

# Bibliographische Dokumentation

## Qumran

Stephan Ahrnke, Matthias Hoffmann, Loren Stuckenbruck (Durham)

### Inhalt:

P.S. Alexander, A Reconstruction and Reading of 4Q285 .....	99
M.J. Bernstein, Angels at the Aqedah .....	100
G.J. Brooke, Some Remarks on 4Q252 .....	100
J.H. Charlesworth, ed., The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls .....	101
J.H. Charlesworth e.a., eds., Miscellaneous Texts from the Judaean Desert (DJD 38) .....	102
J. Duhaime, Les voies des deux esprits: .....	105
H. Eshel and E. Eshel, 4Q448, Psalm <sup>a</sup> 154 (Syriac), Sirach 48:20, and 4QpIsa <sup>a</sup> .....	106
J. Ewolde, Distinguishing the Linguistic and the Exegetical .....	106
C.H.T. Fletcher-Louis, Some Reflections on Angelomorphic Humanity Texts .....	107
H. Najman, Angels at Sinai .....	107
A.M. Reimer, Rescuing the Fallen Angels .....	107
A. Schüle, Deutung und Neugestaltung .....	108
A. Shemes, The Holiness according to the Temple Scroll .....	108
H.G. Snyder, Naughts and Crosses .....	109
J. Strugnell e.a., Sapiential Texts .....	109
E.J.C. Tigchelaar, Working with few Data .....	111
L.T. Stuckenbruck, The 'Angels' and 'Giants' of Genesis 6:1-4 .....	111
E. Tov, A Qumran Origin for the Masada non-biblical Texts? .....	112
J. Trebolle, A 'Canon within a Canon' .....	112
K. De Troyer, Once more, the so-called Esther Fragments of Cave 4 .....	113
J.C. Vanderkam, The Angels of the Presence in the Book of Jubilees .....	113
R. van de Water, Reconsidering Palaeographic and Radiocarbon Dating .....	114
M.G. Wechsler, Two Para-Biblical Novellae from Qumran Cave 4 .....	114
M.O. Wise, מי כמרני באלים .....	114
I. Young, Notes on the Language of 4QCant <sup>b</sup> .....	115

Philip S. Alexander, "A Reconstruction and Reading of 4Q285 (4QSefer ha-Milhama)", *RevQum* 19 no. 3 (June, 2000), pp. 333-348.

Alexander offers a more continuous reading of the 4Q285 fragments than was possible in DJD XXXVI by comparing the completely rearranged fragments between PAM 42.370 and 43.325 with 11Q14. The comparison with 11Q14 is crucial for a reconstruction of 4Q285. A. interprets 4Q285 more coherently in relation to an eschatological context: The new arrangement of fragment 1 allows for a more eschatological understanding because the phrase "for the sake of your name" and the notion of four archangels suggests remnants of a prayer, as also attested in 1QM (1QM X 1 – XII 18). In frg.'s 2-3, there is barely enough

material to contribute further to A.'s idea (the verb יבזם could be either from בִּזְזָה or בִּזְזוּ). Frg. 4 is rather reminiscent of the description of the wars of Gog and Magog (Ezek 38-39); Gog might as a נְשִׂיאַ רֵאשׁ be interpreted as the King of the Kittim when the term is understood as "Chief Prince" (cf. הַרְוֹאֵשׁ כֹּהֵן, 1 QM II 1; XV 4; XVI 13; XVIII 15; XIX 11). The Prince of the Congregation (נְשִׂיאַ הָעֵדָה) who is mentioned here in the fragments for the first time plays an important role in the eschatological scenario of this scroll. Fragments 5-6 do not provide much detail; still, there is a reference to the "night", which is also mentioned in 1QM XIX 9 and which provides some evidence for the new positioning of fragments 5-6. Fragment 7 offers more interesting details: The Prince of the Congregation, identified as דְּוִיד צִמַח, judges the King of the Kittim. The precise verb form נִשְׁפָּטוּ is striking, for it is certainly consecutive, and despite being in the *nif'al*, it is active in sense (cf. Jer 2:35). A translation of the phrase וְהָמִיתוּ נְשִׂיאַ הָעֵדָה as "and they shall put to death the Prince of the Congregation" is unlikely, not only because the particle אֵת is missing in front of הָעֵדָה נְשִׂיאַ, but also because of the underlying parallel in Isa 11:4 (and also in 2 Baruch 40:1-2). A better translation would be "and the Prince of the Congregation shall put him/sentence him [the King of the Kittim] to death" or "and the Prince of the Congregation [and the High Priest] shall put him/sentence him [the King of the Kittim] to death". Fragments 8, 9 and 10 report, in turn, on the final victory over the Kittim. Thus 4Q285 clearly belongs to the great eschatological war cycle; although it does not overlap with 1QM or versions of 4Q War Rules, it may represent another version of the War Rule.

Moshe J. Bernstein, "Angels at the Aqedah: A Study in the Development of a Midrashic Motif", *DSD* 7 no. 3 (2000), pp. 263-291.

The author discusses the motif of the presence of angels at the Aqedah. He surveys and classifies the roles which angels play in a number of post-biblical interpretations of the Aqedah and investigates the relationships between these versions with each other and, in turn, with the biblical text in Gen. 22:1: וַיְהִי אַחֲרֵי הַדְּבָרִים הָאֵלֶּה וְהָאֱלֹהִים נֹסָה אֵת אַבְרָהָם. B. finds versions of the Aqedah, e.g., in Jubilees, 4Q225 (investigating the accusing angel B. discusses שְׁטָטִים), mSanhedrin, Bereshit Rabbati, Pseudo-Philo, Genesis Rabbah (focusing here on שָׁם מִן הַרְהוּרֵי דְבָרִים הָיוּ שָׁם ([Gen. Rab. 55:4]), Yalqut Shim'oni, Midrash Vayosha, Shir ha-Shirim Zutta (respectively Ps.8), and poetical Jewish texts. Analysing this variety of texts, B. concludes that, when looking at the Aqedah, one can distinguish between "accusing angels" (demonic, satanic, jealous), "watching angels", "weeping angels" (cf. e.g. 4Q225 2 ii 5 מְלָאכֵי קִדְשׁ עֹמְדִים בְּכֹכְבֵי עֵלְיָן הַמְזַבְּחִים מִן הַמְּזַבְּחִים וְיִבְכְּיוּ מִן מְלָאכֵי שְׁלוֹם מִן יִבְכְּיוּ in Isa. 33:7 in comparison with Gen. Rab. 56:5), and "singing angels". After categorising the angels present at the Aqedah and giving them their place within the interpretative traditions, B. concludes that "the appearance of angels at specific points in the narrative seems to be a characteristic element in all of these retellings" (290).

George J. Brooke, "Some Remarks on 4Q252 and the Text of Genesis", *Textus* 19 (1998) 1-25.

This text-critical study argues that the text of Genesis preserved in 4Q252 corresponds in consistency in variant and secondary readings to a text-type of LXX over against that of MT and, significantly, over against other Qumran biblical manuscripts analysed by J.R.

