains: 4Q209 comprises forty-one numbered fragments, though a significant portion of them are actually made up of multiple pieces (e.g., frags. 1–3, 6, 7). The largest fragment by far is 7, the outside dimensions of which are nearly those of a small, quarto-sized book. This fragment has parts of three separate columns preserved, though almost nothing remains of the first column. However, significant sections remain of the second and third columns, which along with frag. 23 (approximately the size of a playing card) give an impression of the overall manuscript quality. Seven lines from the second column of frag. 7 are completely (or almost completely) intact, providing us with a sense of the width of the scroll's columns. There is a handful of smaller, but still relatively well-preserved fragments with between six and ten fragmentary lines of text (e.g., frags. 1a, 2, 6, 23, and 26). Over half of the scroll's fragments are nothing more than tiny scraps, containing only a few words or phrases (frags. 1b, 10, 11–22, 24–25, 27, 29–41). We find evidence of stitching on frag. 23, and fully or partially preserved column margins on frags. 1a, 1b, 2, 7, 12, and 23. The only direct overlap with another Qumran manuscript is at 4Q209 23.5–8//4Q210 (Enastr) iiia+b+c.15–18, corresponding to 1 En. 77:2–3.

Notes on provenance: Some fragments of 4Q209 (23, and portions of 2ii, 6 and 7) were photographed as part of the PAM "G series," the relevant plates being PAM 40.581 (various pieces of frag. 2), 40.586 (the left, lower piece of frag. 6), 40.614 (the main piece of frag. 7), and 40.622 (frag. 23). The fragments in this series of images are said to have been discovered in 1952 by the Bedouin in Cave 4 (Strugnell, "Photographing," 124, 131–32), prior to de Vaux's official excavations of Cave 4 from September 22 to 29, 1952.
Material: Skin

Script: Early Herodian formal (Milik, Drawnel)

Proposed palaeographic date: 25 BCE–25 CE (Milik, Drawnel)

Special traits and general comments: 4Q209 is a very high-quality copy, comparable in most respects to the best manuscripts such as 1Q20 (apGen) and 4Q529 (Words of Michael). The scribe wrote in an impeccable, small print that is remarkably consistent in size and shape. Generous empty space is left on the copy, though slightly less than in 1Q20 (apGen). Milik (BE, 273) observed that 4Q209 was “written in the same beautiful Herodian script as 1Q5a,b, 1Q5M, 1QGenAp, and the original hand of 1QH,” though it is unclear whether he thought that the scripts were simply of a very similar style, or that all of these scrolls were penned by the same scribe. In contrast to 4Q208 (Enastrª), with which the content of 4Q209 is similar, in 4Q209 there are many vacats used to indicate minor breaks in thought, and the spelling is far more consistent. For example, where 4Q208 has four different spellings for the word ימשהו “day,” 4Q209 has ימשהו alone in twenty-three fully (or nearly-fully) extant occurrences of the word. A large vacat may have been employed on frag. 2i, though it is no longer possible to judge its size or whether it marked a major sense division. What is left of the manuscript is remarkably free of errors and corrections, though in 23.4 the scribe seems to have mistakenly written an aleph instead of ayin for the word ימשהו. He then immediately fixed it by erasing the first two letters and starting the word over again. Drawnel claims to find another corrected mistake in the 23.5, though this was noticed neither by Milik nor Tigchelaar and García Martínez. In fact, what Drawnel claims is the long down-stroke of the goph is actually a crack in the leather, while the regular downstroke of the resh is preserved and unaltered. At certain junctures this scribe shows a penchant for full spellings using aleph (e.g., זך in 32.3 and זך in 39.1) as also found in numerous other Aramaic Qumran texts – for example, 1Q20 (apGen), 2Q24 (NJ), 4Q205 (Enª), and 4Q550 (Jews at the Persian Court).

A surprising practice of the scribe (or his exemplar) is the habit of collapsing the preposition מ into its prefixed form as part of the phrase מנהירָה “from the light”), thus assimilating the nun of מ into the noun מנהירה. Such a prefixed form of מ is extremely rare in the Aramaic texts from Qumran, the only other possible occurrences being at 4Q60 (Job ii.2, 4Q546 (apocGen) ii.2(?), 4Q518 (Zoology and Bronatology) viii.9, 4Q339 (List of False Prophets) 3, 4Q553 (Four Kingdoms) viii.3(?), and several times in 11Q10 (Job). It is worth noting that most of these texts are of a different literary character than the bulk of the Aramaic works from Qumran, being translations, physiognomic treatises, lists of names, etc. It is also interesting that the expression מנהירה מנהירה is found, spelled fully, in an analogous context in the older 4Q208 (Enastrª) 15.2: מנהירה מנהירה מעזר (compare to 4Q209 7ii.6, ביאר). Here we see that 4Q209 also does not carry over the lamed as marker of the direct object, as is the case in 4Q208 (Enastrª). 4Q209 presumably attests to a later, slightly altered version of the expression, which would complement Ratzon’s proposal (“Reconstruction”) that the calendar of 4Q209 has been updated from the version present in 4Q208 (Enastrª). Another notable linguistic feature is the double use of

### PROFILE OF PHYSICAL LAYOUT

**Margins:**

*Lower:* 2.3–2.7 cm (frag. 7)

**Intercolumnar:** Approx. 1.7 cm (1.5 cm to sewn sheet seam on frag. 23)

**Column dimensions:**

Approx. 10 cm w. x 26 cm h. (height based on line estimates of Milik and Tigchelaar and García Martínez)

**Lines per column:**

Approx. 40 (Milik’s and Tigchelaar and Garcia Martínez’s reconstructions)

**Letters per line:**

Approx. 5 of 2–80 letters per line

**Scribal guidelines:**

*Horizontal script lines:* Yes

*Vertical column lines:* Yes

**Average medial letter height:** 2 mm

**Space between lines:** 6–7 mm

**Space between words:** 0.5–1 mm

**Vacats:** Yes; small (e.g., 2ii.9 [9 mm], 2ii.11 [9 mm]) and medium (e.g., 2ii.4 [1.3 cm], 2ii.5 [1.9 cm]), all minor sense divisions; 15 preserved in total

---

Daniel Machiela - 9789084513815

Downloaded from Brill.com 16/19/2023 05:38:50PM
via Open Access. This is an open access title distributed under the terms of the CC BY-NC-ND 4.0 license, which permits any non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided no alterations are made and the original author(s) and source are credited. 
https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/
the adjective/noun in the expressions (all of this day, all of it) and (all of this night, all of it); cf. 6.8 for an example without the second (ל). This same construction is known from several other Qumran Aramaic texts (e.g., 1Q20 [apGen], 4Q212 [Ena]). Like 4Q208 (Enastr) and most other Aramaic texts from Qumran, the scribe of 4Q209 preferred יד to זל for the demonstrative pronoun. On the reason for placing the verbs and the same in the “Verb-subject (verb early in clause)” and “Subject implied (verb later in clause)” categories of the language section, below, even when the phrases are incomplete, see the profile for 4Q208 (Enastr). As is often the case for our scribes, etymological sin (שון) and samek (סם) are correctly distinguished from each other, though something curious happens with the participle ומכנסים in 23.6 (see also 4Q210 [Enastr] ii2a.17). This is the well-known Hebrew root for “to gather, assemble,” for which Aramaic uses the root ומכא, one of the language section below, with alternative syntactic arrangements and transition words (ה, וה, והר) including the heavy use of participles to suspend the narrative in a way different than we find in the computational treatise. Several words and phrases warrant brief comment: the word תשמח (“calculation”) is a Leitwort in this section (3x in frags. 25–27), and is spelled as in 1Q20 (apGen) 6.9 and other Qumran texts (e.g., 4Q204 [Ena] xvii.24; 4Q534 [Birth of Noah] 11.15; 4Q547 [Visions of Amram] 3.4). In these and other cases the connection seems to be thematic in addition to lexical. Another word is the adverb בדולתי (“whence”; this is the Biblical Hebrew form), which is spelled (and presumably pronounced) the same as in an array of other Qumran Aramaic texts (1Q20 [apGen] 19.15; 4Q213a [Levi] 1.11; 4Q550 [Jews at the Persian Court] iii.4; 4Q553 [Four Kingdoms] 8i.11; and 11Q10 [Job] 25.7). It is not known in earlier dialects, though continues on in later Palestinian forms of the language. Finally, the clause כען לך מחוה אנה ברי (26.6) is strikingly similar to a statement in 1Q20 (apGen) 5.20 (כען לך מחוה אנה ברי) and also resembles 4Q548 [Visions of Amram] iii–iv.9 (כען לך מחוה אנה ברי) and 4Q543 [Visions of Amram] 1a–c.2.

Original manuscript quality: Excellent


Script sample:
Corrections and scribal features:

(a) Characters erased (23.4):

(b) Supralinear letter added (2ii.2):

No image available

Language

Syntax:

Verb-subject (verb early in clause):
- iai.2(?), iai.5(?), iai.6, ib.2, ii.1(?), ii.3(?), 3.4(?), 6.9(2x), 7ii.1, 7ii.5, 7ii.7, 8.4, 23.10(?), 25.3(?), 26.6(part.), 35.2(?)

Subject-verb (verb early in clause):
- 7ii.2–3(?), 7ii.6, 34.2

Verb-subject (verb later in clause):
- 23.3(part.), 23.6(part.), 23.7(part.)

Subject-verb (verb later in clause):
- 26.4(?)

Subject implied (verb early in clause):
- iai.1(?), iai.4(?), iai.6, iai.7, ii.1, ii.5, ii.6, ii.7, ii.8, ii.10, ii.11, 3.7, 4.8(?), 5.3(?), 5.5, 5.6(?), 6.4, 6.5(?), 6.6(?), 6.7, 6.8(2x), 7ii.3, 7ii.4(2x), 7ii.5, 7ii.6, 7ii.7(2x), 7ii.8(2x), 7ii.9, 7ii.10(3x), 7ii.11, 7ii.12, 7ii.13, 7ii.1, 7ii.2(part.), 7ii.3, 7ii.4(2x?), 7ii.5, 7ii.6, 7ii.7, 9.1, 9.2, 9.3, 12.2(?), 13.1, 14.2(?), 16.4(?), 19.1(?), 22.2(?), 23.3(part.), 23.5(part.), 23.6(2x, both part.)

Subject implied (verb later in clause):
- 2ii.7, 5.4, 6.5, 6.7, 7ii.3, 7ii.6, 7ii.9, 7ii.12, 16.3(?), 18.1(?), 23.2(?), 23.7, 25.3, 37.2(?)

Verbless clause:
- 23.4, 23.5, 26.4, 26.5

Object early in clause:
- 23.2(?), 23.4, 25.3

Direct object marker (if present):
- ה: 23.3: 23.4

Double לום נביה construction:
- ii.5, 8.2

Verb of movement + ה + inanimate object:
- 23.6

Lexical items:

Verb-subject:
- iai.1, iai.10, 2ii.4, 2ii.6, 2ii.10, 5.5, 5.6, 5.7, 6.8, 7ii.1, 7ii.4, 7ii.7, 7ii.8, 7ii.10, 7ii.11, 7ii.1, 7ii.5, 7ii.6, 9.1, 9.2, 9.3, 9.4, 17.1, 33.3, 36.2(?)

Supralinear:
- 23.4, 23.5, 23.6, 23.7(2x), 26.2(?)

Verbless:
- 26.4

Object early in clause:
- 26.6

Lexical items:

Verbless:
- 23.3, 23.4, 23.7

Morphology:

Aפעל form:
- iai.5, iai.7, 2ii.4, 2ii.6, 2ii.10, 5.5, 7ii.4, 7ii.7, 7ii.8, 12.2, 13.1, 16.4, 39.1

Verbless:
- 26.4(?)

Assimilated nun:
- 6.5, 6.7, 7ii.3, 7ii.6, 7ii.9, 7ii.12, 14.2, 23.5(2x?), 23.7(?)

Orthography/Phonology:

ש for /s/:
- ib.1, ii.2, 2ii.6, 2ii.7, 5.4, 6.7, 7ii.6, 7ii.9, 8.3, 16.3

Other notable features:

Proposed Hebraisms:

 Newly formed (lexical; 23.6)
 מאי (lexical/morphological; 23.5. 7)
 מאי(לי) (lexical; 23.7) [H]
 למשהים (lexical; 28.1) [H]

Previously unattested in Aramaic:

Verbless:
- בות (verbal root; 23.6)

Verbless:
- 23.5, 7)
4Q210, Astronomical Enochc (Enastrc)
[ed. Milik, BE, 273–97; Drawnel, AAB, 209–26]

Content synopsis and significance: This manuscript contains portions of the Enochic Astronomical Book now found in the later, and somewhat altered, Ethiopic 1 Enoch 72–82. The extant text of 4Q210 corresponds to various portions of 1 Enoch 76–78. In 1 Enoch 76–77 (cf. 4Q210 ii–ii), we learn about the division of the sky into twelve “gates” (תרעיא), three for each of the four cardinal directions or quarters. Each gate (or quarter) is closely associated with its “winds” (רוחיא), various other meteorological phenomena, and qualitative effects such as healing and devastation. While the Aramaic text of 4Q210 is not identical to the later Ethiopic Astronomical Book, the two versions are so similar that a clear literary relationship is beyond doubt; we have here earlier and later versions of the same composition. Judging by the Ethiopic Astronomical Book and the overlap of 4Q210 with part of 4Q209 (Enastrb), it is evident that the contents of 4Q210 are part of an angelic tour of the wonders of the created order given by Uriel to Enoch, which Enoch is in turn relating to his son Methuselah (cf. 1 En. 723, 742, 754, 7614, 7810, 791; 4Q209 [Enastrb] 26.6). As noted in many of the other profiles, such apocalyptic revelations are a regular feature of the Aramaic literature found at Qumran (see Perrin, Dynamics).

Material remains: 4Q210 comprises five fragments. The first and largest fragment (ii–iii; approximately the size of a standard playing card) preserves parts of two columns on two separate sheets, with the stitching still intact for what remains of the seam, using plant-based thread. No text from the first column remains, but nine partial lines from the second column have survived. Ink dots for making the horizontal script guidelines are clearly visible on the right side of the seam, and also on the left side of the sheet seam on frag. iiiia. Three fragments (iiia, ii 2b, and iiia2c) also belong to the second column of frag. ii–iii, according to the reconstructions of Milik (BE, 287) and Drawnel (AAB, 209). They consider the final fragment (iii) to preserve material from a third, successive column. The only direct overlap with another Qumran manuscript is at 4Q210 iiia+b+c.15–18//4Q209 (Enastrb) 23.5–8, corresponding to 1 En. 77:2–3.

Notes on provenance: The fragments of 4Q210 are not found on the early “E series” or “G series” PAM plates. While their discovery in Cave 4 is assured, the mode of that discovery was not documented.

Sample image: 4Q210 ii–iii i
Image B-284661
COURTESY OF THE LEON LEVY DEAD SEA SCROLLS
DIGITAL LIBRARY, ISRAEL ANTIQUITIES AUTHORITY.
PHOTO: NAJIB ANTON ALBINA
Material: Skin

Script: Late Hasmonean ([Milik, Drawnel [comparable to the script of 4QSam]])

Proposed palaeographic date: 75–25 BCE (Milik, Drawnel)

Special traits and general comments: Some of the material features of this manuscript indicate a level of professional care and expense that might be placed in the “Good–very good” category for quality. The scribe left generous vacats between minor breaks in the narrative, and in general the spacing and consistency of the script is quite even. At the same time, however, the scribe made many mistakes – or at least what were perceived to be mistakes – in the meager amount of text preserved. There are at least nine errors, depending upon how one counts ([Milik and Drawnel count more]), in twenty-one very fragmentary lines. These include starting to write one letter and changing it to another, writing letters that do not make sense in the context, adding supralinear words that had been missed during the initial writing process, and going back to change letters and words once they had been written – often with poor results. We are fortunate to have a parallel to parts of the text in 4Q209 (Enastrb), and this allows us to guess what the scribe may have been thinking while emending (corrections in 4Q210 appear to be in the same hand as the original). For example, 4Q209 (Enastrb) has what looks to be the Hebrew word 민אן (“whence”) rather than the expected Aramaic 미אן in 23.5 and 7 (as in, e.g., 4Q197 [Tobitb] 4iii.5). The scribe of 4Q210 had also written this form originally, or something close to it (both 미אן and 민אן), then apparently had second thoughts and decided to convert them to a form closer to 민אן (מעין and Pixels). In 1ii2a.16 the scribe wrote 민אן two words after the corrected 미אן. In general, the scribe corrected forms with an assimilated nun into dissimilated forms (though he did not do so for 민אן in 1ii2a.17). The Hebrew word דוֹלַק (‘shining’) was used in 4Q209 (Enastrb) 23.7 to forge a connection with the (also Hebrew) cardinal direction דָּוָלַק, though we may assume that for etymological reasons the scribe/author of 4Q209 (Enastrb) or of its exemplar diverged purposefully from the analogous Aramaic דכחוק and דָּוָלָק, since both of those words are also used elsewhere in his text. The scribe of 4Q210, on the other hand, changed halfway back to the Aramaic by converting the zayin of דוֹלַק to dalet – actually, twice (both through overwriting and supralinear addition) just for good measure. This both obscured the etymological link present in 4Q209 (Enastrb) and created a word that works in neither language, as noted by Beyer (ATTM; it might be thought that changing the letter was a historicizing move, on analogy with the older ד and younger ד, but in fact our earliest examples of ד and 미דה ד in the fifth century BCE are with dalet).

The use of מִָּיִָן (‘[And] after it’; 1ii1.9; 1 En. 76:10) is of potential significance, for there the phrase (a conflation of the preposition ב, the noun מִָּיִָן [‘place’], and a pronominal suffix ה; lit. “in its place”) is used prepositionally to indicate spatial or chronological succession. When we look at the Ethiopic version, it appears that a similar expression was also employed at the beginning of 1 En. 76:7 and 12 as a repetitive literary transition between each set of three gates under discussion in this section. The Aramaic text uses a singular suffix (“after it”), referring back either to the...
last individual gate mentioned, or collectively the previous three gates. In the Ethiopic version, however, this has justifiably been adjusted to the plural "after these," specifying the three previous gates. The significance of this observation lies in a resulting parallel with other Qumran Aramaic works, such as Daniel and the Genesis Apocryphon (1Q20). In Dan 7:6–7, during one of the prophet's visions, the introductory phrase באתר דנה ("after this") is used twice in succession to indicate a list-like narrative movement between symbolic beasts. In col. 17 of the Genesis Apocryphon the word בתרה ("after him") is used similarly, though more extensively (at least six times), to mark movement from one of Noah's sons to the next in a catalogue of their geographic allotments (cf. 4Q246 [apocrDan] ii.a.1). Together, these texts attest to a common idiom used to signify repeated succession. While this use is well known from later dialects, such as Syriac, it is not common – perhaps not even attested – in earlier forms of the language.⁶

Original manuscript quality: Good

Select bibliography: Beyer, ATTMy, 251–58; Stuckenbruck, 1 Enoch, 57–59; Ben-Dov, Astronomy, 69–108; Nickelsburg and VanderKam, 1 Enoch 2, 339–42.

Script sample:

Representative sample of corrections and scribal features:

(b) Supralinear letters added and erasure (1ii2a.16): שְמִיא
(b) Supralinear letter added and letter conversion (?) (1ii2a.18): יָד מָאֵינ
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PHOTO: NAJIB ANTON ALBINA

⁶ While one fifth–fourth century BCE graffito from Sardinia may preserve a single attestation of the prepositional use of the word, the meaning remains somewhat uncertain. For the Sardinia text and other early uses of בתרה (which tend to stay more strictly with the nominal sense of "place" for באתר/אשר), see Schwiderski, DARI1, 364; DARI2, 94.
Language (Numbering Follows Drawnel, AAB)

Syntax:
- Verb-subject (verb early in clause):
  - iii1.9, iiri2a.14
- Verb-subject (verb later in clause):
  - iii1.4, iii1.5, iii1.7(?), iiiri2a.17(part.), iiiri2a.18(part.)
- Subject implied (verb early in clause):
  - iii1.2(?), iii1.8(part.), iiiri2a.15(part.), iii1.5(part.), iii1.6
- Verbellce clause:
  - iii1.1, iii1.6, iiiri2a.15
- Direct object marker (if present):
  - ⃞: iii1.8, iiiri2a.15
- Verb of movement + ⃞ + inanimate object:
  - iiiri2a–b.17(?)

Lexical items:
- בדיא: iiiri2a.15
- ירבד: iii1.1, iii1.9
- יד: iii1.1, iii1.3(2x), iii1.4, iii1.6, iii1.8, iiiri2a.18

Morphology:
- למתać form:
  - iii1.2
- למתט form:
  - iiiri2a.18, iii1.3

Content synopsis and significance: Though relatively small in terms of its preserved text, 4Q211 is of interest for the study of 1 Enoch because it contains a portion of the Aramaic Astronomical Book that scholars assume was lost in later Greek or Ethiopic transmission. 1 Enoch 82:25–23, the concluding section of the Ethiopic Astronomical Book, has descriptions of the spring and summer seasons, but no corresponding descriptions of fall and winter. In the first column of 4Q211 (frag. 11), we find a description of winter that matches fairly well those of spring and summer in the Ethiopic version, including an account of the trees during that season, and other associated natural phenomena such as rain and dew. These correspondences have led some scholars to posit that the description of winter belongs at or near the end of the Aramaic version of the Astronomical Book (note, however, the cautionary comments of VanderKam in Nickelsburg and VanderKam, 1 Enoch 2, 566). In the second and third columns, after the description of winter, we find astral calculations generally reminiscent of the kinds of calendrical computation present in 4Q208–210 (Enastr)c, on which see Nickelsburg and VanderKam, 1 Enoch 2, 567. The calculations of 4Q211, however, have no direct parallels in 1 Enoch or the extant parts of the other Qumran copies of the Aramaic Astronomical Book. This suggests that the Aramaic version may have had yet other, now-lost sections of the Enochic Astronomical Book that did not survive the chain of transmission to the Ethiopic version. Along with the “synchronistic calendar” of 4Q208 (Enastrd), and especially 4Q209 (Enastrd), 4Q211 provides evidence that the early Aramaic Astronomical Book was significantly more extensive than the later, Ethiopic version, the latter having been abbreviated and reorganized over centuries of transmission through Greek and into Ethiopic.
Material remains: This manuscript preserves the remnants of three consecutive columns, skillfully arranged by Milik in “two composite fragments” (Drawnel, AAB, 227; see Milik, BE, 296). The first composite fragment (frag. i) was produced by joining two smaller pieces, and the second (frag. iii–iii) is also made up of two separate pieces. The material joins are certain, in the studied opinion Drawnel (AAB, 227), and as a result the manuscript is typically numbered as a single fragment (frag. 1) with three columns, despite its composite character. Arranged thus, 4Q211 is approximately the length of a quarto-sized book (ca. 22 cm), though it is only a few centimeters high at its tallest point. Its shape resembles that of a measuring ruler.

Notes on provenance: A large piece of the right-most “composite fragment” of 4Q211 ii–ii is found on an early PAM “G series” photographic plate (PAM 40.619), meaning that this fragment, at least, was among those discovered by Bedouin in 1952 (Strugnell, "Photographing," 124, 131–32).
**PROFILE OF PHYSICAL LAYOUT**

**Margins:**

*Intercolumnar:* 1–1.5 cm

**Letters per line:** Approx. 40

(based on two reconstructed lines from Drawnel)

**Scribal guidelines:**

*Horizontal script lines:* Yes

*Vertical column lines:* None visible

**Average medial letter height:** 2–3 mm

**Space between lines:** 6 mm

**Space between words:** 1–2 mm

**Vacats:** Yes; small (i.6 [1 cm]; minor sense division), and large (i.6 [at least 4 cm]; minor sense division?)

---

**Material:** Skin

**Script:** Late Hasmonean to early Herodian (Milik); late Hasmonean formal (Drawnel)

**Proposed palaeographic date:** 50–1 BCE (Milik)

**Special traits and general comments:** This manuscript, while not very well-preserved, exhibits tidiness and economy of layout, neat handwriting, few mistakes or corrections, and the clear use of vacats, some of significant length. The columns, margins, and line spacing are narrower than in 4Q209 (Enastrb) or 4Q210 (Enastrc), though the scribal execution is otherwise excellent. The language and orthography of 4Q211 fit well the overall profile of most Qumran manuscripts, though one may note the repeated use of the subject to head a clause in the description of winter, and the correct use of etymological *sin* in words such as *עָשָׁב*, *שָׁוָא*, and *עָשֶׂה*, the last of which exhibits some variation (with *samek*) across the Qumran corpus. This was clearly a meticulous, well-trained scribe producing a high-quality manuscript. On the phrase הָּּּּמָּאָּבָּתָּ בַּיָּמִּּוּ in i.iii.4, where Milik apparently understands the first word to be a Hebraism, see the comments of Stadel (Hebraismen, 95) and Drawnel (AAB, 419).

**Original manuscript quality:** Very good

Language

Syntax:
- Verb-subject (verb early in clause):
  - 1i.3(?)
- Subject-verb (verb early in clause):
  - 1i.2(?), 1i.4, 1i.4–5(?), 1ii.6(?; part.), 1ii.4
- Subject implied (verb early in clause):
  - 1ii.4(?)
- Verbless clause:
  - 1i.5
- Verb of movement + על + inanimate object: 1i.2(?)

Lexical items:
- כי: 1i.5

Morphology:
- Assimilated nun:
  - 1i.2

Orthography/Phonology:
- ש for /s/:
  - 1i.5, 1ii.3, 1ii.5, 1ii.6, 1iii.6

Other notable features:
- Proposed Hebraism:
  - והאותה (lexical/morphological; 1iii.4) [H]

Content synopsis and significance: This manuscript is the only one at Qumran to preserve segments of the Epistle of Enoch with its narrative introduction (= 1 En. 91–105), including the Apocalypse of Weeks (= 1 En. 931–10, 931–17). 4Q212 makes a major contribution to the study of 1 Enoch by showing that the original Aramaic Epistle was altered considerably by the time it reached its current form in the Ethiopic versions. Some sections of the Aramaic copy require a text longer than in the Ethiopic 1 Enoch, sometimes much longer. At other points we find that the Aramaic version is shorter than the Ethiopic. The Qumran scroll also confirmed the opinion of scholars that the ordering of verses in the Ethiopic versions of the Epistle had at some point during transmission become confused, with 4Q212 seeming to preserve a more original, intelligible arrangement of the text. According to Milik’s placement of the fragments, which has been debated (see Drawnel, ABE, 402–3), the extant text begins with Enoch’s wisdom exhortation, commanding his sons to follow the ways of righteousness and spurn the paths of the wicked (iii). This is followed by the narration of a dream-vision (the Apocalypse of Weeks), in which Enoch relates future events according to a scheme of ten “weeks,” culminating...
in eschatological judgment (iii–iv). In Milik's last column (iv), we find a fragmentary meditation on the preceding vision, which leads to instruction on the two, opposed paths of righteousness and wickedness. 4Q212 attests to the early date of the Epistle of Enoch, including the Apocalypse of Weeks, and to their composition in Aramaic. The wisdom sections of the Epistle build on biblical exemplars such as Proverbs and Psalms, recasting them in a new mold and placing them in the mouth of one of Israel's most venerable ancestors. Very similar episodes of wisdom teaching are found in a significant number of other Aramaic works at Qumran (Machiela, “Wisdom”). Something similar can be said about the literary mode and contents of the dream-vision in the Apocalypse of Weeks. Drawing on some possible antecedents in the ancestral Hebrew literature of Israel, a surprising number of the Aramaic texts at Qumran share the visionary framework employed in the Apocalypse of Weeks for transmitting heavenly knowledge to humans (see Perrin, Dynamics).

Material remains: Both Milik and Drawnel counted three fairly large fragments of this manuscript, and two or three very small ones (Milik counts two, and Drawnel three; see Drawnel, ABE, 402). The largest fragment, 1c, actually comprises several separate pieces, which together preserve three partial columns of text. The best-preserved, central column is incomplete, but contains parts of sixteen lines and a bottom margin. The outer dimensions of frag. 1c are roughly the size of a standard quarto book page. Fragment 1b evidently contains the bottom, right-hand corner of the first (right-most) column of 1c, confirming that the fragments belong to the same manuscript (Drawnel, ABE, 403). Fragment 1a has the remnants of two columns, though only two letters are preserved of the first column. Intercolumnar margins are preserved on frags. 1a, 1b, and 1c, along with fully in-tact lower margins on frags. 1b and 1c. There are no traces of horizontal or vertical scribal guidelines (Drawnel, ABE, 403).

Notes on provenance: Some fragments of 4Q212 were photographed as part of the PAM “G series” on plates 40.604 (frag. 1b), 40.624 (part of the first two columns of frag. 1c), and 40.610 (part of the last column of frag. 1c). The fragments in this series of images are said to have been discovered by the Bedouin in Cave 4 (Strugnell, “Photographing,” 124, 131–32).
**Profile of Physical Layout**

**Margins:**
- **Lower:** 1.2–1.4 cm
- **Intercolumnar:** 0.3–2.4 cm

**Column dimensions:**
- Approx. 16 cm h. × 13.5 cm w. (height based on Milik’s reconstruction)

**Lines per column:** 25–26 (Milik; 16 preserved); 16 (Tigchelaar); see Drawnel, *ABE*, 430–31

**Average medial letter height:** 3–4 mm

**Space between lines:** 6–8 mm (regularly 3–4 mm)

**Letters per line:** Approx. 35 (based on iv)

**Scribal guidelines:**
- **Horizontal script lines:** No
- **Vertical column lines:** No

**Space between words:** 1–6 mm (typically 1–2 mm)

**Vacats:** None preserved

---

**Material:** Skin

**Script:** Herodian semi-cursive (Cross, Milik); late Hasmonean with cursive features (Drawnel)

**Proposed palaeographic date:** 50–1 BCE (Cross); 75–25 BCE (Milik)

**Special traits and general comments:** This is an interesting copy, written in the first century BCE (if the standard dating is correct), but clearly based on an earlier manuscript judging by the archaisms and the uncharacteristically defective orthography, in comparison with the Aramaic Qumran scrolls more generally. The letters are relatively large, but the overall layout of the text compact, with large fluctuations in intercolumnar margins and spacing between lines and words. The script itself must have been written in greater haste, with less precision, or by a less expert scribe than that of finer manuscripts (e.g., 1Q20 [apGen], 4Q544 [Visions of Amram b], and 4Q205 [En4]). The scribal hand of 4Q212 is fluid, but quite untidy; note especially the formation of final mem and tsade. Other letters with strong cursive characteristics are medial mem, shin, and tav. These features indicate that 4Q212 is a second-tier, or “reading” copy, a relatively unusual occurrence among the Qumran Aramaic scrolls. There are a number of “cover-up” corrections evident in the manuscript, which seem likely to have been carried out by the original scribe (see below). The same practice is found in other manuscripts, such as 4Q210 (Enastrc). Most interesting is the correction of the more archaic form of the relative pronoun  היה to היה. Milik suggests that there is a distinction by the scribe between use of the relative pronominal forms היה and היה (the former being used before verbs, and the latter before nouns), but this does not appear to hold true. The combination of all of these forms by one scribe is remarkable, and illustrates well the intentional scribal intervention in morphological features often used for dating compositions. There does seem to be a relatively consistent delineation of aleph (e.g., marker of emphatic state) and he (e.g., 3ms suffix, feminine nominal ending) according to the expected conventions, in contrast with their freer mixture in some Qumran copies. Note, however, the preference to use aleph for verbal roots with a weak final letter (iviv.18, 19; Milik [Be, 245] suggested a distinction between “ah” [7] and “eh” [8] sounds). The typical distinction between ש and ס for is maintained in 4Q212. Finally, mention should be made of the rare locution ארעא כלה (iviv.20, ivv.21), which is also common in 1Q20 (apGen; 3.9, 10.13, 11.2, 16.10, 19.10). The spelling here is likely a defective form of the 3fs suffix והנ, or perhaps the suffix on כי reflects ארעא being taken as a masc. noun.

On the repeated use of פון בתרה in iviv to indicate a list-like succession of narrative movement, see the profile for 4Q210 (Enastrc). For the doubled use of י in iviv.20–21, see the profile for 4Q209 (Enastrb).

**Overall manuscript quality:** Fair

**Select bibliography:** Beyer, *ATTM*, 225–58; Olson, “Recovering”; Stuckenbruck, *1 Enoch*, 53–54; Tigchelaar, “Evaluating.”

---
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Script sample:

 Corrections and scribal features:

(a) Partially erased suffix? (so Milik; iv.12): שֶׁהָדוֹהִי changed to שֶׁהָדֵי

(b) The word הָכְנָה apparently written over previously existing letters (iv.13)

(c) Horizontal line to strike through (delete) a word (iv.16):

(d) Partial erasure and overwritten character (iv.22):

(e) Overwritten character for correction (iii.25): י changed to דַי
Language

Syntax:

Verb-subject (verb early in clause):

1ii.16, 1ii.21(?), 1iii.23, 1iv.15(2x), 1iv.18

Subject-verb (verb early in clause):

1iii.25, 1iv.13, 1iv.19(?)

Subject-verb (verb later in clause):

1iii.20, 1iii.22(2x?), 1iv.24, 1iv.16(?), 1v.20, 1v.22, 1v.24

Subject implied (verb early in clause):

1ii.19, 1iv.14, 1iv.17, 1iv.21

Subject implied (verb late in clause):

1iv.17, 1iv.26(?)

Verbless clause:

1v.23

Direct object marker (if present):

–ל: 1iv.22

Use of יד to mark genitive relationship:

1v.21

Double כל + construction:

1iv.20, 1iv.21

Verb of movement + ל + inanimate object:

1iv.21

Periphrastic construction (past/future continuative action):

Finite form of היה + participle:

1iv.14

Lexical items:

איתי:

1iv.26

ידי:

1ii.19, 1ii.21, 1iii.25, 1iv.13, 1iv.18, 1v.20, 1v.21, 1v.22

זיו:

1iii.25 (changed to יד), 1iv.17(?)

–ל: 1iv.15

Morphology:

娱乐平台 form:

1iii.21

Assimilated nun:

1iv.13

Dissimilated nun/nasalization:

1v.15

Orthography/Phonology:

ש for /s/:

1iv.25

Other notable features:

Chain use of הבש:

1iv.15, 1iv.19

Content synopsis and significance: This manuscript very likely preserves portions of what scholars have called the Book of Giants, a composition with clear affinities to the corpus of texts focused on Enoch, and especially to the Book of Watchers. There is little coherent text in what remains of 1Q23, but Stuckenbruck included it, along with 6Q8 (papGiants), 4Q203 (EnGiantsa), 4Q530 (EnGiantsb), and 4Q531 (EnGiantsc), among the manuscripts “whose identification with BG is virtually certain” (Giants, 41; cf. Milik, BE, 321–9). The identification of 1Q23 as a Book of Giants manuscript is strengthened significantly by the probable mention of Mahavai, one of the giants, in 27.2 (see Stuckenbruck, Giants, 54). In addition, several groups of two-hundred animals are mentioned (e.g., wild asses, sheep, and rams) in frag. 1, which may predict fertility following the flood. The destructive deeds of the Watchers or their gigantic offspring may also be under discussion in frags. 9, 14, and 15. Not much else can be said regarding the contents of 1Q23, since the scroll is rather poorly preserved. However, we do find a broken reference to a tablet (תבש) in 31.1, and another possible mention of a tablet or tablets in 16.1. Tablets play an important role in a dream-vision scene elsewhere in the Book of Giants (e.g., at 2Q26 [EnGiants] 1.1–3; see the profile on 2Q26 below), and we also find allusions to tablets in a visionary context in 4Q537 (TJacob?) 1–3.3.5. Another reference to a tablet in the Book of Giants occurs in 4Q203 (EnGiantsa) 8, a fragment which purports to preserve the contents of “a copy of the s[ec]ond tablet of the le[tt]er” written by “the hand of Enoch, the scribe of interpretation” (8.3, 4). These references to tablets reflect a broader interest in writing and written documents present across a significant number of Aramaic texts from Qumran, including the early Enochic writings, the Words of Michael, the
Genesis Apocryphon, the Birth of Noah, New Jerusalem, the Aramaic Levi Document, the Testament of Qahat, the Visions of Amram, the Prayer of Nabonidus, and Jews in the Persian Court.

Material remains: This manuscript comprises thirty-one badly damaged fragments, only a handful of which contain more than a few letters or words. At approximately 3 by 4 cm, frag. 1 (see image below) is more than twice as large as any other fragment, containing parts of four lines of text and an intercolumnar margin, with some of the stitching between sheets still preserved. The poor state of preservation has made arranging the material difficult, though scholars have offered several proposals. Milik suggested grouping frags. 1, 6, and 22, and frags. 9, 14, and 15, respectively (BE, 301–3). Stuckenbruck judged these two arrangements “justifiable,” though he is more skeptical of Beyer’s combination of frags. 24 and 25 or García Martínez’s arrangement of frags. 16 and 17 (Giants, 43). 1Q23 contains only one possible textual overlap with another Qumran Book of Giants manuscript (i.e., 1Q23 29/6Q8 [papGiants]; see Stuckenbruck, Giants, 197). However, Beyer and Stuckenbruck have argued that 1Q23 9+14+15 comes from a section of the composition that generally corresponds to 4Q531 (EnGiants) 1 and 5, since each of them contains a description of “the giants’ violent deeds” (Stuckenbruck, Giants, 144). On the ordering of the material more generally, see Stuckenbruck, Giants, 144–5.

Notes on provenance: 1Q23 was discovered during the official excavation of Cave 1 from February 15 to March 5, 1949 (DJD 1:43), supervised by Roland de Vaux and Gerald Lankester Harding. The fragments are currently in the possession of the Department of Antiquities of Jordan, in Amman (Tov, Revised Lists, 13).
**Material:** Skin

**Script:** Late Hasmonean to early Herodian semi-formal (comparable in style to, e.g., 4Q537 [TJacob?], 4Q548 [Visions of Amramf], and 5Q15 [NJ])

**Proposed palaeographic date:** 100–1 BCE

**Special traits and general comments:** There is not much remarkable about this manuscript. It was of good quality, written by a reasonably-skilled, though not exceptional, scribe. The spacing is fairly well-regulated, both between lines and words, though some variation does exist (e.g., frag. 20). There is at least one addition/correction, the supralinear script of which is somewhat smaller than the main hand (frags. 24 and 25). In terms of language, there is little by which to reckon, given the limited amount of running text. However, we may find the disjunctive phrase "ברא מן" ("except for, aside from") in 1.4. Stuckenbruck, following Milik, understood the word ברא as "field," since this word is used elsewhere in the set expression "חיות בראה" ("living creatures of the field"; e.g., Dan 4:22, 1Q20 [apGen] 13.8), and the content of the fragment is speaking of animals. That reading is certainly possible, but given the broken context we should not rule out the preposition ברא. A form of this expression is found elsewhere only in other Qumran texts, Egyptian Aramaic of the fifth to fourth centuries BCE, and Nabatean.

**Original manuscript quality:** Good

**Select bibliography:** Milik, *BE*, 301–3; Beyer, *ATTM*¹, 266–68; Beyer, *ATTM*², 159; García Martínez, *Apocalyptic*, 100; Reeves, *Jewish Lore*, 122; Stuckenbruck, *Giants*, 43–59.

**Profile of physical layout**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Margins:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intercolumnar:</strong> At least 1.1 cm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scribal guidelines:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Horizontal script lines:</strong> Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vertical column lines:</strong> Likely (see breakage pattern on frag. 1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average medial letter height:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2–3 mm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Space between lines:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5–7 mm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Space between words:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1–2 mm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vacats:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes; small (20.2 [4 mm])</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Corrections and scribal features:

(a) Supralinear additions on frags. 24 and 25, in a noticeably smaller script (1–1.5 mm)

Language

Syntax:
- Subject implied (verb early in clause):
  9+14+15.2(?), 9+14+15.4, 17.3(?)

Periphrastic construction (past/future continuative action):
- Finite form of הוה + participle:
  3.2(?)

Lexical items:
- בדין: 1+6+22.5, 20.2
- ברא (מן: 1+6+22.4(?)
- די: 9+14+15.5, 12.2(?), 21.2

Orthography/Phonology:
- מ for /s/:
  9+14+15.4
**Content synopsis and significance:** Several scholars have associated 1Q24 with the Book of Giants, but caution is required when attempting to identify this manuscript, given its poor state of preservation. Milik included 1Q24 among the manuscripts that he deemed “too poorly represented to allow a sufficiently certain identification” (*BE*, 309), and Stuckenbruck classified it as one of the manuscripts “whose identification with BG is plausible” (*Giants*, 41). Beyer included it in his treatment of Book of Giants manuscripts, while other scholars have left it out of theirs (see Stuckenbruck, *Giants*, 59). The best evidence for identifying 1Q24 as a copy of the Book of Giants comes from frags. 5 and 8. Fragment 5 contains the phrase “[the] dew and [the] rain” (אע[למש] ולט [למטרא], 5.4), while a similar phrase, “[the] rain and [the] dew” (וטלא רא ולטומט, 4Q203 [EnGiants a] ii.2), appears in an assured Book of Giants manuscript. However, the Aramaic Enoch fragments also preserve this sort of language; it is not unique to the Book of Giants: “[the] dew and [the] rain” (4Q204 [Enoch c] iixiii.26); “[the] rain and [the] dew” (4Q210 [Astronomical Enoch c] ii.8); “[the] dew” (4Q211 [Astronomical Enoch b] ii.2). Fragment 8 contains the phrase “there is not peace for you” (לא ישכל ללח; line 2). As Stuckenbruck points out, this phrase closely parallels one found in the Manichaean Book of Giants, but it also corresponds to 1 En. 12:5 (*Giants*, 63). Very little else can be said about the contents of 1Q24 or its association with the Book of Giants. Its use of presumably figurative language (e.g., donkeys, lightning) does appear to suggest that it deals with the visionary revelation of divine secrets. It also seems plausible to associate it with the Enochic cluster of writings, given its verbal affinities with the Enochic tradition, outlined above.

**Material remains:** This manuscript consists of eight, poorly-preserved fragments, each of which contains only a few words and/or short phrases. The scroll held at least eight lines of text (and probably more), as can be seen from frag. 1, but almost nothing else can be said about its original dimensions.

**Provenance:** 1Q24 was discovered during the official excavation of Cave 1 from February 15 to March 5, 1949 (*DJD* 1:43), supervised by Roland de Vaux and Gerald Lankester Harding. The fragments are currently held in the manuscript collection of the Bibliothèque nationale de Paris (Tov, *Revised Lists*, 13).
Profile of Physical Layout

Scribal guidelines:

Horizontal script lines: Yes
Average medial letter height: 2.5–3.5 mm
Space between lines: 6–8 mm
Space between words: 2–5 mm
Vacats: Yes; medium (1.5 [1.5 cm])

Material: Skin

Script: Early to mid-Herodian semi-cursive (Stuckenbruck)

Proposed palaeographic date: 33–1 BCE (Stuckenbruck)

Special traits and general comments: The script and scribal execution is of medium quality, and little stands out about this very fragmentary scroll. The word spacing is at places quite generous, though it varies considerably. For such a small amount of text these fragments contain a noticeably high concentration of lamed used as the direct object marker, a feature linked to the list-like format of frag. 1 in particular.

Original manuscript quality: Good

Select bibliography: Milik, BE, 309; Beyer, ATTM1, 267–68; García Martínez, Apocalyptic, 100–101; Reeves, Jewish Lore, 51; Stuckenbruck, Giants, 59–63.

Script sample:

Language

Syntax:

Direct object marker (if present):

–7: 1.3, 1.4(2x), 1.6(?), 1.7, 5.4(2x)

Lexical items:

פְּרֵס: 7.3

2Q26, Book of Giants (EnGiants)

Content synopsis and significance: This fragmentary manuscript, which describes a tablet (מִי) that is immersed and then lifted from water, was originally assigned the title “Fragment de Rituel (?)” by Baillet. On the appearance of tablets in the Book of Giants, and in the Aramaic scrolls more broadly, see the profile for 1Q23 (EnGiantsa), above. Despite preserving very little text, Stuckenbruck classified 2Q26 as one of the manuscripts “whose identification with BG is probable” (Giants, 41). He made this determination on the basis of its similarities to the Manichaean Book of Giants and the medieval Midrash of Shemhazai and Azael, first noted by Milik (Stuckenbruck, Giants, 64–66; cf. Milik, BE, 334–35). The latter two compositions recount two dream-visions seen by the giants Ohyah and Hahyah: the first portends the coming flood and appears to correspond to 2Q26, while the second involves a garden of trees and seems to correspond to 6Q8 (papGiants) 2 (see Stuckenbruck, Giants, 64–66, 201–2). These parallels suggest that the fragmentary material in 2Q26 should be interpreted as belonging to a dream-vision involving the coming destruction of the giants and the survival of Noah and his family. Moreover, if the order of the Qumran Book of Giants manuscripts can be reconstructed on the basis of parallel material in the Manichaean Book of Giants and the Midrash of Shemhazai and Azael, it may be that the text preserved in 6Q8 2 should follow closely after that in 2Q26, as Stuckenbruck suggested (Giants, 22). The Book of Giants is distinct among the extant Qumran Aramaic...
writings in depicting the giants as the recipients of revelatory dream-visions. It should be noted, however, that dream-visions permeate the Aramaic scrolls corpus more generally, and appear to be the dominant form of divine revelation in these writings (see Perrin, *Dynamics*).

**Material remains:** Only a single fragment of this manuscript is extant. Remains of at least four lines are preserved, but the lack of margins precludes any conclusions about the original size of the scroll or its columns. As noted above, the contents of the fragment share affinities with the Manichaean Book of Giants and the Midrash of Shemhazai and Azael, but there are no textual overlaps with any of the other Qumran copies of the Book of Giants.

**Notes on provenance:** Cave 2 was discovered around February 1952 by Bedouin (DJD 3:3; Fields, *Scrolls*, 132). Khalil Iskander Shahin (Kando) facilitated the subsequent sale of the Cave 2 fragments, including 2Q24, to the Palestine Archaeological Museum (DJD 3:3; Fields, *Scrolls*, 563). A survey of the caves near Qumran, which included Cave 2, was organized and carried out from March 10–29, 1952. The expedition uncovered a small number of additional fragments from Cave 2 (de Vaux, “Exploration,” 553; Reed, “Qumran Caves,” 13), but de Vaux made clear that all fragments of significance from the cave had been part of the earlier lot discovered by the Bedouin.
Profile of Physical Layout

Scribal guidelines:

*Horizontal script lines:* Yes

*Average medial letter height:* 2.5–3 mm

*Space between lines:* 9 mm

*Space between words:* 0.5–1.5 mm

*Vacats:* None preserved

Material: Skin

Script: Early Herodian semi-cursive (Stuckenbruck)

Proposed palaeographic date: 33–1 BCE (Stuckenbruck)

Special traits and general comments: The scribal hand and manuscript preparation are very uniform and of high quality. This was likely a manuscript of considerable expenditure and workmanship. The Aramaic prepositional phrase "עלא מן" ("above") occurs in Dan 6:3, 1Q20 (apGen) 20.7, and 4Q206 (Enoch) ixxvi.20, 4i.20. This particular construction is found only once in earlier Aramaic texts (in an Egyptian Jewish letter from ca. 475 BCE), where the more common construction is "מן עלא." It is not found in later Jewish dialects where the more expected forms are "עלא," "מן עלא," or something similar. It would appear that the phrase in the Qumran texts (including Biblical Aramaic) is a feature distinguishing it from later Jewish dialects, drawn from earlier Persian period usage.

Original manuscript quality: Very good


Script sample:

Language

Syntax:

Verb-subject (verb early in clause):

2

Subject implied (verb early in clause):

3

Lexical items:

די: 3(?)

Morphology:

*Afpel form:*

1(?)

Other notable features:

Proposed Hebraisms:

*דיחו* (lexical; 1) [H]

8 DARI 2, 153 (D:7.9(5).4–5), which reads, concerning a servant girl, "Tattoo her on her arm above the tattoo that is [already] on her arm.

9 For later dialects, refer to DARI 2, 1069; DJA, 70; DJPA, 315; DJBA, 630.
Content synopsis and significance: This manuscript is a copy of the Book of Giants, a work that bears clear affinities with the Enoch tradition. Yet, as 4Q203 helps to demonstrate, the Book of Giants can be distinguished from the rest of the Enochic writings, inasmuch as it is told in significant part from the perspective of the giant offspring of the fallen Watchers. In fact, Stuckenbruck has pointed out that, “in both degree and kind, Qumran casts the spotlight on the progeny of the fallen Watchers more than any other Jewish writings composed during the Second Temple period” (Giants, 26).

A number of fragments from 4Q203 recount conversations between the giants themselves, or between the giants and Enoch. Fragment 2 recounts a speech given to a group of giants by Mahaway, a giant and son of a Watcher named Baraq'el, mentioned the Book of Watchers and the Parables of Enoch (see 1 En. 6:7 and 6:92, respectively; Baraq'el is identified as Mahaway’s father in 6Q8 [papGiants 1]). Fragments 4 and 7ii also contain parts of a conversation between two giants named Ohyah and Hahyah. These three giants play prominent roles throughout the composition, a point discussed further in the profiles for 4Q530 (EnGiantsb) and 6Q8 (papGiants). Here, it is sufficient to note that Ohyah and Hahyah receive divine revelations through dream-vision (see also 4Q530 [EnGiantsb] col. ii, and probably 4Q246 [EnGiants] and 6Q8 [papGiants] 2), and that Mahaway acts as an intermediary between Enoch and rest of the giants (4Q530 [EnGiantsb] col. ii–iii).

Enoch is a key figure in 4Q203, and in the Book of Giants more generally. Fragment 8 purports to contain the contents of “a copy of the second tablet of the letter” written by “the hand of Enoch, the scribe of interpretation” (8.3–4). The phrase “scribe of interpretation” (מרשם הכתוב) also occurs in another Book of Giants manuscript, 4Q530 (EnGiantsb), and likely alludes to Enoch’s ability to interpret dreams. (For more on the significance of this title, see the profile for 4Q530.)

The tablet to which frag. 8 refers contains an indictment against the fallen Watchers and their gigantic offspring (8.7–14), and is “presented in the form of an official letter decree” (Stuckenbruck, Giants, 90). As Doering has demonstrated, “Indications of the epistolary nature of the second tablet are the use of prṣgū ‘copy; an Aramaic termi- nus technicus – borrowed from the Old Persian – for copies of official documents, amongst them letters, and a number of epistolary features” (Letters, 171). The same Aramaic term occurs in the incipit of the Visions of Amram: “a copy (-dialog) of the book of the words of the visions of Amram” (4Q543 [Visions of Amrama] 1a–c1/4Q545 [Visions of Amramb] 1a1). Other epistolary features in 4Q203 include the identification of the scribe, in this case Enoch (8.4), and the phrase “let it be known to you th[at]” (Doering, Letters, 172). Enoch’s “second tablet” thus clearly imitates the formal features of an official Imperial Aramaic letter, and we might reasonably assume that his first missive (now missing) did as well. In this respect, 4Q203 shares affinities with the Book of Ezra and Jews at the Persian Court (4Q550), both of which contain letters employing the formal phrase “let it be known” and other conventional epistolary features (Ezra 4:12; 5:8; 4Q550 [Jews at the Persian Court] 1.7).

Enoch’s scribal identity in 4Q203 is consistent with his depiction throughout the Aramaic literature at Qumran. Various compositions comprising 1 Enoch also give him the title “scribe” (1 En. 1:23; 4:153; 92:1), and include scenes in which he writes down information (1 En. 134:6; 14:44; 335:821; 831:921:1081). The Genesis Apocryphon also recounts a story involving Abraham’s possession of “the book of the words of Enoch” (1Q20 [apGen] 19:25). In fact, the Aramaic Qumran literature is replete with examples of pious protagonists who are endowed with scribal knowledge, possess written documents, write down information, and/or are associated with books bearing their names, e.g., Noah, Abraham, Levi, Qahat, Amram, and Daniel. An interest in writing and book lore pervades the Qumran Aramaic texts as a corpus.

Material remains: Milik identified thirteen fragments belonging to this manuscript, though his frags. 7 and 8 each represent combinations of three separate pieces. His arrangement of the pieces that compose frag. 8 is uncontroversial, but his reconstruction of frag. 7 has been disputed by Stuckenbruck (see 1 Enoch, 77–85). Fragment 8 is by far the largest, preserving a relatively substantial amount of running text and parts of fifteen lines. The rest of the manuscript is much more fragmentary. Fragments 1–3 appear to belong together, as Milik suggested (BE, 311). Others of his proposed arrangements are less certain (for a summary and assessment of each, see Stuckenbruck, Giants, 66). There has been significant agreement among scholars working on 4Q203 that it likely belongs with 4Q204 (Ena) as part of the same scroll, since the two batches of fragments share a number
of physical and scribal characteristics, including the same scribal hand (so, e.g., Milik, BE, 310; Stuckenbruck, Giants, 66–67). The implication would be that the Book of Giants was copied on the same scroll as other portions of 1 Enoch (the Book of Watchers, the Book of Dreams, and the Epistle of Enoch), and was therefore considered by the copyist to be closely related to the other Enochic works. For more on the relationship between 4Q203 and 4Q204 (En\textsuperscript{c}), see the Special traits and general comments sections of their respective profiles. Klaus Beyer (ATTM\textsuperscript{2}, 125–26) considered 4Q203\textsuperscript{1} to belong instead with 4Q535 (Birth of Noah\textsuperscript{b}), though this association has been widely rejected (see Puech, DJD 32:17).

In addition to the fragments identified by Milik and reedited by Stuckenbruck (and, in the case of frag. 1, also by Puech), Puech discovered what he considered to be frag. 14 of 4Q203 on PAM 43.610. His identification is reasonable, and adds to the scroll another small fragment with a stitched margin at the beginning of a sheet.

Notes on provenance: Some fragments of 4Q203 were photographed as part of the PAM “G series,” the relevant plates being PAM 40.617 and 40.622. The fragments in this series of images are said to have been discovered by the Bedouin in Cave 4 (Strugnell, “Photographing,” 124, 131–32). If 4Q203 is considered alongside 4Q204 (En\textsuperscript{c}), then the batch of fragments under the latter designation, found as part of de Vaux’s excavation and included on several “E series” plates, should also be taken into account for 4Q203. In this case, fragments of the same scroll (4Q203/4Q204 [En\textsuperscript{c}]) were found both by the Bedouin and in the excavations led by de Vaux.

Sample image: 4Q203 8
Material: Skin

Script: Early Herodian, the same scribe as 4Q204 (Milik); Herodian round semi-formal (Yardeni)

Proposed palaeographic date: 33–1 BCE (Milik); 25 BCE–25 CE (Yardeni)

Special traits and general comments: For a discussion of the scribal traits of this manuscript, see the entry for 4Q204 (Enc), to which I am convinced the 4Q203 fragments also belong. In addition to the matching scribal hand, the measurements and other characteristics of the fragments under these two sigla are fairly well-aligned, within the range of normal variance for a single scroll (though see the observations of Stuckenbruck on the use of vacats and indentation). The overall quality of both batches of fragments (those belonging to 4Q203 and 4Q204 [Enc]) is very high and nearly free of scribal miscues, though the line spacing does vary noticeably from column to column in each group. Like 4Q204 (Enc), it appears from frag. 7b that the scribe often “justified” the left margin of columns, depending on the distribution of words at the end of one line and the beginning of the next. This is, in fact, one argument for the vertical ruling of columns in 4Q203, though the lines cannot be discerned in the images currently available.

As for orthography and morphology, these fragments generally correspond to 4Q204 (Enc). For example, we find a similar, “full” use of aleph as a vowel or syllable marker (e.g., 1.4, 8.14; אָוָא יִשָּׁר, אַבְרָהָא). In both groups the 1cs suffix and pronouns end in נא–. One notable contribution of 4Q203 is its regular use of the “heavy” form of the 2ms pronominal suffix כְּ. Since the ending is not extant in 4Q204 (Enc), it may be assumed that the form would once have been present there as well. In Yardeni’s opinion (“Scribe,” 288), 4Q203 belongs to a long list of scrolls penned by a single, Herodian-period scribe. Curiously, she does not include 4Q204 on the list, and there are other reasons to doubt her central claim. Still, her identification of 4Q203 as having a Herodian script similar in style to the other scrolls she listed is sound.

Original manuscript quality: Very good–excellent

Select bibliography: Sokoloff, “Notes”; Beyer, ATTM1, 261, 263, 268; Beyer, ATTM2, 156; García Martínez, Apocalyptic, 102–103; Reeves, Jewish Lore, 57, 66, 82–84, 109–10, 124–27; Stuckenbruck, Giants, 59–63; Stuckenbruck, 1 Enoch, 47–51; Tigchelaar, “Notes”.

Script sample:
Content synopsis and significance: These fragments represent one of the best-preserved Book of Giants manuscripts. Much of the extant text recounts the deliberations and dream-reports of several giants gathered in an “assembly” (כנשת; see 1i.8; 2ii+6–12[?].5). Some of the giants in the narrative are named, including Ohyah, Hahyah, Mahaway, and Gilgamesh. The Book of Giants is the only known ancient Jewish source to refer to Gilgamesh by name (Stuckenbruck, Giants, 109), reflecting some level of engagement with Mesopotamian traditions about this heroic figure. It is unclear how the authors of the Book of Giants had access to such traditions, though this question is addressed by Goff (“Gilgamesh”). Engagement with Mesopotamian traditions is a more common feature of the Aramaic Scrolls (see Drawnel, “Some Notes”), something that is especially evident in the early Enoch tradition, the Book of Watchers, and the Astronomical Book (see, e.g., VanderKam, Enoch; Kvanvig, Roots and Primeval; Drawnel, “Moon”), but we also see engagement with Mesopotamian tradition in texts such as the Aramaic Levi Document (Drawnel, “Education”) and the Prayer of Nabonidus (Newsom, “Why Nabonidus?”).

The fragmentary character of the manuscript results in a number of interpretative difficulties, but the basic gist of the preserved narrative can be reconstructed with relative confidence. Two of the giants, Hahyah and his brother Ohyah, relate the contents of their dreams to their assembled companions. In Hahyah’s dream, gardeners are watering a garden and shoots begin to emerge from the soil, but the garden is destroyed by water and fire (frags. 2ii+6–12[?].6–12). As Stuckenbruck has shown, the dream appears to be a symbolic retelling of the Watchers myth (Giants, 114). The giants are unable to comprehend the meaning of the dream, and Hahyah proposes to inquire of Enoch, “the scribe of interpretation, so that he may interpret for us the dream” (לספר פרשא ויפשור לנא ( ) frags. 2ii+6–12[?].14–15). Enoch is also described as a scribe of interpretation in 4Q203 (EnGiantsa) 8.4, though this title appears nowhere else in the extant Enoch literature. In 4Q530, the juxtaposition of noun פרשא with the verb פגן seems to function as “a creative attempt to underline Enoch’s role as dream interpreter for the giants” (Stuckenbruck, Giants, 118). The Book of Giants thus reverses the more typical image of Enoch as the recipient of dreams. In this respect, Enoch in the Book of Giants resembles Daniel, who in the Aramaic court-tales is renowned for his ability to interpret (פָּשִׁיר) the dreams of the Babylonian king (e.g., Dan 2:25; 4:18). Before consulting Enoch, Hahyah’s brother Ohyah also recounts his dream among the assembled giants. In Ohyah’s dream, God, who is called both “the ruler of heaven” (שלטן שמין) and “the Great Holy One” (קדישא רבא), descends to earth in order to pronounce judgment (frags. 2ii+6–12[?].16–19). The dream also includes thrones being erected and...
thousands of attending angels (frags. 2ii+6–12[?].17). This judgment scene exhibits striking parallels with the “throne visions” of Dan 7:9–10 and 1 En. 14:8–23, though it is difficult to determine the precise nature of the relationships among these three compositions (see Stuckenbruck, *Giants*, 121–3; Stokes, “Throne Visions”; Trotter, “Tradition”; Angel, “Reading,” 330–41). Upon hearing Ohyah’s dream recounted, the assembled giants become frightened, and enlist Mahaway to seek out Enoch, who lives beyond “the Great Desert” ( frags. 2ii+6–12[?].20–24; 7ii.1–11). The structure of this section of the narrative contains notable parallels with the early columns of the Genesis Apocryphon (see also 1 En. 106–107), in which Methuselah travels to “the end of [the] ea[rth]” to seek out knowledge from Enoch on behalf of Lamech (1Q20 [apGen] 2.21–23), who is mystified by the astonishing appearance and conduct of Noah at birth. In both passages a central character makes a long journey to the distant, eastern edge of the earth to make an inquiry of Enoch, as the result of a dream-vision.

As the discussion above has shown, the Book of Giants has a close literary relationship with the Book of Watchers. However, it is also firmly at home within the broader scope of the Qumran Aramaic literature, as seen in its clear affinities with the Danielic writings and the Genesis Apocryphon, and in its engagement with Mesopotamian traditions.

**Material remains:** This manuscript comprises twenty fragments, several of which come from the same sheet and can be combined to form the remains of three consecutive columns (frags. 2i+3 and 6–12). Fragment 1 preserves the remnants of two additional columns, bringing the total of recognizable columns in 4Q530 to at least five. According to Milik’s arrangement of the main fragments, at least of one of the columns had twenty-four lines (BE, 303–6; so also Stuckenbruck, *Giants*, 104–24; Puech, *DJD* 31:28). This column in particular (the second of the three continuous columns [= col. ii]), has been reconstructed “to provide an almost continuous text” (Stuckenbruck, *Giants*, 102). Despite the relatively large amount of text extant for 4Q530, there are no clear overlaps with other copies of the Book of Giants. However, Milik (BE, 309) noted that 6Q8 2 is part of the dream vision also found partially in 4Q530 2ii+6–12, and Puech accordingly incorporated the text of 6Q8 3+2 into his reconstruction of that column (DJD 31:28).

**Notes on provenance:** Some fragments of 4Q530 were photographed as part of the PAM “G series,” the relevant plates being PAM 40.585 and 40.620. In addition, frag. 17 was included on the “E series” PAM plate 40.979. As a result, we can see that some of the fragments of this scroll were found by the Bedouin, while at least one was discovered in the official excavations led by de Vaux.
**Profile of Physical Layout**

**Margins:**
- **Upper:** At least 1 cm (perhaps not fully preserved; frags. 2, 7)
- **Lower:** At least 8 mm (perhaps not fully preserved; frag. 10)

**Intercolumnar:** 1.5–2.5 cm

**Column Dimensions:**
- Approx. 15.5 cm h. × 9.5 cm w. (Milik’s reconstruction)

**Lines per column:** Approx. 24 (Milik’s reconstruction)

**Letters per line:** 43–52 (frags. 9–11)

**Scribal Guidelines:**
- **Horizontal Script Lines:** No
- **Vertical Column Lines:** No

**Average Medial Letter Height:** 2–3 mm

**Space Between Lines:** 5.5–8 mm

**Space Between Words:** 1–2 mm

**Vacats:** Yes; small (2ii+6–12(?).15 [5 mm]; minor sense division)

---

**Material:** Skin

**Script:** Hasmonean semi-cursive (Cross, Puech)

**Proposed Palaeographic Date:** ca. 100–50 BCE (Cross); 75–25 BCE (Puech)

**Special Traits and General Comments:** This scribe wrote in a legible but relatively undisturbed hand, with letter size and spacing varying considerably. Cross opined that 4Q530 has “an unusual semicursive” style (“Development,” 149), with certain letters – for example, aleph, bet, mem, shin/sin – lacking the more square features typically associated with them in Hasmonean formal scripts. Milik called the script “spidery” in appearance. The space between lines is inconsistent from column to column, and even line to line. If portions of the top and bottom margins are completely preserved, they are fairly small. Several significant corrections are preserved using the relatively uncommon practice of striking words and letters through with a line. Vacats do not appear to have been widely used. We may also note a likely case of uncorrected dittothography through homoioaicron in col. 2, line 4 ( negócio עיניוון מנהון וקמו [.4]), which Stuckenbruck rightly observed implies copying from an earlier manuscript; consequently, this is not the autograph. This scroll is, in general, competently executed, but certainly not of the highest quality.

The archaic form of the relative pronoun זי is written once, and there are two occurrences of the possibly Hebraizing 2ms suffix in the text. This scribe several times employed samek in cases where either samek or sin might be used, though two of these are in names not native to Hebrew (cp. 4Q531 [EnGiants*] 22.12, 4Q203 [EnGiants*] 3.3). הביא הביא (2ii+6–12[?].19) is against the normal spelling practice, while ישע (1i.6) coheres with the more expected spelling. As with many other Qumran Aramaic manuscripts, the orthography in 4Q530 is quite full. This manuscript uses aleph for the indication of a long vowel (בשא, וברא), and Sometimes to mark the internal vowel of a hollow-root participle (��ן), as in Dan 2:31 and elsewhere in the Qumran texts (e.g., 1Q2o [apGen], 4Q550 [Jews at the Persian Court]). As we often find in the Aramaic scrolls, aleph and he are interchanged, as in the particle הב ("thus, here") at 2ii+6–12(?).12, 20.

**Overall Manuscript Quality:** Good

Script sample:

Corrections and scribal features:

(a) Vertical deletion line through a letter (7i.1): יאמר
(b) Horizontal deletion line through a word (7ii.4; homoioarcton): בידוהי (כענל) כמש[ר]

(c) Supralinear letter added (8.1): אשתנ
(d) Alteration of existing letter (7ii.7): להוהי

Language

Syntax:

Verb-subject (verb early in clause):
ii.7, ii+6–12(?).1, ii+6–12(?).3(2x), ii+6–12(?).4, ii+6–12(?).20, ii+6–12(?).21, 7ii.6

Subject-verb (verb early in clause):
ii+6–12(?).1, ii+6–12(?).2, ii+6–12(?).8, ii+6–12(?).10, ii+6–12(?).16(2x), ii+6–12(?).17, ii+6–12(?).18

Subject implied (verb early in clause):
ii+6–12(?).3, ii+6–12(?).4, ii+6–12(?).5(2x), once after obj., ii+6–12(?).7, ii+6–12(?).13, ii+6–12(?).14, ii+6–12(?).15, ii+6–12(?).21(2x), ii+6–12(?).22, ii+6–12(?).23(3x), ii+6–12(?).24, 7ii.4, 7ii.5, 7ii.6(2x)

Subject implied (verb later in clause):
i.5, ii+6–12(?).17, ii+6–12(?).18, ii+6–12(?).23–24
Verbless clause:
2ii+6–12(?).12, 2ii+6–12(?).20

Object early in clause:
2ii+6–12(?).5, 2ii+6–12(?).6, 2ii+6–12(?).17, 2ii+6–12(?).23–24

Direct object marker (if present):

Use of יד to introduce direct quotation:
2ii+6–12(?).23

Verb of movement + יד + animate object:
2ii+6–12(?).5, 2ii+6–12(?).21

Verb of movement + יד + inanimate object:
1i.3, 1i.8, 7ii.5

Periphrastic construction (past/future continuative action):

Finite form of היה + participle:
ii.6, 2ii+6–12(?).6, 2ii+6–12(?).7, 2ii+6–12(?).18

Participle + finite form of היה:
2ii+6–12(?).8, 2ii+6–12(?).15(?)

Lexical items:

איתי:
2ii+6–12(?).24

באדין:
2ii+6–12(?).3, 2ii+6–12(?).15

די:
1i.2, 1i.3, 2ii+6–12(?).9, 2ii+6–12(?).22, 2ii+6–12(?).23, 7ii.11

זי:
2ii+6–12(?).1

כחדה:
1i.5

תנה:
7ii.7

Morphology:


Verb form:
2ii+6–12(?).2

הveal form:
2ii+6–12(?).13

 jewish form:
2ii+6–12(?).3, 2ii+6–12(?).5, 17.2

Object suffix on verb:
2i+3.1, 2ii+6–12(?).21, 7ii.6(2x)

Orthography/Phonology:

2ms verbal affix קד하/נה:
2ii+6–12(?).22, 7ii.7

soon for /s/:
2ii+6–12(?).2(2x), 2ii+6–12(?).19, 18.1(?)

soon for /ß/:
ii.6

Other notable features:

Use of negative particle אַל (+ prefix-conjugation verb):
2i+3.6 (pair), 5.3, 5.4

Proposed Hebraisms:

רוזניא (lexical; 2ii+6–12[?].2 [cf. 4Q542 (TQahat) 2.9]) [H]

נפיליא (lexical; 2ii+6–12[?].6) [H]

חלד (lexical; 7ii.5, following Puech) [H]

נפילי (lexical; 7ii.8) [H]

Content synopsis and significance: Another manuscript thought to be a copy of the Book of Giants, 4Q531 preserves fragments recounting episodes associated with the gigantic offspring of the fallen Watchers, the נפילין or גברין (for these terms see frag. 1.2, 8). This manuscript exhibits clear parallels with the Book of Watchers and related traditions (see Stuckenbruck, Giants, 151–2). For example, the Watchers are said to have “defiled themselves” (frag. 1.1; cf. 1 En. 9:8; 15:3–4), and to have “begat” giants (frag. 1.3; cf. 1 En. 15:3–4), who have ravenous appetites (frag. 1.5–6; cf. 1 En. 7:3–5). A number of the fragments catalogue the violent acts of the giants, including the destruction they unleash on the earth and their interminable warfare (cf. frags. 2+3, 7, 18, and 19). The giants discuss their own impending judgment in frag. 19.3, and they may also describe Enoch and his divine knowledge in frag. 14.4 (so Stuckenbruck, Giants, 155–6). In frag. 22, we learn of an exchange between two of the giants, Gilgamesh and Ohaya, in which someone recounts a great battle, and Ohaya tells of a dream-vision revealed to him. For more on the giants as recipients of revelatory dream-visions in the Book of Giants, see the profiles for 2Q26 (EnGiants), 4Q530 (EnGiantsb), and 6Q8 (papGiants). On Gilgamesh as one of the giants in the Book of Giants, see the profile for 4Q530 (EnGiantsb), and on his self-description as “a wild man” (איש ברא) in 4Q531 22.8, see the discussion of Angel (“Reading,” 334–37). Some of the fragments of 4Q531 were written from the perspective of the giants in the first-person singular or plural voices (e.g., frags. 14, 18, 19, and 22). On first-person narration as a common feature of the Aramaic Qumran scrolls as a corpus, see Stuckenbruck, “Pseudepigraphy” and Perrin “Capturing.”
At least one fragment of 4Q531 was written in the second-person singular (frag. 17), and may preserve portions of a prayer uttered by Enoch, though this is only one possible interpretation of this badly-damaged part of the scroll (see Stuckenbruck, *Giants*, 158).

**Material remains:** Forty-eight fragments of this scroll were initially identified by Starcky, though in his DJD edition Puech puts the number at forty-seven, having joined two pieces to form his frag. 19 (DJD 31:49). At twelve lines, frag. 22 is the largest of the extant fragments, and has attracted the greatest scholarly attention (Stuckenbruck, *Giants*, 165). The majority of the fragments are small scraps of skin with no more than a few letters or words preserved on them (e.g., frags. 3, 8–12, 15, 16, 20, 21, 24–47). Others contain several lines of readable text (e.g., seven lines on frag. 7; eight lines on frag. 1; ten lines on frag. 2+3), but even these fragments are badly damaged. There are no clear overlaps with other copies of the Book of Giants at Qumran, though a possible parallel does occur between 4Q531 1.5 and 4Q532 (EnGiantsd) 2.10.

**Notes on provenance:** Some fragments of 4Q531 were photographed as part of the PAM “G series,” the relevant plates being PAM 40.592, 40.607, 40.619, 40.622, and 40.626. In addition, Tigchelaar has identified several fragments included on the “E series” PAM plates 40.975 (frag. 4), 40.978 (frag. 37), and 40.979 ( frags. 3 and 29). As a result, we can see that some of the fragments of this scroll were found by the Bedouin, while others were discovered in the official excavations supervised by de Vaux.

---

*Sample image: 4Q531 22*

Image B-283885
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**Profile of Physical Layout**

**Margins:**

*Upper:* At least 1.2–1.5 cm (frags. 14, 18)

*Intercolumnar:* At least 1.2 cm (frag. 23)

**Scribal Guidelines:**

*Horizontal script lines:* Yes

*Vertical column lines:* None visible

**Average medial letter height:**

2.5–3.5 mm

**Space between lines:** 7–8 mm

**Space between words:**

0.5–2 mm (somewhat larger for frag. 22)

**Vacats:** Yes; small (10.1 [at least 9 mm]), medium (5.2 [at least 1.2 cm]; 20.2 [at least 2.6 cm]; 22.9 [1.1 cm]; 27.4 [at least 2.1 cm]; 30.4 [at least 2.1 cm]; 45.2 [at least 2.3 cm]), and large (1.7 [at least 3 cm]; 14.5 [at least 5.7 cm]; 22.2 [6.7 cm]; 22.7 [5.2 cm]); The few cases where it is possible to judge appear to be minor sense divisions.

**Material:** Skin

**Script:** Hasmonean formal (Puech); Herodian round semi-formal (Yardeni)

**Proposed palaeographic date:** 67–33 BCE (Puech); 25 BCE–25 CE (Yardeni)

**Special traits and general comments:** 4Q531 is written in a consistent, well-trained formal hand, reminiscent of 4Q203 (EnGiants®), though it is not the same scribe. Yardeni did believe both copies to be written by the same person, including them as part of her long list of scrolls penned by a single, Herodian-period scribe ("Scribe," 288–89). Puech's disagreement on this point is telling, and speaks to the variation among scribal hands for the scrolls listed by Yardeni. Spacing is consistent and relatively generous. Especially noteworthy is the high number of medium and large vacats, though very few of them are preserved in their entirety. Context for deciphering these vacats is lacking in most cases, though where available the evidence suggests that medium and large blank spaces were used to mark relatively minor sense divisions, such as separating new speech vignettes in a discussion between Gilgamesh and Ohaya on frag. 22. Corrections are minimal, with a possible strike-through deletion, an erasure, and a single instance of an added, supralinear letter. Assimilation occurs with tav in a presumed *ithpaal* form in 1.1 (see also 4Q557 [Vision®]), and the same word is apparently corrected to this orthography in 6.4. *Aleph* is assimilated in the noun *צמר* (instead of *סָמָר*) and, as expected, in the imperfect conjugation of *אָסַר* at 18.4. We do not find nasalization (addition of *nun*) in the noun *מצר*, as in some other scrolls (i.e., *מצר*). *Aleph* is typically used to mark the emphatic state (though note a possible *he* at 11.2), but otherwise the scribe seems to prefer *he* for the feminine noun, suffix, and verb endings compared with the penchant for *aleph* in 4Q530 (EnGiants®). Interesting is the unusually high usage of the "long" second masc. suffix-conjugation verb affix (e.g., *רָצוּה* and pronominal suffix (as נָּעָר), which in some cases could be understood as a morphological Hebraism. In contrast to 4Q530 (EnGiants®), which uses samek for *לָמִים* and *לָמִים* and *בָּרָא* for *לָמִים* and *בָּרָא*), we find in 4Q531, *לָמִים* and *בָּרָא*. The use of *samek* or *sin* in such ambiguous cases was apparently the prerogative of the scribe. *Lamed* is used multiple times to indicate the direct object in the list of frag. 7.

In terms of language and idiom, 4Q531 fits well the broader profile of the Qumran Aramaic texts. The phrase *לָמִים* (28.4) is just one indication of this, since it reflects the direct, first-person speech regularly found in these works, and is one of the phrases also used to begin direct address in 1Q20 (apGen) 5.9, 5.20, 4Q212 (Enoch®) iv.24, and 4Q542 (Testament of Qahat) iii.9. (A closely related expression is used at 2Q209 [Astronomical Enoch®] 26.6.) Though attested with very little surrounding context, these words in 4Q531 serve as a representative connection to other works in the Aramaic Qumran corpus.

**Original manuscript quality:** Very good–excellent


---
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Script sample:

Representative sample of corrections and scribal features:

(a) Erasure (2.6; reading uncertain): דקדקא

(b) Possible horizontal strikethrough of first extant letter (6.4; reading uncertain): [ת][א]

(c) Apparent conversion of vav to he, with supralinear letter added (17.1): קדשתה והיטין

Language

Syntax:

Verb-subject (verb early in clause):
- 1.8, 2 2.5, 22.9, 22.10(2x)

Subject-verb (verb early in clause):
- 2 2.9, 5-3, 7-5, 14-3, 22.12, 45-3

Subject-verb (verb later in clause):
- 22.9

Subject implied (verb early in clause):
- 6.3(?), 6-4(?), 14.4(2x), 19-4, 22-4, 22-11

Subject implied (verb later in clause):
- 14.3(?), 17-2, 22-9, 22-11

Verbless clause:
- 18.1, 18.3(?), 19.3(2x)

Object early in clause:
- 14.3, 22.9

Direct object marker (if present):
- ל: 7-1, 7-2, 7-3(3x)

Use of ד to mark genitive relationship:
- 12.3(?), 20.3(?), 22.8

Use of ד to introduce direct quotation:
- 5-3, 22.8(?)

Verb of movement + ל + inanimate object:
- 46.2(?)

Interrogative ה:
- 7.5(?), 15-2
Lexical items:

איתי: 12.1
ברם: 22.4
di: 1.5, 2+3.4, 5.3(2x?), 5.4, 7.4, 12.3(?), 13.6(?), 18.3, 22.8, 22.10, 25.2, 30.3, 40.1
d: ? 20.3(?), 22.5
cען: 28.4, 32.2

Morphology:

אפעל form:
1.1, 1.3, 13.1, 15.3
הפעל form:
17.1
אפעל form:
1.1, 22.5
Object suffix on verb:
1.8, 22.9(?)
Assimilated nun:
2+3.10(?)

