

THE PRINCETON DEAD SEA SCROLLS PROJECT

Sponsored by the Foundation on Judaism and Christian Origins

THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS  
Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts  
with English Translations

Volume 5B

Qumran Greek Fragments, Hymns, Prayers,  
and Related Documents

edited by

JAMES H. CHARLESWORTH

and

HENRY W. MORISADA RIETZ, Associate Editor  
and LOREN L. JOHNS, Associate Editor

with

ELDON J. EPP, LARRY W. HURTADO, and LEA BERKUZ

along with

JOLYON G. R. PRUSZINSKI, BRANDON L. ALLEN, DANIEL M. GURTNER, and BLAKE A. JURGENS

**WJK** WESTMINSTER  
JOHN KNOX PRESS  
LOUISVILLE • KENTUCKY

THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS

Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts

with English Translations

Volume 5B

Qumran Greek Fragments, Hymns, Prayers, and Related Documents

# *The Princeton Dead Sea Scrolls Project*

*Editor: James H. Charlesworth*

*Associate Editors: Henry W. Morisada Rietz  
and Loren L. Johns*

## *Graphic Concordance to the Dead Sea Scrolls*

### *The Dead Sea Scrolls*

*Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations*

- 1. Rule of the Community and Related Documents*
- 2. Damascus Document, War Scroll, and Related Documents*
- 3. Damascus Document II,  
Some Works of the Torah, and Related Documents*
- 4A: Pseudepigraphic and Non-Masoretic Psalms and Prayers*
- 4B: Angelic Liturgy: Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*
- 5A: Thanksgiving Hymns and Related Documents*
- 5B: Qumran Greek Fragments, Hymns, Prayers, and Related Documents*
- 6A: Targum on Job, Parabiblical, and Related Documents*
- 6B: Pesharim, Other Commentaries, and Related Documents*
- 7: Temple Scroll and Related Documents*
- 8A: Genesis Apocryphon and Related Documents*
- 8B: New Jerusalem, Wisdom Texts, and Related Documents*
- 9A: Visions, Testaments, and Other Documents*
- 9B: Copper Scroll, Priestly Texts, and Other Documents*
- 10: Biblical Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha*

### *Lexical Concordance to the Dead Sea Scrolls*

## Table of Contents

<p>List of Contributors ..... xi</p> <p>Preface ..... xiii</p> <p>Foreword (with Signa and Sigla) ..... xv</p> <p>Consistency Chart ..... xvii</p> <p>Abbreviations ..... xix</p> <p>General Introduction: The Dead Sea Scrolls: Primary Sources for Second Temple Judaism and a Clarified Perception of Christian Origins ..... xxvii</p> <p><i>Texts and Translations</i></p> <p>Qumran Greek Fragments (7Q3–7Q19) ..... 1          Introduction (EPP and HURTADO)          Text (EPP and HURTADO)          Translation (EPP and HURTADO)</p> <p>Barki Nafshi (4Q434–4Q438) ..... 35          Introduction (CHARLESWORTH with PRUSZINSKI)          Text (CHARLESWORTH)          Translation (CHARLESWORTH)</p> <p>Prayer of Nabonidus (4Q242) ..... 75          Introduction (CHARLESWORTH with ALLEN)          Text (CHARLESWORTH with ALLEN)          Translation (CHARLESWORTH with ALLEN)</p> <p>Purity Rule A (Tohorot A) (4Q274) ..... 85          Introduction (CHARLESWORTH)          Text (CHARLESWORTH with BERKUZ)          Translation (CHARLESWORTH with BERKUZ)</p> <p>Purity Rule B<sup>a</sup> (Tohorot B<sup>a</sup>) (4Q276) ..... 99          Introduction (CHARLESWORTH)          Text (CHARLESWORTH with BERKUZ)          Translation (CHARLESWORTH with BERKUZ)</p> <p>Purity Rule B<sup>b</sup> (Tohorot B<sup>b</sup>) (4Q277) ..... 103          Introduction (CHARLESWORTH)          Text (CHARLESWORTH with BERKUZ)          Translation (CHARLESWORTH with BERKUZ)</p>	<p>Purity Rule C (Tohorot C) (4Q278) ..... 109          Introduction (CHARLESWORTH)          Text (CHARLESWORTH with BERKUZ)          Translation (CHARLESWORTH with BERKUZ)</p> <p>Four Lots (4Q279) ..... 113          Introduction (CHARLESWORTH)          Text (CHARLESWORTH with BERKUZ)          Translation (CHARLESWORTH with BERKUZ)</p> <p>Unidentified Fragments (4Q281) ..... 119          Introduction (CHARLESWORTH)          Text (CHARLESWORTH with BERKUZ)          Translation (CHARLESWORTH with BERKUZ)</p> <p>A Rule for the Land (4Q282) ..... 125          Introduction (CHARLESWORTH)          Text (CHARLESWORTH with BERKUZ)          Translation (CHARLESWORTH with BERKUZ)</p> <p>Purification Liturgy (4Q284) ..... 141          Introduction (CHARLESWORTH)          Text (CHARLESWORTH with BERKUZ)          Translation (CHARLESWORTH with BERKUZ)</p> <p>Berakot A (4Q286) ..... 151          Introduction (CHARLESWORTH)          Text (CHARLESWORTH with BERKUZ)          Translation (CHARLESWORTH with BERKUZ)</p> <p>Berakot B (4Q287) ..... 171          Introduction (CHARLESWORTH)          Text (CHARLESWORTH with BERKUZ)          Translation (CHARLESWORTH with BERKUZ)</p> <p>Berakot C (4Q288) ..... 181          Introduction (CHARLESWORTH)          Text (CHARLESWORTH with BERKUZ)          Translation (CHARLESWORTH with BERKUZ)</p> <p>Berakot D (4Q289) ..... 187          Introduction (CHARLESWORTH)          Text (CHARLESWORTH with BERKUZ)          Translation (CHARLESWORTH with BERKUZ)</p>
--	--

<p>Berakot E (4Q290) ..... 191  Introduction (CHARLESWORTH)  Text (CHARLESWORTH with BERKUZ)  Translation (CHARLESWORTH with BERKUZ)</p> <p>Blessing and Praising God (4Q291) ..... 195  Introduction (CHARLESWORTH)  Text (CHARLESWORTH with BERKUZ)  Translation (CHARLESWORTH with BERKUZ)</p> <p>Blessings Through the Prophets (4Q292) ..... 201  Introduction (CHARLESWORTH)  Text (CHARLESWORTH with BERKUZ)  Translation (CHARLESWORTH with BERKUZ)</p> <p>Cosmic Blessings (4Q293) ..... 205  Introduction (CHARLESWORTH)  Text (CHARLESWORTH with BERKUZ)  Translation (CHARLESWORTH with BERKUZ)</p> <p>Prayer of Enosh? (4Q369) ..... 209  Introduction (CHARLESWORTH)  Text (CHARLESWORTH with BERKUZ)  Translation (CHARLESWORTH with BERKUZ)</p> <p>Prayer of Joseph A (4Q371) ..... 221  Introduction (CHARLESWORTH)  Text (CHARLESWORTH with BERKUZ)  Translation (CHARLESWORTH with BERKUZ)</p> <p>Prayer of Joseph B (4Q372) ..... 231  Introduction (CHARLESWORTH)  Text (CHARLESWORTH with BERKUZ)  Translation (CHARLESWORTH with BERKUZ)</p> <p>Celebrating God’s Defeat of Og and Goliath (4Q373) 255  Introduction (CHARLESWORTH)  Text (CHARLESWORTH with BERKUZ)  Translation (CHARLESWORTH with BERKUZ)</p> <p>Narrative and Poetic Composition (4Q373a) ..... 263  Introduction (CHARLESWORTH)  Text (CHARLESWORTH with BERKUZ)  Translation (CHARLESWORTH with BERKUZ)</p> <p>Psalms of Joshua<sup>a-b</sup> (4Q378–4Q379) ..... 267  Introduction (CHARLESWORTH)  Text (CHARLESWORTH with BERKUZ)  Translation (CHARLESWORTH with BERKUZ)</p>	<p>Purification Rituals (4Q414) ..... 313  Introduction (CHARLESWORTH)  Text (CHARLESWORTH with BERKUZ)  Translation (CHARLESWORTH with BERKUZ)</p> <p>Various Prayers (4Q441–4Q444) ..... 333  Introduction (CHARLESWORTH)  Text (CHARLESWORTH with BERKUZ)  Translation (CHARLESWORTH with BERKUZ)</p> <p>Prayer for King Jonathan and Psalm (4Q448) ..... 353  Introduction (CHARLESWORTH)  Text (CHARLESWORTH with BERKUZ)  Translation (CHARLESWORTH with BERKUZ)</p> <p>Prayer on Judgments (4Q449) ..... 361  Introduction (CHARLESWORTH)  Text (CHARLESWORTH with BERKUZ)  Translation (CHARLESWORTH with BERKUZ)</p> <p>Prayer on Despair (4Q450) ..... 365  Introduction (CHARLESWORTH)  Text (CHARLESWORTH with BERKUZ)  Translation (CHARLESWORTH with BERKUZ)</p> <p>Prayer on God’s Greatness (4Q451) ..... 369  Introduction (CHARLESWORTH)  Text (CHARLESWORTH with BERKUZ)  Translation (CHARLESWORTH with BERKUZ)</p> <p>Prayer Concerning God’s Mightiness (4Q452) ..... 373  Introduction (CHARLESWORTH)  Text (CHARLESWORTH with BERKUZ)  Translation (CHARLESWORTH with BERKUZ)</p> <p>Prayer as a Lament (4Q453) ..... 377  Introduction (CHARLESWORTH)  Text (CHARLESWORTH with BERKUZ)  Translation (CHARLESWORTH with BERKUZ)</p> <p>Prayer for the Land of Ham (4Q454) ..... 381  Introduction (CHARLESWORTH)  Text (CHARLESWORTH with BERKUZ)  Translation (CHARLESWORTH with BERKUZ)</p> <p>Prayer on Faithfulness (4Q455) ..... 385  Introduction (CHARLESWORTH)  Text (CHARLESWORTH with BERKUZ)  Translation (CHARLESWORTH with BERKUZ)</p>
--	---

Halleluyah (4Q456) ..... 389	Liturgical Fragment 3: His Sanctuary (1Q39) ..... 757
Introduction (CHARLESWORTH)	Introduction (GURTNER)
Text (CHARLESWORTH with BERKUZ)	Text (CHARLESWORTH with BERKUZ)
Translation (CHARLESWORTH with BERKUZ)	Translation (CHARLESWORTH with BERKUZ)
On Creation (4Q457a) ..... 393	Liturgical Fragment 4: Mysteries and [Wo]nders (1Q40) ..... 765
Introduction (CHARLESWORTH)	Introduction (GURTNER)
Text (CHARLESWORTH with BERKUZ)	Text (CHARLESWORTH with BERKUZ)
Translation (CHARLESWORTH with BERKUZ)	Translation (CHARLESWORTH with BERKUZ)
An Eschatological Prayer (4Q457b) ..... 399	Liturgical Fragment 5: Celebrating God’s Wonders (4Q392) ..... 771
Introduction (CHARLESWORTH)	Introduction (CHARLESWORTH)
Text (CHARLESWORTH with BERKUZ)	Text (CHARLESWORTH with BERKUZ)
Translation (CHARLESWORTH with BERKUZ)	Translation (CHARLESWORTH with BERKUZ)
Prayer Concerning God and Israel (4Q471c) ..... 405	Liturgical Fragment 6: Liturgical Work Based on the Exodus Tradition in Jeremiah (4Q393) ..... 783
Introduction (CHARLESWORTH)	Introduction (CHARLESWORTH)
Text (CHARLESWORTH with BERKUZ)	Text (CHARLESWORTH with BERKUZ)
Translation (CHARLESWORTH with BERKUZ)	Translation (CHARLESWORTH with BERKUZ)
The Heavenly Garden (4Q500) ..... 409	Liturgical Fragment 7: Blessings of the First Fruits and Lambs with the Lord’s Holy Name (4Q409) .... 795
Introduction (CHARLESWORTH)	Introduction (CHARLESWORTH)
Text (CHARLESWORTH with BERKUZ)	Text (CHARLESWORTH with BERKUZ)
Translation (CHARLESWORTH with BERKUZ)	Translation (CHARLESWORTH with BERKUZ)
So-Called Marriage Ritual (4Q502) ..... 417	Cave I Miscellaneous Fragments ..... 801
Introduction (CHARLESWORTH)	Introduction (CHARLESWORTH and JURGENS)
Text (CHARLESWORTH with BERKUZ)	Texts and Translations (CHARLESWORTH and JURGENS with BERKUZ)
Translation (CHARLESWORTH with BERKUZ)	Holy Spirit Fragment (1Q30) ..... 804
Songs of the Master (Maskil) (4Q510–4Q511) ..... 539	Men of the Community Fragment (1Q31) ..... 810
Introduction (CHARLESWORTH)	Elect of Israel Fragment (1Q37) ..... 812
Text (CHARLESWORTH with BERKUZ)	Songs of the Te[mple] Fragment (1Q41) ..... 816
Translation (CHARLESWORTH with BERKUZ)	[In] the Days of Hunger Fragment (1Q42) ..... 822
Ritual of Purification (4Q512) ..... 647	All the Angel[s] Fragment (1Q43) ..... 826
Introduction (CHARLESWORTH)	Your [G]lory Fragment (1Q44) ..... 830
Text (CHARLESWORTH with BERKUZ)	The Poor Fragment (1Q45) ..... 834
Translation (CHARLESWORTH with BERKUZ)	Valley Fragment (1Q46) ..... 838
Liturgical Fragment 1: Guarding Your Mysteries (1Q36) ..... 733	Gate Fragment (1Q47) ..... 842
Introduction (GURTNER)	Egg Fragment (1Q48) ..... 846
Text (CHARLESWORTH with BERKUZ)	Your Strength Fragment (1Q49) ..... 848
Translation (CHARLESWORTH with BERKUZ)	The Tree[s] Fragment (1Q50) ..... 850
Liturgical Fragment 2: In My Heart (1Q38) ..... 747	Your Signs Fragment (1Q52) ..... 852
Introduction (GURTNER)	Worm Fragment (1Q53) ..... 854
Text (CHARLESWORTH and JURGENS)	[Co]venant of His Glory Fragment (1Q54) ..... 856
Translation (CHARLESWORTH and JURGENS)	Nations Fragment (1Q55) ..... 858
	Resting Places Fragment (1Q56) ..... 860
	In Your Statutes Fragment (1Q57) ..... 862

[Is]rael Fragment 1 (1Q58) .....	864	Cave IV Poetic Fragments 1–3 (4Q445–4Q447) .....	913
Your Nations Fragment (Psalm 106) (1Q59) ...	866	Introduction (CHARLESWORTH and JURGENS)	
The Son Fragment (1Q60) .....	868	Text (CHARLESWORTH and JURGENS with BERKUZ)	
Covenant Fragment (1Q61) .....	870	Translation (CHARLESWORTH and JURGENS with	
Moses Fragment 1 (1Q62) .....	872	BERKUZ)	
On Their Standards Fragment (1Q63) .....	874	Dead Sea Scrolls	
In the Bitterness Fragment (1Q64) .....	876	List of Document Numbers, Names of Documents,	
[I]srael Fragment 2 (1Q65) .....	878	and Volume Numbers .....	929
Teacher Fragment (1Q66) .....	880	Names of Documents, Document Numbers, and	
Darkening Fragment (1Q67) .....	882	Volume Numbers .....	934
Bread and Roasted Grain Fragment (1Q68) .....	886		
Those Rejoicing Fragment (1Q69) .....	892		

# The Princeton Dead Sea Scrolls Project

## List of Contributors

BRANDON L. ALLEN  
Princeton Theological Seminary,  
Princeton, New Jersey

James F. Armstrong (deceased)  
Princeton Theological Seminary,  
Princeton, New Jersey

JOSEPH M. BAUMGARTEN (deceased)  
Baltimore Hebrew College,  
Baltimore, Maryland

BRADY ALAN BEARD  
Princeton Theological Seminary,  
Princeton, New Jersey

LEA BERKUZ  
Ramat Hasharon,  
Israel

GEORGE J. BROOKE  
University of Manchester,  
Manchester, England

MAGEN BROSHI (deceased)  
Shrine of the Book (Emeritus),  
Jerusalem, Israel

JAMES H. CHARLESWORTH  
Princeton Theological Seminary  
(Emeritus),  
Princeton, New Jersey

CARSTEN CLAUSSEN  
Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität  
München,  
Munich, Germany

JOHN J. COLLINS  
Yale University,  
New Haven, Connecticut

FRANK M. CROSS JR. (deceased)  
Harvard University,  
Cambridge, Massachusetts

MICHAEL T. DAVIS  
Princeton Theological Seminary,  
Princeton, New Jersey

DEVORAH DIMANT  
University of Haifa,  
Haifa, Israel

JEAN DUHAIME  
Université de Montréal,  
Montreal, Quebec, Canada

LORENZO DITOMMASO  
Concordia University,  
Montreal, Quebec, Canada

JULIE A. DUNCAN  
Garrett-Evangelical Theological  
Seminary,  
Evanston, Illinois

CASEY D. ELLEDGE  
Gustavus Adolphus College,  
St. Peter, Minnesota

ELDON J. EPP  
Case Western Reserve University  
(Emeritus),  
Cleveland, Ohio

JOSEPH A. FITZMYER  
Catholic University of America  
(Emeritus),  
Washington, D.C.

PETER W. FLINT (deceased)  
Dead Sea Scrolls Institute,  
Langley, British Columbia, Canada

DAVID N. FREEDMAN (deceased)  
University of Michigan,  
Ann Arbor, Michigan

ANDREW D. GROSS  
The Catholic University of America,  
Washington, District of Columbia

DANIEL M. GURTNER  
Gateway Seminary,  
Ontario, California

MAURYA P. HORGAN  
The Scriptorium,  
Denver, Colorado

LARRY HURTADO (deceased)  
University of Edinburgh,  
Edinburgh, Scotland

LOREN L. JOHNS  
Anabaptist Mennonite Biblical  
Seminary (retired),  
Elkhart, Indiana

BLAKE A. JURGENS  
Princeton Theological Seminary,  
Princeton, New Jersey

JOHN KAMPEN  
Methodist Theological School in  
Ohio,  
Delaware, Ohio

ROBERT A. KUGLER  
Gonzaga University,  
Spokane, Washington

HERMANN LICHTENBERGER  
University of Tübingen,  
Tübingen, Germany

Contributors

---

DANIEL A. MACHIELA  
McMaster University,  
Hamilton, Ontario, Canada

P. KYLE MCCARTER JR.  
Johns Hopkins University,  
Baltimore, Maryland

DORON MENDELS  
Hebrew University,  
Jerusalem, Israel

JACOB MILGROM (deceased)  
University of California (Emeritus),  
Berkeley, California

ROLAND E. MURPHY, O. Carm.  
(deceased)  
Duke University,  
Durham, North Carolina

CAROL A. NEWSOM  
Emory University,  
Atlanta, Georgia

LIDIJA NOVAKOVIC  
Baylor University,  
Waco, Texas

YOSEF OFER  
Hebrew University,  
Jerusalem, Israel

DENNIS T. OLSON  
Princeton Theological Seminary,  
Princeton, New Jersey

STEPHEN J. PFANN  
University of the Holy Land,  
Jerusalem, Israel

JOLYON G. R. PRUSZINSKI  
Princeton University,  
Princeton, New Jersey

ELISHA QIMRON  
Ben Gurion University of the Negev,  
Beer-Sheva, Israel

MICHAEL C. RAND  
The Academy of the Hebrew  
Language,  
Jerusalem, Israel

GARY A. RENDSBURG  
Rutgers University,  
New Brunswick, New Jersey

HENRY W. MORISADA RIETZ  
Grinnell College,  
Grinnell, Iowa

J. J. M. ROBERTS  
Princeton Theological Seminary  
(Emeritus),  
Princeton, New Jersey

JAMES A. SANDERS (deceased)  
Ancient Biblical Manuscript Center  
(Emeritus),  
Claremont, California

LAWRENCE H. SCHIFFMAN  
New York University,  
New York, New York

EILEEN M. SCHULLER  
McMaster University,  
Hamilton, Ontario, Canada

DANIEL R. SCHWARTZ  
Hebrew University,  
Jerusalem, Israel

ALAN F. SEGAL (deceased)  
Barnard College,  
New York, New York

BRENT A. STRAWN  
Duke University,  
Durham, North Carolina

LOREN T. STUCKENBRUCK  
University of Munich,  
Munich, Germany

SHEMARYAHU TALMON (deceased)  
Hebrew University (Emeritus),  
Jerusalem, Israel

EMANUEL TOV  
Hebrew University (Emeritus),  
Jerusalem, Israel

JOSEPH L. TRAFTON  
Western Kentucky University,  
Bowling Green, Kentucky

EUGENE ULRICH  
University of Notre Dame,  
Notre Dame, Indiana

JAMES C. VANDERKAM  
University of Notre Dame,  
Notre Dame, Indiana

MOSHE WEINFELD (deceased)  
Hebrew University,  
Jerusalem, Israel

RICHARD E. WHITAKER (deceased)  
Princeton Theological Seminary  
(Emeritus),  
Princeton, New Jersey

SIDNIE A. WHITE CRAWFORD  
University of Nebraska-Lincoln,  
Lincoln, Nebraska

ADELA YARBRO COLLINS  
Yale University,  
New Haven, Connecticut

ADA YARDENI (deceased)  
Hebrew University,  
Jerusalem, Israel

BRUCE ZUCKERMAN  
University of Southern California,  
Los Angeles, California

## Preface

The Princeton Dead Sea Scrolls Project was launched in 1985. The Project has benefited from scholarly societies, libraries, museums, foundations, and philanthropists. The Computer Committee, the Board of Editorial Advisors, the Editor's assistants, and especially the subeditors have labored to make this series the critical and comprehensive edition of the nonbiblical Dead Sea Scrolls, with texts (and an *apparatus criticus*), English translations, introductions, and composite text (when possible).

*Societies, Libraries, and Museums.* Many assume that the Dead Sea Scrolls are preserved in the Shrine of the Book and the Rockefeller Museum. Most of the Dead Sea Scrolls are in these two locations, but some are preserved in other places. The Editor appreciates each institution that (or individual who) preserves Dead Sea Scrolls and fragments or the *Damascus Document* and has made them available for study and imaging. The Editor also is grateful to institutions and individuals who have provided improved photographs or digital images of the Scrolls. The project is indebted to the following:

The ASOR Ancient Manuscript Committee,  
The Albright Institute,  
The Israel Department of Antiquities and Museums,  
The Shrine of the Book,  
The Rockefeller Museum,  
The Museum of the Studium Biblicum Franciscanum, Jerusalem,  
The Antiquities Department of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan,  
The Bibliothèque Nationale,  
The University of Cambridge Library,  
The Musée Terre Sainte, Paris,  
The Ancient Biblical Manuscript Center,  
The West Semitic Research Project,  
Kodansha Ltd.,  
The Huntington Library, and  
Archbishop Mar Athanasius Y. Samuel.