Davila (*RevQ* 16/61 [1993] 3-37). Text variants of Genesis in 4Q252 are treated under four headings: (1) that which distinguishes 4Q252 from both MT and LXX (אלוהים in Gen. 6:3; רגליו in Gen. 49:10); (2) agreements between 4Q252 and LXX against MT (esp. לחיי נח in Gen. 8:13a; Abraham as אביכה in Gen. 23:4; פחותה in Gen. 49:4; possibly ידור in Gen. 6:3, the the same meaning could be attributed to MT ירון); (3) agreements between 4Q252 and MT against LXX (all of which may be explained without positing a different Hebrew *Vorlage* behind LXX); and (4) independent readings in 4Q252 against MT and LXX (almost all being secondary stylistic and phonological variations, secondary readings not exclusive to 4Q252).

James H. Charlesworth, ed., *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls. Volume One: The Hebrew Bible and Qumran* (Proceedings of the Jubilee Celebration at Princeton Theological Seminary; N. Richland Hills, Texas: Bibal Press, 2000).

The volume contains thirteen articles, of which seven are specifically devoted to implications of Qumran studies for the canon and text-critical study of the Hebrew scriptures (F.M. Cross, E. Ulrich, L.T. Stuckenbruck, S.W. Crawford, R.S. Hendel, D.W. Parry, P.W. Flint) while one focuses on sobriquets used among the Qumran texts (H. Bengtsson). Whereas Cross, Ulrich, and Crawford are chiefly concerned with conceptual problems of genre and canon (Stuckenbruck's article focuses primarily on Aramaic documents), the contributions by Hendel, Parry, Flint, and Bengtsson are the most relevant here.

- Hendel, "Qumran and New Edition of the Hebrew Bible", pp. 197-217.

This article demonstrates through a selected nine examples in relation to Genesis-Kings how the textual data from Qumran may contribute to the production of a superior text to that of MT for the Hebrew Bible. These examples are: (1) Genesis 1:9 (4QGen<sup>k</sup>)-addition of ותרא הים[שה] to MT and Sam.Pent. (as in LXX); (2) Exodus 1:3 (4QExod<sup>b</sup>)-addition of "Joseph" alongside Benjamin (*contra* MT, Sam.Pent., LXX); (3) Leviticus 22:18 (4QLev<sup>b</sup>)-the repetition of הגר ("who sojourn") after הגר (as Sam.Pent., LXX; *contra* MT); (4) Numbers 36:1 (4QNum<sup>b</sup>)-addition of "and before Ele]azar the priest" (as LXX; *contra* MT, Sam.Pent.); (5) Deuteronomy 32:8 (4QDeut<sup>j</sup>)-בני אלוהים (as LXX) instead of בני ישראל (MT, Sam.Pent.); (6) Joshua 8:34-35 (4QJosh<sup>a</sup>)-text is placed at 5:1 and addition of "Joshua" and "when they crossed] the Jordan" (LXX places the text, with variants, at 9:7-8); (7) Judges 6:6-11 (4QJudg<sup>a</sup>)-text lacks 6:7-10 (*contra* MT, LXX); (8) 1 Samuel 10:27 (4QSam<sup>a</sup>)-וידוי כמו חרש (as LXX) instead of MT וידוי כמו חרש; (9) 1 Kings 8:16 (4QKgs)-ל[חיות נגיד על עמ[ן] partially preserves a reading lost in MT and LXX, but which is preserved in 2 Chronicles 6:5-6.

- Parry, "The Challenge of 4QSam<sup>a</sup> and the Canon", pp. 219-239.

The author summarises the significance of 4QSam<sup>a</sup> for text criticism: (1) A number of variant readings of the manuscript betray a similar text to the *Vorlage* of LXX. (2) Josephus (*Ant.*) follows six times readings in this manuscript that are not found in MT and LXX. (3) In parallel sections between Chronicles and 1-2 Samuel, Chronicles has readings corresponding to 4QSam<sup>a</sup> rather than to MT. (4) Over 100 times, the manuscript offers an independent reading not reflected among other witnesses. (5) Readings often depart from

MT: while many are insignificant variants in orthography, while a number are significant. Nine examples are given: (1) 1 Samuel 10:27-11:1-addition of text between 10:27 and 11:1 (absent in MT and LXX, but attested by Josephus); (2) 14:30-misdivision of words in *מכה רבתה מכח* (ms. has *המכה רבה*); (3) 14:47-sing. (as LXX) instead of plur. construct noun “kings of”; (4) 15:27-accidental omission of *שארל ויהזק* in MT; (5) 17:4- “four” cubits instead of “six” in MT; (6) 24:15-MT scribal error which drops final *mem* from *הקדמניים* (so ms.); (7) 25:11-haplography through loss of *צאני* after *לגזזי* in MT; (8) and (9) 26:22-two variants, in which 4QSam<sup>a</sup> corresponds to MT *qere* *הנה חנייה* (the MT *ketib* *הנה החנייה* is “a masoretic device to record two possible variants”).

- Bengtsson, “Three Sobriquets, Their Meaning and Function: The Wicked Priest, Synagogue of Satan, and the Woman Jezebel”, pp. 241-273.

In the study of sobriquets among the Qumran texts, the author notes connections made among the *pesharim* between the lemma and interpretation in thought, theme, and etymological root in a way that reinforces the sobriquet assigned to (a) given figure(s). Brief discussion to the phrase *אבית גלורתו* in the section 1QpHab xi, 4-8 concludes that the *aleph*, though strange, functions as a preposition, analogous to its use in later rabbinic Hebrew and found already in the *Beth Mashko* document from Wadi Murabba‘at; hence, “to the house of his exile”.

- Flint, “Psalms and Psalters in the Dead Sea Scrolls”, pp. 307-359.

The article draws on the author’s major study on the psalms texts from the Dead Sea scrolls (*The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls and the Book of Psalms* [STDJ, 17; Leiden: Brill, 1997]) to account for the status of the psalms manuscripts, in particular 11QPs<sup>a</sup>, in relation to the Psalms of MT, as there is no manuscript among the Dead Sea documents which preserves the longer order of the received MT 1-150. Although at Qumran the Psalter, designated in *War Scroll* (4Q491) as “the book of psalms” (*ספר הדהלים*), was viewed as scripture, the form of such a book was by no means uniform: is one to infer a collection of Psalms 1-150 as in MT or, for example, a clustering of psalms as Davidic compositions, formed around those psalms with Davidic titles (see 4QMMT=4Q397 fr.’s 14-21 C, 9-10; 11QPs<sup>a</sup>; Lk. 24:44)? Flint concludes that the psalter reflected in 11QPs<sup>a</sup> was not necessarily formed at Qumran, as J. Sanders has supposed.

James Charlesworth, Nahum Cohen, Hannah Cotton, Esther Eshel, Hanan Eshel, Peter Flint, Haggi Misgav, Matthew Morgenstern, Katherin Murphy, Michael Segal, Ada Yardeni, Boaz Zissu (eds), in consultation with James VanderKam and Monica Brady, *Miscellaneous Texts from the Judaean Desert* (Discoveries in the Judaean Desert XXXVIII; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000).

- A. Ketef Jericho

9. “Jericho papDeed A heb? (Fig. 22, Pls. XIII-XIV)” - A. Yardeni, pp. 67-69.