Content synopsis and significance:

For this copy of the Book of Giants we have preserved only two very fragmentary columns of text. The first column has nine complete words, which include several verbs (or perhaps participles) in the third-person, singular voice. The second column brings to mind the first four fragments of 4Q531 (EnGiantsc), though there is no clear textual overlap between the two copies (the closest parallel in wording is found at 4Q531 [EnGiantsc] 1.5 and 4Q532 2.10). In both texts we find what is presumably a description of the monstrous acts of the giants, perpetrated against the earth and its inhabitants. 4Q532 casts this account in the past, twice using the past-continuative (periphrastic) tense. There are several striking correspondences of this text with the early columns of 1Q20 (apGen), in which Noah is suspected of being a giant. These include the distinctive phrases מ分会ירין "from Watchers" and אסור תקיף "a strong bond," as well as repeated use of the nouns בשר and ארע.

Material remains:

Starcky grouped six fragments under the heading “Sy 5 = Ps(eudo)-Hênoch.” Upon further analysis, Puech concluded that two of these fragments belonged together, comprising another Cave 4 copy of the Book of Giants (DJD 31:95). Starcky’s other four fragments are treated by Puech in DJD 37 under a different number and heading (4Q582 [Testamentc]). As a result, 4Q532 now refers only to the first two of Starcky’s six fragments. Both fragments of 4Q532 are tall and slender, having remnants of between ten and thirteen lines of text (neither fragment seems to preserve the full column height). No line of text contains more than two complete words, and most contain only a single word or less. Fragment 1 contains portions of two columns of text and an intercolumnar margin, while frag. 2 preserves part of a single column. Puech suggested that there is “une correspondance possible des lignes” between frag. iii and 2 (DJD 31:95), such that frags. 1 and 2 may together represent two consecutive columns of the scroll. There are no certain overlaps between 4Q532 and other copies of the Book of Giants, though a possible parallel exists at 4Q532 2.10 and 4Q531 (EnGiantsc) 1.5.

Notes on provenance:

The fragments of 4Q532 are not found on the early “E series” or “G series” PAM plates. While their discovery in Cave 4 is assured, the mode of that discovery was not documented.
Sample image: 4Q532 1–2 (Fragment placement follows Puech)
Material: Skin

Script: Hasmonean formal (Puech)

Proposed palaeographic date: 100–50 BCE, with a preference for ca. 75 BCE (Puech)

Special traits and general comments: This copy is written in a rather defective orthography, as noted by Puech (e.g., כַּל rather than כַּל, להָנ instead of לָהּ), though note the word אסר written more fully in 2.14. Note, too, the insertion of aleph as a mater lectionis for the hollow-root participle קְנָם (2.4), quite common in Qumran and Biblical Aramaic. A unique case of nasalization with a pael suffix-conjugation form of the root חב״ל (וחנבלו) occurs in 2.9. As in many Jewish Aramaic narratives preserved at Qumran, we find the periphrastic past tense employed by combining a finite form of והו and a participle.

The use of a reading mark (a so-called “paragraphos” sign) in the only preserved, intercolumnar margin is a rare feature in the Aramaic Qumran scrolls (see 4Q542 [TQahat] ii.9), though it is better known from the Hebrew manuscripts, such as 1Qlsa e xxiii.26, 4QDeut b ii.15, and 4Q448 (Apocryphal Psalm and Prayer) 2–3. The mark in 4Q532 is of the sort Tov called the “straight line” paragraphos, as opposed to the “fish hook” or other types (cf. 4Q213 [Levi]) (Scribal Practices, 179–85).

Original manuscript quality: Very good


Script sample:

 Corrections and scribal features:

(a) Marginal reading mark (1.7)  
(b) Suprlinear letters added (2.6): עשיתין

Profile of physical layout

Margins:

Lower: At least 1.1 cm (not fully preserved)

Intercolumnar: Approx. 1.3 cm (frag. 1)

Scribal guidelines:

Horizontal script lines: Yes

Vertical column lines: None visible

Average medial letter height: 3 mm

Space between lines: 6.5–8 mm

Space between words: 0.5–1.5 mm

Vacats: None preserved
Language

Syntax:
Subject implied (verb later in clause):
Object early in clause:

Periphrastic construction (past/future continuative action):
Finite form of הוה + participle:

Lexical items:
די: 1ii.10
כדי: 1ii.3(?)
כען: 2.13

Morphology:
Dissimilated nun/nasalization:

Orthography/Phonology:
ש for /s/:

Other notable features:
Proposed Hebraisms:
Poetic doublets/triplets:

Content synopsis and significance: The manuscript designated here as 4Q533 is occasionally elsewhere referred to by the label 4Q556, on which see the profile for 4Q556 or below under Material remains. Several words and phrases in 4Q533 suggest an association with the so-called Book of Giants, or at least the Enochic tradition more generally. These words and phrases include the first-person plural pronoun נחנא "we" in 2.4 (the voice in which the giants speak elsewhere), a second-person plural address throughout frag. 3, and mentions of prayer and children in 3.1. The negative actions of shedding blood and lying accompany a reference to the flood in frag. 4. All of these details fit well the basic story of the Book of Giants (though see also the early columns of the Genesis Apocryphon), in which the gigantic, violent offspring of the Watchers interact with Enoch, and seek some remedy for their grievous plight. For these reasons most scholars consider 4Q533 to be a copy of the Book of Giants.

Material remains: Stuckenbruck and others have referred to this manuscript using the label 4Q556 (e.g., in his re-edition of 4Q206 in DJD 36:42–48), while using the designation 4Q533 for what Puech titled 4Q556 and 4Q556a in DJD 37. The result is a confusing swap of manuscript numbers for the scrolls among some publications. Thankfully, the label 4QEnGiants is consistent across the different editions. Puech’s siglum and DJD numbering are followed here. The scroll itself is incredibly fragmentary, numbering eight fragments. Fragments 3 and 4 contain only a few readable words and phrases, with most of the other fragments having only a few stray letters or words. Fragment 3, the largest of this scroll, is roughly the size and shape of a postage stamp, as are the slightly smaller frags. 1 and 4. Fragments 5–8 are little more than tiny specks of leather. None of the fragments preserves more than four partial lines of text, although frag. 1 does contain part of an intercolumnar margin. 4Q533 has no parallels with other Qumran copies of the Book of Giants.

Notes on provenance: The fragments of 4Q533 are not found on the early "E series" or "G series" PAM plates. While their discovery in Cave 4 is assured, the mode of that discovery was not documented.
4Q533, BOOK OF GIANTS

Sample image: 4Q533 1, 4 (Not a proposed arrangement of the fragments)
Image B-2846-02
COURTESY OF THE LEON LEVY DEAD SEA SCROLLS DIGITAL LIBRARY, ISRAEL ANTIQUITIES AUTHORITY.
PHOTO: NAJIB ANTON ALBINA

PROFILE OF PHYSICAL LAYOUT

Margins:
Intercolumnar: 1 cm (frag. 1)

Scribal guidelines:
Horizontal script lines: None visible
Vertical column lines: None visible

Average medial letter height: 2 mm
Space between lines: 6.5–8 mm
Space between words: 0.5–1 mm
Vacats: None preserved

Material: Skin

Script: Hasmonean semi-cursive (Puech)

Proposed palaeographic date: 100–50 BCE, possibly closer to the middle of that century (Puech)

Special traits and general comments: Although there is little by which to judge, the scribal execution of this manuscript appears of middle or middle-lower quality. The script is somewhat messy, and the spacing fairly compact. What spelling is preserved fits well the broader orthographic picture of the Qumran Aramaic texts, with yod and aleph regularly representing vowels and full spellings. Puech reads the unusual orthography ה̇קדמו at 3.1 (i.e., the locative prep. [קדמו מן] + a defective masc. [or possibly fem.] suffix), but this is incorrect. The word is rather קדם, the aleph being somewhat obscured on the photographs. Given the spelling, this word is most likely the ordinal numeral (“first,” cf. 1Q20 [apGen] 12.14, 4Q210 [Enastr] iii.15, 4Q211 [Enastr] iii.5) or the object “first/earlier ones,” as in Dan 7:24. The phrase קדם מן in 4Q533 recommends the latter option, but it is impossible to be sure without further context.

Original manuscript quality: Good–very good

Select bibliography: Milik, BE, 237–38; Beyer, ATTM, 260–61; García Martínez, Apocalyptic, 105; Reeves, Jewish Lore, 51–164; Stuckenbruck, Giants, 185–91.
Script sample:

Corrections and scribal features:

(a) Words struck through (3.2): אכ付き

Language

Syntax:
Verb-subject (verb early in clause):
3.1

Periphrastic construction (past/future continuative action):
Finite form of הוה + participle:
4.2(2x)

Lexical items:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ידָל</td>
<td>iii.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>כעל</td>
<td>ii.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>כען</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Morphology:
Object suffix on verb:
3.2

Other notable features:

Proposed Hebraism:
פעול (lexical; 4.3) [H]
Content synopsis and significance: Maurice Baillet originally called this text “un apocryphe de la Genèse,” which he thought might be related to 1Q20 (apGen). However, in view of the wider Qumran corpus it was eventually identified with Cave 1, 2, and 4 copies of what is now called the Book of Giants. Though the remains are very fragmentary, we can glean some basic insights into the scroll’s contents. Fragment 1 has the names of the giant brothers Ohaya and Mahaway (known from other Book of Giants manuscripts), as well as that of their father Baraqel. We learn of a discourse between the brothers, which mentions their having been “shown everything.” This statement undoubtedly refers to the visions given to the brothers elsewhere in the Book of Giants, on which see the profiles for 2Q26 (EnGiants), 4Q530 (EnGiantsb), and 4Q531 (EnGiantsc). Fragment 2 refers to “three shoots” and a “garden” (פרדסא), which are presumably elements in a dream about Noah’s three sons surviving the flood. This dream is preserved more fully in later Manichean and Rabbinic traditions, and it is also referenced in the Genesis Apocryphon (cf. Machiela, DSGA, 96–98). Finally, the location “Lubar” (לובר; frag. 26) is mentioned, one of the mountains of Ararat associated especially with Noah and the flood in other Jewish literature of the Second Temple period (1Q20 [apGen] 12.13, 4Q244 [psDanb] 8.2–3, and Jub. 5:28, 71).

Material remains: 6Q8 is the only extant papyrus copy of the Qumran Book of Giants. The scroll is very poorly preserved, with the majority of fragments being little more than tiny scraps of papyrus containing a few extant letters or words. Slightly more continuous text can be found on frag. 1, the largest of the thirty-three extant fragments. This fragment contains portions of six lines and several complete phrases. With the exception of frag. 1, even the largest fragments (i.e., frag. 2, 3, 4, and 26) contain little readable material. There are no textual overlaps between this and other copies of the Book of Giants.

Notes on provenance: Cave 6 was discovered by Bedouin in September 1952. Most of the fragments from this cave, presumably including 6Q8, were excavated by the Bedouin and then sold to the Palestine Archaeological Museum. Only a small number of remaining fragments were discovered during the official excavation of Cave 6 in late September 1952 (DJD 3:26), a group that seems not to have included the 6Q8 fragments.
**Material:** Papyrus

**Script:** Herodian semi-cursive (Baillet, Stuckenbruck)

**Proposed palaeographic date:** 50–1 BCE (Cross); 25–70 CE (Baillet)

**Special traits and general comments:** Although thirty-three fragments remain of this papyrus manuscript, the writing is very poorly preserved and little of the text can be recovered with confidence. The spacing of lines and words is erratic, as is the sizing of letters, although it is clear from 1.3 that vacats were employed for minor sense divisions. Some margins are preserved, though it is not always clear how fully. The very large right margin (2.7 cm) on frag. 26 deserves special comment, since it has escaped the attention of others working with the manuscript. The space of the margin is considerably larger than we should expect for an intercolumnar margin, the largest of which – even in the best manuscripts – typically do not reach 2 cm. Compare, for example, the slightly better-quality papyrus manuscript 4Q196 (papTobita*), which has an intercolumnar margin of 1.8 cm. Given the lesser quality of 6Q8, it would be very surprising indeed to have an intercolumnar margin of that size on frag. 26. Instead, we ought to consider other options for this large space. One possibility is that this is, in fact, the beginning of the manuscript. Another is that there was a large break preceding this section (e.g., a large portion of the preceding column was left blank to indicate a major sense division). Whatever the case, it may be worth reassessing the fragment’s placement in the scroll. Baillet was the first to notice that the scribe distinguished between medial and final forms of aleph (compare the words לא and אחזיך in 1.3), which is an extreme rarity in the Qumran Aramaic texts. As noted by Cross and Stuckenbruck, the same distinction is evident in epitaphs dated to the Second Temple period (DJD 36:76). This scribe preferred spellings with he for some words where other scribes frequently used aleph (e.g., המ, ה, 1.5; 17, 1.6). The short, more expected Qumran Aramaic form of the dem. pronoun דן is found at 2.3. Finally, we find an idiomatic affinity with other Qumran Aramaic texts in 1.6, where כל is used in an augmentative way in the phrase פרדסא דן כלה (“this garden, all of it”). Though the phrase begins a line, and the end of the preceding line is missing, it may be that the full phrase originally used what I have called the “double כל construction”: כל פרדסא דן כלה. This possibility is strengthened by the fact that no preposition (e.g., ב or ל) is prefixed to כל.  

**Original manuscript quality:** Fair–good

**Select bibliography:** Milik, BE, 300–1, 309–10; Beyer, ATTM 1, 262, 265, 268; Beyer, ATTM 2, 162; García Martínez, Apocalyptic, 101–2; Reeves, Jewish Lore, 59, 63–64, 107–8; Stuckenbruck, Giants, 196–213; Puech, “Les Fragments”.

---

**Profile of Physical Layout**

**Margins:**

*Upper:* 0.9–1.1 cm (frags. 3, 5)

*Lower:* At least 1.5 cm (frag. 6)

**Intercolumnar:** From at least 0.9 cm (frags. 2, 4, 33) to 2.7 cm (frag. 26)

**Scribal guidelines:**

*Horizontal script lines:* None

*Vertical column lines:* None

**Average medial letter height:** 2–4.5 mm

**Space between lines:** 6–10 mm

**Space between words:** 0.5–3 mm

**Vacats:** Yes; medium (1.3 [at least 1.1 cm]; minor sense division?)

---

Daniel Machiela - 9789004513815  
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Corrections and scribal features:

(a) Supralinear letter added (3.2): חַדּוּתְוָי

Language

Syntax:

Verb-subject (verb early in clause):
1.2, 1.5, 1.6

Subject-verb (verb later in clause):
1.4

Subject implied (verb early in clause):
1.2, 1.3

Subject implied (verb later in clause):
1.6

Object early in clause:
1.6

Double בְּהַל constriction:
1.5–6(?)

Periphrastic construction (past/future continuable action):

Participle + finite form of הוה:
2.1–2

Lexical items:

די: 1.5, 2.2

Morphology:

Object suffix on verb:
1.3

Orthography/Phonology:

ש for /s/:
12.2
Content synopsis and significance: This remarkable text, which was unknown before its discovery at Qumran, relates “The words of the written account that Michael said to the angels…” (1.1). Michael is an angel named in several other texts from the Second Temple period; he is the first angel listed in 1 En. 93, while in 1 En. 10 he is instructed by the Lord to bind the rebellious Watchers, to destroy their sons, and to cleanse the earth so that it may be renewed. He has a military role tied to Israel’s fate in Dan 1:9–21. Michael tells of something written “in the books of my master, the Lord of Eternity.” The themes of writing in heavenly books or the transmission of revealed wisdom among righteous individuals from Israel’s past is shared by a number of the Aramaic texts from Qumran, such as 4Q234 (En²) 1vi.9 (cf. 1 En. 8:21–3, 8:30); iQ20 (apGen) 5:29, 19:25; 4Q543 (VisAmrama) 1:1; 4Q547 (VisAmrama) 4:8; 4Q542 (TQahat) iii.9–13; and ALD 10:30. The idea of heavenly books or tablets is also found more broadly in Jewish literature of this period, as in the Book of Jubilees (see Baynes, Heavenly Book, 107–34). Later in 4Q529, Michael’s account shifts to speaking of evil deeds, and the Lord of Eternity remembering his covenant (1.10–11). Here we pivot to events associated either with interactions between Israel (or Israel’s ancestors) and God, or perhaps with an eschatological scenario, judging by the future-looking statements in 1.13–14. Puech considered these lines to be speaking of Noah and Abraham (DJD 31:6–7).

Material remains: 4Q529 comprises three fragments, of which frag. 1 is by far the largest (approx. 5 × 11 cm) and contains most of the preserved text. The fragment is actually made up of five separate pieces originally joined by Jean Starcky, with all of the joints being absolutely certain. Puech noted that the skin was apparently treated with an oil substance in the laboratories of the British Museum in the years after its discovery, which has left it badly darkened in non-infrared photographs. Fragments 2 and 3 are very small, with frag. 2 having gone missing since being photographed on PAM 35:72 in June, 1963. Fragment 3 contains only one complete word, and was identified with 4Q529 after Puech had already published frags. 1–2 in DJD 31. A second copy of this text is found in 4Q357 (Words of Michael⁷), with five overlapping words on two, successive lines in 4Q529 12–14 and 4Q357 11–13–14. 6Q23 (Words of Michael) is often assumed to be a third copy of the Words of Michael, though there is no certain overlap in text between it and 4Q529 or 4Q357.

Notes on provenance: Fragment 1 of 4Q529 was photographed as part of the PAM “E series” on plate 40:696. The fragments in this series of images were discovered as part of the official excavations of Cave 4 on September 22–29, 1952 (Strugnell, “Photographing,” 124, 131–32; see also the comments of Puech in DJD 31:1).
Material: Skin

Script: Late Hasmonean formal (Puech)

Proposed palaeographic date: 75–25 BCE (Puech)

Special traits and general comments: This manuscript is written in a neat, formal hand that is free of mistakes and corrections in what is preserved. When compared to other manuscripts for which the right, sewn edge-seam of a sheet is preserved (e.g., 1Q20 [apGen], 4Q213a [Levi], 4Q542 [TQahat], 4Q543 [Visions of Amram]), 4Q546 [Visions of Amram]), the writing in 4Q529 is placed unexpectedly close to the seam. Based on the likelihood that we have the beginning of the composition in the first words of this sheet, this is perhaps due to a separate, blank sheet being placed before the one we have preserved. In other cases the preceding blank space is part of the same sheet (e.g., 1QM, 4Q571 [Words of Michael]). It is also possible (though less likely) that another, related composition preceded this one on the same scroll, as with, e.g., the blank space preceding 1Q20 (apGen) 5.28 and 4Q203 (EnGiants) 8.3–5. A noteworthy practice of the scribe is an abnormal variation in spacing between words, ranging from no more than the usual distance between letters in the same word (0.5 mm) and what elsewhere would be considered a small vacat (4 mm, as between יremium and רבי in 1.10). This variation speaks against identification of what might otherwise be considered a small vacat in 1.4, between מרא and רבי. Consistent with almost all other Qumran Aramaic texts, the scribe or his exemplar used dalet in words that at an earlier stage would have been spelled with zayin, as seen in 1.11 (דרק) and 1.15 (דהב). The 3ms prefix conjugation of הו ("to be") is spelled with a lamed (להוא), as expected. In 1.6 and 1.9 we find two irregular instances of a noun with a suffix followed by a genitival יד and a nomen rectum (בسري רבי מרא עלמא and רבי עלמא). The second (1.9) is a somewhat surprising example of the proleptic pronoun anticipating the nomen rectum, which would become popular in later (especially Mishnaic) Hebrew. A number of passive verbal forms are used beginning in 1.6. There may be a sheet-numbering letter (yod or vav) in the upper, right-hand corner of the sheet, as in 1Q20 (apGen), though this is based on the photographs, and is uncertain. In favor of the possibility, we may note that the placement is very similar to that in 1Q20 (apGen), and in both manuscripts the letter is smaller than the main hand of the text.

Original manuscript quality: Very good


PROFILE OF PHYSICAL LAYOUT

Margins:
Upper: 1.8 cm

Intercolumnar: 1–3 mm (to sewn edge of sheet)

Column dimensions:
Approx. 8.5 cm w. (based on Puech’s reconstruction)

Lines per column: At least 16

Letters per line:
Approx. 42–50 (based on Puech’s reconstruction)

Scribal guidelines:
Horizontal script lines: Yes
Vertical column lines: Yes

Average medial letter height:
1.5–2 mm

Space between lines: 5–7 mm

Space between words:
0.5–4 mm

Vacats: See the treatment of spacing in Special traits and general comments
Script sample:

Corrections and scribal features:

(a) Possible sheet number mark: iversary (top right of frag. 1; marked by box)

(b) Erasure of מ by scraping, perhaps due to ditography (1.8): ◦ מ (?) [ך כ פ כ ]

Language

Syntax:

Verb-subject (verb early in clause):
1.9(part.)

Verb-subject (verb later in clause):
1.1, 1.10, 1.13, 1.2

Subject implied (verb early in clause):
1.4, 1.5, 1.6(pass. part.), 1.11, 1.14, 2.2(?)

Subject implied (verb later in clause):
1.2(?)

Direct object marker (if present):
← 7: 1.4, 1.11

Use of יד to mark genitive relationship:
1.6, 1.9

Use of יד to introduce direct quotation:
1.2, 1.5

Periphrastic construction (past/future continuative action):

Finite form of וה + participle:
1.14

Lexical items:

די: 1.1, 1.2, 1.5, 1.6, 1.9, 1.10
כדי: 1.8
תמה: 1.2, 1.4, 1.6

Morphology:

הפעל form:
1.2, 1.5

Object suffix on verb:
1.5

Dissimilated nun/nasalization:
1.8(?), 1.13

Other notable features:

Proposed Hebraisms:

נדב (lexical; 1.2) [H]

Previously unattested in Aramaic:

נדב (noun; 1.2)
שפר (verbal root [meaning uncertain]; 1.8)
דמע (noun; 1.8)
נדב (noun [meaning uncertain]; 1.8)
הער (verbal root; 2.1)
Content synopsis and significance: On the composition Words of Michael, see the entry for the better-preserved 4Q529 (Words of Michael), with which 4Q571 has an overlap of five words. Milik (BE, 91) was apparently the first to make an identification between these two manuscripts, and with 6Q23 (Words of Michael). 4Q571 fills in slightly the fragmentary scenario of 4Q529 (Words of Michael), in which Michael describes a revelation (perhaps given to Enoch) in the presence of other angels. 4Q571 1.12–13 mentions a city (קריה) and something being revealed to all the inhabitants of the earth. At 4Q571 1.14, we find the subject רע "son" rather than the רבע "man" of 4Q529 (Words of Michael) 1.14, as part of the phrase “a son will be” saying to his father ‘Until the light has been extended” איה עליך ותפש הילא. The reference to light recalls texts such as the Epistle of Enoch, the Birth of Noah, the Testament of Qahat, and the Visions of Amram, where light is opposed to darkness and represents divinely revealed wisdom. The contents of these lines in 4Q571 lend some weight to the idea that Michael is speaking of an eschatological scene, in which such wisdom will extend to the distant places of the earth. If this is correct, we may find here an echo of eschatological (and messianic) prophetic utterances, such as that of Isaiah in Isa 49:6, “It is too light a thing that you should be my servant to raise up the tribes of Jacob and to restore the survivors of Israel; I will give you as a light to the nations, that my salvation may reach to the end of the earth” (NRSV).

Material remains: Only one, tapering fragment remains of this scroll, containing most of the width of its first column preceded by a sizable blank space on the same sheet of skin. It should be noted that the letter “G” has been stamped in ink on the verso of this fragment after its modern discovery. This letter identifies the fragment as part of the “G series,” on which see the Provenance section, below. The “G” stands for “Government,” signifying a fragment purchased by the Jordanian government from the Bedouin, and therefore not excavated by the official team led by de Vaux. Similar “G” marks are found, for example, on the versos of 4Q84 (Psb) 25, 4Q434 (Barkhi Nafshi) 7, 4Q525 (Beatitudes) 14, and 4Q550 (Jews at the Persian Court) 1. A clear overlap of multiple, successive words occurs between 4Q571 1.13–14 and 4Q529 (Words of Michael) 1.13–14, making clear that these are copies of the same work. The inclusion of a third copy, 6Q23 (Words of Michael), is inferred from similar contents, though not on direct textual overlaps.

Notes on provenance: The single fragment of 4Q571 has a letter “G” stamped on its verso side (see above, under Material remains), marking it as one of those discovered in Cave 4 by Bedouin in 1952, and then sold to the Palestine Archaeological Museum (either directly or through the Bethlehem antiquities dealer Kando).
Material: Skin

Script: Hasmonean (Puech)

Proposed palaeographic date: 150–100 BCE (Puech)

Special traits and general comments: This fragment preserves the beginning of the composition, as shown by a blank area of the scroll preceding the first column of text. Another scribal option was to begin writing on the first column of the second sheet, leaving an entire blank sheet to begin the scroll (as with, for example, 4Q529 [Words of Michael] and 4Q543 [VisAmrama]). Puech noted that this is the oldest copy of the Words of Michael, based on palaeography. Parts of only three lines are preserved on the extant fragment, but we can see the scribe’s style quite well within this limited space. The writing is fairly consistent and neat; a typical formal hand of the Hasmonean period. The orthography is generally full, with yod and vav indicating long vowels, (with the exception of לכל in 1.13). He and aleph are distinguished for the feminine noun ending on the one hand (קריה), and the definite article and conjugation of the verb הו”א on the other. Only the full form of די is used in what little text is preserved, and we find the expected lamed for the 3ms prefix conjugation of הו”א. A rare hofal form seems to be used in 1.14. The construction די (1.13) to begin a new clause, which does not follow closely on a preceding די (as, for example, in 4Q530 [EnGiants] 2ii+6–12 (?),23), is unusual, and the line is difficult to understand without better context (notwithstanding Puech's attempt). The construction is only known otherwise as part of the set phrase (די חזית(א from Daniel and the Genesis Apocryphon (e.g., 14.14), where it must mean something like “And concerning what you saw,” always referring back to an earlier part of the text where a specific element had been previously mentioned. Consequently, one wonders if Michael is referring back to something stated earlier in the narrative, in which case we would translate, “And concerning that in a distant province, a son will be saying to his father...” This interpretation gains some support from 4Q529 (Words of Michael) 1.9, which suggests that the קריה of 4Q571 1.12 was mentioned earlier in the text (and so the same thing may have been true for the מינתיא of 1.13). More generally, the text clearly draws on visionary language also found in Daniel and the Genesis Apocryphon (cf. 4Q529 [Words of Michael] 1.4–5). Perhaps we do not find in 4Q571 the word חזית(א because Michael is speaking to other angels, who presumably would not “see” a vision in the same way as would Daniel or Noah.

If Puech’s transcription and reconstruction are correct, we find some unusual syntactic constructions, leaving the sense of the text at these points uncertain. For example, we would have two periphrastic constructions in which a finite, prefix conjugation of the verb היא “to be” is followed by a participle, something well-attested in other literature. However, in 4Q571 the participle is placed later in the clause, separated from the finite verb by a subject or an indirect object, which is most irregular. At least in the case of 1.13–14 (בר לאבוהי אמר [ הו”א ל,]), this type of construction seems likely, despite its irregularity, and was perhaps the result of the author writing in an exalted, poetic style due to the speaker being the angel Michael.

Original manuscript quality: Good–very good
Script sample:

Language

Syntax:
Verb-subject (verb early in clause):
1.13
Subject-verb (verb later in clause):
1.14 (?)
Subject implied (verb early in clause):
1.12
Use of דִּי to introduce direct quotation:
1.14
Verb of movement + ל + inanimate object:
1.12

Periphrastic construction (past/future continuative action):
Finite form of היה + participle:
1.12–13 (?), 1.13–14 (?), 1.14 (?)

Lexical items:
די: 1.12 (?), 1.13, 1.14

Morphology:


Dissimilated nun/nasalization:
1.13

Other notable features:
Proposed Hebraisms:


Previously unattested in Aramaic:


6Q23, papWords of Michael
[ed. Baillet, DJD 338]

Content synopsis and significance: Maurice Baillet did not know when editing the four fragments of 6Q23 that a larger context for understanding them would be revealed from Cave 4, with 4Q529 (Words of Michael) and 4Q571 (Words of Michaela). These connections were first identified by Milik (BE, 91), and have subsequently been adopted by Émile Puech (DJD 31 and 37) and others (e.g., Dimant, "Textes Araméens," 292). Only four full words are preserved on these Cave 6 fragments, but they strongly suggest that the fragments belonged to a copy of the Words of Michael, thereby providing one of the links between Caves 4 and 6. In 4Q529 (Words of Michael), Michael repeatedly uses the unique title רבי מרא עלמא ("my master, the Lord of Eternity") to speak of God, with no other extant Qumran Aramaic text using precisely this title. The words עלמא (1.11) and רבי מרא (2.2; Baillet had originally read רבי מרא) are evidently parts of the same epithet, and provide the primary connection between 6Q23 and the other copies of Words of Michael. For more information on the Words of Michael as a composition, see the profiles for 4Q529 (Words of Michael) and 4Q571 (Words of Michaela).

Material remains: Only four small, badly-damaged papyrus fragments have been identified with 6Q23, none preserving more than two complete words. There are no certain textual overlaps with the other two Words of Michael scrolls (4Q529 and 4Q571), but the reconstructed divine epithet רבי מרא עלמא at 6Q23 1.1, 2.2, and perhaps 2.3 (see Puech DJD 31:1), suggests a relationship among the three copies.

Notes on provenance: Cave 6 was discovered by Bedouin in September, 1952. Most of the fragments from this cave, presumably including 6Q23, were excavated by the Bedouin and then sold to the Palestine Archaeological Museum. Only a small number of remaining fragments were discovered during the official excavation of Cave 6 in late September 1952 (DJD 3:26), a group that seems not to have included the 6Q23 fragments.
Sample image: 6Q23 1–4 (Not a proposed arrangement of the fragments)
Image B-28360
COURTESY OF THE LEON LEVY DEAD SEA SCROLLS DIGITAL LIBRARY, ISRAEL ANTIQUITIES AUTHORITY.
PHOTO: NAJIB ANTON ALBINA

PROFILE OF PHYSICAL LAYOUT

Margins:
Upper: 1.4 cm (frag. 1)

Intercolumnar: At least 8 mm
(frag. 1)

Scribal guidelines:
Horizontal script lines: No
Vertical column lines: No

Average medial letter height:
3–5 mm

Space between lines: 9–12 mm

Space between words: 1–1.5 mm

Vacats: None preserved

Material: Papyrus

Script: Late Hasmonean to early Herodian semi-cursive

Proposed palaeographic date: 100–1 BCE

Special traits and general comments: This papyrus manuscript has generous spacing, but relatively small margins compared with the better skin copies (if the margins of 6Q23 are, indeed, fully-preserved). The scribal hand is fairly consistent, and employs a mixture of more formal letter forms (e.g., aleph, lamed, and samek) and cursive ones (e.g., mem and tav). The cursive mem as found in 6Q23 is relatively rare in the Aramaic literary manuscripts from Qumran, though it is much more common in documentary texts from around the same period. The letters vav and yod are practically indistinguishable from one another in this copy. In general, the script aligns quite well with those semi-cursive examples dated by Cross to the first cent. BCE ("Development," 149), hence my proposed dating here. Along with the use of papyrus, I take use of the semi-cursive script as an indicator of a somewhat lower-quality scroll. Baillet read incorrectly אֹלֵפ at 2.3, which Puech (DJD 31:1) instead emended to למאע. This would assume a large, formal mem rather than the cursive form found elsewhere, which is certainly possible. However, I wonder if it may instead read אֹלכל, with the vertical, upper stroke of the second lamed effaced (as has clearly happened with parts of the surrounding letters).

Original manuscript quality: Fair–good

Select bibliography: Beyer, ATTM⁶, 127–28; Beyer, ATTM², 165–66; Puech, DJD 31:1; Hamidović, "Transtextualité."
Content synopsis and significance: This manuscript is part of a composition that has been called both the Birth of Noah and the Elect of God. The latter designation comes from an appellation in 4Q534 ii.10 and other Second Temple period Noah traditions, especially the Genesis Apocryphon (1Q20 2–5) and 1 Enoch (106–7). 4Q534 is often associated with two other manuscripts, 4Q535 (Birth of Noah[c]) and 4Q536 (Birth of Noah[c]). There is decisive overlapping material connecting the latter two scrolls (4Q535 3.4–5; 4Q536 1.1–3), and a considerably less extensive overlap between 4Q534 7.2–6 and 4Q536 (Birth of Noah[c]) iii.11–13. Most have judged the evidence sufficient to treat these three manuscripts as representatives of a single composition (DJD 3:121), though some do so tentatively.

The extraneous portions of 4Q534 begin with a description of the protagonist’s physical features, including his hands, knees, hair, distinguishing moles (תלתת ספריא בונוהי), and other bodily markings (e.g., כתבב). The description is clearly already in progress at the beginning of fragment 1, showing that we are missing an unknown amount of preceding text. The physiognomic interests present in 4Q534 led earlier interpreters to associate it with 4Q561 (Physiognomy/Horoscope) (Starcky, “Messianique,” 51–66; Milik, 88, 56; Milik, “Écrits,” 94; Milik, “Les modèleès,” 357, 363–64). However, Puech has rightly stressed that there is no overlap between 4Q534 and 4Q561 (Physiognomy/Horoscope) that would allow us to conclude they represent two copies of the same composition (DJD 3:121). It is more likely that they simply reflect a growing physiognomic interest on the part of Jewish authors in the Second Temple period (see Popović, Physiognomics, 277–80 and the profile for 4Q561).

The physical description of the person under discussion is followed by an account of his intellectual journey. Despite lacking knowledge as a youth (ii.4), the central character comes to a place of profound understanding after an encounter with “the three books” (תלתת ספריא שומוהי; דבורי), though some do so tentatively. These three books are never clearly identified in the preserved material, but Puech associated them with Enochic lore (DJD 3:137–38; cf. Jub. 427–18, 21). This proposal is quite plausible, especially given the propensity in other Aramaic works of this period to attribute book lore to Enoch (1Q20 [apGen] 19.25; 1 En. 821–2; 921; 10.4.12–13). The extraordinary knowledge acquired is described using a number of terms that appear frequently elsewhere in the Qumran Aramaic collection, most notably ו ("mystery"); 1Q20 [apGen] 1.2, 3; 5.20, 21; 6.12; 14.17; 4Q561 [Enb] iv.5; 4Q203 [EnGiants] 9.3; 4Q536 [Birth of Noah] 23+3.8; 4Q545 [Visions of Amram] 4.16; 4Q546 [Visions of Amram] 12.4; Dan 2:18, 19, 27, 30, 47; 46), ומכה ("wisdom"); 1Q20 [apGen] 6.4; 19.25; 4Q5212 [Enb] iv.13; 4Q213 [Levi] 11.9, 10; 4Q213a [Levi] 1.14; 4Q536 [Birth of Noah] 23+3.5; 4Q541 [apocLevi] 7.4; 9.2; 4Q543 [Visions of Amram] 2a–b,2, and וקשת ("plan, calculation"); 1Q20 [apGen] 5.9; 4Q536 [Birth of Noah] 23+3; 4Q530 [Book of Giants] 21+3.4; 4Q547 [Visions of Amram] 3.4). These terms, especially ו, are regularly used to describe divinely-revealed knowledge (cf. 4Q530a [Levi] 11.1–15; 4Q545 [Visions of Amram] 4.16; 1 En. 16:3–4; 103:1–3; 104:10–13; Dan 2:19–23). The text of 4Q534 goes on to report that the protagonist’s wisdom “will reach all people” (אללו חכימה תמכה; ii.8). In this respect, the protagonist functions as a revelatory figure specially imbued with divine knowledge (cf. 4Q536 [Birth of Noah] 23+3.8). The legible portion of this fragment ends with the identification of the protagonist as “the Elect of God” (בחיר אלהא; ii.10) alongside broken references to “his birth” (מלידה; ii.10; cf. 4Q535 [Birth of Noah] 2.2), “the spirit of his breath” (רוח נשמת; iii.10), and a statement concerning the eternality of “his [pl]ans” (משהוותיה) in contrast to those of his enemies. The latter are destined to come to an end (ii.9).

Ever since Fitzmyer’s seminal 1965 article on this text most scholars have followed him in identifying the “Elect of God” figure with Noah, though many have acknowledged that the evidence is circumstantial and the conclusion only provisional (Grelot, “Hénoch,” 481–500; Starcky, “Le Maître,” 53–55; García Martínez,
“El Libro,” 195–232; García Martínez, Apocalyptic, 1–44; Stuckenbruck, “Lamech,” 253–73; and Eshel, “Genesis,” 277–98). Not everyone, however, has accepted Fitzmyer’s interpretation. Proposed alternatives include the protagonist being a/the messiah, Enoch, an Enoch redivivus, Melchizedek, or simply an unnamed, extraordinary individual; see Davila (“Merkavah,” 367–81) and Peters (Traditions, 101–2) for summaries of the various scholarly opinions. Most recently, Dimant (“Themes,” 15–46) challenged the consensus regarding the Noahic identity of the “Elect of God,” while Stökl Ben Ezra (“Messianic,” 515–45) maintained that messianic and Noahic identities are not incompatible in light of the Urzeit-Endzeit eschatological model common in Jewish apocalyptic literature. Finally, Cook (WAC, 539–40) and Peters (Traditions, 100, 106) noted several similarities between the “Elect of God” figure in 4Q534 and the description of the eschatological high priest in 4Q541 (apocrLevi?) 9i.2–3. Both figures are associated with “wisdom” (4Q534 ii.8, 2i+3.5; 4Q541 [apocrLevi?] 9i.2) and “teaching” (4Q536 [Birth of Noah] 2i+3.4; 4Q541 [apocrLevi?] 9i.3), have a mission that is universal in scope (4Q534 ii.8; 4Q541 [apocrLevi?] 9i.2), and yet face considerable opposition (4Q534 ii.9; 4Q541 [apocrLevi?] 9i.5–7). Of whomever the text is speaking, it is clear that he was considered very important, playing a significant role in God’s plan for human history.

Material remains: The preserved portions of 4Q534 comprise seven fragments, though the inclusion of frag. 4 in the collection is uncertain. Each of the two largest fragments (1 and 2) are, in fact, made up of several smaller ones, based on arrangements that were originally suggested by Starcky and later accepted by Puech in the editio princeps. Fragment 1 consists of seventeen collated fragments, while fragment 2 consists of seven pieces. Together, these two fragments allow us to reconstruct parts of two consecutive columns, each of which contains at least twenty lines. The rest of 4Q534’s fragments contain little written material, though some sections of frag. 7 may be reconstructed on the basis of a possible overlap with 4Q536 (Birth of Noah; 4Q534 7.1–6//4Q536 2ii.11–13). In addition to the damage on the surface of the manuscript, there are also signs of significant shrinkage that may affect the precision of particular joins, measurements, and readings (Fitzmyer, “Aramaic,” 357–58; DJD 31:129).

Notes on provenance: Some fragments of 4Q534 (the lower part of iii.1, 2, and 7) were photographed as part of the PAM “G series” plates 40.592, 40.621, and 40.618. The fragments in this series of images were discovered by the Bedouin in Cave 4 (Strugnell, “Photographing,” 124, 131–32).
PROFILE OF PHYSICAL LAYOUT

Margins:

Upper: 1.7–1.9 cm (frag. 1i–ii); 2.2 cm (frag. 5)
Lower: At least 1.5 cm (frag. 3)
Intercolumnar: 1.5–1.8 cm (frags. 1, 5, and 7)

Column dimensions: at least 17 cm h. × 15.5–16.5 cm w. (col. 2)

Lines per column: At least 20
Letters per line: Approx. 40–49

Scribal guidelines:

Horizontal script lines: Yes
Vertical column lines: Yes, both sides of column

Average medial letter height: 3–4 mm

Space between lines: 8–10 mm
Space between words: 2–4 mm

Vacats: Yes; large, all seven preserved examples appear to leave the remainder of the line blank for minor sense divisions (see frag. 1i–ii)

Material: Skin

Script: Early Herodian semi-formal (Puech)

Proposed palaeographic date: 33–1 BCE (Puech)

Special traits and general comments: Considerable care and skill were invested in this manuscript, in the phases of both production and writing. It was fully ruled, with horizontal script lines and vertical guidelines at both ends of the columns. The margins appear to be only moderate in size, though the script lines spaced quite generously. Without the end of a sheet preserved, it is impossible to tell if guide dots were used to assist in plotting the script lines. The two preserved columns are considerably wider than, say, in the Genesis Apocryphon (1Q20) or the Cave 11 Job translation (11Q10), with the full height now lost.

The scribe wrote in an adept, Early Herodian hand, using fairly large letters to fill the generous line spacing. A notable practice is the use of large vacats for quite minor sense-division.s. What remains of this copy contains only one, minor scribal correction. In terms of orthography, the scribe generally preferred full spellings with vav, yod, and aleph as matres lectionis, as is typical in the Qumran manuscripts. We find a relatively rare full spelling of the 2ms suffix מ– at 7.2. The copy's Aramaic language, too, is in keeping with the general profile of the wider Aramaic corpus at Qumran. Verbs tend to be placed, with or without the explicit subject, near the beginning of clauses, with an occasional late verb used to stylistic or poetic effect.

Original manuscript quality: Very good

Corrections and scribal features:

(a) Supralinear word added by original scribe (1.3):
שנין דן מן דן

Language

Syntax

Subject-verb (verb early in clause):
i, i.11, i, i.12, i, i.14, i, i.14(?), i, i.13
Verb-subject (verb later in clause):
i, i.7
Subject-verb (verb later in clause):
i, i.1(?), i, i.7, i, i.8, i, i.9(2x)
Subject implied (verb early in clause):
i, i.5, i, i.6(2x), i, i.8(2x), i, i.13, i, i.16, i, i.18(?)
Subject implied (verb later in clause):
i, i.4, i, i.1(2x), i, i.15
Verbless clause:
i, i.10, i, i.14
Object early in clause:
i, i.15
Verb of movement + ל + animate object:
i, i.8

Lexical items:

כד

בּוּר

די

בּוּר

ô

כד

כד

7.2

ש for /s/:
i, i.9

Morphology:

Object suffix on verb:
i, i.7

Assimilated nun:
i, i.4

Dissimilated nun/nasalization:
i, i.5

Orthography/Phonology:

2ms (pro)nominial suffix בּוּר: 7.2

Content synopsis and significance: This manuscript is one of three copies from Qumran of a text typically referred to as The Birth of Noah (cf. 4Q534 [Birth of Noaha] and 536 [Birth of Noachc]). It was given this name based on proposed literary and thematic parallels between the account of the unnamed individual in this text and that of Noah in portions of the Genesis Apocryphon (1Q20 2–5) and 1 Enoch (106–7). The passages are connected by some scholars with an apocryphal Book of Noah. See the profile on 4Q534 (Birth of Noaha) for a fuller discussion of this composition and its relationship to Noahic (and other) traditions. The majority of what little is preserved of 4Q535 deals with the extraordinary birth of an individual. Fragment 2 contains another reference to “the time of [his] birth” (2.1). Eshel suggested that this passage may depict the newborn’s
horoscope ("Genesis," 288–89). The same fragment refers to "his signs" in a very broken context. Puech noted that this term may refer either to some sort of omen connected with the figure's birth or to bodily markings that are part of a physiognomic description (DJD 31:157).

Material remains: Three fragments remain of this scroll, with frag. 3 preserving the most material in six, partial lines. Puech plausibly assumed that frag. 3 preserves the entire height of a column, based on the probable presence of both an upper and a lower margin. At six lines per column (perhaps five for frags. 1 and 2), 4Q535 would rank among the smallest scrolls in the Qumran library in terms of manuscript height. The various measurements of frag. 3 differ somewhat from those of frags. 1 and 2, the latter being quite consistent with one another. This led Puech to propose that frags. 1 and 2 derive from a different sheet of leather than frag. 3. He further hypothesized that these two sheets were sewn together and formed two consecutive columns (DJD 31:153).

Notes on provenance: The fragments of 4Q535 are not found on the early “E series” or “G series” PAM plates. While their discovery in Cave 4 is assured, the mode of that discovery was not documented.
Material: Skin

Script: Early Herodian semi-formal (Puech)

Proposed palaeographic date: 33–1 BCE (Puech)

Special traits and general comments: There are several outstanding questions about this manuscript. Puech, following Starcky, attributed all three main fragments to the same copy, despite a larger upper margin and wider line spacing on frags. 1–2 than on frag. 3. Puech assumed that the entirety of the manuscript height is preserved on frag. 3, which would make this a remarkably small scroll for Qumran in terms of its height, smaller even than the custom copy of Psalm 19 in 4QPš (4Q89). I see no reason to doubt Puech on this latter point, while the association of the three fragments must remain an open question.

This copy is written in a tidy, consistent hand on a manuscript with moderate margins and otherwise standard spacing. Though horizontal script lines are no longer visible, the consistency of line spacing suggests that they were originally inscribed very lightly as part of the manuscript preparation. The small amount of text preserved makes it difficult to know whether vacats were used regularly, or how much weight should be placed on the absence of corrections. There is nothing abnormal in the orthography for the corpus. As for vocabulary, Puech reads what would be a rare direct object marker יְהַ at 3.4, though the extremely fragmentary preservation of the relevant section precludes any certainty on this point. Consequently, the word should not be included in discussions of use of יְהַ in the Qumran texts.

Original manuscript quality: Good


### Profile of Physical Layout

| Scroll dimension: 6.4 cm h. (frag. 3) |
| Margins: |
| Upper: 1.3–1.4 |
| Lower: At least 1 cm (frag. 3) |
| Column dimensions: 4.1 cm h. (frag. 3) |
| Lines per column: 5–6 |
| Letters per line: At least 20 (not fully preserved) |
| Scribal guidelines: |
| Horizontal script lines: None visible |
| Vertical column lines: None visible |
| Average medial letter height: 3 cm |
| Space between lines: 7–9 mm |
| Space between words: 2–4 mm |
| Vacats: None preserved |

Script sample:

Language

Syntax:

Subject implied (verb early in clause):

3.1, 3.2

Subject implied (verb later in clause):

3.2(part.; ?), 3.4

Lexical items:

- יְהַ: 1.2(?)
- יִשְׁחֵל: 3.1
Content synopsis and significance: This manuscript represents one of three Qumran copies of a text typically referred to as The Birth of Noah (cf. 4Q534 [Birth of Noaha], 535 [Birth of Noabh]). See the profile of 4Q534 (Birth of Noaha) for a fuller discussion of this composition and its relationship to Noahic (and other) traditions. Fragment 1 is typically interpreted to tell of the miraculous birth of an individual, though this section is quite fragmentary in 4Q536 and its parallel in 4Q535 (Birth of Noabh). Fragment 2i+3 displays some thematic and conceptual affinities with 4Q534 1i, though there is no direct overlap between the two copies. This passage describes a revelatory figure who discloses “mysteries like the Watchers” (2i+3.8; “mysteries” are also mentioned in lines 9 and 12). The divine mysteries (רזין) are a recurring theme across a number of the Aramaic works from Qumran, such as the Enochic texts, Daniel, the Genesis Apocryphon, and the Visions of Amram. Other references in 4Q536 to wisdom, teaching, and light connect this passage to both 4Q534 (Birth of Noaha) and other sapiential and/or apocalyptic figures from the broader Qumran Aramaic corpus (e.g., Noah in 1Q20 [apGen]; Levi in 4Q213–214b [Levif]; an unnamed priest in 4Q541 [apocrLevib?]; Qahat in 4Q542 [TQahat]; Amram, Moses, and Aaron in 4Q543–547 [Visions of Amrama–e]). Fragment 2ii mostly contains material unique to this manuscript, with the exception of a small, patchy overlap with 4Q534 7.16 at lines 10–13. In this column we find a question, spoken in the first-person, “Who will write these words of mine in a document that will not wear out?” This question reflects a broader concern with written documents and the act of writing seen elsewhere in the Aramaic literature kept at Qumran (e.g., 4Q204 [Envi.1v19; 4Q541 [apocrLevib?] 7.4; 4Q542 [TQahat] iii.12; and 4Q547 [Visions of Amrama] 9.8).

Material remains: 4Q536 is preserved in four fragments. Of these, frag. 2 is by far the largest, containing a significant amount of text from two successive columns. In fact, it appears that frag. 2 preserves the entire height of the first column, based on the likely presence of both upper and lower margins. The rest of the fragments are much smaller, though they all preserve margins. Stitching between sheets is preserved on frag. 4. Textual parallels between 4Q536 and the other two Birth of Noah copies are found at 4Q536 1.1–3//4Q535 (Birth of Noabh) 3.4–6 and 4Q536 2ii.11–13//4Q534 (Birth of Noaha) 7.1–6; cf. DJD 31:121–22.

Notes on provenance: The fragments of 4Q536 are not found on the early “E series” or “G series” PAM plates. While their discovery in Cave 4 is assured, the mode of that discovery was not documented.
**Material:** Skin

**Script:** Early Herodian semi-formal (Puech)

**Proposed palaeographic date:** 50–1 BCE (Puech)

**Special traits and general comments:** The line spacing varies considerably in this manuscript, raising the possibility that horizontal script guidelines were not used (despite vertical column lines being present). This is unusual, the opposite arrangement being found more regularly among the Aramaic Qumran scrolls. The script of 4Q536 is of high quality, though not as nice as in the finest examples of handwriting in the corpus (e.g., 4Q535 [Birth of Noah])

From what remains of the scroll, the copyist seems to have made very few mistakes. The scribe’s spacing of words was quite generous, and small vacats appear to have been used regularly for both minor (the continuation of a description of an individual) and somewhat more significant (a moderate change of topic) sense-divisions in the text. In the very small amount of text evidently overlapping with 4Q534 (Birth of Noah), it is worth noting that 4Q534 7.4–6 has what appears to be a full line vacat where 4Q536 2ii.13 has none at all (preceding the word גבר).

The spelling is not especially full in 4Q536, though we do find the standard long form of אנתה “you,” and twice in 2ii.11 the long form of the 2ms pronominal suffix כה–. In general, the script and orthography falls comfortably within the standards of the broader Qumran corpus. There are, however, two archaic morphological items worthy of note in this manuscript. The first is an instance of the earlier spelling זי (rather than די) at 2i+3.4, though די is otherwise used throughout the preserved text. The second possibly early form is found at 2ii.12, in the phrase מלי אלה. Most have interpreted the second word as the plural demonstrative pronoun (“these words of mine”), with Puech provided supporting argumentation for this view. His most persuasive point is the poetic parallel with ןמאמרי ד “this saying of mine” in the following line, though the demonstrative pronoun there is partly reconstructed. If this is correct, אלה would be the singular occurrence of the early form of the plural demonstrative pronoun in the Qumran Aramaic corpus, the expected (and morphologically later) form being אלהא. Another possibility is that מלי אלה should be translated “words of God,” in a plural construct relationship. However, Puech sensibly argued that we should then have expected the emphatic אלהא. Although fragmentary and partially reconstructed, 2ii+3.12 is a nice example of the kind of elevated, poetic doublet found in many of the revelatory or didactic sections of the Aramaic Qumran literature.

**Original manuscript quality:** Good–very good

**Select bibliography:** Fitzmyer, “Aramaic”; Starcky, “Messianique”; Caquot, “4Q5ESS AR”; García Martínez, Apocalyptic, 1–44; Beyer, ATTM, 125–26.
Script sample:

Corrections and scribal features:

(a) Supralinear letter added (2.4), apparently by the original scribe: אלפונה

Language

Syntax

Subject-verb (verb early in clause):

Verb-subject (verb later in clause):
2i+3.3

Subject implied (verb early in clause):
2i+3.8(?), 2i+3.13, 2ii.11, 2ii.13, 2ii+3.12

Subject implied (verb later in clause):
1.1, 2i+3.2(?), 2i+3.6(?), 2i+3.10

Lexical items:

בתר: 1.3(?)

די:

זי: 2i+3.4

Morphology:

Object form:
2ii.10

Object suffix on verb:
2ii.11

Dissimilated nun/nasalization:
2ii.11

Orthography/Phonology:

2ms (pro)nominal suffix יִמְנַה/אִמְנַה:
2ii.11(2x)

Other notable features:

Poetic doublets/triplets:
2ii+3.12
Content synopsis and significance: The most extensively preserved of the Aramaic scrolls from the Qumran caves, 1Q20 contains a lengthy retelling of Gen 5:28–15:4 in what remains of the manuscript. There is not only a difference in compositional languages between 1Q20 and Genesis, but a wide range of rearrangements, additions, omissions, harmonizations, and literary fusions carried out by the author(s) of the Genesis Apocryphon in relation to its Hebrew forerunner (see, e.g., Bernstein, “Composition,” 166–75). A special interest in the Apocryphon seems to have been the portrayal of the patriarchs (e.g., Enoch, Noah, and Abram) as paradigmatic, righteous individuals who exhibited a litany of virtuous traits. Divine revelation is regularly imparted by way of dream-visions, often apocalyptic, and a number of other concerns come to the fore, such as the observance of cultic regulations, rights to the Land of Canaan/Israel, endogamy, and the chronology of the events recorded in Genesis. There is an added layer of human interest in 1Q20, with vigorous exchanges between characters and an elevated role for various women in the story (e.g., Batenosh and Sarai). New elements of humor and suspense are also palpable, especially in the exchange between Lamech and Batenosh in col. 2, and the interactions between Abram, Sarai, the Pharaoh, and his nobles in cols. 19–23.

Since its partial publication by Avigad and Yadin, scholars have struggled to place the Genesis Apocryphon within existing literary categories, originally classifying it as targum, midrash, or pseudepigrapha (see Bernstein, "Apocryphon"; Falk, Parabiblical Texts, 41–2). Beginning with the landmark study of Vermes (Haggadic Studies), the Genesis Apocryphon figured prominently into scholarly discussions of Jewish biblical interpretation during the Second Temple period, and especially the much-debated literary category of "rewritten Bible" or "rewritten Scripture." An ongoing discussion about the genre of the Apocryphon ensued, with others arguing for a classification as "parabiblical." However we classify this work, it is clear that it challenges the literary categories typically used at the time of its discovery, and in this way the scroll has generated important discussions on the interpretation of earlier, authoritative texts in Second Temple Judaism.

Avigad and Yadin recognized that the Genesis Apocryphon had close literary relationships with 1 Enoch and Jubilees, and this, too, has sparked much further study. The early columns of 1Q20 exhibit clear overlaps in general content with the Enochic Books of Watchers (1 En. 1–36) and the so-called Birth of Noah story (1 En. 106–107), and, occasionally, close parallels in specific wording. There are also affinities with the Book of Giants, discovered at Qumran and evidently part of the Enochic corpus of the Hellenistic period that had been lost. Later columns of 1Q20 contain striking parallels with the Hebrew book of Jubilees, as in Noah’s very similar division of the earth among his sons in 1Q20 16–17 and Jub. 8:11–9:15. Opinions are divided on the chronological order of these relationships, leading to disagreements on relative dating. In the cases of both 1 Enoch and Jubilees, it is typically asked whether the Genesis Apocryphon borrowed from the other text, or vice versa. In reality, the situation is unlikely to have been so simplistic. What is clear, however, is that the Apocryphon has a striking affinity to others of the Aramaic writings now known from the Qumran caves. The portrayals of Abram in the Genesis Apocryphon and Joseph in the Aramaic Levi Document bear a strong resemblance to each other, both describing exemplary wisdom figures who ably navigated the foreign culture of Egypt (Machiela, “Wisdom”). The story of Abram and Sarai in Egypt shows clear literary affinities with that of Tobias and Sarah (Machiela and Perrin, “Family Portrait”).

A number of other Aramaic compositions found at Qumran exhibit sundry literary affinities with the Genesis Apocryphon. This is seen, for example, in their shared use of dream-visions (Perrin, Dynamics), wisdom language (Machiela, “Wisdom”), cultic practices, and court tale elements. Another shared feature is the use of first-person narration by a figure from Israel’s past in telling the story (i.e., pseudepigraphy), which in the Apocryphon takes the form of several, distinct sections narrated by different characters: the first columns are narrated by Enoch and Lamech, from 5:29 Noah becomes the first-person narrator, and from 18.24 until 21.22 Abram takes over narration. Curiously, from 21.23 to the end of the preserved scroll is narrated in the third-person voice. In light of the affinities listed above, we can see that from a literary point of view the Genesis Apocryphon is very much at home among the Aramaic writings from Qumran, despite the fact that it has often been placed in a generic category (rewritten Bible/Scripture) different than the rest of the corpus.

Upon close reading in comparison with other Aramaic documents and literary texts from the fifth century BCE onward, it is evident that the Genesis Apocryphon is a fine example of Jewish haute literature from the Second Temple period. As such, the Apocryphon is highly “literary” (as argued by Greenfield, “Standard”), and should probably not be
read as an example of the spoken Aramaic of Roman Palestine (contra Dalman, Diez Macho, and Black; for bibliography see Machiela, “Translation,” 217–18).

Material remains: 1Q20 is the only Aramaic manuscript from Qumran to be discovered as a fairly well-preserved, rolled scroll. Parts of at least twenty-three columns are now preserved, but the scroll was once longer than this. Because no other copies of this composition are known from Qumran or elsewhere (with the possible exception of 3Q14 8), it is now impossible to tell just how much longer the scroll may once have been. The manuscript was deposited in Qumran Cave 1 (see Provenance, below) with the last part of the composition rolled to the inside, and its beginning at the outside of the scroll; i.e., it was rolled as if ready to read from the beginning (see Tov, Scribal Practices, 40, 108). Based on the preservation of the scroll when it was found, this suggests that what is now designated “col. 0” stood at or near the beginning of the scroll, possibly preceded by a lost column or two. If so, it is reasonable to conclude that the composition began with a version of the story of the Watchers, their offspring the giants, and Enoch also known from the Book of Watchers and Book of Giants. Following these events, attention turned to the astounding birth of Noah. The outermost columns of the scroll were badly or entirely disintegrated by the time it was discovered in the late 1940s, and it becomes progressively better-preserved as we move further along in the text, towards the innermost revolutions of the scroll. Consequently, some portions of the early columns are now only isolated fragments. A complicating physical feature of the scroll when it was discovered is that one of its sides was more pliable and better-preserved than the other, probably due to the way it was stored (and, hence, deteriorated) in the cave over a long period of time. The upper part of the scroll is also better-preserved than the lower portion, perhaps from a prolonged period standing in a jar. Those columns preceding col. 2 exist only in relatively small, isolated fragments, the arrangement of which has been partially reconstructed by scholars. Columns 2–9 consist of larger fragments, each making up part of one or two columns. From col. 10 onward the fragments become larger, preserving parts of two or three columns, leading to the final, best-preserved piece of the scroll containing five columns (i8–22), of which the last three were originally almost fully in-tact. A point of special interest is that the scroll was cut cleanly in antiquity after col. 22, directly following the seam beginning a new sheet of skin, so that the text ends mid-sentence at a point corresponding to Gen 15:4. Another curious feature of the scroll is that it was rolled together with another protective (or backing) sheet of moderately-prepared skin, considerably lighter in color than the scroll itself and covering only its lower portion (Avigad and Yadin, Genesis Apocryphon, 14; Elgvin and Davis, “1QApocryphon,” 283–84). The purpose of this sheet is not entirely clear, though most consider it to have been part of repairing or protecting the (perhaps partially-damaged) scroll in antiquity. The scroll has deteriorated badly since its modern discovery, and later photographs show that parts of it once relatively well-preserved and physically connected are now cracked and separated. Other parts have disintegrated into a dark, gelatinous substance. This process is attributable, in part, to the ink used to write the text, which in some places has eaten away the skin where the script was written while the surrounding skin is left in tact (Nir-El and Broshi, “Black Ink”). The composition of the ink clearly caused this type of decay, perhaps due to storage in a metal inkwell, or to the particular concoction of binding agents used in the ink’s production. Deterioration of this type is uncommon among the Qumran scrolls, though a handful of other scrolls do have the same phenomenon, including 4Q15 (Dan4) among the Aramaic manuscripts (Tov, Scribal Practices, 53–54).

1Q20 has a complicated history of publication, with portions of the scroll being made available in segments over a period of more than fifty years, in a number of locations, and by different editors. The main stages of this process have been documented by Machiela (DSGA, 21–26), with the only major publication on the manuscript in the meantime being Machiela, “Genesis Apocryphon.”

Notes on provenance: The modern discovery of 1Q20, sometimes called in early literature “the fourth scroll,” is somewhat confused because of conflicting firsthand accounts. However, all accounts place the findspot of the scroll in Qumran Cave 1, and there is no compelling reason to doubt this fact. It is quite clear that the seven main scrolls typically associated with the first discoveries from Cave 1 belonged to two batches, often distinguished by those who purchased them: four scrolls by Mar Athanasius Yeshue Samuel at St. Mark’s Monastery, and three by Eleazar Sukenik on behalf of the Hebrew University. 1Q20 was part of the four scrolls bought by Mar Samuel, but there are discrepancies among firsthand testimonies over whether it was discovered with the other three scrolls owned by Mar Samuel (1QIsaa, 1Q5, and 1QpHab), or with the three scrolls eventually purchased by Sukenik (1QIsab, 1QM, 1QH*) before the sale to Mar Samuel was made (on the conflicting reports see Trever, Untold Story, 106, with notes). In the account endorsed by John Trever (Untold Story, 106), in the summer of 1947 the
Bedouin tribesmen Jum'a Muhammad and Khalil Musa went back to the cave where they had initially discovered 1QIsaa, 1QS, and 1QpHab, by which time Mar Samuel and his associates knew about this first batch of scrolls. They discovered four additional scrolls, which included 1Q20, and brought them to an antiquities dealer, Faidi Salahi, in Bethlehem (see also Fields, Scrolls, 29; Taylor, Mizzi, and Fidanzio, “Revisiting Qumran,” 301). However, another dealer, Kando, kept 1Q20, and eventually added it to the lot sold to Mar Samuel in July, 1947. The remaining three scrolls were sold to Sukenik in November-December, 1947. Whatever actually happened, we can say with some confidence that 1Q20 was discovered by Bedouin on one of their early visits to Cave 1 and was brought to Bethlehem, whence it was sold to Mar Samuel in the summer of 1947.

According to Mar Samuel (Treasure), his four scrolls were transferred to a bank vault in Beirut in 1948, and then eventually to New Jersey in 1949. In 1954, Yigael Yadin arranged for the scrolls to be purchased from Samuel, through an intermediary, for the State of Israel (Avigad and Yadin, Genesis Apocryphon, 7). The main part of the rolled scroll eventually made its way to the Israel Museum, where it was unrolled and remains today in a vault at the Shrine of the Book. Around the time of its discovery, however, some fragments from the outside layers of the scroll broke away and made their way to three different locations. In 1955, eight fragments were published by J.T. Milik in DJD 1 (86–87, PL. XVI; cf. PAM 43.753) under the title “Apocalypse de Lamech.” They were part of a batch of fragments bought by the Palestine Archaeological Museum from an antiquities dealer in Bethlehem (presumably Kando) in the early 1950’s, who must have acquired them from Bedouin (DJD 1:43). It is unclear whether the fragments had broken off the original scroll while in Bethlehem and stayed in the possession of dealers there, or had been looted from Cave 1 by Bedouin sometime after the discovery of the main scroll. It is often claimed that they were found in the controlled excavation of Cave 1 conducted by Harding and de Vaux from February to March, 1949, but de Vaux made clear in DJD 1 (43) that this was not the case. These eight fragments were later reconstructed by Bruce Zuckerman and Michael Wise (cf. Fitzmyer, Genesis, 117) as parts of what are now called cols. 0–1, and are currently held by the National Archaeological Museum in Amman, Jordan. Another piece of the scroll fell into the possession of John Trever during his famous first examination of it on February 21, 1948 (cf. Elgvin and Davis, “1QApocryphon,” 283). At this time a small “wad” of leather with four layers broke off of the brittle, rolled scroll, and were kept by Trever. The wad was sold to Martin Schøyen in 1994 and added to his private collection in Oslo, Norway (MS 1926/2). The fragments were subsequently photographed by Bruce Zuckerman and published by Elgvin and Davis (“1QApocryphon”). Containing only margins and a few legible letters, the fragments belong to the upper part of the scroll’s early columns. Finally, to these may be added the so-called “Trever Fragment,” which was part of col. 1. This fragment of seven partial lines was originally removed from the outside of the scroll by Trever during his first inspection of it at St. Mark’s Monastery in March, 1948 (Fields, Scrolls, 78), and allowed him to determine that the scroll was written in Aramaic. The fragment stayed in Trever’s possession, and its whereabouts were unknown until a 2012 publication (Wolff et al., “Provenance”) suggesting that it is now kept at the Israel Museum as part of their scroll collection.
**PROFILE OF PHYSICAL LAYOUT**

**Scroll dimensions:**
- Approx. 31 cm h. × 2.38 m w. (as preserved)

**Margins:**
- Upper: 2.2–2.7 cm
- Lower: 2.4–2.9 cm

**Intercolumnar:** 1.4–1.8 cm (1.2–1.4 cm to sheet seams)

**Column dimensions:** 24.9–26.8 cm h. × 8–12.3 cm w.

**Lines per column:** 34–37

**Letters per line:** Approx. 45–70

**Scribal guidelines:**
- Horizontal script lines: Yes, with marginal guide dots for ruling
- Vertical column lines: Yes, both sides of column

**Average medial letter height:** 2–3 mm

**Space between lines:** 6–8 mm

**Space between words:** 0.5–1 mm

**Vacats:** Yes; many from small (e.g., 6.9 [7 mm], 19.10 [1.8 cm]; minor sense divisions) to over one full line (e.g., 5.28, 16.12–13; major sense divisions); approx. 55 preserved in total

---

**Material:** Skin

**Script:** Herodian formal (Avigad)

**Proposed palaeographic date:** 50 BCE–70 CE (Avigad); 25 BCE–25 CE (Fitzmyer)

**Radiocarbon date:** 73 BCE to 14 CE (see Van der Schoor, “Radiocarbon”)

**Special traits and general comments:** 1Q20 is among the most finely made manuscripts dating to this period from the Judean Desert. The leather is very well-prepared, including guide dots, full dry ruling, ample space between lines, large margins, and sheet numbering. We possess the remains of four sheets of skin (not including the slight remains of a fifth sheet, cut from the scroll after col. 22), with the first sheet containing at least six columns of text, and the following sheets containing five, seven, and six columns, respectively. As in a number of other Qumran manuscripts, the last column on a sheet was typically narrower than those preceding it. This can be seen especially in cols. 16 (approx. 8 cm w.) and 22 (9 cm w.). The text was written by an experienced scribe with an expert hand and a low occurrence of mistakes. Vacats are used liberally, though spacing between words is relatively tight compared to some manuscripts of a similar quality (e.g., 4Q544 [Visions of Amram]). This scribe had a neat, consistent style that has often been compared to the Cave 1 copy of the War Scroll (1QM). Vav and yod can often be distinguished, as can bet and kaph, and the scribe consistently used final letters in the proper place. Avigad distinguished this script type by “its strict formal hand and by the more developed form of characteristic key letters” (Avigad and Yadin, *Genesis Apocryphon*, 71). Milik (*BE*, 274) suggested that this is the same scribal hand (probably meaning the same script style) as in 4Q209 (Enastrb), 1QIsab, 1QM, and the original hand of 1QHa. The fact that the sheets of 1Q20 were numbered in a different hand than the main text indicates the various stages of creating this manuscript, with the sheet numbers presumably representing a part of the production process prior to the writing of the text by a scribe. The high numbers used on the existing sheets (equating to 17, 18, and 19) suggests that they are not related to the number of sheets in this particular scroll, but were used by those treating and cutting the sheets to mark the order in which they were to be matched for later sewing. Similar sheet numbers are found on only a few other Qumran manuscripts (the clearest examples being 4Q526 [M9] and 4Q493 [M5]; cf. Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 211–12), and are very rare. Another possible occurrence among the Aramaic Qumran scrolls is found on 4Q529 (Words of Michael). 1Q20 was corrected by a different hand at some stage after the main text was written (see below). The orthography of the scroll is nearly always full, sometimes startlingly so (e.g., יִשְׁבָּא [12;15; 19;15; cf. 4Q209 [Enastrb] 26.6]). The scribe or his exemplar freely interchanged כ and ג in certain situations, such as some verbal endings (e.g., התָּי in לָיָי; though compare with the 1cp perfect, which always follows the orthography...
beneath), suffixes (e.g., לָאָלָה/לָהַדָּה and the demonstrative pronom-
noun אֶלֶה). However, spellings of the definite article (8) and feminine noun ending (7) are very stable. Aleph is also used intermittently to fill in hollow verbs (לָאָלָה, 14.14; אָלָה, 0.13; אָלָה, 14.10). Sin is typically preferred to samek in situations where usage is mixed across the scrolls (e.g., אָלָה, 14.19; cf. אתּוֹל in 11Q10 [Job]). Long 2ms forms are regularly used for the pronominal suffix (e.g., תֵּנָה, 20.26), the independent pronoun אֶלֶה, and suffix-conjugation verbs (e.g., חֲפָךְהַה, 22.28). In most cases, these forms can be viewed as graphic reflections of Aramaic phonetic developments, but the pronominal suffix is considered by some to be the result of Hebrew influence. A similarly ambiguous case is found at 8.16 (and perhaps also at 10.7), where the 2mp pronominal suffix בּ— is used, rather than the usual יָבּ—. This is the only time of which I am aware that this form occurs in the Qumran Aramaic corpus, and it seems more likely to be an archaism in Aramaic than a Hebraism. The occasional use of nouns with the ending י—, such as יָלָה יְהֹיֵה (6.9), יָלָה יְהֹיֵה (2.15), and יָלָה יְהוָה (12.17) have also been discussed as possible morphological Hebraisms. Some see the ending as demonstrating the clear influence of Hebrew on the scroll's language, while Stadel (Hebraisms, 15, 141-43) considers most examples of this morphological trait to result from an internal Aramaic process.

The syntax of the scroll is mixed, though some patterns are clearly discernable. As expected, the verb is typically fronted in the sentence or clause, and very often assumes an implied subject from an earlier, governing clause. When a subject is present, it more regularly follows the verb, but many examples of a subject preceding the verb are found. The verb is, on occasion, placed later in the sentence or clause, especially in sections of heightened or poetic language, such as prayers or prophetic utterances. Frequent use is made of the periphrastic construction to express a causative action. One trend worth noting is the habitual placement of the indirect object -- usually indicated by lamed with a pronominal suffix (e.g., אָלָה לָאָלָה, "to tell to her this dream"; 19.18) -- directly after the verb, and before the subject or direct object. This is sometimes called Pronominalregel or pronoun enclisis in the literature, and in the lists below it is sometimes marked with the parenthetical "(sub. late)" where a subject is present. On the use of לָאָלָה in 20.7, see the profile for 2Q26 (EnGiants). As in any language, set cultural conventions accompanying certain speech acts may cause subtle shifts in the syntactic and lexical registers of those sections. This is especially evident in the visionary and poetic sections of the Genesis Apocryphon (e.g., the poem on Sarai's beauty in 20.1-8). An important but widely ignored issue when addressing the language of this scroll is the extent to which we may find linguistic “interference” from Hebrew Genesis in those sections where the content of the two works draws close together. This is especially evident from 21.23 onward, where the Genesis Apocryphon comes very close to translation for short stretches. In this section it may be questioned whether natural Aramaic syntax or the underlying Hebrew are governing the language; it seems to me that it is very often the latter, and that this may alter the character of the Aramaic in various ways. One possible example of this is the complete absence of the indirect object directly following the verb (pronoun enclisis), mentioned above, beginning at 21.23. If this observation is valid, then we should expect a more “natural” Aramaic, reflecting the penchants and dialect of the author(s), in those sections of the scroll where it does not closely follow Hebrew Genesis. As it happens, this describes most of the Genesis Apocryphon, with the exception of its final two columns. Whatever one makes of this feature here and elsewhere in the Qumran texts, there is no doubt that 1Q20 contains many Hebraisms (listed below).

A curious trait of 1Q20 is the cut made directly after the stitching of what would have been sheet 7, after col. 22. This leaves the end of the scroll dangling in mid-sentence, and a satisfactory explanation for the cut has yet to be given (repair of the manuscript or reuse of the parchment are two suggestions, but these are highly speculative).

Overall manuscript quality: Excellent

Script sample:

Representative sample of corrections and scribal features:

(a) Cancelation dots above and below a letter (5.9):

(b) Supralinear letter added in an apparently different hand (6.11):

(c) Supralinear letter added (22.17):

(d) Cancelation dots above and below a letter (22.27):

(e) Sheet number marks: (col. 5), (col. 10), (col. 17)
Use of מ to mark genitive relationship:

Use of מ to introduce direct quotation:
2.25, 20.10, 20.27, 22.22

Double_mesh_construction:
10.13, 12.10, 16.10 (cf. 19.10)

Verb of movement + מד + animate object:
2.3, 2.19, 2.22, 20.21(2x?), 22.1–2, 22.8

Verb of movement + מד + inanimate object:

Verb of movement + מד + inanimate object:
22.10(?)

Verb of movement + מד + inanimate object:
0.11, 2.23(2x), 2.25, 6.3, 10.17, 12.8, 17.10, 19.9, 19.13(2x), 19.22, 20.6, 21.8, 21.10, 21.15, 21.16, 21.17(2x), 21.18, 21.19, 22.4, 22.4–5, 22.13

Verb of movement with no linking preposition:
21.3, 21.18, 21.28

Verb + reflexive pronoun:
2.9, 13.9, 13.10, 13.11, 16.26(?)

Copula pronoun:
11.13, 19.7, 19.20

Periphrastic construction (past/future continuative action):

Finite form of הנ + participle:

Participle + finite form of הנ:
1.25(?), 13.9, 13.10, 13.11, 13.14

Infinitive + participle:
14.14(?)

Lexical items:

 infix form:

prefix form:
1.26, 14.19(?), 15.17, 15.19

Object suffix on verb:
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Assimilated nun:
1.26, 6.10, 12.15, 13.17, 14.13, 22.4, 22.10, 22.19, 22.22, 22.30, 22.34

Dissimilated nun/nasalization:

Assimilated lamed:
21.20

Assimilated he:
21.34, 22.4

Orthography/Phonology:

2ms verbal affix תָא/תָּא:
14.14, 14.15, 15.9 (2x), 15.13, 22.19, 22.28

2ms (pro)nominal suffix הָא/אָא:
5.9 (corrected), 20.26

2mp (pro)nominal suffix כָּם:
8.16, 10.7 (?)

ש for /s/:

Other notable features:

Use of negative particle אַל (+ prefix-conjugation verb):
2.25, 8.34 (2x), 11.15, 15.19 (2x), 19.16, 20.15, 22.30

Proposed Hebraisms:

נפיל (lexical; 2.1, 6.19) [H]
עלמים (morphological; 2.7, 4.3, 10.10, 11.15, 11.18, 14.14, 16.12, 19.8, 20.13, 21.10, 21.12) [H]
הוירוזא (lexical/morphological; 2.16) [H]
דרוזה (lexical/morphological; 6.1) [H]
מטא (lexical; 6.2) [H]
מעיל (lexical; 6.4) [H]
קור (lexical; 6.8) [H]
מאנו (morphological; 6.12, 6.20, 19.15, 19.23, 20.32, 21.13; see Stadel, Hebraismen, 21)
ידע (lexical; 6.13) [H]
מישלד (lexical/morphological; 6.13) [H]
לע (morphological; 6.16) [H]

Use of בִּרְחַ (verbal root; 20.33)
אנס (noun; 22.11)
各样 (noun; 10.15)
שֶׁפֶר/שֶׁפֶר (as a noun; 20.7, 9)
העב (noun; 6.11, etc.)
דרס (noun; 20.12)
דרד (verbal root; 15.21)

Use of בְּ by for a list:
13.7 (?), 17.8 (2x), 17.9, 17.16 (2x), 17.17

Poetic doublets/triplets:
1.9 (noun), 2.1, 2.4, 2.14 (?), 2.13, 2.19, 6.11, 6.13, 6.23
7.7, 7.22, 8.34, 10.8, 11.16, 12.17, 15.16, 19.25, 20.9
Content synopsis and significance: This composition was originally titled Testament-Visions de Jacob by Józef Milik (“Écrits,” 103–5) and then Das Genesis-Apokryphon by Klaus Beyer (ATTM1, 186; later changed to Jakob in Bethel in ATTM6, 70; ATTM2, 102), who believed it to be a later portion of the rewritten account of Genesis also preserved in 1Q20 (apGen). We join a story in progress at 4Q537 1–3, which begins a new sheet of the scroll. Here we find an exchange between a central figure, who speaks in the first-person voice, and a secondary character who addresses the central figure (see also 24.3). Though fragmentary, the episode clearly involves tablets that are presented to the central figure, on which things about him and his future are written. The presence of tablets addressing future events makes it highly probable that the second figure is an angelic messenger, and that the episode is a vision narrated by the central figure. Other parts of the scroll mention tribulations (frags. 1–3), episodes from the life of the protagonist (e.g., frags. 14, 24), and cultic activity in a temple (frag. 12; it is unclear if this is part of the vision recounted in frags. 1–3). Some fragments (5–9) have the central figure addressing a group – most plausibly his sons – in the second-person voice, which accounts for the frequent identification of this text as a “testament” (on which see Frey, “Testament”). As in a number of other Aramaic texts found at Qumran, there is a strong, wisdom-based ethical element present in 4Q537, seen especially in the contrast of justice and uprightness with corruption and lies in 1–3, 1–2, and the metaphor of walking on a crooked path in frag. 5 (see Machiela, “Wisdom”). It is clear that some of the narrative is focused on the future events and activities of the protagonist’s descendants, with a significant portion of the existing text dedicated to cultic or priestly concerns (most notably frag. 12) and the travels of the protagonist (frags. 14, 24). These topics, too, have affinities with other Qumran Aramaic texts: the former is found especially in the Aramaic Levi Document, the Visions of Amram, and the New Jerusalem (see Jones, “Priesthood”), while the latter bears a resemblance to the peregrinations of Abram as described in the Genesis Apocryphon (1Q20) 21.9–22 and 21.33–22.1.