*Foundations, Institutions, and Philanthropists.* The Project has received funding and support from numerous sources. Its success has been made possible by funding from the Alexander von Humboldt Stiftung, Lady Davis Foundation (The Hebrew University), the Foundation on Judaism and Christian Origins, the Institute for Semitic Studies, the Henry Luce Foundation, the Edith C. Blum Foundation, Inc., and Grinnell College. Special appreciations are also expressed to Frances M. and Wilbur H. Friedman, Dan Hales, Dr. John Hoffmann, Linda Wall, and Tom and Ann Cousins for their generous support. We are also grateful for the continued support from James Joyner, Dr. Lamar Barden, and Richard Darden.

*Computer Committee, Board of Editorial Advisors, and Assistants.* When the Project began, a special Computer Committee recommended that the Project work with the IBYCUS Computer System and develop software for the preparation of Semitic texts with appropriate sigla in order to present the exotic forms found in the Dead Sea Scrolls. James F. Armstrong served as chair. The other members were D. Packard, R. E. Whitaker, J. J. M. Roberts, and the Editor. The Princeton Project now uses Nota Bene for Windows to produce the near-camera-ready copy for introductions, texts, and translations.

The Editor has been guided by a Board of Editorial Advisors: F. M. Cross, J. A. Sanders, D. N. Freedman, and S. Talmon. J. Strugnell offered valuable advice and insight. The Board advised the Editor about which documents should be included in early volumes and which should be published later, due to the state of research on unpublished fragments. The Board also suggested scholars to serve as subeditors.

In the Princeton Qumran Laboratory many editorial assistants have helped Charlesworth edit volume 5B by entering all texts into Nota Bene. They also helped by correcting entries, checking readings, and aligning all translations. These assistants include Lea Berkuz, Brandon Lee Allen, Blake A. Jurgens, Brady Alan Beard, Sarah Kay Duke, Jolyon G. R. Pruszinski, and Kenneth Bendiksen.

*Subeditors.* The Project is dependent on the expertise and cooperation of the specialists who prepared the critical texts and translations. The two main criteria employed in selecting a scholar for this work are proven expertise in Qumran research, especially on the document to be assigned, and demonstrated skill with English. The team of subeditors is from the U.S.A., Canada, Germany, France, Great Britain, and Israel (see the List of Contributors).

Finally a personal note: The dedication of all concerned has been encouraging. The enthusiasm of the subeditors, especially the dedicated assistants, helped me in ways that are known only to editors of massive and seemingly impossible projects.

Rietz, Johns, and I are grateful for the assistance from Westminster John Knox. Thanks especially to Daniel Braden and the Westminster John Knox staff for their commitment to making this Project an example of state-of-the-art publishing. To all mentioned above, and to many others, we are both indebted and grateful.

James H. Charlesworth, Editor and  
President, Foundation on  
Judaism and Christian Origins  
Princeton, New Jersey  
30 May 2023

Henry W. M. Rietz,  
Associate Editor  
Grinnell College  
Grinnell, Iowa

## Foreword (with Signa and Sigla)

The Princeton Dead Sea Scrolls Project was established to make available the first comprehensive and critical edition of texts, translations, and introductions to all the Dead Sea Scrolls that are not copies of biblical books (that is, documents collected in the *Biblia Hebraica*). Hence, the documents composed at Qumran, as well as the Jewish writings composed elsewhere but found in the eleven Qumran caves, are collected in this series. Volume 10 in the series is devoted to Qumran versions of documents considered to be part of the biblical Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha.

All Qumran sectarian documents are translated so that technical terms are rendered in the same manner (see the Consistency Chart following the Foreword). On the one hand, the Editor and his staff (in consultation with the Board of Advisors) had to decide how to translate *termini technici*; for example, we voted against “the Teacher of Righteousness,” in favor of “the Righteous Teacher,”<sup>1</sup> and against *Yahad* in favor of “Community.” On the other hand, words or phrases with more than one meaning had to be translated consistently, yet with some variety, so as to reflect the literary context or social setting.

Obviously, each introduction must be tailored both for the corpus and for the idiosyncrasies of the document under consideration. When the document is extensive, introductions can be organized according to an accepted pattern and a recognized order. For the convenience of the reader the guidelines for introductions may be summarized as follows:

*Texts.* The contributor presents all textual evidence for the document and discusses the material state of the manuscript(s).

*Contents.* This section describes the nature of the composition and its general content and character.

*Original Language.* The scholar discusses the language of composition.

*Date.* After assessing the date of the earliest witness to a document, the subeditor discusses the probable date of composition.

*Provenience.* Not all of the documents found in the Qumran Caves were composed at Qumran. Some were composed there; but others were written elsewhere in Palestine (in Jerusalem or perhaps somewhere in Galilee), and perhaps derive from documents (not merely traditions) that took initial shape in Babylon

or elsewhere. In light of these insights the specialist discusses the provenience of the document.

*History.* This section attempts to discern the history or historical episodes reflected in the scroll or necessary to comprehend it.

*Theology.* The expert discusses the major theological ideas and symbols in the writing.

*Relation to the Hebrew Bible.* The contributor assesses how, if at all, the document is related to books in the *Biblia Hebraica* (and perhaps to the versions of it extant before 70 C.E.).

*Relation to Other Jewish Writings.* The scholar discusses possible links to other Jewish writings, especially the *Books of Enoch*, *Jubilees*, and the earliest portions of the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*. The specialist also reflects on how the document helps us reconstruct Early Judaism (or types of Judaism during the period of the Second Temple).

*Relation to the New Testament.* The specialist discusses the significant ties with the documents collected into the New Testament and with the figures (like John the Baptist), symbolic language, or world view mentioned or preserved in these documents. Finally, the contributor presents an assessment of how the document may affect the reconstruction of Christian Origins.

Working with the Editor and his assistants, the subeditors reproduce as accurately as possible the texts of the manuscripts. Contributors use the best available photographs. When necessary, the manuscripts are rephotographed or digitized for their use. Whenever feasible, the contributors consult the actual manuscripts. Initial, medial, and final forms of consonants in anomalous positions are reproduced in the transcription precisely as seen on a scroll. The following signa, sigla, and script are employed in the transcriptions of texts:

⋈	= essentially certain reading of a damaged character <sup>2</sup>
⋈ ◦	= uncertain reading of a damaged character = illegible character
⋈, ⋈, ⋈	= deletion by a scribe <sup>3</sup>
אִשְׁרָאֵל	= deletion by a scribe
אִשְׁרָאֵל	= supralinear correction by a scribe
◊	= emendation proposed by subeditor (used only in the composite texts)

<sup>1</sup> The *môrēh haš-šedeq* was not one who taught “righteousness”; he was the right teacher to whom God had revealed all mysteries (cf. 1QpHab 7.4-5).

<sup>2</sup> The dot added by a transcriber is always above the character.

<sup>3</sup> A scribe’s use of a single dot over a character is indicated in a footnote to distinguish it from the sign for an essentially certain reading of a damaged character.

[ ]	= lacuna
[בני א] [ור]	= restoration of lacuna
[[ ]]	= join between fragments
( )	= area of erasure
(העם)	= area of erasure with legible character or characters
N	= separating mark supplied by scribe in margin
י,י	= a <i>waw</i> which could be a <i>yodh</i> (or a <i>yodh a waw</i> )
vac, vacat	= uninscribed surface <sup>4</sup>
‡	= end of line mark supplied by scribe in margin of CD
יהוה	= Palaeo-Hebrew script for יהוה
אל	= Palaeo-Hebrew script for אל
אלוהים	= Palaeo-Hebrew script for אלוהים
אלי	= Palaeo-Hebrew script for אלי
א	= Ligature (only for CD) signifying אל
...	= Signifies יהוה
ח	= Palaeo-Hebrew ח

Only obvious restorations of lacunae are attempted in the text and are circumscribed by brackets [ ]. In the composite text, these probable restorations of words or phrases are included in the diplomatic text, usually anchored by at least one extant letter. More speculative restorations are relegated to the notes. Restorations are based on comparisons with similar passages in the Qumran corpus; the *GC* serves as our guide.

When appropriate, more extensive restorations of passages from the Hebrew Bible are made according to the Qumran biblical manuscripts, the Aleppo Codex, Codex Leningradensis, or the Masoretic Text. In the case of documents which are attested in multiple manuscript witnesses, a critical apparatus is employed.<sup>5</sup> Whenever possible, each manuscript witness is presented separately with its own critical apparatus or textual notes. In exceptional instances, a composite text is reconstructed from the fragments of various manuscript witnesses.

Finally, the translators present in English the literal *meaning* of the Hebrew, Aramaic, or Greek. They avoid free idiomatic renderings. The following signs are employed in the translations:

[...]	= lacuna <sup>6</sup>
Sons of Li[ght...]	= restoration of lacuna
(God)	= additional words necessary for meaningful English
◊	= emendation proposed by subeditor (used only in the composite texts)
◦	= illegible consonant
(vacat)	= uninscribed surface

Italics are used to transliterate consonants or forms that are not translatable.<sup>7</sup>

J. H. Charlesworth  
Princeton, New Jersey

<sup>4</sup> This term is demanded by the ambiguity of many fragments. To avoid the intrusiveness of a Latin term in a Semitic (or Greek) manuscript, we use *vacat* sparingly. Aligning the text so as to clarify an unscripted surface, especially when the line is indented, serves the intended purpose without intruding editorially into the transcription.

<sup>5</sup> Underlined footnote numbers indicate significant textual variants between manuscripts. In the apparatus, *cf.* is used to refer to similar, though not necessarily overlapping material.

<sup>6</sup> Elipses indicate various lengths.

<sup>7</sup> Transliteration of Hebrew characters are according to the *SBL Handbook of Style*. Since *šîn* and *šîn* are not distinct forms in the manuscripts, both are rendered as *š* in the translation. However, they may be distinguished in the notes. When relevant, vocalizations appear in the notes following the conventions of the Society of Biblical Literature.

## Consistency Chart

The Princeton Dead Sea Scrolls Project primarily intends to present an improved critical text – with an *apparatus criticus* where appropriate and possible – to all the nonbiblical documents found in the eleven Qumran caves (that means all the documents not collected within the *Biblia Hebraica*). The translation provided is dependent on the text and is an aid to comprehending it; hence, it is as literal as good English will allow. Notes to the translation indicate other possible renderings, clarify how a word or phrase has been previously translated, or draw attention to a variant reading in another copy of the document.

Two principles have been followed so as to present a faithful and coherent translation. First, the meaning of a word must be discerned within its context; that is, within the cluster of contiguous words, and within the flow of the document (or a section of it). Previously, translations of Qumran Hebrew were prepared in light of Biblical Hebrew; now, however, the subeditors have decades of experience in reading and translating Qumran Hebrew in over 900 documents. Second, technical terms must be translated uniformly and consistently throughout the extensive corpus. The following list of terms clarify the decisions obtained from the Editor's dialogues with the subeditors and with the Board of Editorial Advisors (words in parentheses indicate examples of how the word or words have been translated in nontechnical contexts).

אביונים	Poor Ones
אודכה אדוני כי	I thank you, O Lord, because
איש הכוב	the Man of the Lie
אלים	divine beings
אסף	gather
ארץ	earth, land
בינה	discernment
בית קודש	House of Holiness
בליעל	Belial
בני אהרון	Sons of Aaron
בני אור	Sons of Light
בני אמת	Sons of Truth
בני השחר	Sons of the Dawn
בני חושך	Sons of Darkness
בני צדוק	Sons of Zadok
בני צדק	Sons of Righteousness
גורל	lot
דביר	inner room
דעת	knowledge
הדרך	the Way, the way
חוק	statute, boundary; (assigned)
חטא	sin
חכמה	wisdom
חסד	mercy

טובים	Good Ones
יום הכפורים	Day of Atonement
יום המשפט	Day of Judgment
יום נקם	Day of Vengeance
היחד	the Community; (community, common, each other, together, one, unity)
יעד	be summoned; (appointed)
הכהן הרשע	the Wicked Priest
הכתיאים	the Kittim
מבקר	Examiner
מועד	appointed time, holy day, season; (meeting, feast, festival)
מורה הצדק	Righteous Teacher
מטע	planting
מטיף הכוב	Spouter of the Lie
מעין	fountain
מעשים	works; (workmanship)
מצוותיו	his ordinances
מקור	spring; (discharge – 1QM 7.6)
משכיל	Master
משפט	judgment, precept; (justice)
נגלות	revealed, revealed (laws)
נפש	soul, being; (life, human being, self)
נצר	shoot
נקמה	(time of) vengeance
סוד	foundation, assembly, principle
עדה	congregation, Congregation
עול	deceit
עון	iniquity
עצה	counsel, the council, the Council
העת, עת	time, the Endtime; (now, age, continually)
פקיד	Overseer
צדקות, צדק	righteous, righteous deeds
צדיקים	Righteous Ones
קדושי קדושים	Most Holy Ones
קדושים	Holy Ones
קהל	assemble, assembly
קץ	Endtime, end, time
רוח קודש	Holy Spirit; (holy spirit)
הרבים	the Many
רז	mystery
תבל	world
תורה	Torah
תירוש	new wine
תכון	norm, measure
תמים, תם	perfect, perfectly; (perfection, continually, always, every, complete)
תמימים	Perfect Ones
תעודה	fixed times, convocation, distinction; (testimony, instruction)

## Abbreviations

### Modern Publications

<i>AASOR</i>	<i>Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research</i>	BDB	Brown, F., S. R. Driver, and C.A. Briggs, eds. <i>A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament</i> . Oxford, 1907.
AB	Anchor Bible	BDS	Charlesworth, J. H., ed. <i>The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls</i> , 3 vols. Waco, Texas, 2006.
<i>ABD</i>	Freedman, D. N., ed. <i>The Anchor Bible Dictionary</i> , 6 vols. New York, 1992.	<i>BeO</i>	<i>Bibbia e oriente</i>
Abegg and Wacholder, PEUPDSS	Abegg, M. G. and B.-Z. Wacholder, eds. <i>A Preliminary Edition of the Unpublished Dead Sea Scrolls</i> , 4 vols. Washington, D. C., 1991–96.	BETL	Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium, Paris and Leuven
ABRL	Anchor Bible Reference Library	BH	Biblical Hebrew
<i>AcOr</i>	<i>Acta orientalia</i>	<i>BHS</i>	<i>Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia</i>
<i>Aeg</i>	<i>Aegyptus</i>	BHT	Beiträge zur historischen Theologie
AGAJU	Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums	Bib	Biblica
<i>AHDSS</i>	Schiffman, L. H., ed. <i>Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls: The New York University Conference in Memory of Yigael Yadin</i> . JSOT/ ASOR Monograph Series 2; JSPS 8; Sheffield, 1990.	BibOr	Biblica et orientalia
<i>AJSL</i>	<i>American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures</i>	<i>BIOSCS</i>	<i>Bulletin of the International Organization for the Septuagint and Cognate Studies</i>
ALBO	Analecta lovaniensia biblica et orientalia	<i>BJRL</i>	<i>Bulletin of the John Rylands Library</i>
<i>ALUOS</i>	<i>Annual of Leeds University Oriental Society</i>	<i>BJRULM</i>	<i>Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester</i>
<i>ANRW</i>	Haase, W., and H. Temporini, eds. <i>Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt</i> . Berlin, New York, 1979–.	<i>BK</i>	<i>Bibel und Kirche</i>
ANTI	Arbeiten zum Neuen Testament und Judentum	BN	Catalogue général des livres imprimés de la bibliothèque nationale
AO	Analecta Orientalia	<i>BR</i>	<i>Biblical Research</i>
AOT	Altorientalische Texte zum Alten Testament	Broshi, DRR	Broshi, M., ed. <i>The Damascus Document Reconsidered</i> . Jerusalem, 1992.
<i>APAT</i>	Kautzsch, E., ed. <i>Die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments</i> , 2 vols. Tübingen, 1900.	<i>BSO(A)S</i>	<i>Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies</i>
<i>APOT</i>	Charles, R. H., ed. <i>The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English</i> , 2 vols. Oxford, 1913.	BWANT	Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament
<i>ArOr</i>	<i>Archiv Orientalní</i>	<i>BZ</i>	<i>Biblische Zeitschrift</i>
ASOR	American Schools of Oriental Research	<i>BZAW</i>	<i>Beihefte zur ZAW</i>
<i>ATR</i>	<i>Anglican Theological Review</i>	<i>BZNW</i>	<i>Beihefte zur ZNW</i>
<i>BA</i>	<i>Biblical Archaeologist</i>	BZRG	Beihefte der Zeitschrift für Religions- und Geistesgeschichte
BAGD	Bauer, W., W. F. Arndt, and F. W. Gingrich, eds. <i>A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature</i> , 2nd ed., rev. and aug. F. W. Gingrich and F. W. Danker. Chicago, 1979.	Carmignac, Règle	Carmignac, J. <i>La Règle de la Guerre des Fils de Lumière contre les Fils e Ténèbres</i> . Paris, 1958.
<i>BAR</i>	<i>Biblical Archaeology Review</i>	<i>CBQ</i>	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
<i>BASOR</i>	<i>Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research</i>	CBQMS	Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series
<i>BASORSS</i>	<i>Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research Supplementary Studies</i>	CCWJCW	Cambridge Commentaries on Writings of the Jewish and Christian World 200 BC to AD 200
		<i>CDSS</i>	Vermes, G. <i>The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English: Revised Edition</i> . New York and London, 2004.
		CEJL	Commentaries on Early Jewish Literature
		<i>CIJ</i>	Frey, J. B., ed. <i>Corpus inscriptionum iudaicarum</i> . Vatican City, 1936–52.
		<i>CIS</i>	<i>Corpus inscriptionum semiticarum</i> . Paris, 1881.
		COL	Christian Origins Library
		<i>CPJ</i>	Tcherikover, A., ed. <i>Corpus papyrorum Judaicarum</i> , 3 vols. Cambridge, MA, 1957–64.
		CQS	Companion to the Qumran Scrolls

CRAI	Comptes rendus de l'Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres	<i>EncyDSS</i>	Schiffman, L. H., and J. C. VanderKam, eds. <i>Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls</i> , 2 vols. Oxford, 2000.
CRB	Cahiers de la Revue biblique	<i>EQ</i>	<i>Evangelical Quarterly</i>
CRINT	Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum	<i>ETL</i>	<i>Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses</i>
Cross, <i>AL</i>	Cross, F. M. <i>The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies</i> , 3rd ed. Minneapolis, 1995.	<i>EvT</i>	<i>Evangelische Theologie</i>
Cross, "Dating"	Cross, F. M. "Excursus on the Dating of the Copper Document," DJD 3; pp. 217–21.	<i>ExpT</i>	<i>Expository Times</i>
Cross, "Development"	Cross, F. M. "The Development of the Jewish Scripts," in <i>The Bible and The Ancient Near East: Essays in Honor of William Foxwell Albright</i> , ed. G. E. Wright. Garden City, New York, 1961; pp. 133–202.	FB	Forschung zur Bibel
CTSRIR	College Theological Society Resources in Religion	<i>Fifty Years</i>	Schiffman, L. H., E. Tov, and J. C. VanderKam, eds. <i>The Dead Sea Scrolls: Fifty Years after Their Discovery [Jerusalem Congress]</i> . Jerusalem, 2000.
<i>DBSup</i>	<i>Dictionnaire de la Bible, Supplément</i>	Fitzmyer, <i>Apocryphon</i>	Fitzmyer, J. A. <i>The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave I</i> , Rome, 1966.
<i>DCH</i>	Clines, D. J. A., ed. <i>Dictionary of Classical Hebrew</i> , 3 vols. Sheffield, 1993–96.	Fitzmyer, <i>Tools</i>	Fitzmyer, J. A. <i>The Dead Sea Scrolls: Major Publications and Tools for Study</i> , rev. ed. SBLRBS 20; Atlanta, 1990.
Delcor, <i>Ancien</i>	Delcor, M. <i>Religion d'Israel et proche orient ancien</i> . Leiden, 1976.	FRLANT	Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments
Delcor, <i>Hymnes de Vaux, Archaeology</i>	Delcor, M. <i>Les Hymnes de Qumrân (Hodayot)</i> . Paris, 1962.	Gaster, <i>DSS</i>	Gaster, T. H. <i>The Dead Sea Scriptures: In English Translation with Introduction and Notes</i> , 3rd ed. New York, 1976.
<i>DISO</i>	Jean, C.-F. and J. Hofijzer, eds. <i>Dictionnaire des inscriptions sémitiques de l'ouest</i> . Leiden, 1965.	GC	Charlesworth, J. H., et al., eds. <i>Graphic Concordance to the Dead Sea Scrolls</i> . Tübingen and Louisville, 1991.
DJD	Discoveries in the Judaean Desert	GKC	Kautzsch, E., ed. <i>Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar</i> , 2nd ed., rev. A. E. Cowley. Oxford, 1910.
<i>DNWSI</i>	Hofijzer, J. and K. Jongeling, eds. <i>Dictionary of North West Semitic Inscriptions</i> , 2 vols. Leiden, 1995.	<i>GNMM</i>	<i>Good News for Modern Man</i>
<i>DSD</i>	<i>Dead Sea Discoveries</i>	<i>HALAT</i>	Koehler, L., and W. Baumgartner, eds. <i>Hebräisches und aramäisches Lexikon zum Alten Testament</i> , 2 vols. Leiden 1967–95.
<i>DSPS</i>	Sanders, J. A. <i>Dead Sea Psalms Scroll</i> . Ithaca, 1967.	<i>HAR</i>	<i>Hebrew Annual Review</i>
<i>DSSAFY</i>	Flint, P. W., and J. C. VanderKam, eds. <i>The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years</i> , 2 vols. Leiden, 1998–99.	HAT	Handbuch zum Alten Testament
<i>DSSSEL</i> (2006)	<i>The Dead Sea Scrolls Electronic Library</i> [revised edition of 2006]. Provo and Leiden, 1991–2006.	HDR	Harvard Dissertations in Religion
<i>DSSR</i>	D. W. Parry and E. Tov, eds. <i>The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader</i> , 6 vols. Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2004–2005.	<i>Hen</i>	<i>Henoch</i>
Dupont-Sommer, <i>EE</i>	Dupont-Sommer, A. <i>Les Écrits Esséniens découverts près de la Mer Morte</i> , 4th ed. Bibliothèque historique; Paris, 1980.	Hengel, <i>JudHell</i>	Hengel, M. <i>Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period</i> , 2 vols., trans. J. Bowden. Philadelphia, 1974.
<i>EB</i>	<i>Estudios Biblicos</i>	HNT	Handbuch zum Neuen Testament
<i>EcInt</i>	Dupont-Sommer, A., M. Philonenko, et al., eds. <i>La Bible écrits intertestamentaires</i> . [Paris] 1987.	Horgan, <i>Pesharim</i>	Horgan, M. P. <i>Pesharim: Qumrân Interpretations of Biblical Books</i> . CBQMS 8; Washington, D.C., 1979.
EJT	Early Judaism and Its Literature	<i>HR</i>	<i>History of Religions</i>
EncBibl	Encyclopaedia Biblica, Jerusalem	HSCPh	Harvard Studies in Classical Philology
<i>EncJud</i>	Wigoder, G., ed. <i>The Encyclopedia of Judaism</i> . New York and London, 1989.	HSM	Harvard Semitic Monographs
		HSS	Harvard Semitic Studies
		<i>HTR</i>	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>
		HTS	Harvard Theological Studies
		<i>HUCA</i>	<i>Hebrew Union College Annual</i>
		<i>IDB</i>	Buttrick, G. A., ed. <i>Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible</i> , 5 vols. Nashville, 1962.
		<i>IDBS</i>	Crim, K., et al., eds. <i>The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, Supplementary Volume</i> . Nashville, 1976.
		<i>IEJ</i>	<i>Israel Exploration Journal</i>
		<i>JAAR</i>	<i>Journal of the American Academy of Religion</i>