This is a double deed in two large, but not well preserved, papyrus fragments. There are no Aramaic features (except perhaps for *mn* on Upper Text of fr. *b*, *recto*, line 6), and there is nothing prevent identifying the language as Hebrew. A possible, though uncertain reference

to 'Domitianus Caesar' (Lower Text, *recto*, line 11: קסר...דפ/מט...[.]) might date the deed sometime the emperor's reign (i.e. 81-96 CE).

10. "Jericho papDeed B heb? (Fig. 22, Pl. XIV)" - A. Yardeni, pp. 71-72

This is a small papyrus fragment, written in cursive hand from the top right of the document. The *he*'s at the beginning of lines 4 and 6, which may be the definite article, suggest the document was written in Hebrew (החציר/שלך, "your half" or "your courtyard", line 4; הערך, "the value(?)").

11. "Jericho papDeed or Letter" (Fig. 23 and Pl. XV)" - A. Yardeni, pp. 73-75

The text comes from three joined papyrus fragments from the upper left of the document (remains of 6 lines) plus five smaller fragments (fr.'s a-e: mostly illegible remains from 6 lines in total). The use of *he* as the definite article (line 1, *recto*: החנורות; line 2: הביית and הלז; line 3: הכל; fr. b הביית) shows that the language is Hebrew. The vocabulary recalls that used for similar Hebrew and Aramaic deeds: גג, בית, הלז (= Aram. דך), מחצית, של- (Aram. ריל-), and זה (Aram. דנה). The document involves an agreement (sale?) concerning property.

14. "Jericho papUnclassified Text heb? (Fig. 24, Pl. XVI)" - A. Yardeni, pp. 81-82

The document consists of two small fragments (a, b). The verb שלחתי (b, line 2) suggests that the language was Hebrew, and מחצה ("half") carries a meaning in Hebrew and not in Aramaic. However, the text is too fragmentary for certainty.

15. "Jericho papUnclassified Fragments ar/heb" - A. Yardeni, pp. 83-91

These are small fragments from thirty different documents; the handwriting resembles similar documents from the late 1st-early 2nd centuries CE. The fragments are presented in 5 groups according to museum plate numbers. None of the fragments can be unambiguously identified as Hebrew.

- B. Wadi Sdeir (Naḥal David)

1. "SdeirGenesis" - A. Yardeni(?), pp. 117-124

Here are three leather fragments from two columns of a manuscript in late or post-Herodian hand corresponding to portions of Genesis 35:6-10, 69-69; 36:1-2, 5-17. Fragment 1, the largest of the three, had been initially published by O. Verf (*ADAJ* 2 [1953] 82-88) and republished by C. Burchard (*ZAW* 78 [1966] 71-75); however, the two smaller fragments are published and edited here for the first time. The text reflects the text-type of MT; with the exception of בנתירי in Gen. 36:6 (col. II, line 3; MT: בנרתירי), it follows the orthography of MT as well. The reconstructions of the biblical text are coordinated and compared with manuscripts from Murabba'at (MurGen - 35:6-7), 2QGen (36:6) and 4QGen-Exod<sup>a</sup> (35:17-29; 36:1-2, 5-13), in addition to the usual text-traditions and ancient versions.

- C. Naḥal Ḥever and Naḥal Ḥever/Wadi Seiyal

1a. "5/6HevNumbers<sup>a</sup> (Pl. XXIV)" - P. Flint, pp. 137-140

The document consists of four small fragments in late Herodian bookhand (ca. 50-68 CE) preserving portions of Numbers 19:2-4; 20:7-8, plus one unidentified piece (merely containing ]פנייה[). The orthography is sparing with no evidence for *plene* spellings. The

realignment of fr.'s 1-2 (they are improperly aligned in PAM 42.187) suggests a shorter text than that of MT to Numbers 19:3. In addition to the ancient text-traditions and versions, the text is compared with that of 4QNum<sup>b</sup>, the only other scroll from near the Judaean Desert preserving fragments from Numbers 19-20 (esp. at 19:1-6).

1b. "5/6HēvPsalms (Pls. XXV-XXVII)" - P. Flint, pp. 141-166.

Fourteen fragments in late Herodian bookhand (ca. 50-68) preserving portions from eleven columns corresponding to Psalms 7:13-8:1,4-10; 9:12-10:6,8-10,18; 11:1-5a; 12:6-13:3; 14:2-4; 15:1-16:1; 18:6-13a,17-43; 22:4-9,15-21; 23:2-6; 24:1-2; 5:4-6; 29:1-2; 30:3; 31:3-22. This manuscript thus contains more text from the Psalms than any other one from the Dead Sea with the exception of 11QPs<sup>a</sup> and 4QPs<sup>a</sup>. The orthography of the text is more "sparing" than that of MT, so that MT *plene* forms (9:15-אגילדה; 10:9-לחטוף; 18:20-וירציאני; 22:6-בושו) are sometimes spelled without the vocalic consonants (i.e. אגלה; ורציאני; בשו); however, see במותי at 18:34 for MT במתי. Moreover, the shorter endings with ך and ך are consistently used. The text of the manuscript conforms mostly to that of MT Leningrad Codex; there are a few variants: (a) at 15:3 (col. vii, 3) the phrase על לשנו לא רגל of MT is lacking; (b) the superscription for Psalm 15 seems to have been lacking (v. 1 begins at the top of col. vii); (c) the acrostic psalm (=MT Ps. 9-10; in LXX=Ps. 9) is presented in two psalms as in the MT; and (d) Psalm 18 (cols. viii and ix) is closer to the text of MT and not to that of 2 Samuel 22.

2. "8HēvPrayer (Pl. XXVIII)" - M. Morgenstern, pp. 167-169.

Three fragments (now broken into four) are identified with this document which, according to Aharoni, "was placed next to the dead". The text is of a prayer in the form of a blessing to God. While the language is apparently Hebrew (so the ברהם [at fr. 1, 3 and מים [at fr. 2, 2), the form מברכין at fr. 1, 1 is conspicuous (final *num*), which is common in Mishnaic Hebrew participles. In view of the prayer context, the letters שמת [in fr. 2, 6 are to be translated "you set" rather than as "who died" (so Aharoni).

2. "XHēv/SeNumbers<sup>b</sup> (Pl. XXIX)" - P. Flint, pp. 173-177.

A large fragment preserves text from Numbers 27:2-13 and 28:1-12 on two columns; other than MT, the only other Dead Sea manuscript overlapping with this fragment is 4QNum<sup>b</sup> (at 28:2-5,7-8,10). The fragment does not use consonants as vowels (i.e. *waw* and *yod*), and shorter forms ך and ך (instead of with a following *he*) are attested (col. i, 32-והעברה and 44-עמיד and ונאספה). There are no variants against MT or 4QNum<sup>b</sup> and several variants agreeing with MT against the Samaritan Pentateuch.

3. "XHēv/SeDeuteronomy (Pl. XXIX)" - P. Flint, pp. 179-182.

A single fragment preserves on two columns text from Deuteronomy 9:4-7,21-23. Only 4QDeut<sup>f</sup> from the Dead Sea documents contains any overlapping text (i.e. הזאת at v. 6). The orthography does not represent vowels with either *waw* or *yod* (ל'אבתיד) and uses the shorter form ך instead of כה (especially ל'אבתיד). The little that is preserved of the text corresponds to MT.

5. "XHēv/SePhylactery (Pl. XXX)" - M. Morgenstern and M. Segal, pp. 183-191.