The central figure of 4Q537 has been identified by several scholars as Jacob, based especially on comparison with the description of Jacob’s (second) vision in Jub. 32:21–26 (see Milik, “Écrits,” 104; Tigchelaar, “Visionary,” 263–64, 268–69). Jubilees’ vision tells of Jacob reading tablets delivered by an angel, revealing what would happen to him and his descendants over future generations in a way that strongly resembles 4Q537 1–3. Although Jub. 32:21–26 does not include an explicit account of Jacob seeing the eschatological temple, Tigchelaar (“Visionary”) drew further connections among Jub. 32, the vision of the New Jerusalem text, and 4Q537 12, proposing that all three texts (along with several others) assume an episode in which the future temple was shown to Jacob. Based on these correspondences, some scholars have suggested that 4Q537 is a copy of the composition used as a source by the author of Jubilees, though this remains a matter of debate. The geographic descriptions in 4Q537 seem to accord with the travels of Jacob in Genesis, especially the probable mention of Bethel at frag. 14.2. Several of the place names used in the scroll are not those found in Genesis, but are instead later, updated toponyms such as Beer Zayit (14.2), Rimmon (14.3), and Ramat Hazor (24.2) (see Puech in DJD 31 for discussion). The last toponym is also found at 1Q20 (apGen) 21.8, 10, in a description of Abrim’s travels, with the broader narrative setting of the Genesis Apocryphon providing an analogous tendency to update place names.

In summary, 4Q537 provides a narrative most plausibly focused on Jacob. In the text, Jacob recounts episodes from his life very like the first-hand accounts found across the Aramaic literature more broadly (e.g., the Genesis Apocryphon, the Aramaic Levi Document, the Visions of Amram, and Tobit, to name only a few). These episodes included visions, descriptions of the temple and its service, and wisdom instruction passed on to Jacob’s sons.

Material remains: Puech identified twenty-five fragments as belonging to this manuscript, though the inclusion of the last three (frags. 23–25) he labelled as “non assurée” (DJD 31:190). Two of the fragments (1 and 12) were in fact constructed of multiple pieces by Puech and the editors before him, all of the joins being quite certain. The largest piece of frag. 1 (roughly 5.5 by 5 cm), and of the entire manuscript, is often called the Testuz Fragment (or 4QTestuz), named after Michel Testuz, a French scholar and collector of antiquities who died in 1987. This piece is labelled frag. 1a in more recent editions, and since the death of Mr Testuz its location is unknown (for this reason it is drawn, not photographed, in DJD 31, Plate XI). Other fragments with significant text preserved are 2, 5, 12, 14.
and 24. The remaining nineteen fragments are quite small, though some of them contain several successive words. A few of the fragments have partially-preserved margins, adding somewhat to our sense of the scroll’s physical features. It should be noted that Starcky, and originally Milik, included a fairly large fragment with a fully-preserved bottom margin as part of 4Q537, and it is still presented as if part of 4Q537 in the Leon Levy Digital Library. Milik later placed the fragment with 4Q550 (Jews at the Persian Court), but Puech rejected both identifications and has instead published the fragment as 4Q583 (Prophecy; DJD 37:447–52). I follow Puech’s identification here.

Notes on provenance: A fragment originally identified by Starcky and Milik with 4Q537 was photographed as part of the PAM “G series” (see the lower portion of PAM 40.622), which implies that the fragment was discovered in Cave 4 by the Bedouin (see Strugnell, “Photographing,” 124, 131–32). However, the fragment was subsequently re-identified by Milik with 4Q550 (Jews at the Persian Court; Milik, “Les modèles”), and Puech later argued that it belonged with neither scroll, publishing it independently as 4Q583 (Prophecy; DJD 31:171, 37:447–52). Despite the separation of this fragment from those included with 4Q537 by Puech in DJD 31, it remains very likely that the 4Q537 fragments were discovered in Cave 4 by Bedouin, who then sold them to the Palestine Archaeological Museum, either directly or through Kando. A supporting datum for discovery by the Bedouin, and brokerage by Kando or another Bethlehem antiquities dealer sometime during the early 1950s, is the so-called Testuz Fragment (4QTestuz). This fragment was purchased by the French collector Michel Testuz, presumably on the Bethlehem or Jerusalem antiquities market, and was published by him in 1955 (“Deux fragments”). The fragment constitutes the major portion of 4Q537 1, and is typically labelled as frag. 1a in the editions. Unfortunately, no infrared photograph of the Testuz Fragment is available (only a drawing made by Puech), and the fragment’s location is no longer known (see DJD 31:xiv).

Sample image: 4Q537 12
Material: Skin

Script: Late Hasmonean, with an inclination towards early Herodian in some forms (Puech)

Proposed palaeographic date: 50–1 BCE, perhaps 50–25 BCE (Puech)

Special traits and general comments: A small, tidy, and remarkably consistent scribal hand marks this copy, with spacing that suggests a very high-quality manuscript. Though it is not possible to judge the nature of the pause in our story, the large vacat on frag. 12 (see the "Sample image," above) reflects a scribal practice similar to manuscripts like 1Q20 (apGen) and 4Q203/204 (EnGiants\^a/En\^c). In many respects, 4Q537 resembles those manuscripts and others like them. Etymological aleph is typically retained (e.g., ויתא, לאהוא, למסא), and the frequent use of aleph as a vowel marker more generally, as in the fem. suffix נה and the particle הנה rather than הנה (12.3). An exception to this trend is יהלן ("you shall eat": 5.1), which graphically assimilates the etymological aleph. Full spelling is the norm, as seen in the yod of the masc. part. (e.g., חירפים 1–3.1), or the imperative ני (1–3.3). Except for 1Q20 (apGen), 4Q537 is the only text to use both the long and short forms of the near demonstrative pronoun דן (1–3.5) and דנה (24.3), in each case using the very unusual syntax of placing the pronoun before the related noun (on which see Muraoka, Grammar, 151, though note that he gives a fictitious example, the only sure cases being in 4Q537). This agreement in word order is one detail supporting the inclusion of frag. 24 as part of 4Q537, which on material grounds Puech considers to be “non-assurée” (DJD 31:188). The longer form דנה is less frequent among the Qumran texts, but is commonly used in Biblical Aramaic. In terms of the general idiom and syntax of 4Q537, there are numerous comparisons to be made with other Qumran Aramaic texts. Not only do we find first-person narration and visionary material, as in many other compositions, but specific phrasing such as כעין + imperative (1–3.3), a poetic triplet of roughly synonymous words (5.2), the stock phrase כל ארעא (17.1), and the partitive construction מין קצת (12.2).

As an aside, the reading of Puech at the end of 12.1 (וטהן), is clearly mistaken, which should be read as והודן. This, it would seem, refers to expressions of thanksgiving (fem. noun הודיה, pl. הודיהם) uttered by the priests or Levites in conjunction with their offering of sacrifices (see the following line). While the noun הודיה is not found in earlier or contemporaneous Aramaic, the root יד ("give thanks, acknowledge") is more broadly attested in the Qumran Aramaic corpus (iQ20 [apGen] 21.3; 4Q96 [papTobit\*] 17ii.3, 17ii.9, 18.15). Moreover, we find an unusual, corresponding Hebrew nominal form הודיה in Neh 12:8, which is placed in a specifically levitical context. The noun הודיה (pl. הודיות) is quite common in the Hebrew sectarian texts from Qumran. If this interpretation is correct, we would then translate, “…they will be dressing, and with expressions of thanksgiving … they will be presenting offerings for the altar …”

Original manuscript quality: Very good–excellent
Select bibliography: Testuz, “Deux fragments”; Milik, “Écrits”; Beyer, ATTM¹, 186–87; Beyer, ATTM², 70–71; Beyer, ATTM³, 102–3; Puech, “Fragments”.

Script sample:

Language

Syntax:
Verb-subject (verb early in clause):
1–3.1, 1–3.3(2x)
Subject-verb (verb early in clause):
9.2, 15.1(?)
Subject-verb (verb later in clause):
1–3.2
Subject implied (verb early in clause):
1–3.5(2x?), 5.4(2x), 5.3, 14.1(?), 24.4–5(?)
Subject implied (verb later in clause):
1–3.4
Verb of movement + ה + animate object:
1–3.4
Verb of movement + ל + inanimate object:
12.2, 14.3
Verb of movement with no linking preposition:
14.1(?), 14.2(?)

Periphrastic construction (past/future continuative action):
Finite form of הוה + participle:
1–3. 6(?)
Lexical items:
19.2

Morphology:
Object suffix on verb:
24.3
Assimilated nun:
1–3.6
Dissimilated nun/nasalization:
7.2(?), 8.1
Assimilated lamed:
12.2

Orthography/Phonology:
ש for /s/:
5.2

Other notable features:
Proposed Hebraisms:
ןישיר (lexical; 1–3.1) [H]
ןריקין (lexical; 1–3.6) [H]
ןפשעי (lexical; 7.2) [H]
ןודון (morphological; 12.1)

Poetic doublets/triplets:
5.2, 6.1, 9.2
Previously unattested in Aramaic:
שע (verbal root; frag. 23)
IQ32, New Jerusalem? (NJ?)
[ed. Milik, DJD 1:134–35]

Content synopsis and significance: Already at the time of its initial publication by Milik in 1955, IQ32 was identified with a composition called the New Jerusalem, represented by manuscripts from Caves 2, 4, and 5, to which an important copy from Cave 11 was later added. Scholars now count seven copies of the work, though IQ32 and 4Q555 (NJc) have no direct overlaps with other New Jerusalem copies. IQ32 is extremely fragmentary, and little of its contents can now be discerned. The extant text consists mostly of isolated architectural terms, typically thought to connect this manuscript to the better-preserved New Jerusalem copies (García Martínez, “New Jerusalem,” 446): “column base” (חישון עמוד), “interior” (לشروط), “wall” (כותל), and “gate” (שער). For a fuller introduction to the New Jerusalem text, along with its broader significance, see the profile for 4Q554 (NJk).

Material remains: Milik identified twenty-three fragments with IQ32, most of which do not preserve even one full word. Milik admitted that “[c]e groupe de fragments n’est pas très homogène,” and the inclusion of frag. 14, especially, has been considered doubtful (DJD 1:135; García Martínez, “New Jerusalem,” 446). Fragment 14 is the largest of the lot, but is damaged and difficult to read. Most scholars speak of frags. 1–7 as the group containing architectural terms, and therefore demonstrating the greatest affinity with other New Jerusalem copies.

Notes on provenance: The fragments assigned to IQ32 were collected during controlled excavations in Cave 1, supervised by Roland de Vaux and G. Lancaster Harding from February to March, 1949 (DJD 1:43). The fragments are currently housed in the manuscript collection of the Bibliothèque nationale de Paris (Tov, Revised Lists, 14).
**PROFILE OF PHYSICAL LAYOUT**

**Scribal guidelines:**

*Horizontal script lines:* Yes

*Vertical column lines:* None preserved

**Average medial letter height:**

2–2.5 mm

**Space between lines:** 7–8 mm

**Space between words:** 1–2 mm

**Vacats:** None preserved

---

**Material:** Skin

**Script:** Herodian round semi-formal (Yardeni)

**Proposed palaeographic date:** 25 BCE–25 CE

**Special traits and general comments:** There is little that can be said about this manuscript, with even the connection between the various fragments being uncertain. Milik reported that guidelines were inscribed lightly, though this is impossible to see on the available images. The script is fairly small and neat, with hardly enough material remaining to give an accurate palaeographic assessment. Milik said nothing on this front, though Yardeni (“Scribe,” 288) included it in the long list of scrolls she argued were written by a single, middle-Herodian period scribe. I am highly skeptical of the claim that all scrolls on her list were written by the same scribe (see further the final chapter on scribal practices), but Yardeni’s association of 1Q32’s script with other Herodian-period scrolls is reasonable. Given the scant remains of this scroll, I have refrained from offering an opinion on the original manuscript quality. There is simply not enough material to make such an assessment.


---

**Script sample:**

[Image of a sample script]

**Language**

**Lexical items:**

*ת: 15.2*

---

**2Q24, New Jerusalem (NJ)**


**Content synopsis and significance:** This manuscript is one of only two New Jerusalem copies for which we have a significant amount of material preserved describing the idealized temple and the functioning of the sacrificial cult (see also 11Q18 [NJ]; in 4Q555 [NJ] we also find some small fragments possibly related to sacrificial practice). The best-preserved portion of 2Q24 is frag. 4, which overlaps with frag. 20 of 11Q18 (NJ). These fragments contain an elaborate description of the showbread ritual also found in Lev 24:5–9, in which twelve loaves of bread are baked using choice flour, arranged in two rows on a table of pure gold, replaced every Sabbath day, and then eaten by the priests in a holy place. While there are clear similarities between the accounts in 2Q24 and Leviticus, a close reading reveals several differences that distinguish the former from the latter. Most notably, 2Q24 appears to describe...
precisely where the showbread should be consumed—i.e., “[outside the Temple, to the right of] its west side” (4.9–10; cf. 11Q18 [NJ] 20.2)—delineates the roles of the high priest and his deputy (lit. “second one”) in the ritual (4.15–16; cf. 11Q18 [NJ] 20.6–7), and notes the specific number of priests involved in the eating of the bread (4.11–14; cf. 11Q18 [NJ] 20.3–5). The rest of the fragments in this manuscript are rather poorly preserved, but refer to the detailed architectural elements and measurements characteristic of this composition. We can discern fragmentary descriptions of the interior of the city in frag. 1, which finds parallels in 4Q554 (NJ*) and 5Q15 (NJ). A sapphire door is mentioned in frag. 8, along with the temple and its courtyard, and the atoning role of the priests (cf. 1Q20 [apGen] 10.13). Frag. 4 also contains clear evidence that this text is framed as a first-person vision report, as seen in the phrases הָיוֹת עֲדֵי חַזְיָה “I looked until” (4.11) and הָיוֹת עֲדֵי הָצָּרִים “I was [look]ing until” (4.14–15, 17). For further discussion of the cultic material in New Jerusalem, including the relation of this material to other cultic material in the Aramaic Scrolls, see the profile for 11Q18 (NJ). On the significance of the New Jerusalem text more generally, see the profile for 4Q554 (NJ*).

**Material remains:** Eleven fragments of various sizes remain of 2Q24, the largest by far being frag. 4. This fragment contains twenty partial lines of text, with lines 9–16 having some correspondence with the text of 11Q18 (NJ) 20.2–7. The overlap is important, since it firmly connects 2Q24 with other copies of New Jerusalem. Fragment 1 also has several words that overlap with 4Q554 (NJ*) iiii.12–15 and 5Q15 (NJ) ii.1–2. All of the fragments preserve some text, but frags. 2 and 9–11 are very small. As noted by DiTommaso (New Jerusalem, 5 n. 12), Baillet’s DJD edition of this manuscript differs in the fragment sigla and joins from his earlier, preliminary edition (Baillet, “Fragments”). Baillet’s frag. 8 accrued two additional, tiny fragments over time, as reflected in the various images.

**Notes on provenance:** Cave 2 was discovered around February 1952 by Bedouin (DJD 3:3; Fields, Scrolls, 132). Khalil Iskander Shahin (Kando) facilitated the subsequent sale of the Cave 2 fragments, including 2Q24, to the Palestine Archaeological Museum (see Fields, Scrolls, 563). A survey of the caves near Qumran, which included Cave 2, was organized and carried out from March 10–29, 1952. The expedition uncovered a small number of additional fragments from Cave 2 (de Vaux, “Exploration,” 553; Reed, “Qumran Caves,” 13), but de Vaux made clear that all fragments of significance from the cave had been part of the earlier lot discovered by the Bedouin.

**Sample image:** 2Q24 4
Material: Skin

Script: Herodian formal (Baillet); Herodian round semi-formal (Yardeni)

Proposed palaeographic date: 1–25 CE (Baillet); 25 BCE–25 CE (Yardeni)

Special traits and general comments: It is clear that this was once a beautiful, high-quality manuscript, with generous spacing, few mistakes, regular vacats, and an elegant, Herodian-period scribal hand. Yardeni (“Scribe,” 288) included 2Q24 among the many scrolls she assigned to a single scribe. Even if all scrolls on her list were not written by the same scribe (see the last chapter on scribal practices), their being classed together stylistically is justified. The margins of 2Q24 are only slightly smaller than, for example, those in 1Q20 (apGen). As in 11Q10 (Job) and other manuscripts with formal Herodian scripts, the final mem is typically the same height as standard medial letters. The lower extension of qoph is also relatively short. This particular scribe had a penchant to add small, leftward ticks at the bottom of vertical strokes, seen especially in the rightmost strokes of aleph, dalet, he, and tav. The scribe also preferred full spellings, most notably when vav could be used to signify vowels. As usual in the Qumran Aramaic corpus, the aleph prefix was used exclusively for the causative verb conjugation (i.e., the aphel). The syntax is also what we might expect, with the verb typically placed at the beginning of a clause. In keeping with the generic style of recounting a dream-vision, we find several occasions of the periphrastic construction marking durative past action.

Original manuscript quality: Very good–excellent

Corrections and scribal features:

(a) Supralinear letter added (4.12): 

Language

Syntax

Subject-verb (verb early in clause):
4.15, 4.16

Subject implied (verb early in clause):
1.3, 3.2, 4.3, 4.5, 4.9, 4.10, 4.11, 4.16(part.), 4.17, 4.19, 8.6, 8.7

Periphrastic construction (past/future continuative action):

Finite form of יד + participle:
8.5

Participle + finite form of יד:
4.15(?), 4.17

Lexical items:

כפירה
3.3, 4.11, 4.14, 4.16, 4.17, 4.19

Morphology:

ספירה form:
1.3, 8.7

Object suffix on verb:
1.3, 8.7

Assimilated nun:
4.5, 4.9

Orthography/Phonology:

ש for /s/:
4.1, 4.13(2x), 8.4, 8.8

Other notable features:

Proposed Hebraisms:

ספירה (lexical; 3.2) [H]
ANTLR (lexical; 4.18) [H]
Memra... עליר (lexical/morpho-syntactic; 8.5) [H]
网站地图 (lexical; 8.7) [H]

Previously unattested in Aramaic:

עבدرس (lexical; 4.16)

Content synopsis and significance: This manuscript is one of three copies of New Jerusalem found in Cave 4 (with 4Q554a [NJa] and 4Q555 [NJb]). Copies of this composition were also discovered in Caves 1, 2, 5, 11 (1Q32 [NJ?], 2Q24 [NJ], 5Q15 [NJ], 11Q18 [NJ]), which suggests its relative popularity in the Qumran library. New Jerusalem recounts a dream-vision in which a seer, whose identity is no longer preserved, is taken on a tour of a colossal city and its temple by an angelic figure. The angelic figure measures and recounts the dimensions of the city’s various features, primarily using rods (קנין) and cubits (אים) – with a conversion rate of one rod per seven cubits. Stades (רסין/ראסין) made up of sixty rods are also used as a unit of measurement for the larger features of the city’s architecture, such as its wall. Much of the composition consists of list-like descriptions of the city in meticulous detail. For this reason, the text takes on the quality of a literary blueprint, only sporadically punctuated by repetitive verbal constructions that highlight the text’s narrative framework – e.g., “he brought me” (אעללי) and “he showed me” (איל).
New Jerusalem has often been compared to Ezek 40–48, a text that should likely be seen as an early example of this literary tradition. However, as the Qumran scrolls attest, the “new Jerusalem” was a much more pervasive literary *topos* in Second Temple Jewish literature than scholars had originally thought, with New Jerusalem and the Temple Scroll (11Q19) being the most conspicuous examples of this motif added to a group that already included the more well-known examples of Ezek 40–48 and Rev 20–21. Earlier scholars often made comparisons between New Jerusalem and the Temple Scroll, with several positing some sort of direct literary dependence. For example, Wacholder (*Sectarian Torah*) suggested that New Jerusalem depends on the Temple Scroll, whereas Wise (*Critical Study*) argued for the opposite relationship. García Martínez, however, has shown that the correspondences between these two texts are tenuous at best, and are certainly not enough to demonstrate direct dependence in either direction (“Apocalyptic”; cf. DiTommaso, *New Jerusalem*).

The now lost identity of the seer is a question that has interested interpreters. In a seminal article on this topic, Tigchelaar (“Visionary”) listed various proposals that have been made as to the seer’s identity: 1.) Ezekiel (Lange, Dimant; cf. Wacholder, ToV), 2.) Jacob? Levi? Qahat? Amram? (Beyer), 3.) one of the ancestors of Israel (Frey), and 4.) Moses (Puech). Many of these proposals were tentative, and still other researchers chose not to offer any conjecture at all based on such uncertainty (e.g., García Martínez). Tigchelaar argued that Moses and Ezekiel should be ruled out as options, since his analysis of the other extant Aramaic Qumran scrolls led him to observe that the protagonists of these texts are taken only from the periods of biblical history related to the pre-Mosaic patriarchs and the Babylonian-Persian exiles. Tigchelaar argued that Jacob is most likely the seer in New Jerusalem, based on literary connections to the visionary experiences of Jacob in 4Q537 and Jub. 32, wherein Jacob is shown a future cultic site in a dream-vision. Whoever the seer is, New Jerusalem fits within a broader tradition in which one of the heroes of Israel’s past is taken on a tour of cosmic or geographical spaces by an angelic figure. These texts are often called heavenly or otherworldly journey apocalypses. Early examples of this type include the Book of Watchers and the Astronomical Book of Enoch, both of which were found at Qumran. Although it is unclear whether or not New Jerusalem should be seen as a heavenly or otherworldly journey, there are striking affinities between these three Aramaic texts.

4Q554 is noteworthy among the other copies of New Jerusalem for two reasons: First, it contains a lengthy (though highly fragmentary) account of the city’s gates in frag. 1 (cols. 1–2). It is clear that the wall contains twelve gates, with each bearing the name of one of the sons of Jacob. In this respect, New Jerusalem participates in the tradition also found in Ezek 40–48, the Temple Scroll, and Rev 20–21, in which the twelve gates of the new Jerusalem correspond to the twelve tribes of Israel, based on the layout of the wilderness tabernacle in Num 2. Not all of the names have been preserved, but there is general agreement that Levi’s gate occupied pride of place, namely, the central gate on the eastern wall (as in 11Q19 [T*], contra Ezek 48:31–34). On this point, see Puech (“Gates,” 379–92) and DiTommaso (*New Jerusalem*, 25–31). Second, frag. 13 preserves the only explicitly eschatological material, in a poorly preserved passage recounting the succession of empires. Although only the names of Babylon and the Kittim are extant, DiTommaso argued that this fragment depicts a four-kingdoms schema, such as those preserved in Dan 2 and 7, and perhaps Four Kingdoms (4Q552, 553). Fragment 13 also contains references to Edom, Moab, and the Ammonites, the traditional enemies of Israel, possibly in the context of an eschatological battle, as in the War Scroll (cf. García Martínez, “Apocalyptic”). DiTommaso, however, saw no need to understand this list of enemies as depicting the opponents of Israel in a martial conflict at the end of days. On his reading, the rehearsal of Israel’s enemies simply reflects an example of the “humbling of the enemy nations” motif. On the question of whether all of the aforementioned nations comprise a single list or two separate lists with separate functions, see DiTommaso (*New Jerusalem*, 173–78). Whatever the case, frag. 13 clearly demonstrates the eschatological character of New Jerusalem, which only strengthens the case for understanding the text as being or containing an apocalypse.

*Materia remains:* Puech numbered fourteen fragments as part of this manuscript, though the larger ones ( frags. 1, 2, and 13) actually comprise several smaller pieces, with some joins being more certain than others. Puech (“Jérusalem nouvelle”; DJD 37129) separated from this lot a single, large fragment originally included by Starcky as part of 4Q554, but now designated as 4Q554A (NJ); see
the following profile). Fragment 1 of 4Q554 is relatively large, representing significant parts of three columns, and containing a bottom and two intercolumnar margins. Portions of frag. iii.13–22 overlap with 5Q15 (NJ) ii.1–6, and iii.11–21 with 5Q15 (NJ) ii.15–ii.4. A few letters of iii.21 also appear to overlap with the first word of 4Q554a (NJb) 1.1. Fragments 2 and 13 are also significant in size, with parts of ten and nine lines preserved, respectively. As seen on PAM 43.589 and subsequent photographs taken by the IAA, Starcky seems to have joined frags. 2 and 13 at the sewn joint between two sheets. However, Puech considered the join to be improbable based on the stitching. Puech does, however, associate frags. 13 and 14 as parts of the same column. The remaining fragments are quite small, the largest of them preserving small bits of three lines. Parts of at least three sheets are represented in the fragments, based on the preserved seams, and at least six or seven columns.

Provenance: 4Q554 13 is found on the early PAM “G series” plate 40.608. This means that frag. 13 was among the fragments discovered by Bedouin in 1952 (see Strugnell, “Photographing,” 124, 131–32). The origins of the remaining fragments of 4Q554 were not clearly documented, though they most likely were also discovered in Cave 4 by the Bedouin.
**Material:** Skin

**Script:** Late Hasmonean formal with some traits of the Herodian period (Puech)

**Proposed palaeographic date:** 75–25 BCE

**Special traits and general comments:** This copy has no ruling, despite the fact that it is of rather good quality in many respects. The absence of horizontal ruling is clearly seen in the non-alignment of lines in successive columns on the same sheet (see frags. 1i–ii and 2i–ii). The right margin alignment of lines also varies somewhat on frag. 13, though in general the scribe kept quite straight right margins. 4Q554 appears to have been a fairly large-format scroll, on well-prepared skin, though the preserved columns are relatively narrow. The extant margins are of average size for the corpus, or slightly above average, but not as large as those in the best manuscripts. The scribe appears to have used several, small vacats in frag. 1ii, but these occur in continuously running text (there are no natural sense divisions), and at 1ii.9 an imperfection in the skin can be seen on the images. Puech suggested that a correction was made here, with some of the original text having been erased through scraping. This seems to me uncertain, and it should be considered whether the scribe simply skipped over a pre-existing imperfection in the skin (see also DiTommaso, *New Jerusalem*, 38). There is a large vacat of nearly one, full line preserved, marking the transition between two sections of the city tour, from the description of the gates in the outer wall to that of the city’s interior. The scribe occasionally left especially large spaces before the final word of a line (though the left margin is not “justified,” as in a few other manuscripts). The script is generally tidy and even, with very few corrections, and Puech (DJD 37:106) described the orthography as “semi-defective.” That is to say, the scribe did use full orthography, but not consistently or even predominantly. For example, we find רסין but also רסין, ארכה but also ארכת. Only the defective כל is found in the preserved text, while the word גוא occurs with its full spelling (e.g., iii.1; some other scribes preferred גו.). We do not find exceptionally full spellings, as in some manuscripts. The scribe preferred the short form of the masc. dem. pronoun 한국 (rather than Ribbon; e.g., ii.10, 13, 14, 16), and although the expected order noun + dem. pronoun is employed, the reverse order is found twice, at ii.22 and iii.7–8. The direct object marker י – quite rare in Qumran Aramaic – is found once at iii.13, and the scribe switched back and forth between writing out numbers and using the alternative numeric symbols. Before one such group of symbols we clearly find an abbreviation of the word אנס with the letter aleph, despite Tov’s claim that abbreviations are not found in the Qumran texts (Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 235). In terms of syntax, there is a noticeable preponderance of constructions with the verb placed later in the clause, something unusual for the corpus more broadly. This can be explained by the use of formulaic, repetitive phrases in the technical description of the city tour, which often place subordinate, locative clauses prior to the main verb. An example of this is the phrase in ii.22, عشر דא ודאוע/ajax’, which is repeated in various permutations throughout this section of the text. These verb-later constructions are more like the formulaic phrases in the Astronomical...
Book than in the more standard prose narratives of many Aramaic texts from Qumran, where verb-early constructions predominate.

*Original manuscript quality:* Very good


*Script sample:*

Correction and scribal features:

(a) Deletion with a horizontal line (iii.18): אֲמָן קָנִין

(b) Unit abbreviation, נ for אֲמָן (iii.18; see also iii.14).

(c) Possible erasure of letters through scraping (so Puech; iii.9): אשר /// ///
Language

Syntax

Subject-verb (verb early in clause):
iii.i.18(part.), iii.21, i.i.14–15, ii.22(part.)

Subject implied (verb early in clause):
iii.9, iii.11(part.), iii.14, iii.14, iii.15, iii.19(?)

Subject implied (verb later in clause):
i.i.13–14, i.i.15, i.i.16, i.i.17–18(?)

Verbless clause:
i.i.10, i.i.11, i.i.12–13(?)

Object early in clause:
i.i.17, iii.20–21(?)

Direct object marker (if present):
ל

Use of תד to mark genitive relationship:
13.19

Verb of movement + ת + inanimate object:
iii.11

Lexical items:

Content synopsis and significance: This manuscript is one of three Cave 4 copies of New Jerusalem (with 4Q554 [NJ^a] and 4Q555 [NJ^c]), and overlaps significantly with the New Jerusalem manuscript found in Cave 5 (5Q15 [NJ]). For a fuller introduction to New Jerusalem as a composition, see the profile for 4Q554 (NJ^a). Much of the content of 4Q554a can be better understood when read in light of its parallel material in 5Q15 (NJ). Both manuscripts provide a description of the interior of the city, with the locations and measurements of staircases, houses, and gates being shown to the seer by an angelic guide. From other New Jerusalem manuscripts we can determine that the city is divided into “blocks” (פרזין) by a series of streets that run north to south and east to west (see 4Q554 [NJ^a] i.i.15–22). 4Q554a contains a fragmentary description of one such block, including its residential spaces. As in all of the extant New Jerusalem manuscripts, there is no description of the human population of the city or their activities; only the physical features of the city’s construction are mentioned. This stands in contrast to the description of the temple in 2Q24 (NJ) and 11Q18 (NJ), in which the activities of the high priest, his deputy, and the other members of the priesthood are described in detail (cf. García Martínez, “New Jerusalem,” 431–60; Perrin, Dynamics, 171).

Material remains: Only one, large fragment remains of this manuscript. Starcky had originally included it with the lot of fragments belong to 4Q554 (NJ^a; his col. iv), but Puech (“Jérusalem nouvelle”; DJD 37:139) argued to assign it an independent siglum based on a clear difference in scripts, and the parts of the scroll preserved (its upper portion for 4Q554a, but the middle and lower portions for 4Q554 [NJ^a]). He also drew attention to a probable overlap between 4Q554 (NJ^a) iii.21 and 4Q554a i.1. Finally, 4Q554a
is very clearly ruled with horizontal and vertical guidelines, while the 4Q554 (NJ) fragments are not. Combining all of these points, Puech’s reasoning is entirely persuasive. There is extensive overlap between 4Q554a 1.1–12 and 5Q15 (NJ) iii.4–15.

Notes on provenance: The fragments of 4Q554a are not found on the early “E series” or “G series” PAM plates. While their discovery in Cave 4 is assured, the mode of that discovery was not documented.
Material: Skin

Script: Late formal Hasmonean with a tendency toward semi-cursive (Puech)

Proposed palaeographic date: 100–50 BCE (Puech)

Special traits and general comments: Although this copy consists of only one fragment, we have enough indicators to determine that it is from a manuscript of quite high quality. The margins and other spacing measurements are approximately the same as for 1Q20 (apGen), though the script is slightly smaller in 4Q554a (among the tiniest of the entire corpus). The manuscript was fully ruled on beautifully-prepared skin. The scribe was clearly well-trained, but one can easily see that the writing is more erratic and untidy than in some of the very best manuscripts. There is little distinction between vav and yod, and the final kaph has a distinctively large lower, horizontal stroke. As in some other New Jerusalem copies, the scribe used the Aramaic number symbols mixed with numbers fully written out. Few mistakes are present in the small amount of preserved text. There is what appears to be a dot of ink between the words ורומה and גו in 1.12, but examination of the newest images taken by the IAA in the Leon Levy Digital Library show that the surface of the skin has been abraded. Starcky and Beyer were probably correct in assuming that it once read ורומה בגו. Puech noted a mark above the dalet of קדם in 1.9, which seems to me to be a small, supralinear aleph placed between the first two letters of the word (קלדם). This is an unexpected addition (though there is an /a/ vowel at this point), and the added aleph is in a different hand, with a more Herodian-period flourish seen in the flag on the upper stroke.

Original manuscript quality: Very good–excellent

Select bibliography: Starcky, "Jerusalem"; Beyer, ATTM¹, 219–20; Beyer, ATTM², 97; Beyer, ATTM³, 131; García Martínez, Apocalyptic, 180–213; Puech, "Jérusalem nouvelle"; Chyutin, New Jerusalem, 29–30; García Martínez, "New Jerusalem"; Puech, "Gates"; DiTommaso, New Jerusalem, 49–56.
Representative sample of corrections and scribal features:

(a) Supralinear letter added (1.9): קדמיתא

(b) Ink dot/abraded surface (1.12): גו ורומה

Language

Syntax

Verbless clause:
1.1(?), 1.4, 1.5(2x), 1.6, 1.7, 1.10

Direct object marker (if present):
 фин: 1.13(?)

Lexical items:
ד: 1.1, 1.13

Orthography/Phonology:
ש for /s/:
1.3

Other notable features:

Proposed Hebraisms:
ליד (semantic; 1.8) [h]

Content synopsis and significance: This manuscript is grouped by Puech with the other two New Jerusalem manuscripts from Cave 4 (4Q554 [NJa] and 4Q554a [NJb]). The highly fragmentary nature of this manuscript makes it difficult to glean much about its contents. However, based on some of the preserved words, it does appear to be related to the description of the temple in 11Q18 (NJ) (Puech, DJD 37, DiTommaso, New Jerusalem, 73). The following cultic terms are extant or partially-extant: "table" (פתור), "oil" (משח), and "seventh day" (יומא שב). If Puech and DiTommaso are correct in associating this manuscript with the cultic material found elsewhere in New Jerusalem (especially that of 11Q18 [NJ]), then 4Q555 is unique among the Cave 4 New Jerusalem copies in preserving a part of the composition related to the temple and its cult. For a fuller description of New Jerusalem as a composition, see the profile for 4Q554 (NJa). For more on the cultic material in New Jerusalem, see the discussions in the profiles for 2Q24 (NJ) and 11Q18 (NJ).

Material remains: This manuscript was originally designated by Starcky as the second Cave 4 copy of New Jerusalem (4OSv 57–NJb), but since Puech’s delineation of 4Q554a (NJb) from 4Q554 (NJa) it has been deemed the third copy. To Starcky’s original three fragments Puech has now added a fourth, based on similarities in line-spacing and script. However, by Puech’s count there are, in fact, five separate fragments, because he also separated Starcky’s frag. 1 into frags. 1a and 1b (followed in most other transcriptions). Other scholars have proposed varying numbers and configurations of fragments, up to six by DiTommaso (New Jerusalem, 73). Several of the fragments not included by Puech under his siglum 4Q555 are gathered together in his 4Q584a–c (Unidentifieda–c). None of the fragments identified by Puech contains much text, with frags. 1a and 3 being very small (frag. 4 primarily contains an intercolumnar margin). There are no clear overlaps between 4Q555 and other copies of New Jerusalem, though the contents of the fragments make it quite certain that they belong to that work.

Provenance: Fragment 4 of 4Q555 is found in the early PAM “G series” plate 40,589, meaning that this fragment was among those discovered by Bedouin in 1952 (see Strugnell, "Photographing," 124, 131–32). The origins of the remaining fragments of 4Q555 were not clearly documented, though they most likely were also discovered in Cave 4 by the Bedouin.
Sample image: 4Q555 3, 1, 2 (Not a proposed arrangement of the fragments)

PROFILE OF PHYSICAL LAYOUT

Margins:

*Intercolumnar:* Approx. 1.5–1.9 cm (frag. 4)

*Scribal guidelines:*

*Horizontal script lines:* Yes

*Vertical column lines:* Yes, both sides of column (based on breakage pattern of frag. 4)

*Average medial letter height:* 2.5–3 mm

*Space between lines:* 6–7 mm

*Space between words:* 1 mm

*Vacats:* None preserved

Material: Skin

Script: Early Herodian (Puech)

Proposed palaeographic date: 33–1 BCE (Puech)

Special traits and general comments: There is little that can be said about this manuscript based on the few preserved fragments. The intercolumnar margin in frag. 4 was slightly larger than average, and the line spacing was around the norm for the Qumran manuscripts. The scribe wrote in a neat Herodian-period formal script, with the full spellings using vav and yod seen more broadly across the corpus. This includes the typical Qumran Aramaic form of the demonstratives עָנָן (1a.1) and עֶלִין (1b.3) with their full spellings. In 1b.1 we find the preposition על על rather than Puech’s על על.

Original manuscript quality: Good–very good


Script sample:
Language

Syntax:

Verb of movement + ל + inanimate object:

3.2

Lexical items:

לב(2): 2.1(?)
וב: 2.1

Morphology:

Object suffix on verb:

4i.8(?)

5Q15, New Jerusalem (NJ)
[ed. Milik, DJD 3:184–97]

Content synopsis and significance: Much of the material preserved in this copy of New Jerusalem overlaps with portions of 4Q554 (NJ*) 1. The preserved parts of 5Q15 describe the interior of the city, including physical features such as entryways, staircases, and pillars. An important aspect of this copy is that it details the interior of one city block, along with its residential spaces, giving us a reasonably good idea of this part of the composition. The measurements of various architectural features are shown to the seer by his angelic tour guide, who is said to be measuring each item as the two of them progress through the city. The tour is told from the first-person perspective of the seer. As in several other New Jerusalem manuscripts, the description of the city in 5Q15 has a repetitive, list-like quality, amounting to a textual blueprint of sorts. For a fuller description of New Jerusalem as a composition, along with its broader significance and the units of measurement used to describe the city and its physical structures, see the profile for 4Q554 (NJ*).

Material remains: Milik numbered twenty-one fragments in his DJD edition of 5Q15, though the photographs make clear that several these comprise multiple, smaller pieces. In fact, his frag. 1 – which contains parts of two columns – is made up of around thirty individual pieces, and frag. 13 is also composite. Fragment 1 is by far the largest remaining "piece" of the manuscript, with frags. 3–21 being very small and containing little or no readable text. Portions of frag. ii.1–6 overlap with 4Q554 (NJ*) iii.13–22, and ii.15–ii.4 with 4Q554 (NJ*) iii.11–21.

Notes on provenance: After Bedouin discovered Cave 4 in September of 1952, an official survey of Cave 4 and the surrounding area was organized by the French Archaeological School and the Palestine Archaeological Museum (September 22–29, 1952). It was at this time that Cave 5 was discovered by J.T. Milik, with an excavation overseen by him and carried out by Bedouin workers on September 25–28 (DJD 3:26; Fields, Scrolls, 142, 505). 5Q15 was among the fragments discovered by Milik during this excavation.
Material: Skin

Script: Late Hasmonean to early Herodian formal (comparable in style to, e.g., 1Q23 [EnGiantsts*], 4Q529 [Words of Michael], and 4Q543 [Visions of Amram*]); Herodian (Milik)

Proposed palaeographic date: 100–1 BCE

Special traits and general comments: 5Q15 was a nicely made manuscript, with margins and line spacing that are around average (or slightly above) relative to the wider corpus. Script lines were ruled with unusual regularity, almost always at 7 mm. Although some reconstruction is required, it appears that the columns were more square in shape than was typical, with frag. 1i seeming to be slightly wider than it is tall. In manuscripts of fairly high quality, columns tend to be noticeably taller than they are wide, though this is the rule and there are certainly exceptions. The scribe of this copy wrote in a small, neat, square script, with few mistakes (only a few supralinear letters added). A small vacat was used near the beginning of a line to mark narrative movement within a description of one part of the city (ii.2), but approximately one-third of a line was left open to signal a similar break later in the same column (ii.7). We may thus surmise that vacats were used often in the scroll, probably of at least a full line for more significant transitions in the narrative. Full spellings are found regularly (e.g., סחר, פותיהון), but not always (e.g., כל). The composition’s syntax is notably varied, something that can be attributed to the terse, list-like description of measurements throughout the best-preserved parts of the manuscript. This often leads to verbless clauses like קןין[ ̇ הַרְיָה שֹׁקֶר שְׁאֹר בֵּין יִשְׁרָאָל קָנָי עַשָּׁרִים וַסֶּהָר סִיחָר לְפָרָא],[ ̊י וַסֶּהָר סִיחָר לְפָרָא],[ ̊י וַסֶּהָר סִיחָר לְפָרָא],[ ̊י וַסֶּהָר סִיחָר לְפָרָא],[ ̊י וַסֶּהָר סִיחָר لְפָרָא],[ ̊י וַסֶּהָר סִיחָר לְפָרָא] “and a walkway [ran] (all) around the block; a street passageway[three staffs](and) twenty [one c]ubits (long).” Cook (dQA, 39) noted that the noun ברית “passageway” is an Akkadian loanword.

Original manuscript quality: Very good

Representative sample of corrections and scribal features:

(a) Supralinear letter added (1i.9): פותיה

Language

Syntax:

Subject-verb (verb early in clause):
1i.3(part.), 1i.4(part.), 1i.5, 1i.6
Subject implied (verb early in clause):
1i.17, 1i.18, 1i.5, 1i.6(2x), 10.2(?)
Subject implied (verb later in clause):
1i.3–4, 1i.2
Verbless clause:
1i.1, 1i.9, 1i.19, 1i.2
Direct object marker (if present):
ית
Use of ¥ to mark genitive relationship:
1i.9

Lexical items:
 ¥: 1i.4, 1i.9(2x), 1i.4, 1i.5, 1i.9, 2.2, 9.2

Morphology:

 så of piel form:
1i.2, 1i.6(2x)
Object suffix on verb:
1i.18, 1i.2(?), 1i.6(2x)

Orthography/Phonology:

ש for /s/:
1i.1, 1i.3, 1i.6, 1i.10, 1i.11(?), 1i.15, 1i.16, 1i.3, 1i.7, 1i.8,
1i.9(?), 1i.11(2x), 1i.11(?), 1i.13, 2.4, 5.3

Other notable features:

Proposed Hebraisms:
[א]דרומ (lexical; 1i.4) [H]
[יהלם (lexical; 1i.7) [H]

nQ18, New Jerusalem (NJ)
[ed. García Martínez, Tigchelaar, and van der Woude, DJD 23:305–55]

Content synopsis and significance: This manuscript is in an especially poor state of preservation. It was discovered as “a partially petrified scroll which could not be unwrapped” (DJD 23:305). Attempts to unravel the scroll were unsuccessful, and what remains is only a relatively meager collection of tiny fragments from the rolled scroll. With a few exceptions, much of the material is hard to interpret or contextualize. García Martínez has attempted to arrange some of the fragments in order according to columns (“Last Surviving”), though several aspects of his reconstruction were challenged by Kister (“Notes”). García Martínez, Tigchelaar, and van der Woude detailed the extreme difficulty of reconstructing the correct order of the nQ18 fragments in their 1998 DJD edition of the scroll (DJD 23:305–9), a conundrum that remains unresolved. The extant fragments of the scroll deal primarily with issues pertaining to the temple and its cult, overlapping on occasion with 2Q24 (NJ). For example, both nQ18 20 and 2Q24 (NJ) 4 describe the ritual of showbread (cf. Lev 19:5–9; discussed in greater detail in the profile for 2Q24). One of the most significant and best-preserved portions of nQ18 is the account of the bovine offering in frag. 13. This fragment shares a number of striking correspondences with cultic scenes from the Aramaic Levi Document and the Genesis Apocryphon, namely, Isaac's sacrificial instructions to Levi and Noah's sacrifice.
following the flood. However, there are a few distinguishing elements in the sacrificial material among the three texts. A comparison of the sacrificial halakha in all three works has been done by Perrin (*Dynamics*, 171–77), who drew on the earlier work of Kister ("Notes") and Schiffman ("Architectural").

The extant fragments of 11Q18 also describe the vestments of the high priest—a description that uniquely includes his seven crowns (frag. 14) and possibly the ephod or breast-piece—the weekly courses of the priests, the physical features of the temple and its furniture, various cultic implements, priestly blessings and sacrifices, and the rising and setting of the sun. Reference is made in frag. 30.4 to the "festivals of God" (משה אל), and Passover is mentioned on several occasions (16ii+17i.2; 27.3). There are a number of suggestive phrases, most of which are now impossible to contextualize due to the poorly-preserved nature of these fragments: "the sacrifices of Israel" (25.1), "all of Israel" (27.1), "while the Levites sacrifice" (30.2), and "a pleasing aroma" (30.2). Fragment 19 is worthy of special comment, since it contains the phrase: "Holy is the Temple and [the] Great Glory" (するのは אברעא [ rek אברעא לבר] קאך ער היכלא 19.3). The distinctive divine epithet "the Great Glory" is also found in 1 En. 14:20, 104:1; and T. Levi 34 (cf. Kister, "Notes," 286; *DJD* 23:336). A few lines later in the same fragment, the seer reports that his angelic tour guide has shown him a writing (כתב), and has read from it. The entire scene appears to take place in the temple, but it is unclear what sort of writing this is, or what it contained. Is it an inscription inside of the temple, or perhaps a handbook of priestly instructions? The answer eludes us, but the convergence of priestly themes, distinctive divine epithets, angelic revelation, and a focus on textuality demonstrates conceptual and lexical affinities with the broader Aramaic literary tradition at Qumran, as all of these themes are found in other Aramaic scrolls.

New Jerusalem’s thoroughgoing interest in the temple, priesthood, and cult, seen especially in 2Q24 (NJ) and 11Q18, situate it firmly within the broader Qumran Aramaic collection, insofar as a concern for matters related to the priesthood characterize a considerable segment of the corpus. Other texts exhibiting this interest include the Testament of Jacob?, the Aramaic Levi Document, the Apocryphon of Levi, the Testament of Qahat, the Visions of Amram, the Book of Watchers, the Astronomical Book, the Animal Apocalypse, the Apocalypse of Weeks, the Genesis Apocryphon, and Tobit. Milik already recognized this shared interest among a number Qumran Aramaic texts in 1957 (*Dix ans*, 95–96), and more recently Angel (*Otherworldly*) and Perrin (*Dynamics*, 158–89) have advanced our understanding of the priestly material in these texts. At the same time, there are features distinguishing New Jerusalem from the other priestly-oriented texts among the Aramaic Scrolls, such as its mention of the name Israel and sacrifices related to the Passover festival.

**Material remains:** 11Q18 originally surfaced as a badly-damaged, desiccated, rolled scroll approximately 10.6 cm long and with a circumference at its center of around 3.5–3.8 cm (*DJD* 23:336, Plate LIII). There is clear evidence that it was stored in a textile wrapping, since part of the wrapping was still stuck to the outside of the scroll. Many such wrappings were found in Cave 11 (Humbert and Fidanzio, *Khârîbêt Qumrân*, 97–124). One piece of cloth associated with the scroll has been identified as wool (*DJD* 23:336), but given that all known scroll wrappings from Cave 11 are linen, this flax-based material is almost certainly the fabric used to wrap the scroll. Unrolling the scroll proved impossible, due to gelatinization of much of it (Humbert and Fidanzio, *Khârîbêt Qumrân*, 181–82), and the best that could be done was to remove a less-damaged portion of it on the advice of H.J. Plenderleith. It seems that at least eight layers from the outside of the scroll were completely lost (*DJD* 23:309). The fragments currently available derive from the portion removed under Plenderleith’s guidance, or otherwise broken off from the brittle scroll. García Martínez, Tigchelaar, and van der Woude numbered thirty-seven fragments of 11Q18, though several of them comprise multiple pieces with definite joins. Approximately fifty additional very small or unscribed fragments were not numbered, but are included on Plate XL of *DJD* 23, and García Martínez, Tigchelaar, and van der Woude described other hardened “wads” of skin, the layers of which could not always be separated (e.g., frag. 3 on Plate XXXV). Since the main fragments were manually removed from the larger scroll, frags. 4–32 are of a somewhat similar shape, with generally diminishing sizes as one moves higher in the fragment numbers (with several exceptions), and presumably closer to the scroll’s center. The largest of these fragments (e.g., frags. 12 and 13) are roughly 8 cm high and 5 cm wide, with the smallest (e.g., frags. 22 and 29) being about 5 cm high by 2 cm wide. The fragments have begun to crack since their removal, but are generally still legible. However, it should be noted that frags. 1–8 are more badly damaged (and less legible) than most others, since they were closest to the damaged outer revolutions of the scroll. The only assured overlap with another copy of New Jerusalem is at frag. 20.2–7, which finds partial parallel in 2Q24 (NJ) 4.9–16.
Notes on provenance: The majority of the Cave 11 manuscripts were discovered by Bedouin in early (probably January) 1956, including 11Q18. Only a few Palaeo-Hebrew fragments and a small scroll titled Apocryphal Psalms (11Q51) were found in the official excavations led by Roland de Vaux in February, 1956 (de Vaux, “Fouilles,” 574; Tigchelaar in Humbert and Fidanzio, Khirbet Qumrân, 250–51). The Palestine Archaeological Museum provisionally purchased a batch of Cave 11 manuscripts that included 11Q18 in July, 1956, and there is no reason to believe that the scroll did not originate in Qumran Cave 11. The cost of a number of the Cave 11 manuscripts, including 11Q18, was eventually covered by the Dutch Academy in 1961–62, with funds provided by the Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen (KNAW) and the Nederlandse Organisatie voor Zuiver-Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek (ZWO). As a result, these manuscripts were published by a group of Dutch scholars. For an extensive discussion of the provenance, publication, and nature of the Cave 11 scrolls, see Tigchelaar’s account in Humbert and Fidanzio, Khirbet Qumrân, 249–58.

Sample image: 11Q18 20, 21 (Not a proposed arrangement of the fragments)
Material: Skin

Script: Early Herodian round semi-formal (García Martínez, Tigchelaar, and van der Woude; Yardeni)

Proposed palaeographic date: 25 BCE–25 CE (García Martínez, Tigchelaar, and van der Woude; Yardeni)

Special traits and general comments: A notable feature of this scroll is that it was found with its textile wrapping still partially intact and stuck to the outer layers. If we assume that the preserved scroll height of around 10.6 cm is close to its original size when produced and used in antiquity, we would have to assume that the columns were quite short in height. Fragment 13 shows that there were at least eleven lines in that column, with a minimum column height of 6.5 cm. Adding the 2.5 cm upper margin and a slightly larger lower margin of, say, 2.8 cm would result in a scroll height of around 11 cm. Based on the appearance of the scroll when it was found, it is plausible that this was close to its original height. The result would be a scroll (and columns) 3–4 cm shorter in height than 11Q10 (Job), the date of which is quite close to that of 11Q8 on palaeographic grounds. Still, 11Q8 would be slightly greater in height than other short manuscripts, such as 4Q246 (apocrDan) and 4Q542 (TQahat). The upper and intercolumnar margins of 11Q8 are relatively large, and the scroll was fully ruled, with ruling guide dots at the ends of sheets (the dots were used for marking both vertical and horizontal lines). Stitching is still seen on the left side of frag. 21.

The scribe wrote in a relatively large script, comparable in size to 11Q10 (Job) and noticeably larger than in most Qumran Aramaic manuscripts. Yardeni included 11Q8 among the list of scrolls attributed by her to a single, Herodian period scribe ("Scribes," 289). Though her palaeographic assessment agrees with that of the scroll's DJD editors, the attribution of all scrolls on her list to a single scribe is open to criticism (see the last chapter on scribal practices). At some points the scribe of 11Q8 fluctuated markedly in script size, using smaller letters, e.g., in frags. 9, 31, 33, and 37. As with many formal Herodian scripts (e.g., 11Q10 [Job], 4Q246 [apocrDan]), the heights of final letters and other typically taller letters, such as qoph, are much closer to the size of a standard medial letter than we would expect to find in earlier, Hasmonean-period hands. The scribe of 11Q8 did not differentiate between medial and final tsade (cf. 14ii.4), always using the former. In line with many other Aramaic manuscripts at Qumran, he tended to use aleph as a vowel letter more often than he, and regularly used full spellings with vav and yod. There is an unusual fluctuation in the 3ms pronominal suffix between the expected ־וּ (e.g., התומם, 13.2) and the abbreviated ־ו (עלוי at 8.3 and 9.4). The shortened ending is typically taken to be a later development, which would fit well with the Herodian date of this copy, and would provide an example of minor scribal intervention through the use of a newer form. We find liberal use of vacats, with the scribe apparently leaving the remainder – or large parts of – a line open to signal small or intermediate progressions in the narrative. In frags. 11 and 12 there are large vacats between what seem to be descriptions of different parts of the temple complex, while in frags. 18 and 19 they seem to occur before a new type of interaction with the angelic guide or some other figure in the vision. As in 1Q20 (apGen) 17.7, the scribe
of 11Q18 used the probable Hebrew prepositional compound לְיד (6.2, 11.2, 13.8) along with various other lexical items derived from Hebrew, mostly related to the temple and the sacrifices performed there.

Original manuscript quality: Very good

Script sample:

Representative sample of corrections and scribal features:

(a) Supralinear word added in same hand (13.4):

(b) Erasure of final nun by scraping (28.5):

Language

Syntax:

Verb-subject (verb early in clause):
14ii.5(?), 16ii+17i.3–4, 18.5(part.), 20.5, 26.3, 27.4(?)

Subject-verb (verb early in clause):
11.2, 11.6(?), 13.6(part.), 15.2, 15.3(part.), 16ii+17i.2–3(part.), 23.6(?)

Verb-subject (verb later in clause):
19.3, 20.3a

Subject-verb (verb later in clause):
18.2(part.)

Subject implied (verb early in clause):
9.4, 13.1, 13.2(2x), 13.3, 13.4, 13.5, 14ii.1, 15.4, 18.5, 19.5, 25.6, 26.2, 28.2(?), 30.3, 32.2(?), 32.7

Subject implied (verb later in clause):
8.3(?)

Verbless clause:
14i.4

Content synopsis and significance: This previously unknown work records a character narrating, in the first-person voice, events from the Joseph story of Genesis. The extant portions of the scroll retell the parts of the story in which Joseph tested his brothers with the hidden silver cup (Gen 44), and in which Joseph revealed his true identity (Gen 45). Connections to the Joseph story are seen throughout the fragments, but are most explicit in the naming of Joseph at 2.3, and in the phrase ויפל על צוארי בנימן אחיו ויבך ("he fell on my neck and embraced me, weeping") at 1.6. This phrase clearly reflects the language of Gen 45:14 "ויפל על צוארי בנימן אחיו ויבך" showing that the speaker in 4Q538 is not Joseph, but Benjamin. It is understandable, then, that Starcky originally titled the scroll “Testament of Benjamin.” However, Milik (“Écrits,” 97–98) – followed by Puech (DJD 31:91–92) – later proposed that the individual speaking is, in fact, Joseph’s older brother Judah. Milik based his identification on details in Jub. 42:25–43:18 (esp. 43:11–18) and the Greek Testament of Judah 12:11–12, in which Judah is said to speak with Joseph and reside with him in Egypt. Klaus Beyer (ATTM1, 187; ATTM2, 103) followed Starcky in assigning the narration of the fragments to Benjamin, but proposed that they belong (along with 4Q537 [TJacob?]) to a Cave 4 copy of Das Genesis-Apokryphon. This last part of Beyer’s proposal has not been accepted by subsequent scholars working on 4Q537 (TJacob?) and 4Q538. Dimant also followed the earlier insight of Starcky in arguing for an identification of the speaker in 4Q538 with Benjamin, an identification that, she wrote, “is salient and fits every detail in the passage” (History, 452). An important detail in this regard is Joseph’s testing of his brothers’ attitude towards Benjamin in 1–2.1–4, which Dimant noted was widespread in Second Temple period Jewish readings of the Joseph story (e.g., in Jubilees and the writings of Philo and Josephus). 4Q538 is another attestation of this tradition, and the earliest of which we know. Dimant avoided
the explicit association with the later Greek Testament of Benjamin that might be inferred from Starcky’s designation Testament of Benjamin, proposing instead the title Words of Benjamin. At the same time, she noted that the very little text preserved on frags. 3–4 seems to be part of an “exhortation” (History, 453), similar to those found in other Jewish and Christian texts identified with the genre “testament.”

As Dimant has shown, Milik’s connection to Judah are not compelling, and the fact that Joseph falls upon Benjamin’s neck in Gen 45:14 (a tradition followed by Philo, Josephus, and others) heavily favors Starcky’s original identification of Benjamin as the speaker and protagonist of 4Q538. In this scroll, we find an Aramaic expansion of a story from Genesis, told from the first-person perspective of a character from that book. This literary style closely resembles many other Qumran Aramaic texts, such as the Enochic writings, the Book of Giants, the Genesis Apocryphon, and the Aramaic Levi Document, to name only a few. Although the speaker of 4Q538 is Benjamin, it is probable that a major focus of the text was Joseph, whose impeccable character was also the focus of the didactic poem at the end of the Aramaic Levi Document, and much of the Greek Testament of Benjamin.

Material remains: We possess four fragments of this scroll, with frags. 1 and 2 being relatively large (approx. 5–6 × 4 cm) and containing most of the preserved text. Already in 1978 Milik proposed that these two fragments belonged to the same column, offering a plausible reconstruction followed by Beyer, Puech, and Dimant. Fragment 2 has a partial left margin preserved. Fragments 3 and 4 are significantly smaller than frags. 1–2, and were first published by Puech in DJD 31. Fragment 3 contains part of a right margin, with clear evidence of a vertical dry-ruled line demarcating the edge of the column. Milik (“Écrits,” 98) suggested that 3Q7 contains a very partial Hebrew copy of the same work as 4Q538, but this identification is extremely tenuous and has not been widely accepted.

Provenance: The fragments of 4Q538 are not found on the early “E series” or “G series” PAM plates. While their discovery in Cave 4 is assured, the mode of that discovery was not documented.
Material: Skin

Script: Late Hasmonean formal (Puech)

Proposed palaeographic date: 50–1 BCE (Puech)

Special traits and general comments: It is difficult to get an accurate read on the quality of this manuscript based on the remaining fragments. The script and spacing are uniform and neat, the manuscript is ruled, with what appear to be relatively generous intercolumnar margins, and it seems there were at least some vacats marking minor sense divisions based on frag. 2. These factors point toward a manuscript of estimable quality and investment. Though based on a very small sample size, notable linguistic traits include a high frequency of the word ירא in lieu of other verbal or predicate structures, and two instances of רומ as a marker of narrative progress. The full orthography of באתה in 3.4 is found in several other manuscripts (4Q547 [Visions of Amram*], 4Q551 [Narrative], 4Q554 [NJ*]), though the defectively-spelled נאם is more prevalent (e.g., 1Q20 [apGen], 4Q196 [pap-Tob*], and 4Q212 [En*]). The morphology and orthography of 4Q538 are very much in keeping with the majority of Qumran Aramaic texts.

Original manuscript quality: Very good

Select bibliography: Milik, “Écrits”; Beyer, ATTM¹, 187; Beyer, ATTM², 103; Dimant, History, 441–54.
Language

Syntax

Subject implied (verb early in clause):
1.1, 1.4, 1.5, 2.2, 2.4, 3.4(?), 4.1(?)

Subject implied (verb later in clause):
1.4(?), 1.5

Verbless clause:
3-3

Lexical items:

איתי: 1.2, 1.4, 2.5
אדין: 1.1, 1.4
די: 1.4, 4.1
כדי: 2.2
כחדא: 1.3

Morphology:

احتمال form:
2.2(2x)

Object suffix on verb:
1.5, 3.4(?)

Other notable features:

Proposed Hebraisms:

̊ אל (lexical; 3.3) [H]

Previously unattested in Aramaic:

עפ״ק (lexical; 1.6)

Content synopsis and significance: Like a number of other Aramaic texts found at Qumran, 4Q539 records the story of a figure from the Hebrew book of Genesis, told from the first-person perspective. This is seen most clearly in the name Jacob two lines before the noun “my father” (אבי) on frag. 2, and in the phrases “li[sten, my children” (מעו בני) and “the children of my uncle, Ishmae[l” (לעא מש י דדי ינ) in frag. 3. The context of a father addressing his children in the latter fragment led to the judgment that this is a death-bed testament (on the genre, see Frey “Testament”), though it should be noted that such addresses are widely attested among the Aramaic texts at Qumran, not always as part of an address on the occasion of the protagonist’s death (see Machiela, “Wisdom”). The central character of 4Q539 is probably Joseph, judging by Milik’s comparison of the text with details in the Greek Testament of Joseph (Milik, “Écrits,” 101–2), which was later strengthened by the analysis of Puech in DJD 31. In addition to Jacob and Ishmael, the name Pentephres may occur at 4.6, though the reading is uncertain. This is the name of Joseph’s Egyptian father-in-law in the Septuagint, Joseph and Aseneth, the Greek Testament of Joseph, and later sources, used as an alternative to the name Potiphar in MT Gen 41:45 and 46:20. The personal name or toponym Memphis (מְפ) may also be preserved at 1.2. Puech noted that, in some traditions, Memphis is the name of Pentephres’s wife. We also read of someone weeping for “my father” and the wisdom aphorism, “[By the word of] his[m]ooth will the spirit of a man be trapped“ (5.2). While Milik and Puech argued for a number of specific parallels with passages in the Greek testament, these are not always as compelling as they seem to assume. Nevertheless, the cumulative evidence does suggest that the Greek work was derived from a significantly earlier, originally Aramaic composition narrated by Joseph, a small part of which is preserved in 4Q539.

Material remains: Józef Milik originally published frags. 1–3 of this scroll (“Écrits,” 101–2; following the preliminary identification of Jean Starcky), to which Puech later added frags. 4–5 (DJD 31). All of the fragments are rather small and difficult to read. None of them preserves more than three or four consecutive words on a line, with frag. 2 having the most successive lines, at seven. Both Milik and Puech reconstructed frags. 2–3 to form part of a single column, which Puech estimated to be approximately 12 cm wide, containing lines of around fifty to sixty letters. A left margin is preserved on frag. 4, with a damage pattern suggesting a vertical column guideline. 4Q539 is the only known copy of this work from Qumran or elsewhere.

Provenance: The fragments of 4Q538 are not found on the early “E series” or “G series” PAM plates. While their discovery in Cave 4 is assured, the mode of that discovery was not documented.
Material: Skin

Script: Hasmonean formal (Puech)

Proposed palaeographic date: 100–50 BCE (favoring 80–50 BCE), slightly earlier than 4Q538 (Puech)

Special traits and general comments: The left side of a column is preserved on frag. 4, though the fragments are in poor condition and difficult to assess for overall manuscript quality. The scroll was evidently ruled throughout, although the horizontal ruling is now too faint to see on the fragments. Lines are evenly spaced, and the scribe wrote in a small, fairly-consistent formal hand. There are no clear instances of vacats or scribal mistakes in the few bits of text preserved. The orthography of 4Q539 is mostly typical of the Qumran Aramaic corpus, with full spellings that included aleph to indicate internal vowels (e.g., זאד איה [from צוז א]; 5.2). Characteristic Qumran spellings include עין, דן, and מא in 3.4–5. Less common is aleph used as the fem. noun ending (מָא, 1.1), rather than ה. Other irregularities include the possible use of a final letter in medial position at 4.4 (ם, 1.2). The syntactic placement of the verb and subject after an indirect object.
in 5.2 can be attributed to the poetic, aphoristic character of this phrase, something found more often with wisdom-sayings in the Aramaic texts (see, e.g., the poem at the end of the Aramaic Levi Document). It appears to me that what Puech read as מָנִין ("quatre-vingts"; 2.4) is rather מָנִין ("times"; cf. 1Q21 [Levi] 3.2).

Original manuscript quality: Good–very good

Select bibliography: Milik, “Écrits”; Beyer, ATTM¹, 188; Beyer, ATTM⁶, 71; Beyer, ATTM², 103–4.

Script sample:

Language

Syntax
Verb-subject (verb early in clause):
5.3
Verb-subject (verb later in clause):
5.2

Periphrastic construction (past/future continuative action):
Finite form of הוה + participle:
2.3(?)

Morphology:

Form:

2.3

5.2

Content synopsis and significance: The contents of this scroll are difficult to discern, due to its extremely poor state of preservation. However, it does overlap in several places with other known copies of the Aramaic Levi Document from Qumran and elsewhere, confirming that it is the only copy of this work from Cave 1. Some important words and phrases reinforcing a connection to the Document are ישע "Isaac" (5.1), ישיבא "my father" (19.1), ישיבא "from the seed of ..." (28.1), ישיבא "my father" (29.1), ישיבא "the heavens" (32.1, 37.3), and ישיבא "Israel" (58.1). The most extensive and noteworthy phrase is found in 1.2, ישיבא ממלכת בחזקה וַחֲדִישָׁה יִשָּׁרֵעַ מִלֵּךְ "the kingdom of the priesthood is greater than the kingdom of [...]. We also find the word יִשָּׁרֵעַ "you will be king" at 7.2, which seems related to the statement in another Qumran copy of the Document that both priests and kings will arise from among Levi's offspring (4Q213 [Levi²] iii+2.10–18; see Kugel, "Levi"). The mention of kingship also coheres with Michael Stone's argument that the Aramaic Levi Document transfers the royal blessing of Judah (Gen 49) to Qahat ("Axis," 134–35). The elevated status of Levi's offspring is a common theme in many of the Qumran Aramaic texts, most notably the Testament of Qahat (4Q542) and Visions of Amram (4Q543–547). These texts often emphasize the priestly identity or cultic functions of Levi's descendants, but they are also exalted for their future roles as teachers, judges, and rulers.
Material remains: This manuscript consists of sixty tiny fragments, none containing more than a few letters, words, or, in several cases, an isolated phrase. Milik identified the fragments with one another primarily on palaeographic grounds (DJD 1:87; cf. Drawnel, *Aramaic Wisdom*, 22). Most are too small to assess or place with any confidence. Several fragments, however, overlap or share verbal affinities with copies of the Aramaic Levi Document known from Qumran, the Cairo Geniza, and Mt. Athos. While no direct overlap exists between frag. 1 and other witnesses to the Document, Milik, Grelot, Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel, and Drawnel place it in the story of Levi's vision(s) as a young man (see Drawnel, *Aramaic Wisdom*, 22; Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel, *Aramaic Levi*, 66, who also place frag. 7 here). 1Q21 3 overlaps for up to two words (3.2) with the Geniza Bodleian manuscript, also as part of Levi's vision (Drawnel, *Aramaic Wisdom*, 54; Greenfield, Eshel, and Stone also place 1Q21 26 here). 1Q21 4 and 45 appear to overlap for one or two partial words with sections of the Bodleian manuscript (lines 9 and 26, respectively) recounting Isaac's instructions to Levi, following Levi's vision(s) (Drawnel, *Aramaic Wisdom*, 54). 1Q21 45 also seems to overlap with 4Q214 (Levi) 2.3 (see DJD 22:46), the only correspondence of 1Q21 with a Cave 4 copy of the Aramaic Levi Document. For a recent, comprehensive overview of the discovery and publication of the Qumran Aramaic Levi materials, focused especially on the central role of J.T. Milik, see Drawnel, "Milik."

Notes on provenance: The fragments assigned by Milik to 1Q21 were found as part of the official excavation of Qumran Cave 1, under the direction of Roland de Vaux and G. Lankester Harding in February and March, 1949 (DJD 1:43).
Material: Skin

Script: Late Hasmonean (Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel) formal

Proposed palaeographic date: 100–1 BCE (Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel)

Special traits and general comments: Although we possess only very fragmentary remains of this copy, it is evident from the larger fragments (1, 3, 7–8, 48) that it was of high quality, comparable in its spacing and scribal execution to manuscripts such as 4Q544 (Visions of Amram), 4Q537 (TJacob?), and 1Q20 (apGen). The only extant intercolumnar margin is very generous in size, and it appears that vacats were used based on frag. 8, and perhaps also frag. 48. The scribe wrote in a small, tidy Late Hasmonean or Early Herodian script that is closely comparable to that of 1Q20 (apGen). A lamed prefix with the verb הוהי (1.10) was used, as expected from the wider Qumran corpus, and the scribe apparently preferred the short form of the demonstrative pronoun ה (36.1, 40.1, 56.1). At times, the orthography is more defective than in many other Qumran Aramaic scrolls, as seen in the repeated spellings כל (8.2, 37.2, 39.1) and והו (22.2, 55.1). However, we also find what appears to be the long form of the second sg. masc. pronoun אתה (7.1), suggesting a mixed orthographic picture. One also wonders if the long form of the fem. possessive suffix is used at 23.2, as in several other Qumran texts (e.g., 1Q20 [apGen]).

Original manuscript quality: Very good–excellent

Language

Syntax:

- Subject-verb (verb early in clause):
  - 7i.1(?), 8.1(?)
- Subject implied (verb early in clause):
  - 1.1
- Subject implied (verb later in clause):
  - 3.2(2x?)

Periphrastic construction (past/future continuative action):

- Finite form of היו > participle:
  - 57.2

Lexical items:

- אדוה:
  - 11.1, 27.1
- די:
  - 1.1, 7i.2, 10.1, 16.1, 25.2, 55.2, 56.1
- Caldwell

Morphology:

- תמליל
  - 30.3

Orthography/Phonology:

- ש for /s/:
  - 18.1(?)

Content synopsis and significance

The DJD editors considered 4Q213 to be one of seven Qumran copies of a work commonly called the Aramaic Levi Document (alternatively, the Visions of Levi [Drawnel] or Aramaic Testament of Levi [Milik]). 1Q21 (Levi), 4Q213, 4Q213a (Levi b), 4Q213b (Levi c), 4Q214 (Levi d), 4Q214a (Levi e), and 4Q214b (Levi f). The division of the manuscripts is, in fact, a matter of dispute, and there may be as few as three Qumran copies (see the section on Material remains, below). Copies of the Aramaic Levi Document were also discovered in the Cairo Geniza and at Mt. Athos, the latter preserving a Greek translation of parts of the original Aramaic composition. The fragments assigned by Stone and Greenfield to 4Q213 contain portions of Levi’s first-person account addressed to his children, seen most clearly in frag. 4. The bulk of the extant text belongs to what most commentators have called a wisdom poem, an ethically-charged discourse in which Levi exhorts his children to walk in the paths of wisdom and knowledge, which includes the cultivation of scribal skills. Fragment 1 provides a stirring description of the ideal sage, with the Cairo Geniza parallel showing that Levi’s brother, Joseph, serves as the paradigmatic example to be emulated. Following this introduction, we find a call to seek wisdom that recalls Job 28 and the early chapters of Proverbs. Fragments 2–5 appear to address the future situation of Levi’s children and their descendants, at times using apocalyptic language. Many of the literary features found in this manuscript invite comparison with other texts among the Qumran Aramaic corpus. The theme of paternal instruction is shared by many other texts. Modelled on the book of Proverbs and other wisdom literature, such instruction is found most often in texts related to the pre-Mosaic patriarchs (i.e., Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Levi, Qahat, and Amram), but it also figures prominently in the book of Tobit. Frey (“Testament”) suggested that the literary device of paternal instruction in the Aramaic Qumran literature demonstrates that it was integral to the development of the later testamentary genre (cf. Drawnel, “Education”; Dimant, “Themes”) exemplified by the Greek Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. In addition, one passage of Levi’s wisdom poem recalls an episode in the Genesis Apocryphon (1Q20). In 4Q213 1i.10–19, we read that the “one who learns wisdom” will not be treated “like a foreigner” in “every land and country to which he will go” (4Q213 1i.10, 16–17, 15). Instead, the inhabitants of those places “will honor him” as a result of their desire “to hear his words of wisdom” (4Q213 1i.14, 19). A strikingly similar scenario, accompanied by close parallels in specific wording, is found in the encounter between Abram and the nobles of the Pharaoh in 1Q20 (apGen) col. 19 (Machiela, “Wisdom,” 233–47). In this account, Pharaoh’s nobles are aware of Abram’s reputation for wisdom. They seek him out during his sojourn in Egypt, so that he might teach them “scribal craft, and wisdom, and truth” (1Q20 [apGen] 19.24–25). In response to their inquiry, Abram reads to them from “the book of the words of Enoch” (1Q20 [apGen] 19.25). In 4Q213, Levi uses a triad of terms (ספר ומסור וחכמה) very close to that describing Abram in 1Q20 (apGen; ספר ומסור וחכמה) and in 4Q213 (ספר ומסור וחכמה). In 4Q213, foreigners will seek out the wise man “to hear the words of his wisdom” (למשמע מלי חכמתה), while in 1Q20 (apGen) Pharaoh’s nobles seek out Abram “because of my words
Material remains: What Stone and Greenfield designated 4Q213 comprises five fragments, frag. 1 being much larger than the rest. Fragment 1 contains parts of two columns on adjoining sheets, each preserving roughly twenty lines of text. The first column overlaps with material from the Cairo Geniza, and has notable similarities with the Greek Testament of Levi 12–13 (this led scholars as early as Milik to consider it to be a part of 4Q213 or the Aramaic Levi Document). In her opinion, Stone and Greenfield misinterpreted this variation, along with some inconsistencies between the skin of different fragments, though they did consider 4Q213a (Levi[b]) and 4Q213b (Levi[c]) to be different copies written by the same scribe. As a result, they wrongly divided the fragments into four different manuscripts based on palaeographic traits that fall within the acceptable range of variation for an informal script from this period. For example, handwriting features that Stone and Greenfield (in consultation with Frank Moore Cross) isolated as distinctive on 4Q213a (Levi[b]), such as the small aleph, the rounded final nun, the large kaph, and the formation of tet, are rightly shown by van der Schoor also to be present on 4Q213 and 4Q214 (Levi[d]). She correctly noted, for example, that tet could be written using either one or two strokes even on the same fragment (4Q213 1), clearly by the same scribe. Final letters show varied forms in several of the fragments. In my opinion, Milik and Van der Schoor (now tentatively affirmed by Drawnel, “Milik”) are quite plausibly correct, and all (certainly most) fragments of Stone and Greenfield’s 4Q213, 4Q213a (Levi[b]), 4Q213b (Levi[c]), and 4Q214 (Levi[d]) may justifiably be gathered under the single designation, 4Q213. Some scribal features not discussed by Milik or van der Schoor support their position, such as overall spacing and sizes of columns, sizes of margins, use of vacats, orthography, comparable “fishhook” scribal marks in the margins of 4Q213 1 and 4Q213a (Levi[b]) 2, similarly-spaced guide dots in the margins of 4Q213 2 and 4Q213a (Levi[b]) 2, and manuscript construction (e.g., the guide dots were marked at the edge of sheets before they were sewn on 4Q213 and 4Q213a [Levi[b]]). As noted by all scholars working on the text, 4Q214a (Levi[e]) and 4Q214b (Levi[f]) should be treated as one, or possibly two, separate manuscripts (on the question of their unity, see the profile for 4Q214a [Levi[e]]). For a recent, comprehensive overview of the discovery and publication of the Qumran Aramaic Levi materials, focused especially on the central role of J.T. Milik, see Drawnel, “Milik.”
Notes on provenance: Most of 4Q213 1 and 4 are present on the early PAM “G series” plate 40.612, meaning that these fragments were among those discovered by Bedouin in 1952 (see Strugnell, “Photographing,” 124, 131–32). Tigchelaar also identified a very small piece of frag. 1 (attached to the left edge of the fragment in later photos) on the “E series” PAM image 40.978. As a result, we can see that some fragments of this scroll were found in Cave 4 by the Bedouin, and others by the official excavation team.
Material: Skin

Script: Late Hasmonean to early Herodian formal (Stone and Greenfield, based on Cross); pre-Hasmonean (Milik, as reported by Drawnel, "Milik")

Proposed palaeographic date: ca. 50–25 BCE (Stone and Greenfield, based on Cross); 175–150 BCE (Milik, as reported by Drawnel, "Milik")

Radiocarbon date: 191–155 BCE (59%) or 146–120 BCE (41%) (see Van der Schoor, "Radiocarbon")

Special traits and general comments: The construction of this manuscript is of immediate interest, since, assuming that the reconstruction of frags. 1–2 is correct, there is a stitched seam on both sides of a single column that presumably fell somewhere towards the middle or end of this composition. Given the combined facts that every other preserved fragment of 4Q213–4Q214 (Levi) also has stitching preserved at one of its edges (on the unity of these manuscripts, see above), and that frags. 3–4 seem to follow in relatively close proximity to the wisdom poem of frags. 1–2 (Drawnel, Aramaic Wisdom, 342–48; cf. T. Levi 13–14), there is a strong probability that other single columns were also written on small, individual sheets of skin and then sewn together. This is highly irregular for the Qumran scrolls, which almost always include several or more columns on each sheet for lengthy literary works like the Aramaic Levi Document (see Tov, Scribal Practices, 33–36). The skin looks to be of good quality, but whoever was responsible for making this manuscript chose small sheets rather than the larger ones often dedicated to the Qumran manuscripts. This trait could be evidence of a somewhat lower-quality manuscript, which accords well with several other scribal features. Judging from the high-quality images made available by the Israel Antiquities Authority, it is clear that the thread used to sew the columns is of a spun, plant-based material, and not animal sinew. The dimensions of the scroll and its columns fall in the middle of the corpus range, roughly comparable to the size of 11Q10 (Job). The same is true of the margins, which appear to vary somewhat from sheet to sheet on the scroll. What Stone and Greenfield considered to be a vacat on 4Q213 1i.1 may, in fact, be a slightly larger upper margin on the sheet containing that column. A measurement of that margin shows that it is similar in size to the left side of the upper margin on the following sheet (col. ii).