JANES	<i>Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society of Columbia University</i>	Licht, RS	Licht, J. <i>The Rule Scroll: A Scroll from the Wilderness of Judea</i> . Jerusalem, 1965. [Hebrew]
JAOS	<i>Journal of the America Oriental Society</i>	Licht, TS	Licht, J. <i>The Thanksgiving Scroll</i> . Jerusalem, 1957. [Hebrew]
Jastrow, Dictionary	Jastrow, M. <i>Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature</i> , 2 vols. New York, 1950, reprinted in Israel.	Lichtenberger, Menschen- bild	Lichtenberger, H. <i>Studien zum Menschenbild in Texten der Aumrangemeinde</i> . SUNT 15; Göttingen, 1980.
JB	<i>Jerusalem Bible</i>	Lohse, Texte	Lohse, E., ed. <i>Die Texte aus Qumran</i> . Darmstadt, 1981.
JBL	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>	LSJM	Liddell, H. G. and R. Scott. <i>A Greek-English Lexicon</i> , 9th ed., rev. H. S. Jones and R. McKenzie. Oxford, 1940 with a Supplement of 1968.
JBLSup	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature Supplement</i>	LSTS	Library of Second Temple Studies
JDS	Charlesworth, J. H., ed. <i>John and the Dead Sea Scrolls</i> . COL; New York, 1990.	Maier, Tempelrolle	Maier, J. <i>Die Tempelrolle vom Toten Meer und das "Neue Jerusalem,"</i> 3rd ed. UTB 829; Munich, 1997.
JDSer	Judean Desert Series	Maier/ Schubert, Qumran	Maier, J. and K. Schubert. <i>Die Qumran Essener and Die Qumran Essener: Die Texte vom Toten Meer</i> , 3 vols. UTB 1862, 1863, 1916; Munich, 1995–1996.
JDSS	Charlesworth, J. H., et al. <i>Jesus and the Dead Sea Scrolls</i> . ABRL; New York, 1992.	Manual	Fitzmyer, J. A., and D. J. Harrington, <i>A Manual of Palestinian Aramaic Texts</i> . BO 34. Rome, 1994 [2nd reprint].
Jeremias, Lehrer	Jeremias, G. <i>Der Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit</i> . SUNT 2; Göttingen, 1963.	MHUC	Monographs of the Hebrew Union College
JGRChJ	<i>Journal of Greco-Roman Christianity and Judaism</i>	Milik, Books	Milik, J. T. with M. Black. <i>The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4</i> . Oxford, 1976.
JJS	<i>Journal of Jewish Studies</i>	MNTC	Moffatt New Testament Commentary
JNES	<i>Journal of Near Eastern Studies</i>	MQ	Moraldi, L., ed. <i>I Manoscritti di Qumrân</i> . Turin, 1971.
JNSL	<i>Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages</i>	Muraoka, Grammar	Muraoka, T. <i>A Grammar of Qumran Aramaic</i> . Ancient Near Eastern Studies 38. Leuven and Walpole, MA, 2011.
Joüon- Muraoka, Grammar	Joüon, P. and T. Muraoka. <i>A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew</i> , 2 vols. Subsidia Biblica 14. Rome, 1991.	NEAEHL	Stern, E., ed. <i>New Encyclopedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land</i> , 4 vols. New York, 1993.
JQR	<i>Jewish Quarterly Review</i>	NEB	<i>New English Bible</i>
JR	<i>Journal of Religion</i>	Newsom, Songs	Newsom, C. <i>Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice: A Critical Edition</i> . HSS 27; Atlanta, 1985.
JSHRZ	Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistisch römischer Zeit. Gütersloh, 1973–.	NHS	Nag Hammadi Studies
JSJ	<i>Journal for the Study of Judaism</i>	NKBE	Koehler, L. and W. Baumgartner, eds., rev. W. Baumgartner and J. J. Stamm, trans. and ed. M. E. J. Richardson. <i>The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament: The New Koehler-Baumgartner in English</i> , 5 vols. Leiden/New York/Boston/Köln, 1994–2000.
JSJSup	Journal for the Study of Judaism Supplements	NovT	<i>Novum Testamentum</i>
JSNT	<i>Journal for the Study of the New Testament</i>	NRSV	<i>New Revised Standard Version</i>
JSOT	<i>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament</i>	NRSVue	<i>New Revised Standard Version Updated Edition</i>
JSOTSup	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series	NRT	<i>Nouvelle Revue Théologique</i>
JSP	<i>Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha</i>	NTL	New Testament Library
JSPS	Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement Series	NTS	<i>New Testament Studies</i>
JSS	<i>Journal of Semitic Studies</i>	NTTS	New Testament Tools and Studies
JSSR	<i>Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion</i>	OEANE	Meyers, E., ed. <i>The Oxford Encyclopedia of Archaeology in the Near East</i> , 5 vols. Oxford, 1997.
JThC	<i>Journal for Theology and the Church</i>		
JTS	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>		
KB	Koehler, L. and W. Baumgartner, <i>Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros and Supplementum</i> . Leiden, 1985.		
Knibb, Qumran	Knibb, M. A. <i>The Qumran Community</i> . CCWJCW 2; Cambridge, 1987.		
Lampe	Lampe, G. W. H., ed. <i>A Patristic Greek Lexicon</i> . Oxford, 1961.		
LD	Lectio divina		
Leaney, Rule	Leaney, A. R. C. <i>The Rule of the Community and Its Meaning</i> . NTL; London, 1966.		
LibCong	Sussmann, A. and R. Peled, eds. <i>Scrolls from the Dead Sea: An Exhibition of Scrolls and Archaeological Artifacts from the Collections of the Israel Antiquities Authority</i> . Washington, 1993.		

<i>Of Scribes</i>	Attridge, H. W., J. J. Collins, T. H. Tobin, eds. <i>Of Scribes and Scrolls: Studies on the Hebrew Bible, Intertestamental Judaism, and Christian Origins</i> . CTSRIR 5; Lanham, Maryland, 1990.	<i>SBL</i>	<i>Society of Biblical Literature</i>
<i>OTP</i>	Charlesworth, J. H., ed. <i>The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha</i> , 2 vols. New York, 1983, 1985.	<i>SBLDS</i>	<i>Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series</i>
<i>OTS</i>	Oudtestamentische Studiën	<i>SBLMS</i>	<i>Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series</i>
<i>PAAJR</i>	<i>Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research</i>	<i>SBLRBS</i>	<i>Society of Biblical Literature Resources for Biblical Study</i>
<i>PDS</i>	Murphy-O'Connor, J. and J. H. Charlesworth, eds. <i>Paul and the Dead Sea Scrolls</i> . COL; New York, 1990.	<i>SBLSS</i>	<i>Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series</i>
<i>PEQ</i>	<i>Palestine Exploration Quarterly</i>	<i>SBT</i>	<i>Studies in Biblical Theology</i>
<i>PFES</i>	Publications of the Finnish Exegetical Society	<i>ScEs</i>	<i>Science et Esprit</i>
<i>PhotogEd</i>	Charlesworth, J. H., et al. <i>Rule of the Community: Photographic Multi-Language Edition</i> . New York, 1996.	Schuller, <i>PsPsalms</i>	Schuller, E. M. <i>Non-Canonical Psalms from Qumran: A Pseudepigraphic Collection</i> . HSS 28; Atlanta, 1986.
Pouilly, <i>Règle</i> <i>Proof</i>	Pouilly, J. <i>La Règle de la Communauté de Qumrân</i> . CRB 17; Paris, 1976. <i>Proof texts: A Journal of Jewish Literary History</i>	Schürer, <i>HJP</i>	Schürer, E. <i>The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ</i> . Rev. ed. by G. Vermes, F. Millar, and M. Goodman, 3 vols. Edinburgh, 1973–87.
PTSDSSP	Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project	ScrHie	Scripta Hierosolymitana
<i>QBONT</i>	Cryer, F. H. and T. L. Thompson, eds. <i>Qumran Between the Old and New Testaments</i> . JSOT-Sup 290; Copenhagen International Seminar 6; Sheffield, 1998.	SCS	Septuagint and Cognate Studies
Qimron, <i>HDSS</i> <i>Qumrân</i>	Qimron, E. <i>The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls</i> . HSS 29; Atlanta, 1986. Delcor, M., ed. <i>Qumrân: Sa piété, sa théologie et son milieu</i> . BETL 46; Paris and Leuven, 1978.	SDSS	Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature
<i>Qumran</i>	Grözinger, K. E. et al., eds. <i>Qumran</i> . Wege der Forschung 410; Darmstadt, 1981.	<i>SEA</i>	<i>Svensk exegetisk Årsbok</i>
Rabin, <i>QumSt</i>	Rabin, C. <i>Qumran Studies</i> . New York, 1957.	Sekine, <i>DSS</i>	Sekine, M., ed. <i>The Dead Sea Scrolls</i> . Tokyo, 1979.
Rabin, ed. <i>ZadDoc</i>	Rabin, C. <i>The Zadokite Documents</i> , 2nd rev. ed. Oxford, 1958.	<i>Sem</i>	<i>Semitica</i>
<i>RB</i>	<i>Revue biblique</i>	<i>ShaTalmon</i>	Fishbane, M. and E. Tov, eds. “ <i>Sha’arei Talmon</i> ” <i>Studies in the Bible, Qumran, and the Ancient Near East Presented to Shemaryahu Talmon</i> . Winona Lake, Indiana, 1992.
Reed, <i>Catalogue</i>	Reed, S. A. and M. J. Lundberg with M. B. Phelps, eds. <i>The Dead Sea Scrolls Catalogue: Documents, Photographs and Museum Inventory Numbers</i> . SBLRBS 32; Atlanta, 1994.	SJLA	Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity
Reed, <i>Inventory</i>	Reed, S. <i>Dead Sea Scroll Inventory Project: Lists of Documents, Photographs and Museum Plates</i> . Claremont, 1993.	<i>SJT</i>	<i>Scottish Journal of Theology</i>
<i>ReScRel</i>	<i>Recherches de Science Religieuse</i>	<i>SNT</i>	Stendahl, K., ed. <i>The Scrolls and the New Testament</i> . New introduction by J. H. Charlesworth; COL; New York, 1992.
Reymond	Reymond, E. D. <i>Qumran Hebrew</i> . Atlanta, 2014.	<i>SNTS MS</i>	<i>Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas Monograph Series</i>
<i>RGG</i>	<i>Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart</i>	Sokoloff,	Sokoloff, M. <i>A Dictionary of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic of the Byzantine Period</i> . Dictionaries of Talmud, Midrash and Targum 2; Ramat-Gan, 1990.
<i>RHPR</i>	<i>Revue d’histoire et de philosophie religieuses</i>	<i>Dictionary</i>	
<i>RHR</i>	<i>Revue de l’histoire des religions</i>	Sokoloff,	Sokoloff, M. <i>The Targum to Job from Qumrân Cave XI</i> . Ramat-Gan, 1974.
<i>RivistB</i>	<i>Rivista biblica</i>	<i>Targum</i>	<i>Studia Theologica</i>
<i>RQ</i>	<i>Revue de Qumran</i>	<i>ST</i>	Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah
<i>RSV</i>	<i>Revised Standard Version</i>	<i>STDJ</i>	<i>Studien zum Neuen Testament</i>
<i>RTL</i>	<i>Revue théologique de Louvain</i>	<i>StNT</i>	Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments
<i>SAOC</i>	<i>Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization</i>	SUNT	Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha
		SVTP	Talmon, S. <i>King, Cult and Calendar in Ancient Israel</i> . Jerusalem, 1986.
		Talmon, <i>King</i>	
		Talmon,	Talmon, S. <i>The World of Qumran from Within</i> . Jerusalem, 1989.
		<i>World</i>	
		<i>TANAKH</i>	<i>TANAKH: A New Translation of the Holy Scriptures According to the Traditional Hebrew Text</i> . Philadelphia, New York and Jerusalem, 5746, 1985.
		TAPA	Transactions and Proceedings, American Philological Association.
		TBN	Themes in Biblical Narrative

<i>TDNT</i>	Kittel, G. and G. Friedrich, eds. <i>Theological Dictionary of the New Testament</i> , 10 vols., trans. G. W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids, Michigan and London, 1964–76.	<i>WUNT</i>	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
<i>TDOT</i>	Botterweck, G. J. and H. Ringgren, eds. <i>Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament</i> , 6 vols., trans. D. E. Green. Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1974–.	<i>WZ Leipzig</i>	Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Karl-Marx Universität Leipzig
<i>TdQ</i>	Carmignac, J., P. Guilbert, É. Cothenet and H. Lignée. <i>Les textes de Qumran traduits et annotés</i> , 2 vols. Paris, 1961, 1963.	<i>WZKM</i>	<i>Weiner Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes</i>
TENTS	Texts and Editions for New Testament Study	Yadin,	Yadin, Y. <i>The Message of the Scrolls</i> . New Introduction by J. H. Charlesworth; COL; New York, 1992.
<i>Textus</i>	<i>Textus</i>	Yadin,	Yadin, Y. <i>The Temple Scroll</i> , 3 vols. with Supplementary Plates. Jerusalem, 1983.
<i>Thesaurus Syriacus</i>	Payne Smith, R. <i>Thesaurus Syriacus</i> , 2 vols. Oxford, 1879–1901; reprinted Hildesheim, 1981.	<i>ZAW</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>
<i>ThRu</i>	<i>Theologische Rundschau</i>	<i>ZKT</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie</i>
<i>ThWQ</i>	Fabry, H.–J. and U. Dahmen, eds. <i>Theologisches Wörterbuch zu den Qumrantexte</i> , 3 vols. Stuttgart, 2011–2016.	<i>ZNW</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>
TICP	Travaux de l’Institut Catholique de Paris	<i>ZPE</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik</i>
<i>TLZ</i>	<i>Theologische Literaturzeitung</i>	<i>ZTK</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche</i>
Tov,	Tov, E. with S. J. Pfann, eds. <i>Companion Volume to the Dead Sea Scrolls Microfiche Edition</i> , 2nd rev. ed. Leiden, 1995.	<b>Additional Abbreviations</b>	
<i>Companion Volume</i>		ab.	above
Tov,	Tov, E., ed. <i>The Dead Sea Scrolls on Microfiche</i> . Leiden, 1993.	add.	added/addition
<i>Revised Lists</i>	Tov, E. <i>Revised List of the Texts from the Judean Desert</i> . Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2010.	alt.	alternative
<i>Scribal Practices</i>	Tov, E. <i>Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert</i> . STDJ 54, Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2004.	appar.	apparently
<i>TS</i>	<i>Theological Studies</i>	assump.	assumption
TSAJ	Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism	beg.	beginning
<i>TWNT</i>	Kittel, G. and G. Friedrich, eds. <i>Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament</i> , 10 vols. Stuttgart, 1932–1979.	betw.	between
<i>Tyn Bul</i>	<i>Tyndale Bulletin</i>	BH	Biblical Hebrew
<i>TZ</i>	<i>Theologische Zeitschrift</i>	bl.	below
<i>USQR</i>	<i>Union Seminary Quarterly Review</i>	bot.	bottom
UTB	Uni-Taschenbücher	c.	circa
<i>VC</i>	<i>Vigiliae christianae</i>	cf.	compare
Vermes, <i>DSS</i>	Vermes, G. <i>The Dead Sea Scrolls in English</i> , 4th ed. London and New York, 1995.	ch., chs.	chapter, chapters
<i>VT</i>	<i>Vetus Testamentum</i>	cit.	citation
VTSup	Vetus Testamentum Supplements	col., cols.	column, columns
Wernberg-Møller, <i>Manual</i>	Wernberg-Møller, P. <i>The Manual of Discipline: Translated and Annotated with an Introduction</i> . STDJ 1; Leiden, 1957.	cons.	consistent
Wise, <i>Temple</i>	Wise, M. O. <i>A Critical Study of the Temple Scroll from Qumrân Cave 11</i> . SAOC 49; Chicago, 1990.	Cop.	Coptic
WMANT	Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament.	corr.	corrected/correction/correctly
WO	Waltke, B. K. and M. O’Connor. <i>An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax</i> . Winona Lake, Indiana, 1990.	cpr.	corruption
		d.leather	defect in the leather
		del.	deletion/deleted
		diff.	different/differ
		eras.	erasure/erased
		ET	English translation
		Eth.	Ethiopic
		excl.	excluding/excluded
		extd.	extended
		frg., frgs.	fragment, fragments
		Gk.	Greek
		HB	Hebrew Bible
		Heb.	Hebrew
		impf.	imperfect
		impv.	imperative
		incons.	inconsistent
		init.	initially
		(in mg.)	letter or word written in the margin

## Abbreviations

---

inter.	interlinear	2Kgs	2 Kings
l., ll.	line, lines	1Chr	1 Chronicles
Lat.	Latin	2Chr	2 Chronicles
lt.	left	Ezra	Ezra
lit.	literally	Neh	Nehemiah
ltr., ltrs.	letter, letters	Esth	Esther
LXX	Septuagint	Job	Job
mg.	margin	Ps(s)	Psalms(s)
MH	Mishnaic Hebrew	Prov	Proverbs
MS, MSS	Manuscript, Manuscripts	Eccl, Qoh	Ecclesiastes, Qohelet
msg.	missing	Song	Song of Songs
MT	Masoretic Text	Isa	Isaiah
n., nn.	note, notes	Jer	Jeremiah
NT	New Testament	Lam	Lamentations
OG	Old Greek	Ezek	Ezekiel
orig.	original/originally	Dan	Daniel
OT	Old Testament	Hos	Hosea
p., pp.	page, pages	Joel	Joel
part.	participle	Amos	Amos
pass.	passive	Obad	Obadiah
pf.	perfect	Jonah	Jonah
pl.	plural	Micah	Micah
Pl., Pls.	plate, plates	Nah	Nahum
poss.	possible/possibly	Hab	Habakkuk
prob.	probably	Zeph	Zephaniah
prps.	perhaps	Hag	Haggai
pt., pts.	part, parts	Zech	Zechariah
QH	Qumran Hebrew	Mal	Malachi
rdg., rdgs.	reading, readings	2Ezra	2 Ezra
recop.	recopying	Tob	Tobit
repet.	repetition	Jdt	Judith
rest.	restoration	AddEsth	Additions to Esther
rt.	right	WisSol	Wisdom of Solomon
sg.	singular	Sir	Sirach
sim.	similar	1Bar	1 Baruch
sp.	space	LetJer	Letter of Jeremiah
supral.	supralinear	PrAzar	Prayer of Azariah
synt.	syntactically	Sus	Susanna
Syr.	Syriac	Bel	Bel and the Dragon
vert.	vertical	1Mac	1 Maccabees
vs., vss.	verse, verses	2Mac	2 Maccabees
writ.	writing/written	Mt	Matthew
		Mk	Mark
		Lk	Luke
		Jn	John
		Acts	Acts
		Rom	Romans
		1Cor	1 Corinthians
		2Cor	2 Corinthians
		Gal	Galatians
		Eph	Ephesians
		Phil	Philippians
		Col	Colossians
		1Thes	1 Thessalonians
		2Thes	2 Thessalonians
		1Tim	1 Timothy
		2Tim	2 Timothy
		Tit	Titus
<b>Ancient Documents</b>			
Bible and Apocrypha			
Gen	Genesis		
Ex	Exodus		
Lev	Leviticus		
Num	Numbers		
Deut	Deuteronomy		
Josh	Joshua		
Judg	Judges		
Ruth	Ruth		
1Sam	1 Samuel		
2Sam	2 Samuel		
1Kgs	1 Kings		

Phlm	Philemon
Heb	Hebrews
Jas	James
1Pet	1 Peter
2Pet	2 Peter
1Jn	1 John
2Jn	2 John
3Jn	3 John
Jude	Jude
Rev	Revelation

Pseudepigrapha

All abbreviations are according to OTP.

Philo

<i>Abr</i>	<i>De Abrahamo</i>
<i>Cher</i>	<i>De Cherubim</i>
<i>Conf</i>	<i>De Confusione Linguarum</i>
<i>Ebr</i>	<i>De Ebrietate</i>
<i>Flacc</i>	<i>In Flaccum</i>
<i>Gaium</i>	<i>De Legatione ad Gaium</i>
<i>Heres</i>	<i>Quis Rerum divinarum Heres</i>
<i>Migr</i>	<i>De Migratione Abrahami</i>
<i>Mut</i>	<i>De Mutatione Nominum</i>
<i>OpDe</i>	<i>Opificio Mundi</i>
<i>Post</i>	<i>De Posteritate Caini</i>
<i>Praem</i>	<i>De Praemiis et Poenis</i>
<i>Quaes Ex I-II</i>	<i>Quaestiones et Solutiones in Exodus I-II</i>
<i>Quod Det</i>	<i>Quod Deterius Potiori insidiari solet</i>
<i>Quod Deus</i>	<i>Quod Deus immutabilis sit</i>

<i>Sacr</i>	<i>De Sacrificiis Abelis et Caini</i>
<i>Somn I-II</i>	<i>De Somniis I-II</i>
<i>Spec Leg I-IV</i>	<i>De Specialibus Legibus I-IV</i>
<i>Virt</i>	<i>De Virtutibus</i>
<i>Vita Mos I-II</i>	<i>De Vita Mosis I-II</i>

Josephus

<i>Ant</i>	<i>Jewish Antiquities</i>
<i>Apion</i>	<i>Against Apion</i>
<i>Life</i>	<i>Life of Josephus</i>
<i>War</i>	<i>Jewish Wars</i>

Rabbinics

ARN	Abot de-Rabbi Nathan
b.	Babylonian Talmud (before a rabbinic text)
Ber	Berakot
GenR	Bereshit Rabbah
Hag	Hagigah
m.	Mishnah (before a rabbinic text)
Meg	Megillah
Sanh	Sanhedrin
SifDeut	Sifre Deuteronomy
Sot.	Sotah
t.	Tosephta (before a rabbinic text)
TK	Lieberman, S., ed. <i>Tosefta Kifshutah</i> . New York, 1955-.
TargPsJon	Targum Pseudo-Jonathan
y.	Jerusalem Talmud (before a rabbinic text)

## General Introduction

### The Dead Sea Scrolls as Primary Sources for Second Temple Judaism and a Clarified Perception of Christian Origins

JAMES H. CHARLESWORTH

Scholars as well as those who are not research specialists on the Dead Sea Scrolls might appreciate a brief introduction to this collection. The following introduction thus attempts to summarize the position of most Qumran experts. Many of the thoughts mentioned now will be developed in the introductions to the documents in this corpus; they will be supported in various ways in the texts, translations, and notes.