The phylactery consists of two fragments belonging to arm *tefillin*, which contain Exodus 13:1-16; Deuteronomy 6:4-9 and 11:13-21. Peculiarities of orthography and morphology

include the following: (a) use of *זת* instead of *זאת* for the fem. sg. demonstrative pron.; (b) interrogative *מא* instead of *מה*; (c) the use of historical *samek* written with *ש* (see fr. 1, 14-*ושרתם*); (d) the prosthetic *aleph* in *ולאזכרון* (fr. 1, 4). The text presents “twenty-nine unique readings”. Although the text contains relatively numerous scribal errors, it is “of independent or non-aligned textual status”, that is, its textual affinity with MT against other witnesses cannot be taken for granted. When mistakes and readings of undetermined cause are removed, real orthographic and morphological variants are as follows: *זכר* (Exod. 13:3); *יציאים* (Exod. 13:4); *לאבותך* (Exod. 13:5); *הזת* (Exod. 13:5); *ולאזכרון* (13:9); *הזת* (Exod. 13:10); *בבנך* (Exod. 13:13); *מא* (Exod. 13:14); *זת* (Exod. 13:14); *הציאנו* (Exod. 13:16); *לבנך* (Deut. 6:7); *ובשערך* (Deut. 6:9); *ושרתם* (Deut. 11:16); *יבלה* (Deut. 11:17); and *מוזות* (Deut. 11:20).

6. “XHev/SeEschatological Hymn (Pl. XXXI)” - M. Morgenstern, pp. 193-200.

Three leather fragments comprise the remains of this document. The writing seems to be Herodian (loop heads of *gimel* and *nun* and the extended base of *bet* to the right). Orthographically of note are the following: (a) use of *samek* instead of *sin* in *מסגבינן* (fr. 1, 3); (b) non-historical spelling (without *aleph*) in *להרישונים* (fr. 1, 8), including the writing out of the def. article after the inseparable preposition; (c) defective spelling of *o*-class vowel in *האחרנים* (fr. 1, 9), *הגדלים* (fr. 2, 4), and *העלם* (fr. 3, 6); (d) writing of final *e*-class vowel with *aleph* (*ת-רוא*-fr. 2, 7); (e) sing. nouns with pron. suffixes have additional *yod* for stressed *e*-vowel (*מ-סגבינן*-fr. 1, 3; perhaps *בתוך*-fr. 3, 2); (f) the cstr. form *בזובל* (fr. 3, 2). The term *תקוניו* means “foundations” (fr. 3, 9), unlike in biblical Hebrew. The tetragrammaton is represented by four small strokes (fr. 2, 7; cf. 4Q248-five strokes and eight Qumran texts using four dots). The text is a petitionary prayer, appealing to God’s past mercies to Israel as the basis for current hope in the rebuilding of the Temple.

F. Unknown Provenance

1. “XJoshua (Pl. XXXVI)” - J. Charlesworth, pp. 231-239.

The manuscript, consisting of two leather fragments (the large of which is inscribed), is of uncertain origin. The script is “a late formal Herodian bookhand”. The text preserves the bottom parts of two columns corresponding to Joshua 1:9-12 and 2:4-5a.

Jean Duhaime, “Les voies des deux esprits (1QS iv 2-14)”, *RevQum* 19 no. 3 (June, 2000), pp. 349-367.

The author or redactor of the description of the ways of the two spirits (1QS iv 2-14) structured this section in such a way as to allow for a clear distinction between microstructural elements: he clearly outlines parallels as well as contrasts between the way of light and the way of darkness. While drawing on similar introduction formulas (*ואלה* *דרכיהן* and corresponding vocabulary, the redactor still elaborates a clear distinction between both ways of the two spirits of truth (*אמת*) and the spirit of lies (*עול*) and also the two spirits of light (*אור*) and of darkness (*חושך*). The catalogues of virtues and sins do not only become distinct by possibly using vocabulary that might be analogously used, but also through an outlined structure that as such reflects the chaotic character of the ways of darkness (set in a sequence of 10 + 5 elements) and the evenly balanced character of the ways of light (2 x 7 elements) within the two descriptions.

Hanan Eshel and Esther Eshel, "4Q448, Psalm<sup>a</sup> 154 (Syriac), Sirach 48:20, and 4QpIsa<sup>b</sup>", *JBL* 119 (2000) 645-659.

Drawing on new readings of col. A of 4Q448 by A. Lemaire, the authors argue that (a) col. A preserves a version of Psalm 154 in an earlier form that was later expanded to form Psalm 154 in 11QPs<sup>a</sup> and the later Syriac manuscripts and (b) the prayer for King Jonathan in cols. B and C was composed by a scribe who was aware of a prior connection that had been made between "Isaiah's prophecies about Sennacherib's campaign" (Isa. 10:28-34) and the campaign of Ptolemy Lathyrus against Jonathan in 103-102 BCE, as exemplified in 4QpIsa<sup>a</sup> (4Q161). Reconstructions for col. A are offered on several grounds: (1) Psalm 154 (the title of which places the song, a prayer of Isaiah and Hezekiah, within the context of Jerusalem as it was being surrounded by the Assyrians) and 2 Chronicles 32:20 (which records that Hezekiah and Isaiah prayed as they were besieged); thus col. A, 5 is restored: ויראו מסנן־הריב ויזעקו. (2) 2 Kings 19:15-19, in which a prayer at this occasion is attributed to Hezekiah; thus lines 5-10 are to be understood as a pseudepigraphic prayer attributed to the king and prophet (cf. also Sir. 48:17-21 Cairo Geniza ms. B). While the 4Q161's connection between Isaiah 10 and King Jonathan enhances the possibility that this connection in 4Q448 might be due to a Qumranic influence, such a notion remains problematic, given the number of terms and phrases which "are not typical of the phraseology found in sectarian Qumran scrolls": הללויה ("halleluyah"); סררת ("you ruled over"); קהל עמך ישראל ("the congregation of your people Israel"), ארבע רוחות שמים ("the four corners of heaven"), ביום ועד ערב ("in the day and until evening"), and the open use of the proper name for King Jonathan.

John Ewolde, "Distinguishing the Linguistic and the Exegetical: The Biblical Book of Numbers and the Damascus Document", *DSD* 7 no. 1 (2000), pp. 1-25.

The author argues that differences between the Masoretic Text of Numbers and quotations from the same book in the Damascus Document may be explained on the basis of developments in the Hebrew language rather than on alterations for interpretative (or exegetical) purposes. He gives three categories of examples for his assumption: The word מחקק experiences slightly different meanings in Num 21:18a, CD 6:3-4 and 4QD<sup>b</sup> [4Q267] 2:9-10. These meanings vary between *staves and lawgivers*. In CD and other Qumranic texts מחקק referred to a human "lawgiver", not to a "staff", as is clear from the immediate contexts. Also, for the discussion about *sons and daughters* (comparing Num 30:17 and CD 7:8-9 = 19:5), E. maintains that the change from לבנו to לבתו reflects a linguistic function (i.e. to include both sexes in the statement rather than to exclude women). As a third example for this phenomenon, E. refers to the *Levites and proselytes*: There is no relationship between CD 4:2-4 and Num 16:2 and 18:2. CD simply reflects the contemporary Hebrew usage, where שם is an idiom of biblical origin but without biblical reference and נלוה עם is a late version of על נלוה. Generally E. emphasises that sometimes changes can be more plausibly explained as a linguistic phenomenon beyond an author's conscious control than as an exegetical intention.