While frags. 1, 2, and 6 suggest that a fairly regular space of 5–10 mm was left between the right-hand stitched edge of a sheet and the beginning of the written lines, ends of lines often come close to the left edge of the column/sheet (cf. frags. 1–5). In fact, at the end of 1i.7 we see that the word וְכָלָּס is written across the stitched seam, telling us that the scribe penned the text after the sheets had been sewn together (Tov, Scribal Practices, 33–34). This is uncommon among the Qumran manuscripts, and it is often assumed that scribes first wrote on individual sheets of skin, only after which were the sheets sewn together. The fact that the scribe wrote after the sheets had been sewn (at least for these columns) may be linked to the unusual use of small, single-column sheets for this manuscript. The penmanship of this scribe is only fair, with more erratic spacing than on the better manuscripts in the corpus (e.g., 4Q204 [Enč], 4Q544 [Visions of Amram⁵]). The latter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROFILE OF PHYSICAL LAYOUT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scroll dimensions:</strong> At least 14 cm h.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Margins:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper: 1–1.5 cm (frags. 1, 3, 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower: 1.8 cm (frag. 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intercolumnar:</strong> 8–15 mm (across seam connecting two sheets; frags. 1–2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Column dimensions:</strong> At least 11.5 cm h. × approx. 8 cm w. (Stone and Greenfield's reconstruction of frags. iii–ii)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lines per column:</strong> At least 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Letters per line:</strong> Approx. 40 (based on Stone and Greenfield's reconstruction of frags. iii–ii)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scribal guidelines:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horizontal script lines: None visible, but marginal guide dots present on frag. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vertical column lines: None visible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average medial letter height: 2–3 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space between lines: 5–8 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space between words: 1–2 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacats: Yes; medium (1i.9 [1.1 cm], 2.8 [1.9 cm]; minor sense divisions)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
trait is due to the fact that scribal guidelines were apparently not used, despite the presence of ink dots to mark where lines would be placed on both sides of the seam for frag. 2. None of the other seams have guide dots preserved, though it may be telling that some of the dots in the upper part of frag. 2 appear to have been sewn into the seam, and are therefore no longer visible. Similar dots are found in the margin of 4Q213a (Levi\textsuperscript{b}). While the dots of frag. 2 were placed on the left and right edges of the two sheets, spaced approximately 5–6 mm apart, they seem not to have been used for ruling the columns. Taken together, these traits suggest that: 1.) small sheets were prepared with guide dots inked on one or both sides of the sheet, 2.) the sheets were sewn together, and 3.) the scribe wrote the text, perhaps following the dots as a rough guide to spacing, but not using ruled guidelines.

This scribe had the idiosyncratic habit of putting a lower, horizontal “foot” stroke on the final \textit{pe}, something witnessed several times in frags. 1 and 2. While this results in the final \textit{pe} being similar to medial \textit{pe} in shape, the final letters are much larger than medial ones in frag. ii. There are few clear mistakes in what remains of the manuscript, aside from several instances of supralinear addition, though Stone and Greenfield noted the unusual number of ink dots on the fragments. While dots are sometimes used as deletion markers (e.g., in 1Q20 [apGen]), the high number of dots and their placement on the manuscript make it likely that at least some of them are the result of ink having dripped accidentally from the pen during the course of copying. Medium-sized vacats were used to indicate minor progressions in the text. A final scribal mark of note is the “fishhook” symbol in the margin of iii.ii, which probably indicates some sort of section break, as suggested by Stone and Greenfield.

This scribe tended toward a more defective orthographic style (e.g., \textit{כַּשְׁתַּים}, \textit{לְבֵן}) than is found in many of the Aramaic Qumran scrolls, with a manuscript like 4Q542 (TQahat) representing the extreme other end of the spectrum. Defective spelling extended to assimilation of the \textit{nun} in a word like \textit{תְּנָתִין}, which would more often be spelled \textit{תְּנהָתִין} (as in 4Q542 [TQahat] ii.10). Nevertheless, several of the spelling practices of this scribe reflect the wider conventions of the Aramaic scrolls at Qumran. These include the use of \textit{aleph} as a \textit{mater lectionis} for vowels, and the correct use of etymological \textit{sin} rather than \textit{samek} in words such as \textit{'name} and \textit{שָׁם} (as in 4Q542 [TQahat] iii.11). Also, in keeping with the compositional character of many other Aramaic texts kept at Qumran is the presence of numerous, lightly Aramaicized Hebrew words drawn from biblical parlance. Stone and Greenfield dated the scribal hand to the middle of the first century BCE, in consultation with Cross, though Drawnel recently reported (“Milik,” 114) that Milik had dated the hand to the early second century BCE in a yet-unpublished monograph on what Milik called the Aramaic Testament of Levi. This is a significant disagreement in palaeographic date, and the script is in need of further study.

Original manuscript quality: Good


Script sample:
Representative sample of corrections and scribal features:

(a) Supralinear letters added, possibly in a different hand (ii.14): מִיָּהוּ דְּבָא

(b) Supralinear word or letters (iii.9): הָרֶב

(c) Scribal “fishhook” symbol in margin (iii.11)

(d) Supralinear letter added and possible scribal dot following aleph (4.5): אַשְׁפ

(e) Ink dots from possible spills: ד (ii.14), נ (iii.1), נ (iii.9), ט (iii.16)

Language

Syntax:

Subject-verb (verb early in clause):
ii.14(part.), 4.7
Verb-subject (verb later in clause):
4.3
Subject-verb (verb later in clause):
ii.8(part.), ii.11(part.)
Subject implied (verb early in clause):
ii.13, ii.16(part.), iii.1, iii.2(?), iii.3(?), 4.4, 4.6(?)
Subject implied (verb later in clause):
ii.15, ii.17(part.), 4.5, 4.6(?), 4.8
Verbless clause:
ii.18

Use of negative particle הָא (+ prefix-conjugation verb): ii.13
Interrogative ה:
4.2, 4.4

Lexical items:
אֵיתָה: iii.4, 2.14
אָדָה: 5.2
בָּד: ii.17
– ה: ii.8
י: ii.10, ii.14, ii.15, iii.9, 4.7
כָּעַן: ii.9, 4.8

Orthography/Phonology:
ש for /s/:
ii.18 (note also הָשָׁמ in ii.20)
Content synopsis and significance: This manuscript is one of up to seven, and as few as three, Qumran copies of the Aramaic Levi Document, parts of which were also found in the Cairo Geniza and at Mt. Athos (see profile for 4Q243 [Levib]). Fragments 1–2 likely fall somewhere near the beginning of the composition (compare the contents of frag. 2 with T. Levi 2). These fragments contain enough text to provide a basic knowledge of this part of the composition, portions of which correspond with Jub. 30–31 and the Greek Testament of Levi. Fragment 1 is a first-person prayer by Levi, addressed to “my Lord” (1.10). The prayer displays several themes also found in other Aramaic compositions from Qumran, such as the “ways of truth” mentioned in 1.12 (cf. 4Q212 [En8] iii.18; iv.22; iv.25; 4Q213 [Leviab] 4.5; 4Q243 [psDanb] 7.3; Tob 13) or the triad “wisdom, knowledge, and strength” in 1.14 (cf. 1Q20 [apGen] 19.25). Levi also asks that God not allow “any satan” to have dominion (יְשַׁלָּח) over him in 1.17, a request that evokes some of the language and themes found in the Visions of Amram (4Q544 [Visions of Amramb] 1.12), where two angels, one good and the other bad, are said to have been given dominion (יְשַׁלָּח) over all of humanity (cf. Peters, Traditions, 58). The prayer is followed, in frag. 2, by a partially-preserved vision bequeathed to Levi while he is travelling to see his father, Jacob. The language used to introduce the vision (יְשַׁלָּח יְחֵי יָדוֹ) parallels other visionary accounts from among the Aramaic scrolls (see, e.g., 1 En. 193; 831–2; 4Q529 [Words of Michael] 1.5). As a motif, the dream-vision is one of the most widely attested features of the Aramaic scrolls, appearing in compositions across the corpus (see Perrin, Dynamics, for the most comprehensive treatment of this theme). The vision occurs in the geographic vicinity of Abel Mayin, as does Enoch’s vision beginning at 1 En. 139. The content of Levi’s vision resembles that of Enoch in 1 En. 14, with both episodes including a heavenly journey and revealed knowledge. A distinctive aspect of Levi’s vision, however, is its focus on the divine bestowal of the priesthood on Levi and his progeny. Fragments 3–4 may deal with the story of Dinah and the Shechemites (Gen 34), though the woman described is unnamed in the preserved material and scholars have debated her identity. Whoever she is, these fragments include the condemnation of an illicit marriage, but turn in the final extant lines to a positive future for the transgressor’s people. Fragments 3–4 end with the mention of a “holy tithe,” highlighting the priestly focus of this text. The same focus is seen in a fragmentary reference to “the eternal priesthood” in frag. 5. Themes related to the priesthood appear in a significant number of the Aramaic scrolls, as first noted by Milik (Dix ans). The Aramaic Levi Document, the Testament of Qahat, and the Visions of Amram show the most explicit and thoroughgoing interest in the priesthood, but such interest is also reflected in the Testament of Jacob, New Jerusalem, Tobit, 1 Enoch, and the Genesis Apocryphon.

Material remains: Stone and Greenfield grouped six fragments under the label 4Q213a, with frags. 5 and 6 being roughly the size of a postage stamp and containing little readable text. However, see the discussion of Material remains for 4Q213 (Leviab) on the likelihood that the fragments of 4Q243 (Leviab), 4Q213a, 4Q213b (Leviab), and 4Q214 (Leviab) should be considered parts of a single manuscript, as suggested by Milik (see now Drawnel, “Milik”) and argued more substantially by Van der Schoor (“Variation”). 4Q213a 1–2 are the most substantial fragments under this manuscript heading, each having fourteen preserved lines of text. They “are ‘triangular fragments from the bottom corners, right and left respectively, of two adjoining sheets that were originally sewn to one another’ (DJD 22:25). The maximum height and width of the triangular, combined fragments are slightly larger than a typical playing card. Overlapping material shared by frags. 1–2 and the Greek Mt. Athos manuscript has allowed the editors to reconstruct a substantial portion of the lines on these fragments (DJD 22:31–33). Fragments 3 and 4 have been plausibly joined by the editors, resulting in seven partial lines of writing. To these Puech added a small, additional fragment with a clear join to the top, right corner of frag. 3 (DJD 37:51–17). These fragments contain text with
no apparent parallels in the other extant Aramaic Levi Document copies, at Qumran or elsewhere.

Notes on provenance: Fragment 2 of 4Q213a is found on the early PAM "G series" plate 40.699, meaning that this fragment was among those discovered by Bedouin in 1952 (see Strugnell, “Photographing,” 124, 131–32). If 4Q213a is treated with 4Q213 (Leviʰ), 4Q213b (Leviʰ), and 4Q214 (Levi⁶) as part of the same scroll, then the small fragment of 4Q213 (Leviʰ) 1 found in the official 1952 excavations of de Vaux, and included on the “E series” PAM plate 40.978, also attests to the Cave 4 origins of 4Q213a.
PROFILE OF PHYSICAL LAYOUT

Margins:

Lower: 1.7 cm (frags. 1–2);
4–7 mm on frags. 4–5 (if the margin is fully preserved)

Intercolumnar: 1.8–2.2 cm
(ffrags. 1–2, across the seam of two sheets), 8–17 mm (frag. 4, to a sheet seam)

Column dimensions: Approx. 11 cm h. (Milik’s reconstruction from frags. 1–2) and at least 9–10 cm w. (frags. 3–4)

Lines per column:
Approx. 18 (Milik’s reconstruction from frags. 1–2; see Puech, DJD 37:512)

Letters per line: Approx. 30–35
(frags. 3–4)

Scribal guidelines:

Horizontal script lines: None visible (though see the comments of Stone and Greenfield, DJD 22:25), plus marginal guide dots

Vertical column lines: None visible

Average medial letter height:
2.5–3.5 mm

Space between lines: 5–7 mm

Space between words:
0.5–1.5 mm

Vacats: Yes; small (1.12):
[2.5 mm], 2.11 [3 mm], 2.13 [4 mm], 2.15 [8 mm]) and medium (6.2 [at least 1.8 cm]); all minor sense divisions

Material: Skin

Script: Late Hasmonean formal (Stone and Greenfield, based on Cross); pre-Hasmonean (Milik, as reported by Drawnel, “Milik”)

Proposed palaeographic date: ca. 75–50 BCE (Stone and Greenfield, based on Cross); 175–150 BCE (Milik, as reported by Drawnel, “Milik”)

Special traits and general comments: The fragments of 4Q213a are comparable in many ways to those of 4Q213 (Levi), and all are likely parts of the same manuscript. Nevertheless, the fragments of 4Q213a give the overall impression of having slightly more even spacing and thicker lettering. Full (plene) spellings are found somewhat more often than in 4Q213 (Levi), but some words are spelled defectively (e.g., בָּה in all but one instance). Such variation is well within the acceptable range of a single scribe among the Qumran manuscripts, as argued by Van der Schoor (“Variation”). The word יַשֶּׁ in 1.17 shows proper use of the etymological sin, with the noun shifting to יַשֶּׁ in later Aramaic dialects. Scribal dots are found along the preserved right margin of frag. 2, regularly placed about 6 mm apart. While scribal guidelines are not discernable on the photographs, the fact that the lines of writing consistently align with these dots may suggest that lightly inscribed lines were once present, but are no longer visible. This would cohere with Milik’s early appraisal of the manuscript (“Le Testament,” 399), and the later comments of Stone and Greenfield (DJD 22:25). The scribal hand is clearly that of a trained scribe, though somewhat messy in the regulation and formation of letters. In frags. 3–4.6 a pair of corrections are of special interest for two reasons: First, it appears that in both cases the longer 3fs was first written, but then later corrected to the shorter form –א. The long form occurs in at least five other Qumran manuscripts, and is an oft-cited feature in discussions of Qumran Aramaic (note, too, the repeated use in 4Q213a of the long 2ms ending לכו–). Second, two different forms of correction were used for what may have been an aleph in each case, erasure in the first instance ([ל]ל), and vertical and horizontal lines struck through the letter for the second ([ל]ל). A scribal “fishhook” mark very similar to that in 4Q213 (Levi) was used between 2.10 and 2.11 to signal a new section, which is evident from the small vacat and the word יַשֶּׁ to begin 2.11. This scribe used small vacats more generally to indicate minor sense divisions in what little remains of this manuscript. A final notable feature is the mixed use of ת and –א in the same manuscript (as in 4Q22 [En1]), representing both the “early” and “late” forms of the relative pronoun (typically ת at Qumran), respectively.

Original manuscript quality: Good

Script sample:

Representative sample of corrections and scribal features:

(a) Marginal “fishhook” symbol (2.10–11)

(b) Supralinear letter added (1.13):

(c) Letter deleted with vertical and horizontal lines (3–4.6):

(d) Possible erasure of letter by scraping (leather is abraded; Stone and Greenfield and Puech suggest aleph) (3–4.6):

Language

Syntax:

Verb-subject (verb early in clause):
2.14, 3.16
Subject-verb (verb early in clause):
2.18(?)
Subject-verb (verb later in clause):
1.11(part.)
Subject implied (verb early in clause):
1.17, 2.11, 2.16, 2.17, 3.13, 3.15

Subject implied (verb later in clause):
2.15(?)
Object early in clause:
2.15
Use of י to mark genitive relationship:
2.7
Verb of movement + ב + inanimate object:
1.8, 2.17
Use of negative particle לא (+ prefix-conjugation verb): 1.17
Lexical items:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ת</th>
<th>162 4Q213b, Levi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>גליתה</td>
<td>[apGen] 19.17; 4Q547 [Visions of Amrame] 9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ה</td>
<td>fragment contains six partial lines of text, most having</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Material remains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>section for 4Q213 [Levi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b 4Q214 (Levi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a 4Q213a (Levi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b 4Q213b, Levi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4Q213b, Levi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Material remains: Stone and Greenfield included only one fragment under this manuscript designation, though it most probably belongs together with 4Q213 (Levi), 4Q213a (Levi), and 4Q214 (Levi) as part of a single scroll (see the Material remains section for 4Q213 [Levi]). The fragment contains six partial lines of text, most having between four and six complete or nearly-complete words (with the exception of line 6, which is badly damaged). It comes from the left side of a column, with a small part of the margin preserved. 4Q213b overlaps with several lines of the Cairo Geniza text, allowing scholars to reconstruct some missing portions of the Qumran fragment. As Stone and Greenfield highlight in the textual notes, “[W]here the text is extant in the two manuscripts, it is almost completely identical” (DJD 22:43). It is worth noting that their reconstructed text, based on the Cairo copy, makes for an appreciably wider column (approx. fifty-five letters) than that reconstructed in 4Q213 (Levi; approx. forty letters). While this should be considered in connection with van der Schoor’s argument about 4Q213 (Levi)–214 (Levi) being parts of a single scroll, it is a rather weak reason for separating 4Q213 (Levi) and 4Q213b into two different copies. We know that widths can vary significantly in different columns of a single copy, as seen, for example, in the Genesis Apocryphon (1Q20). For a recent, comprehensive overview of the discovery and publication of the Qumran Aramaic Levi materials, focused especially on the central role of J.T. Milik, see Drawnel, “Milik.”

Notes on provenance: 4Q213b is found on the early pam “G series” plate 40.618, meaning that it was among those discovered by Bedouin in 1952 (see Strugnell, “Photographing,” 124, 131–32). If 4Q213b is treated with 4Q213 (Levi), 4Q213a (Levi), and 4Q214 (Levi) as part of the same scroll, then the small fragment of 4Q213 (Levi) 1 found in the official 1952 excavations of de Vaux, and included on the “E series” pam plate 40.978, also attests to the Cave 4 origins of 4Q213b.
Profile of Physical Layout

Column dimensions: Approx. 13 cm w. (based on Stone and Greenfield's reconstruction)

Letters per line: Approx. 55 (Stone and Greenfield's reconstruction)

Scribal guidelines:

- Horizontal script lines: None visible
- Vertical column lines: None visible

Average medial letter height: 2.5–3.5 mm

Space between lines: 7–8 mm

Space between words: 0.5–1 mm

Vacats: Yes; small (2 [2 mm], 5[?]) [2 mm]; minor sense divisions)

Material: Skin

Script: Late Hasmonean formal (Stone and Greenfield, based on Cross); pre-Hasmonean (Milik, as reported by Drawnel, “Milik”)

Proposed palaeographic date: ca. 75–50 BCE (Stone and Greenfield, based on Cross); 175–150 BCE (Milik, as reported by Drawnel, “Milik”)

Special traits and general comments: This single fragment has no fully-preserved margins, though a part of the left column margin remains. The scribe of this manuscript wrote in an even script with tightly-packed word spacing, but generous, regular spacing between lines. Although there are no significant vacats, a measurement of spacing reveals that approximately 1 mm extra was left before אדו in line 2 and ויל in line 5, relative to the surrounding space between words. There is nothing particularly distinctive about the orthography, and no mistakes or corrections are preserved in these few lines.

Original manuscript quality: Good

Script sample:

Language

Syntax:
1. Verb-subject (verb early in clause):
   - 1.4
2. Subject-verb (verb early in clause):
   - 1.2
3. Subject implied (verb early in clause):
   - 1.1, 1.3(?)
4. Subject implied (verb later in clause):
   - 1.5(?)

Periphrastic construction (past/future continuative action):
1. Finite form of הוה + participle:
   - 1.4

Lexical items:
1. אדין: 1.2
2. כד: 1.4

Morphology:
1. Verb conjugation form:
   - 1.2
2. Object suffix on verb:
   - 1.1

Orthography/Phonology:
1. ש for /s/:
   - 1.1, 1.4

Other notable features:
1. Proposed Hebraisms:
   - הוהי (lexical; 1.6, following the correct reading of Beyer and Drawnel) [H]

Content synopsis and significance: This manuscript is one of up to seven, and as few as three, Qumran copies of the Aramaic Levi Document, a composition which was also partially found in the Cairo Geniza and, in Greek translation, at Mt. Athos (see the profile for 4Q213 [Levi]). In frag. 2 of 4Q214, we read part of the cultic instructions for sacrificing a bull, handed down from Isaac to Levi during a visit by Levi to his grandfather’s house. The Qumran Aramaic corpus includes a number of texts that take special interest in sacrificial and other cultic procedures. The Genesis Apocryphon recounts the sacrifices of Noah and Abraham, both of which are elaborated in much greater detail than in their counterparts from the Hebrew Bible (Reeves, “Noah”). New Jerusalem and Testament of Jacob? also include visions in which the sacrificial cult is described in some detail. Schifman (”Halakha,” Qumran) has compared the sacrificial regulations found in New Jerusalem to that of the Aramaic Levi Document, and other studies of this part of the composition include Mali, “Instruction,” Feldman, “Sacrifice,” and Machiela and Jones, “Beginnings.” Fragment 3 contains an otherwise unknown part of the Aramaic Levi Document, discussing the topic of honor (יקר; cf. 4Q213 [Levi] 1.12, 17). As in other parts of the composition, these fragments contain first-person discourse directed at another individual or group (e.g., the broken phrase אנה די תמרון לי; 3.2). For first-person narration as a prevalent feature in the Aramaic Scrolls, see Dimant (“Qumran Aramaic,” “Themes”), Stuckenbruck (“Pseudepigraphy”), Tigchelaar (“Pseudepigraphy”), and Perrin (“Capturing”).
Material remains: Four fragments are included by Stone and Greenfield under the siglum 4Q214, though if Van der Schoor is correct they should be included together with 4Q213 (Leviᵃ), 213ᵃ (Leviᵇ), and 213ᵇ (Leviᶜ) as parts of a single scroll (see the Material remains section for 4Q213 [Leviᵃ]). Fragment 1 is very narrow, with parts of eight lines preserved, none with more than a single word. Fragment 2 contains the most preserved text, though its surface is partially abraded. This fragment overlaps with 4Q214ᵇ (Leviᵇ) 2–3.8 and 1Q21 (Levi) 45, as well as parts of the Cairo Geniza and Mt. Athos witnesses. Fragments 3 and 4 have suffered less damage than frags. 1 and 2, but contain little text, especially frag. 4. A fifth fragment appears on PAM 43.243, but the editors considered it to be an "unidentified fragment" not affiliated with the Aramaic Levi Document (DJD 22:51). It contains very little legible text, and no complete words. For a recent, comprehensive overview of the discovery and publication of the Qumran Aramaic Levi materials, focused especially on the central role of J.T. Milik, see Drawnel, "Milik."

Notes on provenance: The fragments of 4Q214 are not found on the early “E series” or “G series” PAM plates. However, if they are treated together with 4Q213 (Leviᵃ), 4Q213ᵃ (Leviᵇ), and 4Q213ᵇ (Leviᶜ) as part of the same scroll, then the small fragment of 4Q213 (Leviᵇ) 1 found in the official 1952 excavations of de Vaux, and included on the “E series” PAM plate 40.978, also attests to the Cave 4 origins of 4Q214.
Material: Skin

Script: Late Hasmonean formal (Stone and Greenfield, based on Cross); pre-Hasmonean (Milik, as reported by Drawnel, “Milik”)

Proposed palaeographic date: ca. 75–50 BCE (Stone and Greenfield, based on Cross); 175–150 BCE (Milik, as reported by Drawnel, “Milik”)

Special traits and general comments: The orthography of this scribe tends to be defective, though the long form of the demonstrative דנה (rather than דן) is used in 4.3. The successive use of the preposition בתר (“after”; sometimes with a suffix) in order to list items is notable, and matches the practice found in 1Q20 (apGen) 10.14 and 17.8–17. The script is of fair quality, somewhat erratic in the sizes and shapes of letters, and the scribe used vacats to indicate minor pauses in the flow of the narrative. Like 4Q213 (Levi*), 213a (Levi*), and 213b (Levi*), the script is technically “formal” (perhaps better, semi-formal) based on ductus and letter formation, though the level of execution is quite relaxed, probably indicating a less formal purpose for this manuscript than for more carefully written copies. A noticeable fluctuation in spacing between lines corresponds with the apparent lack of scribal guidelines, while spacing between words is slightly larger than average.

Original manuscript quality: Good


### Profile of Physical Layout

**Margins:**

- **Lower:** 1.8 cm (frag. 2)

**Intercolumnar:** At least 1.1 cm (frag. 3, partially preserved)

**Letters per line:** Approx. 30–35 (Stone and Greenfield’s reconstruction)

**Scribal guidelines:**

- **Horizontal script lines:** None visible
- **Vertical column lines:** None visible

**Average medial letter height:** 2–3 mm (*kaph* and *tav* are often larger)

**Space between lines:** 5–7 mm

**Space between words:** 1–2 mm

**Vacats:** Yes; small (2.8 [8 mm]; minor sense division)

**Script sample:**

עָבָר אֶחָד וְאֶחָד וְהִיוֹ קִרְוָאִים יִבְשָׂ הַצְּלֹא שֹׁנָה

גָּזִירֵךְ לָמָּה וּבֵשַׁ שָׁנֵי שָׁמְאִים שָׁחָה

Daniel Machiela - 9789004513815
Downloaded from Brill.com 10/19/2023 05:38:50PM via Open Access. This is an open access title distributed under the terms of the CC BY-NC-ND 4.0 license, which permits any non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided no alterations are made and the original author(s) and source are credited.
https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/
Corrections and scribal features:

(a) Supralinear word added (3.2): [ְ ה̊ ל̊ ו̊י̊ ד̊י̊]

Language

Syntax:
- Verb-subject (verb early in clause):
  2.4; 3.1–2(?)
- Subject implied (verb early in clause):
  3.2
- Use of דָּי to introduce direct quotation:
  3.2
- Use of negative particle אַל (prefix-conjugation verb):
  2.4

Lexical items:
- בָּעֵר: 2.5, 2.6, 2.8(?), 2.9
- דָּי: 3.2(2x)

Morphology:
- אַלַּי form:
  1.6(?)
- Assimilated lamed:
  1.6(?)

Other features:
- Proposed Hebraisms:
  • כָּקָר (lexical; 2.7) [H]

Content synopsis and significance: This manuscript is one of up to seven, and as few as three, Qumran copies of the Aramaic Levi Document, a composition also found in the Cairo Geniza and at Mt. Athos (see further the profile for 4Q214a [Leviα]). The three fragments (or two, in Drawnel's assessment) of 4Q214a contain only a small amount of text, some of it also being found in other witnesses to the Document. Fragment 1 contains bits of a description of what types of wood to use for sacrifices on the altar, which is a part of Isaac's instructions to Levi on proper cultic practices (see the profile of 4Q214 [Leviβ] for a discussion of the sacrificial material in this section). Parallels with other copies allow us to see that col. 1 of frags. 2–3 was part of an autobiographical account of the birth of Levi's children with his wife, Melcha. The issues raised in these two fragments highlight one of the salient themes of the Aramaic Levi Document and the Aramaic literature at Qumran more broadly: endogamy (see Eshel, "Proper," "Marriage"; Perrin, "Tobit's Context"; and Dimant, "Tobit"). The Aramaic Levi Document recounts that Levi's wife Melcha was a member of Abraham's line, and reports that Levi's daughter Jochebed married Levi's grandson Amram. It also contains the command to "take a wife for yourself from my family, so that you may not defile your seed" (ALD 6:4). This theme is also found in the Visions of Amram, in which the opening scene records the marriage of Amram's sister Miriam to her uncle Uzziel. The Testament of Qahat seems to allude to the practice of endogamous marriage when it refers to remaining "pure from intermingling" (4Q542 [TQahat] i.8–9; cf. Drawnel, "Education"; Harrington, "Identity"). Some scholars have associated the emphasis on endogamy in the above texts
with their priestly character (e.g., Tervanotko, “Ideal Marriages”); however, the theme of endogamy, and specifically marriage within the family or tribe, is also an important theme in both the Genesis Apocryphon (e.g., 3Q23 [apGen] 6.7–9) and Tobit 1:9; 3:15; 4:22–13 (see Machiela and Perrin, “Family Portrait”; Perrin, “Tobit’s Context”). Column 2 appears to be part of the wisdom discourse placed by scholars near the end of the composition. The discourse is directed at Levi’s sons, extolling the virtues of wisdom and the difficulty of finding it (cf. 4Q213 [Levi6] and 4Q214b [Levi7]). For a recent, comprehensive overview of the discovery and publication of the Qumran Aramaic Levi materials, focused especially on the central role of J.T. Milik, see Drawnel, “Milik.”

Material remains: 4Q214a consists of three very small fragments, at several points overlapping with other copies of the Aramaic Levi Document from Qumran, the Cairo Geniza, and Mt. Athos. Milik (BE, 5, 244) evidently thought that Stone and Greenfield’s 4Q214a and 4Q214b (Levi6) were parts of a single copy, which Milik called 4QTestLevi8. This is confirmed by the fact that all fragments of 4Q214a and 4Q214b (Levi6) were placed by Milik on same photographic plate (PAM 43.260), and were clearly labelled in his hand as 4QTestLevi8 in the bottom, left-hand corner of the plate. The writing is very similar across the fragments, as are their physical and scribal features (this view was recently affirmed by Drawnel, “Milik,” 113–15). Stone and Greenfield, seemingly followed by Drawnel (Aramaic Wisdom, 27), noted the similarity of script in the two groupings, but maintained their separation on two bases: 1.) slight differences in the formation of the letters mem, final nun, and lamed; and 2.) what they considered to be overlapping text between 4Q214a 1 and 4Q214b (Levi6) 2–3, and 4Q214a 2–3ii and 4Q214b (Levi6) 8. Regarding the differences in script, an argument similar to that mounted by Van der Schoor for 4Q213 (Levi6)–214 (Levi6) (see the profile for 4Q213 [Levi6]) could also be made in this case. The script of 4Q214a–214b is slightly more formal than in 4Q213 (Levi6)–214 (Levi6), but it is plausible that a single scribe could make the kinds of small variation noted by Stone and Greenfield between 4Q214a and 4Q214b (Levi6; see also the comments of Drawnel, Aramaic Wisdom, 27, for 4Q214b). As for the overlaps among the fragments, they are very minimal, and the text for this section of the composition is not well established (see now Drawnel, “Milik,” 117–18). In view of these considerations, it is entirely possible that Milik’s view is the correct one. On balance, Milik’s original combination of 4Q214a and 4Q214b (Levi6) as a single scroll seems preferable.

Fragment 1 of 4Q214a is no bigger than a postage stamp, but its few preserved phrases are thought by Stone and Greenfield to overlap with words from the Cairo Geniza text and 4Q214b (Levi6) 3 (DJD 22:54, 64). Fragments 2 and 3 were joined by Milik on PAM 43.260 (accepted as correct by the editors in DJD 22:53), with the fragments containing parts of two columns. Drawnel claims, however, that the two pieces are still connected, and should be labelled as a single fragment (Aramaic Wisdom, 27). Despite the poor state of preservation, the editors find material in frags. 2–3, col. 1 that may overlap with the Cairo Geniza copy, while small parts col. 2 were thought to overlap with the Geniza text, 4Q213 (Levi6), and 4Q214b (Levi6; DJD 22:54, 57–60). The small overlap with the Cairo Geniza text is the most certain of these possibilities. Although the evidence is very fragmentary, Stone and Greenfield, followed by Drawnel, concluded that 4Q214a contains a significantly shorter (or perhaps rearranged) text than the other witnesses to the Aramaic Levi Document. This led to talk of two recensions of the Document (or at least this section of it), with 4Q214a representing the shorter recension, and 4Q213 (Levi6), 4Q214b (Levi6), and the Cairo Geniza copy the longer one. See Kugler (“Reflections”) on whether the Qumran fragments of the Aramaic Levi Document attest to a “single, relatively consistent work” or “a work that existed in diverse recensions.”

Notes on provenance: The fragments of 4Q214a are not found on the early “E series” or “G series” PAM plates. While their discovery in Cave 4 is assured, the mode of that discovery was not documented.
Material: Skin

Script: Late Hasmonean or early Herodian formal (Stone and Greenfield, based on Cross); Early Hasmonean (Milik [BE, 244], who identified the scribe as the same who wrote 4Q207 [Enf]; see also Drawel, “Milik,” 114)

Proposed palaeographic date: ca. 50–25 BCE (Stone and Greenfield, based on Cross); Milik implicitly dated this script to ca. 150–125 BCE, based on its association with 4Q207 (Enf) (BE, 244; Drawel, “Milik,” 114)

Special traits and general comments: The scribe of this manuscript (probably to be combined with 4Q214b [Levi⁸]) also appears to have written 4Q207 (Enf). Little remains of this scroll, but from our scant evidence it appears that it was of quite high quality. The script is relatively regular, upright, and neat. Spacing is even and moderate, with small vacats used to indicate minor narrative progressions. Although scribal guidelines are for the most part not discernable, the regular spacing of lines hints that they were once present, but very lightly inscribed. The breakage pattern at the right edge of 4Q214a 2–3i strongly suggests that a vertical guideline was inscribed there with more pressure, although there is no evidence of such a line at the left edge of the preceding column. There is little that can be said about this manuscript in terms of scribal practices or language.
The lengths of lines at the left edge of the column vary considerably, and at least in the case of אלן (1.1), the scribe preferred a more defective spelling, rather than the longer form אלין.

Original manuscript quality: Very good

Script sample:

Language

Syntax:
Subject implied (verb early in clause):
2–3i.1

Lexical items:
ךד: 1.2(?), 2–3i.1
ךען: 2–3ii.5

Morphology:
Assimilated nun:
2–3ii.1

Content synopsis and significance: This manuscript is one of up to seven, and as few as three, Qumran copies of the Aramaic Levi Document, a composition also found in the Cairo Geniza and at Mt. Athos (see further the profile for 4Q213 [Levi⁸]). The preserved text of frags. 2–3 and 5–6 is part of a pedagogical discourse given by Isaac to Levi, while Levi was visiting his grandfather’s home (see the profile of 4Q213 [Levi⁸] for a discussion of the significance of paternal instruction in the Aramaic literature from Qumran). Fragment 7 contains only three words, מָן אָרֶץ שֶׁב לְוֵי, a phrase which appears to be distinguishing the chosen status of Levi or his progeny “from all flesh.” Fragment 8 contains the words מִשְׁרְרֶנִי דְבָרָה מִי (“hidden places”), and belongs to the wisdom poem – more specifically the description of wisdom’s difficulty to attain – that seemingly fell toward the end of the Document (see the profile of 4Q213 [Levi⁸] for a fuller treatment of the wisdom poem).

Material remains: Stone and Greenfield’s 4Q214b comprises eight fragments, few being larger than a postage stamp. It is quite possible that the fragments of 4Q214a (Levi⁹) and 4Q214b belong to a single copy, on which see the Material remains section for 4Q214a (Levi⁹). In virtually every respect, the fragments assigned to the two manuscripts are closely comparable. 4Q214b frags. 2–6 overlap with portions of the Cairo Geniza manuscript, as well as several of the other Qumran manuscripts. For a proposed reconstruction of the combined texts, see DJD 22:68–69. Fragment 1 contains only a handful of complete words, and has no parallels with any extant Aramaic Levi Document manuscript. Fragment 7 has only a single, legible phrase. It may overlap with material from 4Q213b (Levi⁹) 1 or the Geniza text, though this is not certain (cf. DJD 22:69–70). Fragment 8 is also very poorly preserved, but it appears to overlap with portions of 4Q213.

Select bibliography: Beyer, ATTM¹, 188–208; Beyer, ATTM², 71–78; Beyer, ATTM³, 104–10; Kugler, Levi-Priestly; Drawnel, Aramaic Wisdom; Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel, Aramaic Levi; Drawnel, “Milik.”

4Q214b, Levi⁷
(Levi²), perhaps 4Q214a (Levi⁴; in the opinions of Stone and Greenfield), and the Geniza material (DJD 22:71). This fragment evidently comes from the wisdom poem, which can be partially reconstructed on the basis of 4Q213 (Levi⁵), 4Q214a (Levi⁴), 4Q214b, and the Cairo Geniza codex (DJD 22:72).

Notes on provenance: Tigchelaar identified 4Q214b 1 on the early PAM “E series” plate 40.976. The fragments in this series of plates were found in the official excavations of Cave 4 on September 22–29, 1952, directed by de Vaux (Strugnell, “Photographing,” 124, 131–32). While the discovery of the remaining fragments of 4Q214b in Cave 4 is assured, the mode of their discovery was not documented.
Material: Skin

Script: Hasmonean formal (Stone and Greenfield, based on Cross); Early Hasmonean (Milik [BE, 244], who identified the scribe as the same who wrote 4Q207 [En⁴]; see also Drawnel, “Milik,” 114)

Proposed palaeographic date: ca. 150–100 BCE (Stone and Greenfield, based on Cross); Milik implicitly dated this script to ca. 150–125 BCE (BE, 244; Drawnel, “Milik,” 114)

Special traits and general comments: This scribe, who is likely also responsible for 4Q207 (En⁴), wrote in a tidy, well-regulated script, very evenly spaced despite the apparent lack of scribal lines (these may simply be no longer visible). The single intercolumnar margin is smaller than in many higher-quality manuscripts, and in the extant text the scribe twice used very small vacats to indicate minor pauses in the narrative progression. The width and variation in this margin closely resembles that of the margin in 4Q214a (Levi⁷ 2–3, supporting the idea that they belong to the same copy, written by a single scribe. This scribe tended to employ the plene orthographic conventions typical of the Qumran Aramaic manuscripts, though as in 4Q214a (Levi⁷ 1.1 the short form יָלֵין is used (instead of יָלֶין) at 4Q214b 2–3.3. While the etymological sin is correctly employed in יָשָׁר (2–3.2), as is samek in אֶדֶסָא (5–6i.5), the samek in אֶדֶסָא (5–6i.4; Drawnel correctly reads aleph, but incorrectly yod for the vav) is apparently derived from an etymological shin or sin (Stadel, Hebraismen, 46–47). The word אֶדֶסָא may also testify to a weakening of the spirantized ב, which is the first letter of this noun in other (admittedly later) Aramaic dialects. Another interesting phonological detail is the spelling of the noun עָע (cf. Heb. עַע) and is found elsewhere in Qumran Aramaic as עָע (see Morgenstern in DJD 22:62).

Original manuscript quality: Very good

Select bibliography: Beyer, ATTM¹, 188–238; Beyer, ATTM², 71–78; Beyer, ATTM³, 104–10; Kugler, Levi-Priestly; Drawnel, Aramaic Wisdom; Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel, Aramaic Levi; Drawnel, “Milik.”

Script sample:
Content synopsis and significance: The preserved text of these fragments tells of an individual, identified in line 1 as “the youth/little one,” who will suffer a variety of maladies. In line 3, it may be that these maladies are reversed, if the same individual is still the subject. “Possessions” (נכסין) and the verb “to lack” (חסְרֵר) with reference to the individual(s) under discussion are repeatedly mentioned in the fragment. Taken as a whole, the text seems to be a prophetic or apocalyptic prediction of events surrounding one or more figures, possibly in the context of a dream-vision. The final lines mention “the holy place” or “the temple” (מקדשא) and a destruction of some sort (יחרב). These details led a number of scholars, beginning with Jean Starcky, to identify this manuscript with the priesthood and, more specifically, with Levi. In fact, Milik identified both copies with a work that he called the Aramaic Testament of Levi, also represented by 4Q213 (Levi—they) and 4Q214b (Levi—they) (see Drawnel, “Milik,” 114). A messianic theme is also discerned by many who have worked on the text, causing some to associate it with the priestly messiah (or messiah of Aaron) mentioned in some of the Qumran sectarian literature (e.g., CD 12.23 and 1QS 9.11). Unfortunately, it is very difficult to confirm these opinions with what little text remains of 4Q540. Based on some thematic, generic, and lexical similarities with 4Q541 (apocrLevi—they), Puech suggested that the two scrolls may be copies of the same work: Both speak in the third-person voice about the future of an individual, outline the sufferings he will endure, and seem to have priestly connotations (this last point being much more obvious in 4Q541 [apocrLevi—they]). However, there is no direct textual overlap between the two manuscripts, and consequently this identification must be treated with caution. A significant number of the Qumran Aramaic texts involve priestly protagonists, some of whom are identified explicitly as priests, while others simply exhibit priestly attributes. Many of the priestly compositions center around Levi and his offspring (e.g., the Aramaic Levi Document, the Testament of Qahat, and the Visions of Amram), though texts with priestly characters and themes are not limited to those focused on the Levitical ancestry (e.g., 1 Enoch, the Genesis Apocryphon, and New Jerusalem).

Material remains: 4Q540 comprises only three fragments, none of which overlaps with any other Qumran Aramaic manuscript. Fragment 1 is the only one containing a significant amount of text. This fragment is rectangular in shape, greater in width than height. Neither the full height nor width of the fragment’s single column can be discerned with certainty. Parts of six lines remain, but we cannot know how many are missing. The upper margin is visible, though Puech does consider the possibility that what has been taken as the upper margin is actually a large vacat (DJD 3:217). The final two fragments are tiny scraps, containing only a few letters each and smaller than an average postage stamp.

Notes on provenance: The fragments of 4Q540 are not found on the early “E series” or “G series” PAM plates. While their discovery in Cave 4 is assured, the mode of that discovery was not documented.
**Material:** Skin

**Script:** Hasmonean (Puech, noted that the hand is similar to that of 4Q541 [apocrLevi])]; early Hasmonean (Milik, as reported in Drawnel, “Milik,” 114)

**Proposed palaeographic date:** 125–100 BCE (Puech); ca. 175 BCE (Milik, as reported in Drawnel, “Milik,” 114)

**Special traits and general comments:** The orthography in this manuscript is of the sort seen in many of the other Qumran Aramaic scrolls, with a number of full spellings, particularly those using vav and yod to represent vowels. The word כָּסַר in line 3 is noteworthy, since it is most likely a mis-spelling of חָסַר, a root that also occurs in lines 1 and 2. This may indicate a similar pronunciation of the two letters at the time and place of this copy being made, though Puech prefers to see haplography of an intended khet, with the kaph being a preposition (Koch). Although the lamed of לָלַח in line 3 might be seen as the direct object marker, it is also the expected preposition to accompany the preceding verb יְדַמְּה, and is best understood in that light. As for syntax, line 1 preserves a clause in which the subject is, somewhat surprisingly, placed after both the verb and the object. This may again be the case at the end of line 2, and the shift in expected syntax is best explained as the use of a poetic, heightened prose for this apocalyptic utterance. Other scribal characteristics include considerable variation in spacing between lines, and the use of numeric symbols in line 2, as in a number of other Qumran Aramaic manuscripts (e.g., 4Q554 [Nja], 4Q554a [Njb], 4Q558 [papVisionb], and 559 [papBiblical Chronology]).

**Original manuscript quality:** Good

**Select bibliography:** Beyer, ATTM², 78–82; Beyer, ATTM³, 110–14.
Content synopsis and significance: What remains of this text is focused on the discourse between a first-person speaker and an individual addressed in the second-person voice (see frags. 2–6, 24). Discourse of this sort is common in the Aramaic literature found at Qumran, often taking place between a father and his son(s) or an angel and the recipient of a dream-vision. Within the framework of this discourse, several fragments (notably 7–9) contain predictive proclamations in the third-person voice about a remarkable individual who bears the marks of a priest: He will “atone for all the children of his generation,” “his teaching (will be) according to God’s will,” and
“his light will show to all the ends of the earth” (on this theme see Angel, *Otherworldly*, 77–82). Puech and others have noted that frags. 9 and 24, in particular, bear a close resemblance to the Greek Testament of Levi 4 and 18. This has provided the basis for an identification of the scroll’s central figure with Levi, though the precise nature of that connection remains unclear, as does any potential connection to other Aramaic texts connected with Levi (e.g., the Aramaic Levi Document). Fragment 24 has been the subject of much discussion, with Puech arguing that lines 4–5 refer to crucifixion as part of the maladies that will come upon the addressee. Cook (“4Q541”) and others have offered alternative readings that exclude crucifixion, and Cook’s interpretation seems more plausible than that of Puech. The fragment ends with a dualistic appeal for the hearer to act uprightly, recalling similar statements in the Testament of Qahat, the Aramaic Levi Document, and elsewhere in the Aramaic literary corpus at Qumran. Unfortunately, the central figure of 4Q541 cannot be identified with certainty, even if Levi is a strong candidate. Whoever the figure is, he has unambiguous priestly attributes set within a future-oriented eschatological frame, and scholars have discerned in his suffering (frag. 24) intertextual relationships with earlier Hebrew literature such as the “suffering servant” passage of Isa 53 (Brooke, *Scrolls*, 140–55; Hengel, “Isaiah 53,” 106–18) and the vision of restoration in Jer 30 (Elgvin, “Trials”). Others (e.g., Peters, *Traditions*, 100–106) have seen connections with traditions about Noah found in the Aramaic Enoch materials and the Genesis Apocryphon (1Q20), which may be premised on a basic analogy during the Second Temple period between the flood of Noah’s generation and the expected eschatological restoration. Based on the description and role of the central figure outlined above, a number of scholars have included the scroll in discussions of Second Temple period Jewish messianism, especially in connection with the New Testament (Brooke, *Scrolls*, 140–57). While Collins (*Apocalypticism*, 86–87) seemed to suggest that the work represented by 4Q541 was composed by the group also responsible for the Hebrew sectarian literature kept at Qumran, this view is rightly rejected by Elgvin (“Trials,” 97) and others (cf. Angel, *Otherworldly*, 77–78). It is reasonable to assume, however, that the work was of great interest to the later sect because of its contents.

**Material remains:** Twenty-four fragments of varying sizes constitute 4Q541, the most substantial of which are frags. 9 and 24. These two fragments contain by far the most running text. Fragments 1–4 and 6–7 also contain a significant amount of text, while the remaining fragments are tiny scraps with only a few letters and/or words. However, even the stray words and phrases on some of the smaller fragments help to establish 4Q541’s themes and genre. None of the preserved fragments overlap with other works known from Qumran or elsewhere, despite Puech’s argument that 4Q541 is to be associated with 4Q540 (apocrLevi?). (See the profile on 4Q540 [apocrLevi?] for a discussion of the possible relationship between these manuscripts.) The width of an entire column is preserved on frag. 24, with part of an intercolumnar margin extant on both sides. Fragment 9 also has nearly the entire width of a column. Based on the preserved margins, Puech has concluded that 4Q541 originally contained at least eight or nine columns (DJD 31:225).

It should be noted that images B-370756 and B-370757—taken in August, 2012, by the Israel Antiquities Authority and available in the Leon Levy Digital Library—show two stamps of the letter “S” on the verso of frag. 9. These letters were stamped on some large fragments from Cave 4 in the 1950’s in order to indicate the institution that donated money to the Palestine Archeological Museum for purchasing fragments from the Bedouin (see Fields, *Scrolls*, 142). The letter “S” shows that the money for these fragments was donated by McGill University, as arranged by R.B.Y. Scott. Other scrolls bearing “S” stamps include 4Q84 (Ps, along with a “G” stamp), 4Q370 (AdmonFlood), and 4Q525 (Beatitudes, again with a “G” stamp).

**Notes on provenance:** Fragment 2 of 4Q541 is found on the pum “G series” plate 40.594, indicating that this fragment was among those discovered by Bedouin in 1952 (see Strugnell, “Photographing,” 124, 131–32). In addition, Tigchelaar identified several fragments included on the “E series” pum plate 40.976 (frags. 11, 13–14). As a result, we can see that some of the fragments of this scroll were found by the Bedouin, while others were discovered in the official excavations supervised by de Vaux. The connection with Cave 4 is further confirmed by two “S” letters stamped on the verso of frag. 9, associating it clearly with the Cave 4 Bedouin finds (see Material remains, above).
Material: Skin

Script: Hasmonean (Puech); late Hasmonean (Milik, as reported in Drawnel, "Milik," 114)

Proposed palaeographic date: 125–100 BCE (Puech); ca. 75–50 BCE (Milik, as reported in Drawnel, "Milik," 114)

Special traits and general comments: Puech noted that the hand of this manuscript is close to that of 4Q540, with some differences evident in the letters gimel, dalet, resh, vav (in the combination vav-yod), lamed, nun, pe, samek, and ayin (DJD 31:217). He also situated the hand of 4Q541 close to that of 4Q542 (TQahat; DJD 31:226–27). The orthography of 4Q541 is generally full, sometimes exceptionally so, as with אוחידואן in 2(+(?)1ii.7 and 4i.4, or מכאוביכה in 6.3. Such spellings are comparable to a number of other Qumran Aramaic scrolls, such as 1Q20 (apGen) and 4Q542 (TQahat). The scribe used medial pe for both medial and final positions, and the same appears to be true for kaph (the shape of which varies considerably), if we compare the final forms (2ii.5, 9i.6) with some medial forms (e.g., 6.1, 9ii.6). Etymological sin is used properly throughout, including in ישתמק at 7.3, as is the samek in יסוד (3.1, 24.5). This scribe used the longer form of the demonstrative pronoun דנא, as well as the long feminine suffix known from other Qumran texts (روحאה). Alongside these long spellings we find assimilation of the first root letter in pe-nun (i.2, ii.2) and pe-aleph (9i.4) prefix-conjugation verbs.

The manuscript is written in a less tidy hand than the finest Aramaic Qumran scrolls, though the letters are quite evenly sized. Line spacing and margins vary considerably, with no evident scribal guidelines. A number of margins are preserved, notably the bottom margin on frag. 24, which evidently includes two empty lines. An upper margin may be partially preserved on frag. 18 (8 mm), but due to the nature of the material and the writing style, it is difficult to determine its exact location.
to possible vacats and the large distance between lines on some fragments (e.g., frag. 13) it is difficult to be certain. Puech holds that the stitching on frag. 10 is due to a repair of the leather after it was written upon, and not the usual sutting of two sheets. This would be a notable feature, but after close inspection of the IAA photographs I consider it more likely that this is indeed the seam between two sheets, which has become shrunken and contorted over time. It is difficult to know if the dot of ink under the yod of ובדיין, noted by Puech, is intentional or simply an errant drop from the scribe’s pen.

The elevated language used in this text, particularly in frag. 9, has led to some aberrations from the syntax expected in an Aramaic narrative text from Qumran. There is a higher than usual number of fronted objects, leading to a relatively high number of verb-late clauses.

This should be seen as a stylistic device, also found in a number of other Aramaic texts from this corpus. The prepositional phrase in 2(+?)3ii).8 and 3.4 (על + yod; לעליוכ, לעליוכ) is shared by 1Q20 (apGen) 2.26 and 4Q545 (Visions of Amramc) 10.10. Other notable expressions or forms include the temporal phrase בה בזמנה in 10.3 (compare Ezra 5:3, Dan 3:7–8, 4:33), the expected lamed prefix-form of והרי in 2(+?)3ii).9, 9i.7, and 16.2 (להוה), and the reconstructed partitive phrase קונץ [ץ at 9ii.5–6 (also in Dan 2:42, 1Q20 [apGen] 14.16–17, and 4Q537 [TJacob?] 12.2).

Original manuscript quality: Fair–good


Script samples:

Representative sample of corrections and scribal features:

(a) According to Puech, correction from אבריככה to אבריכ עלת (2ii.4)

(b) According to Puech, ש corrected to ט, or perhaps vice versa (4ii.5): בש/טש
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(c) Supralinear letter added and, according to Puech, erasure of second letter (24ii.6): שו[ב]יה

Language

Syntax:

Verb-subject (verb early in clause):
3.2(?), 7.3, 7.4, 9i.4(2x), 9i.7, 9i.7(?), 9ii.6, 10.4
Subject-verb (verb early in clause):
3.4, 9i.3
Subject implied (verb early in clause):
2(+(?))iii.7, 2(+(?))iii.9, 2ii.3(?), 2ii.4, 2ii.5, 2ii.8, 6.2, 9i.2(3x), 9ii.7, 17.2, 24.2, 24.4, 24.5, 24.6(2x)
Subject implied (verb later in clause):
2(+(?))iii.4(?), 2(+(?))iii.5, 3.5(?), 9i.4, 9i.5, 9i.5–6, 9i.6, 9i.7(?), 24.5, 24.5–6
Verbless clause:
9i.3(2x), 9i.5, 9i.6, 9i.7
Object early in clause:
2(+(?))iii.4(?), 2(+(?))iii.5, 9i.5, 9i.5–6, 9i.6, 24.5
Direct object marker (if present):
=; 2ii.8
Verb of movement + ל + animate object:
2(+(?))iii.8, 3.4
Verb of movement + ל + inanimate object:
9i.2–3
Verb of movement + ג + inanimate object:
10.4
Use of negative particle גש (+ prefix-conjunction verb):
24.2(2x?), 24.4, 24.5

Lexical items:

גש: 7.4, 9i.4
ל: 3.4, 6.3(?), 7.2, 9i.7
ג: 2ii(+(?))iii.8
ל: 23.1(?)

Morphology:

Object suffix on verb:
24.4
Assimilated nun:
ii.2, iii.2

Orthography/Phonology:

2ms (pro)nominal suffix תב/ב:
2ii.4(first hand), 3.1(?), 3.2, 3.4, 4ii.3, 4ii.4, 6.2, 6.3, 6.4, 6.5
ש for s/:
3.5, 4i.6, 9i.5(2x), 24.3(2x), 24.6

Other notable features:

Poetic doublets/triplets:
9i.3, 9i.3–4, 9i.4–5, 9i.5–6, 9i.7(?), 24.4, 24.5, 24.6

Proposed Hebraisms:

אל (lexical; iii.4, ii.2, 9i.3) [H]
יתוח (lexical; iii.3) [H]
ויוד (lexical; 3i.4) [h]
מקבר (lexical; 6.1) [H]
מקבר (lexical; 6.3) [H]
ירש (lexical; i.2) [H]
ש强奸 (lexical?; 24.4)
ירש (lexical; 24.5) [h]
יאוס (lexical; 24.6) [H]

Previously unattested in Aramaic:

טחל (lexical [verb]; 24.4)
שחפא (lexical; 24.4)
Content synopsis and significance: The extant portions of this manuscript purport to record an exhortation of Qahat, son of Levi, which was unknown prior to the Qumran discoveries. Qahat is a relatively minor figure in the Hebrew Bible and in Second Temple Jewish traditions, although the Aramaic Levi Document credits Qahat with a high-priestly pedigree (ALD 12; cf. 4Q245 [psDan}). The purpose of this composition seems aimed, at least in part, at bolstering the image of Qahat as a member of the priestly genealogy, and as a link between the more important figures of Levi and Aaron (cf. Tigchelaar, “Pseudepigraphy”; Tervanotko, “Trilogy”). As with many other Qumran Aramaic works, this one is written in the first-person voice of Qahat, and is aimed at teaching and admonishing his sons. Amram, in particular, is singled out in iii.9, and we find a number of noteworthy verbal, stylistic, and thematic features connecting this composition to the larger Qumran Aramaic corpus. Machiela (“Testament of Qahat”) has argued on material grounds that 4Q542 belongs to the same scroll as 4Q547 (Visions of Amram), and that the Testament of Qahat may, in fact, be a part of the Visions of Amram. For further discussion of this possibility, see the profile for 4Q547 (Visions of Amram)

The narrative framing of 4Q542 is one place where we see a connection to the Aramaic Qumran literature more broadly. Many Aramaic texts from Qumran, especially those related to the pre-Mosaic patriarchs, are presented as the first-person speech of a father to his son(s) or grandson(s) in an instructional context (e.g., 1 En. 82:1–3; 83:1–2; 91:1–4; 1Q20 [apGen] 5.20–25; 4Q213 [Levi] ii.3–6; 4Q543 (Visions of Amram) 1.1–4). First-person narration is one of the clearest unifying features of this literature, the importance of which has been discussed in a number of studies (Dimant, “Qumran Aramaic,” “Themes”; Tigchelaar, “Pseudepigraphy”; Stuffenbruck, “Pseudepigraphy”; Perrin, “Capturing”). The propensity of these texts to use the first-person voice, combined with their emphasis on the theme of ancestral instruction, has drawn scholars to investigate the relationship of the Aramaic literature from Qumran and the Jewish literary genre of “testament” (Drawnel, “Admonitions”; Dimant “Themes”; Frey, “Testament”). Scholars working in the early years after the Qumran discoveries gave several previously-unknown Aramaic compositions the title “Testament of X” (e.g., 4Q537 [TJacob?], 4Q538 [TJud/Words of Benjamin], and 4Q539 [TJoseph]), based on their similarity to the later Greek Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs and related texts. Subsequent scholars noted that the Aramaic texts bearing these titles often do not clearly contain some central features of the later, more developed testamentary genre, such as a death-bed setting. Nevertheless, there is general agreement that some of these compositions very likely served as sources for the later Greek testaments (e.g., the Aramaic Levi Document). Frey concluded that, although not all of the Aramaic compositions should be classified as testaments, we should nevertheless look to the Aramaic works kept at Qumran to understand the origin and development of the later testamentary genre (see also Reed, “Textuality”).

4Q542 explicitly associates Qahat’s teaching with a chain of patriarchal transmission along which knowledge was handed from one generation to the next, beginning with Abraham and continuing down to Qahat and his sons (4Q542 ii.7–12; cf. 4Q214b [Levi] 5–6i; 4Q545 [Visions of Amram]) 3.5; see Dimant, “Themes,” 35). Elsewhere, we see that much of this ancestral teaching ultimately derives from the prediluvian heroes Enoch and Noah (Stone, “Axis”). One means by which Qahat’s teaching was passed on is described in 4Q542 iii.9–13, where Qahat entrusts Amram with “all my writings” (לבנך ובנו) and lists the benefits of heeding them. This emphasis on writing coincides with other occasions where the patriarchs are said to have written down information for posterity’s sake (e.g., 1 En. 82:1–3; 83:1–3; 4Q547 [Visions of Amram] 4.8), or are otherwise associated with books that bear their name (e.g., 4Q204 [En] xvi.9; iQ20 [apGen] 5.29, 19.25; ALD 10.31; 4Q543 [Visions of Amram] 1.1). It also accords with other places in the Aramaic texts from Qumran where ability as a scribe (כתביה) is listed as a positive attribute associated with wisdom, knowledge, and righteousness (iQ20 [apGen] 19.25; 4Q213 [Levi] ii.9, 2.5; 1 En. 12:3–4; cp. Ezra 7:6).

Qahat’s instructions include topics related to the priesthood (iii.13) proper ethical conduct (iii.6, 8), and the eschatological future (iii.4–8), all of which appear as common topics and themes in other Aramaic texts from Qumran (e.g., the Aramaic sources of 1 Enoch, the Genesis Apocryphon, the New Jerusalem, the Testament of Jacob, the Aramaic Levi Document, the Visions of Amram, Daniel, and Four Kingdoms). Qahat implores his children to attend to their “inheritance” while living among “foreigners” (e.g., ii.4–ii.1), a concern which some have associated with the practice of endogamy (Drawnel, “Admonitions”; Harrington, “Interrmarriage”). As pointed out by several scholars, the concern for endogamy is a theme repeated often among the Aramaic texts from
Qumran (Eshel, "Marriage"; Perrin, "Tobit’s Context"; Dimant, "Tobit"). We also find a strong dualistic juxtaposition between righteous and wicked conduct, with the associated imagery of light and darkness (2.11–12), another motif common in the Aramaic Qumran scrolls (e.g., the Enoch materials, the Genesis Apocryphon, the Aramaic Levi Document, and especially the Visions of Amram; see Machiela, "Wisdom").

The Testament of Qahat shares a number of salient verbal parallels with other texts from among the Aramaic Qumran scrolls, especially the Aramaic Levi Document and the Visions of Amram. These parallels include use of the verbs פקד "to command" (ii.13; iii.9, 10) and אֶלֶף "to teach" (iii.1), as well as very similar use of the term קושטא "truth" and/or "righteousness" (iii.1–2), all in instructional contexts strikingly similar to one another. (On the prevalence and importance of the term קושטא in the Aramaic Scrolls see Lange, "Vision of Righteousness"; Machiela, "Wisdom"). Note also the phrase ען לכה עמרם ברי אנא כו in 1ii.9, which closely resembles phrases in 1Q20 [apGen] 5.9, 20; 4Q209 [Enastrb] 26.6; 4Q212 [En8] iv.24.

Material remains: The remnants of this manuscript consist of three fragments, two of which are made from a combination of smaller fragments joined by Jean Starcky, the manuscript’s original editor (DJD 3:257). The original manuscript had at least four columns (very likely more), based on the right margins preserved on frags. 2 and 3, in addition to those on frag. 1. Fragment 1 is by far the largest of the three, measuring approximately 9.5 by 27 cm and containing the majority of two text columns. The first column is preserved nearly in its entirety, with the exception of a few small pieces missing from the final few lines. It also has preserved upper and lower margins, allowing for an accurate measure of scroll’s original height. Fragments 2 and 3 are significantly smaller. Fragment 2 is slender and curved, preserving parts of only single words on each of its seven lines. Fragment 3 is wider than frag. 2, but has fewer lines. Fragment 3 appears to contain the remnants of two columns, though col. i is attested by only a single complete word.

Notes on provenance: Fragment 3 of 4Q542 is found on the PAM “G series” plate 40.613, and so was among those fragments discovered by Bedouin in 1952 (see Strugnell, “Photographing,” 124, 131–32). The origins of the remaining fragments of 4Q542 were not clearly documented, though they most likely were also discovered in Cave 4 by the Bedouin.

Sample image: 4Q542 1
Material: Skin

Script: Early Hasmonean (Puech) semi-formal

Proposed palaeographic date: 125–100 BCE (Puech)

Radiocarbon date: 388–353 BCE (34%); 309–235 BCE (66%) (see Van der Schoor, “Radiocarbon,” with the discussion in Doudna, “Radiocarbon,” 445–46)

Special traits and general comments: Emile Puech described in personal correspondence (Sept. 14, 2019) the rough, thick skin used for this manuscript relative to the higher-quality skins used for the large majority of the Qumran Aramaic corpus. The skin had an unusual hole at 1ii.2 when the text was written in antiquity, as seen by the large space left between the continuous words ממר and קושטא. Combined with the significant variation between the radiocarbon and palaeographic dates, the poor quality of the writing surface suggests that an old skin may have been used for this manuscript, though the possibility of secondary writing as a palimpsest is ruled out definitively by Bonani et al. (“Dating,” 848). Puech (DJD 31:264) described this scribe as “negligent,” and it is difficult to argue with his assessment given the irregularity of line and word spacing, letter size, and especially the very high number of mistakes and corrections (some in a second hand) in relation to the amount of text preserved. The scribe also varied significantly in where lines ended, and engaged in some alphabetic curiosities: the medial forms of kaph and tsade are used in both medial and final position, while final mem and medial nun are occasionally used in the wrong position. Also rare among the Qumran Aramaic scrolls is the vertical addition of at least two words (the second was subsequently corrected) in the intercolumnar margin of frag. 3. This practice is also found in some Hebrew manuscripts from Qumran, most famously 1Qlsa*. All told, this is the most mistake-filled extant Qumran Aramaic scroll, well outpacing others also deemed “fair” in quality, such as 4Q201 [Ena] and 4Q212 [Enb]. Despite this, the word spacing is surprisingly generous, and there were clearly some vacats used to indicate minor sense divisions, as seen at 1ii.13. Given the many corrections, it is likely that this copy was being compared against another manuscript, or perhaps a well-established oral tradition.

Puech proposed that the scribe of this manuscript is also that of 4Q547 (Visions of Amram*) (DJD 31:377), an assessment with which I agree. For more on the scribal affinities between these two manuscripts, and the possibility that they may in fact belong to a single scroll, see the profile for 4Q547 (Visions of Amram*).

Hebraisms abound in this copy, showing lexical, morphological, and semantic influence from Hebrew. As noted by Stadel, many of these cases may be explained through familiarity with biblical usage, though this does not adequately explain every case. The orthography of the scroll falls within the parameters of other Qumran manuscripts, with full spellings predominating: Aleph is employed often (though not always) for the definite article, the fem. noun ending (as opposed to he in most Qumran Aramaic scrolls), and various other prefixes and vowels (e.g., אנה, טמא, מס׳). He is found for the 2ms and 3ms pronominal suffixes, and regularly for...
feminine adjective endings. One surprising practice is the occasional correction of aleph to he, as in 11.10 and 111.4, which seems to assume some perceived orthopraxy in the use of these letters, not followed by the original scribe. Yod and vav, too, are typically present in their consonantal or vocalic uses. Samek and sin are correctly discerned for the simple /s/ sound (שגי, ויבסרון). Note the two forms of 2mp imperfect in 11.5 and 11.10 (תתנו and תנתנון), with the earlier instance using the apocopated form after the negation אל, as in 1Q20 (apGen) 19.16. We find a rare paragraph mark in the right margin of 1i, between lines 8 and 9. 4Q213 (Levia) 2.10–11 also has such a mark, though there it is of the “fish hook” style, rather than the straight line used in 4Q542. Despite the relatively poor quality of this manuscript, the fact that it was corrected and re-inked shows that the scroll was valued and well-used.

The syntactic profile of 4Q542 follows roughly that of 1Q20 (apGen), with a mix of verb-subject and subject-verb constructions, the latter often using a verbal participle. Both constructions are outweighed by those with a verb only, assuming the subject from prior clauses. There is a high concentration of poetic doublets in this text, distinguishing Qahat’s teaching from normal prose and giving his speech the elevated, expressive character of wisdom texts like Proverbs and the instructions of Ahiqar.

Original manuscript quality: Fair


Script sample:

Representative sample of corrections and scribal features:

(a) Supralinear letter added (11.1):

![Supralinear letter added](image)

(b) Dittography and subsequent erasure of second word by scraping (11.2):

![Dittography and subsequent erasure](image)

(c) Use of final mem in medial position (11.2 [2x]; cf. 2.1):

![Use of final mem](image)

(d) Supralinear letter added and possible erasure of second vav by scraping (11.4):

![Supralinear letter added and possible erasure](image)

(e) Supralinear he, according to Puech superimposed over an erased supralinear aleph (11.4):

![Supralinear he](image)

(f) Erasure and subsequent corrections by a second hand, from verb + ֹ + direct object (ה היתה הכ), to verb + object suffix (ה היתה הכ) (1.5; according to Puech, this change involved several steps)

![Erasure and subsequent corrections](image)
(g) Erasure of tav by scraping following לשלח (ii.6)

(h) Correction of tav (ii.7): בִּמְעַה {ב"ה}

(i) Erasure and overwritten characters from בּוּלְלְלַבִּב to הֵוָלִימַלְלַב (ii.9)

(j) Possible erasure(s) and subsequent corrections of second letter (iii.2): Originally חָא (see Puech)

(k) Original supralinear yod later re-inked by second hand (iii.7)

(l) Scribal “paragraph” mark in margin (iii.9; at far right edge)

(m) Aleph overwritten with he and deletion dots for lamed of following word (iii.10)

(n) Corection in second hand of pronominal suffix from בה to בהון (iii.13)

(o) According to Puech, וּמָמ corrected to וּלָח (2.11)

(p) Vertical insertion of text in right margin (frag. 3)

Language

Syntax:

Verb-subject (verb early in clause):
   ii.5, ii.12, iii.8
Subject-verb (verb early in clause):
   iii.2, iii.3, iii.9(part.), iii.10(part.)
Subject implied (verb early in clause):
   ii.1(2x), ii.2, ii.3, ii.5, ii.6(2x), ii.7(2x), ii.10, ii.11, ii.12, ii.13, iii.1, iii.5, iii.11, iii.12

Verbless clause:
   ii.2, ii.3, 2.13(?)

Use of negative particle אַל (+ prefix-conjugation verb):
   ii.5
Content synopsis and significance: This manuscript is one of at least five copies of a composition known only from Qumran, referred to as the Visions of Amram (4Q543–547 [Visions of Amram*a–e]), possibly with 4Q548–549 [Visions of Amram*f–g]). The composition centers on the activities of Levi's grandson, Amram, the eponymous protagonist of the text. This copy of the Visions contains a rare opening superscription, which presents the document as a written copy of a first-person speech that Amram recounted to his children near the time of his death: “A copy of the words of visions of Amram son of Qahat son of Levi, all that he explained to his children and commanded them on the day of his death” (4Q543 1a–c.1–2; cf. 4Q545 [Visions of Amram*c] 1ai.1–2). On the basis of this superscription, scholars have considered whether the Visions of Amram should be understood as an early example of the Jewish genre of “testament,” known especially from the later Greek Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs (cf. Frey, “Testament”; Reed, “Textuality”). The first-person narrative voice of the Visions of Amram demonstrates its affinity with a large number of the Aramaic texts from Qumran, many of which purport to record the first-person speech of venerable figures from Israel’s past (e.g., the Aramaic sources of 1 Enoch, the Genesis Apocryphon, the Testament of Jacob?, the Aramaic Levi Document, the Testament of Qahat, and Tobit). On this phenomenon, see Tigchelaar (“Pseudepigraphy”), Stuckenbruck (“Pseudepigraphy”), and Perrin (“Tobit’s Context”). The Visions of Amram also shares a number of features in common with a smaller group of Aramaic works, especially those related to the Levitical family (Aramaic Levi Document and Testament of Qahat). Beginning with Milik (“4Q Visions”), several scholars have suggested that these three texts comprise a “priestly trilogy” (Drawnel, “Admonitions”) or “trilogy of testaments” (Tervanotko, “Trilogy”) due to the fact that they “are connected stylistically, thematically, and linguistically” (Tervanotko, “Trilogy”; cf. Puech, “Qahat”; DJD 31:257–75).

4Q543, Visions of Amram*
[ed. Puech, DJD 31:289–318]
4Q543 is a relatively poorly-preserved copy of the Visions of Amram, but it does contain a portion of the composition’s superscription and opening scene, which can be partially reconstructed with the help of 4Q545 (Visions of Amram⁴) and 4Q546 (Visions of Amram⁵). Fragment 1a–c records the date of Amram’s farewell speech, his one hundred thirty-sixth year, in the one hundred fifty-second year of Israel’s exile in Egypt (lines 2–4). It also recounts Amram’s arrangement of his daughter Miriam’s marriage to his brother Uzziel (lines 4–6), and the subsequent wedding banquet (lines 6–7). The focus on endogamy in this passage has drawn the attention of a number of scholars (Loader, Sexuality, 324–26; Tervanotko, “The Hope”; Tervanotko, “Ideal Marriages”). Endogamy is also an important theme later in the Visions of Amram, in the context of its description of Amram’s marriage to his aunt Jochebed. Interestingly, uncle-niece and aunt-nephew marriages are prohibited in several Second Temple texts, including some from Qumran (4QHalakha A [4Q251] 17.3–5; 4QTemple Scrollb [4Q524] 15–22.3–4; 11QTemple Scrollb [11Q19] 66.15–17; and the Damascus Document [CD] 5.7–11). For a discussion of the importance of endogamy as a motif in the Aramaic Scrolls more broadly, see Eshel (“Proper,” “Marriage”), Perrin (“Tobit’s Context”), and Dimant (“Tobit”). 4Q543 also contains fragmentary portions of a few other passages from the Visions of Amram, on which see the profiles of the additional copies of the text, below.

Material remains: This manuscript consists of forty-six fragments, most of which are only tiny scraps and contain little more than a few letters, words, or phrases. Several fragments are somewhat more substantial, though none is larger than a standard playing card. 4Q543 overlaps with four other Visions of Amram manuscripts: 4Q544 (Visions of Amram⁶; at 4Q543 3; 4; 5–9; 14), 4Q545 (Visions of Amram⁷; at 4Q543 1 a, b, c; 2a–b; 3), 4Q546 (Visions of Amram⁸; at 4Q543 1 a, b, c; 3; 15), and 4Q547 (Visions of Amram⁹; at 4Q543 4; 5–9). Fragment 1a–c contains a significant portion of the right and upper margins. Margins are also found on frags. 4 and 15, though the manuscript’s poor state of preservation does not allow us to say anything about the scroll’s original overall dimensions, or those of its columns.

Notes on provenance: Some fragments of 4Q543 (e.g., frag. 5) were photographed on the PAM “G series” plate 40.620, and so are part of the lot of fragments discovered by the Bedouin in Cave 4 in 1952 (see Strugnell, “Photographing,” 124, 131–32). In addition, Tigchelaar identified several fragments included on the “E series” PAM plates 40.978 (frags. 1c, 23, 33) and 40.979 (1b, 2b, 45), associated with the official excavations of Cave 4 led by de Vaux in 1952. As a result, we can see that some of the fragments of this scroll were found by the Bedouin, while others were discovered in the official excavations supervised by de Vaux.

Sample image: 5Q543 1a–c
Material: Skin

Script: Hasmonean formal (Puech)

Proposed palaeographic date: 150–100 BCE, perhaps around 125 BCE (Puech)

Special traits and general comments: The beginning of this manuscript is partially preserved, and we can see from the clear evidence of stitching at the right edge of the first preserved sheet (frags. 1a–c) that another one preceded it. This must have been either a blank cover sheet or a sheet containing part of another composition. Of these two options, I find the former more likely, since we know of blank cover (or handle) sheets for other Qumran scrolls (e.g., 1QIsaa, 1QS, and 1QH; see also the end of 11QTa). An alternative method to an entire blank sheet was to leave a part of the initial sheet blank, placing the first column of writing part-way through it (as with 4Q571 [Words of Michaela] and 1QM). Margins and line spacing fall toward the larger end of the spectrum for our manuscripts. The script of 4Q543 is also relatively large, and the scribe spaced words generously. The evenness of the line spacing supports Puech's claim that script guidelines were used, even though they are no longer visible on the available images. Vacats seem to have been used regularly to signal minor narrative progressions. Orthography and morphology are generally typical for the Qumran Aramaic texts, with noteworthy features being a possible haphel verb form at 28.2 and what appears to be the long form of the 2ms suffix at 19.1.

Original manuscript quality: Very good

Select bibliography: Milik, "4Q Visions"; Beyer, ATTM¹, 210–14; Beyer, ATTM⁵, 85–93; Beyer, ATTM², 117–25; Drawnel, "Initial Narrative"; Duke, Social Location, 9–34.
Language

Syntax
Subject-verb (verb later in clause):
16.2(?)
Subject implied (verb early in clause):
5–9.4(2x), 5–9.7(part.), 15.1(?), 32.1
Subject implied (verb later in clause):
5–9.6
Verbless clause:
5–9.7 (understanding חעכון as an adj. part. ועכון)
Object early in clause:
5–9.6, 16.2(?)
Verb of movement + ל + inanimate object:
15.1(?)

Lexical items:
אadin: 16.3
בاذין: 32.1(?)

Morphology:

Orthography/Phonology:
2ms (pro)nominal suffix רבח:
19.1(?)
ש for /s/:
15.3

Other notable features:
Proposed Hebraisms:
אל (lexical; 2a–b.4; 2x) [H]
עליין (lexical; 22.2) [H]

Content synopsis and significance: This manuscript represents one of at least five copies of a composition known only from the Qumran finds, referred to as the Visions of Amram (4Q543–547 [Visions of Amram* *], possibly with 4Q548–549 [Visions of Amram* *]). The preserved portions of 4Q544 contain an account of the events that transpired during Amram’s journey from Egypt to Canaan, of which we hear nothing in Exodus. In frag. 1 we learn that Amram and a group, which included his father Qahat and a number of other Israelites, traveled to Canaan in order to build family tombs. (On burial as an important indicator of piety in both the Visions of Amram and Tobit, see Goldman, “Burial”). The theme of rebuilding ancestral tombs as part of the city of Jerusalem also appears in the late Persian-period Neh 2:1–5, which uses language similar to the Visions of Amram. Before Amram’s building project is complete, the group hears rumors of a coming war between Philistia and Egypt, causing them to return to Egypt. Amram, however, stays behind to complete the work. A border closure resulting from the war leaves Amram stranded in Canaan for forty-one years, during which time he longs for his wife Jochebed, but points out that he refrained from taking another wife from among the nations. Here, as we see elsewhere in the Aramaic literature from Qumran, endogamy is an important indicator of personal piety and faithfulness to one’s Israelite identity (see Eshel, “Marriage”; Perrin, “Tobit’s Context”; Tervanotko, “Ideal Marriages”; Dimant, “Tobit”). For more on the relationship between Amram and Jochebed, see the profile for 4Q543 (Visions of Amram*). Fragment 1 ends with a fascinating dream-vision seen by Amram. The vision is lengthy, continuing in frags. 2–3, and tells of two opposed “judges” – presumably angelic spiritual beings – who have “a great dispute” over Amram. The two beings represent the two paths of righteousness and wickedness. Language of light and darkness features prominently in the dream-vision, with one of the judges ruling over the light and the other ruling over the darkness. This theme has led to discussions about the place of the Visions of Amram in the development of Jewish dualistic thinking and its relation to those Qumran sectarian texts using similar light/darkness imagery, such as the War Scroll (1QM) and the Two Spirits Treatise (IQS 3–4) (cf. Goldman, “Dualism”; Perrin, “Dualism”). The use of light/darkness imagery characterizes a significant number of the Aramaic texts from Qumran (the Aramaic sources of 1 Enoch, the Genesis Apocryphon, the Apocryphon of Levi?, the Aramaic Levi Document, and the Testament of Qahat). In these texts, the motifs of light and darkness function as a way to distinguish between righteousness and wickedness in ethical, cosmological, and eschatological contexts. Several scholars have also speculated as to the identity of the two angelic beings in Amram’s vision, especially the judge who rules over the realm of light. His
name is not preserved in the extant manuscript, but he has often been identified with Melchizedek due to the fact that his opposite is identified clearly in the text as Melchiresha (מלכי רע). The identification of the good angel as Melchizedek has led to the Visions of Amram often being incorporated into studies on the figure of Melchizedek in early Judaism and Christianity (e.g., Kobelski, *Melchizedek*; Mason, *Priest*). For the rationale behind this identification, see Milik ("4Q Visions") and Perrin (*Dynamics*, 166–67), though the suggestion has not been accepted enthusiastically by all (e.g., Dimant "Melchizedek," 366).