The Dead Sea Scrolls have revolutionized scholars' understanding of Early Judaism (Second Temple Judaism) and Early Christianity (Christian Origins). Prior to their discovery, scholars tended to reconstruct pre-70 Judaism in terms of the opening of *Aboth*, according to which Moses received Torah from Sinai, committed it to Joshua, he to the elders, the elders to the prophets, and the prophets to the men of the so-called great Synagogue. Three things were imperative: be deliberate in judgment, train many disciples, and *construct a fence around Torah*. Accordingly, Early Judaism was considered to be monolithic, orthodox, and isolated ("fenced-off") from the rest of the world. This depiction of Early Judaism was constructed out of improper analyses of the Mishnah, the New Testament, and Josephus.

Since the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls in 1947, and their subsequent intensive study beginning in the early fifties, scholars have come to affirm that this reconstruction does not reflect the complexities of Judaism before the destruction of the Temple in 70 CE. Now, we know – thanks to exhaustive research on the transmission of the tractates in the Mishnah – that the Mishnah was shaped by post-70 Jewish concerns, and was codified by Judah the Prince shortly after 200 CE. It thus embodies the struggle of Hillel's group of Pharisaism first against the Zealots of 66–70 (the first Jewish revolt against Rome) and then against the zealous warriors who from 132 to 136 CE. followed Simon Bar Kosiba (whom Akiba may have hailed as the "Messiah"). Hillel's followers (the House of Hillel) also had to struggle for self-identification and survival against the "Christians" (who made apocalyptic and increasingly exclusivistic claims about their Messiah, Jesus of Nazareth). Furthermore, the Hillelites had to struggle over the meaning of Torah against their fellow Pharisees, notably the followers of Shammai. The Mishnah (and the later Tosephta and Talmudim) nevertheless preserve early traditions and thus provide valuable information regarding religious life in pre-70 Judaism, espe-

cially in the Temple cult. Rabbinic literature, therefore, should be read as an edited and expanded record of Early Judaism.

The New Testament was another main source for reconstructing the Judaism of Jesus' day. Today, however, scholars have been forced to admit that passages preserved in this canon of scripture are sometimes anti-Jewish, and received their present shape because of many social pressures and needs, including the struggle for self-definition against other Jewish groups. Hence, Paul and the authors of Matthew and John, for example, do not present us with reliable records of what Judaism was like when Hillel was a Rabbi and Jesus was an eschatological prophet from Galilee. Rather, the New Testament documents represent the attempts of some Jews (and also a few Gentiles) to establish and convert others to their own proclamations. Many of the sayings of Jesus preserved in the canon, therefore, reflect the polemical ambience of the period from circa 30 (the date of Jesus' crucifixion) to 100 CE (the probable date of the final form of the latest gospel, the Gospel of John). The New Testament does provide invaluable data regarding the life and teachings of Jesus, as well as life in Galilee and in Jerusalem when the Temple was the economic and religious center for millions of Jews living in the Hellenistic world. The New Testament gospels, however, are not objective biographies of Jesus, and the New Testament documents, with the exception of Paul's authentic letters, reached their definitive form after 70, perhaps decades later, and often in places far removed from ancient Palestine.

Finally, before 1947 many specialists considered Josephus to be a reliable and unbiased historian of Jewish thought and history prior to 100 CE. It was commonly accepted by almost all that he correctly depicted the Judaism of Hillel's and Jesus' time as quadrifurcated into four "sects" like the Greek philosophical schools: Pharisees (the dominant sect), the Sadducees, the Essenes, and the Zealots. Now scholars widely affirm that Josephus' report is biased and at times unrepresentative. There were not "four sects"; and they were not modeled after the Greeks. There were certainly more than 20 groups, and it is unwise (without careful definition) simply to continue to use the sociologically loaded term "sect." Josephus, however, is a reliable source regarding the topography of ancient Palestine, the mood of Palestinian Jews before the War of 66–70, the movement and success of Roman troops, and the general concerns and fears of Jews. Even so, he surely shaped his presenta-

tion of Judaism, especially Jewish thought, to win the admiration of his Roman readers, especially the Roman establishment and the Emperor, who paid him an annual stipend.

Now, thanks to the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls, we have Jewish documents that are not in any way altered by thoughts, redactions, or additions that date after 68 CE, the year when the Qumran Community was burned by Roman soldiers. All the Dead Sea Scrolls antedate 68 (with the exception of the *Copper Scroll*). They were once held and studied by Jews contemporaneous with Hillel and Jesus. Some of the Jewish documents found in the Qumran caves were composed by Jews who lived in the Qumran Community from circa 100 BCE to 68 CE. Other documents were composed elsewhere and were brought to the Community. Some of them (e.g. 1En) contain compositions that may antedate the third century BCE.

Established scholars around the world affirm the indispensability of archaeology and palaeography (which is not simply an art but is also a science which can date a document within plus or minus 50 years). Using these methods scholars can demonstrate that the Qumran Community is where some of the Dead Sea Scrolls were composed and studied. The Dead Sea Scrolls contain allusions to history; hence, it is possible to reconstruct the origins of the Qumranites. They were priests who left the Temple around 150 BCE because of factions within the priestly circles in Jerusalem. They eventually went into the wilderness of Judaea and found at Qumran an abandoned Israelite ruin, perhaps an old border fort. They built communal buildings at this site. Later, the group became a Community and the architectural complex was considerably expanded. There were many incentives for the move from the Temple to the wilderness: the corruption of the Temple cult by priests who compromised Torah in face of Greek influences from Syria, the conviction that the Righteous Teacher (probably of the lineage of Aaron and Zadok, King David's high priest) alone had been given special powers and revelations by God, the allegiance to a different lunar-solar calendar, and especially the profession of halakot different from the priestly establishment (cf. 4QMMT). The clarion words of Isaiah 40:3 were interpreted to mean that the Qumranites were to heed the Voice and prepare *in the wilderness* the way of the Lord.

Over the next nearly two hundred years converts came to Qumran from many of the Jewish groups that were scattered over the land of Israel (probably including the precursors of the Sadducees and Pharisees). After a period of initiation lasting at least two years the novitiates became full members of the Community. The Community existed until the spring of 68 CE. At that time the Roman legions, under the direction of Vespasian (the future emperor of Rome), had just conquered the last hold-outs in Galilee and quelled all resistance in the environs of Jericho. Qumran is less than 15 kilometers or 10 miles south of Jericho.

Today, most experts recognize that the Qumran library was not a genizah or a depository of scrolls that belonged to only one group of Jews. Rather, experts affirm that the eleven caves – especially Cave IV – preserved documents from a variety of Jewish groups and constituted an early Jewish library. In this Jewish library were preserved all the books of the TANAK or “Old Testament” (with the exception that Esther has not been

recognized among the tiny fragments), some of the Apocrypha (esp. *Tobit*) and the Pseudepigrapha (esp. the *Books of Enoch* and *Jubilees*), writings peculiar to and composed at the Qumran Community (notably 1QS, 1QSa, 1QSB, 1QH, 1QM, MMT and the *Pesharim*), and documents written elsewhere by other related groups or subgroups (viz. *Prayer of Jonathan*, *Second Ezekiel*, *Copper Scroll*).

This ancient library contained early Jewish writings of different genres. Hence, the corpus of this series is divided into the following categories: Rules, Hymns, Liturgies, Targumim, Commentaries, Apocryphal Works, Miscellanea, and Biblical Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha.

One final caveat: As early Jewish writings must not be interpreted as if they represent a normative system, so Qumran ideas must not be pressed into a unified system. The documents in this corpus demonstrate many competing ordinances regarding purification and cleansing, different types of calendars (variations of the lunar-solar calendar), and contrasting rules (the *Rule of the Community* was clearly a late “vulgate” text that incorporates different documents with various textual histories – a theory confirmed by the fragments of the document preserved in Cave IV). Most of these clashing concepts, explanations, exhortations, and rules existed at Qumran, if not simultaneously, then at least during the extended history of its existence from perhaps 100 BCE to 68 CE. Therefore, it is prudent to discuss diverse ideas at Qumran and within the thought-world of an Essene.

Qumranites seemed to refer to themselves as “the Poor Ones,” members of “the Way,” the “Sons of Righteousness,” “the Most Holy Ones,” and notably the “Sons of Light.” All others – including Jews and especially ruling priests in the Temple – were the “Sons of Darkness.” As the Qumranites developed their special ordinances, cosmic speculations, and rules they were influenced by the books in the TANAK or Hebrew Bible (especially Isaiah, Deuteronomy, and the Psalms), some so-called extracanonical works (like the *Books of Enoch* and *Jubilees*), and previously hitherto unknown writings (notably the *Moses Apocryphon*, the *Psalms of Joshua*, *Pseudo-Ezekiel*, the *Temple Scroll*, and *Some Works of the Torah*).

The Dead Sea Scrolls present data that are fundamental for any reconstruction of Early Judaism and Early Christianity. They disclose a variety of creative issues, perspectives, and concerns that were current in many Jewish circles before the destructions of 66–74 CE. Most important among these are innovative prescriptions and provisions for ritual purification, the impossibility of obtaining forgiveness except through God's “mercy,” speculations on the nature of the human and the origin of evil in the world, and the presence and efficaciousness of good angels. Probably unique to Qumran – at least in terms of development – are the following concepts: The paradigmatic cosmic dualism centered in the opposition between the Angel of Light and the demonic power of the evil angels, notably Belial, who is probably identical (in some scrolls) with the Angel of Darkness; the development of the concept of the Holy Spirit *from* God (which obviously influenced the development of Christian proclamations and social identity); the cosmic hymnic celebrations at twilight (in the evening praying for protection from the darkness, and in the morning particip-

ating in the bringing of light [the sun] back to God's created order); the clarifications of the importance of the lunar-solar calendar with the special feast days, the weeks, the Sabbaths, the months, and the yearly celebration (perhaps the Day of Atonement); the descriptions of the heavens above filled with angels chanting praises to God (the Creator); the eschatological expectations for God's visitation (the Day of Judgment); and the joyous time when the Messiah or the Messiahs of Aaron and Israel will appear.

The Qumran Community was in existence during the time of Jesus' ministry; but there is no reference to him or to any of his disciples. There is no reason to be surprised by this fact. There were many groups within Early Judaism, and the Dead Sea Scrolls do not mention any known first-century Rabbi or Jewish leader. It is not the alleged direct influence from the Dead Sea Scrolls upon any New Testament document that is significant (with the probable exception of the Gospel of John which seems to be influenced by the thoughts preserved in a unique way in the Dead Sea Scrolls). What is paradigmatically important is this internationally acknowledged insight: The Dead Sea Scrolls reveal ideas once considered unique to "Christianity" and this discovery proves that Early Christianity was for many years one of the groups (probably a sect) within Judaism. Now, the milieu – the intellectual and social matrix – of earliest "Christianity" is coming into view. The importance of the Dead Sea Scrolls, however, must always remain firmly grounded in the invaluable and precious insights preserved in them. The Dead Sea Scrolls were once held, studied, and revered by Jews who lived in an erudite and deeply religious Community that eked out an existence on the northwestern shores of the Dead Sea, waiting for the fulfillment of God's promises found in Scriptures which we share with the Qumranites.

#### *Qumran and Masada*

Why should manuscripts found on Masada be included in the Princeton edition of the Dead Sea Scrolls? First, it is imperative to include all ancient witnesses to a text in a critical edition; some of these manuscripts have been found in the Qumran caves and some on Masada. Second, it is now clear that almost all, or all, of the manuscripts found on Masada were taken there by Qumranites sometime about June 68 CE when the Roman army conquered Jericho and its surrounding area, including Qumran.<sup>1</sup> Third, the *Angelic Liturgy* has been found only in Qumran Caves (4Q400–4Q407, 11Q17) and on Masada (Mas1k).<sup>2</sup> Fourth, *A Joseph Apocryphon* (Mas1045–1350 and 1375) found on Masada was copied in the first century BCE and thus was probably not copied on Masada. Fifth, the manuscript evidence of *A Joseph Apocryphon* (Mas1045–1350 and 1375) reveals parallels and orthography associated with the Qumran Scribal School.<sup>3</sup> Sixth, while a Jew may have conceivably prepared animal skins for scrolls on Masada, on this desert fortress there is no evidence of a scriptorium for the copying of scrolls. Seventh, the Qumran and Masada corpora show characteristics that distinguish them from the manuscripts found elsewhere in the Judean desert. Finally, it is evident that those on Masada did not gather their manuscripts into a central location or locations, as at Qumran; thus they were probably only studied or used liturgically on Masada. Consequently, most of the Masada texts were probably taken to Masada from Qumran (or other Essene locations). I thus agree with Yadin, Talmon, and Tov that the Masada texts were taken to Masada by refugees from Qumran.

<sup>1</sup> See the comments by E. Tov in "A Qumran Origin for the Masada Non-Biblical Texts?" *DSD* 7 (2000) 57–73. Tov suggests that "all the texts found on Masada were imported from Qumran," observing similar scribal practices, such as guide dots and rulings, large inscribed areas, number of columns per sheet, paragraphing systems, superscriptions, and special layout of the poetical texts.

<sup>2</sup> See volume 4B.

<sup>3</sup> See volume 8A. Note the insights and data in E. Tov, "The Hebrew Texts from Masada," *Scribal Practices*, pp. 317–22. See especially p. 322 on which Tov summarizes the data to support the assumption "that all the texts found at Masada were imported from Qumran..."

# Qumran Greek Fragments 7Q3–7Q19

ELDON JAY EPP and LARRY W. HURTADO

## Introduction

Twenty-one papyrus fragments of Greek texts and three pieces of solidified earth containing impressions of texts were recovered from Qumran Cave 7 during February 16–19 of the 1955 season of excavation. This cave is situated at the edge of the plateau that extends southward from the ruins of Khirbet Qumran. The cave also contained pottery remains.

The Cave 7 manuscript fragments were published in 1962, edited by M. Baillet, with the assistance of P. Benoit and M.-E. Boismard.<sup>1</sup> The papyrus remnants were grouped by the editors into eighteen items, numbered accordingly, with 7Q1, 4, and 6 comprised of two fragments each. These eighteen fragments contain no writing on their reverse sides and presumably are from rolls. The three earthen blocks, classified as 7Q19 frgs. 1–3, however, are grey solidified mud that have retained, on both top and bottom in two of the three cases, mirror-image impressions of papyrus texts that were in contact with them on the ground over a long period of time. They also reveal horizontal striations from the fibers of the original papyrus.

### 1. Identification of Contents

All the fragments are very small. Some contain as little as a portion of one or two readable letters (e.g., 7Q14, 16, 17, 18). Others have portions of four or five lines, and in one case nine

lines (7Q1), with six to nine, and in one case eleven, letters in a single line (e.g. 7Q 1, 2, 3, 5, 19.1). One fragment (7Q4) preserves the ends of five lines from the right-hand margin of a column, as does 7Q12 of its column, while another fragment (7Q8) may preserve the left-hand margin of the four lines remaining. But no line of any fragment is complete from one edge of the papyrus to the other. Thus, the length of lines (i.e., the average number of letters per line) cannot be determined for any fragment prior to a clear identification with a known text. Length of lines is crucial when attempting to match known texts with any fragments containing portions of two or more lines. As a matter of fact, several of the 7Q fragments do have readable letters on multiple lines: 7Q1, 7Q2, 7Q3, 7Q4 fragment 1, 7Q5, 7Q6 fragment 1, 7Q7, 7Q8, 7Q11, 7Q12, 7Q14; of course, the more lines with text, the more feasible becomes a reconstruction and identification of it.

Two Cave 7 fragments have been identified without question as portions of LXX texts: 7Q1 (7QLXXExod) containing remnants of Exodus 28:4–6, 7; and 7Q2 (7QLXXEpJer) containing remnants of the Letter of Jeremiah 43b–44 (= Bar 6:43b–44).

The *editio princeps* offered no identifications of the other fragments, though subsequently numerous identifications with the LXX and other writings have been proposed. Initially, nearly all of them were in response to the claims of J. O’Callaghan that 7Q4, 7Q5, 7Q6 fragments 1 and 2, 7Q7, 7Q8, 7Q9, 7Q10, and 7Q15 preserve New Testament texts (see the discussion below). For example, 7Q3 was tested for a possible relationship to Jeremiah 43:28–29, but with negative results,<sup>2</sup> and the following other proposed identifications were offered

<sup>1</sup> M. Baillet, J. T. Milik, and R. de Vaux with a contribution by H. W. Baker, *Les ‘Petites Grottes’ de Qumran: Exploration de la falaise. Les grottes 2Q, 3Q, 5Q, 6Q, 7Q à 10Q, Le rouleau de cuivre*, 2 vols. (DJD 3; Oxford, 1962) vol. 1, pp. 143–46; vol. 2, p. 30. For clarification on the identity of the editor(s) of the 7Q fragments, see Baillet, “Les manuscrits de la Grotte 7 de Qumrân et le Nouveau Testament,” *Bib* 53 (1972) 508–9; but see especially Baillet in *Bib* 54 (1973) 348; S. R. Pickering and R. R. E. Cook, *Has a Fragment of the Gospel of Mark been Found at Qumran?* (Papyrology and Historical Perspectives, 1; Sydney, 1989) p. 15 n. 2.

<sup>2</sup> Baillet (*Bib* 54 [1973] 348–49) reported that Boismard suggested this possibility to him; and J. O’Callaghan, *Los papiros griegos de la cueva 7 de Qumrân* (BAC 353; Madrid, 1974) pp. 89–91 = “Notas sobre 7Q tomadas en el ‘Rockefeller Museum’ de Jerusalén,” *Bib* 53 (1972) 530–31, who says it is not feasible. See also Pickering and Cook, *Has a Fragment*, p. 16 n. 5.

by various investigators: 7Q4 with Numbers 14:23–24<sup>3</sup> (and tested against Job 34:12–15);<sup>4</sup> 7Q4 fragment 1 with *1 Enoch* 103:3–4<sup>5</sup> or Numbers 14:23–24;<sup>6</sup> 7Q5 with 2 Kings 5:13–14<sup>7</sup> or Exodus 36:10;<sup>8</sup> 7Q6 fragment 1 with Isaiah 40:1–2,<sup>9</sup> Isaiah 40:3–4, Ruth 2:12,<sup>10</sup> Psalm 34:28, Psalm 50:17–18, Proverbs 7:12–13, or Psalm 9:32;<sup>11</sup> 7Q6 fragment 2 with Isaiah 18:2,<sup>12</sup> Numbers 10:34, Psalm 58:16, or Psalm 67:2;<sup>13</sup> 7Q7 with Numbers 10:27, 10:31, 11:6,<sup>14</sup> Judges 14:1, 1 Samuel 19:1, 2 Chronicles 8:17, or Isaiah 40:12;<sup>15</sup> 7Q8 with Zechariah 8:8,<sup>16</sup> Isaiah 1:30,<sup>17</sup> Numbers 22:38,<sup>18</sup> Psalm 18:14–15, Daniel 2:43, or Ecclesiastes 6:3;<sup>19</sup> 7Q9 with Proverbs 7:22, or Jeremiah 32:20;<sup>20</sup> 7Q10 with Isaiah 45:23, 65:12, 66:4, Exodus 12:15, or 13:8;<sup>21</sup> and 7Q15 with Joshua 6:26–27, or Psalm 118:159–160.<sup>22</sup> A sizable number of proposed identifications with New

Testament texts other than O’Callaghan’s have also been proposed and countered.<sup>23</sup> Subsequently (1980s and 1990s), several scholars proposed that a number of the Cave 7 fragments are remnants of *1 Enoch*: 7Q4 fragment 2 (*IEn* 98:11 or 105:1), 7Q8 (*IEn* 103:7–8), 7Q11 (*IEn* 100:12), 7Q12 (*IEn* 103:4), 7Q13 (*IEn* 103:15), 7Q14 (*IEn* 103:12).<sup>24</sup> But scholarly opinion remains divided on the merits of these proposals, with many (perhaps most) scholars regarding 7Q4–18 as still unidentified. Also, M. V. Spottorno suggested that 7Q5 = Zechariah 7:3c–5, pointing to *1 Enoch* 15:9d–10 as another possibility.<sup>25</sup> But in his recent survey of proposed identifications of 7Q5, Kraus judged them all “problematic” because “the letter remains of the fragment can hardly be reconciled with the letters mandatory for each hypothesis.”<sup>26</sup>

A number of these proposed or attempted identifications, especially those in the immediate aftermath of O’Callaghan’s somewhat sensational proposals, appear more to have been exercises designed to detract from his New Testament identifications (or, at best, to test the validity of his method) than confident, independent equations with other known texts. Nebe, e.g., stated, “Our identification of 7Q4,1... is at least as good as that of O’Callaghan.”<sup>27</sup> Still more candid was C. Hemer, who, in referring to his “experiment” in matching 7Q6 fragment 1 with various New Testament texts, wrote, “I am not here concerned with viable alternatives, but only with a theoretical estimate of the range of possibilities.”<sup>28</sup>

O’Callaghan, for his part, tested and rejected identifications of 7Q3 with Jeremiah 43:28–29 and of 7Q4 with Job 34:12–15;<sup>29</sup> rejected other 7Q identifications with the LXX;<sup>30</sup> and affirmed, by comparison with computerized texts, that the 7Q

<sup>3</sup> G. D. Fee, “Some Dissenting Notes on 7Q5 = Mark 6:52–53,” *JBL* 92 (1973) 110; A. C. Urbán, “La identificación de 7Q4 con Núm 14,23–24 y la restauración de textos antiguos,” *EstBib* 32 (1973) 219–44.

<sup>4</sup> O’Callaghan, *Los papiros*, pp. 91–93 = *Bib* 53 (1972) 531–33. He rejects this identification in favor of 1 Tim 3:16; 4:1, 3.

<sup>5</sup> G. -Wilhelm Nebe, “7Q4–Möglichkeit und Grenze einer Identifikation,” *RQ* 13 (1988) 629–33.

<sup>6</sup> A. C. Urbán, “Observaciones sobre ciertos papiros de la cueva 7 de Qumrán,” *RQ* 8 (1972–1975) 249.

<sup>7</sup> C. H. Roberts, “On Some Presumed Papyrus Fragments of the New Testament from Qumran,” *JTS* 23 (1972) 446 n. 4.

<sup>8</sup> P. Garnet, “O’Callaghan’s Fragments: Our Earliest New Testament Texts?” *EvQ* 45 (1973) 8–9. P. Parker, “7Q5: Enthält des Papyrusfragment 5 aus der Höhle 7 von Qumrán einen Markus-text?” *Erbe und Auftrag* 48 (1972) 567–69, suggested that the fragment fits better with Mt 1:2–3.

<sup>9</sup> Garnet, *EvQ* 45 (1973) 10.

<sup>10</sup> Urbán, *RQ* 8 (1972–1975) 240.

<sup>11</sup> Fee, *JBL* 92 (1973) 110–11.

<sup>12</sup> Fee, *JBL* 92 (1973) 111.

<sup>13</sup> Urbán, *RQ* 8 (1972–1975) 242–43.

<sup>14</sup> P. Benoit, “Nouvelle note sur les fragments grecs de la grotte 7 de Qumrán,” *RB* 80 (1973) 10, referring to tests by P. Lemoine.