Crispin H.T. Fletcher-Louis, "Some Reflections on Angelomorphic Humanity Texts among the Dead Sea Scrolls", *DSD* 7 no. 3 (2000), pp. 292-312.

F.-L. aims to show that the members of the Qumran Community regarded themselves as angelic. To demonstrate this, he focuses especially on the figures of Moses and the high priest in 1QSb 4:24-28 and 4Q377. After discussing "Pre-Qumran Angelomorphic Humanity Texts" (such as 1 En. 89:1; Sir. 45:2 [אלהים]; 47:7 [תועפות ראם]; 50:6-7; and Jub. 31:13-15), he concludes - based on the understanding of *Adam* in the DSS (esp. in 4Q504,506 in comparison with Gen.1:26 [אלהים]) - that according to the DSS the members of the Community ascribed to themselves an angelic identity because they they were the true Israel and true Adam created to bear God's Glory (אדם אבינו יצרתה בדמות) כבודנכה [4Q504 8]; לכבודכה ברתנו [fr. 1-2 iii 2-4]). The author then argues that there is an "angelomorphic Moses" in 4Q374 2 ii and 4Q377 1 recto ii. Comparing the latter text with Dt. 5:4-7, he draws attention to the use of the verb עמד (and also בהקדשו in line 11), concluding that "Moses' standing there is God's standing" (302). Looking at 4Q374 2 ii (the word לאלהים in line 6) and at Ex. 7:1, and comparing these texts with Philo leads F.-L. to argue that "Moses is God's angel". Finally, he defines the priesthood, especially the high priest, as "angelomorphic or divine". He draws this conclusion from 4Q511 frag. 35, and 1QSb 4:23-28 (cf. also 1QS 8:5-6, 8-9; 4QMMT B 76-79). 1QSb 4:23-28 is discussed in detail, especially the relationship between the priests/high priest and God (i.e. the expressions יהדר; נזר; מפיל; נזר; בשם קודשו יגברכה).

Hindy Najman, "Angels at Sinai: Exegesis, Theology and Interpretive Authority", *DSD* 7 no. 3 (2000), pp. 313-333.

The author is concerned with the role of the angels at the Sinai during the revelation of the law during the Second Temple period, early Christian writings, and rabbinic literature. Among the Second Temple writings, N. finds an "increasingly prominent role played by angels" (315) in the portrayal of prophetic revelation. Second, she compares several early Christian texts with especially Jubilees (discussion of מלאך הפנים in Jub. 1:27-29). She finds that the Christian texts inherit the angelic mediation tradition, but differ in that respect from Jubilees and from the motif as found among rabbinic texts. N. argues that although the tradition that angels played a significant role in the theophany at Sinai is widely attested in the rabbinic texts, only a few understood angels to have acted as *mediators* who revealed the Law. The texts either insist that the revelation occurred without angelic mediation whatsoever (see Sifre Zuta 12 in comparison with פה אל פה אדבר בו of Num. 12:8, and לא על ידי מלאך in the Passover Haggadah with LXX Isa. 63:9), or they interpret מלאך as prophet and not as angel. Others portray angels at Sinai not as mediators, but as obstacles, who must be overcome before Moses can receive the law directly from God. In this context N. discusses מלאך המות in Avot de R. Nathan A 2 in comparison with Num. 17:13).

Andy M. Reimer, "Rescuing the Fallen Angels: The Case of the Disappearing Angels at Qumran", *DSD* 7 no. 3 (2000), pp. 334-353.

In a critique of P.S. Alexander, "The Demonology of the Dead Sea Scrolls," *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years*, vol. 2, the author asks whether or not the DSS ever refer to evil or

fallen angels. Describing entities such as angels and demons as “chaotic, irrational and typical to all-out speculation” by definition, the major problem - according to R. - is to categorise these entities, hence to distinguish between angels and demons. Following Alexander, he points out that 1 Enoch and Jubilees are the key to Qumran demonological aetiology. With respect to the Hebrew texts, R. discusses in this context the רוחות ממזרים (4Q510 1 5), the בנות יענה in Isa. 13:21, and the אחים and ציים in 4Q510 1 5. Then he analyses the impact of כול רוחי מלאכי חבל (4Q510 1 5) on understanding demonology of the DSS. In the third section, R. criticises Alexander’s hypothesis that there is a coherent demonology among the scrolls. R. states that “Mastema/Satan” is in the DSS (and according to Alexander) understood as angel and he points out that, unfortunately, this is the only “evil” angel Alexander could find in the DSS. R. finally discusses the expressions מלאך המשטמה (CD-A 16:5); מלאך הרושך (1QS 3:20-21); and מלאך משפטה (1QM 13:11).

Andreas Schüle, “Deutung und Neugestaltung. Althebräische Grammatik in alttestamentlichen Texten”, *ZDPV* 116 (2000) 14-25.

Schüle uses *inter alia* an example from Qumran texts to show that later copies of earlier biblical texts cannot be expected to provide a reliable basis for a grammatical study of biblical Hebrew; the transmission of grammatical forms involves a reconfiguration of these forms. In 1QIsaiah<sup>a</sup>, in comparison to MT Isaiah 5:1-7, the *imperfectum consecutivum* is retained in two cases (ויקח in vv. X,X), while in three the longer forms are used instead (ויבנא v.X; ויעשה v.X; וישח v.X). The differences in verb forms are not due to the orthographic suppression of an unaccented syllable in earlier Hebrew (which are now orthographically - as stylistic variants - represented at Qumran), but are rather changes which reflect developments in later Hebrew. This difficulty avails not only in Qumran manuscripts vis-à-vis MT, but also within MT itself where different forms are used in identical or analogous syntactical structures. This raises the question of how the *tempus* forms are to be understood in relation to one another. Two different, but not mutually exclusive, models have been used to explain this: (1) two verbal forms could serve both impf. and perf. aspects, “perfect” and “imperfect” forms being retained in the consecutive for impf. and perf. aspects respectively (e.g. Brockelmann) and (2) a short impf. was formally retained in impf. consecutive (with perf. meaning), and the perf. was formally retained in the perf. consecutive (with long impf. meaning). These formal developments constitute evidence for a “regrammarisation” of earlier written Hebrew.

Aharon Shemes, “The Holiness according to the Temple Scroll”, *DSD* 19 no. 3 (June, 2000), pp. 369-382.

The author states that there are various ways in biblical literature to address the problem of God’s location: In the minimalistic perception, God dwells in the Sanctuary or Temple, or, more broadly, God is in the heavens or everywhere. These different perceptions have implications for one’s understanding of “sanctity” induced by divine presence. S. argues that the redactor of the Temple Scroll has his own way of describing divine presence: he harmonizes the different perceptions of the Torah, especially the accounts of Leviticus and Deuteronomy. Basically the two different conceptions, respectively, envision God dwelling

in a specific place (Priestly literature) or describe only His name as being there (Deuteronomy). The Temple Scroll combines these positions. The understanding of the concept of holiness is thus regarded as the result of God's presence. Within the Temple Scroll God's presence is more of an abstract description of the God who dwells among people than it is a geographical designation. It is simply God living among the people. On the other side, it is not God himself who resides in the temple, but God's glory (כבוד). Accordingly, the description of God's location in the Temple Scroll is closer to the Deuteronomic perception. The Temple Scroll also stresses the importance of God's divine presence which is not restricted to a physical area. The shifts in the Temple Scroll from biblical conceptions provided the sectarians with a necessary complement to the theory of their community as a surrogate temple.