**Material remains:** Three fragments comprise what remains of this manuscript. Fragment 1 is quite large and well-preserved, containing an upper and right margin, as well as parts of fourteen lines. Parallels with material from 4Q543 (Visions of Amram^a^), 545 (Visions of Amram^c^), 546 (Visions of Amram^d^), and 547 (Visions of Amram^e^) allow us to reconstruct even more of this fragment’s original content. The stitching visible on its right margin also indicates that this fragment begins a new sheet. Fragment 2 is much smaller, but preserves portions of six lines and a bottom margin. Fragment 3 is the smallest by far, preserving only a few words. It does, however, contain a full upper margin.

**Provenance:** Some fragments of 4Q544 (e.g., 2 and the right half of 1) were photographed on the PAM “G series” plates 40.609 and 40.617, having been discovered by the Bedouin in Cave 4 in 1952 (see Strugnell, “Photographing,” 124, 131–32). The origins of the remaining fragments of 4Q544 were not clearly documented, though they most likely were also discovered in Cave 4 by the Bedouin.

Sample image: 4Q544 1, 3 (Not a proposed arrangement of the fragments)
Image B-284599
COURTESY OF THE LEON LEVY DEAD SEA SCROLLS DIGITAL LIBRARY, ISRAEL ANTIQUITIES AUTHORITY.
PHOTO: NAJIB ANTON ALBINA
Material: Skin

Script: Hasmonean semi-formal with some semi-cursive features (Puech)

Proposed palaeographic date: 150–100 BCE, perhaps ca. 125 BCE (Puech)

Special traits and general comments: This is a very well-executed manuscript with a small, tidy script, a generally high level of consistency in spacing, and the use of small vacats to indicate minor pauses or shifts in the narrative. Margins are fairly large and uniform and there are no extant corrections, indicating a skilled copyist. Word spaces are exceptionally large, regularly reaching 3 and sometimes even 4 mm.

Despite the generally high quality of the manuscript and scribal work, the scribe of this copy had several idiosyncratic spelling practices in comparison with the larger Qumran Aramaic corpus. The letters aleph and he are freely interchanged at the end of words (e.g., התנחא and והינא in 1.4, 6), to the extent of writing the negation לא as אל in 1.3. Noteworthy, and perhaps unique (cf. the profile for 4Q542 [TQahat]) among Qumran Aramaic manuscripts, the scribe wrote the piel infinitive with a mem prefix (למעמרא) in 1.1, something that is rare in earlier Aramaic but is well-known from later dialects. In the parallel at 4Q545 (Visions of Amram) iii.13 the verb is written without the prefixשוממה. Other aberrant or unexpected spellings includeשנפיה (forשנפיה), theaco (forהאכ), חעכן (forחעכן) in 1.14, and הדן in 2.12. The last word is difficult to interpret with certainty based on its fragmentary context. Cook (DQA, 63) suggested that it may be an early proclitic use of the focusing particle הדא plus the demonstrative pronoun זה (דה); cf. אמד in 1Q20 [apGen] 2.6), something that becomes widespread in later Aramaic dialects. Several of these scribal features suggest the weakening, shifting, or levelling of guttural vowels and consonants, and may be considered relatively late or progressive in terms of diachronic morphology and phonology. In the realm of orthography, the letter he occasionally takes on a more semi-cursive “cross” shape, as seen in 2.2 (האם) and 2.4 (הנשה). In this case, the formation of the letter (i.e., the ductus) has not changed, but is simply done with more flourish. This is especially true of the right, vertical leg of the letter.

Overall manuscript quality: Very good–excellent

4Q545, Visions of Amram

[ed. Puech, DJD 31:331–49]

Content synopsis and significance: Like 4Q543 (Visions of Amram\(^a\)) and 546 (Visions of Amram\(^b\)), 4Q545 preserves the beginning of the Visions of Amram, including the introductory superscription and the subsequent marriage of Miriam to Uzziah. Unlike any of the other Visions of Amram manuscripts, however, 4Q545 records what happens immediately after the wedding of Miriam and her paternal uncle. Following seven days of celebration, Amram summons his son Aaron, who is instructed to fetch a figure called מלאכיה. Scholars have debated the identity of this figure (or figures), but Duke has shown persuasively that מלאכיה is the Hebrew name of Moses, Aaron’s brother (“Hebrew Name”). Amram’s following speech to מלאכיה can be partially reconstructed on the basis of overlapping material in 4Q543 (Visions of Amram\(^a\)). In the speech, Amram notes that Moses has received wisdom (4Q543 [Visions of Amram\(^a\)] 2a–b.2), and affirms Moses’ status as a מלאכיה, “messenger of God” (4Q543 [Visions of Amram\(^a\)] 2a–b.4). The speech contains two broken references to דרי עלמין, “generations of eternity,” a phrase that occurs elsewhere in the Visions of Amram and the broader Qumran Aramaic corpus (the Aramaic sources of 1 Enoch, the Aramaic Levi Document, the Testament of Qahat, and Tobit). Some of the other occurrences of דרי עלמין appear, unsurprisingly, in eschatological contexts, but in every case the phrase refers to the perpetual endurance of a lineage or institution in Israel (e.g., the Aaronide priesthood or the Jerusalem temple). The Hebrew equivalent of the phrase is found in the Hodayot (1Q11\(^a\)), 4QCommentary on Genesis A (4Q253), and Words of the Luminaries (4Q504). Fragment 4 of 4Q545 contains a predictive discourse on the future priesthood of Aaron and his descendants. The precise context of this fragment is difficult to determine, but it seems most likely to belong within Amram’s dream-vision. In this passage, Aaron is called a “holy priest” (ן קדיש), “the seventh among the men of [his [i.e., God’s] favor” (שביעי באנוש), and “an eternal priest” (הן עלמין). Aaron’s service (עובד) is described as a “mystery” (רז). It is also foretold that Aaron’s descendants will be “holy” (שליいくודש) for “all the generations of eternity” (למין כל דרי ע). Perrin’s discussion of this fragment demonstrated the striking
extent to which the description of Aaron’s priesthood in this passage is similar to that of Levi in the Aramaic Levi Document (Dynamics, 165; cf. DJD 31:343). It is possible that the Visions of Amram is attempting to stress the continuity between these two priesthoods.

Material remains: Twelve fragments remain of this manuscript, of which only frags. 1 and 4 exceed the size of a typical postage stamp. Frags. 10, 11, and 12 are tiny scraps of skin, preserving only a few letters each. The large majority of the preserved material comes from the two columns of frag. 1, which itself comprises two fragments (a and b), the second of which is much smaller than the first. The remnants of this fragment include parts of both the upper and the lower margins, demonstrating that this sheet contained nineteen lines of text with a column height of over 14 cm. The text of frag. 1 is quite poorly preserved, but the parallels that it shares with 4Q543 (Visions of Amrama), 544 (Visions of Amramb), and 546 (Visions of Amramd) allow us to reconstruct some of its contents with confidence, including the superscription in lines 1–4.

Fragment 4 preserves considerably less text than frag. 1, but its seven lines contain an interesting section of the Visions of Amram not extant elsewhere in the Qumran fragments.

Notes on provenance: Tigchelaar identified 4Q545 1 on the early PAM “E series” plate 40/665. The fragments in this series of plates were found in the official excavations of Cave 4 on September 22–29, 1952, directed by de Vaux (Strugnell, “Photographing,” 124, 131–32). While the discovery of the remaining fragments of 4Q545 in Cave 4 is assured, the mode of their discovery was not documented.
Material: Skin

Script: Hasmonean (Puech)

Proposed palaeographic date: 100–50 BCE, favoring 67–33 BCE (Puech)

Special traits and general comments: The preparation of this manuscript included full ruling of the script lines and column limits on both sides, including guide dots at the beginning and end of sheets. Close examination of the fragments reveals that the bottom margin is likely not fully preserved on frags. 1a or 1b. It may be that the full height of this margin was around 1.2–1.3 cm, as on frags. 2, 4, 6, and 8. However, as Puech noted, frag. 8 contains clear evidence of an unused ruled line between the last line of writing and what appears to be the bottom of the scroll. Were this empty line to contain writing, the bottom margin would be exceptionally small, around 4–5 mm. Puech thought that the blank spaces at the bottom of frags. 2, 4, 6, and 8 may be vacats, but I find it more likely that the scribe simply left this line blank in all columns of this sheet (or perhaps the entire scroll) in order to leave a more reasonably-sized bottom margin. In either case the bottom margin is notably small relative to the broader corpus. The top margin is claimed by Puech to be 1.8 cm (DJD 31:331), though we have only 8 mm preserved on frag. 1a. The top edge of the fragment is quite obviously torn in the images, and the original margin was certainly larger than 8 mm. Judging by the evidence available, the intercolumnar margins were quite narrow, around 1.1 cm on frags. 1a and 3, though the latter is measured to the seam at the beginning of a new sheet, meaning that the overall intercolumnar margin here likely would have been in the range of 1.5–2 cm. The stitching holes can still be seen on frag. 3, along with the guide dots for the horizontal ruling. As with the intercolumnar margins, the columns are relatively narrow, roughly half the width of those in 4Q544 (Visions of Amram a). The height of 4Q545 falls around the middle of the spectrum for those manuscripts with a full height preserved in the corpus. It is slightly taller than 4Q112 (Dana) or 11Q10 (Job), but considerably shorter than the largest manuscripts, such as 1Q20 (apGen), 4Q202 (En b), and 4Q204 (En c). An incomplete 2.4 cm area of uninscribed skin precedes the first column of frag. 1a. This is a much larger distance than would be expected to the stitched seam of a preceding, blank cover sheet (as on 4Q543 [Visions of Amram a]), suggesting instead that one or more blank columns were left at the start of the manuscript, as on 4Q571 (Words of Michael a) and 1QM.

The scribe of 4Q545 wrote in a very neat, square, upright script, with words spaced quite compactly (cf. the much more open spacing of 4Q544 [Visions of Amram b]). Vacats were clearly used, though their size and the nature of their narrative function is for the most part not clear. Some of them seem to have been quite large (at least 3.3 cm). As in so many of the Aramaic narratives from Qumran, there is a clear preference for VSO syntax.

Original manuscript quality: Good–very good

Script sample:

Language

Syntax

Verb-subject (verb early in clause):
- 1ai.7–8, 1a–bii.15(?), 1a–bii.16, 1a–bii.17(?)

Subject-verb (verb later in clause):
- 4.18

Subject implied (verb early in clause):
- 1ai.4, 1ai.5, 1ai.6, 1ai.7(2x), 1ai.8, 1ai.9(?), 1ai.10, 1a–bii.11, 1a–bii.12(?), 1a–bii.17(?), 4.14, 4.16, 4.18, 4.19, 7.1

Subject implied (verb later in clause):
- 6.3

Verbless clause:
- 1ai.3, 7.1

Direct object marker (if present):
- 7; 1ai.5, 1ai.9

Use of רד to mark genitive relationship:
- 1ai.3, 1a–bii.17

Verb of movement + י in + animate object:
- 1ai.4(?)

Verb of movement + י in + inanimate object:
- 1a–bii.16

Lexical items:

רדה: 1ai.7
יר: 1ai.2, 1ai.3, 1a–bii.17

Morphology:

ארפ form:
- 1ai.7

אָרָפ form:
- 1ai.7

Assimilated nun:
- 1a–bii.18

Orthography/Phonology:

2ms (pro)nominal suffix יבכ/בכ:
- 1ai.14, 4.14, 4.16

ש for /s/:
- 1a–bii.14

Other notable features:

Proposed Hebraisms:

לאך אל [H]
ומ (lexical; 1a–bii.17) [H]
ח מ ש (lexical: 5.4) [H]
ן לירות ל [H] (lexical: 8.1) [h]
Content synopsis and significance: This copy of the Visions of Amram (4Q543–547 [Visions of Amram^a–e]), possibly with 4Q548–549 [Visions of Amram^f–g]) consists mostly of small fragments, the context and content of which is difficult to discern. However, several of the fragments provide important details that give insight into the composition as a whole. For example, frag. 12 contains a reference to the “mystery of Miriam” (רצ מרים). The figure of Miriam appears earlier in the Visions of Amram, in a passage addressing her marriage to her uncle Uzziah, but the reference to Miriam’s “mystery” suggests that she had more than just a passive role in the story. The word רצ is used more widely in the Aramaic texts from Qumran, and often refers to aspects of the divine plan for the cosmos and human history, with a specific focus on Israel. Aaron’s “service” (עבד), which surely refers to the priestly, cultic activity assigned to him, is also described as a רצ in 4Q545 (Visions of Amram^c) 4.16. While scholars have generally noted the importance of Aaron in the Visions of Amram, the elevated status of Miriam in this composition has received far less attention. However, the Visions of Amram clearly imbues all three of Amram’s children with special qualities and functions. On the figure of Miriam in the Visions of Amram and other ancient Jewish texts, see Tervanotko’s publications on the topic (“The Hope,” “Dreams,” “Ideal Marriages,” and Her Voice). 4Q546 contains several other intriguing details, though they occur in very fragmentary contexts. These include references to “the priest” (כהן; 18.2) and “the tablet” (לוח; 20.2). Though difficult to interpret with confidence, these references connect the Visions of Amram to the larger collection of Qumran Aramaic texts, with their interest in the priesthood and in the contents of (heavenly) tablets and books (see, e.g., 4Q537 [TJacob?]).

Material remains: This manuscript consists of twenty-five small, relatively poorly-preserved fragments, very few of which contain any more than four or five lines of text. Frags. 1, 2, 4, and 6 have clear parallels with other Visions of Amram manuscripts (i.e., 4Q543 [Visions of Amram^a], 544 [Visions of Amram^b], 545 [Visions of Amram^c]). The manuscript’s poor state of preservation prevents us from getting a sense of its original dimensions, but a number of its fragments contain sizeable upper, lower, and intercolumnar margins.

Notes on provenance: The fragments of 4Q546 are not found on the early “E series” or “G series” PAM plates. While their discovery in Cave 4 is assured, the mode of that discovery was not documented.

Sample image: 4Q546 2, 14 (Not a proposed arrangement of the fragments)
**PROFILE OF PHYSICAL LAYOUT**

*Scroll dimensions:* Approx. 21.5 cm h. (based on Puech’s reconstruction)

*Margins:*

Upper: At least 2.2 cm (frag. 10)

Lower: 2.1–2.2 cm (frags. 2, 24)

*Intercolumnar:* 2–2.2 cm (frag. 14; to sheet seam)

*Column dimensions:*

Approx. 17 cm h. (Puech’s reconstruction)

*Lines per column:* Approx. 21 (Puech’s reconstruction)

*Scribal guidelines:*

*Horizontal script lines:* Yes, with marginal guide dots (frag. 14)

*Vertical column lines:* None visible

*Average medial letter height:* 2–2.5 mm

*Space between lines:* 5–8 mm

*Space between words:* 1–1.5 mm

*Vacats:* Yes; medium (15.5 [at least 1.3 cm] and 24.2 [at least 2.4 cm])

---

**Material:** Skin

**Script:** Late Hasmonean formal hand, with some semi-cursive influence (Puech)

**Proposed palaeographic date:** 67–33 BCE (Puech)

**Special traits and general comments:** If Puech is approximately correct in his reconstruction, this was a relatively tall scroll, nearly the same height as the better-preserved 4Q204 (En"). Margins are toward the more generous end of the spectrum relative to the overall corpus, and we possess part of the beginning of a new sheet (including the flax thread) on frag. 14. The layout of the manuscript included guide dots, as seen clearly on frag. 14. These dots are spaced quite regularly at around 6 mm, and most written lines are also spaced at 6–7 mm. There does occasionally seem to be larger variation in line spacing, though it should be kept in mind that the leather has become shrunken and contorted in places. Horizontal ruling for writing was used, but there does not appear to be vertical column ruling. The absence of these lines is supported by the irregular distance of where the scribe began writing lines relative to the right side of the column on frag. 14. The scribe was very capable, but wrote in a less tidy script than we find in some of the highest-quality manuscripts. There are no scribal mistakes on the preserved fragments, and the scribe apparently used sizeable vacats. Puech’s proposed vacats on frags. 3.2 and 15.1–4 are quite uncertain, and for this reason I have not measured an intercolumnar margin at the right side of frag. 15. The only sure vacats are at 15.5 and 24.2, in uncertain narrative contexts. One minor scribal idiosyncrasy on this copy is the use of a medial kaph as the final letter of בֵיתכ “your house” at 14.3. There is also a curious, large medial mem found on what appears to be the bottom margin of frag. 9 (it occurs at the edge of the fragment). The letter is noticeably larger (4 mm) than the letters used for the main script, and is oriented at a downward angle relative to the ruled script lines. It is possible, but not certain, that the letter was written by the original scribe of the copy, and Puech has tentatively suggested that it may be part of a scribal notation indicating the contents of the column (DJD 31:353). Whatever its original function, the letter is anomalous among the Aramaic scrolls from Qumran.

**Original manuscript quality:** Very good–excellent

Corrections and scribal features:

(a) Large medial mem in bottom margin (frag. 9)

(b) Medial kaph used in final position (frag. 14.3)

Language

Syntax
- Verb-subject (verb early in clause):
  2.3, 9.2(?, 12.2(part.; ?)
- Subject implied (verb early in clause):
  2.2, 3.3(?), 4.1(?), 4.3(2x), 8.4, 9.3(?), 12.3(?)
- Subject implied (verb later in clause):
  12.4(?)
- Verbless clause:
  4.2, 11.3(?)
- Object early in clause:
  12.4(?)
- Direct object marker (if present):
  9.6(?)
- Verb of movement + ל + inanimate object:
  9.6(?)

Lexical items:
- בתר: 9.4, 11.4, 14.2(?)
- די: 7.3, 9.5, 14.4
- כען: 12.2, 14.1, 14.4

Morphology:
- Object suffix on verb:
  2.3, 4.3
- Assimilated nun:
  2.4
- Dissimilated nun/nasalization:
  14.2

Orthography/Phonology:
- ש for /s/:
  10.1(?)

Other notable features:
- Proposed Hebraisms:
 ומפתין (lexical; 10.2) [H]
Content synopsis and significance: This is the last of the numbered manuscripts identified with certainty as a copy the Visions of Amram, the identifications of 4Q548 (Visions of Amram) and 4Q549 (Visions of Amram) being debated by scholars. 4Q547 is very fragmentary and contains little overlapping material with the other Visions of Amram copies. The absence of context for most fragments makes it difficult to interpret the contents of this copy, though several of the fragments contain phrases that aid in our understanding of the larger composition. For example, some of the fragments apparently focus on the cultic activities of Amram’s ancestors. Fragment 5 appears to have a reference to Noah in close proximity to the verb קבר ("to bring near, sacrifice"), reminding us of Noah’s activity as a priest in Genesis Apocryphon column 10, which is based on Gen 8:20–22 (see Machiela and Jones, “Beginnings”). In frag. 8 we find the phrase "a[ll] that Levi his son brought near" ([א]לו רבי נהב), along with an allusion to "a[ll] the offerings" ([א]ל עבי생) and an "altar of stones" ([א]ל אבני). Fragment 9 also displays an interest in cultic matters, being well-preserved enough to allow us to say slightly more about its contents than for other fragments. In line 8 we find the phrase "and I awoke from the sleep of my eyes" (וַאֲבַע אוֹת עַיְנָי), a formula that closely resembles those at the conclusions of revelatory dream-visions in the Aramaic Levi Document (4Q213b [Levi] 1.2) and the Genesis Apocryphon (1Q20 [apGen] 15.21; 19.17). Just as significant for determining this fragment’s broader context is its reference to "the land of Canaan" ([א]_velocity) in the next line. From 4Q544 (Visions of Amram), we learn that Amram fell asleep and began to dream while sojourning in Canaan (1.10). Fragment 9 likely contains the conclusion of this dream-vision. What remains of the preceding material in frag. 9 deals with some sort of sacrifice being offered "upon [the] bronze altar" ([ל]ַע מִסְכִּינ) line 5) and describes a priest who "will be elevated over all the sons of eternity" ([יִהְיֶה חָלֵב פַּתּוֹן מִכָּל בָּנֵי עֶתְנַיָּה) line 6) and will eventually be succeeded by "his children after him for all the generations of eternity" (וַיְהִי בַּּתּוֹ מִכָּל רֵעוֹד עֶתְנַיָּה; line 7). This statement concludes the dream-vision, and shows that one focus of the dream was the divinely-established lineage of the Levitical (and, more specifically, Aaronic) priesthood. Though the name of the priest being discussed at the end of the dream is not preserved, it is most likely Aaron, considering the strikingly similar statements about the eternal priesthood of Aaron and the perpetual inheritance of his children elsewhere in the Visions of Amram (cf. 4Q545 [Visions of Amram] 4.16–19). These aspects of 4Q547 connect it to themes found more widely throughout the Qumran Aramaic corpus. Information about the Israelite priesthood and the operation of the cult is disclosed to protagonists by way of revelatory dream-visions in the Aramaic Levi Document (see Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel, Aramaic Levi, 66–69). New Jerusalem (2Q24 [NJ]; 1Q18 [NJ]), and the Testament of Jacob? (4Q537). Second, both Noah and Levi are elsewhere described as cultic figures, especially in the Aramaic Levi Document. There, Noah is presented as the point of origin for the sacrificial instructions passed from Isaac to his grandson Levi. As mentioned above, Noah also carries out an atoning sacrifice after the flood in the Genesis Apocryphon (1Q20 [apGen] 10.13–17; cf. Jub. 6:2–4). All of these texts witness to a proclivity in the Aramaic scrolls to depict heroes from Israel’s past in the genealogical line of Levi (stretching both forwards and backwards) as priests, emphasizing the ancestral connections among them and highlighting their legitimate transmission of priestly knowledge (see esp. 4Q542 [TQahat] 11.7–13; 4Q545 [Visions of Amram] 4.18).

Building on Puech’s observation (DJD 31:377) that the same scribe wrote 4Q547 and 4Q542 (TQahat) I have argued (Machiela, “Testament of Qahat”) that these two manuscripts are, in fact, part of the same scroll (see further below, under Special traits and general comments). I also made the additional suggestion that the Testament of Qahat, which hitherto has been considered an independent literary work, may have originally been part of the Visions of Amram. This would, in turn, reshape somewhat our conceptions of both the Testament of Qahat and the Visions of Amram, showing that the latter text has a section in which the first-person narration of Amram includes a secondary layer of first-person instruction by Qahat. A very similar situation is found in the Aramaic Levi Document, where Levi’s grandfather Isaac gives a long sub-discourse on cultic matters in the first-person voice.

Material remains: Nine fragments are all that remain of this manuscript, the first three of which overlap with other copies of the Visions of Amram. Of the other six fragments, only frag. 9 contains any significant amount of running text. It is possible that both the upper and lower
margins are preserved on this fragment, which would attest to a column height of twelve lines and roughly 7 cm. However, the presence of the upper margin is uncertain. Fragment 5 has a fairly sizable left margin with remains of the stitching between two sheets still preserved. Some of the other fragments may also have preserved margins, but it is often not clear whether these are margins or vacats.

Notes on provenance: The fragments of 4Q547 are not found on the early “E series” or “G series” PAM plates. While their discovery in Cave 4 is assured, the mode of that discovery was not documented. If 4Q547 does belong to the same scroll as 4Q542 (TQahat), as I believe it does, then the presence of 4Q542 (TQahat) 3 on the PAM “G series” plate 40.613 is also of relevance for 4Q547.
Material: Skin

Script: Early Hasmonean (Puech)

Proposed palaeographic date: 150–100 BCE (Puech)

Radiocarbon date: If 4Q547 and 4Q542 (TQahat) are parts of a single scroll, the radiocarbon date for 4Q542 (TQahat) would also apply to 4Q547.

Special traits and general comments: If Puech’s reconstructions are correct, this was a relatively small manuscript in terms of its height. A reconstruction of column heights, containing twelve to thirteen lines of text, depends mainly on the relative placement of frags. 1–2, considered alongside frag. 9. Supporting evidence for such a reconstruction is not completely absent, but it is meager. Margins are small, and the use of script lines are indicated by Puech, though they cannot be seen on the available images. The erratic spacing of the lines does make one wonder if they were, indeed, used. There is a rare manuscript repair on frag. 5, where a 3 cm diagonal tear in the skin that started at the seam between two sheets (toward the bottom half of the column) has been sewn back together. Given the placement of the tear’s beginning near the middle of the sheet, it seems likely that it was made before the sheets were sewn, and that the repair was made when the scroll was first being assembled.

Puech proposed that the scribe of 4Q547 is the same as that who wrote 4Q542 (TQahat), and I completely agree with his assessment. The similarity is seen not only in the untidy scribal hand, but also in other scribal habits. For example, in both manuscripts we find full spellings of the long /i/ vowel with aleph (e.g., אִדָּא in 4Q542 [TQahat] ii.11 and הלטניאָא in 4Q547 3.2) and the long 2ms pronoun endings spelled with he (72–). There is a general absence of vacats being used in the small amount of text preserved, and where we might expect them to have been used (as at 9.6) they are not.

The similarities between 4Q547 and 4Q542 (TQahat) extend beyond the scribal hand alone, as I have argued elsewhere (Machiela, “Testament of Qahat”). If Puech’s estimate of the lines per column in 4Q547 is correct, this is precisely the same number as found in 4Q542 (TQahat). In almost every other respect the manuscripts are closely comparable. They are written on similarly colored and tanned skins, with the hair follicle grain moving in the same direction (horizontally from lower left to upper right), and all of the measurements (margins, line spacing, etc.) are quite similar. The one possible exception to this trend is the use of horizontal script ruling in 4Q547, but not 4Q542 (TQahat). However, as mentioned above, this trait can be questioned for both scrolls. When combined with Puech’s observation that the scrolls share the same scribe, the striking similarity in manuscript size and execution raises the possibility that both 4Q542 (TQahat) and 4Q547 are, in fact, parts of one and the same scroll. In this case, we could then understand the speech from Qahat in 4Q542 (TQahat) to be either a distinct work included on the same manuscript as the Visions of Amram, or a sub-section of the larger Visions of Amram narrative. The latter possibility is quite plausible when we consider that the Aramaic Levi Document incorporates a
long speech by Levi’s father Isaac, teaching cultic regulations associated with Levi’s election to the priesthood. In the Aramaic Levi, Isaac’s speech proceeds in the first-person voice after a third-person introduction by Levi. We also find serial narratives in the first-person voice in other Aramaic works, like the Genesis Apocryphon and Tobit.

Original manuscript quality: Fair


Script sample:

Representative sample of corrections and scribal features:

(a) Supralinear word added: וָהָיְד[3] (3.4); supralinear letter added: וַהָיְדָה (3.5)

(b) Possible scribal dots between columns (frag. 4)

(c) Manuscript repair by stitching (frag. 5)

(d) Possible cancellation dots under and over final two characters (6.2): אָאֶרֶץ

10 Puech has an erasure of ל in 1–2.7. However, the correction is not evident on the available images. I would read instead: לְהֶרֶץ נַחֲרָיָה.
Language

Syntax
- Subject-verb (verb early in clause): 9.8
- Verb-subject (verb later in clause): 8.2, 9.6
- Subject-verb (verb later in clause): 1–2.12(part.; ?)
- Subject implied (verb early in clause): 1–2.8, 1–2.9, 1–2.10(part.; ?), 6.5, 8.3(?), 9.9
- Subject implied (verb later in clause): 3.1, 3.3, 9.7, 9.10
- Object early in clause: 3.1, 8.2, 9.7, 9.8
- Use of ד to mark genitive relationship: 8.3
- Verb of movement + ל + inanimate object: 1–2.5, 1–2.8

Lexical items:
- בהר: 4.2(7), 5.4(?), 9.7, 9.10(7)
- יה: 7.3, 8.2, 8.3
- בני יר: 3.1, 9.9
- ח: 3.4, 3.6

Morphology:
- אفعال form: 6.2
- דמויות form: 3.5(?)
- אבות form: 9.8

Orthography/Phonology:
- 2ms verbal affix דוה/את: 9.11
- 2ms (pro)nominal suffix חב/כה: 8.3
- ש for /s/: 9.10

Other notable features:

Proposed Hebraisms:
- ̊ תופע (lexical; 3.1) [H]
- ̊ לא (lexical; 6.3) [H]
- הר סיני (lexical; 9.4) [H]

Content synopsis and significance: This manuscript has often been treated as a copy of the Visions of Amram (with 4Q543–547 [Visions of Amrama–e] and possibly 4Q549 [Visions of Amramg]), though scholars disagree over the certainty of this identification. Puech tentatively associates 4Q548 with the other Visions of Amram manuscripts in his editio princeps, though he notes that this or any other proposal about the identity of 4Q548 is made “sans certitude en l’absence de recoupement avec les autres exemplaires” (DJD 31:392; see also the earlier suggestions of Milik along these lines “4Q Visions,” “Écrits”; cf. Puech, “Fragments”). For arguments against identifying 4Q548 with the Visions of Amram, see Duke (Social Location, 35–42) and Goldman (“Dualism”). The preserved sections of the scroll contain the first-person address of an individual to a plural “you.” Taking into account the broader context of the Aramaic literature found at Qumran, it seems very likely that the speaker is one of the ancestors of Genesis or Exodus addressing his sons about their future conduct and the course of human history. This preview of history appears to culminate in a scene of eschatological judgment for the righteous and wicked at 1ii–2.13–14, though the text is fragmentary. One of the most striking features of this manuscript’s contents is its way of dividing people into two, opposed groups, “the children of light” (בני נהורא) and “the children of darkness” ( חשוכא). The combination of first-person address and the light/dark dichotomy is also found in other Visions of Amram copies, and this ideological connection constitutes the main argument for associating 4Q548 with the Visions. Dualistic language of light and darkness pervades frags. iii–2, characterizing the identity and eschatological fate of two groups with opposing ethical and intellectual qualities. For example, line 12 reports that “every fool and wicked person is dark and every [wise] and righteous person is light,” while lines 12–14, though quite broken, appear to recount that “[all the children of light] (will go) to the light” and “all the children of dark[kness (will go) to the darkness.” The same passage speaks about the children of darkness going “to destruction” (לאבדנא). The sharp contrast between light and dark in this text has often been associated with an emerging Jewish dualism,
taken to be present in this and other Qumran Aramaic manuscripts (cf. Frey, “Dualistic Thought”). Although this contrast is more sharply defined in 4Q548 than in most other Aramaic works kept at Qumran, the theme does appear often elsewhere in the collection (e.g., the Aramaic sources of 1 Enoch, the Genesis Apocryphon, the Aramaic Levi Document, the Apocryphon of Levi?, the Testament of Qahat, and the Visions of Amram). We also find references in 4Q548 to “the children of the blessing” (בני ברכתא), “children of deceit” (בני שקר), and possibly to “the children of righteousness” (בני צדק). The language used in 4Q548 to categorize humanity closely resembles that of the Treatise on the Two Spirits in 1QS 3–4, which refers to “the children of light” (בני אור), “the children of righteousness” (בני צדק), and “the children of deceit” (בני שקר), the latter group being associated with the “angel of darkness” (מלאך חושך). See the profile for 4Q544 (Visions of Amram) on the correspondence between the two otherworldly beings in Amram’s dream-vision and the two angels of 1QS 3–4. If 4Q548 is counted among the Visions of Amram manuscripts, the basic connection in ideology between this composition and 1QS 3.13–4.26 is further strengthened. However, if 4Q548 is not considered to be a copy of the Visions of Amram, we would have two Aramaic scrolls that likely influenced the language and concepts found in 1QS. For more on the similarities between these two Aramaic manuscripts and 1QS 3–4, see Machiela, “Library,” 255–56. Dualistic language pitting “children of light” against “children of darkness” is found elsewhere in the sectarian literature of Qumran, most famously in the opening lines of the War Scroll (1QM 11). The same terms and imagery are attributed to Jesus (יווי פוחת [Jn 12:36]) and Paul (טננה פוחת [Eph 5:8], יויי פוחת [1 Thess 5:5], both in contrast to darkness) in the New Testament. As far as we can tell, the Visions of Amram (with 4Q548) preserve the earliest clear use of this motif in a well-developed form.

**Material remains:** Three fragments are assigned to this manuscript in Puech’s *editio princeps*. Parts of two columns are preserved in frag. 1, though what remains of the first column amounts only to traces of one or two letters. Column ii appears to come from the same column as that of frag. 2, as Puech’s placement and reconstruction suggest. When combined, these two fragments (iii–ii) are the primary witnesses to this manuscript. Fragment 3 is tiny, and contains only two complete words. Puech is uncertain as to whether frag. 3 even belongs to the same manuscript as frags. 1–2 (DJD 3:391). Fragment iii–ii presently contains sixteen lines, though the absence of upper and lower margins prevents us from knowing its original size. The column as preserved is just over 9.5 cm in height, and at least the same in width if Puech’s reconstruction is accepted.

**Notes on provenance:** The fragments of 4Q548 are not found on the early “E series” or “G series” PAM plates. While their discovery in Cave 4 is assured, the mode of that discovery was not documented.
Material: Skin

Script: Late Hasmonean or early Herodian formal, with some semi-cursive influence (Puech)

Proposed palaeographic date: 50–1 BCE (Puech)

Special traits and general comments: This well-prepared manuscript appears to have been finished without horizontal ruling for the script, though a fairly clear, dry-ruled line for the right side of a column is preserved on frag. 1. The same fragment contains an intercolumnar margin that is average in size for the corpus, at 1.3 cm. The absence of script ruling is confirmed by the relatively erratic line spacing on the extant fragments. The last two lines of frag. 2 (15–16) are placed particularly far apart (9 mm), raising some question of whether a blank line may have been left between them. Though placed far apart, the distance does not appear to be quite large enough to accommodate an empty line, and so Puech is likely correct to consider them to be successive, without a vacat. This position gains strong support from frag. 1, which was presumably the basis for Puech's decision. It may be that line 16 was the last of the column, and that for this reason (along with the absence of ruled guidelines) the scribe gradually strayed downward relative to the preceding line as he wrote. The scribe wrote in a practiced hand, somewhat less tidy than in the best manuscripts. The orthography is not especially full, but occasionally a full spelling is found, as when the long /i/ vowel was spelled with an aleph in אסיאנהון at 2.3. At least two scribal corrections were made in the sixteen, partially-preserved lines. In terms of syntax, the relatively high percentage of clauses with the verb placed late may perhaps be attributable to the elevated, poetic style of the first-person address. In keeping with the dialectical constraints of the corpus more broadly, the scribe used the root הוהי for the peal prefix-conjugation verb “to go” at 2.14, as opposed to ביא (used for the suffix-conjugation verb and participle).

Original manuscript quality: Good–very good

Corrections and scribal features:

(a) According to Puech, partial erasure and correction of word (iii.6): <נֶן־הָאָמּוֹן> וְאָמַרְתָּן
dot א ת מ י ע נ.

(b) Attempted erasure by scraping with added cancellation dot (2.9): לא רחנה

Language

Syntax

Subject-verb (verb early in clause):
- iii–2.9(part.), iii–2.9, iii–2.11

Subject-verb (verb later in clause):
- iii–2.9(part.), iii–2.9–10, iii–2.10, iii–2.11, iii–2.12–13, iii–2.14

Subject implied (verb early in clause):
- iii–2.14

Verbless clause:
- iii–2.12(2x)

Object early in clause:
- iii–2.9

Lexical items:
- רֶץ: iii–2.7

Morphology:

Form:
- iii–2.14, iii–2.15(?)

Dissimilated nun/nasalization:
- iii–2.11

Other notable features:

Proposed Hebraisms:
The possible Hebraisms discussed by Stadel (Hebraismen, 63) are based on incorrect readings in Beyer's transcriptions, corrected by Puech in DJD 31.

Poetic doublets/triplets:
- iii–2.9(?)

4Q549, Visions of Amram®?
[ed. Puech, DJD 31:399–405]

Content synopsis and significance: Like 4Q548 (Visions of Amram®), Puech grouped this scroll with those representing the Visions of Amram (i.e., 4Q543–549 [Visions of Amram®]) in his edito priceps. However, scholars disagree as to whether 4Q549 actually represents a copy of this composition, since it does not overlap with any of the preserved portions of 4Q543–547 (Visions of Amram®) or 4Q548 (Visions of Amram®). Duke (Social Location, 35–42) and Goldman (“Dualism”) represent those who doubt the identification of 4Q549 with the Visions of Amram, while Puech (DJD 31:399–400), White Crawford (“Traditions”), and Tervanotko (“Trilogy”) take the opposite position. For a helpful summary of the reasons for viewing 4Q549 as copy of the Visions of Amram, see Tervanotko (“Trilogy,” 42–44). Fragment 1 contains very little text, but we do find a reference to Egypt (מצרים). Fragment 2 is also quite fragmentary, but from it we can discern two main sections. The first is a story, now very broken, that reports the deaths of several people perhaps related to Amram, though this connection is not assured. There is one euphemistic expression for death in 2.6: פָּרַת לְבֵית עַלְמָה “he departed to his eternal home” – that is of interest, since it has a close parallel in Tob 3:6. In the latter text, Tobit asks that he be granted death by using the idiom ἀπόλυσόν με εἰς τὸν τόπον τὸν αἰώνιον “bid me depart to the eternal place” (GII). Based on comparison of the Greek and Aramaic at 4Q196 (pap-Tob®) 6.8, we can plausibly posit that the Aramaic phrase underlying the Greek of Tob 3:6 would have been אמרתי ייבד לי בית עולם “bid me depart to the eternal home” or something very similar, which amounts to the same expression...
as in 4Q549 2.6. Puech noted (DJD 31:434) that the same idiom is also found in later rabbinic literature (e.g., Lam. Rab. 46:24). Fragment 2 also includes a genealogical list of some members of the Levitical family, though it is unclear just how many generations were originally included. The list repeatedly uses the phrase “and he begat from” (ואולד מן), which does not mimic the standard biblical expression והוליד את (cf. 4Q559 [papBiblical Chronology]), but is similar to a single formulation in a genealogy from 1 Chronicles that is not present in Samuel-Kings (יהלד פ). Names present in the extant parts of the list include Miriam (מריאם), Sithri (סתרי), Hur (חור), Ur (אור), and most likely Aaron (אהר). Some earlier scholars (e.g., Eisenman and Wise, Uncovered, 152) posited that this fragment reflects a marital connection between Miriam and Hur, a tradition also attested in Josephus. However, both White Crawford and Tervanotko have convincingly shown that 4Q549 probably originally identified Uzziel as Miriam’s husband, and Hur as the couple’s son. As noted in the profile for 4Q543 (Visions of Amram®), the opening section of the Visions of Amram explicitly identifies Uzziel as Miriam’s husband. It is also worth noting that rabbinic tradition depicts Hur as Miriam’s son, as Tervanotko observed (“Trilogy,” 43). 4Q549 shares an interest in the genealogy of the Levitical family with several other Aramaic texts from Qumran, including the Aramaic Levi Document, the Testament of Qahat, the Visions of Amram, Pseudo-Daniel (4Q245), and 4Q559 (papBiblical Chronology). However, it should be noted that we cannot know with certainty whether 4Q549 is concerned with the Levitical genealogy as a whole, or only the family of Amram.

Material remains: 4Q549 comprises two fragments, the first of which is no larger than a small coin and preserves only a few, isolated words. Fragment 2 is considerably larger, containing portions of at least eleven lines. There is some question as to whether the bottom of the fragment preserves a lower margin or a vacat, given the size of the vacat in the middle of the fragment. The right side of frag. 2 also preserves part of an intercolumnar margin.

Notes on provenance: The fragments of 4Q549 are not found on the early “E series” or “G series” PAM plates. While their discovery in Cave 4 is assured, the mode of that discovery was not documented.
**Profile of Physical Layout**

**Margins:**
- **Intercolumnar:** at least 1 cm (frag. 2)

**Column dimensions:** At least 6.7 cm h. (Puech reconstructs the column of frag. 2 as 9.5–10 cm w.)

**Lines per column:** At least 11 (frag. 2)

**Scribal guidelines:**
- **Horizontal script lines:** None visible
- **Vertical column lines:** Yes, both sides of column (frag. 2)

**Average medial letter height:** 2–4 mm

**Space between lines:** 6–9 mm

**Space between words:** 1–2 mm

**Vacats:** Yes; small (2.9 [9 mm]) and large (2.7 [4.7 cm])

---

**Material:** Skin

**Script:** Early Herodian round semi-formal, with some lingering traits of Hasmonean style (Puech)

**Proposed palaeographic date:** 33–1 BCE (Puech)

**Special traits and general comments:** What little remains of this manuscript suggests good, competently-done work. The one, preserved intercolumnar margin is on the small side among the extant Aramaic manuscripts, and what Puech takes to be a bottom margin following 2.9 is, in fact, small enough simply to be an empty space between successive lines. If it is the bottom margin of the column, it does not seem to be fully preserved. A number of the measurements (e.g., line spacing and vacats) for the scroll should be taken as approximate, due to the significant puckering and wrinkling of the manuscript on the bottom portion of frag. 2. The scribe wrote in a script that varied significantly in size, something seen clearly in the word למצרי on 1.2. Orthography also varies noticeably, from full spellings like הלאה "to/for her" (2.2) and מרים "Miriam" (2.8) to defective ones like ארבעה "forty" (2.11). The long form of the 3fs suffix הא is notable, and is also found in a number of other Qumran Aramaic manuscripts. Puech suggested (DJD 31:401, 405) that the final nun of ארבעה was corrected in the middle of writing, the scribe having started to write the letter aleph, though I do not find his arguments very compelling. The scribe used vacats of varying sizes to mark pauses in the text, which is the main reason for my extending the rating of the manuscript into the “Very good” range. In truth, it is difficult to give an accurate assessment without more material preserved. Aside from the possible scribal slip noted above for ארבעה, there are no mistakes in the small amount of extant text.

**Original manuscript quality:** Good–very good


---

**Script Sample:**

![Script Sample Image]

**Language**

**Syntax**
- **Verb-subject (verb early in clause):** 2.1, 2.2(2), 2.9
- **Subject-verb (verb early in clause):** 2.10(?)
- **Subject implied (verb early in clause):** 2.3(2), 2.5, 2.6, 2.8, 2.10
- **Direct object marker (if present):** ל: 2.10
Content synopsis and significance: The most extensively preserved of the Qumran Tobit copies, 4Q196 contains a significant number of fragmentary passages from the book previously known only from the Greek and later versions. These include portions of the Ahiqar story near the beginning of the book, Sarah's dilemma and prayer, the journey of Tobiah and Azariah toward Ecbatana, Tobiah's arrival at Raguel and Edna's house, Azariah's self-revelation as Raphael, Tobiah's final instructions and prayer, and the book's conclusion in Tob 14. This wide range of passages from Tobit shows that 4Q196 contained most, and very likely all, of the book as we know it from the later Greek versions, particularly the longer Greek translation (G11). The presence of Tobit's discourse at the end of 4Q196 (Tob 14) is of special importance for helping to resolve a source-critical debate, since prior to the Qumran discoveries many had considered this section of the book to be a secondary addition in the Greek and other recensions. While this is technically still possible at a stage that preceded the Qumran copies, the likelihood of the chapter being part of the book's original composition increases significantly with its presence in 4Q196. Most now consider it to have been a part of Tobit's earliest compositional stages.

There are definitely four, and perhaps as many as six, Aramaic copies of Tobit discovered at Qumran, depending on how one judges the cases of 3Q14 4 and the papyrus fragment that is part of the Martin Schøyen Collection in Oslo, Norway (Schøyen Tobit; MS 5234). For the former manuscript, the identification of which is far from certain, see the profile in this volume. The provenance and genuineness of the latter has come under intense scrutiny since its publication by Hallermayer and Elgvin ("Tobit-Fragment"), who originally considered it to be another fragment of 4Q196 and labelled it 4Q196a. However, the fact that the word beginning the first line of the Schøyen fragment (תועות) falls in the middle of 4Q196 shows beyond doubt that the fragments cannot belong to the same manuscript. More recently, it has been argued that the Schøyen fragment is a modern forgery, along with a larger group of forged fragments (Davis et al., "Dubious"; Elgvin and Langlois, "Forgeries"). The argument merits serious consideration, and is most likely correct. (For this reason, the Schøyen fragment has not been included among the profiles in this book.) Alongside the Aramaic copies of Tobit, a single Hebrew copy was also found in Cave 4 (4Q203). The presence of Tobit in Hebrew raises the question of the book's original language of composition, an issue that had already been debated before the Qumran discoveries (see Machiela, "Hebrew of Tobit"). A very small group of scholars maintains that the book was composed in Hebrew and later translated into Aramaic, while Schmitt ("Die hebräischen") argued that it was published simultaneously in both languages. However, a clear, growing consensus has emerged around the book having been composed in Aramaic, and only later translated into Hebrew. This translation may well have been the product of a growing sense during the Hasmonean period that Hebrew was the sacred, national language (Perrin, "Scripturalization"; Machiela and Jones, "Revival"). Whatever the case, the copies of Tobit from Qumran have dramatically reshaped discussions of the book's language of composition.

The book of Tobit shares a number of broad themes, literary type scenes, and more specific idioms with other Aramaic texts kept at Qumran. These resemblances have been catalogued by scholars such as Nickelsburg ("Tobit," "Mixed Ancestry"), Dimant ("Tobit"), Eshel ("Proper"), Machiela ("Hebrew of Tobit"), Machiela and Perrin ("Family Portrait"), and Perrin ("Tobit's Context"). Many of these connections can be seen only with recourse to the Greek translations, especially the G11, because of the fragmentary state of the Qumran copies. Some of the relevant passages, however, are partially present in 4Q196. Fragment 2 contains the account of Tobit's service in the Assyrian royal court, along with mention of his nephew Ahiqar's high position. This portion of Tobit bears a resemblance to several other "court tales" written in Aramaic, such as the tales of Daniel 2–6, the Pseudo-Daniel texts (4Q243–244), the Prayer of Nabonidus (4Q242), Jews at...
the Persian Court (4Q553), and the augmented story of Abram and Sarai in the Pharaoh’s court in the Genesis Apocryphon (1Q20). Such tales were clearly a prominent, popular part of Hellenistic-period Jewish Aramaic literature. The story of Sarah’s marital dilemma with the demon Asmodeus and her eventual marriage to Tobias, parts of which are preserved in 4Q196 6 and 13–15, has clear literary connections to the rewritten story of Abram, Sarai, and the Pharaoh in the Genesis Apocryphon (see Machiela and Perrin, “Family Portrait”). Tobit’s ethically-charged wisdom address to Tobias (4Q196 8–10) is similar to ethical wisdom discourses by Noah in the Genesis Apocryphon, Isaac and Levi in the Aramaic Levi Document, and Enoch in the Epistle of Enoch (see Machiela, “Hebrew of Tobit”). Finally, Tobit’s description of Jerusalem in 4Q196 18 shares several details with the New Jerusalem text. Because Tobit was found in Aramaic at Qumran, we are now able to identify solidly with passages from Tobit. The remaining thirty fragments are so small as to be unidentifiable, often containing only a few partial letters or a single word. Fragment 2 is by far the largest of this copy, from which we can determine the height of the manuscript and its columns. Fragments 6, 14, 17, and 18 also containing a considerable amount of preserved text. Passages identified (often only partially) in the fragments are Tob 1:17; 1:19–2:3; 2:10–11; 3:5, 9–15, 17; 4:2, 5, 7; 4:21–5:3; 5:3; 6:6–8, 13–18; 6:18–7:6; 7:13; 12:1; 12:18–13:6; 13:6–12; 13:12–14:3; and 14:7.

Notes on provenance: Some fragments of 4Q196 were photographed on the early PAM “G series,” plates PAM 40.600, 40.633, 40.631, and 40.632. The fragments in this series of images were discovered by the Bedouin in Cave 4 in 1952 (Strugnell, “Photographing,” 124, 131–32). In addition, Tigchelaar identified a number of fragments (at times only partial) included on the “E series” PAM plates 40.974 (frags. 9, 11, 12, 34) and 40.977 (frags. 9, 14, 29), associated with the official excavations of Cave 4 led by de Vaux, also in 1952. As a result, we can see that some of the fragments of this scroll were found by the Bedouin, while others were discovered in the official excavations supervised by de Vaux.

Material remains: We possess forty-nine fragments of 4Q196, only nineteen of which Fitzmyer was able to identify solidly with passages from Tobit. The remaining
Material: Papyrus

Script: Late Hasmonean semi-formal (Fitzmyer, based on Cross)

Proposed palaeographic date: 75–25 BCE (Fitzmyer, based on Cross)

Special traits and general comments: This is the only preserved papyrus copy of Tobit from Qumran, unless the Schøyen MS 5324 is proved to be genuine (see above), in which case there would be two papyrus copies. 4Q196 is of estimable quality for a papyrus manuscript, with fairly generous spacing and a well-trained scribal hand. However, it lacks some traits of the better skin manuscripts, such as vacats to indicate sense divisions in the text, the evenness of spacing provided by scribal guidelines, and distinct spacing between words. In fact, the text of 4Q196 is effectively written *scripta continua* in some places. The scribe also made mistakes quite regularly, such as forgetting an obvious letter. Fitzmyer suggested the presence of one, small vacat in 13.2, but close investigation shows that this is far from certain; in reality, no definite cases can be identified in the preserved fragments. A few scribal features are notable: First, we find a “hooked” insertion mark for an added, supralinear word in 6.8, something that is very rare in the Qumran manuscripts (Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 203). Second, the vertical line used to strike through, and thereby cancel, a letter in 2.2 (likely a kaph, cf. 13.1) is also uncommon in the Qumran scrolls. The mark is found elsewhere in only two skin manuscripts, also written in Aramaic (4Q530 [EnGiants] ii.1 and 4Q213a [Levi 3–4.6]). For each of these corrections only a single letter is cancelled by the line (horizontal lines are used for two or more letters), with the more expected way to make such cancellations being dots above and/or below the letter in question (e.g., 1Q20 [apGen] 5.9). Third, the scribe of 4Q196 had the singular practice of replacing the divine name אֱלֹהִים with four dots, or the tetrapuncta (Machiela, “Tetragrammaton”). Use of the tetrapuncta for the Tetragrammaton in Hebrew texts is well known at Qumran (Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 219–21), but this is the only manuscript in which it is used for אֱלֹהִים. While unique, the substitution of the tetrapuncta for אֱלֹהִים in 4Q196 accords well with other evidence for the special treatment of אֱלֹהִים (and Hebrew אֱלֹהִים) in other Qumran texts, such as אֱלֹהִים written with palaeo-Hebrew letters in 4Q243 (psDan) 1.2.

Close examination of the script and spacing of 4Q196 suggests that there may, in fact, be either two manuscripts, or two scribal hands within a single manuscript, represented in the fragments assigned by Milik to 4Q196 and subsequently adopted by Fitzmyer. Fragments 2, 6, and 14i are representative of a group that tends to have larger letter size, more even line spacing (around 6 mm), and employs a cursive tav and a more “hooked” final nun. In contrast, fragments 17–18 have less even spacing and letter size, using the formal (or monumental) tav and a more “hooked” final nun. Milik did not designate these fragments as a single manuscript without reason, since many of the letters are indeed very similar across the group, and the variation in spacing is not necessarily outside the acceptable range of variation in a manuscript written by one scribe. It is certainly possible that all fragments are the work of a single scribe. Although it is rare, we do find manuscripts that have a mixed orthography for tav, switching back and forth between...
cursive and formal forms of that letter (e.g., 4Q550 [Jews at the Persian Court], 4Q553 [Four Kingdoms\textsuperscript{b}], and 4Q553a [Four Kingdoms\textsuperscript{c}]). However, in these cases the two forms are not generally grouped into large, consistent bunches, as in our fragments, but vary more frequently and inconsistently. While the presence of two separate copies or two scribal hands under the siglum 4Q196 cannot be established with certainty, the variation between fragments should be borne in mind by those analyzing them. It may be that future scientific analysis of the papyrus and ink will reveal further details supporting or eliminating the possibility of two manuscript or two scribes.

The language and orthography of the scroll comport well with much of the other Aramaic literature preserved at Qumran. It is noteworthy that we find several loanwords from Akkadian in this work. These include the nouns נפתן ("meal, banquet"; 2.11) and שד ("demon"; 6.18), along with the official titles רב שקה, רב עזקן, and שיזפן, associated with Tobit’s nephew Ahiqar in 2.6–8.

**Original manuscript quality:** Good

**Select bibliography:** Beyer, *ATTM\textsuperscript{1},* 298–300; Beyer, *ATTM\textsuperscript{2},* 134–47; Beyer, *ATTM\textsuperscript{3},* 172–86; Weeks, Gathercole, and Stuckenbruck, eds., *Book of Tobit;* Hallermayer, *Tobit;* Machiela, “Tetragrammaton”.

**Script sample:** Since it is possible that there are two scribal hands used in this scroll (see discussion above), samples representing each possible hand are provided below. Because of this, the first abecedary A is composed of characters only from frag. 2. The largest fragment potentially representing the second scribe is 18; abecedary B represents this hand.

**A: Script sample from frag. 2:**

![Script sample from frag. 2]

**B: Script sample from frag. 18:**

![Script sample from frag. 18]
Representative sample of corrections and scribal features:

(a) Supralinear letters added (2.1):

(b) Letter deleted with a vertical line: Fitzmyer read pe, but I would read instead kaph (2.2)

(c) Scribal insertion mark below the supralinear אוסר (6.8)

(d) Letter deleted with a horizontal line (13.1)

(e) Partially extant tetrapuncta (18.15):

(f) Letter conversion? (18.16): Fitzmyer reads בקדה, but the last letter is not a typical he, and may have been converted from a tav or another letter
Language

Syntax:
- Verb-subject (verb early in clause):
  - 2.3, 2.6, 2.8, 2.13, 6.12, 13.2, 14.i.12(?)
- Subject-verb (verb early in clause):
  - 2.1, 2.4, 2.7, 2.9, 2.13(?), 17.ii.3(?)
- Subject-verb (verb later in clause):
  - 6.8, 11.2, 13.1, 14.i.5(?), 17.ii.3(?), 18.7(?), 18.8(?)
- Subject implied (verb early in clause):
  - 2.1(3x), 2.9, 2.11(3x), 2.12, 2.13(?), 6.1, 6.10(?), 6.12(?), 14.i.8, 14.ii.6, 16.1, 17.ii.1(?), 17.ii.7, 18.12, 18.14, 18.16
- Subject implied (verb later in clause):
  - 14.ii.7, 17.ii.14, 18.11
- Verbless clause:
  - 2.12, 6.9, 6.10(?), 6.11(?), 14.ii.11, 17.ii.15(?), 17.ii.16
- Object early in clause:
  - 6.8
- Direct object marker (if present):
  - ל 2.1, 2.5, 2.13(?)
- Use of י to mark genitive relationship:
  - 1.1, 18.9
- Verb of movement + י + animate object:
  - 2.10, 2.13(?)
- Verb of movement + י + inanimate object:
  - 2.4, 2.9–10, 6.2
- Use of negative particle יִם (+ prefix conjugation verb):
  - 14.1.9(?)

Periphrastic construction (past/future continuative action):

- Finite form of הוה + participle:
  - 17.1.4–5(?)

Lexical items:
- ב: 18.11
- י: 1.1, 2.1(?)
- ה: 14.1.4, 14.1.7, 14.1.8, 14.1.9, 18.9
- ז: 2.1, 2.9, 14.1.1, 29.2
- ל: 2.3(?)
- ט: 17.1.13

Morphology:
- נפעל form:
  - 2.1, 2.5, 2.8, 2.10, 2.11, 6.8, 17.12
- רפע form:
  - 2.1, 14.ii.6
- נפתיע form:
  - 2.13
- Object suffix on verb:
  - 2.8, 2.13, 6.8, 6.11(?), 14.ii.8, 18.16
- Dissimilated nun/nasalization:
  - 2.2, 2.3

Orthography/Phonology:
- ש for /s/:
  - 2.12, 9.2, 14.ii.4, 40.1

Other notable features:

Proposed Hebraisms:
- משחריר
- יְהַנְל (lexical; 17.ii.7) [H]
- יָאָרוּי (lexical; 17.15, 16[2x]) [H]
- פָּפֵה (lexical; 18.7) [h]

Content synopsis and significance: This manuscript preserves considerable portions of Tob 3–9, including parts of Tobit and Hannah’s farewell to Tobiah and Azariah, Tobiah and Azariah’s departure to Media, episodes along their journey (e.g., catching the medicinal fish, Azariah’s description of Sarah), their arrival at Raguel and Edna’s house in Ecbatana, and Azariah’s departure further east to Rages. In general, the Aramaic text more closely corresponds to the longer Greek recension (G11) than other later translations.

On the significance of the Aramaic copies of Tobit for our understanding of the book’s original language of composition, eventual translation, and connections with other Aramaic literature at Qumran, see the profile for 4Q196 (papToba*).

Material remains: Seven fragments remain of this manuscript, the last two (frags. 6–7) being so small that Fitzmyer could not identify them with a passage from Tobit. Fragments 1–3 are quite small, but Fitzmyer’s frag. 4.
which in fact combines a number of separate pieces of skin, preserves parts of three columns covering portions of Tob 5–7. Because we appear to have upper and lower margins partly preserved on some of these pieces, a physical reconstruction of the manuscript could be attempted (e.g., estimated manuscript height and length), though no one has done so to date. Of the fragments on which the text of Tobit has been identified, we possess parts of Tob 3:6–8; 4:21–5:1; 5:12–14; 5:19–7:10; and 8:37–9:4.

**Notes on provenance:** Some fragments of 4Q197 (e.g., the left-hand piece of fragment 4a) were photographed on the PAM “G series” plate 40.576. The fragments in this series of images were discovered by the Bedouin in Cave 4 (see Strugnell, “Photographing,” 124, 131–32). The origins of the remaining fragments of 4Q197 were not clearly documented, though they most likely were also discovered in Cave 4 by the Bedouin.
PROFILE OF PHYSICAL LAYOUT

Margins:

Upper: At least 8 mm (frag. 4i; not fully preserved)

Intercolumnar: 8–14 mm
  (frag. 4iii)

Column dimensions:
  Approx. 11.5 cm h. × 12 cm w.
  (frags. 4i–4iii)

Lines per column: Approx. 19
  (frag. 4i)

Letters per line: Approx. 48–58

Scribal guidelines:

Horizontal script lines: Yes

Vertical column lines: Yes, both
  sides of column

Average medial letter height:
  3 mm

Space between lines: 6–7 mm

Space between words:
  1–2.5 mm

Vacats: Yes; small (4iii.13
  [5 mm]), medium (4i.4
  [1.5 cm]), and large (5.3
  [at least 3.7 cm]); all minor
  sense divisions

Material: Skin

Script: Early Herodian formal (Fitzmyer, based on Cross)

Proposed palaeographic date: ca. 25 BCE–25 CE (Fitzmyer, based on Cross)

Special traits and general comments: This beautifully-written manuscript
exhibits the characteristics of a highly-trained scribe. Corrections are
minimal, limited to the addition of supralinear letters, which appear to be
from the same hand as the main text. Letters are crisp and very consistent,
though the spacing of lines and intercolumnar margins are slightly more
cramped than in the best manuscripts (e.g., Q20 [apGen], Q204 [En°],
Q537 [T]Jacob[?]). Word spacing, however, is noticeably more generous than
is typical, even when compared with the highest-quality Qumran manu-
scripts. Vacats appear to have been used liberally, with an especially large
one found at 5:3, where Tobiah turns from the speech of his future father-
in-law, Raguel, to address Azariah (Tob 8:21–91). Since this is part of a single
episode in the story, I consider it to be a “minor” sense division. A remark-
able feature of Q197 is the scribe’s apparent practice of “justifying” the last
word of a line when too much space would be left at the end of the line
based upon the following word, beginning the next line. This takes place
at the end of 4i.8 and 11, and is also found on Q203/Q204 (EnGiants°/En°;
see the profile for Q204 for further discussion). Even though the prac-
tice is very rare among the Qumran Aramaic texts, the scribes of Q197 and
Q203/Q204 (EnGiants°/En°) are not the same. As can be seen by the lan-
guage profile below, verbal object suffixes are employed in this text at an
especially high frequency.

The orthographic and morphological features of Q197 are consistent with
much of the Qumran Aramaic corpus and resemble better manuscripts like
Q20 (apGen) and Q537 (T]Jacob[?). He and aleph are typically, though not
always, distinguished from one another in ways that accord with the broader
corpus. He is used for fem. absolute noun endings and adjectives, and some
suffixes and pronouns (fem. and masc. sg. suffix ʾa-, first sg. pronoun ʾənə). Aleph
is used for the def. article, the long fem. sg. suffix ʾa-n, and the first
pl. pronoun and suffix (ʾənə, ʾən-n). Generally speaking, aleph as a vowel
marker is used somewhat less than in a number of other Qumran scrolls,
such as Q20 (apGen) and Q203/Q204 (EnGiants°/En°). Both forms of the
near dem. pronoun are found (ʾən, ʾən), and ʾən (rather than ʾən) is the pl.
form used for the object of a clause. We also find both Qumran spellings of
the locative preposition ʾal (4i.15, 4iii.1). The interrogative noun ʾal in 4iii.5
is similar to the forms in Q201 (Enastr°), some of which are corrected in the
latter scroll. In later dialects of Aramaic, the word was apocopated to ʾən, or
less often, ʾən. Finally, the noun ʾənən (the poor [person]; 2:1) is originally
an Akkadian loanword (see also the profile for Q196 [papTob°]).

Fitzmyer has not transcribed accurately a few words from the last lines
of frag. 5, as can now be discerned from the additional images placed online
by the Israel Antiquities Authority: What Fitzmyer transcribes as אנתְה (5:10) is, in fact, את
גבי (5:10). Without further context, the sense of the first word (presumably from הָאָדָם, “come,
arrive”) is difficult to make sense of in conjunction with the following בַּי.
The second word is obviously יָמָן in the photographs, and not בי, despite Fitzmyer's statement that "the second word is clearly יָמָן" (DJD 19354). In the next line, what Fitzmyer transcribed as יָאָרִים יָשִׁיא is rather (with my conjectural reconstruction, following the more standard syntax of the periphrastic tense; the word יָאָרִים is not at all certain), יָאָרִים יָשִׁיא מַעְטַה יָאָרְיָא. Judging by the typical syntax of the periphrastic construction in Qumran Aramaic, Fitmyer's interpretation in 4ii.8 is more likely מַעְטַה עַלְיוֹן עָלִיָּה הוֹ הוא.

Original manuscript quality: Very good

Select bibliography: Beyer, ATTM¹, 298–300; Beyer, ATTM², 134–47; Beyer, ATTM³, 172–86; Weeks, Gathercole, and Stuckenbruck, eds., Book of Tobit; Hallermayer, Tobit.

Script sample:

Corrections and scribal features:

(a) Supralinear letter added (4ii.8):

(b) Supralinear letters added (4iii.3):

Language

Syntax:

Verb-subject (verb early in clause):
4i.1(sub. late), 4i.5(?), 4i.6(2x?), 4i.7, 4i.11, 4i.12, 4i.14, 4i.4(2x; 1 part.), 4i.9(part.), 4i.18(2x?; 1 part.), 4i.19, 4ii.1–2, 4ii.5(2x), 4ii.6(part.), 4iii.7(2x; 1 part.), 4iii.8, 4iii.13(?)

Subject-verb (verb early in clause):
1.3(?), 4i.5(?), 4ii.1, 4ii.4(part.), 4ii.5(part.), 4iii.1(Fitzmyer's corrected text)

Verb-subject (verb later in clause):
4i.2

Subject-verb (verb later in clause):
4ii.2

Subject implied (verb early in clause):
3.4, 4i.2(2x), 4i.3(2x), 4i.4, 4i.10, 4i.13, 4i.15(2x), 4i.16(2x), 4ii.3(3x), 4ii.5, 4ii.6(?), 4ii.8(part.), 4ii.17(?), 4ii.1, 4ii.2(2x), 4ii.3(3x), 4ii.4(2x), 4ii.5, 4iii.6(2x; 1 part.), 4ii.7(2x; 1 part.), 4ii.8(2x), 5.8(?)

Subject implied (verb later in clause):
4ii.7(?), 4ii.1, 4ii.4, 5.7(2x)

Verbless clause:
3.3, 4i.12, 4i.14, 4ii.17, 4ii.19(?), 4ii.17, 4ii.5, 4ii.7, 4iii.8

Object early in clause:
4iii.11
Content synopsis and significance: All of the extant material from this manuscript derives from Tob 14, the final chapter of the book, which contains Tobit’s deathbed discourse to his son, Tobiah. In the fragments preserved here, we find Tobit’s injunction to give alms and fear God, leave Assyria and Babylon because of their coming destruction as foretold by Israel’s prophets, and the instructive fate of Nadav (or, possibly, Nadin; the name is not preserved), nephew of Ahiqar. As mentioned in the profile for 4Q196 (papToba*), the presence of this chapter among the Qumran copies of Tobit is strong evidence that it was part of the book in its early stages of composition and dissemination, rather than a later addition as previously argued by some scholars.

For discussion of the Tobit manuscripts as they relate to study of the book more generally, see the profile for 4Q196 (papTob*).

Material remains: This manuscript comprises two “fragments,” each of which is, in fact, made up of a number of small pieces joined together by early scholars working on the Qumran materials (in this case, most likely J.T. Milik). Fragment 1 is much larger than frag. 2, and contains parts of fourteen lines identified with portions of Tob 14:2–6. Fragment 2 is roughly 2 × 4 cm, slightly larger than a postage stamp, and has parts of five lines of text from the right side of a column. Fitzmyer thought the fragment might preserve Tob 14:10, something that can now be confirmed (see the Special traits and general comments section, below).

Notes on provenance: Tigchelaar identified pieces of 4Q198 1 on the PAM “E series” plates 40.964 and 40.976. The fragments in this series of plates were found in the official excavations of Cave 4 on September 22–29, 1952, directed by de Vaux (Strugnell, “Photographing,” 124, 131–32). While the discovery of the remaining pieces of 4Q198 in Cave 4 is assured, the mode of their discovery was not documented.
Material: Skin

Script: Late Hasmonean or early Herodian formal with some semi-cursive features (Fitzmyer, based on Cross)

Proposed palaeographic date: 75–25 BCE (Fitzmyer, based on Cross)

Special traits and general comments: This manuscript is not ruled, and the scribe therefore varied space between lines appreciably. Also varied is the spacing between words, with a script that is relatively messy and inconsistent. Both cursive and formal (or monumental) tavs are used, an example of the former being found in 1.5 (יתעבר) and the latter in 1.7 (יתבין). Compare the morphology of א[יתאיית] (“will be brought [to pass]”) in 1.6 with א[יתהייתה] (“cause him to be brought”) in 4Q96 (papToba) 2.13, both of which use two yods to signify the internal vocalization. In general, the morphology and orthography of this scroll corresponds with the broader profile of the Qumran Aramaic manuscripts.

A few of Fitzmyer’s transcription require comment. The dalet of ית עבר (1.5) is instead resh, ית עבר. The most recent Israel Antiquities Authority images for frag. 2 are excellent, and consequently that fragment may be read as follows:

This fragment is, in fact, a collection of small pieces, some of which are held together by twine already in the earliest photographs. While the lamed of Fitzmyer’s פָּח in line 4 is understandable based on the images, close inspection shows unambiguously that the preposition is a bet, although there is a stray ink stroke between lines 3 and 4 resembling in shape a final nun. It is possible that this is the lower extension of the leg of the qoph in line 3, with the small fragments having shifted somewhat. At the same time, this would be an unusually long extension for a qoph. In any case, the stroke should not affect the readings of lines 3–4. The third line differs substantially from Fitzmyer’s transcription, and the occurrence of the name Ahiqar confirms his suspicion that this fragment preserves part of Tob 14:10.

Original manuscript quality: Fair–good

Select bibliography: Beyer, ATTM1, 298–300; Beyer, ATTM6, 134–47; Beyer, ATTM2, 172–86; Weeks, Gathercole, and Stuckenbruck, eds., Book of Tobit; Hallermayer, Tobit.
Script sample:

Language

Syntax:

Verb-subject (verb early in clause):

1.6, 1.12(?)

Subject-verb (verb early in clause):

1.5, 1.6, 1.7(?, part.)

Subject implied (verb early in clause):

1.1, 1.2(2x), 1.13

Direct object marker (if present):

~\: 1.1, 1.11

Lexical items:

ד: 1.3, 1.6, 1.9

Morphology:

Form:

1.1(2x)

Object suffix on verb:

1.2

Other notable features:

Proposed Hebraisms:

[ל(lexical;1.13)] [H]

Content synopsis and significance: In these two small fragments we have only short snippets of Aramaic text, with frag. 1 clearly belonging to the book of Tobit. Fragment 1 provides part of Tobiah's reply to his soon-to-be father-in-law, Raguel, stating that he will not eat or drink until he is promised Raguel's daughter, Sarah, as a bride (Tob 7:11). On frag. 2, see the section on Material remains, below. If Fitzmyer were correct about it containing the name "Nadin," this would be of some significance, for it is the Assyrian name of Ahiqar's nephew in the framing narrative of the Wisdom of Ahiqar, found, for example, at the Judean settlement of Elephantine. Yet, in the Greek and other translations of Tobit we always find Ahiqar's nephew named Nadav, part of a clear effort in the book to coopt the famous Ahiqar and Nadin/Nadav into Israelite history. If the name Nadin were used in 4Q199, an Aramaic copy of Tobit, we would have to assume that the change of name was not present in the early stages of the book, and was instead introduced at the later stage of translation. Neither Nadin nor Nadav is found in the Qumran copies of Tobit apart from 4Q199 2 (including in the Hebrew 4Q200 [Tob]), and I argue below that it is most likely not found in this copy either. It seems more plausible that the early Aramaic copies of the Tobit contained the name Nadav, as reflected in the later translations.

The profile for 4Q196 (papToba) discusses the importance of the Qumran copies for our understanding of the book of Tobit more generally.

Material remains: In the earliest PAM images, there is only one fragment assigned by Milik to 4Q199 (Fitzmyer's frag. 1). However, by the time new photographs were taken in 1993, another fragment had been added to the plate (Fitzmyer's frag. 2), along with two very tiny additional pieces of skin (never mentioned by Fitzmyer). These additional three pieces are present in all images taken since 1993, with frag. 2 containing part of a large bottom margin. Fitzmyer read the two words of frag. 2 as ]ד, confidently connecting them to Tob 14:10 even though the proposed Aramaic does not line up especially well with
the Greek or Latin translations. In fact, Fitzmyer’s reading is clearly incorrect, and as a result the fragment cannot be connected with any confidence to Tob 14:10, and perhaps not even to 4Q199. Based on the images taken by the Israel Antiquities Authority in 1993 (PAM 1-363566) and 2013 (B-371259 and B-359925–26), Fitzmyer’s frag. 2 undoubtedly reads [רַדְנַדְיֶד]. The bottom hook of the lamed for the first word can be clearly seen following the yod, rendering the standard Aramaic compound preposition “because of, on account of.” None of the later translations mentioning Nadav (Tob 11:10 and 14:10) have a text in which we would expect the name to be preceded by the word בָּדֵּיל, and so it seems quite unlikely that this fragment should be understood to contain the name Nadin. Once this is recognized, there are reasons to wonder whether Fitzmyer’s frag. 2 belongs with 4Q199 1 at all, reasons that include the scripts and the follicle patterns of the skin. In my opinion, if the fragment does belong to 4Q199, it is doubtful that it contains part of Tob 14:10 or the name of Ahiqar’s nephew. The uncertain association of frag. 2 with frag. 1 should be kept in mind when considering other aspects of the scroll’s profile, below. As for the two additional fragments on the post-1993 images of 4Q199, they are so small as to preclude any certainty whatsoever about their inclusion under the siglum 4Q199.

Notes on provenance: The fragments of 4Q199 are not found on the early “E series” or “G series” PAM plates. While their discovery in Cave 4 is assured, the mode of that discovery was not documented.
Material: Skin

Script: Hasmonean (Fitzmyer)

Proposed palaeographic date: 125–75 BCE (Fitzmyer); “Not enough distinctive letters are extant on this text to date it more precisely” (DJD 19:61)

Special traits and general comments: Little is left of this manuscript, but we are fortunate to have an upper margin preserved on frag. 1, and a lower margin on frag. 2. In the single line of frag. 1 we find the word יִד used to introduce a direct quotation of Tobiah, and the use of aleph as a vowel marker in the word תָּנָא (“here”).

Original manuscript quality: Good–very good

Select bibliography: Beyer, ATTM¹, 298–300; Beyer, ATTM², 134–47; Beyer, ATTM³, 172–86; Weeks, Gathercole, and Stuckenbruck, eds., Book of Tobit; Hallermayer, Tobit.

Profile of physical layout

Margins:

Upper: 1.5 cm (frag. 1)
Lower: 2.1 cm (frag. 2)

Scribal guidelines:

Horizontal script lines: No
Vertical column lines: No

Average medial letter height:
2.5–3 mm

Space between lines: At least 9 mm (frag. 1)

Space between words: 1 mm

Vacats: None preserved

Script sample:

Language

Syntax:

Verb-subject (verb early in clause):
1.1(?)

Subject implied (verb early in clause):
1.1

Use of יִד to introduce direct quotation:
1.1

Lexical items:

יִד: 1.1
תָּנָא: 1.1
Content synopsis and significance: Eight, or possibly nine (see Puech, “Daniel”), fragmentary manuscripts of the book of Daniel were found among the Qumran caves. Five of these (or six, if Puech is correct) had parts of the Aramaic section of Daniel (Dan 2:4b–7:28) preserved, and only these manuscripts are included among the profiles here. For the three copies in which only Hebrew text is preserved (4Q114 [Danb], 4Q16 [Danb], and 6Q7 [pap-Dan]), see the editions of Ulrich in DJD 16 (Cave 4) and Baillet in DJD 3 (Cave 6). These three copies are of natural interest to study of the Aramaic manuscripts at Qumran, since it is plausible to assume that they once contained the Aramaic section of Daniel as well. The contents of Daniel are, of course, well known because of its canonical status in Judaism and Christianity. 1Q71 contains portions of the first two chapters of the book. Dan 1:1–2:4a are written in Hebrew, and recount the trial and ascent of Daniel and his companions in the Babylonian court of Nebuchadnezzar. The transition to Aramaic in Dan 2:4b is preserved in this copy, preceded by a 2 cm vacat. Several fragmentary phrases of the Chaldeans’ address to Nebuchadnezzar in Dan 2:4–6 follow on five partial lines of text. In wider view of the Qumran Aramaic corpus, two things stand out about the contents of these lines. First, the story of an Israelite finding success in a foreign king’s court recounted in these chapters (and, indeed, throughout Dan 2–7) is paralleled in a number of other Aramaic compositions kept at Qumran. We find similar or related “court tales” in the Pseudo-Daniel texts (4Q243–245), the Prayer of Nabonidus (4Q242), Jews at the Persian Court (4Q550), and perhaps Four Kingdoms (4Q552, 553, 553a). A clear interest in this genre is also reflected in the first chapters of Tobit and the Abram cycle in the Genesis Apocryphon (1Q20). Second, the dream-vision and its interpretation found in Dan 2 contributes to one of the most widespread themes in the Aramaic literature from Qumran, as documented by Perrin (Dynamics). Comparable dream-visions are found in many Aramaic texts, such as the New Jerusalem, the Visions of Amram, the Book of Giants, and the Genesis Apocryphon. 1Q71 is the only Qumran copy of Daniel to preserve these verses of Dan 2, though 4Q112 (Danb) contains some verses from later in the same chapter.

Material remains: John Trever first reported one main fragment remaining of this manuscript, roughly 1.5 times the size of a standard playing card, plus a small (1 × 4 cm) additional fragment with part of an intercolumnar margin, and no fully preserved letters (labelled frag. 4 on Plate VII in Trever, “Publication,” 344; Elgvin and Justnes, “MS 1926/4a,” 249, instead label it as frag. 3). A small, additional fragment with parts of several words from Dan 2:5–6 was later identified by Elgvin and Justnes (“MS 1926/4a”; their frag. 2 = MS 1926/4a), which they successfully joined to the left edge of the main fragment. All of the fragments were part of a folded wad comprising small parts of at least three manuscripts: 1Q71, 1Q72 (Danb), and 1Q34 (Prayers). Trever (“Publication”) described carefully the wad and its process of unfolding, making clear that these manuscripts were not rolled individually when placed in the cave in antiquity, but that portions of them, likely already damaged, were folded together and deposited as a group. 1Q71 was on the outside of the wad, pressed against the verso of another Daniel fragment (1Q72; the lighter part of image “b” on Trever’s Plate 11). Trever’s entertaining historical description of how the fragments came to be deposited in Cave 1 is speculative and completely unverifiable. The main fragment of 1Q71 was clearly folded on an axis diagonal to its original orientation, after which much of the sheet or fragment evidently eroded away. Once Trever unfolded the fragment, we were left with a butterfly-shaped piece of skin with very similarly shaped “wings” on each side of the fold (see the Sample image, below). Despite its damage, the remaining fragment is in good condition and portions of text from Dan 1:10–17 and 2:2–6 can be easily read. Trever’s frag. 4 (Elgvin and Justnes’ frag. 3) contains only a small part of one letter, but Trever suggested that it originated from the left side of col. 11 on the main fragment. Elgvin and Justnes (“MS 1926/4a,” 249) claim that it has traces of sewing from a sheet seam, and if this is true we have evidence of the end of the first sheet of this manuscript. One column must have preceded Trever’s col. 1, meaning that the first sheet once contained three columns of text. Based on photographs of 1Q71 and 1Q72 (Danb) published by Athanasius Yeshue Samuel in his autobiography (Treasure, appendix), one can see that the fragments of these scrolls had deteriorated significantly between the photos taken by Trever in April, 1949, and those done for Samuel around 1965 (Trever, “Future,” 471).