<sup>15</sup> Urbán, *RQ* 8 (1972–1975) 243–44.

<sup>16</sup> Roberts, *JTS* 23 (1972) 447; independently by M. V. Spottorno, “Nota sobre los papiros de la cueva 7 de Qumrán,” *Estudios clásicos* 15 (1972) 261–63, who also tries Num 1:3–4 and 2Kgs 7:28; and Fee, *JBL* 92 (1973) 111.

<sup>17</sup> Roberts, *JTS* 23 (1972) 447.

<sup>18</sup> Fee, *JBL* 92 (1973) 111.

<sup>19</sup> K. Aland, “Neue neutestamentliche Papyri III,” *NTS* 20 (1973–1974) 368–69. Aland also tested 7Q4 against several New Testament passages by utilizing the Münster computerized *Fragment-Identifizierungsprogramm*, rejecting them all, and he lists the myriad of theoretical possibilities turned up by the computer to match elements of 7Q6 frg. 2, 7Q7, and 7Q10 with various New Testament passages, though he does not pursue the matter further (pp. 375–76).

<sup>20</sup> Urbán, *RQ* 8 (1972–1975) 245–46.

<sup>21</sup> Urbán, *RQ* 8 (1972–1975) 246–47.

<sup>22</sup> Urbán, *RQ* 8 (1972–1975) 247–48.

<sup>23</sup> See, e.g., Urbán, *RQ* 8 (1972–1975): for 7Q7 (pp. 244–45); 7Q8 (pp. 238–239); 7Q9 (p. 246); 7Q10 (p. 247); Aland, *NTS* 20 (1973–1974) 367, 371–76; Benoit, *RB* 80 (1973) 10 n. 9; C. J. Hemer, “New Testament Fragments at Qumran?” *TynBul* 23 (1972) 125–28.

<sup>24</sup> After Nebe’s initial proposal that 7Q8 = *IEn* 103:3–4, and that 7Q4 frg. 2 may = *IEn* 98:11 (see n. 5), other identifications of 7Q fragments as portions of Greek *1 Enoch* were proposed by E. A. Muro, “The Greek Fragments of Enoch from Qumran Cave 7,” *RQ* 18 (1997) 307–12; and É. Puech, “Sept fragments de la Lettre d’Hénoch (Hén 100, 103, et 105) dans la grotte 7 de Qumrán,” *RQ* 18 (1997) 313–23.

<sup>25</sup> M. V. Spottorno, “Can Methodological Limits be Set in the Debate on the Identification of 7Q5?” *DSD* 6 (1999) 66–77.

<sup>26</sup> T. J. Kraus, “7Q5–*Status Quaestionis* and Fundamental Remarks to Qualify the Discussion of the Papyrus Fragment,” in *Ad Fontes: Original Manuscripts and Their Significance for Studying Early Christianity—Selected Essays* (TENT 3; Leiden, 2007) pp. 247–48 (231–59).

<sup>27</sup> Nebe, *RQ* 13 (1988) 632.

<sup>28</sup> Hemer, *TynBul* 23 (1972) 125.

<sup>29</sup> O’Callaghan, *Los papiros*, pp. 89–93 = *Bib* 53 (1972) pp. 530–33.

<sup>30</sup> O’Callaghan, *Los papiros*, pp. 95–99; “Sobre la identificación de 7Q4,” *Studia Papyrologica* 13 (1974) 44–55.

fragments do not contain portions of Homer, Apollonius of Rhodes, Aristotle, Lysias, or Thucydides,<sup>31</sup> or of other New Testament texts.<sup>32</sup> In addition – in defense of his procedures – he reviewed various paleographical identifications of very small manuscript fragments.<sup>33</sup>

But, to repeat for emphasis, in spite of all of these academic exercises, 7Q3–19 are still for the most part “unidentified” texts as far as many scholars are concerned.<sup>34</sup> Compare, e.g., P. Flint’s endorsement of the identifications of a number of 7Q fragments as remnants of Greek *I Enoch* with the skepticism expressed by Nickelsburg and others, and the cautious stance taken by Larson.<sup>35</sup> At best, the proposals mentioned above are

considered by some as possible rather than plausible identifications, and perhaps the net genuine gains have been not in establishing textual matches for the 7Q manuscripts, but in the vigorous exchange of ideas about methodology for identifying small documentary fragments.

It is clear that both the *quantity of extant text* (including the number of readable letters and words, especially significant words, and the number of lines containing text) and a *knowledge of length of lines* (i.e., the average number of letters per line) are crucial in the process of identification with known texts. Since lines in papyrus manuscripts in general vary considerably in length, the scholar is in a difficult position: If the length of lines in a given *multi-lined* papyrus fragment were known, testing for identifications with already extant texts not only would be relatively simple (especially when using database, machine-readable texts for comparison) but also much more certain, for then one would know the approximate number of missing letters between those letters remaining on any two lines, as well as the approximate number of letters before and after those extant portions (the exact position of the preserved material within the column of text, however, still could not be determined).<sup>36</sup> Likewise, if a fragment containing so small a quantity of text as these papyri do could be tested against known texts simply by matching *content* (e.g., by using proper names, technical terms, or other keywords), the length of lines (and the subsequent reconstruction of the missing text) could be determined with relative ease when a successful

<sup>31</sup> O’Callaghan, “El ordenador, 7Q5 y Homero,” *Studia Papyrologica* 13 (1974) 21–29; “¿El texto de 7Q5 es Tuc I 41,2?” *Studia Papyrologica* 14 (1974) 125 and plate.

<sup>32</sup> O’Callaghan, “The Identifications of 7Q,” *Aegyptus* 56 (1976) 287–94.

<sup>33</sup> O’Callaghan, “La identificación de papiros literarios (biblicos),” *Studia Papyrologica* 12 (1973) 91–100; “7Q5: Nuevas consideraciones,” *Studia Papyrologica* 16 (1977) 41–47.

<sup>34</sup> E.g., granting that 7Q3–18 may be fragments of Greek translations of the Hebrew Bible, E. Tov nevertheless listed these items largely as “unclassified frags” in “A Categorized list of All the ‘Biblical Texts’ Found in the Judean Desert,” *DSD* 8 (2001) 67–84 (esp. p. 79); see also E. Tov, “The Greek Biblical Texts from the Judean Desert,” in *The Bible as Book: The Transmission of the Greek Text*, edited by S. McKendrick and O. O’Sullivan (London, 2003) pp. 97–122. 7Q4–9 are listed as unidentified texts in J. van Haelst, *Catalogue des papyrus littéraires juifs et chrétiens* (Paris, 1976) no. 1094 [apud Pickering and Cook, *Has a Fragment*, pp. 18–19 n. 13]. Moreover, O’Callaghan’s request that 7Q5 (and other 7Q documents) be included in the official list of New Testament manuscripts at Münster has not been granted; see O’Callaghan, *Aegyptus* 56 (1976) 287; cf. Aland, “Neue neutestamentliche Papyri? Ein Nachwort zu den angeblichen Entdeckungen von Professor O’Callaghan,” *Bibel und Kirche* 28 (1973) 19, and “Über die Möglichkeit der Identifikation kleiner Fragmente neutestamentlicher Handschriften mit Hilfe des Computers,” in *Studies in New Testament Language and Text: Essays in Honour of George D. Kilpatrick on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, edited by J. K. Elliot (NovTSup 44; Leiden, 1976) p. 15 n. 8.

<sup>35</sup> Cf. P. W. Flint, “The Greek Fragments of Enoch from Qumran Cave 7,” in *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection*, edited by G. Boccaccini (Grand Rapids, 2005) pp. 224–33; G. W. E. Nickelsburg, “The Greek Fragments of *I Enoch* from Qumran Cave 7: An Unproven Identification,” *RQ* 21 (2004) 631–34; E. W. Larson, “On the Identification of Two Greek Texts of *I Enoch*,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls at 60*, edited by L. H. Schiffman and S. Zoref (Leiden, 2010) pp. 157–78. Similar doubt was expressed by T. H. Lim, “The Qumran Scrolls, Multilingualism, and Biblical Interpretation,” in *Religion in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, edited by J. J. Collins and R. A. Kugler (Grand Rapids, 2000) pp. 57–73 (esp. p. 69), and M. A. Knibb, “Christian Adoption and Transmission of

Jewish Pseudepigrapha: The Case of *I Enoch*,” *JSJ* 32 (2001) 396–415 (esp. p. 401).

<sup>36</sup> A relevant example appears in B. Lifshitz, “The Greek Documents from the Cave of Horror,” *IEJ* 12 (1962) 201–7. Lifshitz provides “certain” identifications of twelve parchment fragments with nine Greek Old Testament texts (four fragments combine to form one of the texts). The nine portions of a revised version of the LXX preserved here are all from the same parchment scroll. One fragment contains only five letters, but almost all fragments have multiple lines, leading Lifshitz to comment, “To our good fortune, most contain at least two lines, enabling certain identifications for the majority of them” (202). Since one of the identified fragments contains the end of four lines, the length of lines could be determined for the entire scroll: thirty-four to thirty-eight letters per line (202, 205). However, only in this one case – where ends of lines exist – can the exact position of the preserved portions be reconstructed *within the original column of text*. Yet, the matter is not as simple as described, for D. Barthélemy, *Les devanciers d’Aquila: Première publication intégrale du texte des fragments du Dodécaphéton trouvés dans le Désert de Juda* (VTSup 10; Leiden, 1963) p. 168 n. 9, differently identifies six of the nine fragments – though Barthélemy still identifies eight altogether as from the Minor Prophets, leaving the ninth unidentified. Still, this is a more fortunate case than the Cave 7 situation, where perhaps only three tiny fragments are related to any others, and where only two fragments (7Q4, 7Q12), and possibly a third (7Q7), show the ends of lines.

match of keywords was found. In the case of 7Q3–19, however, not only is the quantity of preserved text extremely small in nearly all these fragments, but content-significant words among those that can be read are extraordinarily few and not particularly helpful.

To be specific, these Cave 7 fragments preserve *a few definite articles* (one or two in 7Q5, perhaps one in 7Q15, and doubtless three in 7Q19 frg. 1), perhaps *an indefinite pronoun* (τι = “something” in 7Q3), *two prepositions* (ἀπό = “from” and ἐν = “in” in 7Q19 frg. 1), and καί = “and” in 7Q3 and 5). Beyond these, *only two words are unambiguous*, both in 7Q19 frg. 1: ΚΤΙΣΕΩ[Σ] in the phrase “of [t]he creatio[n]”; and ΓΡΑΦΑ[ΙΣ] in the phrase “in the writing[s]/scripture[s].” In addition, ΠΙΝΕΥ - in 7Q4 is almost certainly some form of the word “wind/breath/spirit” (with a remote possibility that this same word occurs also in 7Q10).

Therefore, given *both* the lack of knowledge of length of lines *and* the limited number and nature of words and letters extant, widely acceptable or even plausible identifications of 7Q3–19 are unlikely. Ironically, the “poverty” of most of these fragments (their preservation of only a few letters) permits some of them to be identified (however tentatively) with various texts, and so many easy alternatives actually undermine the integrity of the process and the certainty of the results.<sup>37</sup> On the one hand, as C. H. Roberts cautioned, “the smaller a fragment is, the more complete the identification must be (especially in the absence of a proper name or *terminus technicus*), and the less must it assume any irregularity in the text or involve any tampering with the evidence of the papyrus,” such as postulating a scribal error.<sup>38</sup> On the other hand, “rich” fragments (those with more extensive and readable text, especially with keywords, such as 7Q1 and 7Q19 fragment 1) will allow fewer likely matches, with perhaps only one or no known text, for keywords assist *both* in matching *and* in eliminating matches with already known texts. Thus, it is not particularly encouraging to find that many of the fragments containing no unambiguous keywords have been claimed to match one or several known texts, but that the one fragment (besides 7Q1) that does have such keywords, 7Q19 fragment 1, has not been so identified.

This last result suggests, first, that 7Q19 fragment 1 no doubt preserves a hitherto unknown composition, and, second, that definitive claims for identification of the other highly fragmentary papyri are tenuous and unlikely to garner confidence. This is not meant to imply that the other fragments necessarily contain presently unknown texts, but only to highlight the diffi-

culties that these Cave 7 fragments present to us due to their extremely fragmentary nature and their greatly limited quantity of text. Above all, any claims to *certainty* in identifying the tiny fragments should be met with great caution.

A further caution arises out of an additional difficulty accruing to the Cave 7 manuscripts: They contain writing only on one side, and therefore presumably are remnants of rolls. With codex fragments, by contrast, there are typically portions of a given text on both sides, offering further data useful in identifying the text in question.<sup>39</sup>

Since the length of lines in 7Q1 and 7Q2 can now be calculated, however, it might be argued that these reconstructions provide a guide for the other fragments from Cave 7. But few of the Cave 7 fragments appear to be related to any others (7Q1, 4, and 6 consist of two fragments each according to the editors).<sup>40</sup> Therefore, no assumptions can or should be made about length of lines beyond 7Q1 and 2. Still more importantly, 7Q1–3 are dated by the editors to around 100 BCE (but in no case after 50 CE), whereas the remaining fragments (7Q4–18) are said to date between 50 BCE and 50 CE. Though these ranges of dates overlap, there still is little basis for positing line lengths for the unidentified fragments on the basis of those earlier (perhaps much earlier) ones whose lines have been reconstructed (7Q1–2). So, e.g., O’Callaghan’s calculation of the stichometry of 7Q5 as twenty to twenty-three letters per line on the basis of 7Q1 and 7Q2 is dubious.<sup>41</sup>

## 2. Provenience and Date of the Fragments

In the preceding discussion we have noted that demonstrable identifications of 7Q3–19 with known texts entail a range of formidable difficulties, and that claims to certainty generally should be resisted. Traditionally, the provenience of newly found manuscripts is a significant factor in establishing textual identifications. Can that help with the Cave 7 texts?

<sup>37</sup> O’Callaghan himself says, “...it is evident that the smaller the number of letters in a papyrus, the greater the possibility of textual attribution” (in his introduction to D. Estrada Herrero and W. White, Jr., *The First New Testament* [Nashville, 1978], p. 9).

<sup>38</sup> Roberts, *JTS* 23 (1972) 446. Note also his comment in “A Papyrus Fragment,” *London Times* (7 April 1972) 15: “Only rarely can it be said with confidence what such incomplete letters are; much more frequently it can be said what they are not.”

<sup>39</sup> On the identification of Greek manuscript fragments, see Aland, “Über die Möglichkeit,” pp. 14–38, especially pp. 21–24. See also Fee, *JBL* 92 (1973) 112.

<sup>40</sup> Nebe, *RQ* 13 (1988) 632–33; however, thinks that the relation of 7Q4 frg. 1 and 2 is “in no way clear, apart from a similar (the same?) scribal hand,” and he suggests further that “7Q8 could be the same scribal hand as 7Q4,” tentatively identifying 7Q8 as *IEn* 103:7–8, just as he identifies 7Q4 frg. 1 with *IEn* 103:3–4. Baillet, *Bib* 53 (1972) 513 n. 2, suspects that 7Q8 and 9 fit together, but he was unable to perform the verification.

<sup>41</sup> O’Callaghan, “¿Papiros neotestamentarios en la cueva 7 de Qumrán?” *Bib* 53 (1972) 96–97 = *JBLSup* (1972), pp. 8–9. 7Q1 has between 16 and 22 letters per line; 7Q2 has between 21 and 23 letters. Roberts, *JTS* 23 (1972) 447 n. 3, states: “The length of lines in prose literary texts varies considerably...; up to fifty letters to a line is not uncommon, and higher figures are known. In the style of these fragments [i.e., 7Q] one would not expect more than forty.” He adds that even within a single manuscript (e.g., P45) “the difference can be as much as seven” (n. 1).

Nothing is known of the provenience of the 7Q Greek fragments except their discovery in the Qumran area and the assured identification of the first two fragments as portions of the LXX. This evidence, however, encourages the presumption that many of the other fragments are also from the LXX or from related Jewish religious writings (noting also the theological character of other recognizable words mentioned already: “creation,” “writings” [most likely, “scriptures”], and “spirit”).

The dating of the Cave 7 papyri, however, raises a further possibility (perhaps merely speculation) about their provenience that we will examine here. But first we must note that the paleographic dating offered by C. H. Roberts was misstated in the *editio princeps*; and Baillet provided the correct information in 1972. Roberts had not, in fact, dated 7Q4 the same as 7Q1. In this later publication, Baillet gave the dates from 7Q1–18 as follows<sup>42</sup> (no date was provided for 7Q19):

7Q1–3: around 100 BCE, but in no case after 50 CE  
7Q4–18: between 50 BCE and 50 CE

The attention attracted to 7Q5 by O’Callaghan’s claim that it contains a passage in Mark prompted him and others to explore the date of that fragment particularly, whose Greek hand was viewed as an ornamental or decorated style (*Zierstil*). W. Schubart allowed no more than a century for this style, “from the last century of the Ptolemies to around 100 AD.”<sup>43</sup> Schubart’s successors, however, have tended to advance the currency of this style – even well into the third century CE. But E. G. Turner, writing in 1971, was reluctant to recognize it as a sub-type, preferring rather a broader style-classification he called “Formal round hand,” the first type of which runs from the first century BCE to the third century CE. Prior to this was a style that he classified as “Informal round hand,” which included sub-types and was current from the Ptolemaic period (with examples from 2<sup>nd</sup> century BCE) into the first and even second century CE.<sup>44</sup> Obviously, it is no simple matter to classify hands or to assign precise dates to Greek papyrus manuscripts.<sup>45</sup> In

discussing 7Q5 in 1972, J. A. Fitzmyer pointed out that examples of the *Zierstil* persist across the last century BCE and the first CE, and he allowed, “So a date for the alleged Marcan fragment as late as A.D. 100 is not yet ruled out.”<sup>46</sup>

If, however, the Qumran Community was destroyed by Roman soldiers advancing toward Jerusalem in 68 CE, these Cave 7 fragments (assuming that they are Qumran possessions) could not date after the 60s of the first century. But Fitzmyer, although not necessarily affirming a late date for 7Q5 or other Cave 7 fragments, highlighted the interesting query of C. M. Martini, whether Cave 7 might have been used by (Jewish) Christians after 70 CE.<sup>47</sup> The archaeological assessment of the pottery in Cave 7, however, which is similar to other Qumran pottery, “would indicate that this cave had been utilized during the two main periods of [Khirbet Qumran] occupation,” that is, from the end of the second century BCE to the outset of the reign of Herod the Great, and from about the beginning of our era to 68 CE, respectively.<sup>48</sup> Thus, there is no ceramic (or other) evidence of occupation by anyone but Qumranites. Some argue, however, that a jar inscription (see below) and the fact that *only Greek manuscripts and only papyrus manuscripts* were found in this (at least originally) *Qumran* cave may comprise clues to a later, *Christian* occupation and so may support the identification of some of the manuscript fragments as portions of Christian writings. In this proposal, the pottery evidence is considered irrelevant to the provenience and dating of the papyri discovered in Cave 7.

Greek manuscripts, of course, have been found in other Judean sites (such as Qumran Cave 4, Wadi Murabba’at, Naḥal Ḥever, and Masada), but in all such cases Hebrew and Aramaic texts were found as well, and in far greater numbers.<sup>49</sup> Martini asked why, if Cave 7 had been used (as were other Qumran caves) “as a place of refuge or of deposit,” it did not contain Hebrew and Aramaic manuscripts as did the others. Taking account of O’Callaghan’s proposed identifications of Cave 7 fragments as remnants of New Testament writings, Martini then speculated that Cave 7 might possibly have served “as a hiding place or genizah for manuscripts of a Christian community in the territory of Jericho,” perhaps in the general period of the last Jewish revolt (132–35 CE).<sup>50</sup> Fitzmyer (without adopting the view) observed that, in such a case, a use of the cave by Jewish Christians would have allowed a New Testament manu-

<sup>42</sup> M. Baillet, “Les manuscrits de la Grotte 7 de Qumrân et le Nouveau Testament,” *Bib* 53 (1972) 514–15. For the original, incorrect statement, see DJD 3 (*Textes*), vol. 1, pp. 142–44.

<sup>43</sup> W. Schubart, *Griechische Palaeographie* (HAW I.4.1; Munich, 1925) p. 110. Reference to *Zierstil* and Schubart is frequent in the 7Q discussion. Not so frequently noted, however, is the important point made by Aland, “Neue neutestamentliche papyri? Ein Nachwort zu den angeblichen Entdeckungen von Professor O’Callaghan,” *Bibel und Kirche* 28 (1973) 19, that in a range of paleographical dates, “the greatest probability lies in the middle,” something overlooked consistently by those supporting O’Callaghan’s views.

<sup>44</sup> E. G. Turner, *Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World* (Oxford, 1971), pp. 24–25.

<sup>45</sup> For a good summary of proper paleographical method in dating Greek manuscripts, see P. Orsini and W. Clarysse, “Early New Testament Manuscripts and Their Dates: A Critique of Theological Palaeography,” *ETL* 88 (2012) 443–74.

<sup>46</sup> J. A. Fitzmyer, “A Qumran Fragment of Mark?” *America* 126 no. 25 (24 June 1972) 648; cf. P. Bellet, “Review of O’Callaghan, *Los papiros griegos de la cueva 7 de Qumrân*,” *CBQ* 38 (1976) 125–35.

<sup>47</sup> Fitzmyer, *America* 126 (1972) 649, referring to C. M. Martini, “Notes on the Papyri of Qumrân Cave 7,” *JBLSup* 91 no. 2 (1972) 16–19.

<sup>48</sup> R. de Vaux, “Archéologie,” DJD 3 (*Textes*), vol 1, pp. 30, 32.

<sup>49</sup> See Tov’s comparison of the number of Greek manuscripts found in various Judean sites: “Greek Biblical,” esp. 97–99.

<sup>50</sup> Martini, *JBLSup* 91 (1972) 16–18.

script to be found there, “if the date of the alleged Marcan fragment could be as late as A.D. 100.”<sup>51</sup>

If, however, so late a date for Cave 7 fragments were entertained, another datum gains importance. As noted already, the fragments have writing on one side, which likely means that they are remnants of rolls, not codices. But the earliest extant copies of identifiably Christian books (especially copies of texts treated as scriptures, e.g., Old Testament writings and those that came to form the New Testament) are overwhelming in codex form rather than rolls.<sup>52</sup> If, therefore, 7Q5 or any other Cave 7 fragments were a remnant of a New Testament text brought into Cave 7 by Christian occupants between 70 and 135 CE (to pursue the Martini and Fitzmyer speculations), it would be very ancient, prior to the very early Christian preference for codices for their sacred books.<sup>53</sup>

This datum (the roll format), however, cuts both ways. From what we know of the 7Q fragments and their environment, and in light of the early Christian preference for the codex, it is more likely that the Cave 7 fragments are *not* Christian and do *not* contain New Testament texts. After all, the only two clear 7Q identifications are with LXX texts, 7Q1 and 7Q2, which constitute two of the four largest fragments; and two others, 7Q3 and 7Q19 fragment 1, though they continue to resist identification, are definitely not New Testament texts.<sup>54</sup> Why, then, should there be any predilection toward finding New Testament manuscripts in the Cave 7 fragments? Moreover, to repeat the point, there is no evidence in Cave 7 that it was anything but a Jewish (Qumranite) cave. The pottery, as noted above, is

“similar” to that of Khirbet Qumran.<sup>55</sup> Furthermore, one of the jars has רומא (*ruma* or *roma*) painted (twice) on it, a Hebrew word which de Vaux took to be a person’s name.<sup>56</sup> Thus, the larger context of the Cave 7 discoveries indicates a Jewish (Judean, likely Qumran) milieu, and it is perhaps most natural and wisest to look to this sectarian Jewish environment for our understanding of the Cave 7 fragments.