H. Gregory Snyder, "Naughts and Crosses: Peshet Manuscripts and their Significance for reading Practises at Qumran", *DSD* 7 no. 1 (2000), pp. 26-48.

The author investigates *how* scripture might have been read at Qumran. Some of the DSS documents offer evidence for this kind of study; in this regard palaeographic features in the peshet manuscripts are worth considering. These features include the use of *vacats* (i.e. open spaces of two or more letterwidth spaces) to separate the lemmata and comments and of scribal marks which cancel open spaces. Peshet commentaries quote lemmata in full, followed by commentary. Sections of commentary are prefaced by a formula incorporating the term פֶּשֶׁט as in פֶּשֶׁט עַל פֶּשֶׁט or פֶּשֶׁט דִּבְרֵי, while the recitation of scripture is prefaced by וְאִשֶּׁר אָמַר or כִּי הוּא אִשֶּׁר אָמַר. On the basis of several peshet commentaries (4QIs<sup>a</sup>, 4QpPS<sup>a</sup>, 4QpNah and 1QpHab), Snyder demonstrates different tendencies among palaeographic features. He concludes that *vacats* and crosses (which cancel them) would have been helpful for readers in order to guarantee a mistake-free reading. This indicates that reading without mistakes must have been important for members of the group.

John Strugnell, Daniel Harrington, Torleif Elgvin in consultation with Joseph A. Fitzmyer, S.J., Sapiential Texts, Part 2 4QInstruction (MÛSĀR LĒ MĒVĪN): 4Q415 ff. (Discoveries in the Judaean Desert XXXIV; Oxford: Clarendon Press 1999).

#### - Introduction: General Linguistical Observations

4Q415ff. is clearly a sapiential work. Its ideas and vocabulary differ in significant ways from the documents which can be readily assigned to the Qumran community. Typical Qumranic features, as e.g. divine epithets (such as אֱלֹהִים, אֱדוֹנֵי, אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל, אֵל, אֲדוֹנֵי, אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל), radical or strict observance of the (purity-) Law (טוֹרָה never occurs in 4Q415ff.), emphasis on the Community, developed eschatology and dualism, and the presence of polemic against the Temple are almost completely absent in 4Q415ff. In addition, priestly language of "purity" or "impurity" is, known from the Qumranic documents, is almost totally absent from 4Q415ff.; thus terms such as טְמֵאָה, טוֹהַר, and נִדָּה rarely occur. The characteristically sectarian noun דִּיחָד is not present, although the adverbial use of יָחַד is more frequent in 4Q415ff.. Collective nouns are only rarely attested in the Old Wisdom tradition, probably because the paraenesis is there

addressed to individuals; words as הַרְבִּים and הַיְחָד are unparalleled anywhere in the wisdom tradition, though they would be hard to avoid in any truly Qumranic text.

It is noteworthy that the eschatological language occurs with the same frequency in 4Q415ff. as in the 1-11Q corpus. Accordingly, the eschatological vocabulary occurs with roughly similar frequency in both corpora (e.g. קִיץ, שַׁחַת, שְׁפֹט, מְשֹׁפֵט).

Sapiential terminology in 4Q415ff. is usually the same as that of Proverbs, Job, Sirach, and the 1-11Q texts, though the relative frequency of some words may differ.

- 415. 4QInstruction<sup>a</sup> (Mūsār I<sup>e</sup> Mēvîn<sup>a</sup>) (Pl. I-II) - pp. 41-71

4Q415 is preserved on medium-thin skin containing 32 fragments ranging from Herodian or occasionally late Hasmonian hands. All the surviving fragments of this work have sections of 4Q414 inscribed on their reverse and they are fairly well preserved by the standards of other fragments from Cave 4.

- 416. 4QInstruction<sup>b</sup> (Mūsār I<sup>e</sup> Mēvîn<sup>b</sup>) (Pl. III-VII) - pp. 73-141

The 22 fragments of 4Q416 are written on medium thick skin. They date transitionally between the late Hasmonian and the earlian Herodian hands.

- 417. 4QInstruction<sup>c</sup> (Mūsār I<sup>e</sup> Mēvîn<sup>c</sup>) (Pl. VIII-XI) - pp. 143-210

The skin of 4Q417 (29 fragments) is thin and smooth. A large number of the smaller fragments are in a poor state of conservation. The degree of precision of dating is limited, because the surface has abraded part or all of many letters and occasionally the ink has run at certain points, preventing the study of the order of the strokes.

- 418. 4QInstruction<sup>d</sup> (Mūsār I<sup>e</sup> Mēvîn<sup>d</sup>) (Pl. XII-XXVII) - pp. 211-474

4Q418 consists of 303 fragments. From the first two fragments (medium thick skin) the writing is suspended. They may have come from another hand's replacement of the damaged outside and lost layer of the scroll. For the rest of the fragments it is difficult to establish the order of the fragments in the work; the smaller pieces are usually grouped around each larger one. The writing lies between the "transitional" hands and the earliest fully developed Herodian formal hands.

- 418a. 4QInstruction<sup>e</sup> (Mūsār I<sup>e</sup> Mēvîn<sup>e</sup>) (Pl. XXVIII-XXIX) - pp. 475-495

Only little of the text of the manuscript of 4Q418a is preserved. It is a copy of the fragments of 4Q418a. The hand is very close to those of 4Q415 and 4Q418 (early Herodian formal or bookhand or perhaps even late Hasmonaeon).

- 418b. 4QText with Quotation from Psalm 107? (Pl. XXIX) - pp. 497-499

A certain number of superficial similarities in the script and in conservation of the skin can be observed, but these fragments have nothing to do with any manuscript of 4QInstruction. The text provides insufficient evidence to classify it as a part of an unknown Psalms manuscript.

- 418c. 4QInstruction<sup>f</sup>? (Mūsār I<sup>e</sup> Mēvîn<sup>f</sup>?) (Pl. XXIX) - pp. 501-503

The manuscript has been separated from 4Q418 (former fr. 161). The similarity of its script to that of 4Q418 and several other early Herodian formals makes it unclear whether some of the smaller fragments of 4Q418 could also alternatively be assigned instead to 4Q418c.

423. 4QInstruction<sup>s</sup> (Mūsār l<sup>s</sup> Mēvīn<sup>s</sup>) (Pl. XXX-XXXI) - pp. 505-533

The 24 fragments of 4Q283 preserves a fragmentary copy of 4QInstruction. The script is middle or late Herodian formal hand (10 BCE - 50 CE).

Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, "Working with few Data: The Relation between 4Q285 and 11Q14", *DSD* 7 no. 1 (2000), pp. 49-55.