Notes on provenance: The 1Q71 fragments were discovered as “the result of the clandestine prospecting of the Syrians” (see de Vaux’s comments in DJD 1:43). Mar Athanasius Yeshue Samuel claimed that one of his men discovered the fragments in August 1948 (Elgvin and Justnes, “MS 1926/4a,” 247; see also Fields, Scrolls, 85).
and John Trever gave credit for the discovery to George Isha’ya, who then brought the fragments to Mar Samuel at St. Mark’s Monastery in Jerusalem (Trever, “Publication,” 323). A detailed record of the excavation was not kept, so that the cave from which the fragments were found cannot be determined with absolute certainty. However, one fragment (1Q5 [Deut\(^b\) 13] among those that Isha’ya discovered, is linked to a manuscript excavated by de Vaux in Cave 1 in February–March, 1949 (DJD 1:43, n. 1). This connection increases the probability that 1Q71 can be firmly linked to Cave 1. As tensions from the Israeli-Arab war grew in the autumn of 1948, Mar Samuel smuggled the Daniel fragments (among others) out of the country, without an export license, in December 1948 or January 1949 (Fields, Scrolls, 85, 242–45). In the United States in February 1949, Samuel allowed John Trever to handle and photograph the fragments, which he finally published in 1965. It is unclear how the exchange occurred, but somehow Trever acquired a small wad ("an inseparable stack of fragments," see Elgvin and Justnes, “MS 1926/4a,” 248) containing four layers (= MS 1926/4). The wad contained some layers from 1Q71, and other layers from 1Q72. This wad of fragments was purchased from the Trever family in 1994 by Martin Schøyen (Elgvin and Justnes, “MS 1926/4a,” 247) and is now kept in his personal collection in Oslo, Norway. The remaining fragments are currently kept by the Syrian Orthodox Archdiocese in Teaneck, NJ (Elgvin and Justnes “MS 1926/4a,” 247, n. 4).
Material: Skin

Script: Late Herodian formal (Trever)

Proposed palaeographic date: 1–50 CE (Ulrich; Trever)

Special traits and general comments: The two preserved columns of 1Q71 are almost certainly the second and third inscribed columns of the scroll. This copy of Daniel has a fairly substantial height, judged against the Aramaic scrolls for which we can estimate this dimension. It falls well short of the tallest scrolls, such as 1Q20 (apGen; 31 cm), but is larger than other high-quality copies like 4Q545 (Visions of Amram; around 16 cm) and 11Q10 (Job; 14 cm). 1Q71 was a very finely-wrought manuscript, carefully and fully ruled in the style of other Herodian-period manuscripts like the Cave 1 Pesher Habakkuk (1QpHab) and War Scroll (1QM), or 4Q246 (apocrDan) from among the Aramaic scrolls. The ruled line spacing and margins are even and quite generous, though the overall manuscript and writing block sizes are medium (using the terminology of Tov, Scribal Practices, 86–87) in view of the wider Qumran corpus. The skin preparation and ruling is among the best found in the Aramaic writings kept at Qumran. The scribe wrote in one of the neatest, most practiced formal hands found among the Qumran texts, accurately described by Trever as “approaching the appearance of the printed page.” Trever also suggested that the same scribe may have written both 1Q71 and the copy of Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice from Masada (MasShirShabb; Trever, Scrolls, 134–35). The two manuscripts are comparable typologically, both exhibiting formal, late Herodian scripts with similar ornamental flourishes. However, on close examination I do not think that we have here the same scribe. There are no mistakes or corrections in the small amount of text preserved. A generous vacat was left at the transition from Hebrew to Aramaic in the middle of Dan 2:4 (col. II.5), which also marks the beginning of the Chaldeans’ speech to the king. By contrast, the word spacing is quite tight, with breaks between words sometimes being no larger than that between letters in a word. At the end of col. I.1 it is obvious that more space than usual has been left between two words, since only the short preposition אל would fit on the remainder of the line despite there being space for three or more letters. Because of the additional space, the scribe chose to leave extra room between the last words, bringing אל close to the vertically-ruled column line. In other cases, the scribe often wrote beyond this line by one or two letters. The orthography of the Aramaic text in this copy closely resembles that of MT Daniel, differing only by interchanging the letters of he and aleph at the end of two words (נחוה and ענא). The sole textual difference is the addition of די at the beginning of a sub-clause in col. II.7. In terms of typological palaeographic dating, this is one of the latest Aramaic manuscripts from Qumran. It seems likely that it was written at the site of Qumran, based on comparison with scribal practices in a number of the Hebrew sectarian texts.

Original manuscript quality: Very good–excellent

Content synopsis and significance: For a brief introduction to the Daniel manuscripts at Qumran, see the profile for 1Q71 (Dan¹). 1Q72 is one of five (or perhaps six; see Puech, “Daniel”) Qumran copies of the book that contain part of the Aramaic section of Daniel (Dan 2:4b–7:28), with several verses from towards the end of Dan 3 preserved on two fragments. This chapter contains the harrowing story of three young Judean men – Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego – being thrown by Nebuchadnezzar into a burning furnace for their refusal to do obeisance before a large statue erected by the king. The story is also partly preserved on 4Q115 (Dan²) 2, with several lines of text overlapping between the two copies at Dan 3:24–25 (there are no significant textual or orthographic differences). It is of some interest for the textual development of the book that both Qumran copies are missing the Prayer of Azariah and the Song of the Three Judean Youths, placed between verses 23 and 24 of the Aramaic text in the Greek and Latin translations. In this respect, 1Q72 and 4Q115 (Dan²) closely resemble the MT version of the story. As a tale about the trials and successes of Judeans in the upper echelons of the royal court, Dan 3 is but one representative of a “court tale” genre well-represented in the Qumran Aramaic literature. In addition to the stories of Dan 2–7, we find similar tales in the Pseudo-Daniel texts (4Q243–245), the Prayer of Nabonidus (4Q242), Jews at the Persian Court (4Q55o), and Four Kingdoms (4Q552, 553–553a). The first chapter of Tobit and the story of Abram and Sarai in Egypt, in the Genesis Apocryphon (1Q20), also incorporate new or expanded court episodes into their stories. Based on the frequency of such stories, it is clear that the royal court was a social setting of obvious interest to whoever wrote this Hellenistic-period literature. Prominent themes shared by Dan 3 and other Jewish court tales written in Aramaic are the positive impact of Judeans on the royal court and the king, and the king’s eventual recognition of Israel’s God as ruler over the entire created order, to be worshipped above all others.

Material remains: Barthélemy and Trever published two main fragments of 1Q72, frag. 1 being roughly twice the size of frag. 2 (labelled by Trever 1a and 1b). Elgvin and Davis later identified a small, third fragment (“1QApocryphon”) from the private collection of Martin Schøyen, which they labelled frag. 1c (= MS 1926/4b) and successfully joined to lines 8–10 of the left side of frag. 1. Barthélemy’s frag. 1 has fifteen mostly-incomplete lines of text (several with less than one, full letter preserved), and frag. 2 has ten partial lines. Davis and Elgvin’s frag. 1c contains only a few letters, identified as belonging to Dan 3:26–27. On the discovery and handling of the skin “wad,” of which 1Q72 was part, see the Material remains and Provenance entries for 1Q71.
(Dan⁸). The top part of 1Q72 1 was exposed, with the writing visible, when Trever received the wad of fragments, the bottom portion of frag. 1 being exposed only when other fragments were removed. One of these removed fragments was 1Q72 2, which was pressed to the bottom portion of frag. 1 with the writing of the two fragments facing each other. This makes clear that, like 1Q71 (Dan⁸), a portion of 1Q72 (at least one column) had been separated from the larger scroll before being placed in Cave 1 in the first century CE, where it was folded and deposited together with segments of 1Q71 (Dan⁸) and 1Q34 (Prayers). The group of pieces then suffered further deterioration over the centuries in the cave, with the result that they were partially “gelatinized” and fused together. 1Q72 1–2, plus MS 1926/4b, contains portions of Dan 3:22–32, partially overlapping with the text of 4Q115 (Dan⁸) 2ii. The right side of 1Q72 1 shows that this was the beginning of a new sheet of skin, being the second or third sheet of the scroll, depending on the original height and line number of the columns. I would estimate that 5–7 columns of text preceded this one. Some manuscripts held up to 5–7 columns per sheet (see, e.g., 1Q20 [apGen] and 1QpHab), while others (e.g., 1QS and 1QIsa⁷) had only 2–4 columns per sheet. It is now impossible to tell where 1Q72 fit on this spectrum.

Notes on provenance: The provenance of 1Q72 is linked to that of 1Q71 (Dan⁸). Both sets of fragments were allegedly among those discovered in 1948 by George Isha’ya (see the Provenance section for 1Q71 [Dan⁸]) and brought to Mar Athanasius Yeshue Samuel in Jerusalem (Trever, “Publication”; Fields, Scrolls, 85). The fragments were probably found in Cave 1, due to a link between one of the scrolls Isha’ya discovered and those from de Vaux’s 1949 excavation of Cave 1 (DJD 1:143, n. 1). The fragments were smuggled out of the country by Samuel in December 1948 (or possibly January 1949). Once in the United States, the fragments were photographed by John Trever, in February 1949, and Trever published the images in 1965. Trever kept a small wad of fragments (“an inseparable stack of fragments”; see Elgvin and Justnes, “MS 1926/4a,” 248) containing four layers (MS 1926/4). Some layers were from 1Q71 (Dan⁸), and others were from 1Q72, proving the common origin of the two manuscripts. The wad of fragments was purchased from the Trever family in 1994 by Martin Schøyen (Elgvin and Justnes, “MS 1926/4a,” 247) and is now kept in his personal collection in Oslo, Norway. The remaining fragments remained in the possession of the Syrian Orthodox Church, and are currently kept by the Syrian Orthodox Archdiocese in Teaneck, NJ (Elgvin and Justnes, “MS 1926/4a,” 247, n. 4).
Material: Skin

Script: Herodian, with a “more cursive tendency” than the hand of 1Q71 (Trever, cf. Flint, “Daniel”)

Proposed palaeographic date: 100–25 BCE (Ulrich); 50–1 BCE (Davis and Elgvin); 37 BCE–70 CE (Trever)

Special traits and general comments: This is a high-quality manuscript, carefully prepared and fully ruled with guide dots for the horizontal script lines. The double vertical lines at the right edge of the sheet (seen on frag. 1) give a clue to the order in which the ruling process was done: Vertical lines were first inscribed at the two ends of each sheet, after which guide dots were marked along this line and horizontal script lines were drawn. Vertical lines demarcating the right and left sides of the columns could have been inscribed either at the beginning or end of this process. In many respects, the construction of this manuscript (quality of skin, layout, margin size, etc.) closely resembles 1Q20 (apGen), though the scribe of 1Q72 wrote with slightly larger letters and tended to leave a bit more space between words. It is not possible to determine the number of lines in the single column of 1Q72, but there are eighteen preserved (as opposed to the seventeen mentioned by previous scholars; see the trace of the upper stroke of lamed on 2.9). These lines were on the longer side for the Qumran Aramaic scrolls.

The scribe wrote is a formal script of moderate quality (less steady and practiced than the scribe of 1Q71 [Dan#], for instance) with some elements that Trever labelled “cursive.” Distinctive elements of this scribe are the leftward return on the lower, middle stroke of aleph, the similar leftward return at the bottom of final kaph, and the “closed” box of medial mem. The script might best be described as semi-formal. The scribe made no mistakes requiring correction on what is preserved, and used vacats frequently. Some of these are partly preserved on the fragments, while others can be hypothesized based on the reconstructed letter counts of partial lines (1–2 cm at the end of 1.7, between רומא and זאений at Dan 3:26; approx. 4 cm at the beginning of 2.7). A large space (about 4.5 cm) was left before Nebuchadnezzar begins his benediction of the God of Israel (Dan 3:28) in 1.11. Between Dan 3:30 and 31, which begins an address by the king only loosely related to what precedes, close to a half of 2.6 (6.5 cm) was left blank, and then another 4 cm or so at the beginning of the following line. Barthélemy failed to transcribe the two words clearly seen on 2.7, which was remedied by Trever (“Publication,” 331). Even Trever, however, missed the small trace of a lamed under the shin of א₽תל in 2.7, proving an eighteen line for the column. Based on letter count, the lamed very likely belongs to the word א₪תל “Most High” from Dan 3:32. In the little text preserved we find a high number of orthographic or phonetic variants from the MT, including several words spelled more defectively in the Qumran copy than in the MT, an ḫaphiṣṭil form at 1.4 rather than the MT ḫaphiṣṭil, a spelling with sin rather than samek for שדראות לא in 1.14, and a plural imperative rather than the singular MT שָׁמָּו at 2.4. As in MT Daniel, 1Q20 (apGen), and a number of other Qumran manuscripts, the long form of the demonstrative pronoun זה is used, not the more widespread Qumran form גז.
Original manuscript quality: Very good

Select bibliography: Trever, "Publication"; Beyer, *ATTM*¹, 301–3; Flint, "Daniel"; Ulrich, "Text of Daniel"; Davis and Elgvin, "MS 1926/4b."

Script sample:

Language

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Syntax</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Verb-subject (verb early in clause)</td>
<td>1.8(part.), 1.10(part.), 1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject-verb (verb early in clause)</td>
<td>1.3, 1.5, 1.6(part.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject implied (verb early in clause)</td>
<td>1.3, 1.4(part.), 1.7, 1.13, 2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject implied (verb later in clause)</td>
<td>1.10, 2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object early in clause</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct object marker (if present)</td>
<td>¹: 1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of יד to mark genitive relationship</td>
<td>1.1(?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of יד to introduce direct quotation</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lexical items:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>בדיאין</td>
<td>1.6, 1.8, 2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יד</td>
<td>1.1(?) 1.6, 1.12, 2.4, 2.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Morphology:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>הפעל form</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אתפעל form</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>התפעל form</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assimilated nun</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Orthography/Phonology:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ש</td>
<td>for /s/ 1.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Content synopsis and significance: 4Q112 is the best-preserved Daniel manuscript from Qumran, and one of five copies of the book preserving portions of its Aramaic chapters (or six if Puech, “Daniel,” is correct about his 4QDn³). Eight (perhaps nine) total copies of Daniel were discovered at Qumran, discussed briefly in the profile for 1Q71 (Dan⁴), above. 4Q112 contains verses from all chapters of Daniel except for 6, 9, and 12, but there is no serious doubt that the scroll originally contained all chapters of the book as we know it in later transmission. The contents of Daniel are well-known due to its canonical status in Judaism and Christianity, and in this copy we find portions of the first, Hebrew chapter introducing the main characters, four of the five Aramaic tales recording the exploits of Daniel and his companions in the Babylonian and Persian royal courts, Daniel’s apocalyptic vision in chapter 7, and the extensions of that theme in three of the Hebrew chapters that conclude the book (Dan 8–12). Thus, all of the main components of Daniel are present in 4Q112. Two major themes are of significance in view of the wider Qumran Aramaic corpus: 1.) The trials and successes of Israelites in the court of a foreign king, often called “court tales,” and 2.) the reception of divinely revealed knowledge through dream-visions. Both of these themes are shared among Daniel and a number of other Aramaic texts, as discussed more fully in the profile for 1Q71 (Dan⁴). In terms of textual variation, this copy is the most distinctive among the Daniel copies from Qumran, differing markedly from the MT and other Qumran copies in many small ways. These minor differences encompass syntax, morphology, and orthography, and are quite evenly spread throughout the scroll. All of these variances are captured in the chart on scribal variation, in the following chapter on language (Chapter 3).

Material remains: Twenty fragments remain of this copy, with frags. 3 and 14 being quite substantial in size. Fragment 3 contains one, nearly fully-preserved column of text and part of another, with a small portion of the surface and its writing partially flaked off. Other fragments also have such flaking. Fragment 14 is roughly the size of a standard playing card, with fourteen partial lines preserved. A number of the other fragments contain enough text to help us place them in the manuscript and reconstruct the scroll’s original size and length. Fragments 16–20 are so small, however, that they are not included in the DJD photographic plates, and only two of them have any writing preserved. Only frag. 17 can be placed with confidence, together with the first column of frag. 3. A number of the fragments have margins preserved, several still with the stitching in-tact between sheets, allowing for a good overall sense of the original scroll. Ulrich reconstructed the scroll as having twenty-eight columns of text, which must be approximately correct (it could vary by one column in either direction, based on the consistency of column widths). It is reasonably clear that the first sheet of skin had three columns, and based on Ulrich’s recognition that col. 6 was narrower than some of the others. It seems likely that this column was also the last in a sheet with three columns, since final columns on sheets are often narrower than the others (see also the profile for 1Q20 [apGen; cf. Tov, Scribal Practices, 83–84]). Based on the extant fragments, we can estimate that column width varied in 4Q112 between narrower columns of 35–45 letters per line (cols. 3 [33–43 letters], 6 [37–45], 13 [43–44], and 19 [43–49]; each of which is the last column on a sheet) and wider ones of up to 55 letters per line or more (cols. 1, 4, 5, 12, 17, and 25; none being the last on a sheet). Intermediate-sized columns include cols. 2, 11, 14, and 24. The available evidence suggests that the smallest columns would have measured approximately 8.5 cm wide, and the widest around 10.5 cm. New sheets most likely began at cols. 4, 7, 10 (or 11), 14, 17, 20, 23, and 28. Either the third or fourth sheet must have had four columns, while most or all others seem to have had three (similar, e.g., to 1QIsa⁵). Consequently, we can theorize nine sheets, each approximately 30–35 cm in length (at least one, with four columns, closer to 45 cm), for an overall manuscript length of around 300 cm, perhaps slightly longer. This is around half the length of 11Q10 (Job). For a full list of the parts of Daniel preserved on the fragments, see Ulrich’s list in DJD 16:240. There are overlaps in the Aramaic section of Daniel with other Qumran copies at 4Q112 10–11.1–6//4Q113 (Dan⁶) 1–4.7–8 (= MT Dan 512–14), 4Q112 13.1–4//4Q113 (Dan⁶) 12–13.3–4 (= MT Dan 7:5–7), and 4Q112 14.5–9//4Q113 (Dan⁶) 15.19–21 (= MT Dan 7:25–28).
Notes on provenance: While it is not clear exactly who found all of the 4Q112 fragments, they have been confidently linked to Cave 4 (see DJD 16:2). At least frag. 14 was included on one of the “G series” PAM plates, 40.613, associated with the Bedouin excavation of Cave 4 in 1952 (see Strugnell, “Photographing,” 124, 131–32). Tigchelaar also identified part of frag. 3 on the PAM “E series” plate 40.965, connected with the documented excavations of Cave 4 led by Roland de Vaux in September, 1952 (DJD 6:3–4). The remaining fragments of 4Q112 could, in theory, have been discovered either by the Bedouin or in de Vaux’s excavations.

Sample image: 4Q112 3i–ii
Image B-284885
COURTESY OF THE LEON LEVY DEAD SEA SCROLLS DIGITAL LIBRARY, ISRAEL ANTIQUITIES AUTHORITY. PHOTO: NAJIB ANTON ALBINA
Material: Skin

Script: Late Hasmonean to early Herodian formal (Ulrich)

Proposed palaeographic date: 75–25 BCE (Ulrich)

Special traits and general comments: The relatively extensive remains of 4Q112 allow us to determine that it was carefully prepared, laid out with even margins and lightly-ruled vertical and horizontal lines. The overall height of this copy was roughly half that of 1Q20 (apGen; 31 cm) or 4Q202 (Enb; 30 cm), but considerably larger than the smallest manuscripts, such as 4Q535 (Birth of Noah; 6.4 cm). Column height and width are about average for the corpus, with margins slightly smaller than the average. Nevertheless, the layout is even and neat, with an overall appearance of uniformity and generous spacing. When scrutinized, it turns out that the spacing between words varies appreciably; there is usually an easily perceptible space of 1–2 mm, but occasionally no more space is left between two words than is typically left between letters (e.g., יִהְיֶה לְךָ בָּרָא at 7.3 or יִשָּׁבךָ at 31+17.13). The scribe sometimes wrote with noticeably more cramped or open spacing than usual at the end of a line, depending on the available space. Pfann and Ulrich noted that visibly larger word-spaces of around 3 mm were sporadically left between “sentence” units that equate to our modern verse divisions (e.g., at 3i+17.7, 10, 13; 3ii, 4–6.1, 12; 7.4, 12.2). Although this clearly does happen, it is more the exception than the rule. Vacats were clearly inserted between units within a single story, as seen in the obvious space left between Dan 2:45 and 46, a parashah petuhah in the MT. Much larger vacats of at least two-thirds of a line were left at 7.6 and 14.10, both of which correspond with modern chapter divisions. The space at 14.10 also marks the transition between the Aramaic Dan 2–7 and the Hebrew Dan 8–12. This scribe’s orthography tends toward more defective spellings than other Qumran copies of Daniel, and even the MT. For example, we find יִהְיֶה rather than יִהְיֶה, רָעָד rather than רָעָד, and דִּירִית rather than דִּירִית. There is a striking orthographic difference between 4Q112 and 4Q113 (Danb), the latter regularly employing full spellings. In the few preserved cases, the scribe consistently (and distinctively) used the verb forms rather than the partial forms. There are fairly regular minor scribal variants from the MT, along with some more significant ones, such as the phrase מַסְפִּיק יִהְיֶה rather than מַסְפִּיק יִהְיֶה (3i+17.16; Dan 2:31) rather than מַסְפִּיק יִהְיֶה. One extraordinary variant is the archaic (or, less plausibly, Hebraized) form הָרָא rather than הָרָא (cf. 4Q113 [Danb] 1–4.8, with a similar reading) rather than הָרָא. There is a striking orthographic difference between 4Q112 and 4Q113 (Danb), the latter regularly employing full spellings. In the few preserved cases, the scribe consistently (and distinctively) used the verb forms rather than the partial forms. There are fairly regular minor scribal variants from the MT, along with some more significant ones, such as the phrase מַסְפִּיק יִהְיֶה rather than מַסְפִּיק יִהְיֶה (3i+17.16; Dan 2:31) rather than מַסְפִּיק יִהְיֶה. One extraordinary variant is the archaic (or, less plausibly, Hebraized) form הָרָא rather than הָרָא (cf. 4Q113 [Danb] 1–4.8, with a similar reading) rather than הָרָא. There is a striking orthographic difference between 4Q112 and 4Q113 (Danb), the latter regularly employing full spellings. In the few preserved cases, the scribe consistently (and distinctively) used the verb forms rather than the partial forms. There are fairly regular minor scribal variants from the MT, along with some more significant ones, such as the phrase מַסְפִּיק יִהְיֶה rather than מַסְפִּיק יִהְיֶה (3i+17.16; Dan 2:31) rather than מַסְפִּיק יִהְיֶה. One extraordinary variant is the archaic (or, less plausibly, Hebraized) form הָרָא rather than הָרָא (cf. 4Q113 [Danb] 1–4.8, with a similar reading) rather than הָרָא. There is a striking orthographic difference between 4Q112 and 4Q113 (Danb), the latter regularly employing full spellings. In the few preserved cases, the scribe consistently (and distinctively) used the verb forms rather than the partial forms. There are fairly regular minor scribal variants from the MT, along with some more significant ones, such as the phrase מַסְפִּיק יִהְיֶה rather than מַסְפִּיק יִהְיֶה (3i+17.16; Dan 2:31) rather than מַסְפִּיק יִהְיֶה. One extraordinary variant is the archaic (or, less plausibly, Hebraized) form הָרָא rather than הָרָא (cf. 4Q113 [Danb] 1–4.8, with a similar reading) rather than הָרָא. There is a striking orthographic difference between 4Q112 and 4Q113 (Danb), the latter regularly employing full spellings. In the few preserved cases, the scribe consistently (and distinctively) used the verb forms rather than the partial forms. There are fairly regular minor scribal variants from the MT, along with some more significant ones, such as the phrase מַסְפִּיק יִהְיֶה rather than מַסְפִּיק יִהְיֶה (3i+17.16; Dan 2:31) rather than מַסְפִּיק יִהְיֶה. One extraordinary variant is the archaic (or, less plausibly, Hebraized) form הָרָא rather than הָרָא (cf. 4Q113 [Danb] 1–4.8, with a similar reading) rather than הָרָא. There is a striking orthographic difference between 4Q112 and 4Q113 (Danb), the latter regularly employing full spellings. In the few preserved cases, the scribe consistently (and distinctively) used the verb forms rather than the partial forms. There are fairly regular minor scribal variants from the MT, along with some more significant ones, such as the phrase מַסְפִּיק יִהְיֶה rather than מַסְפִּיק יִהְיֶה (3i+17.16; Dan 2:31) rather than מַסְפִּיק יִהְיֶה. One extraordinary variant is the archaic (or, less plausibly, Hebraized) form הָרָא rather than הָרָא (cf. 4Q113 [Danb] 1–4.8, with a similar reading) rather than הָרָא.
which begins almost identically to the opening words of Dan 10, the scribe accidentally continued with the words from the later chapter, דְּבָר נַגֵּלָה from Dan 10:1. Realizing the mistake, the scribe placed two horizontal strokes through the words and continued with the correct phrase from Dan 8:1, חזון נראה.

At some point, the corrected words were also scraped and partially erased.

Original manuscript quality: Very good

Select bibliography: Beyer, ATTM⁴, 148–60; Beyer, ATTM², 187–99; Puech, “Daniel”.

Script sample:

Representative sample of corrections and scribal features:

(a) Ink dots above penultimate letter (perhaps last two letters) of word, possibly for erasure (3i+17.8): אֶלֶּה (MT and other witnesses have אֶלֶּה)

(b) Supralinear dalet added and misspelling of וָבָכֶדֶנָצֶר as וָמְכֶדֶנָצֶר (7.6–8)

(c) Near full-line vacat at transition from Aram. ch. 7 to Heb. ch. 8. Erasure of words with double lines and subsequent scraping in first line of Heb. text (14.10–11): רִבְרָר נָלָל
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https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/
Content synopsis and significance: This manuscript is one of five (or six if Puech, "Daniel," is correct about his 4QDn) Qumran copies containing the Aramaic chapters of Daniel, and one of eight (or nine) overall copies of the book. The extant fragments of 4Q113 contain parts of Dan 5 (5:10–12, 14–16, 19–22), 6 (6:8–22, 27–29), and 7 (7:1–6, 26–28). Chapters 5 and 6 are the best preserved, both being stories of Daniel's travails in the Babylonian and Persian royal courts of Belshazzar and Darius, respectively. On the significance of these court tales and the
vision of Dan 7 in view of the Qumran Aramaic literature more broadly, see the profiles for 1Q71 (Dan\(^a\)) and 4Q112 (Dan\(^a\)). In terms of its textual character, 4Q113 is marked by a fairly high number of minor variants in orthography, morphology, and syntax when compared with the MT, many of which can be attributed to scribal preferences. However, the differences between 4Q113 and the MT do not appear to be as extensive as we find in 4Q112 (Dan\(^a\)). Both 4Q113 and 4Q112 (Dan\(^a\)) are important witnesses to the kinds of scribal variation that occurred in authoritative Jewish texts during the Second Temple period.

**Material remains:** Twenty fragments remain of this manuscript, varying considerably in size. The two largest fragments are 7 and 18, each of which has parts of two columns preserved. The smallest fragments (2–4, 12, 14, 20) contain only a few letters. Since we are dealing with a relatively stable text that we possess in full, these and several other fragments help to determine line length (about 35–45 letters) and column width (11.5–13.5 cm) in the scroll. Based on letter count, the column width seems to have varied within a few centimeters, as is typical. From frag. 7 we can also reconstruct the column height and line number, allowing for a rough estimation of the scroll’s length. Ulrich proposed 31–32 columns in total, which would make for a scroll around 400–450 cm long. This is longer than the reconstructed 4Q112 (Dan\(^a\)), but still not as long as other scrolls like 11Q10 (Job). No seams are preserved between sheets, and so we cannot estimate the columns per sheet, or how many sheets were used. There are overlaps in the Aramaic section of Daniel with other Qumran copies at 4Q113 1–4.7–8//4Q112 (Dan\(^a\)) 10–11.2–3 (= MT Dan 5:22), 4Q113 12–13.3–5//4Q112 (Dan\(^a\)) 13.2–3 (= MT Dan 7:5–6), and 4Q113 15.18–22//4Q112 (Dan\(^a\)) 14.6–8 (= MT Dan 7:26–28).

**Notes on provenance:** The provenance of 4Q113 is comparable to that of 4Q112 (Dan\(^a\)). A portion of frag. 7ii appears on PAM 40.612, which is part of the “G series” photographic plates containing fragments discovered by the Bedouin and then sold to the Palestine Archaeological Museum directly (to Roland de Vaux of the École Biblique) or through the Bethlehem antiquities dealer Kando (Strugnell, “Photographing,” 124, 131–32). Tigchelaar also identified 4Q113 2 on the PAM “E series” plate 40.963, connected with the documented excavations of Cave 4 led by Roland de Vaux in September, 1952 (DJD 6:3–4). The origins of the fragments not on PAM 40.612 or 40.963 are less certain, having been discovered either by Bedouin or de Vaux’s excavations. Ulrich noted that two fragments of the manuscript went missing (frag. 14 and 19), while still at the Rockefeller (Palestine Archaeological) Museum (DJD 16:256). Fragment 14 was reported missing in 1982, and frag. 19 in 1999.
Material: Skin

Script: Herodian formal (Ulrich, based on Cross)

Proposed palaeographic date: 20–50 CE (Ulrich, based on Cross)

Special traits and general comments: The preparation of this scroll seems to have been good (not excellent), and a noteworthy characteristic is its high number of blemishes – six or seven on the extant fragments – relative to most manuscripts at Qumran. These included imperfections or pits (5–6.2) in the skin, and even holes (7i.17, 7ii+8.3–4). The fact that the scribe regularly wrote around these blemishes shows that they were part of the scroll already when it was inscribed in antiquity. This copy had quite large upper, lower, and intercolumnar margins. Most columns seem to have averaged lines in the mid-thirties for letter count, though some columns, such as that containing the beginning of Dan 8 (frags. 16–18i+19), were closer to the mid-forties. The scribe wrote in a rather large, consistent Herodian script. Full orthography was regularly used, as in the pronoun אנתה and the long 2ms pronominal suffix הכ,– which contrasts with the more defective orthography of 4Q112 (Dana). Like the scribe of 4Q112 (Dana), that of 4Q113 preferred the הפעל verb form to the התפעל of the MT, but used the הפעל spelling rather than the אفعال. The scribe wrote correctly, as a closed compound word כלקבל at 7i.15 (so also 4Q15 [Danb] 3–7.17) as opposed to the MT’s כל קבל and, surprisingly, wrote מיד instead of the expected יד at 9–11.13. This seems best interpreted as a morphological Hebraism. Ulrich (“Identification”) suggested that the scribe who copied 4Q113 can also be identified in 1Q11 (Psb), 4Q57 (Isac) and 11Q14 (Sefer ha-Milhamah). The scripts are indeed very similar, though Tigchelaar harbors some reservations (in Humbert and Fidanazio, Khirbet Qumrán, 258). Most of the spaces left blank are due to the manuscript blemishes mentioned above, but the scribe did leave large vacats of nearly a full line at a point of significant progression within a story (7ii+8.14, before Dan 6:19), and between two distinct stories (9–11.15, between Dan 6 and 7). In the parts of the scroll preserved, syntactic arrangements with the verb placed later in clause are quite common. Many of these clauses occur in Dan 6.

Original manuscript quality: Good–very good

Select bibliography: Beyer, ATTM², 148–60; Beyer, ATTM³, 187–99;
Representative sample of corrections and scribal features:

Supralinear vav added (7ı.14):

(b) Blemish on skin (in this case a hole), avoided by the scribe (7ıı+8.3–4; see also 5–6.2; 7ı.17; 9–11.14–17, 2ı; and 12–13.4)

Language

Syntax

Verb-subject (verb early in clause):
7ıı+8.13, 7ıı+8.14, 7ıı+8.15, 7ıı+8.18

Subject-verb (verb early in clause):
7ıı+8.8, 7ıı+8.12, 7ıı+8.15, 7ıı+8.16

Subject implied (verb early in clause):
7ıı+8.3, 7ıı+8.13, 7ıı+8.15, 7ıı+8.18

Subject implied (verb later in clause):
9–11.16

Subject implied (verb early in clause):
7ıı+8.3, 7ıı+8.13, 7ıı+8.15, 7ıı+8.18

Subject implied (verb later in clause):
7ıı+8.6, 7ıı+8.7, 7ıı+8.7–8, 7ıı+8.11, 7ıı+8.17, 7ıı+8.17–18, 9–11.17

Verbless clause:
7ıı+8.6

Object early in clause:
9–11.17

Use of הָ to mark genitive relationship:
7ıı+8.11, 7ıı+8.17

Verb of movement + ל + animate object:
7ıı+8.8

Verb of movement + ל + inanimate object:
7ıı+8.15, 7ıı+8.17

Use of negative particle הָ (prefix-conjugation verb):
1–4.ı

Periphrastic construction (past/future continuative action):

Finite form of הוה + participle:
5–6.2, 7ıı+8.7–8

Participle + finite form of הוה:
9–11.21

Lexical items:

אִתי:
7ıı+8.1

אַרְדִּין:
7ıı+8.6

בַּאַרְדִּין:
7ıı+8.8, 7ıı+8.15, 7ıı+8.16

די:
7ıı+8.11, 7ıı+8.17

כַּדי:
7ıı+8.6

Morphology:

הפעל form:
5–6.2, 7ıı+8.8, 7ıı+8.10, 7ıı+8.15

ָרָפָמֶל form:
7ıı+8.16

Object suffix on verb:
7ıı+8.8

Assimilated nun:
9–11.13

Dissimilated nun/nasalization:
7ıı+8.15

Orthography/Phonology:

2ms (pro)nominal suffix הָ ב/ן:
1–4.ı, 1–4.14, 7ıı+8.18

ש for [s]:
7ıı+8.4, 7ıı+8.6, 7ıı+8.7, 7ıı+8.13, 12–13.3(2x), 15.22

Other notable features:

Proposed Hebraisms:

/rules (morphological; 9–11.13)

עִלוֹנִים (lexical; 15.2ııı) [ııııı]
Content synopsis and significance: This is the last of five (or possibly six; see Puech, “Daniel”) Qumran copies of Daniel preserving parts of the Aramaic portion of the book, out of eight (or nine) copies of Daniel in total. 4Q115 contains parts of Dan 3, 4, and 7, comprising both court tales and Daniel’s apocalyptic vision. On the significance of these two genres in view of the wider Aramaic literary corpus at Qumran, see the profiles for 1Q71 (Dan⁹) and 4Q112 (Dan⁵). Like 1Q72 (Dan⁹), 4Q115 is missing the Prayer of Azariah and the Song of the Three Judean Youths, placed between Dan 3:23 and 24 in the Greek and Latin translations. Thus, 1Q72 (Dan⁹) and 4Q115 have the same version of the story as found in the MT. Apart from some minor, mostly orthographic variants, the text of 4Q115 is quite close to that of other Qumran copies, and to the MT. We do occasionally find an added word repetitive of other, nearby contexts (see terms from Dan 3:24 replicated in 3:25 at 2i.5), and at 3–7:3 (Dan 4:6) a minor syntactic alteration.

Material remains: Twelve fragments remain of this manuscript, the largest being frags. 2, 4–6 (joined with certainty into one), and 8. Fragment 2 is irregularly shaped, but at its outer dimensions is roughly the size of a standard playing card. Fragments 10–12 are very small, containing few or no legible letters. What are labelled frags. 13–15 in DJD 16 have been identified by Ulrich as belonging to other manuscripts, something that is clearly the case at least for frag. 14. The Aramaic passages of Daniel partly preserved on the fragments are Dan 3:8–12, 23–25; 4:5–9, 12–16; and 7:15–23. Because frag. 2 contains upper and intercolumnar margins, along with the beginnings of five lines of 2ii, it allows us to estimate within a range the width of one column of the scroll. By placing frag. 1 relative to the scant remains at the left edge of 2i, it is possible to determine that the first line of 2i began with Dan 3:8 (Machiela, “New Reconstruction”). This critical piece of evidence paves the way for reconstructing two successive columns at around twenty-five lines each, from which we can estimate the length of the entire scroll at between 300 and 400 cm, depending on several factors such as whether it once had a handle sheet at its beginning. The scroll would likely have contained 24–25 columns of text, with the inscribed portion of the scroll being around 300–350 cm long. Fragments 1–2 most likely belong to cols. 7–8, frags. 3–7 to col. 9, and frags. 8–9 to col. 16. The remaining fragments cannot be placed with certainty. Although it is impossible to know for certain, each sheet appears to have contained around four columns of text, based on the fact that col. 8 can be reconstructed as appreciably narrower (approx. 10.5 cm) than col. 7 (approx. 12 cm), and was likely the last column on a sheet. The only overlap with another Qumran copy of Daniel is at 4Q115 2ii.1–5//1Q72 (Dan⁹) 1.3–5 (= MT Dan 3:23–25).

Notes on provenance: 4Q115 2 is found on the early “G series” PAM plate 40.620. The “G Series” images are associated with the fragments discovered by Bedouin in 1952 (Strugnell, “Photographing,” 124, 131–32). The Bedouin sold these fragments to the Palestine Archaeological Museum either directly or through the Bethlehem antiquities dealer Kando (DJD 6:3–4). Others fragments of 4Q115 were discovered during the official excavation of Cave 4, led by Roland de Vaux during September 22–29, 1952, as shown by their presence on the “E series” PAM plates 40.975 (frags. 5, 7), 40.982 (frag. 6), and 40.985 (frag. 4).
Sample image: 4Q15 2i–ii, 4 (Not a proposed arrangement of the fragments)
Image B-284285
COURTESY OF THE LEON LEVY DEAD SEA SCROLLS DIGITAL LIBRARY, ISRAEL ANTIQUITIES AUTHORITY. PHOTO: NAJIB ANTON ALBINA
Material: Skin

Script: Early Herodian formal (Pfann; Ulrich, based on Cross)

Proposed palaeographic date: 25–1 BCE (Ulrich, based on Cross)

Special traits and general comments: Ulrich described the skin of this manuscript as “ill-prepared,” but this impression may be partly due its advanced state of deterioration. At high magnification the hair follicles do make the surface of the skin look quite rough. Pfann (“Preliminary Edition,” 38–39), however, proposed that the skin may be in poor shape due to environmental degradation over the course of storage. Based on its preparation techniques, it seems to be a copy of fairly high (not the highest) quality. Margin sizes are at or slightly above the norm for Qumran manuscripts, and the scroll was carefully, evenly ruled and written. Judging by standard practices among the Qumran manuscripts, we would expect the bottom margin to have been slightly larger than the upper one. Assuming that the upper margin is fully preserved at 1.6 cm on frag. 2, it is thus likely that the lower margin was once around 2 cm. Horizontal and vertical lines were made to guide writing and demarcate columns widths, and several scholars have commented on the unusual three vertical lines (rather than the usual two) inscribed in the intercolumn of frag. 2 (see Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 59–61). This practice resembles the so-called “double ruling” used in a handful of other Qumran scrolls (e.g. at the beginnings of sheets on 4Q27 [Num2]), and also occurring outside Qumran (Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 59–60). The only other Aramaic scroll on which this trait clearly occurs is 11Q10 (Job) 21, also in an intercolumn on the middle of a sheet. Proposed reasons for the practice vary, including neatness, ensured observance of the left margin (Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 59), and guidance for minimum and maximum line length (Pfann, “Preliminary Edition,” 40). None of these explanations is especially convincing, since the practice is only occasional, sometimes occurs at the right side of columns (e.g., 4Q27 [Num2]), and scribes do not seem to have used the guidelines for the purpose suggested by Pfann (on 4Q15 all lines fall well short of the right-most line). Given all of the evidence, one wonders if, in some cases, the sporadic use of an extra vertical line resulted from a mistake in preparing the manuscript, with the added line adjusting the original size of the column or intercolumn. Pfann’s (“Preliminary Edition,” 39) and Ulrich’s (1916:279) observation that “indents,” or *points jalons*, were made along the middle vertical line, to be used as guide dots for inscribing the horizontal script lines, is incorrect. Such dots typically occur only at the beginnings and ends of sheets (which is not the case here), and the holes cited by Ulrich in connection with frag. 2.4–5 do not line up well with the vertical or horizontal ruling marks; they are the result of deterioration. Pfann (“Preliminary Edition,” 39) suggested that the horizontal ruling was done with “very diluted ink,” which would be abnormal and does not appear to me to be correct. The ruling was more likely done as usual, with light scoring by a sharpened reed or other instrument, creating a darkened line on the skin.

The scribe wrote in a tidy, consistent, and small script (among the smallest preserved among the Aramaic scrolls) with notably generous word spacing at many points in the preserved text. Pfann (“Daniel and Ezra,” 136; “Preliminary Edition,” 45–53) commented at some length on a rare system of
regular vacats used by this scribe to indicate minor breaks in the narrative progression, essentially constituting a punctuation system. Many, though not all, of these spaces align with later Masoretic sense-divisions of varying types, and approximate modern verse and paragraph partitions. Several such vacats are preserved on the extant fragments, while a number of others can be posited with confidence based on reconstructed line lengths and comparison with the received versions of Daniel. Pfann proposed that these vacats attest to a Second Temple period reading tradition that was reflected in large part by the later Masoretic system of pauses. The scribe of 4Q115 wrote with an orthographic style that tended towards being defective, like 4Q112 (Dan⁸) and the MT, as opposed to the more consistently full orthography of 4Q113 (Dan⁹). There are, however, occasional full spellings in 4Q115, such as חלקה in 3–7.12, later corrected to חלקה (MT חלקה). The noun “portion” is also spelled חלק in 1Q20 (apGen), reflecting a different phonology than in the MT, and the 3ms pronominal suffix was originally spelled כה (perhaps mistakenly written as feminine, and then corrected to masculine?). The letters aleph and he regularly vary at the end of words in comparison with the MT, and the scribe idiosyncratically wrote the name Nebuchadnezzar with a word-break in the middle (בִּנְכָּד נֶצֶר; cf. 2ii.2), like the compound name Abednego (בִּינְדָו נֶצֶר; cf. 2ii.1). As in 4Q113 (Dan⁸) 71.15, is written in the correct etymological form (3–7.17), without the incorrect word-break found in the MT חלָק (חֲלָק). A curious physical feature of the writing is that the ink has slowly eaten away the surface of the skin, in some places leaving only the negative impression of the letter that was once present. Lines of writing have sometimes decomposed entirely, leaving only uninscribed strips of leather between where the writing once was. The same phenomenon has been observed, for example, on 1Q20 (apGen), 4Q26 (Lev⁹), and 4Q406 (ShirShabb⁹) (see Tov, Scribal Practices, 53–54, for further examples). Nir-El and Broshi (“Black Ink”) attributed this trait to the type of binding agents used in the ink mixture of these manuscripts, while Cross had earlier assumed it was due to storage of the ink in a metal inkwell.

Original manuscript quality: Good–very good


Script sample:

Representative sample of corrections and scribal features:

(a) “Double ruling” (three vertical lines) inscribed in the intercolumnar margin (frag. 2)

(b) Erasure of letter at end of word by scraping (3–7.12):

Image B-284285

COURTESY OF THE LEON LEVY DEAD SEA SCROLLS
DIGITAL LIBRARY, ISRAEL ANTIQUITIES AUTHORITY.
PHOTO: NAJIB ANTON ALBINA
Content synopsis and significance: What little remains of this manuscript contains snippets of Ezra 4:2–11 (frags. 1–2; parallel in 1 Esdras 5:66–70) and 5:17–6:5 (frag. 3; parallel in 1 Esdras 6:20–25). This is the only preserved copy of Ezra from the Qumran caves, and is important for showing that the book was kept as part of the library there. One of the transitions from Hebrew to Aramaic in Ezra occurs at 4:8, and while we do not possess the actual change from one language to the other on the extant fragments, frag. 1 (Hebrew) and frag. 2 (Aramaic) contain nearby text, showing that it was once present in the intervening space on the original scroll. The small amount of extant text is quite close to the version of Ezra known from the MT, with a few minor variants. The differences are mostly orthographic, but also include two cases of changing the number of a verb, once from plural to singular, and once from singular to plural. In at least the first case (3:3; Ezra 6:3), this change makes good sense in the narrative context, and corresponds to a variant also present in the LXX. Ezra, like Daniel, is a text whose literary framing is in Hebrew, but includes extensive material in Aramaic. Although it seems to have been composed at a time slightly earlier than the majority of Aramaic texts in the Qumran library, there are clear thematic connections between Ezra and other Aramaic works. These include interest in the positions and success of Israelites in the foreign royal court, how those from Israel are to interact with foreigners more generally, the pedagogical role of priests in Israel, and proper marriage.

Material remains: 4Q17 consists of three fragments. Fragments 1 and 2 are quite small, with portions of several lines of writing preserved on each. Fragment 3 is over twice the size of frags. 1 or 2, with nine partial lines of text. Because the content of all three fragments is part of a known text that closely resembles the MT, we can reconstruct some of the surrounding context, line length, and column width with a fairly high degree of certainty. The column to which frag. 3 once belonged was approximately 10.5 cm wide, and the column of frags. 1–2 closer to 10 cm. It is likely that frags. 1–2 belonged to a single column, perhaps directly preceding the column of frag. 3. Because no margins are preserved on the fragments, it is now impossible to determine the number of lines per column, column height, or the original length of the scroll.

Notes on provenance: The fragments of 4Q17 are not found on the early “E series” or “G series” PAM plates. While their discovery in Cave 4 is assured, the mode of that discovery was not documented.
**Profile of Physical Layout**

**Column dimensions:** Approx. 10.5 cm w.

**Letters per line:** Approx. 50–60

**Scribal guidelines:**
- **Horizontal script lines:** Yes
- **Average medial letter height:** 1–1.5 mm
- **Space between lines:** approx. 6–7 mm
- **Space between words:** 0.5–1
- **Vacats:** Yes; small (3.9 [9 mm]; intermediate sense division)

**Material:** Skin

**Script:** Late Hasmonean or early Herodian formal (Ulrich, based on Cross)

**Proposed palaeographic date:** 75–25 BCE (Ulrich, based on Cross)

**Special traits and general comments:** This manuscript was made of finely-prepared skin, with horizontal guidelines placed at around the average spacing of 6–7 mm from the top of one line to the next. The scribe wrote in a tiny, neat hand, among the smallest scripts on any of the Aramaic Qumran scrolls. Despite the overall care taken by the scribe, a lapse in the usual, formal style is found in the cursive `tav` at 3.9 (this seems to have been intended as a formal `tav` based on the ductus, the scribe having failed to lift the pen sufficiently when moving from the first to the second stroke). The spacing of words is very tight in some places, essentially scriptio continua (e.g., 3.3, towards the end of 3.7), but in other places word spaces are more easily discerned. The single, preserved vacat at 3.9 marks a significant section break within a chapter of Ezra, and we might expect that vacats were used regularly throughout the manuscript to demarcate larger sense-units in the narrative. As in many of the Aramaic texts for which we have multiple copies, 4Q117 appears to have exchanged `he` and `aleph` indiscriminately in comparison with the MT text of Ezra. It also twice differs from the MT on the number of a verb. As in MT Ezra, we find in 4Q117 the more archaic (or
formal) כענת (2.3), rather than the form כען typical of the Qumran Aramaic scrolls. The far demonstrative pronoun דך "that" is used at 3.2, the only other Qumran attestation being in 4Q556a (Prophecyb) 5i.13.

Original manuscript quality: Good–very good


Script sample:

Language

Syntax

Subject-verb (verb later in clause):
3.7
Subject implied (verb early in clause):
3.8, 3.9
Use of כען to mark genitive relationship:
3.6
Verb of movement + ל + inanimate object:
3.8

Lexical items:

די:
3.6
כען:
2.3 (כענת, 3.9 (?)

Morphology:

Form:
3.8
Assimilated nun:
3.9
Dissimilated nun/nasalization:
3.4

Content synopsis and significance: This manuscript is often associated with 4Q244 (psDanb) and 4Q245 (psDanc), all of which were given the title Pseudo-Daniel by J.T. Milik ("Prière de Nabonide," 411). However, this shared designation is slightly misleading for two reasons. First, 4Q243 and 4Q244 (psDanb) contain overlapping material (4Q243 13.1–4//4Q244 [psDanb] 12.1–4), but neither scroll overlaps with 4Q245 (psDanc) so that it is not clear whether 4Q245 (psDanc) represents the same composition as 4Q243 and 4Q244 (psDanb). Second, the title Pseudo-Daniel implicitly privileges the Daniel traditions that eventually came to constitute the biblical book of Daniel (see Perrin, “Daniel Traditions”). It has become clear that Daniel traditions were pervasive and diverse in the early Second Temple period, and it seems best not to assume that a text like 4Q243 is derivative of the canonical book of Daniel. The names Daniel and Belshazzar in frag. 2 of 4Q243 reveal that at least part of this text is set in the royal Persian court, a setting further confirmed by reference to "the nobles of the King" (רברבני מלכה) in 4Q244 (psDanb) 1–3.1. Court tales are found repeatedly among the Aramaic Scrolls, as in the Prayer of Nabonidus (4Q242), Jews at the Persian Court (4Q550), Four Kingdoms (4Q552, 553, 553a), and the copies of biblical Daniel at Qumran. Portions of Tobit and the Abram cycle in the Genesis Apocryphon (1Q20) also draw on aspects of the court-tale theme.

While 4Q243 clearly narrates a court tale focused on Daniel, the precise contents of the story in 4Q243 and
4Q244 (psDanb) are difficult to discern, given the poor state of preservation for both scrolls. Two features, however, provide some sense of the plot. First, there is a reference to something being written down in 4Q243 6. Second, much of the preserved portions of 4Q243 (and 4Q244 [psDanb]) evidently involve a review of Israelite history, spanning from primordial times to at least the Hellenistic period. That the review extends into the Hellenistic period is seen in the reference to someone named “Balakros” (בלקרוס), which is “decidedly Hellenistic, and was a popular name among Alexander’s generals” (Collins and Flint, DJD 22:137). This helps to establish a likely terminus post quem for this composition during the fourth to second centuries BCE. Collins and Flint reconstructed the arc of this historical review, dividing it into four periods: the primeval period, the period from the patriarchs to the exile, the Hellenistic period, and the eschatological period. An interesting aspect of this account is that the exile seems to have been caused as a result of God’s anger at the Israelite practice of sacrificing their children “to demons of error” (לאשידי טעותא), an otherwise unattested tradition (4Q243 13; cf. 4Q244 [psDanb] 12). Collins and Flint suggested that Daniel is expounding for the king the contents of some sort of revelatory book, though it is unclear when and where the book was written, and by whom. One thing that distinguishes 4Q243 from other Danielic historical reviews is the fact that it does not begin with the exilic period (e.g., Dan 2, 7; cf. 4Q552–553a [Four Kingdoms c]).

Enoch is named in frag. 9, and “the tower” (מגדלא, perhaps a reference to Gen 11) in frag. 10. With respect to its historical scope, the account in 4Q243 is closer to the Enochic Animal Apocalypse and the Apocalypse of Weeks than to the historical visions in the biblical book of Daniel. A small detail linking this text to others in the Aramaic corpus at Qumran is the phrase "paths of truth" in 7.2. This is a common expression in descriptions of positive conduct, often in texts where fathers are teaching their children (e.g., 1Q20 [apGen] 6.3; 4Q212 [Enb] 11.18, 1v.25; 4Q213 [Levi b] 4.5), but also in the so-called "son of God" text (4Q246 [apocrDan] ii.5).

The narrator of the historical review is never made clear in the available fragments, though the most plausible speaker in light of frags. 1–2 is Daniel. This first-person narrative perspective is extremely popular in the Aramaic literature at Qumran. However, as in many other comparable texts, frags. 1–2 reveal that 4Q243 is framed by third-person narration.

Material remains: Forty fragmentary pieces remain of this manuscript, only a handful of which are (slightly) larger than a postage stamp. Few fragments contain more than four fragmentary lines of text (frags. 12, 24). Several fragments preserve parts of the upper, left, and right margins, though the lower margin is not present. Intercolumnar margins are extant in frags. 11 and 17. Remnants of the scroll’s stitching can be seen in frag. 1. The order of the fragments cannot be reconstructed on material grounds, and the editors have relied primarily on biblical referents to determine their placements.

Notes on provenance: The fragments of 4Q243 are not found on the early “E series” or “G series” PAM plates. While their discovery in Cave 4 is assured, the mode of that discovery was not documented.
**PROFILE OF PHYSICAL LAYOUT**

**Margins:**
- **Upper:** 1.1–1.5 cm

**Intercolumnar:** Approx. 7 mm
- (frag. 11i–ii)

**Letters per line:**
- Approx. 36 (based on overlap with 4Q244 [psDanb] 13; Collins and Flint)

**Scribal guidelines:**
- **Horizontal script lines:** Yes
- **Vertical column lines:** Yes, both sides of column

**Average medial letter height:**
- 3–4 mm

**Space between lines:**
- 7–9 mm

**Space between words:**
- 1.5–2 mm

**Vacats:** None preserved

---

**Material:** Skin

**Script:** Herodian (Collins and Flint) semi-formal (Langlois, “Theonyms”)

**Proposed palaeographic date:** 1–25 CE (Collins and Flint) or slightly earlier (Langlois, “Theonyms”)

**Special traits and general comments:** Collins and Flint (DJD 22:97) doubted the presence of horizontal ruling in this manuscript, but such ruling appears likely based on the even line spacing and what appear to be very faint script lines on several of the fragments. These are more lightly impressed and thicker than the more obvious vertical column lines, and may be seen best on the third line of frag. 11. The scribe wrote into the ruled intercolumnar margin in frag. 8, and from our few samples it appears that these margins were considerably smaller than in scrolls like 1Q20 (apGen), 4Q544 (Visions of Amramb), and 4Q554 (NJb). Nevertheless, 4Q243 is otherwise generously-spaced, and the scribe wrote in a tidy, well-trained hand making few mistakes as far as we can tell. The most distinctive characteristic of the scribe’s practice is his use of palaeo-Hebrew script at 1.2 to write the divine name אלהי “your God.” The letter kaph of the 2ms suffix has been the topic of some discussion, considered by Milik (“Prière de Nabonide,” 412, n. 1) and Tov (Scribal Practices, 240) to be an aberration from the more traditional palaeo-Hebrew kaph, with its two-step head (see Langlois, “Theonyms”). Milik deemed the letter to have “une forme nettement ‘samaritaine,’” while Tov suggested that the scribe was ignorant of some palaeo-Hebrew letters. However, Langlois (“Theonyms”) rightly noted that the shape of the letter is within the expected bounds of palaeo-Hebrew letter formation. In fact, the kaph in 4Q243 resembles those of the of the first hand in 1Q3 (palaeoLev [and palaeoNum?]), 2Q5 (palaeoLev), and 11Q1 (palaeoLev*), showing that forms similar to that in 4Q243 were more widely employed by scribes at or beyond Qumran. Langlois (“Theonyms”) is of the opinion that the word was written at the same time as the rest of the text, by a single scribe.

The scribe used at least once the long form of the 2ms suffix, in the theonym just discussed, and perhaps employed samek for /s/ in לנדס “hate” (39.2), though the context of these letters is lacking and the meaning of the word remains uncertain. In other respects, the language and orthography are typical of Qumran Aramaic.

**Original manuscript quality:** Very good

**Select bibliography:** Milik, “Prière de Nabonide,” 411–15; Beyer, ATTM⁵, 195–7; Beyer, ATTM², 139–42; García Martínez, Apocalyptic, 137–61; Collins, “Pseudo-Daniel.”
Script sample:

Corrections and scribal features:

(a) Divine name written in palaeo-Hebrew characters (1.2): אֱלֹהֵי
(b) Supralinear letters inserted (35.1): ] אָנָו [ד

Language

Syntax

Verb-subject (verb early in clause):
13.1, 24.2, 25.3(?)

Subject-verb (verb early in clause):
24.3(?)

Subject implied (verb early in clause):
1.1(?), 4.1(?), 10.2(?), 12.2(?), 13.1–2(?), 16.2, 24.3

Subject implied (verb later in clause):
6.3

Verbless clause:
16.4

Direct object marker (if present):
–ל; 13.2

Periphrastic construction (past/future continuative action):
Finite form of הוה + participle:
13.2(?)

Lexical items:

אֵיתֵן: 3.1
דיל: ב.1.1
די: 6.3, 8.3, 20.3, 26.2

Morphology:

אֵיתֵן form:
24.1

Orthography/Phonology:

2ms (pro)nominal suffix הָב/הָב:
1.2
ש for /s/:
20.2
ד for /s/:
39.2(?)
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Content synopsis and significance: This manuscript is often grouped together with 4Q243 (psDan\(^a\)) and 4Q245 (psDan\(^c\)) under the name Pseudo-Daniel, though 4Q244 overlaps only with 4Q243 and not 4Q245. It is quite possible, therefore, that the three manuscripts classified as Pseudo-Daniel comprise two, distinct compositions. For a fuller discussion of the contents and significance of the composition represented by 4Q244, see the profile for 4Q243 (psDan\(^a\)). The largest preserved fragment of 4Q244 (frag. 12) presents God’s rationale for subjecting Israel to the Babylonian conquest and exile, and contains the only text paralleled in 4Q243 (psDan\(^a\)). Both copies depict the desolation of Israel as the result of their decision to forsake God and follow the ??ז?? (“demons of error” (4Q244 12.1–4; cf. 4Q243 [psDan\(^a\)] 13.1–4). Reynolds (“Demons of Error”) and others have made a case that this passage has child sacrifice to foreign deities in view. Other parts of 4Q244 reflect the broader Second Temple period tradition of Daniel serving in the court of a foreign king (frags. 1–3, 4). The clearest references to events from Israel’s past, more fully attested in 4Q243 (psDan\(^a\)), are present in frag. 8. Here we find mention of the flood, Noah, and (Mount) Lubar (lines 2–3; see also 1Q20 [apGen] 12.13; Jub. 5:28, 7:3; cf. Fitzmyer, *Commentary*, 161).

Material remains: Less text is extant in 4Q244 than in 4Q243 (psDan\(^a\)). The manuscript comprises fourteen fragments, though these are made up of seventeen pieces, two being joined to make frag. 1 and three to make frag. 12 (Collins and Flint, *DJD* 22:223). Like 4Q243 (psDan\(^a\)), 4Q244 has several upper margins preserved, most fully on frags. 1 and 12. No lower margins remain, making the dimensions of the columns difficult to discern. Only frags. 1–3 and 12 contain text of any significant length, each preserving broken portions of four lines. Most of the remaining fragments contain little more than one or two complete words. Collins and Flint reported that several of fragments contain worm-holes, and suggested that the damage patterns created by these holes might in the future prove helpful in reconstructing the original order of some of the fragments (DJD 22:223).

Notes on provenance: The fragments of 4Q244 are not found on the early “E series” or “G series” PAM plates. While their discovery in Cave 4 is assured, the mode of that discovery was not documented.
Material: Skin

Script: Herodian, of a similar but "more minute hand than 4Q243" (Collins and Flint)

Proposed palaeographic date: 1–25 CE (Collins and Flint)

Special traits and general comments: This scribe wrote in a small script that is visibly more erratic, messy, and cursive than the scribe of 4Q243 (psDan). Collins and Flint (DJD 22:129) mentioned that the script changes on frag. 12, becoming "more cramped" and "more cursive" for the remainder of the fragment. They entertain whether this implies a change of scribe or an attempt to squeeze text secondarily into a preexisting vacat. Neither of these explanations is convincing, and the script remains quite constant throughout the fragment. It does, however, appear that the scribe may have made a new calamus pen or recut his existing one based on the thick letters at the beginning of line 1, and especially the malformed shin of ישראלי in that line. He also used two cursive-style tavs in frag. 12, as opposed to the formal or square-style tavs in frags. 5 and 8, a variation that also occurs in other Qumran scrolls. It seems that this scribe was less experienced than those who wrote the best Qumran texts, with the relatively faint, thin letters in line 2 resulting from too little ink in the calamus. The scribe of 4Q244 wrote with a fairly full orthography, very common in the Qumran scrolls. The manuscript bears the marks of careful preparation, with both horizontal and vertical ruling and ample line spacing, but it has much smaller margins than the highest quality scrolls like 1Q20 (apGen), 4Q537 (TJacob?), and 4Q554a (NJ). Together with the script, this indicates that the copy was of a medium quality.

There is no vav at the beginning of 5ii.4 as transcribed by Collins and Flint, where it seems they either mistook the right, upper arm of the aleph as a separate letter, or forgot to add a bracket indicating textual reconstruction.

Original manuscript quality: Good


Script sample:
Corrections and scribal features:

(a) Supralinear letter added (1.1): רברבני

(b) Supralinear word added (4.2): [лимך[ה]]

Language

Syntax

Verb-subject (verb early in clause):
4.2(?), 12.1(?), 12.2
Subject implied (verb early in clause):
5ii.4, 12.2, 13.1(?)
Use of י to mark genitive relationship:
1–3.1

Lexical items:

Verb: 8.2
ל: 1–3.1, 11.1, 12.3

Morphology:

לי form:
1–3.2(?), 12.3

Content synopsis and significance: This manuscript is grouped with 4Q243 (psDan⁰) and 4Q244 (psDan⁰) under the heading Pseudo-Daniel. Despite this identification, 4Q245 does not contain any material that overlaps with either 4Q243 (psDan⁰) or 4Q244 (psDan⁰), and it is not a settled matter that 4Q245 comes from the same composition as the other two manuscripts (DJD 22:153). For more on the relationship between the three scrolls see the profile on 4Q243 (psDan⁰). 4Q245 1 appears to preserve the opening portion of the composition (DJD 22:153–54), and near the beginning of the fragment we find an occurrence of the name Daniel along with the phrase “a book that was given” (תב די יהיב כ). The notion that Daniel consults or reads a book containing information about the past and the future also appears in 4Q243–244 (psDan⁰–b), and constitutes one thematic connection between the three scrolls. The theme of knowledge being transmitted, preserved, and found in books pervades the Aramaic Qumran literature (see, e.g., the Aramaic sources of 1 Enoch, the Genesis Apocryphon, the Aramaic Levi Document, and the Testament of Qahat). The reference to Daniel in frag. 1 is followed by at least two, poorly-preserved lists, the first recording a succession of high priests and the second a sequence of kings. The extant portion of the high-priestly list begins with Qahat, includes the name Onias, and likely ends with someone named Simon. The name Simon is preceded by the letters י, and the full name has plausibly been reconstructed by Collins and Flint as ייונ “Jonathan.” There are several Simons in the high-priestly line during the Second Temple period, but as Collins and Flint remark, the “direct sequence of Jonathan-Simon is only found in the Hasmonean line” (DJD 22:161). They find it most likely that Simon ended the list. If this reconstruction is correct, the last reference would be to Simon the Hasmonean, who held the office of high priest from 142–135 BCE. 4Q245 stands out among the Qumran Aramaic texts as the only one containing a plausible historical allusion to the Hasmonean period. Overt historical references to persons or events proximate to a text’s composition are very rare in the Aramaic literature kept at Qumran, making many of the texts difficult to date on the basis of their contents. The extant part of the royal list begins with the names of David and Solomon, with Ahazia[h] and [Joa]sh also being named in the following line. The only other
fragment to preserve a significant amount of text (frag. 2) recounts an eschatological scenario in the third-person voice referring to the extermination of wickedness (2.1) and to two contrasting groups, one that will go astray (טע״י) due to their blindness (עו״ר) (2.2) and another that will arise (קו״ם) and return (תו״ב) (2.4–5). Dualistic language is used in ethical and eschatological contexts often in the Aramaic literature kept at Qumran, but there is an especially close verbal parallel between 4Q245 and the Enochic Animal Apocalypse in their shared use of עו״ר “to be blind” and טע״י “to go astray” as a way of describing wicked behavior (1 En. 89:32–33, 54). Stuckenbruck (“Daniel,” 377) notes that the combination of these two metaphors in 4Q245 “is, among documents previously composed in the Jewish tradition, shared only with the Animal Apocalypse.”

Material remains: Four fragments of this manuscript are extant, and no other extant scroll from Qumran clearly contains the same composition as 4Q245. Fragment 1 is the tallest of the four fragments, at over 11 cm and preserving parts of twelve lines. However, the precise height of the manuscript is impossible to determine with any certainty, since nothing remains of the lower margin. Fragment 2 likely fell at the end of the scroll, with the four blank lines in 2ii suggesting a column that was all or mostly blank. Fragments 3 and 4 are very small, containing only a few legible letters (frag. 4) to two words (frag. 3). If Collins and Flint are correct about frag. 1 belonging to the beginning of the scroll and frag. 2 to its end, we would possess text from near both its ends. Unfortunately, the poor state of the manuscript prevents us from hazarding a guess as to how much intervening material we now are missing.

Notes on provenance: 4Q245 1 is found in the early PAM “G series” plate 40.622, meaning that this fragment was among those discovered by Bedouin in 1952 (see Strugnell, “Photographing,” 124, 131–32). The origins of the remaining fragments of 4Q245 were not clearly documented, though they most likely were also discovered in Cave 4 by the Bedouin.
Material: Skin

Script: Herodian, "written in a larger, clearer hand than 4Q243 or 4Q244" (Collins and Flint)

Proposed palaeographic date: 1–25 CE (Collins and Flint)

Special traits and general comments: Among the first things one notices about this manuscript are its very high-quality of skin and its neat, formal, and relatively-large script. The skin is thin and noticeably lighter in color than is the norm among the Qumran scrolls (comparable with the 11Q19 [Ta], though written on the opposite side of the skin), and the manuscript is carefully, evenly ruled with generous spacing. The space between columns in 4Q245 is only slightly less than in 1Q20 (apGen). The only things keeping this manuscript from being labeled as "excellent" in quality is that we lack an accurate estimate of the outer margins and several scribal features, such as the scribe’s use (or non-use) of vacats. In what little text remains of the scroll, the scribe wrote in the Aramaic orthography and style typical of the texts found at Qumran.

Original manuscript quality: Very good–excellent


Script sample:

Language

Syntax:
  Subject implied (verb early in clause):  
  2.3(?) , 2.4(?) , 2.5(?)

Lexical items:
  יְדֵי : 2.4
  יָדָיו : ii.2, ii.4, iii.9

4Q246, Apocryphon of Daniel (apocrDan)
  [ed. Puech, DJD 22:165–84]

Content synopsis and significance: This text has received much attention, due in large part to its mention of the parallel titles “Son of God” (בר הים ובו נל א) and “Son of the Most High” (בר עלון) in frag. iii.1 (cf. Luke 1:32–33), though there has been considerable scholarly debate over whether this individual is cast in a positive (e.g., Fitzmyer, “Son of God”; Collins, Daniel, 77–79; García Martínez, Apocalyptic, 162–79) or negative light (e.g., Flusser, "Antichrist"; Milik, “Les modèles”; Segal, “Son of God”). The scroll was preliminarily titled 4Qpseudo-Daniel by Puech (“pseudo-Dan”), and by other scholars 4QSon of God (e.g., Fitzmyer, “Son of God”). The general narrative setting of this apocalyptic work is the interpretation of a dream-vision, apparently in the context of a royal court. The court setting of 4Q246
connects it to the wider phenomenon of Jewish Aramaic court tales attested at Qumran, which includes the Prayer of Nabonidus (4Q242), Pseudo-Daniel (4Q243–245), Jews at the Persian Court (4Q550), Four Kingdoms (4Q552–553a), the Aramaic tales of Daniel 2–6, portions of the Genesis Apocryphon (1Qc), and Tobit 1. The dream-vision in 4Q246 was symbolic (see the "comets" [ܙ堅] in iii.1), and is interpreted in historical terms (kings of Assyria and Egypt are mentioned in ii.6). This is comparable with the symbolic dream-vision in Four Kingdoms (4Q552–553a), Dan 7, and other Aramaic works kept at Qumran. 4Q246 builds to a scene of salvation and deliverance involving “the people of God” (עם אל; i.ii.4), which has often been compared to the final, eschatological kingdoms of Dan 2 and 7. The scroll shares specific language with both of those passages (hence the association with Daniel in its title), and has regularly been discussed among a group of Aramaic texts in the Danielic tradition from Qumran. Representative examples of studies dedicated to 4Q246 in view of Daniel (with other intertexts) are those of Berthelot, “References,” and Segal, “Son of God.” The precise affiliation between 4Q246 and the book of Daniel, however, is often difficult to determine, and Tigchelaar (“Aramaic Texts”; see also Perrin, “Daniel Traditions”) has warned against assuming that our canonical Daniel was always a direct literary influence on this and other texts in the “Danielic” tradition, even if it likely did exert influence in some cases, such as that of 4Q245 (psDan). 4Q246 benefits from being viewed within the broader context of the Aramaic literature kept at Qumran, in which dream-visions more often function to “forecast geopolitical movements on the eve of the eschaton” (Perrin, Dynamics, 218). Such texts include the Enochic Animal Apocalypse and Apocalypse of Weeks, the Book of Giants, the Genesis Apocryphon, New Jerusalem, and Four Kingdoms. All of these texts share a deterministic view of history according to which God is guiding historical events to their final culmination. From the divine vantage point, all of the powers that currently dominate the earth are ephemeral, and will soon be replaced by a permanent, divinely-established kingdom (see Perrin, Dynamics, 221–25).

Material remains: Only a single fragment remains of this manuscript, though it is quite well-preserved relative to other Aramaic scrolls in the Qumran corpus. The fragment contains portions of two consecutive columns, the second of which is almost completely intact. Roughly half of the first column also remains. The left edge of the fragment represents the end of a sheet. The presence of upper, lower, and intercolumnar margins gives us a sense of the original height of the scroll and the dimensions of one of its columns, but we can say nothing of the its original width. Scribal guidelines and regular spacing indicate the skill and care with which this scroll was prepared and written, though it now bears the scars of damage, having been wrinkled, abraded, and torn or gnawed by insects (DJD 22:165).

Notes on provenance: The fragment of 4Q246 is not found on the early “E series” or “G series” PAM plates. While its discovery in Cave 4 is assured, the mode of that discovery was not documented.
Material: Skin

Script: Early Herodian formal (Cook)

Proposed palaeographic date: 33–1 BCE (Milik); ca. 25 BCE (Puech)

Special traits and general comments: This is a small, but very well-executed manuscript. The scribal preparation and script are among the highest quality of the Qumran Aramaic corpus, and compare favorably even with 1Q20 (apGen), though the scale of 4Q246 is much more modest than that scroll (hence, my “Very good” designation, rather than “excellent”). The left side of the manuscript is the end of a sheet, which has been detached from the originally following sheet. A number of scholars have agreed that this text is written in a highly poetic configuration of parallel bicola, in which two parallel phrases are paired, each with three (or occasionally two) stresses (i.e., a 3+3 or 3+2 structure). The structure is easily perceived, for example, in iii.5–6:

אֵּאֵרָא בֶּקֶשׁ וּכְלָּא יַעֲבָד

This trait demonstrates the highly literary character and careful design of 4Q246, and parallels closely other poetic passages in the Aramaic literature kept at Qumran, such as Dan 7:9–14, 1 En. 14:8–23, 4Q530 (EnGiantsb) ii.17–18 and portions of 1Q20 (apGen) 5–6. Regarding the verb of movement אתה, we see three different ways of linking with the inanimate object: with the more expected –ל (1i.2; cf. 1i.5); with על (1i.4); and with עד (1i.3). The frozen expression על ארעא (1i.4; cf. 1i.7, 1ii.2–3) may be considered a special exception to the usual rule of using –ל for inanimate objects and –ל for animate objects after a verb of movement. The meaning of עד עלמא (1i.3) is not entirely clear (indeed, Puech considers אתה here and elsewhere to be the 2ms pronoun), and seems intended to convey a special meaning. It may simply mean “forever,” as in 4Q546 (Visions of Amramd) 6.4 and 1Q20 (apGen) 21.14 (so Puech). The large mem (or scribal mark) between lines two and three of the first preserved column has been debated, and is not in keeping with expected correction practices. Also to be noted is the vacat preceding the word עד (1ii.4). This word marks the beginning of a new sense unit in the text, indicating a new historical phase in the vision’s interpretation.

Original manuscript quality: Very good

Corrections and scribal features:

(a) Sublinear letter or scribal mark, with the reading disputed between a bet or mem (ii.2). Puech suggests the insertion of a cursive mem by a later scribe, signifying מ with an assimilated nun (cf. Ezra 6:8; Dan 6:5), though this is far from certain.

Language

Syntax:

Verb-subject (verb early in clause):
- iii.4, iii.5–6

Subject-verb (verb early in clause):
- ii.3, ii.4, ii.7, ii.8, iii.4, iii.6, iii.8

Verb-subject (verb later in clause):
- ii.2

Subject-verb (verb later in clause):
- ii.1(?) ii.2–3(?), iii.2, iii.3, iii.6, iii.7, iii.8, iii.8–9

Subject implied (verb early in clause):
- ii.1

Subject implied (verb later in clause):
- ii.9(2x), iii.1(2x), iii.1–2, iii.2, iii.3

Verbless clause:
- ii.5, iii.3, iii.5(2x), iii.7, iii.9

Object early in clause:
- ii.9(2x), iii.1(2x), iii.3, iii.8, iii.8–9

Direct object marker (if present):
- ל: iii.3(2x)

Use of ל to mark genitive relationship:
- iii.1

Verb of movement + על + inanimate object:
- ii.4

Verb of movement +ל + inanimate object:
- ii.2(?), ii.5(?)

Verb + reflexive pronoun:
- iii.7, iii.8

Lexical items:

די: iii.1, iii.2

Morphology:

Object suffix on verb:
- iii.1

Dissimilated nun/nasalization:
- iii.8

Other notable features:

Proposed Hebraisms:
- אל (lexical; iii.1, iii.4, iii.7) [H]
- עלון (lexical; iii.1) [H]
- זכרון (lexical; ii.5) [H]

Previously unattested in Aramaic:
- מישרין (lexical [Iranian loanword]; ii.5)
- אלי (lexical [Hebraism?]; iii.7)

Poetic doublets/triplets:

See the section on Special traits and general comments. The entire text exhibits poetic couplings, for example, in ii.9–ii.1 (יְהִי יְהֵא וְיִתְכַּרְבּ וּבֵשַׁמְתּ יִתְכַּנְו [ר]בַּהֲזָה יִתְכַּרְבּ בֵּשַׁמְתּ יִתְכַּנְו [פ"ה])
Content synopsis and significance: This fragmentary manuscript purportedly records the first-person narration of Nabonidus, the last king of Babylon (556–539 BCE). It is known as the Prayer of Nabonidus because of the partially intact incipit with which it begins: “The words of the [p]ayer which Nabonidus, king [of Baby]lon, pray[ed] when he was smitten [with] a bad disease by the decree of G[ô]d in Teima” (1–3.1–2). After this introduction, the king briefly recounts his seven years of affliction and the divine intervention that led to him being healed of his sickness and forgiven of his sin (1–3.3–4). Nabonidus reports that a Jewish diviner (نبي) instructed him to compose a document giving honor and exaltation to the name of God (1–3.4–5). What follows is the beginning of the king’s composition, which restates the information about his affliction and adds (assuming Collins’ reconstruction to be basically correct) that he had previously prayed to various idols for seven years, having thought that they were actually gods (1–3.6–8). The implication, of course, is that the king now realizes they are false gods. Unfortunately, the first column ends suddenly at this point due to deterioration. Presumably, the king went on to describe his rejection of idolatry and his acceptance of the God of the Jews. The last fragment of 4Q242 (frag. 4) is very poorly-preserved and difficult to interpret. Some early interpreters of the fragment, principally Milik (“Prière de Nabonide,” 409), understood the king to receive a dream-vision at this point in the text based on some supposed links to Dan 4. Others, including Collins (DJD 22:92–93), more plausibly read the fragment to describe the king’s recovery after being healed by God of his affliction.

Some scholars have suggested that 4Q242 occupies an intermediate place between several Babylonian accounts about Nabonidus on the one hand, and the story of the madness and exile of King Nebuchadnezzar in Dan 4 on the other (Collins, DJD 22:86; cf. Newsom, “Why Nabonidus?”). Long before the discovery of the Qumran finds, it was suspected that the story in Dan 4 was originally about Nabonidus, not Nebuchadnezzar (e.g., Reissler, Das Buch Daniel, 43; Hommel, “Abfassungszzeit”). The Nabonidus Chronicle published in 1882 recounts that Nabonidus spent ten years of his reign at Teima in Arabia. Two additional, competing accounts of Nabonidus’ sojourn have also come to light, a harshly critical one written by a group of Babylonian clergy (“Verse Account of Nabonidus,” in ANET, 305–7) and Nabonidas’ own report on the Harran Stele (cf. Gadd, “Nabonidus”). These texts and the kingship of Nabonidus more generally have now been studied extensively by Beaulieu (Reign of Nabonidus), though they have recently been supplemented by a number of cuneiform inscriptions referring to Nabonidus’ reign, found in Tayma (in modern Saudi Arabia) between 2004 and 2015 (Macdonald, ed., Tayma’ II). The Prayer of Nabonidus represents a Jewish version of the king’s sojourn in Teima, and contains several, striking similarities to the story of Nebuchadnezzar in Dan 4. Newsom (“Why Nabonidus?”) and Kratz (“Nabonid”) saw in the Prayer a dependence on the sixth-century BCE cuneiform literature, while Waerzeggers (“Prayer”) noted that Babylonian speculation on Nabonidus’ legacy continued into the Hellenistic period. Both 4Q242 and Dan 4 associate a Babylonian king with a seven-year sojourn, are narrated from the king’s first-person perspective, involve a Jewish hero, and recount the king’s eventual recognition of the error of idolatry followed (presumably, in the case of 4Q242) by his confession of Israel’s God. We cannot know with certainty if the author of Dan 4 depended on some form of the Prayer of Nabonidus, though Dan 4 does appear to reflect an awareness of either oral or written traditions regarding the sojourn of Nabonidus similar to those underlying 4Q242. In this scenario, the author of Dan 4 would have changed the name of the Babylonian king to the more famous Nebuchadnezzar and attributed the name of Daniel to the anonymous diviner of 4Q242. In doing so, the older Nabonidus tradition was associated with the broader collection of Danielic literature that flourished in the Second Temple period (e.g., 4Q433–245 [psDan*] and the Greek additions to Daniel).