The suggestion that the רומא inscription might be “an attempt to write Greek *Rome* or Latin *Roma*,”<sup>57</sup> however, was taken up by C. P. Thiede, who accepted fully O’Callaghan’s view that 7Q5 (from around 50 CE) is part of the Gospel of Mark (and Thiede accepted also O’Callaghan’s other New Testament identifications). Thiede developed a far-reaching though all-too-clever speculative scenario about Cave 7 and the earliest Christians.<sup>58</sup> He asserted, first, that the jar with the Hebrew inscription רומא “to all appearances had been the container for the rolls, if not also their permanent place of safekeeping” (p. 2). The 7Q archaeological report, however, gives no such information, but states rather that “the majority of the written fragments were gathered up on the steps” which extended down to the cave from the plateau’s edge, although only the lower steps survived.<sup>59</sup> Because other Qumran scrolls have been found in jars, Thiede appears to have jumped to the conclusion that the 7Q manuscripts were in this jar. Then, building upon this presumed but unsupported connection between the jar and the 7Q manuscripts, he asserted that the Hebrew inscription is a mark of the jar’s origin and possession-rights: “It belongs to the Roman [Christian] community from which it came,” and, for a group of Qumran (Christian) believers “directly from Rome” (where, he held, the Gospel of Mark was written) it held a collection of the first Christian writings, which would supplement their “Torah and other Old Testament Texts” (p. 63).<sup>60</sup> Thiede’s elaborate scenario, however, over-

<sup>51</sup> Fitzmyer, *America* 126 (1972) 649. Note, however, that Fitzmyer was “very skeptical about the identification” of 7Q5 as Mk 6:52–53 (p. 650); cf. J. Fitzmyer, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Major Publications and Tools for Study* (SBLRBS 20; Atlanta, 1990) p. 168.

<sup>52</sup> C. H. Roberts and T. C. Skeat, *The Birth of the Codex* (Oxford, 1983) pp. 33–44, esp. pp. 40–42; and L. W. Hurtado, *The Earliest Christian Artifacts: Manuscripts and Christian Origins* (Grand Rapids, 2006), pp. 43–93.

<sup>53</sup> Martini, *JBLSup* 91 (1972) 20. One could add a point made by C. P. Thiede, *Die älteste Evangelien-Handschrift? Das Markus-Fragment von Qumran und die Anfänge der schriftlichen Überlieferung des Neuen Testaments* (Wuppertal, 1986) p. 63, that the 7Q fragments do not show the use of contractions for the *nomina sacra* (used and probably invented by Christians [see Roberts and Skeat, *Birth*, p. 57]), though the only relatively sure place where such a contraction might have been used is in 7Q4 for πνεῦμα (“spirit”). Note, however, that O’Callaghan argues that *nomina sacra* abbreviations were used in 7Q7 – though with no direct evidence and obviously to fit his proposed stichometry in matching it with Mk 12:7. He claims that “Jesus” and “God” (twice) were abbreviated there in the (non-extant) text of 7Q7 (O’Callaghan, *Los papiros*, pp. 67–69).

<sup>54</sup> Hemer, “7Q5: A Correction,” *Studia Papyrologica* 16 (1977) 39–40.

<sup>55</sup> de Vaux, “Archéologie,” DJD 3 (*Textes*), vol. 1, pp. 30, 32: “similar,” though not “exactly parallel.”

<sup>56</sup> de Vaux, “Archéologie,” DJD 3 (*Textes*), vol. 1, pp. 30–32, citing evidence of the frequent attestation of the name in Nabatean, Palmyrene, Elephantine, and Dura-Europos inscriptions and texts. For a description of the jar see DJD 3 (*Texts*, p. 28), and DJD 3 (*Planches*, plate VIII) for photos of the jar and the word painted on it.

<sup>57</sup> By Fitzmyer, *America* 126 (1972) 649, though he does not elaborate on the possible implications. Thiede does not refer to O’Callaghan, *Los papiros*, pp. 22–23, where he raised the question whether the inscription might indicate contents of manuscripts belonging to the nascent church of Rome.

<sup>58</sup> Thiede, *Die älteste Evangelien-Handschrift?*, pp. 61–63.

<sup>59</sup> de Vaux, “Archéologie,” DJD 3 (*Textes*), vol. 1, p. 27.

<sup>60</sup> Thiede was anticipated in his views of the jar’s origin by Estrada Herrero and White, *The First New Testament*, pp. 72, 138; the latter also combine the jar inscription and the “Herculean” paleographic style of 7Q6 frg. 1 and 7Q8 to assert that “this all points to an Italian origin for the [Cave VII] papyri” and “these fragments from the tiny cave on the Northwest shore of the Dead Sea are evidence of manuscripts written in the fine scribal hands

looks several things that render it unpersuasive: (1) the Cave 7 pottery (including this jar) is similar to other Qumran pottery, rendering virtually impossible a Roman origin of the jar; (2) the inscription's style of writing is the same as writing on graves, vases, ostraca, and the alphabet on a scribe's exercise tablet, including a 4Q jar and a 10Q ostrakon;<sup>61</sup> and (3) a jar from a Christian circle in Rome containing *Greek* manuscripts would more likely have a *Greek* inscription of origin or ownership rather than one in Hebrew.<sup>62</sup>

Notwithstanding the lack of clear evidence, however, Thiede insisted that Cave 7 was a Christian cave, belonging to a group made up of Essene converts to Christianity, or of non-Essene Jewish Christians, who, in their cave (which was "something like a Christian library," p. 17) already had "the Torah and other Old Testament texts," and who also secured "directly from Rome a collection of the first Christian writings."<sup>63</sup> Moreover, he asserted that "7Q shows us a Torah-scroll next to a Gospel-scroll: an impressive nearness and togetherness" in a collection of sacred writings whose "formal unity" appears in their exclusive form as Greek papyrus rolls. These rolls show that the "first Christians" had not yet employed the codex form or the *nomina sacra* abbreviations, and, in particular, that the Gospel of Mark held by these "first ambassadors of the faith" is now documented at the middle of the first century CE (pp. 61–63).<sup>64</sup>

Of course, the evidence from the cave *does not exclude* a later Christian reuse of the site. Thiede's argument, however, has a goodly measure of circularity about it: 7Q fragments are taken as remnants of New Testament writings, and so the cave and its artifacts were used by Christians; and since the cave was used by Christians, the case is supposedly then stronger that the papyri fragments really are remnants of New Testament writings. But no direct evidence supports a later Christian occupation, and Thiede's claim rests largely on silence, involves

and used by the wealthiest Roman literati ... in the heart of Italy" [!] (p. 123). Curiously, Martini, when referring to the inscribed jar, speaks of "the papyri preserved in it," though he rejects any connection between the jar and the 7Q manuscript. Martini, *Bib* 53 (1972) 18.

<sup>61</sup> de Vaux, "Archéologie," DJD 3 (*Textes*), vol. 1, p. 32. Cf. Martini, *Bib* 53 (1972) 18, for further information; as noted earlier, he concludes that the jar probably has no connection with the manuscripts.

<sup>62</sup> See H.-U. Rosenbaum, "Cave 7Q5! Gegen die erneute Inanspruchnahme des Qumran-Fragments 7Q5 als bruchstück der ältesten Evangelien-Handschrift," *BZ* 31 (1987) 203.

<sup>63</sup> It is puzzling why supposed Essene Christians in Judea would have obtained copies of "the first Christian writings" from Rome. Thiede appears to have presumed a supremacy of the Roman church rather early!

<sup>64</sup> Estrada Herrero and White, *The First New Testament*, p. 138, earlier asserted (without basis) that "someone from the Christian community at Jericho or the environs hid the jar with its precious contents [sic!] before the final onslaught of Titus against Jerusalem..."

dubious inferences, and amounts to pure speculation. Only if definitive or *highly* plausible identifications of 7Q fragments with New Testament writings were established could any consideration at all be given to the proposal that Cave 7 was used by Christians subsequent to its Qumran occupation.

### 3. Relation to the New Testament

Initially in scholarly debate, the major issue regarding the 7Q manuscripts (that is, 7Q3–19, or more precisely 7Q4–10 and 15) was whether (as claimed by O'Callaghan especially) they are fragments of New Testament texts. What is the basis for O'Callaghan's reconstructions? How have they held up to critical scrutiny?

His proposals cannot be reviewed fully here, but the detailed annotations and judgments on the 7Q fragments below, documenting their poor state of preservation, the extremely few letters surviving in most cases, and the difficulty of ascertaining clear and acceptable readings of the disputed letters, must be given their due weight in considering proposed identifications with any known texts. Scrutiny of photographs, even clear enlargements, leaves many questions unanswered about the remnants of individual letters; expert opinions differ at point after point; and difficulties multiply as different judgments about identifying one letter are complicated by equally differing judgments on the next letter, and so on. Perhaps perfect cases should not be expected, but perfect cases – to say the least – seem not yet to have been made; indeed, whether plausible or even possible cases have been established for most of the fragments remains in doubt. Let us consider O'Callaghan's proposed identifications.

#### List of O'Callaghan's Identifications:<sup>65</sup>

7Q4 =	1Tim 3:16, 4:1, 3
7Q5 =	Mk 6:52–53
7Q6 Frg. 1 =	Mk 4:28
7Q6 Frg. 2 =	Acts 27:38
7Q7 =	Mk 12:17
7Q8 =	Jas 1:23–24
7Q9 =	Rom 5:11–12
7Q10 =	2Pet 1:15
7Q15 =	Mk 6:48

Analysis and critique of O'Callaghan's proposals have emphasized a number of general points and have provided extensive scrutiny of particular identifications as well. General problems include the following:

(1) *Provenience*. As noted earlier, the whole context of these discoveries is Jewish, Septuagint, and Qumran in nature, with

<sup>65</sup> This chart was compiled by Brandon L. Allen using J. O'Callaghan, *Los papiros*, pp. 33–76.

no external evidence or direct basis for inferring any Christian connection.

(2) *Dating*. Palaeographical dating placed 7Q1–3 at ca. 100 BCE, but in no case after 50 CE, and 7Q4–18 at between 50 BCE and 50 CE, with the presumptive dating in these cases resting somewhere in the middle. These ranges are not fixed, however, and palaeographic dating alone cannot be decisive. Nonetheless, O’Callaghan’s assignment of virtually all the identified fragments to the latest end of the originally proposed dating range seems presumptuous, and the attribution of these early dates to manuscripts of the New Testament has drawn much skepticism. Yet, the matter must be approached with an open mind. Theoretically, of course, Christian writings could have been produced at any time after ca. 30 CE, but we have no evidence of Christian literary texts before Paul, and Paul (writing in the 50s–60s) makes no reference to gospels. Granted, secure and specific dating of New Testament books does not come easily. Early and late dates for James and 2 Peter are still debated, though the majority opinion would place them late: James in later decades of the first century and 2 Peter still later. Likewise, Acts is often viewed as written no earlier than 90 CE, and 1 Timothy is often placed in the first or even second quarter of the second century. Although not unanimously held, these are not arbitrary dates but are based both on internal evidence and on the interpretation of the (admittedly sparse) external evidence available to us. Of course, a secure identification of one of these New Testament texts with a manuscript of unquestioned early date could, and would have to be, accommodated by scholarship – indeed, it would be welcomed. At the same time, however, the other external evidence (e.g., that coming from the Apostolic Fathers about knowledge or lack of knowledge of various New Testament writings, etc.) has to be given its due weight as well. On the face of things, then, it is difficult to take seriously the dating of several New Testament fragments prior to the time when the writings they allegedly transmit can reasonably be thought to have been composed. Even if one takes the earlier dates of some of these writings preferred by some (e.g., ca. 60 CE for James, ca. 60–70 for Acts, ca. 60–65 for 1 Timothy), it is most unlikely that copies of all these texts would have been made, collected, and then deposited in Cave 7 by ca. 68 CE (as proposed, e.g., by Thiede). So the foci of scrutiny would seem to be the palaeographic dating and the identification of the fragments’ contents.<sup>66</sup>

(3) *Multiple Manuscripts*. Very few of the twenty-one 7Q fragments are related palaeographically to any of the others, but at least three are, and this raises two kinds of problems. First, in the case of related fragments, normally they should preserve portions of the same text. We are not informed and cannot know how these scrolls were lying in the cave during the process of deterioration, but fragments found stuck to one another (with similar contours from weathering), as were 7Q6 fragments 1–2, are most likely to be from the same roll, and also likely portions originally close to each other. Yet, O’Callaghan identifies 7Q6 fragments 1 and 2 as fragments of different texts, one a fragment of Mark and the other a fragment of Acts. Many things are possible, but if those identifications were valid, such a juxtaposition of texts would be unlikely in adjacent turns of a rolled manuscript.

Also, though not confirmed, 7Q8 and 9 may fit together and therefore may be from the same papyrus sheet (see n. 40, above). If so, it would be impossible for one fragment to contain part of James and the other a part of Romans. Similarly (though again not confirmed) if 7Q4 fragments 1–2 and 7Q8 (dated 100 CE and 50 CE, respectively, by O’Callaghan) are by the same hand,<sup>67</sup> in O’Callaghan’s proposals Timothy and James would have been on the same roll. Though there are various patterns of transmission, to be sure, normally the New Testament writings did not circulate in these combinations, particularly in such an early time.

A second problem concerns the large array of non-related fragments among those of Cave 7. Portions of six different New Testament books are included on O’Callaghan’s proposed identifications of nine of these fragments. If Cave 7 were itself a Christian library or the depository for a collection of Christian books (including LXX writings, such as 7Q1 and 2), such an array would be possible – leaving aside for the moment the crucial question of the early dates. But, to find four different copies of Mark (7Q5, 7Q6 frg. 1 lines 7, and 15) in a single location is certainly unlikely in any very early Christian period, and – on the claim that they all date around 50 CE – would be (to put it mildly) remarkable in the highest measure. For, leaving aside for the moment the customary external evidence and modern scholarly judgments about the likely date of its composition, this would be an unlikely early date for the Gospel of Mark, or any gospel, to have been written and then circulated in sufficient copies to result in four copies gathered in this one location.<sup>68</sup> Even if one were to accept a date of around 100 CE

<sup>66</sup> “The date the author [O’Callaghan] gives makes the identifications impossible; or else the identifications necessitate a complete revision of paleography, especially with regard to the ‘Zierstil’”: Bellet, *CBQ* 38 (1976) 125. Most of O’Callaghan’s defenders want to keep the early date (or they simply assume it). E.g., Thiede, “Neutestamentliche Papyrologie: Die ersten Handschriften, ihre Datierung und Bewertung,” *IBW Journal* 23 no. 10 (Nov.–Dec. 1985) 14–15, is adamant that 68 CE is the *terminus ad quem* for the 7Q manuscripts. Cf. Estrada Herrero and White, *First*, p. 122. On this view, it is difficult to explain how a manuscript that O’Callaghan dates around 100 CE (7Q4) could

have been deposited in the cave prior to 68 CE (J. Vardaman, “The Earliest Fragments of the New Testament,” *ExpT* 83 [1971–1972] 376).

<sup>67</sup> Nebe, *RQ* 13 (1988) 633.

<sup>68</sup> If all the Greek manuscripts at Qumran were imported from outside, as E. Tov believes [see note 34 above], one might argue that four different copies made their way perhaps from four diverse localities. But this would have required sufficient time for copies to be made and to have been circulated after the composition of Mark. For a survey of the comparative number of copies

for the 7Q fragments that have been designated as in *Zierstil* (such as 7Q5; 7Q6 frg. 1; 7Q9<sup>69</sup>), and were to adopt the speculative view that Christians brought these manuscripts into Cave 7 around 132–135 CE (see above), the presence of so many different New Testament manuscripts there, and particularly (to repeat the point) four different Marcan manuscripts, would be most surprising in that period. To be sure, copies of fifteen different New Testament books survived at Oxyrhynchus, some in several copies, but this was a highly literate, thriving, cosmopolitan city, and the fragments vary in date from the second to the early fourth centuries – a long period of use. In addition, the Chester Beatty papyri may have been recovered from a ruined church, perhaps revealing a collection of New Testament books that included the gospels, Acts, Pauline letters, and the Apocalypse from early to late in the third century – again a long period of use in the literate, bustling Fayyûm district.<sup>70</sup> That is, these manuscripts reflect a situation a century to a century and a half later than the period O’Callaghan is assuming – and by then much had already transpired in that developmental period of early Christianity.

All of these general difficulties speak against the presence of New Testament manuscripts in the Qumran cave, especially manuscripts that are almost all claimed (by O’Callaghan) to date around the middle of the first century CE. Yet, for the sake of argument, these several difficulties could be overcome if positive, widely accepted identifications could be made with New Testament writings.

In every case, however, O’Callaghan’s identifications appear to have a “fatal flaw,” one or more serious and often insuperable difficulties, as well as a fair number of additional impediments to a satisfactory match. Indeed, it appears that the more text there is in one of his identified fragments, the greater the problems seem to be and the more numerous are the adjustments and accommodations that he requires to justify his claim.

For example, although 7Q4 fragments 1–2 may pose less severe difficulties than some others (if one ignores the issues of the late dating of these fragments and the likely late date of 1 Timothy), numerous problems plague the identifications. Most interesting is that after O’Callaghan announced his identification with 1 Timothy 3:16–4:1, 3, but before he had published

his stichometric reconstruction, two scholars<sup>71</sup> (presumably independently) attempted reconstructions, but neither could fit the τὸν of line 2 into the passage in 1 Timothy. As it turns out, O’Callaghan had to postulate an extended space before the beginning of 1 Timothy 4:1 – a space of about ten letters in line 2 – to accommodate the stichometry required for the material preceding and following τὸν. But there is no indicated *paragraphus* or other marker of a sectional division here, such as the space in line 3 of 7Q5 that he viewed as a crucial factor in identifying that fragment as part of Mark. With respect to these same letters, τὸν, he also had to read ῥητῶν for ῥητῶς, and in line 3 omit ὄτι ἐν from 1 Timothy 4:1, although no such textual variant is found in any copy of 1 Timothy. Finally, his proposal of η as the first letter of line 5 (replacing both the illegible first letter and the well-assured ι) creates difficulty. Although at first he read αἰ here, it was clear that the first letter was not α; and so, later, proposing instead an η, O’Callaghan had to argue for a textual substitution of η for αἰ in the word δαίμωνιων in 1 Timothy 4:1.

O’Callaghan’s first and most popularized identification, 7Q5 as Mark 6:52–53, caused an avalanche of almost immediate responses, many raising crucial issues. The chief problem was O’Callaghan’s need to assume or propose a number of highly unlikely or quite impossible readings, such as ν in line 2, when it is clearly ι-adscript (“and without the *nu* O’Callaghan’s case evaporates”).<sup>72</sup> Likewise, O’Callaghan posited another η, also in line 2, when α is virtually certain; and ι at the end of line 3 where the remaining stroke is not straight but curved, and in the wrong direction if it were ι. In addition, the omission of ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν in an alleged Mark 6:53 has no text-critical precedent,<sup>73</sup> and O’Callaghan’s argument that τ has replaced δ in line 3 has left many unconvinced.<sup>74</sup>

In 7Q6 fragment 1, the letter in line 1, though poorly preserved, cannot be φ (or ο); the fourth letter in line 2 cannot be ε; nor can the fifth letter in line 3 be ρ. In 7Q6 fragment 2, κ cannot be validated as the second letter in line 1. In addition, ignoring the relationship of 7Q6 fragments 1 and 2 is unwarranted because of the evidence of contiguity and joint weathering. In 7Q7, the letter in line 1 cannot be ο, nor can the third letter in line 3 be υ.

In 7Q8, a reconstruction of James 1:23–24 would require τ following O’Callaghan’s line 3, but the surviving letter on line

of various texts in Christian manuscripts of the first three centuries, see L. W. Hurtado, *Earliest*, pp. 16–35. Only one copy of Mark is attested.

<sup>69</sup> But so is 7Q1, which may be dated as early as 100 BCE.

<sup>70</sup> See E. J. Epp, “The New Testament Papyri at Oxyrhynchus in Their Social and Intellectual Context,” in *Sayings of Jesus: Canonical and Non-Canonical. Essays in Honour of Tjitze Baarda*, edited by W. L. Peterson, et al. (NovTSup 89; Leiden, 1997) pp. 56–63; E. J. Epp, “The Oxyrhynchus New Testament Papyri: ‘Not Without Honor Except in Their Hometown?’” *JBL* 123 (2004) 10–20; reprinted in E. J. Epp, *Perspectives on New Testament Textual Criticism: Collected Essays, 1962–2004* (NovTSup 116; Leiden, 2005) pp. 506–13 and 748–61, respectively.

<sup>71</sup> Fee, *JBL* 92 (1973) 110; Garnet, *EvQ* 45 (1973) 10.

<sup>72</sup> Fee, *JBL* 92 (1973) 110. Similarly, Pickering and Cook, *Has a Fragment*, p. 12, judged, “It is clear that the reading of iota is fatal to the proposed identification.”

<sup>73</sup> Martini, *JBLSup* 91 (1972) 19.

<sup>74</sup> See, e.g., Fitzmyer, *America* 126 (1972) 648; especially Rosenbaum, *BZ* 31 (1987) 198–203. He points out (p. 199 n. 20) that O’Callaghan’s list of examples (*Bib* 54 [1973] 415) of the δ/τ shift are not at all from the same period as 7Q5. Hemer, “A Note on 7Q5,” *ZNW* 65 (1974) 156, states the weakness of an “assumption that the only complete letter preserved διαπερῶσαντες is a spelling error.”

4 reads ν (or possibly μ), but not τ.<sup>75</sup> O’Callaghan argued, however, that the letter in line 4 is written in another hand and, since it is somewhat farther separated from line three than are lines 1–3 from each other, that it is a remnant of a marginal note and need not be taken into account. But both of his claims are disputed.<sup>76</sup> Still more problematic is his omission of γὰρ ἐαυτὸν in line 2, for there is no other witness for the omission of ἐαυτὸν in the textual tradition.<sup>77</sup>

In 7Q9, there is almost no probability that the remains of the last letter in line 2 could be the π required by O’Callaghan’s identification with Romans 5:12. In 7Q10, the few traces in line 1 do not support τ, nor does line 2 accommodate μ as the first letter, and the last letter cannot be ξ, assumed by O’Callaghan to fit his reconstruction of 2 Peter 1:15; it is most likely γ. Finally, in 7Q15, the first letter in line 1 is unlikely to be ν, and the small angled apex remaining from the second letter of line 2 cannot be ε.