Though it is beyond doubt that 11Q14 1 ii and 4Q285 1 preserve a virtually identical text, 11Q14 and 4Q285 are not necessarily copies of the same composition, at least according to W. J. Lyons. If 4Q285 1 9 is reconstructed on the basis of 11Q14, it has fifteen letters more than the average in the preceding lines; therefore 4Q285 1 9 might not simply be a variant of the same work (Lyons *contra* the editors of DJD XXIII). Lyons points out further that the letters טר at the end of line 10 would be the sole textual link between 11Q14 1 i and 4Q285 5. Still, it is uncertain how often the word חוטר (as reconstructed by the editors) occurs in this text of unknown size and, moreover, other words ending with טר may be reconstructed for the text. In contrast to Lyons, T. argues that the problem of 4Q285 and 11Q14 being the same document does not depend on the evidence of two letters: Despite the uncertainty of physical evidence, it is plausible to place 4Q285 1 d (line 15) in the column of fr. 5 because the term חללי is predominantly used in texts describing eschatological war. Moreover, the reconstruction of the word חוטר on the basis of only having the last two letters visible seems unwarranted as such, but because of partial overlaps between 4Q285 and 11Q14, it nevertheless becomes more plausible. This is especially because חוטר is a relatively rare word in the Hebrew Bible. In addition, the chance of finding another passage with טר and חללי only five lines apart would be quite slim. T. concludes that one can hardly prove that 11Q14 and 4Q285 are wholly identical, but that the available evidence suggests that 11Q14 and 4Q285 are indeed copies (or versions) of the same composition. For this reason the same name was given to both manuscripts.

Loren T. Stuckenbruck, "The 'Angels' and 'Giants' of Genesis 6:1-4 in Second and Third Century BCE Jewish Interpretation: Reflections on the Posture of Early Apocalyptic Traditions", *DSD* 7 no. 3 (2000), pp. 354-377.

The author describes how early Jewish apocalyptic writings interpreted Gen. 6:1-4 as an account relating to the introduction of evil into the world. In order to do so, S. discusses the role of the "giants" by analysing how it was that the בני האלהים (vv.2, 4a), the הגברים השם (v.4b), and the הנפלים (v.4a) could have been associated with the great flood (cf. also Gen. 10:8-12; Num. 13:33). Since ambiguities in Gen. 6:1-4 led to a wide range of interpretations in the Jewish apocalyptic writings, S. discusses firstly the Greek "Pseudo-Eupolemus" fragments (Eusebius, *Praeparatio Evangelica*, 9.17.1-9 [fr.1] and 9.18.2 [fr.2]). Secondly, he analyses the early Enoch traditions (1 En. 1-36; 85-90) according to which the flood is a divine act of judgement: the *Book of Watchers* where the giants survive the flood as "evil spirits" (in later literature identified with "demons"); the *Book of Giants* where the giants are described as being evil, deserving punishment (cf. 4Q531 14 2-3); the *Animal Apocalypse* where the flood appears as conclusive punishment of the giants. Thirdly, S. focuses on Jubilees (looking at the flood, the origin of demons, the watchers'

teaching, and the locus and timing of the watchers' Rebellion) and concludes that according to Jubilees the "watchers" and the "giants" are culpable, the deluge putting into effect an partial judgement that anticipates completion at the end of time (here S. offers an interpretation of יִדְרֹן [Gen. 6:3]).

Emanuel Tov, "A Qumran Origin for the Masada non-biblical Texts?", *DSD* 7 no. 1 (2000), pp. 57-73.

The texts from Masada form a corpus comparable in nature to the more numerous manuscripts found at Qumran. Certain similarities between these two finds may suggest a Qumran origin for some Masada texts: "MasQumran-type Text" is, for instance, similar in nature to Qumran composition in morphology and orthography; though little can be said about the content it contains the typical Qumran form הַרְאָה (line 3), a feature unknown outside Qumran. "MasShirShabb" represents a composition which is well documented in Qumran and has a distinct sectarian content. Two texts on biblical themes (named by Talmon "Apocryphon of Joshua" and "Apocryphon of Genesis") resemble Qumran documents that rework biblical texts or motifs. "Mas apocrJosh" also reflects (next to MT-type spellings and linguistic forms כִּי in line 4 and יִהְיֶה- in lines 5-7) the typical Qumran form מוֹאֲדָה in line 8 and two additional *plene* spellings in lines 5 and 7 (אֲדוֹנֵי and לֹא). The *plene* spelling יוֹם קִדְשׁוֹ in "Mas apocrGen" in line 4 shows an affinity to the Qumran system as well. Furthermore, "MasJub/psJub" reflects a composition which was close to Qumranic material; וְיִשְׂרָאֵל הַמְשַׁטְמָה (only known in Qumran) seem to reflect this. Also Ben Sira may have been imported from Qumran (present there as 2QSir), as well as some other or all the Masada biblical texts, though there is no evidence for this hypothesis. Despite other similarities between the two corpora (both of them including biblical texts and sectarian writings and paleo-Hebrew texts and the similarity of writing material and also the content between the non-canonical texts), T. emphasises that there are important differences (proportional and in character) between the two collections of texts: the biblical texts constitute a larger component in the Masada corpus, and the number of Torah scrolls at Masada seems to have been larger. In addition, the identification of the Masada biblical texts with what was to become the central text of Judaism (MT) points to a community that was closely connected with the spiritual center of Jerusalem. Finally, in contrast to Qumran, no Aramaic and Latin evidence has been found at Masada, and only a few Greek fragments.

Julio Trebelle, "A 'Canon within a Canon': Two Series of Old Testament Books differently transmitted, interpreted and authorized", *RevQum* 19 no. 3 (June, 2000), pp. 383-400.

The author summarises two groups of Old Testament books which have characteristics that differ from each other. T. assigns to one group the books of the Pentateuch, Isaiah, Minor Prophets and Psalms, plus Job and Proverbs, while the other group consists of Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings, Jeremiah and Ezekiel, plus Daniel. T. describes the different treatment of both series of books within different religious contexts (namely, Qumran and early Christianity) and identifies eight different categories: (1) they are differently copied and preserved, (2) they are differently transmitted, (3) differently composed and edited, (4)

differently translated (introduced by stereotypical formal quotations e.g. לְאָמֹר or כְּתוּב, (5) differently quoted, (6) differently ordered, (7) differently interpreted, and (8) differently authorized. T. concludes that throughout Second Temple Judaism, and not only in certain Jewish communities, did there exist a “canon-within-a-canon”, which included the books of the Pentateuch, Isaiah, Minor Prophets and Psalms, as these writings enjoyed a special authority reflected by their transmission, quotation and interpretation.

Kristin De Troyer, “Once more, the so-called Esther Fragments of Cave 4”, *RevQum* 19 no. 3 (June, 2000), pp. 401-422.

The author addresses various issues concerning the so called Esther fragments from Cave 4 and the possibilities of knowledge at Qumran of Esther. De Troyer maintains that there is still no witness for an Esther text among the Qumran documents – in contrast to what has been previously assumed - and that 4Q550 is far from sure being a version of Esther. This fragment, in turn, rather represents a “Persian Court Tale”. However, this does not indicate that the book of Esther was not known among the members of the Qumran group. It is likely that there are traces of Esther in the Genesis Apocryphon, where there are allusions to the beauty contest from the second chapter of the book of Esther. Moreover, one may find an even more interesting hint in the Temple Scroll that the book of Esther was known in Qumran: col. 64, line 9: יתלו אורו העץ is very reminiscent of Esther 9,13 יתלו על-העץ ראה עשרת בני-המין. De Troyer strengthens her argument that Esther was known in Qumran by comparing different formulas for “hanging”, as תלה (hanging), תלה על-עץ (hanging a dead body) and תלה חי על-עץ (crucifixion) and, in addition, the use of the Greek κρεμάσθαι, which enables her also to demonstrate that the Temple Scroll refers to the MT text of Esther 9,13.