Beyond its obvious connections to Dan 4, the Prayer of Nabonidus uses a number of literary tropes that characterize the Qumran Aramaic texts more generally. First, 4Q242 is a good example of Jewish court-tale literature, a genre repeatedly encountered in the Jewish Aramaic literature of the Second Temple period. In many of these tales, a Jewish courtier achieves high standing within the foreign court because of his wisdom or skill, with the foreign king eventually coming to acknowledge the authority of the God of Israel. The most well-known examples of court tales are found in the now-canonical book of Daniel, but are also present in the so-called Pseudo-Daniel texts (4Q433–245), Jews at the Persian Court (4Q550), Four Kingdoms (4Q552–553a), parts of the Abram cycle in the Genesis Apocryphon (1Q30), and the introduction of Tobit (see Tob 13:–22). Second, the incipit in the opening line of 4Q242 resembles a number of other headings found in the Aramaic Qumran literature, used to introduce narrative
works or major subsections within them (see Perrin, “Capturing”). These include the Genesis Apocryphon (1Q20 5.29), Words of Michael (4Q529 1.1), Visions of Amram (4Q543 1a–c.1), and Tobit (Tob 1:1). Finally, the command that the king write down his praise of God reflects a general concern with textuality and written records that pervades the Aramaic texts from the Qumran caves, which often depict their protagonists as consulting or composing texts of various kinds. This motif is present, for example, in the Aramaic sources of 1 Enoch, the Book of Giants, the Words of Michael, the Birth of Noah, the Genesis Apocryphon, the Testament of Jacob?, New Jerusalem, the Aramaic Levi Document, the Apocryphon of Levi?, the Testament of Qahat, the Visions of Amram, and Dan 7.

Material remains: Three fragments have been combined to reconstruct part of this scroll’s initial column, of which the first nine lines partly remain (along with an interlinear addition above line 9). In fact, what are labelled frags. 1 and 2 each comprise several smaller pieces (frag. 1, three pieces; frag. 2, two pieces). Fragment 1 is approximately \(8 \times 8\) cm, roughly the size of a standard playing card. The damaged frag. 4 is considerably smaller, containing only a few partially preserved words and phrases. In 4.1, the last letter of the first preserved word is certainly a dalet, as read by Puech, and not a resh, as read by Collins and others who follow Milik. Puech’s mem toward the beginning of the same word is based on a false reading from a shadow on the earlier photographs, and should not be accepted. We can, however, read with some confidence the letters דב to begin the line, as Puech suggested, and therefore some form of the root “to make, do.”

Notes on provenance: Tigchelaar identified 4Q242 3 on the “E series” PAM plate 40.964. The fragments in this series of plates were found in the official excavations of Cave 4 on September 22–29, 1952, directed by de Vaux (Strugnell, “Photographing,” 124, 131–32). While the discovery of the remaining pieces of 4Q242 in Cave 4 is assured, the mode of their discovery was not documented.
Material: Skin

Script: Semi-cursive (Collins); late Hasmonean semi-cursive (Puech)

Proposed palaeographic date: ca. 75–50 BCE (Collins, based on Cross); ca. 50 BCE (Puech)

Special traits and general comments: We possess the beginning of this manuscript, with a cut edge at what is either the right side of a skin sheet or the now-broken vertical scribal rule mark at the left edge of a preceding column. While the comparable right-hand side of the first column of 4Q543 (Visions of Amram and a) has clear signs of a sewn seam, indicating a preceding cover sheet, 4Q242 bears no such evidence. Although either a cover sheet or a preceding blank column seems to have been used commonly for scrolls at Qumran, we cannot be certain that 4Q242 had either of these features. It seems unlikely that the upper margin is preserved in its entirety, since it is badly damaged and would be exceptionally small for a manuscript of this quality. A vertical ruled line is clearly discernable at the right edge of the first column, but horizontal script lines must have been inscribed very lightly if they were ever made at all. The fluctuating distances between lines suggests that they were not used. Nevertheless, the scribe did an admirable job of writing a neat, attractive copy, using generous line and word spacing. No vacats are preserved, though minor sense divisions do occur at 1–3.3 (between שֵׁבָע and וֹמֶן) and probably 1–3.4 (between הָלַה and גֶּזֵּר; the syntax of the line is difficult to interpret).

The scribe of 4Q242 wrote in a squared, tall script with several distinguishing features. These include a long, descending vertical stroke on the shin and a final mem that is skinny and extends well below the bottoms of the surrounding medial letters. In 1–3.2, however, the final mem was apparently foregone for a medial form, either by mistake or, as Puech ("Pièce de Nabonide," 214) suggests, because this is a construct noun formation viewed as a single unit. The latter would still be a very rare practice among the Qumran Aramaic scrolls. As noted by Collins (DJD 22:85), the scribe preferred to use aleph and yod to represent vowels at the ends of words rather than he, a practice that may have extended even to indefinite feminine nouns, if this is the proper interpretation of שַחָנָא בָאִישָא in 1–3.2. In other respects, the orthography is what we would expect at Qumran. The scribe used the long form of the pronoun אָנתָה (4.4), which Collins curiously calls archaic despite the early Aramaic forms being את and אָנת.

Aside from the Qumran Daniel manuscripts, which vacillate between the shorter (4Q112 [Dan^a], 4Q115 [Dan^b]) and longer forms (4Q113 [Dan^c]), it is the long form that is typically used in the Qumran copies. More unexpected is the actual archaic form עַמֵּן at 4.1, the much more widely used form at Qumran being עֵמֶן. In Qumran Aramaic, עֵמֶן is otherwise found only in 11Q10 (Job) and at Dan 2:34–35 (4Q112 [Dan^a] 3ii, 4–6.2). As in 1Q20 (apGen) and the Aramaic portions of Ezra, the scribe spelled the noun יָם "wood" (1–3.8) with the later orthography/phonology, according to which the first guttural has weakened from י to ע (for the earlier spelling י see 4Q214b [Levi^b], which at an even earlier stage had been written יָם). We find the periphrastic construction used repeatedly in 4Q242, as in many of the Aramaic Qumran texts, and the elevated prose of this composition features syntactic variation reminiscent of the Aramaic portions of Daniel.
Original manuscript quality: Very good

Select bibliography: Milik, “Prière de Nabonide,” 407–11; Meyer, Nabonid, 16; Beyer, ATTM¹, 223–4; Beyer, ATTM⁶, 104; Beyer, ATTM², 139; García Martínez, Apocalyptic, 116–28; Puech, “Prière de Nabonide”; Eshel, “Book of Daniel.”

Script sample:

Corrections and scribal features:

(a) Supralinear text inserted (1.9, 3.9; approximate placement of fragments)

Language

Syntax

Verb-subject (verb early in clause):
1–3.1, 1–3.3(?), 4.4

Subject-verb (verb later in clause):
1–3.2–3(?), 1–3.5–6(?)

Subject implied (verb early in clause):
4.1(?)

Subject implied (verb later in clause):
1–3.4, 1–3.7

Verbless clause:
1–3.4

Object early in clause:
1–3.4

Direct object marker (if present):
–ב: 1–3.4

Periphrastic construction (past/future continuative action):

Finite form of הוה + participle:
1–3.8(?)

Participle + finite form of הוה:
1–3.7

Lexical items:

די:
1–3.1, 1–3.8(2x)

Morphology:

אפיעי form:
4.1, 4.2(?)

Content synopsis and significance: 4Q552 is one of three manuscript witnesses to a composition known as the Four Kingdoms, a composition that, despite being quite fragmentary, can be identified as a court-tale that includes a vision. Like many of the Aramaic scrolls from Qumran, this text was unknown prior to the Qumran discoveries, though it bears some clear resemblances to the better-known stories of Dan 2 and 7. This manuscript is most notable for its account of a vision told in the first-person voice, which overlaps with parts of 4Q553 (Four Kingdoms); Puech also identified a third manuscript as 4Q553a [Four Kingdoms’]. In the vision, four symbolic, animated trees (אַרְבָּעָה אֵילָנִים) introduce themselves to a seer. Most interpreters have held that 4Q552–553 reflect a literary trope also found in the book of Daniel, in which world empires are symbolically presented as parts of a three- or fourfold historical succession (Swain, “Four Monarchies”; Flusser, “Four Empires”; Collins, Daniel, 166–70). However, Sharon (“Four Kingdoms”) recently challenged this view, positing a geographic rather than a temporal structure how the kingdoms are introduced. One significant difference between 4Q552 and Dan 2 and 7 is that 4Q552 explicitly identifies the empires being represented by the vision’s symbolic elements. In line 5 of frag. iii, the first tree identifies itself as בַּבֵּל (“Babylon”), at which point the seer notes that Babylon is “the one who rules over Persia” (iii.6). Unfortunately, the names of the other three trees have not been preserved, with ongoing debate as to their identities. Various proposals have been put forward by Collins (“Apocalypticism,” 415–17), Flint (“Daniel,” 362–63), Hogeterp (“Daniel”), Puech (DJD 37:57–58), Reynolds (Symbolism, 191, 199–201), and Perrin (Dynamics, 213–18). In addition to Daniel, 4Q552 shares a number of similarities with other texts among the Aramaic scrolls. Trees also figure into the dream-visions of Noah and Abram in 1Q20 (apGen), with both patriarchs being symbolized as trees in that text (14.9; 19.14). Although the term עָרָב (cedar tree) is used in 1Q20 (apGen), as opposed to the more general noun אֵילָן in 4Q552, both texts feature personified trees that can move and speak. More generally, the fact that 4Q552 contains a dream-vision connects the text to the wider corpus of Aramaic scrolls kept at Qumran, dream-visions being a pervasive motif across this literature (cf. Perrin, Dynamics). The phrase “and the king said to me” (ואמר לי מלכא) suggests that Four Kingdoms should be understood as a court-tale (Perrin, Dynamics, 73), a genre that characterizes the Aramaic scrolls corpus more broadly (cf. the profile for 4Q550 [Jews at the Persian Court]). 4Q552 also refers to Israel’s God as “God Most High” (אל עליון), a divine epithet that pervades the Genesis Apocryphon and appears in other Aramaic scrolls from Qumran. On some specific verbal connections between Four Kingdoms and the Visions of Amram, see Machiela, “Connections.”

Material remains: Six fragments remain of this manuscript, two of which contain most of the preserved text (frags. 1 and 2). Puech proposed joining frag. 2 to col. i of frag. 1, a placement that he acknowledges is not certain (DJD 37:59). If this placement is accepted, the collated frags. 1 and 2 would provide us with a significant portion of two consecutive columns. The four remaining fragments (3–6) contain very little text, ranging from parts of a few lines (frags. 3, 5, and 6) to a portion of a single word (frag. 4). We do, however, have several margins preserved (upper, lower, and intercolumnar). Fragments 1 and 3 appear to preserve a complete upper margin, and frag. 1 provides a complete intercolumnar margin.

Notes on provenance: The fragments of 4Q552 are not found on the early “E series” or “G series” PAM plates. While their discovery in Cave 4 is assured, the mode of that discovery was not documented.
Sample image: 4Q552 ii–ii, 2
Material: Skin

Script: Late Hasmonean or early Herodian formal, slightly prior to 4QSam (Puech)

Proposed palaeographic date: 50–25 BCE (Puech)

Special traits and general comments: This is a very carefully-prepared and neatly-written manuscript, virtually free of mistakes in the little text preserved. The margins of 4Q552 are similar in size to good or very good manuscripts like 4Q208 (Enastra) and 4Q534 (Birth of Noah), but somewhat smaller than the best ones (e.g., 1Q20 [apGen], 4Q209 [Enastr]). We can see in frag. 1i that the scribe used at least small vacats to indicate minor breaks in running dialogue. Another notable practice in frag. 1i is the scribe’s justification of the last word of a line with the left-hand column guideline, often leaving a conspicuous gap between the penultimate and final words of lines. This same practice occurs in 4Q203/204 (EnGiants/En) and 4Q554 (NJ). The scribal practice is otherwise typical of the corpus more widely, with the scribe using a lamed for the prefix-conjugation verb הוהי, the short form of dem. pronoun ה, and full spellings with aleph. A relatively rare use of the fem. dem. pronoun היא is found in 3.1. Little can be said with confidence on the topic of syntax, other than that the scribe frequently placed the verb early with an implied subject (again, typical of Qumran Aramaic) and quite often placed an object suffix on the main verb.

Original manuscript quality: Very good

Corrections and scribal features:

(a) Supralinear vav or yod added (1.10):

Language

Syntax

Verb-subject (verb early in clause):

\[ i+2.6, \text{iii.2} \]

Subject-verb (verb early in clause):

\[ i+2.9, i+2.10(?), \text{iii.1, iii.4(?)} \]

Subject implied (verb early in clause):

\[ i+2.5(?), i+2.6(?), i+2.8, i+2.9, \text{iii.2, iii.2(?), iii.3(3x), iii.5(2x), iii.8, iii.9, iii.11, 3.1, 3.2(?)} \]

Verbless clause:

\[ \text{iii.5, iii.6, iii.8, iii.9, 3.1} \]

Periphrastic construction (past/future continuative action):

Finite form of הוה + participle:

\[ i+2.9, \text{iii.4} \]

Lexical items:

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{דיל} \text{(ב): } & i+2.8 \\
\text{די} : & \text{iii.5, iii.6, iii.8, iii.9, 3.1}
\end{align*} \]

Morphology:

Object suffix on verb:

\[ \text{ii+2.9, iii.5, iii.8} \]

Assimilated nun:

\[ \text{ii+2.10} \]

Dissimilated nun/nasalization:

\[ \text{ii+2.9} \]

Orthography/Phonology:

2ms verbal affix הוה/והי:

\[ \text{5.11, 7 for /s/: } \text{iii.4} \]

Other notable features:

Proposed Hebraisms:

\[ \text{מחוזא (lexical; 6.10) [H]} \]

\[ \text{אל עליון (lexical; 6.10) [H]} \]

Content synopsis and significance: 4Q553 is one of three manuscripts associated with a previously unknown text, referred to by Puech and others as the Four Kingdoms (see also 4Q552 [Four Kingdoms\textsuperscript{a}] and 4Q553a [Four Kingdoms\textsuperscript{b}]). For a fuller summary of the composition and explanation of the significance of its dream-vision, see the profile on 4Q552 (Four Kingdoms\textsuperscript{a}). A sizeable portion of 4Q553 overlaps with frag. iii of 4Q552 (Four Kingdoms\textsuperscript{a}), the visionary portion of the text telling of four trees that stand for four kingdoms. It is important to note that, while “Babylon” is clearly named as the first kingdom in both manuscripts, Puech’s reconstruction of “Media” as the name of the second kingdom in 4Q553 has met with severe criticism. Hogeterp (“Daniel,” 178) accepts Puech’s reading at face value, but a number of other interpreters have rejected the proposal, including Perrin (Dynamics, 215–16), Reynolds (Symbolism, 206), and Sharon (“Four Kingdoms,” 213–14). Puech noted two verbal correspondences between 4Q553 and 4Q246 (apocrDan; the so-called Son of God text), namely, the use of the
phrase בשם ("by his name" in ii.i.5; cf. 4Q246 [apocrDan] ii.9) and the term שלט ("his dominion," Puech’s reconstruction at iii.4). The latter term is common in the Aramaic texts from Qumran (4Q246 [apocrDan] iii.9; cf. 4Q550 [Jews at the Persian Court] 1.6, 7; 1Q2o [apGen] 9.3; Dan 4). Machiela (“Connections”) observed similar connections between Four Kingdoms and the Visions of Amram. 4Q553 mentions the name of Moses (משה) in a somewhat broken context. While Moses does not often figure into the narrative texts among the Aramaic texts kept at Qumran, he is also mentioned in Tobit and the Visions of Amram (Tob 1:8; 6:13; 7:11, 12, 14; 4Q545 [Visions of Amram]) 4.15).

Material remains: The four numbered fragments of this manuscript are actually formed from several smaller pieces, originally joined by Jean Starcky. If Starcky’s arrangement of the fragments is correct, it would suggest that the remains of 4Q553 cover portions of three consecutive columns (the first, frag. 2i; the second, a combination of frags. ii and 3+2ii+4; and the third, frag. iii). Puech considers this possibility, but also expresses some ambivalence about it, noting that we may actually have the remains of four columns. In any case, Starcky’s collation of frags. 3+2ii+4 as belonging to a single column seems secure, given the overlapping material that it shares with 4Q552 (Four Kingdoms4). Based on this arrangement, Puech attempted to reconstruct the dimensions of the scroll’s columns (13 to 13.5 cm wide, with seven lines). An intercolumnar margin with a seam between two sheets is quite well preserved between cols. i and ii of frag. 1. A fairly sizable upper margin is present on the same fragment, while frag. 2 contains both lower and intercolumnar margins (the latter with no seam).

Notes on provenance: Tigchelaar identified 4Q553 4 on the “E series” PAM plate 40.978. The fragments in this series of plates were found in the official excavations of Cave 4 on September 22–29, 1952, directed by de Vaux (Strugnell, “Photographing,” 124, 131–32). While the discovery of the remaining pieces of 4Q553 in Cave 4 is assured, the mode of their discovery was not documented.
Material: Skin

Script: Hasmonean semi-cursive, with some traces of semi-formal style (Puech)

Proposed palaeographic date: 100–50 BCE (Puech)

Special traits and general comments: The physical layout of this manuscript is more generous in its spacing than 4Q552 (Four Kingdoms⁵), and the scribe of 4Q553 also used significantly larger vacats for the same type of narrative pauses in dialogue. At the same time, the scribe of 4Q553 wrote in a slightly less controlled, tidy hand than the scribe of 4Q552 (Four Kingdoms⁵), occasionally using some cursive letters (e.g., the tav switches back and forth between more formal and more cursive forms). In other respects, the scribe of 4Q553 abided by the conventions typical of most Qumran Aramaic scrolls, with orthographic, morphological, and syntactic characteristics mirroring those in 4Q552 (Four Kingdoms⁵). If we accept Puech’s relative palaeographic dating, 4Q553 appears to be the earlier of the two copies.

Puech noted, based on autopsy, that there are very lightly traced horizontal script lines (DJD 37:73), though these are not visible in the images. The regular line spacing across columns on frag. 2 confirms his testimony.

Original manuscript quality: Very good


### Profile of Physical Layout

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Margin</th>
<th>Width</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>1.8 cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>At least 1.3 cm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intercolumnar</th>
<th>Approx. 1.7 cm (frag. 2); or approx. 1.5 cm (frag. 1; across seam); 3–7 mm (frag. 3; to seam)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Column dimensions | 13–13.5 cm w. (Puech’s reconstructed col. 2) |

| Lines per column  | At least 7 (Puech’s reconstructed col. 2) |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scribal guidelines</th>
<th>Horizontal script lines: Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vertical column lines: None visible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average medial letter height</th>
<th>2.5–3 mm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Space between lines | 8–10 mm |

| Space between words   | 1–2 mm |

| Vacats               | Small (3+ii+4.5 [5 mm]); medium (3+ii+4.1 [14]); 3+ii+4.4 [18 mm]); all minor sense divisions |

**Script sample:**

![Script sample image]
Corrections and scribal features:

(a) Supralinear letters added (3.3–4):

Language

Syntax

Verb-subject (verb early in clause):

3+2ii+4.2

Subject implied (verb early in clause):

2i.5, 3+2ii+4.1(?), 3+2ii+4.3(4x), 3+2ii+4.4(?),
3+2ii+4.4(2x), 3+2ii+4.5(2x), 3+2ii+4.6(?)

Verbless clause:

3+2ii+4.4, 3+2ii+4.5–6

Lexical items:

די:

1i.3, 1i.5, 2i.3, 2i.4, 3+2ii+4.2
cדי:

2i.6

Morphology:

אתפעל form:

1i.4

Object suffix on verb:

3+2ii+4.4, 3+2ii+4.5

Content synopsis and significance:

Starcky had originally grouped the fragments comprising 4Q553a with those of 4Q553 (Four Kingdoms\(^b\)) using the siglum ‘Sy 20.’ Puech subdivided Starcky’s copy into two, based in part on linguistic considerations and in part on palaeography (DJD 37:81–90). As a result, Puech tentatively included 4Q553a as one of three manuscripts discussed under the title Four Kingdoms, along with 4Q552 (Four Kingdoms\(^b\)) and 4Q553 (Four Kingdoms\(^b\)). However, unlike 4Q552 (Four Kingdoms\(^b\)) and 4Q553 (Four Kingdoms\(^b\)), the extant fragments of 4Q553a do not bear clear evidence of the four-kingdoms schema, nor are there any obvious overlaps between 4Q553a and the other two manuscripts. As a result, Puech could not definitively state that 4Q553a is a part of the same composition as 4Q552 (Four Kingdoms\(^b\)) and 4Q553 (Four Kingdoms\(^b\)). That being said, he rightly notes that the references to dream-visions, angels, and trees found in 4Q553a indicate that it shares in the "same literary genre" as the other two Four Kingdoms manuscripts.

The extant text of 4Q553a is very fragmentary, and the lack of running narrative prevents one from saying much about its contents. The vocabulary of 4Q553a is reminiscent of many other visionary compositions from the Aramaic Scrolls. Angels are referred to twice (2i.1, 2; cf. 1Q20 [apGen] 15.14; 4Q213a [Levi\(^b\)] 2.18; 4Q529 [Words of Michael] 1.1, 4Q552 [Four Kingdoms\(^b\)] 1.5), trees may be mentioned (on which, see below; 7.2, 3; cf. 4Q201 [En\(^c\)] iii.4, 5; 4Q204 [En\(^c\)] ii.48, xii.26; 4Q211 [Enastr\(^d\)] ii.4, 5; 4Q552 [Four Kingdoms\(^b\)] ii.1, 2, 4, 11; 4Q553 [Four Kingdoms\(^b\)] 6ii.2, 5; 10.2, 3), and there is a reference to the heavens (6.1; cf. 4Q204 [En\(^e\)] 5ii.27; 4Q209 [Enastr\(^d\)] 23.2, 5, 6, 7; 4Q213a [Levi\(^b\)] ii.8; iii.16–18; 4Q530 [EnGiants\(^b\)] 7ii.11). The phrase “and I saw” (וחזית) occurs once, in a very broken context, which strongly suggests the report of a vision based on the phrase’s use to describe visionary experiences elsewhere in the Qumran Aramaic corpus (cf. 1Q20 [apGen] 19.14; 2Q24 [NJ] 4.11; 4Q204 [En\(^e\)] xii.5; 4Q213a [Levi\(^b\)] 2.16; 4Q529 [Words of Michael] 1.4: 4Q537 [TJacob?] 1+2+3.5; Dan 7). Puech draws a parallel between 4Q553a and the Enochic Animal Apocalypse (1 En. 85–90) due the occurrence of the phrase “calves and lambs” in 4Q553a 10. Given this association, it is worth considering afresh two of Puech’s reconstructions or interpretations of words in
4Q553a. On frag. 7, he reconstructs twice the noun “tree” (‘אילֶנֶ) from the readings ָאיל (7.2) and ֶאיל (7.3). Based on the mention of calves and lambs on frag. 10, both occurrences may be better interpreted as the noun “ram” (‘איל). This, of course, would change our understanding of the scroll appreciably, in particular its possible relationship to 4Q552–553 (Four Kingdomsᵃᵇ). It would also strengthen the scroll’s connection with the Animal Apocalypse (with the preceding ר “master” in 4Q553a 7.2, compare 1 En. 89:42–43). Although the context is broken, one also wonders whether the reading ָסמה in 2ii.4 (the last letter is uncertain), which Puech takes to mean “eliminate,” might refer to blindness, as in the Animal Apocalypse.

Material remains: Puech groups under the siglum 4Q553a the fragments of PAM 43.579 not included in his 4Q553 (Four Kingdomsᵇ), but he warns that we cannot know with certainty whether all of the fragments not belonging to 4Q553 (Four Kingdomsᵃ) derive from the same manuscript (DJD 37:81). Puech organized the eleven small fragments into two, distinct sub-groups on the basis of their material features: frags. 1–3 and frags. 4–11. He argued that the former grouping attests to between three and five columns, while the latter group attests to at least two columns. The extant fragments vary considerably in size and shape, though none of them is much larger than a postage stamp, and several are considerably smaller than this (i.e., frags. 8, 9, and 11). Frags. 1, 2, and 3 contain (or may contain) intercolumnar margins, frag. 3 having in its margin a seam with the plant-based thread still well preserved.

Notes on provenance: Tigchelaar identified 4Q553a 1 on the “E series” PAM plate 40.976. The fragments in this series of plates were found in the official excavations of Cave 4 on September 22–29, 1952, directed by de Vaux (Strugnell, “Photographing,” 124, 131–32). While the discovery of the remaining pieces of 4Q553a in Cave 4 is assured, the mode of their discovery was not documented.

Sample image: 4Q553a, 2, 3 (Not a proposed arrangement of the fragments)
Material: Skin

Script: Late Hasmonean semi-cursive (Puech)

Proposed palaeographic date: 75–25 BCE (Puech)

Special traits and general comments: Little can be said about this collection of fragments, all of which may not even belong to the same scroll. Very little text is preserved, and what is preserved does not show significant idiosyncrasies relative to the broader Qumran Aramaic corpus. We do find a medial mem used in final position at 3ii.2, and the scribe may have varied between formal and cursive tav (though we do not have both styles used on the same fragment). Compared to 4Q552 (Four Kingdomsα) and 4Q553 (Four Kingdomsβ), the scribe of 4Q553a generally seems slightly more erratic in style. The “good” assessment of manuscript quality below is very tentative, based on too small a sample to be made with confidence.

Original manuscript quality: Good


Profile of physical layout

Margins:

Intercolumnar: Approx. 1.2 cm (frag. 2) to 1.5 cm (frag. 3; across seam joining sheets)

Scribal guidelines:

Horizontal script lines: Yes (so Puech; frags. 2–3)

Vertical column lines: None visible (perhaps on frag. 2?)

Average medial letter height: 2–3 mm

Space between lines: 7–10 mm

Space between words: 1–3 mm

Vacats: None preserved

Script sample:

 Corrections and scribal features:

(a) Possible supralinear letter added (10.2):

Language

Syntax

Subject implied (verb early in clause):

3ii.2(?), 7.1, 9.3(?)
Content synopsis and significance: 4Q550 centers on two apparent Judeans with Persian names, Patireza and Bagasrav. In this very fragmentary, otherwise unknown text we learn that the two men served in the courts of the Persian Kings Darius and Xerxes, respectively. The later fragments of the text, as ordered by Puech, recount Bagasrav's conflict with an antagonist named Bagoshi. Unfortunately, many details of the narrative are now obscured due to the fragmentary nature of the scroll. In fact, there is some debate as to whether 4Q550 tells a single, coherent story (e.g., Talmon, “Book of Esther”) or two distinct tales, one about Patireza and the other about Bagasrav, understood as two unrelated figures (e.g., Wechsler, “Para-Biblical”). While the phrase “to Patireza, your father” in 1.1 implies a second protagonist in the parts of the story mentioning Patireza, Patireza and Bagasrav are never named together on the same fragment, and so their familial connection cannot be established with certainty. In the editio princeps, Puech weighed both of the options above, and concluded that 4Q550 tells a single story about Patireza and his son Bagasrav, serving under successive Persian kings (DJD 37:6–7). In Milik’s initial, influential publication of these fragments (“Les modèles”), he identified 4Q550 as the “modèles,” “archétypes,” or “sources” underlying the book of Esther. Milik’s proposal led to significant debate over the relationship between 4Q550 and Esther, the latter being otherwise unattested at Qumran (see White Crawford, “Esther”; Talmon, “Book of Esther”; Collins and Green, “Persian Court”). Despite some striking verbal and thematic similarities, it is difficult to prove direct literary dependence or establish a specific tradition-historical relationship between the two texts. What can be said is that both 4Q550 and Esther participate in the wider literary phenomenon of the Jewish court tale. The hallmarks of this genre include rivalries between Jewish and non-Jewish courtiers, the ascendancy of Jewish courtiers to positions of power as a result of their skill and righteousness, and the foreign king being led to confess the greatness of Israel’s God. All of these traits are found in 4Q550, as in the Aramaic literature focused on Daniel found at Qumran (see, e.g., the profile for 4Q532 [Four Kingdoms*]). There are also telling verbal correspondences between 4Q550 and other Aramaic court tales, such as use of the temporal phrase אַלְכְּבָה בֶּן בָּשָׂר (a defective spelling of שָׂר בֶּן בָּשָׂר) “in that very hour” in 4Q550 1.3, also found in Dan 36, 15:4:33, and 55. 4Q550 contains some striking correspondences to the narrative frame of the Tale of Ahiqar, as Puech frequently pointed out in the notes to his edition. Beyond its affinities with texts typically characterized by scholars as court tales, 4Q550 shares important connections with other Aramaic texts from Qumran. The story is set in the post-exilic period, a characteristic feature of a large number of the Aramaic texts kept at Qumran (see Dimant, “Qumran Aramaic,” “Themes”; Tigchelaar, “Visionary”; Ben Dow, Astronomy). There is an interest in books, writing, and scrolls (1.4–7; cf. 1Q20 [apGen] 5:29; 19:35; 4Q529 [Words of Michael] 1–6; 4Q539 [EnGiants*] ii.18–19; 4Q541 [apocrLevi*] 7.2, 4; 4Q542 [TQahat] iii.12; 4Q543 [Visions of Amram*] 1.1; 4Q547 [Visions of Amram*] 4.8). One of the protagonists is described as שֵׁסָה “righteous,” like many other characters in the Aramaic literature from Qumran (4.3; cf. Tob 1.3; 1 En. 15:4; 1Q20 [apGen] 6:1–6). Israel's God is referred to with universalizing epithets, such as אֱלֹהִים Most High (7:7a.1; cf. 1Q20 [apGen] 2.4; 6:24; 18:18; 4Q568 [Prophecy*] 1.1) and שֶׁלֶט “Ruler” (7:7a.1; cf. 1Q20 [apGen] 2.13; 4Q542 [TQahat] ii.12). Finally, the edict in 1.5–7, claimed to have been written by Darius, shares clear verbal and structural parallels with the epistle in 4Q203 (EnGiants*) 8.6, which was said to have been written by Enoch. Most notable among these parallels is the phrase יְבַע לְבָנָה יִשְׁרֵי יְשֵׁי “let it be known to you that...” (1.7; see also Ezra 4:12; 3:58; TAD A6.8; TAD A6.10; cf. Doering, Letters, 170–89). In fact, both texts reflect standard epistolary conventions known to exist in the Persian and Hellenistic periods based on caches of Aramaic documents from Elephantine, Bactria, and Samaria dating from the fifth to third centuries BCE. This knowledge is beautifully illustrated in the detailed description of the “si[ngle] scroll [seal]ed with seven seal[s],” along with the inscription on the outside of the sealed scroll, in 1.5–6. These features are regularly found on documents from the Elephantine, Bactria, and Samaria corpora, including scrolls sealed with seven seals. In addition to formal features, the contents of Darius’s edict in 1.5–7 bear a striking resemblance to the Behistun inscription of Darius 1, especially in the advice given to future rulers. The content is so similar that it is not unreasonable to suppose detailed knowledge of the Behistun inscription of Darius 1, especially in the advice given to future rulers. The content is so similar that it is not unreasonable to suppose detailed knowledge of the Behistun decree on the part of whoever composed Jews at the Persian Court. Whoever composed the story copied in 4Q550 was clearly very well-educated, familiar with a wide array of literature and literary conventions.

Material remains: Puech assigned sixteen fragments to this scroll, though several of them are combinations of smaller pieces (there are at least twenty-three pieces comprising...
Puech's sixteen fragments). Significant portions of five columns are extant, giving a basic sense of some of the scroll's dimensions. The best-preserved column is 7 (frags. 7+7a), the outside dimensions of which (including margins) are around 6 by 16 cm. The skin is in many places wrinkled, shrunken, or contorted, and so the measurements are only approximate. It should be noted that Milik (“Les modèles,” 361–63) included as part of 4Q550 a fragment not present in Starcky's original grouping (Starcky, and initially Milik, had placed it with 4Q537 [TJacob?]), containing what seems to be part of an historical apocalyptic narrative to which Milik gave the siglum 4QprEsther. The contents of the fragment would add a new conceptual dimension to the text and has been included in some editions, such as that of García-Martínez and Tigchelaar (DSSSE, 1102–3; there it is given the siglum 4Q550e). Puech rejected Milik's inclusion of the fragment, and instead numbered it as 4Q583 (Prophecy; DJD 37:447–52), a decision with which I agree. 4Q550 is the only known copy of this text.

An ink mark in the shape of a circle intersected by an “x” should be noted on the verso of frag. 1. When compared with other available images of the verso sides of Qumran fragments, it is clear that the mark is a “G,” stamped onto the manuscript at an early stage of the modern cataloguing process. This letter identifies the fragment as part of the “G series,” on which see the Notes on provenance section, below. The “G” stands for “Government,” signifying a fragment purchased by the Jordanian government from the Bedouin, and therefore not found in the official excavations directed by Roland de Vaux. Similar “G” marks can be seen, for example, on the versos of 4Q84 (Ps²) 25, 4Q434 (Barkhi Nafshi) 7, 4Q525 (Beatitudes) 14, and 4Q571 (Words of Michael) 1.

Notes on provenance: Some fragments of 4Q550 were photographed on the PAM “G series” plates 40.585 and 40.590. The fragments in this series of images were discovered by the Bedouin in Cave 4, in 1952 (Strugnell, “Photographing,” 124, 131–32). The origins of the remaining fragments of 4Q550 were not clearly documented, though they most likely were also discovered in Cave 4 by the Bedouin.
**Profile of Physical Layout**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scroll dimensions:</th>
<th>Approx. 6–6.5 cm h. x at least 1.5 m l. (Puech’s estimate)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Margins:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper:</td>
<td>6–10 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower:</td>
<td>7–12 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercolumnar:</td>
<td>At least 6–11 mm (frags. 1, 2, 5, 7); 1–7 mm to sewn sheet seam at left margin (frags 1, 3, 5a) and 1 cm at right margin (frag. 6b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column dimensions:</td>
<td>3.75–4.75 cm h. x approx. 13–15 cm w.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lines per column:</td>
<td>7–8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters per line:</td>
<td>Approx. 50–60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scribal guidelines:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horizontal script lines:</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vertical column lines:</td>
<td>Yes, both sides of column (frag. 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average medial letter height:</td>
<td>2.5–4 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space between lines:</td>
<td>5–9 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacats:</td>
<td>Yes; large (7.7 [8 cm]; end of manuscript or composition?); others are possible, but not assured</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Material:** Skin

**Script:** Hasmonean semi-formal, with some influence of semi-cursive style (Puech)

**Proposed palaeographic date:** 100–50 BCE (Puech)

**Special traits and general comments:** A number of large fragments of this manuscript are preserved, allowing us to achieve a relatively good sense of its overall size and the dimensions of its columns. Puech found evidence of at least six sheets and up to twelve columns, with portions of approximately ten columns remaining. Four seams between sheets are partially preserved (frags. 1, 3, 5a, 6b). The copy was laid out with columns that were relatively short in height, appearing to have averaged around 4.5 cm high and 14 cm long, with seven or eight lines of text. The scribal hand is quite neat and practiced, though there are several corrections (note that Puech’s suggested supralinear lamed at 6+6a–c.5 is actually a just hole in the leather), and no clear evidence for extensive use of vacats. The only unambiguous case is at 7.7, with a vacat over half a line long that may well mark the end of the composition, as Puech proposed. In this case, we may possess the last sheet of the manuscript, suggesting that it was rolled at the center of the scroll when stored in Cave 4 in antiquity. The two other vacats suggested in Puech’s edition (8.1; 10.7) are subject to some hesitation. In the first case, there is no visible dry-ruled guideline, as in the following lines, and the preserved skin above the first line of script is only slightly larger than the upper margin of frag. 1 (which seems to have shrunken). As for 10.7, a similar logic applies, with skin preserved beneath that last written line of approximately the same size as the lower margin of frag. 5.

There is a significant amount of scribal variation in this manuscript. While all of the fragments have very similar physical characteristics, suggesting that they belong to a single scroll, there is often disparity in the way some characters are penned, even within the same fragment and in close proximity (e.g., the cursive and formal forms of tav in תיתיא [וש at 6.4]). Puech raised the possibility that two scribes are reflected (DJD 37:9), but at the end of his analysis concluded that it was more probably one scribe who vacillated between formal and cursive forms of some characters, and changed or re-cut his pen at some point. For characters where Puech has noted deviation, an effort was made to reflect this in the abecedary, below. As for linguistic character, we find relatively heavy use of phrases with תות, extensive verb-early clause constructions (as we would expect in a narrative of this sort), and fairly frequent use of object suffixes on verbs. An occurrence of the direct object marker י at 5+5a.7 is notable for two reasons: First, the particle is very rare in the Qumran Aramaic texts; and second, of the few occasions where it is used in the corpus, most are in clear imitation of Biblical Hebrew phrases that call for the Hebrew particle את (see the profiles for 4Q559 [Biblical Chronology] and 11Q10 [Job]). Only here and in the New Jerusalem do we find the particle used in a more “native” Aramaic setting, not clearly reliant on Biblical Hebrew. The orthography of 4Q550 is, generally speaking, full, though not exceptionally so. Dalet is used rather than zayin for the words ובברית and וביה. A notable exception...
to the expected orthographic conventions in this scroll is
the defective spelling of the noun שעתא “hour” as שטא at 1.3, which could conceivably be an error by the scribe. The probability of this being a mistake is somewhat lessened, however, by the rare, defective spelling of the pronoun הו as ח at 7+7a.1.

Original manuscript quality: Good


Script sample:

Representative sample of corrections and scribal features:

(a) Supralinear addition of the phrase “of all the [ea]rth” (1.6a): רעא מ[א]לו רך

Language

Syntax:

Verb-subject (verb early in clause):
1.4, 2.1, 2.2, 2.4, 4.4, 5+5a.1(part.), 6+6a+6b+6c.6, 6+6a+6b+6c.7, 7+7a.3

Subject-verb (verb early in clause):
1.4, 5+5a.4(part.), 5+5a.5(part.; 2x[?]), 5+5a.6(part.), 6+6a+6b+6c.1(?), 6+6a+6b+6c.2(?), 6+6a+6b+6c.3(2x?), 6+6a+6b+6c.4, 7+7a.1(part.), 7+7a.2, 7+7a.5(part.), 7+7a.6(part.)

Verb-subject (verb later in clause):
1.5

Subject implied (verb early in clause):
1.6(3x), 2.7, 4.2, 5+5a.2, 5+5a.2(?), 5+5a.4, 5+5a.6(2x), 5+5a.7, 6+6a+6b+6c.8(?), 6+6a+6b+6c.8, 7+7a.1, 7+7a.3(?), 7+7a.7(?)

Verbless clause:
7+7a.1(2x)

Direct object marker (if present):
5+5a.7

Use of י to mark genitive relationship:
1.4, 1.5, 10.6(?)

Verb of movement + לע + inanimate object:
4.2, 7+7a.6(?)

Verb of movement + ל + inanimate object:
6+6a+6b+6c.6, 6+6a+6b+6c.7

Periphrastic construction (past/future continuative action):

Finite form of וה + participle:
4.3(?)

Participle + finite form of וה:
1.7

Lexical items:
איתי: 2.1, 2.3, 6+6a+6b+6c.5(?), 7+7a.2
אדין: 6+6a+6b+6c.6(?), 6+6a+6b+6c.7
Content synopsis and significance: The text preserved on this manuscript has proven to be something of an enigma among the Aramaic scrolls from Qumran. Enough of the text remains to show beyond doubt that it is a fairly literal translation into Aramaic of some verses from a description of the Day of Atonement ritual in Leviticus 16. On the two extant fragments we find small bits of Lev 16:12–15 and 16:18–21, mostly preserving only partial words (there are twenty-three complete words in total). If we exclude the more literal segments of the Genesis Apocryphon (1Q20), 4Q156 is the only known Aramaic translation of a passage from the Pentateuch dating to the Second Temple period, marking it as a highly significant text in view of the broader Qumran Aramaic corpus. Predating the two Job translations from Qumran on palaeographic grounds, this manuscript is also the earliest surviving translation of a passage from the Hebrew Bible into Aramaic. However, scholars have debated what to make of this discovery. Beginning with the original DJD publication of Milik, some have suggested that 4Q156 attests, along with 11Q10 (Job) and 4Q157 (Job), to a Second Temple period translation tradition that may be genealogically related to later Jewish (rabbinic) targums. This approach seems to assume that 4Q156 represents a translation of the entire Hebrew book of Leviticus, or at least a significant portion of it. Other scholars (e.g., Fitzmyer, “Targum”; Stuckenbruck and Freedman, “Fragments”) have cautioned that this may have been something other than a “targum,” such as a liturgical text (suggested as a possibility already by Milik) or part of a larger Aramaic composition that might resemble, for example, the New Jerusalem text. Even if the latter option were correct, the very close adherence of 4Q156 to the Hebrew text of Leviticus is noteworthy. Although this adherence is striking, Stuckenbruck and Freedman (cf. appendix by M. Kasher in DJD 6:92–93) have rightly pointed out a number of places where 4Q156 stands in notable disagreement with the later Pentateuch targums. This is one reason to remain suspicious of suggestions about genealogical relationships between 4Q156 and the later rabbinic targums. Moreover, even among the scanty remains of 4Q156 we find some rather free translation, at least when compared to known Hebrew and Greek versions of Leviticus (these variations also do not resemble anything preserved in cols. 25–27 of the Temple Scroll [11Q19]). The first variation occurs in 1.6, where 4Q156 omits the Hebrew locative פנים of Lev 16:14, and displaces to a later verse the notification that the blood of the bull is to be sprinkled “to the east” (Heb. קדימה; לימדה in 4Q156) of the cover of the ark. At 2.4, the beginning of Lev 16:20 was rewritten slightly to provide a clearer temporal progression for the actions of the high priest (see Material remains, below). Among the other notable features of this translation, we find that the Hebrew כפרת (“place of atonement”) is uniquely translated with the word כסא (“cover, lid,”) and את-הקדש (“the holy place”) of Lev 16:20 with the phrase על בית קדשה.

Material remains: We possess two medium-sized, irregularly-shaped fragments of this scroll, the smaller of which (5×5 cm) is roughly the size of the large fragment of 4Q156, Leviticus? (Lev?)

[ed. Milik, DJD 6:86–89]
4Q157, and contains seven partial lines of text. The slightly larger second fragment also has seven partial lines, but is several centimeters wider than frag. 1. While the transcriptions of Milik and Beyer are largely accurate, each has problems, some of which affect how we understand the text and its reconstruction. First, Milik and Kasher are almost surely correct in transcribing a kaph in the phrase פֶּּנֶּה יִמָּךְ וּמַלָּא at 1.2, despite the insistence of other scholars (Beyer, Stuckenbruck and Freedman) that it is a bet. The latter reading allows these scholars to read the word as בַּשְׁלַח ([“he[rs]”]), which is then related to the later targums. While this is convenient for their theories, the problem is that this scribe distinguishes clearly between bet and kaph (as do many Qumran scribes), and the relevant letter at 1.2 matches kaph much better than bet – it should thus be read as a kaph. The spacing of the reconstructions of Milik and Beyer, יַרְדֵּנָה וּמַלָּא in 2.1, יָדְּרֵנָה וּמַלָּא in 2.3, and יָדְּרֵנָה וּמַלָּא in 2.4 is off badly.

In the first, there is too much space for [ם] alone, and the preserved ink traces read as יַרְדֵּנָה וּמַלָּא must represent something slightly later in the text, such as יָדְּרֵנָה וּמַלָּא. Conversely, there is not enough space for יָדְּרֵנָה וּמַלָּא in 2.3. As for 2.4, there is considerably more space before the he than allowed by Milik and Beyer. Each has the approximately eight to nine letter spaces, whereas in fact there are at least twelve spaces. A plausible reconstruction, given the available space, is יָדְּרֵנָה וּמַלָּא.

Notes on provenance: Fragment 1 of 4Q156 is found on the early Pam “G series” plate 40.617, meaning that this fragment was among those discovered by Bedouin in 1952 (see Strugnell, “Photographing,” 124, 131–32). The origins of the remaining fragments of the scroll were not clearly documented, though they most likely were also discovered in Cave 4 by the Bedouin.

Sample image: 4Q156 fragments 1 and 2 (Not a proposed arrangement of the fragments)
Image B-284476
COURTESY OF THE LEON LEVY DEAD SEA SCROLLS DIGITAL LIBRARY, ISRAEL ANTIQUITIES AUTHORITY. PHOTO: NAJIB ANTON ALBINA
Material: Skin

Script: Hasmonean semi-formal

Proposed palaeographic date: Second century BCE (Milik)

Special traits and general comments: The most striking characteristic in this manuscript is undoubtedly the scribe's use of two vertical dots (a dicolon) to mark a pause between small sense-units in the text (cf. Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 138–39). There are nine dicola either legible or reconstructed with some confidence, six of which correspond to the Masoretic sof pasaq dicolon (i.e., end of verse), two to the Masoretic atrakh, and one to a natural break in Lev 16:21 lacking either of these marks in the Masorah. Eight of the nine dicola precede a conjunctive vav and a verb indicating a new action in the narrative, the one exception being a more clearly marked temporal progression in 2.4, in which the conjunctive vav is replaced by כָּלְדָי ("when"). This scribal trait sets 4Q156 apart among other Qumran Aramaic texts, and has been claimed by some as unique in the entire scrolls corpus at Qumran. The latter claim is true only if referring to the type of use, as a punctuation sign between small sense-units, since dicola are systematically used in 4Q364 (Reworked Pent B) before the Tetragrammaton (Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 220).

Beyer (ATTM*, ATTM2*) compared the use of this scribal mark to those used in both cuneiform texts from Uruk and Greek texts, although he gave very few details about the similarities. Given that other Jewish manuscripts from Qumran contain signs that are obviously Greek in derivation, such as the ancora and paragraphos (cf. Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 178–88), it is worth seriously considering whether the scribe of 4Q156 employed dicola following the Greek tradition, albeit adapted to a different linguistic situation. This punctuation mark, identical in appearance to the marks in 4Q156, was used by scribes of Greek texts as early as the fourth century BCE to signal minor transitions or progressions in thought. A number of scholars have produced the example of Platonic dialogues, observing that the dicolon is used there to mark the frequent changes in speaker (e.g., Turner and Parsons, *Greek Manuscripts*, 9; Johnson, *Bookrolls*, 271–73). While this is true, it is notable that in a manuscript like Oxyrhynchus 2181 (Plato, *Phaedo*) the dicolon represents a change in speaker less than half of the time, and more often signals a minor pause within the speech of an individual. Thus, while use of the dicolon in Greek manuscripts and 4Q156 is not exactly the same, the sign's general use to mark a minor pause and narrative progression is very similar. In Greek manuscripts, dicola can occur with around the same frequency as we see in 4Q156, depending on the nature of the text, and it seems to me most likely that the practice of 4Q156 is inherited from the realm of Greek scribal production (cf. Angerstorfer, “Toratargums,” 22, 33; contra Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 139).

Aside from the remarkable use of the dicolon, this manuscript is quite typical for those found at Qumran. Ruled guidelines are not visible on the images, and the line spacing varies appreciably, especially between the two fragments, with frag. 1 being more tightly spaced than frag. 2. Although the fragments are missing only approximately three verses from Leviticus between them, this difference in spacing may suggest that the fragments come from two successive columns. The scribe wrote in a well-trained,
Hasmonean semi-formal hand, and Stuckenbruck and Freedman (“Fragments,” 93) have observed that a more conservative (or defective) spelling style is used. Letter size and shape varies slightly more than we might expect within the highest quality manuscripts, but the small amount of preserved text exhibits no mistakes or corrections. The translation follows Hebrew Leviticus quite closely, and this includes the predominantly verb-early syntax of the source text.

**Original manuscript quality**: Very good


**Script sample:**

Representative sample of corrections and scribal features:

(a) Two dots (dicolon) used to indicate minor sense-divisions (1.6):

Language

**Syntax**

*Verb-subject (verb early in clause)*:
1.4, 2.5

*Subject implied (verb early in clause)*:
1.3, 1.5(2x), 1.7, 2.1(?), 2.3(2x), 2.6

*Subject implied (verb later in clause)*:
1.6–7

**Lexical items**

כדי: 21.6

Morphology:

*Object suffix on verb*:
2.3(2x)

*Assimilated nun*:
1.7

**Other notable features**:

*Proposed Hebraisms*:

ֶלָּהְדִּי (lexical; 1.3) [H]
**4Q157, Job**  
[ed. Milik, DJD 639]

**Material remains:** Two fragments of this scroll have been identified, the outer dimensions of the first being slightly smaller than a modern-day playing card, while the second is only a fraction of this size. Fragment 1 contains portions of two columns, with ten partially-preserved lines of writing at its greatest height (col. 2). It also has a nicely-preserved intercolumnar margin. In 1i.4, the last letter (left untranscribed by Milik) may be read as כ, probably part of the word בה = (Heb. ב) from the end of Job 3:7. Fragment 2 has only small bits of two lines, of which the few extant words have been partly effaced. Neither Milik nor Beyer transcribed frag. 2, though some letters can be read. Line one begins with a 7 mm vacat, followed by the letters א and ו. The following line contains a single word, of which all that may presently be read is מ.beans. The critical second letter has a horizontal upper stroke, like that of a dalet of kaph, but is largely effaced. I have not been able to determine the location of the fragment vis-à-vis the Hebrew book of Job based on these scanty remains, though see now the proposal of Puech (“Le targum”). On Milik’s proposed reading בעפרה at 1ii.4, see below.

**Notes on provenance:** The fragments of 4Q157 are not found on the early “E series” or “G series” PAM plates. While their discovery in Cave 4 is assured, the mode of that discovery was not documented.
**Profile of Physical Layout**

**Margins:**

- Intercolumnar: 1.3 cm

**Lines per column:** At least 10

**Scribal guidelines:**

- Horizontal script lines: Yes
- Vertical column lines: Yes, both sides of column

**Average medial letter height:** 1.5–2 mm

**Space between lines:** 4–5 mm

**Space between words:** 0.5–1 mm

**Vacats:** Yes; medium (1i.4 [1.2 cm]; minor sense division), cf. frag. 2.1

---

**Material:** Skin

**Script:** Developed Herodian (Milik); late Herodian (Puech)

**Proposed palaeographic date:** 1–50 CE (Milik); 25–50 CE (Puech)

**Special traits and general comments:** This manuscript is made from high-quality, lightly-colored leather. It is neatly spaced with clear ruling and a fairly generous margin between the two preserved columns. The vertical guideline, providing the scribe with the right side of the column, is more deeply incised than the other lines on the large fragment. The writing and spacing is slightly more compact than in many of the Qumran manuscripts, comparable, for example, to 4Q529 (Words of Michael). The scribe wrote in a well-trained, Herodian-period style, with some of the calligraphic flourishes also present in 11Q10 (Job) (though the scribes are clearly different). There are two preserved vacats, with that at 1ii.7 corresponding to a verse break in MT Job. Little weight should be placed on the absence of scribal errors, given the small amount of preserved text.

Regarding orthography and morphology, 4Q157 exhibits some of the traits also seen in 11Q10 (Job). We find the prefixed preposition – מ rather than detached מ at 1i.2, and there is an increased use of the interrogative ה. However, Milik’s reading in the first case should be rejected, and I admit to strong reservations about the second. At 1i.4, there is definitely not enough room for a full dalet, especially since the scribe has assiduously kept within the ruled guideline at the right side of the column. A dalet would cause a very unlikely aberration, and we should therefore read בַּעֲפַרְתָּה, which also makes good sense of the verse.

**Original manuscript quality:** Very good

**Select bibliography:** Vasholz, “Targum Job”; Beyer, ATTM¹, 280–85; Mastin, “Re-Examination”; Puech, “Le targum.”

---

**Script sample:**

![Script sample image]

**Language**

**Syntax:**

- Verb-subject (verb early in clause):
  - iii.2
- Subject-verb (verb early in clause):
  - iii.4
- Subject implied (verb early in clause):
  - iii.6(?)
- Subject implied (verb later in clause):
  - iii.3(?), iii.5(?), iii.7
- Subject-verb (verb later in clause):
  - iii.8

Daniel Machiela - 9789004513815
**Content synopsis and significance:** This scroll is of considerable significance among the Aramaic works discovered in the Qumran caves, for several reasons. First, it is among the most extensively preserved Aramaic scrolls in the Qumran corpus, with a fragmentary translation of Hebrew Job 17:14–42:12 extant in thirty-nine partial columns. By all appearances, the underlying Hebrew text from which the translation was made resembled quite closely the later Masoretic Text of Job, though it seems to have differed in some minor respects (Sokoloff, *Job*, 6–8). The preserved translation begins in the midst of the second cycle of dialogues between Job and his three friends, at approximately the opening of Bildad’s second discourse (ch. 18). Various parts of the dialogues are preserved, including some of Job’s wisdom poem (ch. 28) and portions of Elihu’s speech. God’s reply to Job’s challenge and the concluding frame narrative (ch. 42) are partially extant, with the text breaking off due to physical damage only six verses short of the end of the book as it is preserved in Hebrew. Second, 11Q10 is one of very few examples of translation from Hebrew to Aramaic during the Second Temple period. Scholars quickly connected 11Q10 with the mention of a “targum” of Job in the Tosefta, Shabbat 13:2 (Lieberman edition), associated with the first century CE sage Rabbi Gamaliel I. Urbach and others have noted that it is not entirely clear whether the targum mentioned in this story was Aramaic or another language, such as Greek (Sokoloff, *Job*, 5), though Alexander (“Targum,” 167) is surely correct that Aramaic is much more likely. Others saw 11Q10 as proof that the rabbinic targums are the direct descendants of an earlier, Second Temple period practice of translating Hebrew scriptures into Aramaic. In some instances, this was closely linked to debates over the status of Hebrew and Aramaic in Palestine during the Second Temple period, and to the language(s) of Jesus (cf. Machiela, “Translation”). More recent studies have urged extreme caution over a simplistic linking of the Qumran translations with later rabbinic targums. David Shepherd (*Translation*), for example, demonstrated the significant stylistic differences between the Qumran Aramaic Job, which is a loosely paraphrastic translation akin to that of the Syriac Peshitta, and the rabbinic targums, which follow much more rigidly the syntax of the governing Hebrew source text. These dissimilar methods for representing the underlying Hebrew source reflect more fundamental differences in the purpose of each type of text – one being a “translation,” and the other a “targum” – thus throwing into question the soundness of any suggested correlation among 11Q10 and the rabbinic targums. Third, the literary character of this scroll, as a translation of an earlier Hebrew book, stands apart noticeably from most of the Qumran Aramaic corpus. The large majority of texts in the corpus were originally composed in Aramaic, and betray numerous affinities in both general literary style and specific concerns. A discussion related to the place of 11Q10 in the wider Aramaic corpus from Qumran has taken place around the particularities of the text’s Aramaic dialect. Muraoka (“Aramaic,” “Notes”), for example, drew attention to linguistic features that suggest an “eastern” derivation, which he compared with the more “western” language of a scroll like 1Q20 (apGen). The latter text coheres better with the Aramaic of the Qumran corpus more broadly. The only other text linked unmistakably with 11Q10 in terms of genre is 4Q157 (*Job*), another translation of *Job* from Cave 4. The translation of a brief passage of Leviticus (4Q156 [Lev?]) into Aramaic is more ambiguous, and its genre has been debated. When viewed against the wider backdrop of the Qumran texts, 11Q10 is a very rare, relatively well-preserved example of Aramaic translation from the Second Temple period, a translation that, incidentally, attests to the highly venerated status of Hebrew *Job* in at least some Jewish communities at the time.

**Material remains:** 11Q10 was found as a rolled scroll approximately 14 cm in height, which was heavily gelatinized from centuries of storage in Cave 11, especially at the scroll’s top and bottom. Unfortunately, the gelatinized portions mostly crumbled away when the scroll was opened. As a result, this manuscript has a distinctive damage pattern, showing clearly that the better-preserved final columns of the translation were rolled at the inside.
of the scroll when last stored in antiquity. This meant that the book was rolled so as to be ready for reading from its beginning. For this reason, the beginning of the book (i.e., the outermost part of the scroll) suffered considerably more damage from the elements in Cave 11 than the end of the book. One physical area of the rolled scroll fared especially well in the cave, with the result that the earliest discernable portions of text are preserved on ovoid fragments of approximately 3 cm wide by 5.5 cm tall. There are twenty-eight such unconnected, ovoid fragments, which increase in size (especially width) as they get nearer to the center of the scroll. The last such fragments are approximately 8.5 cm wide by 7.5 cm tall, and the similar, ovoid shape of all of the separate fragments shows clearly that they were once situated one on top of the other, representing successive revolutions of this part of the scroll. After the twenty-eighth ovoid fragment, the remainder of the scroll is connected in one large piece, approximately 109 cm wide and vacillating between 1.5 and 6.5 cm tall. The large piece comprises parts of three leather sheets and eleven ruled columns, with the last two sheets containing four columns each. The physical remains suggest that the sheets generally had four or five columns, with the exception of a small sheet of only two columns at XVIII–XIX (frags. 15–17). The last column of the scroll was left blank by the scribe. Even though it fell at the end of the sheet and manuscript, the leftmost margin of this last column had been ruled and prepared for sewing by small holes punched through the leather. This suggests that the sheets were pre-manufactured before their exact purpose was known, or without a firm knowledge of how long the scroll would ultimately be. For both the large piece and the twenty-eight ovoid fragments it seems that between five and nine lines of text are now missing due to damage, especially in the lower portions of the scroll (the top margin is preserved at several places). A number of other small fragments are extant (DJD 23:79–80), all containing only a few letters or partial words. The majority of these smaller fragments can no longer be placed with confidence amidst the remainder of the scroll. There is no overlap with the other Aramaic translation of Job from Cave 4, 4Q157.

Notes on provenance: The majority of the Cave 11 manuscripts were discovered by Bedouin in early (probably January) 1956, including 11Q10. Only a few Palaeo-Hebrew fragments and a small scroll titled Apocryphal Psalms (11Q1) were found in the excavations led by Roland de Vaux in February, 1956 (de Vaux, "Fouilles," 574; Tigchelaar in Humbert and Fidanzio, Khirbet Qumrân, 250–51). The Palestine Archaeological Museum provisionally purchased a batch of Cave 11 manuscripts that included 11Q10 in July, 1956, and there is no reason to believe the scroll did not originate in Qumran Cave 11. The cost of a number of the Cave 11 manuscripts, including 11Q10, was eventually covered by the Dutch Academy in 1961–62, with funds provided by the Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen (KNAW) and the Nederlandse Organisatie voor Zuiver-Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek (ZWO). The rights to 11Q10 were the first to be purchased, on December 11, 1961. As a result, these manuscripts were published by a group of Dutch scholars. For an extensive discussion of the provenance, publication, and nature of the Cave 11 scrolls, see Tigchelaar’s account in Humbert and Fidanzio, Khirbet Qumrân, 249–58.
**Material:** Skin

**Script:** Late Herodian formal (García Martínez, Tigchelaar, and van der Woude)

**Proposed palaeographic date:** 25–70 CE (García Martínez, Tigchelaar, and van der Woude)

**Special traits and general comments:** The distinctive damage pattern of this scroll, along with its reliance on a well-known Hebrew text, has allowed scholars to form a fairly good idea of its original dimensions. Compared with many of the other high-quality Aramaic scrolls from Qumran, 11Q10 is rather short in height, at approximately 14 cm and 15–18 lines of text per column. The scribe was obviously highly-trained, with a more calligraphic flourish to the script than found in most Aramaic manuscripts from Qumran. This is seen, for example, in the more pronounced serif and head strokes on the right-most stroke of sin/shin, the upper, right head stroke of aleph, and the horizontal roof of qoph. These factors are a clue to the relative diachronic placement of this late Herodian-period scribe compared with the large majority of Qumran Aramaic manuscripts, regularly situated in the Hellenistic, Hasmonean, and Early Roman periods. While the scribe was very adept at his craft, the script size varies appreciably by column, as seen in a comparison of frags. 16 and 19, the former having noticeably smaller script than the latter. In general, the script is fairly large relative to the broader corpus, similar in size to 11Q18 (NJ). Corrections are fairly regular, but tend to be of a minor sort, such as the supralinear addition of a letter or the erasure of a letter by scraping the surface of the skin. More extensive erasures occur occasionally, as when the second half of Job 34:11 was apparently erased at 21ii.6. The manuscript was beautifully ruled with deep scoring, and the preserved sheet joins were masterfully done (compare, for example, the much rougher seam on a "good" manuscript, like 4Q210 [Enastr]). On the relatively rare "double ruling" in the intercolumnar margin of frag. 21, see the profile for 4Q115 (Dand), the only other Aramaic scroll with this trait (cf. Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 59–61). Vacats are used regularly, with small spaces typically indicating minor sense divisions (e.g., a slight change of focus within an individual’s speech) and large ones signifying more major shifts of speaker or topic. The 1.6 cm vacat at 27.6 merits special comment, since it does not appear to be based on a natural sense-division in the text or an imperfection in the leather, the two reasons for which we might expect a vacat to be used. Sokoloff (*Job*, 141) suggested that there may have been a problem at this point in the text being copied, such as an illegible or missing word. As opposed to a scroll like 1Q20 (apGen), where the final column of a sheet is often narrower than those before it, 11Q10 tends to have final columns that are quite close in width to the others on a sheet. This feature likely speaks to a different method by those laying out the sheets prior to the composition being written and sewn together. While the extant writing is generally well-preserved and readable, ink has flaked off on some of the fragments (e.g., 3, 5, and 20).

The scribe of 11Q10 generally preferred to use aleph in cases where either an aleph or he could be used interchangeably, with a few notable exceptions. He is used more often than aleph for the prefix in the causative and passive

---

**Profile of Physical Layout**

**Scroll dimensions:**
Approx. 14 cm h. × 7 m w.
(García Martínez, Tigchelaar, and van der Woude); approx. 68 columns

**Margins:**

*Upper:* 1.3–1.6 cm (frags. 11, 17–18)

*Intercolumnar:* 1.2–2 cm (within a sheet) or 2.1–2.4 cm (across the seam connecting two sheets)

**Column dimensions:** 10.5 cm h. × 7.3–10.5 cm w.

**Lines per column:** 15–18

**Letters per line:** Approx. 27–37

**Scribal guidelines:**

*Horizontal script lines:* Yes

*Vertical column lines:* Yes, both sides of column

**Average medial letter height:** 2.5–3.5 mm

**Space between lines:** 5–8 mm

**Space between words:** 1–3 mm

**Vacats:** Yes; small (XXXI.2 [1 cm]; very minor sense division), medium (22i.3+22ii.4 [3 cm], XXXVI.1 [1.5 cm]; minor sense divisions), and large, at times exceeding one full line (1a–b.3–4, 3.1–2, 6a.1, 8.3, 9.6–7, 17.5, XXXVI.12, XXXVII.9+frg. J, XXXVII.11.8; major sense divisions)
verbal conjugations, something that clearly distinguishes the orthography of this manuscript from most others written in Aramaic at Qumran (in which aleph predominates). The irregular spelling of שדירת in 11Q10, with the long -ו prefix, is otherwise unknown in Qumran Aramaic, if indeed the word is correctly understood as a suffix-conjugation (perfect), reflexive form (cf. Sokoloff, Job, 119).

Sokoloff and Cook take the initial aleph as a scribal mistake by dittography (Sokoloff, "Aramaic," 11; Cook, DQA, 6). He is always used in the word פ ("if"), rather than the alternative פ, the latter being used interminently in some other Qumran Aramaic texts (e.g., 1Q20 [apGen], 4Q538 [TJud/Words of Benjamin], 4Q539 [TJoseph]). We find פ used at 24.7 rather than פ, as in all other Qumran Aramaic texts except for 4Q529 (Words of Michael). Also in the realm of phonology/orthography, note that קן is used in the word פ ("pure"; 8:8; cf. 17ii.4, XXXIV.4) instead of the פ expected from other Qumran texts (4Q542 [TQahat] has mixed use). Otherwise, פ predominates in situations where phonological/orthographic ambiguity might have existed. The supposed use of samek for shin in 1Q10, what Cook calls a case of lapsus calami (DQA 23:106–7), should clearly be read, with Sokoloff, as כ on palaeographic grounds, despite the protestations of Garcia Martinez, Tigchelaar, and van der Woude (on the keraia, see the instances of shin on frag. 23; as for the upper oblique stroke, it is visible on the fragment).

Consequently, there is no phonological/orthographic anomaly here. Sokoloff (Job, 14–15) has observed that 11Q10 regularly uses samek to represent the etymological /ay sound, whereas Biblical Aramaic and 1Q20 (apGen) show much heavier usage of sin. We could now add other Qumran Aramaic scrolls to the list of those with a preference for sin, though occasionally a scribe preferring samek is found (e.g., 4Q201 [En*]).

The scribe’s use of פן ("therefore"; 3.3) is odd, as noted by Stadel (Hebraismsen, 107–8) and others. The construction follows the Hebrew of Job 20.2, but is anomalous compared to Biblical Aramaic, Qumran Aramaic, and other dialects, where we would expect instead פן (e.g., 4Q542 [TQahat] ii.7). The word is sometimes considered a Hebraism. In 1.1, 4.3, and 8.2, פְּנֵי with the meaning “then” is somewhat unexpected in view of Qumran Aramaic, though the word is found in Aramaic outside Biblical Aramaic and Qumran Aramaic, and so should not be considered a Hebraism. Nevertheless, in 1.1 and 8.2, פְּנֵי reflects the underlying Hebrew of Job, and its use may well be attributable to that influence. The construction פְּנֵי פ ("because of"; 6a.2) differs from 1Q20 (apGen) 19.16, 20 (the only comparable occurrences in Qumran Aramaic) and Egyptian Aramaic, both of which use פ with the same meaning. The form in 11Q10 is more like the פְּנֵי מ of JPA, CPA, and Syriac. The fact that the form פְּנֵי מ in 11Q10 does not directly correspond to anything in the Hebrew text of Job increases the likelihood that this was the form known to, and typically used by, the translator or copying scribe. Another distinctive trait of 11Q10 in the context of Biblical Aramaic and Qumran Aramaic is its broader use of the determinate state, something documented by Sokoloff (Job, 23–24), who built on the general observation of van der Woude. Sokoloff detected that use of the definite article is markedly less discriminate in 11Q10 than in Biblical Aramaic and 1Q20 (apGen), and in this detail 11Q10 more closely resembles later Aramaic dialects. The infinitive constructions in the pattern infin.+ פ (perfect), reflexive form (cf. Zuckerman and Reed, "Fragment," 7). The spelling is unique, but the word is likely associated with the asseverative (positive assertion)/optative particle ли in Akkadian and other Semitic languages. The preposition פ followed by an independent noun instead of an attached suffix (XXXVIII.4–5) is likely the first known instance of this construction in Aramaic, with no other clear example in Biblical Aramaic or Qumran Aramaic (Sokoloff, Job, 169, notes a comparable use among the Nahal Hever documents). In fact, Sokoloff has observed that Biblical Aramaic and Qumran Aramaic typically use the preposition פ to follow the verb פ • פ • פ – the verb used here by 11Q10 – a feature discussed more fully by Folmer (Aramaic Language, 589–621). 11Q10’s use of פ with the prepositional sense "to, toward" is unique among Biblical Aramaic and Qumran Aramaic texts, where it otherwise means "with" or "from" (the latter combined with פ). Two other notable vocabulary items viewed against the wider backdrop of Qumran Aramaic are the use of the direct object marker פ (XXXV.9, XXXVIII.11.9), and the third-person plural pronoun פ. The former is extremely rare in both Biblical Aramaic and Qumran Aramaic, which typically mark the direct object with a prefixed פ, if it is marked at all. Some instances of פ in Qumran Aramaic.
can be attributed to influence from the Hebrew particle את, and this is the case at 11Q10 XXXVIII.9. As for המן, it is used exclusively in what remains of 11Q10, rather than the alternative form of the pronoun אחר. Precisely the opposite situation obtains for nearly all other Qumran Aramaic texts, while in the Aramaic of Daniel each form is found three times.

In the realm of syntax, we find the periphrastic construction used at 13.7 (והוא עני), although the order (part. + finite form of the verb הזה) differs from the clear norm in Qumran Aramaic, which places הוהי first (e.g., 1Q20 [apGen] 21.6). This could, of course, simply be poetic license on the part of the translator. More generally, there is a much higher ratio of clauses in which the verb is placed later than we would expect from comparison with the broader Qumran Aramaic corpus, or even the Aramaic of Daniel. The most obvious explanation for this fluctuation would seem to be a generic one, since the book of Job is highly poetic – and, therefore, associated with greater flexibility or creativity in word order – while the remaining Qumran Aramaic texts are mostly narrative prose, albeit with occasional poetic sections. While this explanation is no doubt correct in the main, Muraoka (“Aramaic,” 439–41) has observed that placement of the verb late in a clause sometimes occurs even where the underlying Hebrew has the verb earlier, leading him to posit some additional influence from “Sumero-Akkadian” syntax on the translator.

A number of Akkadian loanwords have been detected in 11Q10, including נכסין (“possessions”; 4.6), מן (“without reason”; 6i.5), מך (“poor person”; 7ii.5, xxv.4, xxvii.2), and קים with the meaning “gale, wind” (27.5). Another feature suggesting eastern derivation is the verbal root בקי (“to examine”; 27.3; see Sokoloff, Job, 140). Appearing together with these “eastern” traits is the word כסין (“hut, small chamber”; 10i.9), which Sokoloff (Job, 119) considers to be a Greek loanword from κοίτα. The high number of Hebraisms in the text is striking, though not altogether surprising when we consider that this is a translation from Hebrew.

In sum, 11Q10 has a number of scribal and linguistic features that distinguish it from the Qumran Aramaic corpus more generally. At least some of these differences may be attributed to the fact that 11Q10 is a translation from Hebrew, written at a time somewhat later than the majority of Qumran Aramaic scrolls. However, some factors suggest that the Aramaic of 11Q10 is of a slightly different dialectical derivation than most other Qumran Aramaic compositions, as already noted by Muraoka and others.

Original manuscript quality: Very good–excellent

Representative sample of corrections and scribal features:

(a) Supralinear addition of tav and yod, followed by erasure of a letter, possibly vav (5.8; García Martínez, Tigchelaar, and van der Woude):

(b) Supralinear letter added (7.7):

(c) Erasure of one letter (21i.5) and at least two words (21i.6) by scraping:

Language

Syntax

Verb-subject (verb early in clause):
1.4, 2.1, 2.2, 4.3(?), 6a.1, 8.3, 8.6, 8.7, 9.4, 9.10(?), 12.5, 13.4, 15ii.3, 16ii.2, 17ii.4, 17ii.6, 20.2(?), 21i.3, XXIX.6, XXX.5, XXXIV.2, XXXV.2, XXXVI.13,

Verb-subject (verb later in clause):
12.4, 14.5, 19.8, 24.8(?), XXXIII.4–5, XXXIII.7, XXXV.1–7

Subject-verb (verb early in clause):
2.7(?), 4.5, 5.3(part.), 5.5, 6ii.4, 7ii.2(?), 8.2, 10i.2, 10i.6, 11i.4, 12.3, 12.5, 12.6, 14.6, 14.7–8, 18.5, 19.1, 21i.9(?), 23.5, 23.9(?), 27.5, 27.6, XXIX.2, XXIX.8, XXX.3(2x), XXX.4, XXX.12, XXX.5–6, XXXII.4, XXXIII.1–9, XXXV.3, XXXVI.1–7, XXXVI.8(part.), XXXVI.7, XXXVI.7–8, XXXVI.9

Verb-subject (verb later in clause):
12.4, 14.5, 19.8, 24.8(?), XXXIII.4–5, XXXIII.7, XXXV.1–7, XXXVI.7, XXXVI.7–8
Subject-verb (verb later in clause):

Subject implied (verb early in clause):

Subject implied (verb later in clause):

Verbless clause:

Object early in clause:

Direct object marker (if present):

Use of י to mark genitive relationship:
2:8(?), 26ii:9(?), XXXV:10(?)

Verb of movement + ל + animate object:
XXXVI:1 (also note בָּרָא at XXXVIII:4)

Verb of movement + ל + inanimate object:
1:2, XXIX:2

Copula pronoun:
27:3

Interrogative יו:
1:2, 1:3, 3:5, 8:5, 8:10, 22i:6, 22i:10(?), XXIX:6(?), XXXI:7(?), XXX:6, XXX:9, XXX:15, XXXII:18(2x), XXXII:9, XXXII:11, XXXII:17, XXXIII:4, XXXIII:3, XXXIV:4, XXXV:5, XXXVI:6, XXXV:7

Periphrastic construction (past/future continuative action):
Participle + finite form of הוהי:
13:7

Lexical items:
ירש: 61:4, 8:5, 18:3, 20:10(?), XXXI:5, XXXIV:5, XXXIV:10(?)
ירש: 17ii:6
ירש: iii:8
ירש: xxix:7, XXXVIII:3
ירש: 2ii:3, XXXII:7, XXXII:10
ירש: 15ii:7
ירש: 5:6 (ה anthem), XXX:5(2x), XXXIV:9
ירש: XXXVII:7
ירש: 18:5
ירש: XXXVIII:14
ירש: XXXVI:2 (더음)
ירש: 24:7 (вшей), XXX:8 (נתה)

Morphology:
שלך form:
14:6, 14:9
שלך form:
Content synopsis and significance: In 1963 Maurice Baillet suggested that this single fragment, preserving the beginnings of six lines, might be a copy of the Aramaic Book of Tobit. He based this suggestion on what may be parts of the names Reuel/Raguel (רְאוּל; line 2) and Edna (אֶדְנָא; line 4), along with what could be the word רְאוּל (his dwelling; line 3), though all of these words are uncertain. Baillet compared the possible contents of lines 2–4 with Tob 7:1–2 in the longer Greek text of Codex Sinaiticus. However, because the Greek text provided no parallel to lines 5–6, he jettisoned the idea. Baillet did not have the Cave 4 evidence of Tobit available, which shows a general alignment with the longer Greek version of the book (often called G11), but at many points differs in small ways from later translations and recensions, including G11. Consequently, it is at least possible that this manuscript preserves a portion of Tobit not found elsewhere in the Aramaic copies, and which differs in some respects from the Greek and other versions. If this were the case, the names רְאוּל and אֶדְנָא would indicate a passage from Tob 7–8, perhaps 8:9–15, in which the Greek contains phrases that mirror the בֵּנוֹל and בֵּנוֹל of lines 5–6 respectively. Most suggestive of an identification with Tobit is that line 6, which contains the name לֹא (lexical; 8.8) [h].

3Q14 4, Tobit? (Tob?)
possible words in Aramaic or Hebrew. In the end, however, this manuscript's association with Tobit remains speculative. For a recent argument against an identification with Tobit, see Dimant, "Hebrew Copy," 297–300.

*Material remains:* This fragment belongs to a batch of unidentified fragments gathered by Baillet under the siglum 3Q14. Fragment 4 is the only from this batch identified as a possible copy of the book of Tobit. The fragment preserves the lower right corner of a column, along with a nearly complete intercolumnar margin, part of a lower margin, and the beginnings of six lines of text.

*Notes on provenance:* 3Q14 was discovered in Cave 3 on March 14, 1952, during an official survey of the greater Qumran region. The survey was organized by de Vaux and William Reed in reaction to the Bedouin discoveries of Caves 1 and 2. Three teams, led by Dominique Barthélemy, Henri du Bessey de Contenson, and Józef Milik, were assembled to survey the area from March 10–29, 1952 (DJD 3:3; Fields, *Scrolls*, 133; VanderKam, *Today*, 16). De Contenson's team discovered and excavated Cave 3 (Fields, *Scrolls*, 134–35).
**Material:** Skin

**Script:** Early Herodian semi-formal

**Proposed palaeographic date:** 50–1 BCE

**Special traits and general comments:** We are fortunate to have the bottom and one intercolumnar margin preserved on this fragment, with the latter ending at a stitched seam of two sheets (the preceding sheet is not preserved). Due to the few words left, there is little one can say about the scribal traits of the manuscript, other than that the scribe was quite able, writing in a tidy script.

**Original manuscript quality:** Good–very good

**Select bibliography:** Dimant, “Hebrew Copy,” 297–300.

---

**Profile of physical layout**

**Margins:**
- **Lower:** 1.4 cm
- **Intercolumnar:** 1.4 cm (to seam between sheets)

**Scribal guidelines:**
- **Horizontal script lines:** Yes
- **Vertical column lines:** Yes

**Average medial letter height:** 2–3 mm

**Space between lines:** 7–9 mm

**Space between words:** 1 mm
  (only two spaces preserved)

**Vacats:** None preserved

**Script sample:**

4Q318, Zodiology and Brontology
[ed. Greenfield and Sokoloff, DJD 36:259–74]
observed, 4Q318 demonstrates “a Jewish interest in astrological matters on a scientific level that matches similar texts from the Hellenistic world.” Albani (“Der Zodiakos”) and Greenfield and Sokoloff (DJD 36:259) stressed the Mesopotamian background and derivation of the astronomical science underlying the scroll, while scholars such as Popović (Physiognomics, 128), Ben-Dov (Astronomy, 256–57), and especially Jacobus (“Jewish Zodiac,” “Zodiac Sign,” “Zodiac Calendars”) have noted that astrological traditions quite similar to those in 4Q318 were also alive and well in Hellenistic and Roman cultures.