Letters surviving merely as a dot of ink that appears to begin or end its movement in a direction that at best can only be tenuously identified provide a less than satisfactory basis for claims, particularly when there are few other letters that are clear, and especially when there are no key words that are complete or at least sufficiently extant to be identified with confidence. Often these small traces will nullify proposed identifications more readily than they serve to provide positive evidence. But proposals cannot commend themselves unless they comport with the evidence that is present. This veto factor looms even larger when the evidence is as sparse as it is in many of these tiny fragments. In other cases, of course, the limited evidence conceivably could be interpreted as O’Callaghan does, were there larger factors lending plausibility, but both the general considerations outlined above and his treatment of the minute data, whether considering each individual case or taking several or all nine of his identifications together, contribute to a broad lack of confidence in his proposals. The efforts to shore up O’Callaghan’s proposals by arguments from statistical probability have not been persuasive.<sup>78</sup> In short, there is really no

sound basis for thinking that any of the Cave 7 fragments preserves a portion of any New Testament writing.<sup>79</sup>

#### 4. Other Proposed Identifications

As noted briefly earlier, a few scholars (esp. Muro, Nebe and Puech)<sup>80</sup> have proposed that Cave 7 fragments may be remnants of a Greek translation of *1 Enoch*. Various factors make such a proposal plausible in principle. The other texts securely identified in the Qumran caves are writings of the Qumran community, biblical (Old Testament) writings, and various other second-temple Jewish writings. Moreover, portions of *1 Enoch* in Aramaic have been identified among the Qumran fragments in Cave IV, which means that *1 Enoch* was known and circulating in Judea in the period.<sup>81</sup> Given the evidence of the text in Aramaic, it is in principle plausible that a Greek translation may also have circulated before 68 CE.

P. Flint endorsed the identification of several Cave 7 fragments as remnants of Greek *1 Enoch*, contending that 7Q4 fragment 1, 7Q8, and 7Q12 preserve portions of *1 Enoch* 103:3–8 “on two successive columns of a scroll classified as pap7QEn gr,” and that, in light of further proposals, “at least seven fragments” belong to this manuscript: 7Q4 fragment 1, 7Q8, 7Q12, 7Q14 comprising portions of *1 Enoch* 103:3–8, 12; 7Q4 fragment 2 containing text from *1 Enoch* 98:11 or 105:1; 7Q11 containing text from *1 Enoch* 100:12; and 7Q13 containing text from *1 Enoch* 103:15. These fragments, he urged, “yield a ‘new’ scroll (pap7QEn gr) from a group of previously unidentified fragments,” show that “a Greek copy of *1 Enoch* existed at Qumran,” and this “underscores the importance of *1 Enoch* for the Qumran community,” with a total of twelve manuscripts of *1 Enoch* in the Qumran manuscripts (eleven from Cave 4 in Aramaic and one from Cave 7).<sup>82</sup> Some other scholars

<sup>75</sup> It is curious that he breaks off his stichometry without including the last two letters of a word! His stichometry in every other case varies at least by one or two letters – and often much more – from line to line, so he could and should have permitted a couple more letters here.

<sup>76</sup> Baillet, *Bib* 53 (1972) 513 n. 1, disputes O’Callaghan’s calculations of interlinear distance, and Roberts, *JTS* 23 (1972) 447, his claims about a different hand.

<sup>77</sup> Roberts, *JTS* 23 (1972) 447; cf. Martini, *JBLSup* 91 (1972) 20. At James 1:24, some witnesses have δε instead of γαρ (614. 1505 *et al.*), and a few witnesses have no connective (e.g., 429. 630), but none omits ἐαυτὸν.

<sup>78</sup> K. Jaroš, “Die Qumranfragmente der Höle 7 (7Q) im Computertest,” *Aeg* 80 (2000) 147–68; R. Scribona, “7Q5 e il ‘calcolo delle probabilità’ nella sua identificazione,” *BeO* 43/209 (2001) 133–81. Cf., e.g., Kraus’s negative judgment about these efforts: “7Q5–Status Questionis,” esp. p. 252.

<sup>79</sup> Among somewhat more recent critiques of O’Callaghan’s most publicized proposal that 7Q5 is a portion of Mark: Stefan Enste, “Qumran-Fragment 7Q5 ist nicht Markus 6, 52–53,” *ZPE* 126 (1999) 189–94; S. Enste, *Kein Markustext in Qumran. Eine Untersuchung der These: Qumran-Fragment Mk 6,52–53* (NTOA 45; Freiburg and Göttingen, 2000); H. Förster, “7Q5=Mark 6.52–53: A Challenge for Textual Criticism?” *JGRChJ* 2 (2001–2005) 27–35; and also the review of the matter by Kraus, “7Q5–Status.” Cf., however, the more positive views given earlier by J. Peláez del Rosal, “El Debate sobre los Papiros Neotestamentarios de Qumrán: 7Q5 y 7Q4,” *EB* 57 (1999) 517–38; J. M. Vernet, “Si riafferma il papiro 7Q5 come Mc 6,52–53?” *RivistB* 46 (1998) 43–60.

<sup>80</sup> See n. 24.

<sup>81</sup> J. T. Milik, *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4* (Oxford, 1976). Milik, “Fragments grecs du livre d’Hénoch (P. Oxy XVII 2069),” *Chronique d’Égypte* 46 (1971) 321–43, also proposed that the fragments P.Oxy 2069 were remnants of Greek *1 Enoch*, but cf. Larson’s critique: “On the Identification,” pp. 158–68.

<sup>82</sup> Flint, “Greek,” pp. 232–33.

(e.g., Fitzmyer and Millard) as well have reacted positively to these identifications.<sup>83</sup> In his review of these proposals, Larson judged them “tantalizing,” but also acknowledged that questions about them remain.<sup>84</sup>

Others, however (e.g., T. Lim and M. Knibb), have expressed doubts, observing that the paucity of preserved text in the fragments makes their identification speculative.<sup>85</sup> Still more negative is the judgment by Nickelsburg. In a footnote in his commentary on *1 Enoch*, he considered the Cave 7 fragments “too small to allow a certain identification.”<sup>86</sup> In an article published subsequently, he offered a further reason to doubt the proposed identification of the fragments. As well as noting the few letters preserved in the fragments, he criticized the use of the Chester Beatty-Michigan papyrus (CBM) of Greek *1 Enoch* in the identifications, characterizing the CBM as “a notoriously corrupt and defective text” differing markedly from the Ethiopic version.<sup>87</sup> This, he argued, makes it necessary to resort to hypotheses about the putative Greek text supposedly attested in the Cave 7 fragments that are “methodologically questionable.”<sup>88</sup> Consequently, he concluded that the proposed identifications of Cave 7 fragments as portions of *1 Enoch* are “as unproven as previous attempts to assign them to the New Testament.”<sup>89</sup>

In summation, it appears that, with the exception of the identification of 7Q1 as a portion of Exodus (7QpapLXXExod) and 7Q2 as a portion of the Letter of Jeremiah (7QpapEpJer gr), none of the remaining Cave 7 fragments has an identification that has won wide assent. Indeed, in light of the problems noted making any identification, it is unlikely that this situation will change. In light of the secure identification of 7Q1 and 7Q2, together with the Cave 4 Greek fragments (which likewise have been identified as portions of Greek translations of biblical writings), perhaps the net effect of the Qumran Greek fragments has been to show a variety of textual traditions represented, contributing more to text-critical study of the Greek Old Testament than to anything else.<sup>90</sup>

<sup>83</sup> J. A. Fitzmyer, “The Dead Sea Scrolls and Early Christianity,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Christian Origins* (Grand Rapids, 2000) p. 25 n. 24; A. Millard, *Reading and Writing in the Time of Jesus* (New York, 2000) p. 56.

<sup>84</sup> Larson, “On the Identification,” p. 178.

<sup>85</sup> See n. 35.

<sup>86</sup> G. W. E. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch, Chapters 1–36; 81–108* (Minneapolis, 2001) p. 14 n. 49.

<sup>87</sup> Nickelsburg, *RQ* 21 (2004) 632.

<sup>88</sup> Nickelsburg, *RQ* 21 (2004) 633.

<sup>89</sup> Nickelsburg, *RQ* 21 (2004) 634.

<sup>90</sup> See, e.g., R. D. Miller, “The Greek Biblical Fragments from Qumran in Text-Critical Perspective,” *BeO* 43 (2001) 235–48; E. Tov, “The Greek Biblical Texts from the Judean Desert” (105): “In the wake of the existence in caves 4 and 7 of texts of the Greek Pentateuch, the most likely assumption is that 7Q3–7 contain either the Septuagint text of the Pentateuch (LXX Pentateuch) or LXX *Enoch*.”

## 5. Selected Bibliography

### Text Edition

Baillet, M., et al. *Les ‘Petites Grottes’ de Qumran: Exploration de la falaise. Les grottes 2Q, 3Q, 5Q, 6Q 7Q. a 10Q, Le rouleau de cuivre*. 2 vols. DJD 3. Oxford, 1962, vol. 1, pp. 142–43; vol. 2, Plate 30.

### Textual, Historical, and Theological Studies

Aland, K. “Neue neutestamentliche Papyri? Ein Nachwort zu den angeblichen Entdeckungen von Professor O’Callaghan.” *BK* 28 (1973) 19–20.

Aland, K. “Neue neutestamentliche Papyri III.” *NTS* 20 (1973–74) 357–81.

Aland, K. “Über die Möglichkeit der Identifikation kleiner Fragmente neutestamentlicher Handschriften mit Hilfe des Computers.” In *Studies in New Testament Language and Text: Essays in Honour of George D. Kilpatrick on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, edited by J. K. Elliott. *NovTSup* 44; Leiden, 1976, pp. 14–38.

Baillet, M. “Les manuscrits de la Grotte 7 de Qumrân et le Nouveau Testament.” *Bib* 53 (1972) 508–16; *Bib* 54 (1973) 340–50 +1 Plate. Part 1 tr. into Italian in *Ridattare I Vangeli?*, edited by F. D. Vecchia. *Giornale di teologia* 247. Bescia, 1997, pp. 71–81.

Baillet, M. “Les fragments grecs de la grotte 7 de Qumrân et le Nouveau Testament.” In *Orient Chrétien: Actes du xxix<sup>e</sup> Congrès international des Orientalistes*. Paris, 1975, pp. 4–10.

Benoit, P. “Note sur les fragments grecs de la grotte 7 de Qumrân.” *RB* 79 (1972) 321–24 +1 Plate.

Benoit, P. “Nouvelle note sur les fragments grecs de la grotte 7 de Qumrân.” *RB* 80 (1973) 5–12 +1 Plate.

Betz, O. and R. Riesner. “Were Manuscripts of the New Testament Found in Qumran Cave 7?” In *Jesus, Qumran and the Vatican: Clarifications*. New York, 1994, pp. 114–24.

Boismard, M.-É. “À propos de 7Q5 et Mc 6,52–53.” *RB* 102 (1995) 585–88. Italian tr. in *Ridattare I Vangeli?* edited by F. D. Vecchia. *Giornale di teologia* 247; Bescia, 1997, pp. 163–67.

Enste, S. *Kein Markustext in Qumran: Eine Untersuchung der These: Qumran-Fragment 7Q5 = Mk 6,52–53*. NTOA 45. Freiburg and Göttingen, 2000.

Estrada Herrero, D. and W. White, Jr. *The First New Testament*. Nashville and New York, 1978.

Fee, G. D. “Some Dissenting notes on 7Q5 = Mark 6:52–53.” *JBL* 92 (1973) 109–12.

Fitzmyer, J. A. *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Major Publications and Tools for Study*. SBL Resources for Biblical Study 20. Atlanta, 1990 [rev. ed.].

Fitzmyer, J. A. “A Qumran Fragment of Mark?” *America* 126 no. 25 (24 June 1972) 647–50.

- Flint, P. W. “The Greek Fragments of Enoch from Qumran Cave 7.” In *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection*, edited by G. Boccaccini. Grand Rapids, 2005, pp. 224–33.
- Focant, C. “Un fragment du second évangile à Qumrân: 7Q5 = Mc 6,52-53?” *Revue théologique de Louvain* 16 (1985) 447–54.
- Förster, H. “7Q5 = Mark 6.52–53: A Challenge for Textual Criticism?” *JGRChJ* 2 (2001–2005) 27–35.
- Garnet, P. “O’Callaghan’s Fragments: Our Earliest New Testament Texts?” *EvQ* 45 (1973) 6–12.
- Hemer, C. J. “A Note on 7Q5.” *ZNW* 65 (1974) 155–157.
- Hemer, C. J. “New Testament Fragments at Qumran?” *TynBul* 23 (1972) 125–28.
- Knibb, M. A. “Christian Adoption and Transmission of Jewish Pseudepigrapha: The Case of *1 Enoch*.” *JSJ* 32 (2001) 396–415.
- Kraus, T. J. “7Q5—*Status quaestionis* and Fundamental Remarks to Qualify the Discussion of the Papyrus Fragment.” In *Ad Fontes: Original Manuscripts and Their Significance for Studying Early Christianity—Selected Essays*. TENTS 3; Leiden, 2007, pp. 231–59.
- Larson, E. W. “On the Identification of Two Greek Texts of *1 Enoch*.” In *The Dead Sea Scrolls at 60: Scholarly Contributions of New York University Faculty and Alumni*, edited by L. H. Schiffman and S. Tzoref. STDJ 89; Leiden, 2010, pp. 157–78.
- Leaney, A. R. C. “Greek Manuscripts from the Judean Desert.” In *Studies in New Testament Language and Text: Essays in Honour of George D. Kilpatrick on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, edited by J. K. Elliott. NovTSup 44; Leiden, 1976, pp. 283–300.
- Lim, T. H. “The Qumran Scrolls, Multilingualism, and Biblical Interpretation.” In *Religion in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, edited by J. J. Collins and R. A. Kugler. Grand Rapids, 2000, pp. 57–73.
- Martini, C. M. “Note sui papiri della grotta 7 di Qumrân.” *Bib* 53 (1972) 101–4. Eng. tr. by W. L. Holladay, “Notes on the Papyri of Qumrân Cave 7,” [separately published] *Supplement to JBL* 91 (1972), No. 2. Philadelphia, 1972, pp. 15–20.
- Mayer, B., ed. *Christen und Christliches in Qumran?* Eichstätter Studien. N.F. 32. Regensburg, 1992. [16 essays, mostly on 7Q5].
- Muro, E. A., Jr. “The Greek Fragments of Enoch from Qumran Cave 7 (7Q4, 7Q8, & 7Q12 = 7QEn gr = Enoch 103:3–4, 7–8).” *RQ* 18 (1997) 307–12.
- Nebe, G.-W. “7Q4—Möglichkeit und Grenze einer Identifikation.” *RQ* 13 (1988) [= *Mémorial Jean Carmignac*] 629–33.
- Nickelsburg, G. W. E. “The Greek Fragments of *1 Enoch* from Qumran Cave 7: An Unproven Identification.” *RQ* 21 (2004) 631–34.
- O’Callaghan, J. “7Q5: Nuevas consideraciones.” *Studios Papyrologica* 16 (1977) 41–47.
- O’Callaghan, J. “El Cambio δ > τ en los papiros bíblicos.” *Bib* 54 (1973) 415–16.
- O’Callaghan, J. “El ordenador, 7Q5 y Homero.” *Studia Papyrologica* 13 (1974) 21–29.
- O’Callaghan, J. “¿El texto de 7Q5 es Tuc 1 41,2?” *Studia Papyrologica* 14 (1974) 125 + Plate.
- O’Callaghan, J. “La identificación de papiros literarios (biblicos).” *Studia Papyrologica* 12 (1973) 91–100.
- O’Callaghan, J. *Los papiros griegos de la cueva 7 de Qumrân*. Biblioteca de autores cristianos 353; Madrid, 1974. [photographs]
- O’Callaghan, J. *Los primeros testimonios del Nuevo Testamento: Papirologia neotestamentaria*. En los orígenes del cristianismo 7; Cordova, 1995.
- O’Callaghan, J. “¿Papiros neotestamentarios en la cueva 7 de Qumrân?” *Bib* 53 (1972) 91–100. Eng. tr. by W. L. Holladay: “New Testament Papyri in Qumrân Cave 7?” [separately published] *JBLSup* 91 (1972) 1–14; Italian tr. in *Ridattare I Vangeli?* edited by F. D. Vecchia. Giornale di teologia 247; Bescia, 1997, pp. 11–23.
- O’Callaghan, J. “Sobre la identificación de 7Q4.” *Studia Papyrologica* 13 (1974) 44–55.
- O’Callaghan, J. “The Identifications of 7Q.” *Aegyptus* 56 (1976) 287–94.
- Parker, P. “7Q5: Enthält des Papyrusfragment 5 aus der Höhle 7 von Qumrân einen Markustext? *Erbe und Auftrag* 48 (1972) 567–69.
- Pickering, S. R. “Looking for Mark’s Gospel Among the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Continuing Problem of Qumran Fragment 7Q5.” *New Testament Textual Research Update* 2 (1994) 94–98.
- Pickering, S. R., and R. R. E. Cook. *Has a Fragment of the Gospel of Mark Been Found at Qumran?* Papyrology and Historical Perspectives 1; Sydney, 1989.
- Puech, É. “Des fragments grecs de la grotte 7 et le Nouveau Testament? 7Q4 et 7Q5, et le Papyrus Magdalen grec 17 = P<sup>64</sup>.” *RB* 102 (1995) 570–84. Italian tr. in *Ridattare I Vangeli?* edited by F. D. Vecchia. Giornale di teologia 247; Bescia, 1997, pp. 127–47.
- Puech, É. “Sept fragments grecs de la Lettre d’Hénoch (1 Hén 100, 103 et 105) dans la grotte 7 de Qumrân (= 7QHéng).” *RQ* 18 (1997) 313–23.
- Roberts, C. H. “On Some Presumed Papyrus Fragments of the New Testament from Qumran.” *JTS* 23 (1972) 446–47.
- Rohrhirsch, F. *Markus in Qumran? Eine Auseinandersetzung mit den Argumenten für und gegen des Fragment 7Q5 mit Hilfe des methodischen Fallibilismusprinzips*. Wuppertal, 1990.
- Rosenbaum, H. -U. “Cave 7Q5! Gegen die erneute Inanspruchnahme des Qumran-Fragments 7Q5 also bruchstück der ältesten Evangelien-Handschrift.” *BZ* 31 (1987) 189–205.
- Scibona, R. “7Q5 e il ‘calcolo delle probabilità’ nella sua identificazione.” *BeO* 43 (2001) 133–81.
- Scribona, R. “7Q5—O’Callaghan: Formule simboliche, numerali, e analogie.” *BeO* 46 (2004) 163–86.
- Spottorno, M. V. “Can Methodological Limits Be Set in the Debate on the Identification of 7Q5?” *DSD* 6 (1999) 66–77.

Thiede, C. P. *The Earliest Gospel Manuscript? The Qumran Papyrus 7Q5 and Its Significance for New Testament Studies*. Exeter, 1992.

Tov, E. "A Categorized List of All the 'Biblical Texts' Found in the Judaean Desert." *DSD* 8 (2001) 67–84.

Tov, E. "The Greek Biblical Texts from the Judean Desert." In *The Bible as Book: The Transmission of the Greek Text*, edited by S. McKendrick and O. A. O'Sullivan. London and New Castle, 2003, pp. 97–122.

Urbán, A. C. "La identificación de 7Q4 con Núm 14,23–24 y la restauración de textos antiguos." *EstBib* 32 (1973) 219–44.

Urbán, A. C. "Observaciones sobre ciertos papiros de la cueva 7 de Qumrán." *RQ* 8 (1972–1975) 233–51.

Vardaman, J. "The Earliest Fragments of the New Testament." *ExpT* 83 (1971–72) 374–76.

Wischmeyer, W. "Zu den neuen Frühdatierungen von Carsten Peter Thiede." *Zeitschrift für Antikes Christentum/Journal of Ancient Christianity* 1 (1997) 280–90.

## Qumran Greek Fragments 7Q3–7Q19

### 7Q3 Frg. 1

- 1 ]ÈÑΤΩΣ ì[<sup>1</sup>  
 2 ]ΆΚΕΙΜ ΚΑΙ Σ̣̣[<sup>2</sup>  
 3 ]°ΑΝ Δ°ΤΙΕ°[<sup>3</sup>  
 4 ]ΕΙΑΤ̣[<sup>4</sup>

### 7Q4 Frg. 1<sup>5</sup>

- 1 ]<sup>6</sup>  
 2 ]ΤΩΝ<sup>7</sup>  
 3 ]°ΝΤΑΙ<sup>8</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Most of the letters are reasonably certain, although the first three are not completely preserved. The first letter seems to be the lower part of an *epsilon* (cf. with the *epsilon* below in line 2). The second letter must be a *nu*. The third letter is likely a *tau*. The letter following the *sigma* is illegible (so DJD 3). The last letter is quite likely an *iota*.

<sup>2</sup> ἀκεῖμ is the end of a proper Semitic name – common in LXX (DJD 3, p. 144). The *alpha* is represented only by the foot of the left oblique stroke, and the second letter seems to be an incompletely preserved *kappa*. Boismard read the final two letters as ερ and suggests Ἰω]κέμ και ἐρ[εις, which matches Jer (LXX) 43:28–29 (Baillet, *Bib* 53 [1972] 516, but see line 3).

<sup>3</sup> No clear trace exists of a letter before the initial *alpha* – perhaps a minute dot at best. At least one damaged letter follows the *delta*, perhaps two, in which case the first may be an *iota* (DJD 3). The final letter is uncertain (cf. the *gamma* proposed in DJD). Boismard suggests ]°ανδιᾶτιεγ[̣, which, with difficulties, could fit Jer (LXX) 43:29, but lines 1 and 4 do not match the Jeremiah text (Baillet, *Bib* 53 [1972] 516).

<sup>4</sup> The first three letters, εια, seem assured. The fourth, represented only by an upper crossbar, could well be a *tau*.

<sup>5</sup> The upper right-hand corner of a column (DJD 3). The dark rectangle above the first line is a piece of Scotch tape (Baillet, *Bib* 54 [1973] 342 n. 1).

<sup>6</sup> The *eta* posited in DJD 3 (p. 144) is very difficult to detect, and so must remain uncertain (Baillet, *Bib* 54 [1973] 341–43; Puech, *RQ* 18 [1997] 316) proposed τα, but this seems no more secure.

<sup>7</sup> As for the *tau*, the vertical stroke is certain, though only three dots of ink remain. There is also a fiber with a horizontal stroke; but it is displaced, and it continues into the ων at the right, giving the effect of another horizontal line there (Baillet, *Bib* 54 [1973] 342; cf. Benoit, *RB* 80 [1973] 7). Assured and likely letters: των (Benoit, *RB* 80 [1973] 8); ων (Aland, *NTS* 20 [1973–74] 364).