James C. Vanderkam, “The Angels of the Presence in the Book of Jubilees”, *DSD* 7 no. 3 (2000), pp. 378-393.

The author demonstrates what Jubilees says about the character and roles of the Angel of the Presence and identifies those sources on which the author of Jubilees drew in preparing his portrait of this Angel. To achieve this aim V. focuses firstly in detail on the occurrence and meaning of the title “Angel of the Presence”: מלאך הפנים (Jub. 2:2). In the Hebrew Bible it occurs only as ומלאך פניו דושיעם (Isa. 63:9; 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>), but it is attested in texts of Qumran (cf. 1QSb 4:25,26; 3Q7 5 3; 1QH<sup>a</sup> 14[6]:13). Then, V. discusses those roles of the Angel of the Presence which could be exegetically derived from the Hebrew Bible. He examines the following texts: Isa. 63:9; Ex. 14:19 in comparison with Jub. 1:29 (האלהים); Ex. 23:20-23 (mentioning פנים and examining the difficult words תמר and קלו); 32:34; Num. 20:16; and Dt. 4:37. To determine the character of the Angel of the Presence in more detail, V. analyses the occurrences and the meaning of the מלאך יהוה/אלהים in the Hebrew Bible in great detail and compares these with Jubilees. He concludes that Jubilees identifies מלאך יהוה/אלהים with the Angel of the Presence. Finally, V. observes that the Angel of the Presence claims for himself what in the Bible are words or deeds of God (cf. Jub. 6:19,22; 12:22; 30:12; 48:4,13). God is being removed from almost all immediate contact with the world.

Rick Van De Water, "Reconsidering Palaeographic and Radiocarbon Dating of the Dead Sea Scrolls", *RevQum* 19 no. 3 (June, 2000), pp. 423-440.

The author considers the results of different radiocarbon tests on the Dead Sea Scrolls and the question of whether or not these results cope with the palaeographic estimates. Publishers of radiocarbon tests seem to express the agreements between palaeography and radiocarbon dates rather modestly. In certain cases, there is a disagreement between palaeographic and radiocarbon ages. For instance, in the dating of 4Q524 (TQahat) the discrepancy between the palaeographic estimate and the radiocarbon dating is rather large. Similarly the results from both approaches vary for some writings where the palaeographical estimate seems undoubted and normally relates the writings to each other, as for instance 4Q171 and 1QpHab or 11QTemple and 1QpHab. Van De Water concludes that the sole use of palaeographic dating is rather inadequate and that both approaches are in need of refinement.

Michael G. Wechsler, "Two Para-Biblical Novellae from Qumran Cave 4: A Reevaluation of 4Q550", *DSD* 7 no. 2 (2000), pp. 130-172.

The subject of W.'s study is 4Q550. W. demonstrates that 4Q550<sup>a-f</sup> represents three independent, non-successive works which are not closely connected with the extant versions of the book of Esther. Arguing especially against the opinion of Milik, W. focuses on four different aspects: the onomastic evidence, the parallels to 4Q550 in other biblical and para-biblical sources, the distribution of linguistic-literary elements in 4Q550, and the palaeographic evidence. This requires W. to use and discuss frequently Aramaic/Hebrew in vocabulary, grammatical, literary, and textual analyses. Especially the discussion of the onomastic evidence leads him to detailed analyses of names such as אסתר (or אסא), זרש (or אסרה), etc., and the analysis of the distribution of linguistic-literary elements requires leads to a thorough review of occurrences of phrases. After this, W. offers his version of the text of 4Q550<sup>d</sup> I-III (= 4QEzNehseq ar) and 4Q550<sup>b</sup> I-III (= 4QEsthpreq ar) with a detailed discussion.

Michael O. Wise, "מי כמוני באלים", A Study of 4Q491c, 4Q471b, 4Q427 and 1QH<sup>a</sup> 25:35-26:10", *DSD* 7 no. 2 (2000), pp. 173-219.

After a long review of research on 4Q491, W. offers another edition of 4Q491c, 4Q471b (4Q431 i), 4Q427 i, and 1QH<sup>a</sup> 25:35-26:10, followed by an discussion of the relationship between these four texts and 4Q491 frag.11 (i.e. the "Canticle of Michael" and the "Canticle of Righteousnes" [cf. DJD VII]). Furthermore, W. offers an interpretation of the texts, chiefly by asking the question who is talking in the texts. W. concludes that it is each individual member of the user group speaking of him- or herself. The editions of the texts consist always of a transcription (including hand-drawings of the fragments and an *apparatus criticus*), a translation, and a discussion. The hand-drawings and the transcriptions contain numerous reconstructions. In the discussion W. focuses on those junctures where his decisions require justification. Often by comparison with previous editions he discusses textual problems, analysing the Hebrew text in great detail, Hebrew being the point of focus throughout the discussions.



Ian Young, "Notes on the Language of 4QCant<sup>b</sup>", *JJS* 52 (2001) 122-131.

In addition to material differences from the MT, 4QCant<sup>b</sup> (4Q107) contains a number of linguistic forms - on the surface, these could be interpreted as Aramaising intrusions into the Hebrew - that contrast with those of the MT. Thirteen examples previously noted by E. Tov are weighed: (1) Seven instances of מן being non-assimilated before a noun without the definite article (Sgs. 4:8 [4X], 10 [2X], 16; MT only in 4:15: מן־לבנון), whereas only twice is it assimilated (to 4:8,9: respectively, ממענות and מעיניך; in MT 25X altogether). (2) הררי as plural cstr. for "mountains" (4:8; MT Heb. 28X הררי), but this is an old, not exclusively, Aramaic form (cf. Num. 23:7; Deut. 33:15; Hab. 3:6; Pss. 36:7; 50:10; 76:5; 87:1; 133:3; and even Cant. at 4:8). (3) Aramaic phonology in טללים "shadows" (Heb.: הצללים) at 2:17 (not preserved for MT Cant. 4:6), though the MT at 1:17 has the Aramaising ברוהים instead of standard Heb. ברושים "cedars". (4) Masc. plur. noun ending with ך (בשמין "spices"), but Moabite and the Deir Alla dialect attest this phenomenon and is common to Mishnaic Hebrew. (5) את in 4:8 (2X), where MT has אתי "with me"; 4QCant<sup>b</sup> can be understood as a hypercorrection to fem. sg. pron. "you" (as the form in MT to 6:4). (6) The geographical name אומנון for the Antilebanon mountains at 4:8 (MT: אמנה). The first -o class vowel adapt to the following labial -m- (as documented e.g. in 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>) and the second one follows suit; the origin is hard to clarify. These variations does not allow one to judge which, whether the Qumran ms. or MT, contains a more 'original' text. Not only 4QCant<sup>b</sup> but also MT contains "peculiarities"; to begin with MT as the point of departure is therefore misleading.