Because of its 360-day calendar, Greenfield and Sokoloff (DJD 36:270) held the text to be non-sectarian, an opinion that has generally been followed. Popović (Physiognomics, 28), for example, wrote that “there is nothing particularly sectarian, or even Jewish, about these texts. If they had been Greek papyri found in Egypt, nothing would suggest a Jewish context.” While this is true, Jacobus (“Jewish Zodiac,” “Zodiac Calendars”) has repeatedly emphasized 4Q318’s Jewish context, and that the scroll can be interpreted as complementary to the Jewish calendar and early Jewish beliefs about revealed knowledge.

**Material remains:** Most of the remaining text of 4Q318 is preserved on a piece of skin (8 cm × 20 cm) slightly larger than a banking cheque, containing significant portions of two columns. As can be seen from early photographs (e.g., PAM 40.612), this large piece is actually made up of a number of smaller fragments, though the joins are mostly very certain. Based on a plausible reconstruction (DJD 36:265–66; Jacobus, “Jewish Zodiac,” 367), we can gather that this piece likely preserves cols. 7–8 of the scroll, at least if it began with the selenodromion partially preserved in these two columns. In addition to the large piece, six small fragments have been identified with 4Q318 by its editors. One of these they positioned in a column preceding the large piece (col. iv), but the placement of the remaining five fragments is uncertain.

**Notes on provenance:** A fragment containing the upper, right-hand corner of 4Q318 col. vii is found in an early PAM “G series” photograph (PAM 40.612), implying that this fragment was among those discovered by Bedouin in 1952 (see Strugnell, “Photographing,” 124, 131–32). In addition, Tigchelaar identified frag. 3 on the “E series” PAM plate 40.978, associated with the official excavations of Cave 4 led by de Vaux, also in 1952. As a result, we can see that some of the fragments of this scroll were found by the Bedouin, while others were discovered in the official excavations supervised by de Vaux.

*Sample image: 4Q318 vii–viii*
**Profile of Physical Layout**

**Scroll dimensions:** Approx. 8 cm h. x at least 1.4 m w. (reconstructing 12 cols.; cf. Jacobus, "Jewish Zodiac")

**Margins:**
- **Upper:** 7–10 mm
- **Lower:** 6–7 mm
- **Intercolumnar:** 1.5 cm

**Column dimensions:** 6.4 cm h x 10 cm w.

**Lines per column:** 9

**Letters per line:** Approx. 41

**Scribal guidelines:**
- **Horizontal script lines:** Yes
- **Vertical column lines:** Yes, both sides of column

**Average medial letter height:** 2.5–3 mm

**Space between lines:** 6–7.5 mm

**Space between words:** 1–2 mm

**Vacats:** Yes; small (viii.9 [7 mm]; intermediate sense-division) and large (vii.4 [1.6 cm]; vii.9 [4.8 cm]; viii.6 [4 cm]; intermediate to major sense-divisions)

---

**Material:** Skin

**Script:** Early Herodian book-hand (formal) (Yardeni)

**Proposed palaeographic date:** 25 BCE–25 CE (Yardeni)

**Special traits and general comments:** This manuscript was carefully prepared and ruled on high-quality skin, though it is among the smallest scrolls in terms of its height among those with their full height preserved (only 4Q535 [Birth of Noah] and 4Q569 [Proverbs] are smaller). It also has relatively small upper and lower margins. Yardeni noted that the scribe wrote in a book-hand – a formal, square script – though the size of the writing varies quite significantly, at times leaving an impression of haste or untidiness. Especially distinctive are the large, looping tet, and the large aleph. The scribe clearly distinguished between the medial and final symbol for the number one (a single, vertical stroke), with the latter extending further downward to mark the number's end. Generous vacats were left between the individual months of the selenodromion (what I consider to be an intermediate sense-division), and again between the end of the selenodromion and the beginning of the brontologion (a major sense-division). The text's editors suggested that the samek of מסבת in viii.6 was “written over a correction” (DJD 36:263). The letter does look rather malformed, if indeed it is a samek.

The syntax of the scroll is idiosyncratic, since it is largely a formulaic list that forgoes the use of verbs. This is especially true of the selenodromion, which is mostly a repetition of numerical data in a list-like format, punctuated by the relevant names of the months or zodiac signs. The brontologion also has the terse wording of scientific manual, but does include verbs for thunder and various events associated with it. The verb placement seems to be later in the phrase more often than we might expect to find in a prose narrative text, though very little of the brontologion is preserved. This verb-later syntax is likely a result of the text’s genre.

**Original manuscript quality:** Good

4Q339, List of False Prophets
[ed. Broshi and Yardeni, DJD 19:77–79]

Content synopsis and significance: This small manuscript stands apart from the large majority of Qumran Aramaic scrolls in a number of respects. In terms of its contents, it preserves a list of eight (or perhaps seven, see below) “prophets of the lie” (שְׁנֵא וֲיִמְנֵא). The list is introduced by a simple Aramaic phrase: “Prophets of the lie who arose in [Israel].” On the disputed reading of this line, see the Special traits and general comments section, below. The phrase “prophets of the lie,” translated by many as “false prophets,” does not otherwise appear in the extant Hebrew or Aramaic Jewish textual record until the Mishnaic period (e.g., m. Sanh. 1.5), but its Greek equivalent does occur in the Greek translations of Jeremiah and Zechariah (DJD 19:78). Wise (Cave 4, 153) also noted the very similar phrase in 1QH 12.18, כבש נביאי כזב “prophets of a lie,” which demonstrates a comparable concept among the Hebrew sectarian texts from Qumran. After its introductory phrase, 4Q339 follows a pattern of listing one name per line, each qualified by either a patronym or a toponym related to the prophet’s origin (e.g., Balaam [son of] Beor; Shemaiah the Neḥlemite). The bulk of figures named in the list come from either 1 Kings or Jeremiah. Scholars have debated the identity of the final prophet, or prophets, in lines 8–9. These lines are mostly missing, with only their final few letters preserved: ר( line 8) and עון (line 9). While there is general agreement that the penultimate line once read “[Hananiah son of Az[ur],” named in Jer 28, two significantly different reconstructions have been proposed for line 9: 1.) נביאה די מן גב[עון] “[a prophet from Gib]eon” (DJD 19:79; Qimron, “More”; cf. Golani, “Reflections,” 259–62), in which case the line is a further description of Hananiah on line 8; and 2.) יוחנן[עון] “[John son of Sim]on” (Lange, “False Prophets,” 206, following Rofé, “False Prophets,” and Qimron, “False Prophets”), which would be a reference to the second-century BCE Hasmonean leader John Hyrcanus (ruled 135/34–104 BCE). Both 1 Maccabees and Josephus commented positively on John’s prophetic station, which some see as supporting his inclusion in a list of this sort (though here he is instead viewed negatively). An argument that some have used to support the reconstruction of Broshi and Yardeni is that it restricts the list to figures known from the Jewish scriptures. On the other hand, the presence of John Hyrcanus’s name would maintain the format of earlier lines, listing only one prophet per line. Wise (Cave 4) and especially Lange (“False Prophets”) have given additional reasons why “Jonathan son of Simon” should be the preferred reconstruction, including that his name would help to explain the list’s creation in the Second Temple period. However, Golani (“Reflections”
has argued forcefully for reconstructing the line as “[t]he prophet from Gibe’on,” in connection with line 8. If line 9 did once list John Hyrcanus as a false prophet, which must remain an open question, then 4Q339 would align with the negative view of him in 4QTestimonia (4Q175).

Regarding literary genre, the fact that 4Q339 is a simple list of names is unique among the Qumran Aramaic texts, and finds its closest parallel in the Hebrew 4Q340 (List of Netinim). Cohen (“False Prophets”) argued that lists such as these were works of scholarship, testifying to the early stages of collection that would eventually support intellectual work like the composition of more extensive texts. Cohen very helpfully set the list genre of 4Q339 and 4Q340 into the wider context of Hellenistic list-making in Greek, which is well documented in the textual record. Many of these Hellenistic lists bear a strong resemblance to 4Q339 and 4Q340. Though the function of the list on 4Q339 is now lost to us, Lange (“False Prophets,” 213) believed it was written by sectarians in order to compose a pesher text that included a critique of John Hyrcanus as a false prophet. This is extremely speculative, based on several unfounded assumptions. Regardless of the intended purpose of its list, when compared with the general picture of the Aramaic scrolls from the Qumran caves the uniqueness of 4Q339 can be fully appreciated. The large majority of Aramaic texts are extended narratives such as Tobit, the Genesis Apocryphon, and the Book of Giants. A much smaller proportion are translations of a Hebrew book (Job, and perhaps Leviticus), and a few scrolls do not fit either of these genres. 4Q339 is one of these few. Combined with the linguistic situation discussed below, this point urges us to treat the manuscript as a special case amidst the Aramaic scrolls corpus.

The mixed linguistic profile of 4Q339 is another of its unusual traits. While the first line is clearly composed in Aramaic, most or all of the following lines are instead written in Hebrew. The names of lines 4, 5, and 6 use the Hebrew word בן rather than the Aramaic בר. The editors of the editio princeps have reconstructed a Hebrew def. art. –ה in 1.3 and 1.7, at least the first of which seems very likely on material grounds. Following the suggestion of Puech, and against all previous transcriptions, Lange and Golani read the Hebrew relative pronoun –ש in 1.3 (with which I agree; see the Special traits and general comments section, below). These observations have led Lange to conclude that the author of 4Q339 wrote the introductory line in Aramaic, but then switched to Hebrew for the rest of the document, illustrating “how someone who is more fluent in Aramaic changes back to Hebrew once he directs his mind to the realm of holy Hebrew scriptures” (“False Prophets,” 209). Golani (“Reflections,” 261–62) has recently argued that the last name of the list, in line 9, was also written in Hebrew. Whatever the socio-linguistic background of this short text, its unusual mixture of Aramaic and Hebrew in a literary unit of this kind sets it notably apart from the other Aramaic writings at Qumran.

Material remains: 4Q339 was originally a single piece of skin not much larger than a modern playing card, of which two separate fragments now remain. Cohen (“False Prophets”) has compared it to a hypothetical Greek pinax, on which lists were presumably written. The upper, bottom, and left margins of our manuscript are preserved, and it evidently tore in two width-wise (perhaps through use) in antiquity. Damage patterns include obvious holes opposite each other on either side of the tear, which may suggest that 4Q339 was originally folded and at some point had to be held together with flax thread or a leather thong (DJD 19:77). On the material similarities with 4Q175 and other material features, see the Special traits and general comments section, below.

Notes on provenance: Both 4Q339 fragments were photographed on the PAM “G series” plates 40.577 and 40.614. The fragments in this series of images were discovered by the Bedouin in Cave 4, in 1952 (see Strugnell, “Photographing,” 124, 131–32).
Sample image: 4Q339
Image B-36433
COURTESY OF THE LEON LEVY DEAD SEA SCROLLS DIGITAL LIBRARY,
ISRAEL ANTIQUITIES AUTHORITY. PHOTO: SHAI HALEVI
Material: Skin

Script: Herodian formal (Broshi and Yardeni)

Special traits and general comments: This manuscript is fundamentally unlike any other in the Aramaic scrolls corpus. It was evidently what Broshi and Yardeni called a "card" of tanned skin, presumably intended for the list partially preserved on it. The unruled card is very small and shows clear evidence of being folded once in each direction. It also appears to have been sutured together with string or a leather strip based on matching holes on both sides of the horizontal fold. All of this suggests that the card may have been designed for portability or discrete storage. In being a single sheet, folded twice, it closely resembles the Hebrew 4Q175 (Testimonia) from Qumran, though the latter is roughly twice as large (ca. 19 cm h. x 12 cm. w.) as 4Q339. Broshi and Yardeni noted that 4Q339 has a dark band around its edge, which they claim "has been rubbed off" (DJD 19:77). The origin or function of this band is unclear, but it is noteworthy that the outer edges of 4Q175 are also slightly darkened (though not as much so as 4Q339), something most visible in the upper, right corner of the sheet. The dark band on 4Q339's upper, left corner strongly suggests that the upper margin is partly or completely preserved here. Based on its unique physical features and contents, Lange ("False Prophets," 208) considered it to be one of only a few autographs at Qumran, which seems a reasonable claim. Published images of the fragments have been of low quality, but this has now been remedied by the images published online by the IAA as part of the Leon Levy Dead Sea Scrolls Digital Library. Based on these new images, some previous debates over readings and reconstructions can be definitively resolved. The end of the first line has been reconstructed or read as both יד קמו בירש (Broshi and Yardeni in DJD 19:78, with most others) and י קמו (Lange, "False Prophets," 236, based on comments by É. Puech). Despite Lange’s assurances that Broshi and Yardeni's reconstruction is impossible based on the physical remains, the newly-released images show beyond doubt that Lange's transcription is incorrect, and that of the editio princeps close to accurate. It reads: יד קמו ב MOCK (see also the comments of Golani, "Reflections," 259, n. 8). The plene spelling of Israel with a double yod is unexpected, but the clear (second) yod, aleph, and bottom portion of the lamed make clear that this is the name written on the scroll. Lange ("False Prophets," 206, again following the suggestion of Puech) was on the right path, however, in reading ב MOCK "who (was) from Bethel" in line 3, against Broshi and Yardeni’s ב MOCK. We can now read with some confidence ב MOCK "who (was) at Bethel." The rightmost arm of the shin is clearly present, and we can now see that the formulation of 4Q339 follows more closely the initial notification in 1 Kgs 13:11 that the aged prophet was ב MOCK "residing at Bethel." The writing of this scribe is respectable, of better quality than we find in some of the poorly-written literary texts. Line spacing in uneven due to the card not being ruled, but it should be noted that the skin is now shrunken and contorted in several places. Providing a rating of the original manuscript quality for 4Q339 is difficult, since it is so different in size and function than the mostly narrative scrolls in the corpus. It may

PROFILE OF PHYSICAL LAYOUT

Scroll dimensions: Approx. 8.5 cm h. × 7 cm w. (reconstruction of Broshi and Yardeni)

Margins:

Upper: At least 1 cm
Lower: 1.8 cm
Left: Approx. 1.8 cm (there was evidently only one column)

Column dimensions:
Approx. 5.6 cm h × 3 cm w

Lines per column: 9

Letters per line: 10–20

Scribal guidelines:

Horizontal script lines: No
Vertical column lines: No

Average medial letter height:
2.5–3 mm

Space between lines: 4–6 mm

Spaces between words: 1–3 mm

Vacats: No
have been of good or even very good original quality for a
text of its sort (before tearing and being repaired?), but in
view of the broader corpus of literary texts I have assigned
it a relatively low rating.

Original manuscript quality: Fair

Script sample:

Language

Lexical items:

Other notable features:

Proposed Hebraisms:

Content synopsis and significance: This manuscript pre-
erves snatches of a story that, at least in part, recounts an
episode between an individual and a group. In frag. 1, the
individual – perhaps the “aged man” (rebbe šeḥ) mentioned
in 1.2 – pleads with the group not to engage in a shameful
act. Fragment 1 also includes an otherwise unknown gene-
alogy tracing at least five men. Early on, Milik (“Daniel,”
355–59) suggested that this narrative may be related to
Daniel and Susanna, preserved in the Christian tradition
as a deuterocanonical addition to the book of Daniel. This
proposal has not been widely accepted, and a number
of other scholars (e.g., Beyer, Nickelsburg, Puech) have
pointed instead to the story of the Gibeonites in Judg 19,
or less likely to that focused on Sodom in Gen 19, as the
account being retold in 4Q551. There are some intriguing
affinities with Judg 19, but the scroll is fragmentary enough
to preclude certainty about the relationship. An Aramaic
retelling of a portion of Judges would be striking, due to the
typical affiliation of the Qumran Aramaic literature with
either the era of the patriarchs and matriarchs of Genesis
and Exodus, or the period of the Babylonian–Persian exiles
(cf. Dimant, “Qumran Aramaic”; Tigchelaar, “Visionary”;
García Martínez, “Aramaica”). Various theories have been
put forward for the interest in these two historical periods,
though we must remain circumspect given our very partial
possession of the corpus. My own theory is that these peri-
ods, as opposed to those of the biblical monarchies, were
times when Israel was living under the varied pressures of
foreign domination, and thus provided situations analo-
gous to the Persian and Hellenistic periods in which this
Jewish Aramaic literature was written (see, e.g., Machiela,
“Language,” 92–8). If this theory is correct, the period
of the Judges would still provide a historical context in
which the authors of the Aramaic literature could explore
the negative and positive aspects of life without political
hegemony. Whatever the case, 4Q551 exhibits a number of
generic and linguistic affinities with the broader corpus of
Qumran Aramaic literature. It is an entertaining narrative,
based on the activity of protagonists and antagonists who
presumably gave readers positive and negative examples
of conduct. Like many other Aramaic texts, 4Q551 seems
to be based on earlier Hebrew traditions, either explicitly

Select bibliography: Broshi and Yardeni, “Netinim”;
Qimron, “False Prophets”; Qimron, “More”; Cohen, “False
Prophets”; Shemesh, “A Note”; Wise, Cave 4, 153; Beyer,
ATTM2, 128; Lange, “False Prophets”; Golani, “Reflections.”
or by inference. In sum, while the specifics of the story in 4Q551 are beyond our reach at present, this text has the look and feel of many other Aramaic compositions discovered in the Qumran caves.

**Material remains**: This scroll consists of four fragments, two of which are very small and contain only a few letters (frags. 2, 4). Fragments 1 and 3 are somewhat larger, preserving parts of six and eight lines, respectively. Puech considered the earlier suggestion that these four fragments belong to the same column (esp. Milik, “Daniel,” 355), but he eventually concluded on both material and textual grounds that the arguments in favor of this view are unpersuasive. As a result, he maintained that each fragment should be studied separately, in the order in which they are laid out in the *editio princeps* (DJD 37:47).

**Notes on provenance**: The fragments of 4Q551 are not found on the early “E series” or “G series” PAM plates. While their discovery in Cave 4 is assured, the mode of that discovery was not documented.

*Sample image: 4Q551 1, 3 (Not a proposed arrangement of the fragments)*
Material: Skin

Script: Late Hasmonean, with some characteristics of early Herodian (Puech)

Proposed palaeographic date: 75–25 BCE (Puech)

Special traits and general comments: This scribe wrote in a small, tidy hand, with Puech sensibly suggesting that the supralinear additions – apparently done by the same scribe as the main text – imply that 4Q551 is based on an older copy. On the older PAM photographs, scribal guide dots for making dry-ruled horizontal lines appear to be present in an ink fainter than the main script. If these dots are indeed present, it would be a sure indication that the left edge of frag. 3 is also the end of a sheet, though there is no longer any evidence of a sewn seam. In the more recent IAA photos, the possible guide dots can no longer be seen as clearly, leaving one to wonder if they are a result of the photography in the older images. In any event, guidelines are visible on frags 1 and 3. Line and word spacing is quite erratic, though this may be exaggerated by contortion of the skin due to shrinkage.

Puech noted that the formation of some medial nun and final mem may represent archaisms in the script (DJD 37:50). Puech noted several phrases that are found in other Aramaic works from this period, such as Daniel (e.g., באתר דנה at 3.3; cf. Dan 7:6–7). Note, too, the typical Aramaic narrative convention for moving the action of the story forward, וכנען (2.1). The scribe used a mixture of full (באתר) and defective (כל, אנש, ויימרון, קדם, etc.) orthography, though with an inclination towards the more defective end of the spectrum. In this text we find the root הנפ[כ] used in 1.4, as in 1Q20 (apGen), 4Q204 (Enr), 4Q243 (psDanb), and 4Q530 (EnGiantsb), but in distinction from הנפ[כ] in 4Q209 (Enastrb) and 4Q210 (Enastrc). In our only relevant example, the haphel was used, not the aphel (דנ[כ]פ; 1.4). This scribe used the long form of the demonstrative pronoun הנר, and aleph to spell הנר (as in 4Q197 [Tobb], 4Q199 [Tobb], 4Q530 [EnGiantsb], and 11Q10 [Job]). Puech noted that at 3.4 could be either a Hebraism or a jussive, with the latter being more likely, in my opinion.

Original manuscript quality: Good–very good

Select bibliography: Milik, "Daniel"; Beyer, ATTM1, 224–25; Beyer, ATTM4, 105; Beyer, ATTM6, 142; Nickelsburg, "4Q551.

Script sample: Note that the qoph is from a supralinear insertion (1.4), though it seems plausible that this was the scribe correcting his own work.
Corrections and scribal features:

(a) Two supralinear insertions, the second subsequently erased by scraping (1.4; cf. 2.2).

Language

Syntax

Verb-subject (verb early in clause):
1.4
Subject implied (verb early in clause):
1.4, 1.5, 3.6(?)
Use of י to mark genitive relationship:
3.7(?)
Verb of movement + על + inanimate object:
1.4
Use of negative particle ב (+ prefix-conjunction verb):
1.5

Lexical items:

די:
3.7
כען:
2.1
תנה:
3.5

Morphology:

Dissimilated nun/nasalization:
1.4

Orthography/Phonology:

ש for /s/:
1.2, 1.4(?)

4Q556, Prophecy

[ed. Puech, DJD 37:155–58]

Content synopsis and significance: The numerical designation of 4Q556 in DJD 37, separated by Puech into two copies, has a somewhat confusing history (see Stuckenbruck, Giants, 185–87, 221). Scholars have occasionally discussed 4Q556 under the designation 4Q533 [EnGiants*], and vice versa, such that usage of the two sigla varies across publications. The other manuscript alternatively numbered either 4Q556 or 4Q533 (the latter designation being used by Puech in DJD 31, and here) is a copy of the Book of Giants. The fragments here designated 4Q556 and 4Q556a (Prophecyb), however, do not appear to have any relation to the Book of Giants. Puech considered 4Q556 and 4Q556a (Prophecyb) to be different copies of a single composition based primarily on the mention of Sinai (סיני) in both manuscripts, though this identification is far from certain. The single fragment identified by Puech with 4Q556 is lacking context, but refers to several geographic locations and a now lost utterance of “the prophet.” Mount Sinai ( tasar סיני) is mentioned in line 2, a rare occurrence in the Qumran Aramaic scrolls. Aside from 4Q556a (Prophecyb), the toponym also appears in the Visions of Amram (4Q547 [Visions of Amram*] 9.4), though there the Hebrew word הר is used rather than the expected Aramaic מ. There is also a reference to Mount Sinai in the Book of Watchers (1 En. 1:4), but the Aramaic phrase has not been preserved at Qumran. The toponym Jaffo (יפוא) appears twice, at 4Q556 1.5 and 1.9. The likely occurrence of מַשִּׂרְיָהוּ וּמַשִּׂרְיָהוּ יִשָּׁב (line 3) along with the phrase מִירְסָא מֵהָדָא יָדָא יַשָּׁב (the new city that he captured) (line 6) suggests the description of a military campaign, though the precise nature of the implied conflict remains elusive. Cook (WAC, 563) and Puech suggested that this fragment deals with the persecutions of the Jews under Antiochus IV, supported by the mention of Jaffo and a possible reference to someone being hunted and seized in line 5. This hypothesis depends partly on 4Q556 belonging
to the same composition as 4Q556a (Prophecy), which mentions the eating of pig flesh in frag. 5i–ii. If 4Q556 is judged on its own terms, it becomes far more difficult to identify any historical referents. Finally, line 7 contains an allusion to a prophetic utterance "concerning this the prophet said." A similar prophetic formula also appears in the very fragmentary 4Q562 (Unidentified Text A) 7.1: "which the prophet spoke." It seems that 4Q556 is presenting some sort of historical conflict in the language of prophetic discourse. It is possible that 4Q556 should be interpreted as an example of ex eventu prophecy, though too little material remains for any firm judgment on this point. The narrative framing and characters of the composition are now missing, but its contents call to mind other, historically-oriented revelations among the Aramaic corpus at Qumran.

Material remains: Only one fragment remains of this manuscript, approximately 5 by 6 cm in size. It contains parts of ten lines, though the first and last are rather poorly preserved. The middle of the fragment contains the longest, best-preserved lines, growing progressively narrower in the upper and lower portions. The damage patterns on the fragment suggest that it was folded along its vertical axis for some time before its modern discovery.

Notes on provenance: The fragments of 4Q556 are not found on the early “E series” or “G series” PAM plates. While their discovery in Cave 4 is assured, the mode of that discovery was not documented.

Sample image: 4Q556 1
Image B-285378
COURTESY OF THE LEON LEVY DEAD SEA SCROLLS DIGITAL LIBRARY, ISRAEL
ANTIQUITIES AUTHORITY. PHOTO: NAJIB ANTON ALBINA
Material: Skin

Script: Early Herodian formal (Puech)

Proposed palaeographic date: 33–1 BCE (Puech)

Special traits and general comments: The line spacing on this fragment varies noticeably, suggesting that script lines were not used. A single vacat is preserved in the few extant lines, seemingly used for a fairly minor narrative break in a continuing prophetic or visionary account. The script is carefully and capably done, and in my estimation Puech is certainly correct to discern a different hand here than in the fragments of 4Q556a (Prophecy b). In keeping with the Jewish idiolect of Aramaic typical at Qumran, the prefix-conjugation of the verb "to be" takes a lamed prefix in 1.8, and the standard Hebrew morphology of the noun “prophet” is used by the scribe.

Original manuscript quality: Good–very good


Script sample:

Language

Syntax

Verb-subject (verb later in clause):
1.7
Subject implied (verb early in clause):
1.3, 1.4, 1.5(2x)
Object early in clause:
1.6
Use of "di" to introduce direct quotation:
1.7

Lexical items:

uspended: 1.6(2x), 1.7

Morphology:

Object suffix on verb:
1.5

Other notable features:

Proposed Hebraisms:

展望 (morphological; 1.7) [H]
Content synopsis and significance: In DJD 37, Puech split into two a batch of fragments originally treated together by Jean Starcky, Józef Milik, and others under the numerical designations 4Q556 (Prophecya) or 4Q533 (EnGiants) (on the confusion over the numbering see the profiles for 4Q533 [EnGiants] and 4Q556 [Prophecya]). Puech based his decision on palaeographic grounds, but considered the two manuscripts, now designated 4Q556 (Prophecya) and 4Q556a, likely to be copies of the same work. The preserved text of 4Q556a is highly fragmentary, but full of tantalizing historical references. It names a number of Israel’s historic enemies, including the Ammonites, Moabites, and Amalekites (frag. 1i.4), as well as Egypt and the king of Egypt (4.2; 5i–ii.4). Puech noted that the former list of nations also appears in Dan 11:41 and New Jerusalem (4Q554 [NJ*] 13:18) (DJD 37:53), and seems to have become a stock motif in the texts from the Second Temple period promoting an eschatological viewpoint.

On the mention of “Sinai” at frag. 5i–ii.13, see the profile for 4Q556 (Prophecya). 4Q556a contains a number of allusions to conflict, impiety, and persecution, especially in frag. 5i–ii, where we find the words or phrases “an idol” (פתן; line 3), “impiety” (שעיא; line 11), “the land of desolation” (מותא עדר; line 12), and “eating the flesh of pigs” ( Trafford; line 9), all in broken contexts. These references have led some scholars to suggest that this composition may allude to the events of the Antiochean persecutions and the Maccabean revolt (DJD 37:53; WAC, 563). Both 2 Macc 6:18–19 and 4 Macc 5:1–2 speak of Jews being compelled to eat pork on the command of Antiochus IV Epiphanes. 4Q556a also bears some of the hallmarks of revelatory literature from this period, including especially other Aramaic texts from Qumran. Fragment ii.3 refers to “the people who are in the book” (עמדין די במשלי), which may refer to a writing that contains knowledge of the future. Revelatory documents of this kind are well-represented in the Qumran Aramaic corpus (e.g., Book of Watchers, Book of Giants, Words of Michael, Testament of Jacob?, Apocryphon of Levi?, and Pseudo-Daniel). There is a relatively high concentration of the exclamatory particles הָא and אַרְוָא, which Perrin has shown is a common feature in Aramaic texts containing dream-visions (Dynamics, 102–3). There is also a preference for the future tense throughout this text. These features led Puech to ask whether 4Q556a (and 4Q556 [Prophecya]) should be understood as an ex eventu prophecy, though he rightly acknowledged that this hypothesis must remain tentative in light of its poor state of preservation. It can be stated with some confidence that the text records a revelation of some kind.

Material remains: Puech identified eleven fragments with 4Q556a. Most are poorly preserved scraps that contain little text (frags. 2, 6–11). Only frags. 1 and 5 have significant amounts of writing preserved, both containing parts of two columns. Column ii of frag. 5 has no legible text. The two larger fragments preserve portions of eleven and twelve lines, respectively.

Notes on provenance: Tigchelaar identified 4Q556a 9 on the “E series” PAM plate 49.975. The fragments in this series of plates were found in the official excavations of Cave 4 on September 22–29, 1952, directed by de Vaux (Strugnell, “Photographing,” 124, 131–32). While the discovery of the remaining pieces of 4Q556a in Cave 4 is assured, the mode of their discovery was not documented.
**Material:** Skin

**Script:** Early Herodian with a tendency towards semi-cursive style (Puech)

**Proposed palaeographic date:** 25–1 BCE (Puech)

**Special traits and general comments:** Puech identified a possible upper margin and a certain bottom one, though in fact both are uncertain due to surface damage of the fragments. The possible upper margin on frag. 4 is preserved in so small an area that it could also be a vacat. The top of the fragment also appears to be ripped, not having a finished edge. On frag. 8 there are traces of ink one line below Puech’s last line of script (i.e., there was some writing on 8.4), and the same issues apply here as on frag. 4. Puech finds evidence of full ruling for lines and columns, and the left column line is quite clearly seen on frag. 5. Horizontal script ruling is less evident on the images, but is supported by the fairly even line spacing and, especially, the consistent spacing between cols. i and ii on frag. 1. The scribe of 4Q556a wrote in an even, square script that is, however, somewhat more erratic than we find in the best Qumran manuscripts. Sizeable vacats were incorporated into the text (at least 1.7 cm in frag. 5.6), though their narrative functions are no longer clear. The long and short (prefixed) forms of the relative pronoun were used (ד and ד), and we find a rare occurrence in the Qumran corpus of the accusative particle יִת in the phrase יִת פתגמא “the utterance” at frag. 5i–ii.7, and perhaps also at 3.3. There is one occurrence of the far demonstrative pronoun ד in the phrase ד in the phrase ד “that,” found elsewhere only at 4Q17 (Ezra) 3.2 in the Qumran corpus. Puech noted two cases of Persian loanwords: פֵּתְגָּמא “utterance, event” and פֵּתָר “idol.” The scribe or a later corrector placed an X the size of a standard letter in the empty space at the beginning of the line in frag. 1i.9. This sign is found only on 4Q584 m.4 (in a broken context) elsewhere among the preserved Aramaic Qumran manuscripts, though such a mark was used in several Hebrew scrolls (e.g., 1Qsa* * xxvi.9, xxxv.10; 4Q177 [Catena A] 12–13ii.9, 29.2; and 4Q17 [Instruction] 4.1). In cases where we have some context the mark seems to indicate a matter of importance in the text, typically situated to the left of the mark.

**Original manuscript quality:** Very good

**Select bibliography:** Beyer, ATTME, 107; Beyer, ATTM2, 142–43; Stuckenbruck, Giants, 233–37.

---

**Profile of physical layout**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Margin</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>At least 9 mm? (frag. 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>At least 8 mm? (frag. 8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercolumnar</td>
<td>1–1.3 cm (frags. 1, 5, and 10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column dimensions</td>
<td>At least 9 cm h. (frag. 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lines per column</td>
<td>At least 12 (frag. 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scribal guidelines:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horizontal script lines</td>
<td>Yes (Puech)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vertical column lines</td>
<td>Yes (Puech)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average medial letter height:</td>
<td>2–3 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space between lines:</td>
<td>6–8 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space between words:</td>
<td>1.5–2.5 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacats: Yes; small? (iii.9 [at least 7 mm]), and medium or large (5i.6 [at least 1.7 cm])</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Corrections and scribal features:

(a) X mark at the beginning of a line (iii.9)

Language

Syntax
Verb-subject (verb early in clause):
i–ii.6(?), ii–ii.9, i–ii.2
Subject-verb (verb early in clause):
i–ii.6
Subject implied (verb early in clause):
i–ii.6, ii–ii.9, ii–ii.10(?), 3.6
Verbless clause:
i–ii.8, i–ii.3
Direct object marker (if present):
i–ii.3, 3.3, i–ii.7

Periphrastic construction (past/future continuative action):
Finite form of הוה + participle:
i–ii.9(?)

Lexical items:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th>Hebraic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>אדין</td>
<td>אדין</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Morphology:

Orthography/Phonology:

Other notable features:

4Q557, Vision
[ed. Puech, DJD 37:75–78]

Content synopsis and significance: This fragmentary manuscript was given the name Vision C by Jean Starcky, a title retained by Puech in the DJD edition. The lack of preserved material prevents us from saying much about the contents of this composition, though there is an intriguing reference to “the angel Gabriel” (ךָבָרָאָל מִלָּא) in the second line of frag. 1. 4Q557 participates in an emerging Second Temple trend wherein the angelic beings are organized...
hierarchically, named, and given particular tasks. Gabriel appears elsewhere in the Qumran Aramaic collection as one angel in a list of four in 1 En. 10–11, and in a list of seven at 1 En. 20 (cf. Tob 12:5). In the first of these passages, Gabriel is in charge of destroying the offspring of the Watchers by initiating cataclysmic war between them, while the second describes Gabriel as wielding authority over paradise, the serpents, and the cherubim. Gabriel also appears in a fragmentary text from the Qumran Aramaic collection entitled the Words of Michael (4Q529). Other ancient references include the War Scroll (1QM; 4Q285), the Hebrew Birth of Noah (1Q19+1Q19bis), the Hebrew portions of Daniel, the Gospel of Luke, the Parables of Enoch, and 2 Enoch. Gabriel's particular function is impossible to discern in 4Q557, especially considering his diversity of duties in Second Temple period literature. The references to a remnant (ושאר כל), a group being defiled (אטמיון; 1:3), and tribulation or distress (עקתא; 1:8) may suggest that the narrative in 4Q557 involves some sort of retelling of Gen 6–9, and is either similar or related to the Book of Watchers, but we cannot know this with certainty. It is not even possible to identify the “we” and “you” figures who are part of the text's dialogue, though the archangels and the fallen watchers are plausible options. Whoever these characters may be, like so many other Aramaic scrolls, this one contains a lively narrative told in part from a first-person perspective.

Material remains: The extant portions of 4Q557 are contained in two small fragments. Most of the preserved material comes from frag. 1, which measures 6 × 3.1 cm. This fragment has nine lines with between one and three words on each. Fragment 2 is less than half the size of frag. 1, preserving nothing more than a few partial words. No other copies of this composition have been identified.

Notes on provenance: The fragments of 4Q557 are not found on the early “E series” or “G series” PAM plates. While their discovery in Cave 4 is assured, the mode of that discovery was not documented.
**Profile of physical layout**

**Margins:**
- Lower: Approx. 8 mm

**Scribal guidelines:** None visible

**Average medial letter height:** 3–4 mm

**Space between lines:** 6–7 mm

**Space between words:** 1–2 mm

**Vacats:** None preserved

---

**Material:** Skin

**Script:** Early Hasmonean formal, with some semi-cursive influence (Puech)

**Proposed palaeographic date:** 150–100 BCE (Puech)

**Special traits and general comments:** There is a general preference for aleph over he in what little remains of the scroll for cases where he might also be used. This is seen most clearly in the suffix נא and the prefix of the ith-paal and aphel verb forms. It may be significant for determining the original quality of the manuscript that there are two scribal corrections in frag. 1, given the scroll’s very limited state of preservation. The writing is somewhat messy, comparable to manuscripts like 4Q540 (apocrLevia?) and 4Q542 (TQahat). It appears that scribal guidelines either were not used or were inscribed very lightly, so as to be no longer be visible.

**Original manuscript quality:** Fair

---

**Script sample:**

---

**Corrections and scribal features:**

(a) Supralinear letter added (1.5): ליא

(b) Supralinear word added (1.7): קדום

---

**Language**

**Lexical items:**
- די: 1.5

**Morphology:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>אפעל</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אתפעל</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Content synopsis and significance: This composition was originally labeled by Starcky as 4QVision B, a designation retained by Puech (4QpapVisionb). Besides its obvious visionary character, much of the scroll’s contents remain obscure, and there are no obvious overlaps with any other known text at or outside of Qumran. In fact, all that can be known of the scroll’s contents must be deduced from suggestive words and phrases with very little narrative context. It is likely that at least a portion of 4Q558 involves a dream-vision, in which a seer engages in dialogue with an interpreting angel. Perrin (Dynamics, 76–77) came to this conclusion after highlighting a variety of key terms that this scroll shares with other Aramaic visionary works at Qumran, such as the verb性价比 (“to see”; 7:1; 48:2; 65:2) and the exclamation性价比 (“behold”; 20:2; 34:2; 51ii.3). The occurrence of the phrases “and he said to me” and “my lord,” along with a number of references to angels throughout the manuscript, only reinforces this conclusion. Such dialogues between human and divine figures pervade the Qumran Aramaic texts (e.g., the Aramaic sources of 1 Enoch, the Testament of Jacob?, New Jerusalem, and the Visions of Amram). Another feature that 4Q558 shares with other Aramaic dream-vision texts is its extensive arboreal imagery, as seen in the mentions of an性价比 (“roots”; 10:2; 13:1),性价比 (“branch”; 21a–b; 26:1), and性价比 (“branches”; 51.3). Vocabulary associated with trees and their parts is found in a number of the preserved fragments, and presumably made up a major part of this text. The symbolic use of the imagery is unclear, but trees and tree parts are used symbolically as part of dream-visions in the Genesis Apocryphon (1Q20), the Book of Giants (4Q530, 6Q8), and Four Kingdoms (4Q552–553a). It is likely that the same is true in 4Q558, with arboreal imagery representing people and events from Israel’s past (or, perhaps, future). At least some of the narrative is written in the first-person voice (frags. 51ii.3, 140:1), as is often the case in the Aramaic literature found at Qumran.

In view of the wider corpus of Aramaic texts from Qumran, a distinctive feature of 4Q558 is its (at least partial) focus on Israel’s monarchical period. Scholars have primarily focused on frag. 51ii, which in line 4 refers to the sending of the prophet Elijah. Several have identified the mention of Elijah as an allusion to Mal 3:23 (453), in which God promises to send Elijah before “the great and terrible day of the Lord” (cf. Starcky, “Quatre Étapes,” 497–98; DJD 37:180–81; Stökl Ben Ezra, “Messianic,” 521–22). In this fragment we also find mention of a “chosen one” (ברק;パー), and possible theophanic imagery (e.g., ילקתי, “lightning”), plausibly linked to the day of judgment mentioned in Malachi. The title “chosen one” also appears in 4Q534 (Birth of Noahb) among the Aramaic Scrolls. This grouping of terms has led some scholars to suggest that 4Q558 be understood against an eschatological or even messianic backdrop, though most of the references occur in contexts that are too broken to interpret with much certainty. For a recent discussion of 4Q558 along these lines, see Stökl Ben Ezra (“Messianic”; also, Starcky, “Quatre Étapes”; Zimmermann, Messiahische Texte, 413–15; DJD 37:80–81). In addition to frag. 51ii, 4Q558 has a number of fragments that reflect historical and/or apocalyptic concerns. Most strikingly, there is mention of “the kingdom of Uzziah” in frag. 29, which represents “the only non-ciphered reference to a kingdom of the Israelite monarchy in the Aramaic texts” (Perrin, Dynamics, 77). In general, unambiguous references to any period of Israelite history between that of the judges and the exile are very rare in this literature (cf. Dimant, “Qumran Aramaic”; Tigchelaar, “Aramaic Texts”; Machiela, “Library”). Puech has proposed that 4Q558 contains references to Horeb, Elijah, Elisha, Egypt, Aram, Pithom, Jebus, and Reuben. Although some of these readings are open to question, it is clear that 4Q558 displays a striking, distinctive interest in Israel’s history, which led Puech to classify this text as a “histoire prophétique,” and Beyer as Prophetengeschichten (ATTME, 93). Other aspects of 4Q558 are reminiscent of apocalyptic literature, including mentions of “a writing” (יִתְנָה; 82), the act of writing (104:1), “the time of the end” (יָנָה; 26:1), and an “eagle” (شاه; 22.2) immediately before the phrase “rulers of the kingdoms.” These features connect 4Q558 with a broader apocalyptic tradition in which historical processes – past, present, and/or future – are conveyed to a worthy human in a dream-vision (e.g., Animal Apocalypse, Apocalypse of Weeks, Daniel 2 and 7, New Jerusalem, and Four Kingdoms). Finally, if Cook’s reading of 27.1 is correct (DQA, 119), 4Q558 may describe an atoning act carried out by a plural subject (יִתְנָה). It is not clear, however, who does the atoning and what role, if any, atonement plays in the eschatological scenario. Both New Jerusalem (2Q24) and Apocryphon of Levi (4Q541) use this verb in an eschatological context.

Material remains: 4Q558 is a very badly damaged papyrus manuscript, with little running text. Many of its extant one hundred and forty-one fragments contain less than one complete word. Most are not bigger than a postage stamp. Even the largest and best-preserved fragments...
(e.g., 33, 51, 53) do not provide much of an interpretive context. The fragments are too small to be arranged with any confidence, though Starcky attempted to group some of them on the basis of their contents and, especially, the appearance of their handwriting and papyrus. Puech distinguished several fragments from Starcky’s original batch, and assigned them a different siglum: 4Q558a (cf. DJD 37:79–80, 259–62). 4Q558a consists of seven very small fragments with few complete words, which Puech believed did not belong with 4Q558 based on scribal and physical traits. It is not even clear that all fragments of 4Q558a belong together. Since 4Q558a has virtually no usable text or any sizeable fragments, a profile is not included in this book.

Notes on provenance: Some fragments of 4Q558 were photographed on the PAM “G series” plates 40.630, 40.631, 40.632, 40.633, 40.634, and 40.635. The fragments in this series of images were discovered by the Bedouin in Cave 4, in 1952 (see Strugnell, “Photographing,” 124, 131–32). In addition, Tigchelaar identified a number of other fragments on the “E series” PAM plates 40.972 (frag. 53), 40.974 (frags. 31, 50b), and 40.977 (frags. 64, 106, and 125). This series is associated with the official excavations of Cave 4 led by de Vaux, also conducted in 1952. As a result, we can see that some of the fragments of this scroll were found by the Bedouin, while others were discovered in the official excavations supervised by de Vaux.
Material: Papyrus

Script: Late Hasmonean to early Herodian, with a style ranging from semi-cursive to semi-formal (Puech)

Proposed palaeographic date: 75–25 BCE (Puech)

Special traits and general comments: This papyrus manuscript was written on the recto side (i.e., with the horizontal fibers), as was typical in antiquity. The upper and lower margins are among the largest in the Qumran Aramaic corpus, and the intercolumnar margin falls around the median average. This is very likely connected to the use of papyrus, which was relatively less expensive than prepared skin scrolls. Based on the medium of papyrus alone, I take this manuscript to be of somewhat lower quality and material value than a comparable copy on skin, leading to my placement of 4Q558 in the “good” quality category. Nevertheless, generous margins and spacing suggest that this was a highly-valued literary text. Line and word spacing are also quite generous (again probably due to the medium of papyrus) and evenly-spaced despite the absence of scribal guidelines, which were not necessary on papyrus due to the natural, horizontal grain of the plant fibers. The scribe wrote in a mostly square, formal script, but with some less-formal, cursive features mixed in. Puech suggested that the hand is slightly later than that of 4Q530 (EnGiantsb; DJD 37:181). This is seen especially in the cursive tav and the occasional, cursive final mem. The orthography and grammatical forms of this copy are typical of the Qumran Aramaic corpus, with yod and vav sometimes used to mark long vowels, and less frequent use of aleph as a mater lectionis than in the most fully-spelled scrolls (e.g., 1Q20 [apGen], 4Q542 [TQahat]). The word יִב was regularly spelled without vav (e.g., 47.1), and (ג)ב both with (34.2) and without (20.2) aleph. This scribe used number symbols (35i.1, and perhaps 67.3) rather than fully-written numbers. The prepositional phrase "because of this" (41.2) is also found in 4Q552 (Four Kingdoms9 1.8 and 4Q581 (Testamentb?) 2.2. The phrase is distinctive to this corpus, with an alternative formulation being וב (e.g., 4Q562 [Unidentified Text A] 7.2).

Original manuscript quality: Good

Representative sample of corrections and scribal features:

(a) Fragmentary numeric symbols (35i.1)

(b) Supralinear letter added (42.1): כתון

(c) Irregular character ("lamed sans pied") preceding mem, which according to Puech signifies a correction (58.2)

(d) Numeric symbols (or, less plausibly, tetragrammaton dots) (67.3)

Language

Syntax

Subject-verb (verb early in clause):

33ii.4(part.; ?), 53.1(?)

Subject implied (verb early in clause):

4.1, 29.4(?), 29.5(?), 33ii.5, 5iii.4, 5iii.6(?), 64.3, 66.2(?)

Verbless clause:

21a–b.3, 86.1

Direct object marker (if present):

–ל: 33ii.5, 5iii.4, 64.3

Lexical items:

דיל (ב): 41.2(?)

בתר: 33i.4(?)

ד: 4.3, 7.1, 22.4, 37.2, 5ii.2, 53.1, 55.2, 57.2, 62.2, 67.3, 72.1a, 77.1, 116.3

כען: 50.1

כה: 65.2

ן: 5ii.2, 58.2

Morphology:

Aorist form:

67.5

Object suffix on verb:

62.3

Dissimilated nun/nasalization:

64.2

Orthography/Phonology:

ש for /s/:

122.2

Other notable features:

Proposed Hebraisms:

ספחת (lexical; 59.3) [H]
Content synopsis and significance: This scroll preserves part of a unique chronographic account focused on biblical figures and events from Israel's past, part of which has a genealogical framework. The account uses an outline in which numbers of years are repeatedly given to relate one figure or event to others in a chronological sequence, told in a very abbreviated way. As both Puech and Wise have argued, the text seems aimed at solving or easing a number of exegetical problems in the received chronologies of the Hebrew scriptures. Wise (“Times and Seasons”) summarized the main chronological issues addressed in the extant fragments as the length of Israel's sojourn in Egypt, the period of Israel's wandering in the wilderness, and the period of the judges. The earliest figure, chronologically speaking, mentioned among the fragmentary remains of the scroll is Enoch (2.5), though his name occurs in a section dealing more directly with the lives of Isaac and Jacob (and perhaps Levi). Puech reconstructed three successive columns (Wise has instead four, numbering the fragments differently), and we lose the account during the time of Israel's judges (frags. 4–5), or perhaps Eli and Samuel if Puech's questionable reconstruction of frag. 6 is correct. One gets the sense that the text's focus is primarily on the chronological framework of the figures and events recorded, rather than on the figures and events themselves. In this sense, it may be viewed as a scholarly resource text, recording, in short form, the kinds of exegetical calculations that underlie longer narratives such as the Aramaic Levi Document, the Visions of Amram, and Jubilees. Wise developed this argument at some length, calling 4Q559 “a literary missing link” between earlier texts of the Hebrew Bible and later ones from the Second Temple period (“Times and Seasons,” 51).

Wise helpfully placed 4Q559 among a broader set of Jewish writings displaying an interest in chronography during the Second Temple period (e.g., Demetrius the Chronographer, the Septuagint translators, Jubilees, and Josephus’ Antiquitates), and indeed across the Greco-Roman world more generally. As he pointed out (“Times and Seasons,” 3–5), 4Q559 may now be the oldest preserved Jewish chronograph, rivaling the Hellenistic-period dating of Demetrius. He believed 4Q559 to date to the third-century BCE (“Times and Seasons,” 50–51; so too Puech DJD 37:266), which I find plausible, even if impossible to prove. Wise also noted (“Times and Seasons,” 25) that the last line of his frag. 2 (Puech's frag. 3) appears to show a chronological section culminating with Aaron and the priests, rather than with Moses, suggesting to him that the text is “of priestly origin, propagandistic” (“Times and Seasons,” 25). This interpretation was followed by Puech. In view of the wider Qumran Aramaic corpus, the terse chronographic genre of the text stands out as unique, though it must be noted that chronological interests are certainly present in narrative accounts like the Genesis Apocryphon, the Aramaic Levi Document, and the Visions of Amram. The priestly focus of 4Q559 lines up very well with the outlook of texts like those just listed, and both Wise and Puech have noted that the chronologies of all these texts are similar in their approach. At the same time, the extension of 4Q559 into the period of Israel's judges is something atypical of the Aramaic narrative texts from Qumran, with the notable exception of 4Q551 (Narrative).

Material remains: Thirteen fragments remain of this manuscript, of which the joined frags. 2–3 and frag. 4 are the largest (approximately 6 x 8 cm). The remainder of the fragments are very small, no bigger than 2 x 2.5 cm and preserving little text. Wise (“Times and Seasons,” 7–10) offered the most extensive discussion of the scroll’s physical reconstruction, though his confidence often outstrips the evidence. His reconstruction was based on recurring damage patterns among the fragments and the largely hypothetical text of four partial columns, the most basic points of which makes good sense (and also underlie Puech's reconstruction). Wise posited a scroll of approximately 10–15 columns, with the extant columns reconstructed at 13.8–13.8 cm wide and ten lines long. Puech was rightly skeptical of the extensiveness and confidence of Wise's reconstruction. Puech is more reserved in his own proposal, adhering more closely to the fragments available and suggesting somewhat narrower columns. Both Wise and Puech have reconstructed around twenty-five full lines of text based on sparse physical remains, and some of these lines are much more convincing than others. In general, their reconstructions are quite similar, though occasionally they differ in ways that have an important impact on how we understand the text. On these occasions the actual evidence of the fragments is more accurately reflected in Puech's transcription. No other manuscript has been identified with parallels to 4Q559.
Notes on provenance: Fragments 1, 4, and 10 of 4Q559 were photographed on the PAM “G series” plates 40.600 and 40.634. The fragments in this series of images are reported to have been discovered by the Bedouin in Cave 4, in 1952 (see Strugnell, “Photographing,” 124, 131–32). In addition, Tigchelaar identified frag. 12 on the “E series” PAM plate 40.974. The “E series” is associated with the official excavations of Cave 4 led by de Vaux, also conducted in 1952. As a result, we can see that some of the fragments of this scroll were found by the Bedouin, while others were discovered in the official excavations supervised by de Vaux.
**Profile of Physical Layout**

**Margins:**
- Lower: 1.6 cm

**Column Dimensions:**
- Approx. 7 cm h. × 9–11 cm w. (as reconstructed by Puech)

**Lines per Column:**
- 10 (as reconstructed by Wise and Puech)

**Letters per Line:**
- Approx. 25–35 (as reconstructed by Puech)

**Scribal Guidelines:**
- Horizontal script lines: No
- Vertical column lines: No

**Average Medial Letter Height:**
- 3–5 mm

**Space between Lines:**
- 6–9 mm

**Space between Words:**
- 1–3 mm

**Vacats:**
- Perhaps small vacats at 3.5 (at least 4 mm) and 4.6 (3.5 mm)

**Material:** Papyrus

**Script:** Herodian semi-cursive (Wise); Late Hasmonean with semi-cursive and semi-formal features (Puech)

**Proposed Palaeographic Date:** 50 BCE–70 CE (Wise); ca. 100–50 BCE (Puech)

**Special Traits and General Comments:**
- Puech’s text and column reconstruction should be treated with caution, but if correct it would result in a scroll of about 9–10 cm in height. Wise aptly called the scribe’s work “far from deluxe” (“Times and Seasons,” 8), with noticeable variation in the space left between lines and the sizes of letters. Still, the scribe wrote in an easily-legible script and appears to have made few mistakes in the small sample left to us. The extent to which vacats were used is now impossible to judge with confidence, but the remaining fragments suggest that they were small, if used at all. Combining the above factors with the use of papyrus, Wise (“Times and Seasons,” 8) considered 4Q559 to be the copy of an earlier work for private study. It is certainly among the lower-quality scrolls in the Qumran Aramaic corpus, perhaps linked to its status as a scholarly resource text (see the Content synopsis and significance section, above). The orthography of the scroll tends toward full spellings, similar to most of the corpus. The genre of the scroll appears to dictate its terse syntax, at some points taking the form of a list-like succession of verbless clauses (e.g., 4.7–10). A notable feature of 4Q559 is its use of the Aramaic direct object marker conjunction ו in the fixed phrase ויהי ירד שתים וששים שנה ומאת ויולד את חנוך (Gen 5:18). Consequently, ו in 4Q559 is the clear equivalent of Hebrew י in a fixed expression, and so can be viewed as a morphosyntactic Hebraism (Stadel considered י to be a feature mainly of “die gesprochene Sprache” up until its widespread use in the later Targums, though this remains a matter of debate). Another morphological Hebraism is found at 3.4, with the assimilated preposition מ at the beginning of מפסל [ר] מ in 4Q559 is the clear equivalent of Hebrew מ in a fixed expression. As with י, this linguistic feature seems to be based on mimicry of well-known Hebrew words, and betrays the close dependence of 4Q559 on earlier Hebrew texts.

**Original Manuscript Quality:** Fair–good

**Select Bibliography:** Nebe, “4Q559”; Wise, “Times and Seasons”; Beyer, *ATTM*², 128.
Script sample:

Corrections and scribal features:

(a) Sublinear gimel added (4.5): בֹּֽגֵלָ֖לִֽהּ
Content synopsis and significance: This fragmentary scroll contains the remnants of an incantation text, describing various demonic illnesses and providing exorcistic incantations for dealing with them. 4Q560 is partially preserved, has no parallels in the Qumran corpus, and has generated significant debate over several key terms (see Cook, DQA, 84, for a discussion of the numerous ways scholars have rendered תודלות). While interpretations of the scroll must remain tentative, a number of specific features confirm its relation to a broader Jewish tradition of technical, apotropaic manuals known primarily from the Late Antique and Medieval periods. 4Q560 is an important witness to the early existence and development of this tradition. The extant text of frag. 1 is primarily descriptive in nature, preserving broken references to something entering the flesh (רונ) אשתה; line 2), “iniquity and transgression” (םינש והלמה; line 4), “fever and chills” (חלה ואשא; line 4), pairs of male (يمنון) and female (נקבתא) entities (lines 3, 5), and possibly “the [e]vil eye” (יין עין; line 6, according to Puech). Fragment 2 preserves even less material, but attests to at least one incantation formula in which a first-person speaker addresses a spirit: “I adjure you, O spirit” (אתך רוחא; line 5). Some of these features find close parallels in magical texts of diverse chronological and geographical origins. For example, Naveh noted that the Aramaic or Hebrew pair “fever and chills” (חלה ואשא) is a common occurrence in the amulets from fifth- to seventh-century CE Palestine (“Magic Book,” 257), while Penney and Wise point out that this pair also appears in Egyptian and Akkadian magical texts (“Aramaic Incantation,” 640–41). The characterization of demonic or other malevolent entities as being both male and female (i.e., ‘X male-demon and X female-demon’) is also a pervasive feature of apotropaic bowls and amulets from locales such as Aleppo and southern Turkey, as noted by Naveh (“Magic Book,” 258–59; cf. Penney and Wise, “Aramaic Incantation,” 639, who trace this particular feature back to Akkadian sources). Given these correspondences, 4Q560 may have originally been a part of a larger magical booklet, akin to those found in the Cairo Geniza. If so, 4Q560 would be the earliest example of a Jewish magical text of this kind, pointing to the presence and use of such texts in the Second Temple period, perhaps even at Qumran. However, the fragmentary nature of this scroll warrants some caution on this point; we cannot know for certain whether 4Q560 once took the form of a “recipe book” containing a larger collection of technical apotropaic knowledge and formulae. Nevertheless, 4Q560 remains an important piece of evidence for understanding the development of Jewish apotropaic literature, and exhibits clear links to an international literature on this topic in antiquity. It should be stressed that 4Q560 is generically unique among the Aramaic Qumran literature, but it is noteworthy that we find several exorcistic narratives among the rest of the corpus. The main examples are found in Tobit (4Q196–200), the Genesis Apocryphon (1Q20), and the Prayer of Nabonidus (4Q242). Jub. 10:1–14, which may depend on earlier traditions composed in Aramaic, recounts how Noah was the first to be taught exorcistic arts by the angels. The Hebrew Qumran scrolls also include several apotropaic incantation texts that bear comparison with 4Q560 (e.g., 4Q444 [Incantation]; 4Q550–511 [Shir* b]).

Material remains: Only two fragments remain of 4Q560, though only frag. 1 contains a significant amount of text. Fragment 2 preserves little more than a few complete words from two lines. Fragment 1 contains portions of two columns, with more material remaining from col. 1 (seven lines). However, without a right margin it is difficult to know how close col. 1 comes to preserving a complete line, and so to determine the column width. Neither column bears an upper or lower margin, making it is impossible to determine the original height of the scroll.

Notes on provenance: The right half of 4Q560 1 is found on the early PAM “G series” plate 40.602, meaning that it was among those discovered by Bedouin in Cave 4, in 1952 (see Strugnell, “Photographing,” 124, 131–32). The origins of the remaining fragments of the scroll were not clearly documented, though they most likely were also discovered in Cave 4 by the Bedouin.
Material: Skin

Script: Hasmonean semi-formal (Puech)

Proposed palaeographic date: 100–50 BCE (Puech)

Special traits and general comments: The intercolumnar margin, line spacing, and letter height of this copy fall around the norm for the Qumran corpus, while word spacing is slightly more generous than usual. The scribe used at least some vacats, though the type of sense-division being marked is no longer discernable. Although there are no visible scribal lines, the writing is very even and neat, with regular spacing, suggesting that at least horizontal guidelines were inscribed very lightly as part of preparing the scroll and can no longer be seen. The scribe had a distinctive writing style, with a large, closed, medial mem, a very short lower extension on qoph, and no differentiation between medial and final kaph (cf. iii.6). The word collocation “iniquity and transgression” (עואן ופשע) is a clear Hebraism, found on several occasions in the Hebrew Bible (e.g., Num 14:18, Mic 7:18). The first word of the pair, however, has an orthography common to the Aramaic Qumran texts compared with the Hebrew form (עון). The syntax is difficult to assess without more running text than is currently available. I suspect that if we had more of this copy preserved, it would be placed in the “Very good” quality category. However, in the absence of more material evidence I have labelled it as “good–very good.”

Original manuscript quality: Good–very good

4Q561, Physiognomy/Horoscope

Script sample:

Corrections and scribal features:

(a) Possible (partial?) aleph converted to he (ii.2):

Language

Syntax

Subject-verb (verb later in clause):

Subject implied (verb early in clause):

Subject implied (verb later in clause):

Lexical items:

Morphology:

Object suffix on verb:

Other notable features:

Proposed Hebraisms:

4Q561, Physiognomy/Horoscope

Content synopsis and significance: This manuscript preserves fragmentary portions of a physiognomic text, describing the physical features of at least one male human body moving from head to toe. As far as we can tell, the Qumran library contains no other extant copy of this composition, though Starcky originally proposed viewing 4Q561 as an Aramaic version of the Hebrew 4QZodical Physiognomy (4Q186) (“Messianique,” 51). This association, however, has been rejected in later scholarship (cf. Popović, Physiognomics, 65–67, 240–75). 4Q561 includes brief, schematic descriptions of the eyes, nose, teeth, beard, limbs, fingernails, thighs, and feet. It is difficult to determine precisely how many bodies are described in this text, due to its poor state of preservation (see WAC, 567–68; DJD 37:306; Popović, Physiognomics, 60). The extant text mostly contains a report of physical features, but Popović demonstrated that such description may serve a prognostic function, even if almost none of the predictive material is preserved. It is also possible, though far less certain, that 4Q561 contains a reference to a person’s character or “spirit” (נשמה; frag. 6.2), as is the case in 4Q186 (Starcky, “Messianique,” 64–65; DJD 37:318; Alexander, “Physiognomy,” 393; Lange, “Magic and Divination,” 390). Popović, on the other hand, both questions the textual
basis for this conclusion and cautions against reconstructing the missing portions of 4Q561 based on a perceived parallel with 4Q186 (Physiognomics, 64–65).

Popović has demonstrated the “emergence of a marked interest in the physical description of people’s bodies in Second Temple period Judaism” (Physiognomics, 277), of which 4Q561 is part. This broader trend appears elsewhere in the Qumran Aramaic material, most notably in the description of Noah’s appearance in Birth of Noah (4Q534–536), 1 Enoch 106, and Genesis Apocryphon (1Q2) col. 5, as well as the head-to-toe description of Sarai’s beauty in Genesis Apocryphon 20. Although the descriptions in these texts differ in both content and function, they tend to pay special attention to bodily features either as an indication of intellectual prowess or as a means of prognostication. Popović argued that this literary trend, evinced also in Ben Sira, 4QBarhi Nafshi—a (4Q434, 4Q436), 4QWiles of the Wicked Woman (4Q184), and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, reflects a broad awareness of physiognomics among writers in the Greco-Roman period. According to Popović, these traditions may even bespeak some familiarity with Ptolemaic administrative practices of identifying individuals based on their bodily features. In the sectarian (most probably Essene) context of Qumran and related communities, it is plausibly argued by Alexander and Popović that physiognomic evaluation of the kind witnessed in 4Q561 played some role in considering the membership of aspiring entrants to the community (Alexander, “Physiognomy”; Popović, Physiognomics, 172–208). This is perceived especially in the Treatise on the Two Spirits, in 1QS 3–4.

Material remains: 4Q561 is composed of either seven (Popović) or eight (Puech) fragments, though some scholars have argued for the inclusion of several more (see, e.g., Holst and Høgenhaven “Physiognomy”). The majority of the preserved material comes from two fragments (i and 3), one of which, according to Puech and Popović, contains nearly the entire width of a column (ii). The rest of the manuscript is quite fragmentary, preventing us from making definitive statements about the original order of the material or length of the manuscript. It is important to note that there are some minor discrepancies between the two most recent editions of 4Q561 with respect to how the fragments are labeled (cf. Popović, Physiognomics, 60–65; DJD 37:308–21). For one thing, Popović follows Starcky’s original join of Puech’s frag. 3 to the bottom of Puech’s frag. iii, with Popović labeling the collated fragments together as frag. iii, defending this join on material grounds. Puech, on the other hand, doubts whether the join is defensible, either materially or with respect to content. Both scholars accepted Starcky’s join of frag. ii to frag. iii. There are other discrepancies over their respective ways of numbering the remaining fragments: Puech labels Popović’s frag. 3 as frag. 6, frag. 5 as frag. 7, frag. 6 as frag. 5, and frag. 7 as frag. 8. Puech noted that his numbering system is somewhat arbitrary, given the fact that it is very difficult to determine the order of the fragments. Numbering in this profile follows that of Puech in DJD.

Notes on provenance: The fragments of 4Q561 are not found on the early “E series” or “G series” PAM plates. While their discovery in Cave 4 is assured, the mode of that discovery was not documented.
**Profile of Physical Layout**

**Margins:**

*Upper*: At least 1 cm (frags. 1i–1ii)

*Intercolumnar*: 1.2–1.5 cm (frag. 1i–1ii)

**Column dimensions:**

5–6 cm w.

**Letters per line:** Approx. 20–30

**Scribal guidelines:**

*Horizontal script lines*: Yes

*Vertical column lines*: Yes, both sides of column

**Average medial letter height:**

2–3 mm

**Space between lines:** 5–6.5 mm

(frags. 8 somewhat smaller)

**Space between words:** 1–2 mm

**Vacats:** None preserved

**Material:** Skin

**Script:** Late Hasmonean (Puech); early Herodian round semi-formal (Popović)

**Proposed palaeographic date:** 100–50 BCE, perhaps 75–50 BCE (Puech); ca. 50–25 BCE (Popović)

**Special traits and general comments:** This manuscript has below average margin sizes, and among the narrowest column widths in the Qumran corpus if the estimates of Puech and Popović for frag. 1i are correct. Such narrow column make it likely that this was a small scroll, and thus perhaps short as well (see Popović, Physiognomics, 56). It was evidently prepared with ruled lines at the top, right, and left edges of columns (no bottom margins are preserved), based on lines visible on frags. 1i–iii, 4, and 6. It seems, however, that horizontal guidelines were not used inside the text columns, since none are visible in the images and there is considerable variation in spacing between lines. Puech considered frag. 8 to have a preserved marginal guide dot for ruling at the beginning of line 1, but I find this very doubtful. It is much more likely a partially effaced vav or yod (so also Popović, Physiognomics, 63). The scribal hand is of good quality, and the orthography is in keeping with the broader picture in the Qumran manuscripts. Vav and yod are regularly used to represent vowels, aleph is occasionally used where we might have expected he, and the expected prefix conjugations of the verb הוהי take a lamed prefix. We find an assimilated nun in the word הָנָּה "nose" as in 1Q20 (Job) 35:3, 4–5, though the unassimilated form is used in 1Q20 (apGen) 20:3 (מהמה, "her nose"). The noun יָפָה "beard" is spelled, as expected in Qumran orthography, with what was presumably a harder dental dalet rather than zayin (the same root is apparently spelled with zayin in 4Q339 [List of False Prophets] 3). There are no sure cases of correction in what remains, though Puech proposes what I find to be a very doubtful supralinear letter at the beginning of frag. 7.3. It is difficult to say much about the syntax of the scroll, given the small amount of preserved text.

**Original manuscript quality:** Fair–good

**Select bibliography:** Starcky, "Messianique"; Beyer, ATTM⁶, 125; Beyer, ATTM², 163–4; Holst and Hogenhaven, "Physiognomy"; Popović, Physiognomics, 54–67, 262–76.
Language

Syntax

Verb-subject (verb early in clause):

1:ii(?)

Subject-verb (verb early in clause):

3:5(?)

Subject-verb (verb later in clause):

1:i.3–4, 1:i.4–5(?)

Verbless clause:

1:i.1, 1:i.1–2, 1:i.2–3, 1:i.3

Periphrastic construction (past/future continuous action):

Participle + finite form of הוה:

1:i.4–5(?)

Lexical items:

די:

2.2

Morphology:

Assimilated nun:

1:i.2

Orthography/Phonology:

ש for /s/:

1:i.1, 1:i.4, 8.1

Other notable features:

Proposed Hebraisms:

דק (lexical; 1:i.4) [H]

Previously unattested in Aramaic:

דק (adjective; 1:i.4)

סגלגל (adjective; 7.3)

4Q569, Proverbs

[ed. Puech, DJD 37:353–61]

Content synopsis and significance: Very little of this scroll is preserved, but from what remains it is clear that 4Q569 is a Jewish representative of a broader ancient Near Eastern wisdom tradition that flourished during the Persian and Greco-Roman periods. Aramaic proverbial wisdom literature of the sort in 4Q569 is also found, for example, in the sayings of Ahiqar, discovered in the cache of Judean texts attested at Elephantine. Wisdom discourses were also popular in Aramaic narrative texts from Qumran, such as Tobit, the Epistle of Enoch, and the wisdom poem near the end of the Aramaic Levi Document (see Machiela, “Wisdom”). Hebrew examples related to this genre from the Greco-Roman period include the Wisdom of Ben Sira, 4QInstruction, Wiles of the Wicked Woman (4Q184), and several other previously unknown Jewish wisdom texts found at Qumran (cf. Goff, Discerning Wisdom; Kampen, Wisdom Literature). Little can be said about the contents of 4Q569, due to its poor state of preservation. As with most wisdom literature, the extant sayings are written to a second-person singular addressee and include imperatives (e.g., “remember the poor,” דכור עני; 1:i.8), prohibitions (e.g., “do not humble yourself,” פלֵּת אל תש; 1:i.4), and conditional statements (e.g., “if your lord loves …” תִּרְצוּן-mar רָעָם; 1:i.6). Although none of the sayings is preserved in full, the words and short phrases that remain appear to reflect a concern with social and economic relations: “like a prince” (בַּנֶּס 1:5), “your lord” (מקד; 1:6, 2:3), “the poor” (עַנֵי; 1:8), and “gold” (בִּקְדֶם 2:4). It is also worth noting that 4Q569 preserves two important terms that pervade the Qumran Aramaic collection: קֹשֶׁשׁ (“dominion”) and שִׂיָּה (“truth/righteousness”). These words and concepts appear repeatedly in texts such as 1 Enoch, the Aramaic Levi Document, the Testament of Qahat, the Visions of Amram, Pseudo-Daniel, Jews at the Persian Court, Four Kingdoms, and Vision 4Q558. Puech reconstructed the word לְיהָכֵן “to/for the sage” in 4Q569 1:i (DJD 37:355), cited by Dimant as evidence of a parallel between this text and 4QInstruction (Dimant, “Themes,” 42). If once present, the word would also be a blatant Hebraism. However, scrutiny of the PAM photographs and the digital images on the Leon Levi Digital Library demonstrates just how tenuous this reading is. In my opinion, it is better treated as a reconstruction, and is not likely to be correct.

Material remains: Puech’s 4Q569 comprises four modest fragments, the largest measuring only 2.5 × 6 cm. Two of these four were combined by Puech into his frag. 3. Most of the preserved text is found in frag. 1, which contains meager remains from nine lines. Each of the fragments is very narrow in width, with even frag. 1 containing no more than three extant words in any line. Close examination of the fragments raises serious questions about their cohesion as parts of a single scroll. The two fragments of Puech’s frag. 3 clearly belong together based on color, script, line...
spacing, and unambiguous dry ruling at regular intervals (though they were not used by the scribe writing the text), while frags. 1–2 obviously belong together as well. However, there are several physical features distinguishing frag. 3 from frags. 1–2. If Puech’s arrangement of frag. 3 and his proposed number of lines for both groups of fragments are correct, frag. 3 is approximately 1 cm taller than frags. 1–2. The bottom margins would also vary considerably, with a very small margin on frags. 1–2 (around 3 mm), but one more than double that size for frag. 3. The color and preservation of the skin are also different, though this can sometimes happen with fragments from a single copy that were preserved in different environments. Line spacing is another trait where the two groups diverge, as Puech already observed. Fragment 3 has quite even line spacing, at around 6 mm per line, while we find much greater variation on frags. 1–2 (4–8 mm). Palaeographic differences are not determinative, since we have so little remaining text and the scripts are similar typologically. There is almost no textual basis on which to connect the two groups of fragments, and so it is advisable to leave their relationship an open question. In my opinion, the two groups of fragments should not be uncritically treated as parts of the same manuscript.

Notes on provenance: Fragment 2 of 4Q569 is found in the early PAM “G series” plate 40.579, meaning that it was among those discovered by Bedouin in Cave 4, in 1952 (see Strugnell, “Photographing,” 124, 131–32). The origins of the remaining fragments of the scroll were not clearly documented, though they most likely were also discovered in Cave 4 by the Bedouin.
Material: Skin

Script: Hasmonean semi-formal with some semi-cursive elements (Puech)

Proposed palaeographic date: 133–100 BCE (Puech)

Special traits and general comments: If Puech’s proposed number of lines and overall manuscript height are correct, this manuscript is among the shortest preserved at Qumran. This is one factor in assessing the quality of the manuscript, and accounts for my relatively low rating of “fair–good.” However, as observed above under Material remains, frags. 1–2 and frag. 3 are best assessed independently. Fragment 3 has a curious feature: It is very clearly ruled with horizontal script lines, the first being placed 1.4 cm from the top of the sheet, with lines then evenly spaced at 7 mm. The scribe, however, began writing the first line only 1 cm from the top of the sheet, and then regularly spaced the lines at about 6 mm apart. The result is lines of writing that do not align with the ruling, which had been done earlier in the scroll’s preparation process. Puech notes that the orthography is generally defective, but there are two preserved examples of plene spelling: the full form of the imperative דכור at 1.8 and the second sg. suffix כה at 1.9 (cf. כ– at 1.6, 7; 2.3; 3a–b.2, 6). Puech suggested that the orthography of דכור was influenced by the Hebrew form (זכר), in which case this would be a morphological/phonological Hebraism.

Original manuscript quality: Fair–good

Select bibliography: Puech, “Moreaux.”

---

**Profile of physical layout**

**Scroll dimensions:** Approx. 7.2 cm h. (based on Puech’s frag. 3)

**Margins:**

*Upper:* 1 cm (frag. 3)

*Lower:* Approx. 3 mm (frag. 1–2) and at least 1 cm? (frag. 3)

*Intercolumnar:* At least 1.2 cm (frag. 1)

**Column dimensions:** 4.3 cm h.

**Lines per column:** 9 (frag. 3)

**Scribal guidelines:**

*Horizontal scribal lines:* Yes (frag. 3), not on frags. 1, 2

*Vertical column lines:* None visible

**Average medial letter height:** 2–4 mm

**Space between lines:** 4–8 mm

**Space between words:** 1–2 mm

**Vacats:** None preserved

---

**Script sample:**

![Sample script]
Language

Syntax
- Subject-verb (verb early in clause):
  1–2.6, 1–2.8
- Subject implied (verb early in clause):
  1–2.2(?) , 1–2.5
- Use of negative particle אַל (+ prefix-conjugation verb):
  1–2.3; 1–2.4

Orthography/Phonology:
- 2ms (pro)nominal suffix הָיָּה/יָהּ:
  1.9

Other notable features:
- Proposed Hebraisms:
  דכור (morphological/phonological; 1.8) [h]

Content synopsis and significance: Little can be said about the contents of these two small fragments, if indeed they belong together (see below). The first seems to mention a destruction of “all the beasts of the field” (_Style:1.6), and “peoples” (1.7), though without any context. The second fragment has the verb “he/it will rise up” (2.1) and “mourning and weeping” (אֶלָּו 돌아 צְבָּי [2.3]), again with no context. Based on the implied calamity and the mention of beasts in these fragments, Baillet (DJD 3:128) suggested that an eschatological scenario was in view, an observation that led to his label for 6Q14, “Texte apocalypse.” Beyer went a step further (ATTM1, 268), arguing that 6Q14 belongs to the Book of Giants and warned of the coming Flood (hence his title, “Die Ankündigung der Sintflut”). Stuckenbruck (Giants, 219; cf. García-Martínez, Apocalyptic, 102, n. 13) rightly judged Beyer’s identification to be extremely tenuous, writing that “identification of this manuscript with the Qumran BG represents at best only a questionable possibility.” In fact, 6Q14 is so fragmentary that little can be said about it with confidence, including that it is an apocalypse. One can only say that the scroll’s possible identification as apocalyptic and eschatological in its outlook would be in keeping with the profile of the Qumran Aramaic corpus more broadly.

Material remains: Baillet identified two fragments under the siglum 6Q14, both being smaller than 2 × 2 cm. Fragment 1 is actually made up of two joined pieces in the earliest plate arranged by Baillet (PAM 41.510), with the join seeming plausible. By later that year (1955), a small third piece had been added on the upper, righthand edge of the fragment, as seen on PAM 41.734. This third piece has moved slightly in subsequent photographs, and while its identification with 6Q14 seems tenable, the join is open to serious doubt. Scholars since Baillet have accepted his identification of the two main fragments without scrutiny, though in my opinion there is good reason to question that they belong to the same manuscript. The skin is similar in color, but the script has clear differences, with frag. 1 having a more rounded, untidy script character when compared to the more square, regulated style of frag. 2. This is seen especially in a comparison of the letters qoph and dalet. In addition, the sizes of the letters is more consistent (2 mm) on frag. 2 than on frag. 1 (varying from 1.5 to 2 mm), and the spacing of the lines on frag. 2 is visibly more generous than on frag. 1. Analysis of the hair follicle patterns would have to be done in person, but there is no clear connection based on the photographs. In any event, this would only apply if we could show that the fragments come from the same area or sheet of the manuscript. With such a small sample size it is difficult to come to a definitive conclusion, but I am skeptical of identifying the two fragments as belonging to the same manuscript.

Notes on provenance: Cave 6 was discovered by Bedouin in September, 1952. Most of the fragments from the cave, likely including 6Q14, were extracted by Bedouin and then sold to the Palestine Archaeological Museum (DJD 3:26). Only a small number of remaining fragments were discovered during the official excavation of Cave 6 in late September, 1952 (Fields, Scrolls, 142).
Material: Skin

Script: Herodian (Baillet), though see Special traits and general comments below

Proposed palaeographic date: 1–70 CE (Baillet)

Special traits and general comments: The spacing of this manuscript is close and erratic, with the upper extension of the lamed sometimes intruding into the preceding line. This is especially true for frag. 1, which as suggested above may well belong to a different manuscript than frag. 2. Fragment 1 has a rounded Hasmonean or early Herodian script, comparable in its poor execution to 4Q201 (Ena²). A more assuredly Herodian, square script is found on frag. 2, resembling in its formality copies such as 4Q209 (Enastrb) and 4Q531 (EnGiants). There are no preserved margins, vacats, or corrections in the very little text preserved. Baillet referred to scribal guidelines based on autopsy, but these are not visible on the images (early or more recent) and it is unclear whether he discerned them on both fragments. The orthography is characteristic of the corpus generally, tending to have full spellings, using vav and yod in particular to indicate vowels.

Original manuscript quality: Fair–good

Select bibliography: Beyer, ATTM¹, 268; Stuckenbruck, Giants, 218–19, 231.
Script sample:

Language

Lexical items:

"ד": 1.2, 2.2