<sup>8</sup> The first letter has only a tiny dot of ink remaining, level with the bottom of the other letters (photograph PAM 42.358, though this does not show in PAM 42.961); the appearance of the curve in the DJD photograph is the hook at the base of the next letter (probably a *nu*), and there is no trace of an *omicron* (as proposed by O’Callaghan, *Los papiros*, p. 42, and Puech, *RQ* 18 [1997] 316; cf. Baillet, *Bib* 54 [1973] 342). The dot is visible through a magnifying glass; it is unlikely to be part of an *omicron* – beginning as it does on the baseline almost touching the hook on the left vertical of the *nu* (though *omicron* is not absolutely ruled out, because some start at that point and can be quite angular). In the second letter (i.e., at the left of the *tau*), the apparent vertical stroke next to the *tau* is a lacuna in the papyrus (Benoit, *RB* 80 [1973] 7; Baillet, *Bib* 54 [1973] 342; this is confirmed by the photos in Thiede and in Estrada Herrero and White). Further left are vestiges of two downstrokes, which could be a *nu*; but below the one on the right is a small horizontal stroke; two other *nus* in this fragment join at an angle without this horizontal, so it could be a separate *iota* (though

## Qumran Greek Fragments 7Q3–7Q19

### *7Q3 Frg. 1*

- 1 [...]<sup>o</sup>entōs i[...]
- 2 [...]*akeim* and s<sup>o</sup>[...]
- 3 [...]<sup>o</sup>an d<sup>o</sup> tie<sup>o</sup>[...]
- 4 [...]*eiati*[...]

### *7Q4 Frg. 1*

- 1 [...]<sup>o</sup>
- 2 [...]*tōn*
- 3 [...]<sup>o</sup>*ntai*



4 [...] spirit

5 [...] *imo*

*Frg. 2*

1 [...]°°]

2 [...] *othe*[...]

*7Q5 Frg. 1*

1 [...] [...]

2 [...] *tōi* °° [...]

3 ]Ĥ̄ KAI TΩ̄[<sup>15</sup>

4 ]NNHΣ̄[<sup>16</sup>

5 ]Θ̄HĒΣ̄[<sup>17</sup>

7Q6<sup>18</sup> Frg. 1

1 ]<sup>o</sup>[<sup>19</sup>

<sup>15</sup> The first letter may be an *eta* (cf. line 5), but there is no trace of a crossbar; the letter could be a *pi*. The surviving vertical stroke, which curves slightly to the right, is the right-hand side of the letter and has the same configuration as the two clear *etas* in lines 4 and 5, and so is probably an *eta* (Benoit, *RB* 79 [1972] p. 322). The first letter and the assured *καί* seem to be separated by an interval approaching 5mm (DJD 3). This probably indicates the beginning of a new section, making *καί* an important factor in the fragment's identification (O'Callaghan's identification with Mark 6:52–53; Fitzmyer, *America* 126 [1972] 648), though its definition and significance can be questioned (Rosenbaum, *BZ* 31 [1987] 192–97, who is concerned mainly with Thiede's interpretation; cf. Rohrhirsch, *Markus*; Focant, *RTL* 16 [1985] 450). The fifth letter, *tau*, is assured by all (including O'Callaghan). Since this assured letter does not fit the text of Mark 6, O'Callaghan proposes a *delta* to *tau* shift to accommodate his identification: δι[ for τι[*απεράσαντες* (*Los papiros*, pp. 51–53; *JBLSup* 91 [1972] 6; *Bib* 54 [1973] 415–16). The issue is much discussed; see e.g., Rosenbaum, *BZ* 31 (1987) 198–204; Focant, *RTL* 16 (1985) 450; Pickering and Cook, *Has a Fragment*, p. 12. The sixth and last letter (the one following the *tau*) is an *omega* or *omicron* (DJD 3). O'Callaghan reads an *iota*, largely on the dubious claim that *tau* and the following *omega* in line 2 are “somewhat separated,” while the letter in question in line 3 “definitely touches” the preceding *tau* (*Los papiros*, pp. 53–55; *JBLSup* 91 [1972] 6–7). An *iota* is not possible; however, the stroke below the crossbar of the *tau* curves clearly to the right and is like that in τω of line 2, so it is an *omicron* or *omega* (Benoit, *RB* 79 [1972] 322). The vertical stroke is not straight, but curved, and has no hook to the left on top, as do the clear *iotas* in lines 2 and 3; and the measurement between the vertical bar of the *tau* and the left stroke of this letter is only .25 mm greater than the same combination in line 2 (and not 1 mm, as claimed by O'Callaghan, *Los papiros*, p. 54). An *omega* is preferred (Baillet, *Bib* 53–54 [1972–73] 349, 510–11). Assured and likely letters: η *καί*το (or ω, Benoit, *RB* 79 [1972] 323); *καί*τ (Aland, *NTS* 20 [1973–74] 364).

<sup>16</sup> Only the right-hand vertical stroke of the initial letter survives. A *nu* is certain (O'Callaghan, *Los papiros*, p. 55) or very probable (Benoit, *RB* 79 [1972] 322), supported by a trace of ink to its left that could be the remains of an oblique stroke rising from the lower portion of the vertical. But the vertical stroke curves slightly to the left, whereas the right-hand vertical of the adjacent undoubted *nu* is straight (Pickering and Cook, *Has a Fragment*, p. 8). The fourth and last letter (following the assured νη) has the angular trace of a *sigma* (DJD 3). One could imagine the beginnings of a *sigma*, but it is highly conjectural (Benoit, *RB* 79 [1972] 322), though the trace of ink may be similar to the remnants of the third letter in lines 5 – perhaps a *sigma* (or an *epsilon*, see below, Pickering and Cook, *Has a Fragment*, pp. 8–9). There is an apparent ink dot at a level just below the middle of the preceding letter – where an angular *sigma* or *epsilon* would begin – following by a vertical lacuna extending into the line below. Assured and likely letters: ννης (Benoit, *RB* 79 [1972] 323); ννη (Aland, *NTS* 20 [1973–74] 364).

<sup>17</sup> The first letter is an *omicron* or more likely a *theta* (DJD 3). It is not a major problem that the horizontal bar of the *theta* does not rejoin the right curve: it does not in 7Q7 either, although that is a different hand (Benoit, *RB* 79 [1972] 322). The second letter, *eta*, is certain (DJD 3). The third letter is an *epsilon* or *sigma* (the median stroke is not certain, DJD 3). A small horizontal stroke in the curve is visible. Is it a median bar? Boismard says the median bar is uncertain; and in that case it is a *sigma* (Baillet, *Bib* 53 [1972] 511). The fourth letter could be a *sigma*, *epsilon*, or *theta* (DJD 3). Only traces of ink remain. Per O'Callaghan (*Los papiros*, pp. 57–58; *JBLSup* 91 [1972] 7–9), this is probably an *alpha*, with the papyrus fibers presently dislocated, though this is not absolutely certain. But the appearance of an *alpha* is deceptive; an inclined shaft, from the top down to the right, which might be suggested by the facsimile, is in fact a hole in the papyrus (Benoit, *RB* 79 [1972] 323). There seems to be remains of a well-centered median stroke. So, if the preceding letter is an *epsilon*, then this fourth letter is perhaps a *theta*; if the preceding letter is a *sigma*, then it could be an *epsilon*. Clearly, it is not an *alpha*, for then the left stroke would ascend to the right (Baillet, *Bib* 53–54 [1972–1973] 349, 511). Assured and likely letters: θη (Benoit, *RB* 79 [1972] 323); η (Aland, *NTS* 20 [1973–74] 364).

<sup>18</sup> Frgs. 1 and 2 of 7Q6 were found stuck to one another; they have worn away together and have partially similar contours (DJD 3).

<sup>19</sup> At the fragment's top right remains a small stroke that rises to the right, which must be the hook at the left bottom of a letter with a vertical or oblique downstroke, so it is not an *omicron*, as O'Callaghan first proposed (*Bib* 53 [1972] 98; *JBLSup* 91 [1972] 11; Baillet, *Bib* 53 [1972] 512); later, O'Callaghan proposed a *phi* (*Los papiros*, pp. 63–64), to which the same objection would apply.

**3** [...]ē and tō[...]

**4** [...]nnēs[...]

**5** [...]thēs[...]

*7Q6 Frg. 1*

**1** [...]°[...]

2 ]ĖIT °°[<sup>20</sup>3 ]°ΛH°°[<sup>21</sup>

## Frg. 2

1 ]°°°°[<sup>22</sup>2 ]ÖYΦ°[<sup>23</sup>

<sup>20</sup> The first letter, proposed as *epsilon*, is much less certain than the facsimile might suggest; there is a small stroke ascending toward the right (above the level of the *tau*'s crossbar) that in reality is a hole and specks of dark fiber, so it is not part of the letter's left curved stroke. If it were, the slightly downward curving horizontal stroke at the level of the *tau*'s crossbar could be the horizontal median of an *epsilon*, but – since it is not – it could be the top of an *epsilon*, but also of an *omicron*. The two ink spots below are parts of the letter's lower curve (modified from Benoit, *RB* 79 [1972] 323–24). Photograph PAM 42.358 seems to show the upper half of the curve of an *epsilon* including a clear median bar. The second letter could be an *iota*, but it is not totally certain (Benoit, *RB* 79 [1972] 324). It is probably an *iota* (Baillet, *Bib* 53 [1972] 512). The third letter is possibly, indeed, probably, a *tau* (Benoit, *RB* 79 [1972] 324). The fourth letter survives, first, as two dots of ink (separated by a space) at the level of the preceding *tau*'s crossbar. Then, below the intervening notch in the papyrus, to the right, is a small curled stroke, which (whatever it is) cannot be part of an *epsilon* (Benoit, *RB* 79 [1972] 324). The small ink dots (mentioned above) are the top of a nearly vertical downstroke and, below the break, may be the lower end of a slightly oblique stroke, descending to the right with a small hook at the left of its base. These traces are difficult to interpret, but they cannot constitute an *epsilon* (Baillet, *Bib* 53 [1972] 512). The fifth letter is represented only by a horizontal stroke at the base level of the preceding letters. This stroke clings to a papyrus fiber that extends beyond the rest of the fragment; a *nu* is not possible (Baillet, *Bib* 53 [1972] 512). Assured and likely letters: ιτ (Aland, *NTS* 20 [1973–74] 364).

<sup>21</sup> The first letter survives only as a dot of ink at the extreme left of two extended fibers – there is no horizontal stroke (apparent in some photos, but it is the gap between the fibers; see Benoit, *RB* 79 [1972] 324, and Baillet, *Bib* 53 [1972] 512). To read *pi* (as does O'Callaghan, without explanation, *Los papiros*, pp. 63–64; *JBLSup* 91 [1972] 10–11) is merely an assertion (Benoit, *RB* 79 [1972] 324; Baillet, *Bib* 53 [1972] p. 512). The second and third letters, λη, are certain. The dot under the *eta* in the *editio princeps* should be removed (Baillet, *Bib* 53 [1972] 530). For the fourth letter, a vertical shaft is probable (better seen on the original than in the photos), but it does not show the loop or curl of a *rho* (Benoit, *RB* 79 [1972] 324). The remaining base of a letter has above it a vague remnant of a vertical bar, whose ink has vanished; but the top of this bar is not apparent. It is possible then to have an *iota*, but not a *rho* (Baillet, *Bib* 53 [1972] 512). The vertical seems clear on PAM 42.358 (though the ink is missing beyond the base), and it seems to hook to the left at the top. For the fifth letter, near the edge of the fragment, there is a stroke at the baseline, with a hook to the left, which seems to have been vertical, and also a stroke at mid-height which might have been horizontal. This conceivably might be the median bar of an *eta*, but it cannot be proved (Baillet, *Bib* 53 [1972] 512; cf. also Benoit, *RB* 79 [1972] 324). The baseline stroke is clearer and wider on PAM 42.961 (= DJD), on which the median stroke does not appear; this median dot, slightly below mid-height, is clear, however, on PAM 42.358 and slightly less so in Estrada Herrero and White (p. 107). Assured letters: λη (Aland, *NTS* 20 [1973–74] 364).

<sup>22</sup> A first letter is possibly preserved by some remnants of ink of fibers extending to the left, but it cannot be identified (Baillet, *Bib* 54 [1973] 344). A *tau* is the proposed second letter in DJD. But it may be doubted because of the lower horizontal stroke going to the left, which is even less favorable to a *kappa* (as proposed by O'Callaghan, *Los papiros*, p. 65; Benoit, *RB* 80 [1973] 9). As for the *kappa*, there is absolutely no vestige of either oblique stroke, whereas there certainly is, at the top, a horizontal stroke extending far to the right, so a *kappa* cannot be proposed over a *tau* (Baillet, *Bib* 54 [1973] 334). For the third letter, *omicron* is not impossible, but it is not compelling (Benoit, *RB* 80 [1973] 9). For the fourth letter, a *rho* is no more compelling; the letter's remnant, its upper left in the form of a right angle, suits a *pi*, *gamma*, or *beta*. The whole line is highly uncertain (Benoit, *RB* 80 [1973] 9). Assured letters: none (Aland, *NTS* 20 [1973–74] 364).

<sup>23</sup> The first three letters, ουφ, are considered certain by most (e.g. Benoit, *RB* 80 [1973] 9; O'Callaghan, *Los papiros*, p. 65), although the *omicron* is only partially preserved. All that remains of the fourth letter is a small curved stroke that descends to the left from the torn edge of the papyrus, which could be the lower tip of any downstroke or the extremity of an *alpha*; an *iota* (proposed by O'Callaghan, *Los papiros*, p. 65–66) is not impossible, but far from compelling (Benoit, *RB* 80 [1973] 9). There is no way of knowing whether the stroke is vertical or oblique (Baillet, *Bib* 54 [1973] 344). Assured and likely letters: ουφ (Benoit, *RB* 80 [1973] 9); ουφ (Aland, *NTS* 20 [1973–74] 364).

2 [...]eit<sup>oo</sup>[...]

3 [...]lē<sup>oo</sup>[...]

*Frg. 2*

1 [...]<sup>oooo</sup>[...]

2 [...]ouph[...]

7Q7<sup>24</sup> Frg. 1

- 1 ]°[<sup>25</sup>  
 2 ]ΚΑ°[<sup>26</sup>  
 3 ]ΘΑ°[<sup>27</sup>

7Q8<sup>28</sup> Frg. 1

- 1 Σ[<sup>29</sup>  
 2 ΕΣΟ[  
 3 ΛΗ[  
 4 Ν[<sup>30</sup>

<sup>24</sup> Written in large letters (4mm in height).

<sup>25</sup> The *omicron* (proposed by O'Callaghan, *Los papiros*, p. 67) is doubtful; the curve representing its lower outline is interrupted in its middle and on its right, but it is difficult to tell – even on the original – whether these are due to papyrus deterioration or not. If it were a continuous curve, one could imagine the base of an *omicron*, but also of a *theta*; if the curve really stopped at the right, it could be a *sigma* or *epsilon* (Benoit, *RB* 80 [1973] 10). The stroke is not curved, but straight, and it descends to the right and is followed by a dot of ink, so it could not be an *omicron* (Baillet, *Bib* 54 [1973] 344). Assured letter: none (Aland, *NTS* 20 [1973–74] 364).

<sup>26</sup> The first two letters, *κα*, are practically certain, although the *alpha* is partially abraded away. The *kappa* has a stroke over it, which may be an abbreviation mark (DJD 3), though O' Callaghan (*Los papiros*, p. 67) relates it to the preceding line, understanding it as the sign of a *paragraphus*, and supporting this view by the line's separation or distance above the *kappa*. But his calculations in millimeters are not convincing. Taking into account the dot of ink which increases the length of the *kappa*'s vertical shaft, the distance of the horizontal stroke from the *kappa* is only 1.5mm (against O'Callaghan's measurement of 3mm; Benoit, *RB* 80 [1973] 10). However, such strokes indicating a new section can be observed close to and even touching the letter of the line below in manuscripts from the 2nd Century BCE to 3rd CE (See E. G. Turner, *Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World*: plates 11, 45, 66, 73). For a third letter there remains only a hook of its base and a dot of ink above the break in the papyrus, so one can always propose an *iota* (as does O'Callaghan, *Los papiros*, p. 67), but it could just as well be another letter (Baillet, *Bib* 54 [1973] 344). Assured and likely letters: *κῶ* (Aland, *NTS* 20 [1973–74] 364).

<sup>27</sup> Though incompletely preserved, the *theta* seems assured, followed by a clear *alpha*. The third letter survives only as two traces of ink, which suggests an oblique stroke rising to the right and therefore perhaps an *alpha* or *lambda*. If it were an *upsilon* (as O'Callaghan, *Los papiros*, p. 67 reads it), there should be a trace of it between the top of the *alpha* and the edge of the fragment – but there is not (Baillet, *Bib* 54 [1973] 344). Assured and likely letters: *θα* (Aland, *NTS* 20 [1973–74] 364).

<sup>28</sup> Is this the left edge of a sheet? Lines 3 and 4 have wider space between them (DJD 3). 7Q4 frgs. 1–2 could be in the same hand as this fragment (Nebe, *RQ* 13 [1988] 633).

<sup>29</sup> There is general agreement on the readings for lines 1–3. Line 1: *σ* (O'Callaghan, *Los papiros*); *σ* (Aland, *NTS* 20 [1973–74] 365), although the letter is incompletely preserved. Line 2: *εσ* (O'Callaghan, *Los papiros*); *εσ* (Aland, *NTS* 20 [1973–74] 365), the *omicron* is partially preserved. Line 3: *λη* (O'Callaghan, [*Los papiros*]); *λη* (Aland, *NTS* 20 [1973–74] 365), the *lambda* is partially abraded.

<sup>30</sup> The proposed *nu* seems not by the same hand as the rest of the fragment; it is notably thinner than the other letters, and there is no hook on the vertical stroke. Its greater distance from the preceding line suggests that it could be a notation in the lower margin, perhaps to assist in calculating the *stichoi* (O'Callaghan, *Los papiros*, pp. 71–72; *JBLSup* 91 [1972] 12–13). This latter point is not inconceivable, but there is no means to determine whether or not this letter strands at the base of a column of text (and would this proposal have been made if Jas 1:24 had required an *eta* in its text? Baillet, *Bib* 53 [1972] 513). This letter could be either a *nu* or possibly a *mu*; the surviving stroke is thinner than the others, but it hardly warrants the elaborate explanation given by O'Callaghan (Roberts, *JTS* 23 [1972] 446–47). Assured letters: none (Aland, *NTS* 20 [1973–74] 365).

*7Q7 Frg. 1*

- 1 [...]ḡ[...]
- 2 [...]kaḡ[...]
- 3 [...]thaḡ[...]

*7Q8 Frg. 1*

- 1 s[...]
- 2 eso[...]
- 3 lē[...]
- 4 n[...]

7Q9<sup>31</sup> Frg. 11 ]ΑΓΗΝ[<sup>32</sup>2 ]<sup>ooo</sup>[<sup>33</sup>

## 7Q10 Frg. 1

1 ]<sup>o</sup>[<sup>34</sup>2 ]<sup>o</sup>ΗΝΕ<sup>o</sup>[<sup>35</sup>7Q11<sup>36</sup> Frg. 11 ]<sup>o</sup>[<sup>37</sup>

<sup>31</sup> Baillet, in drafting the *editio princeps*, had made a note that 7Q8 and 7Q9 belong to the same manuscript and that joining them at the top right of 7Q8 should be attempted; he found, however, that 7Q8 was completely covered with Scotch tape and the verification could not be carried out (Baillet, *Bib* 53 [1972] 513 n. 2). What appears in some photographs as a letter-sized curved stroke above the second letter of line 1 is a tear in the papyrus.

<sup>32</sup> For the first three letters, a partially preserved *alpha* seems likely, and γη are secure (Benoit, *RB* 80 [1973] 10). Per O'Callaghan (*Los papiros*, p. 73), the fourth letter is very probably a *nu*. The vertical stroke at the right edge of the papyrus could be the beginning of a *nu* or could be another letter, such as an *iota*. In any case, the beginning of a *nu*'s oblique stroke cannot be assured (Benoit, *RB* 80 [1973] 10–11). If 7Q8 and 7Q9 belong together, line 1 would read σ[ ]αγην (Baillet, *Bib* 54 [1973] 345 n. 1; cf. *Bib* 53 [1972] 513 n. 2). Assured and likely letters: αγην (Benoit, *RB* 80 [1973] 11); ἰγη (Aland, *NTS* 20 [1973–74] 364).

<sup>33</sup> Four or five dots or small strokes of ink likely from the tops of letters remain from this line of text, identified as ωσπ by O'Callaghan (*Los papiros*, p. 73). First, he takes the tiny dot of ink on the left edge of the papyrus as the right extremity of the *omega*. Second, following is not one, but two curved strokes – one nearly vertical and one descending to the right, which may continue to a point of ink on the lower edge of the papyrus. This he takes as the top of a *sigma*, but it could be an *omicron* as well. Third, there are the tops of two vertical strokes, but there is no horizontal stroke; the top of the first vertical is decorated with two curved hooks, and the one on the right could not be from a *pi*. So, O'Callaghan's proposal cannot be accepted (Baillet, *Bib* 54 [1973] 345; cf. Benoit, *RB* 80 [1973] 11). Assured letters: none (Benoit, *RB* 80 [1973]; Aland, *NTS* 20 [1973–74] 364).

<sup>34</sup> Only dots of ink remain (on the upward projection of the papyrus); they suggest a vertical bar with a hook at its base. But to the left of this bar the trace descends strongly to the right, and it could not be from the top of a *tau* (as O'Callaghan, *Los papiros*, pp. 74–75 postulates; Baillet, *Bib* 54 [1973] 345) any more than another letter (Benoit, *RB* 80 [1973] 11). Assured letters: none (Aland, *NTS* 20 [1973–74] 365).

<sup>35</sup> The *editio princeps* suggested it is “not absolutely impossible” to read πνευ (DJD 3), but an *eta* seems much more likely than a *pi* as the first identifiable letter (Baillet, *Bib* 54 [1973] 345), judged certain by others as well (Benoit, *RB* 80 [1973] 11; Aland, *NTS* 20 [1973–74] 365). There are remains of a preceding letter, a partially preserved vertical stroke on the left edge of the fragment, and also what appears to be the end of a horizontal transversal which is nearer the bottom than the top. This would allow a *nu*, but not a *mu* (as proposed by O'Callaghan, *Los papiros*, p. 74). To the right and lower, at a notch, there is a dark spot, but this is not on the fragment but perhaps part of a shadow (Baillet, *Bib* 54 [1973] 345–46). Also, there is a space the size of a letter – with no ink traces – between the remains of this letter and the identifiable letters. The third letter, *nu*, is clear, and the fourth appears to be an *epsilon* (here it is angular rather than curved). There is only the upper portion of a vertical stroke of a fifth letter, with the beginning of a horizontal stroke to the right and curving slightly upward. O'Callaghan (*Los papiros*, p. 74) says it cannot be read, but he assumes a *xi* (to fit his identification with 2Pet 1:15); but the remnant rather suggests a *gamma* (Benoit, *RB* 80 [1973] 11). Assured and likely letters: ηνε (Benoit, *RB* 80 [1973] 11); ηνε (Aland, *NTS* 20 [1973–74] 365).

<sup>36</sup> The right margin is preserved [ed.].

<sup>37</sup> Trace of ink at the upper right (DJD 3). It could be the remnants of the base and left hook of a vertical stroke.

*7Q9 Frg. 1*

1 [...]agēn[...]

2 [...]° [°...]

*7Q10 Frg. 1*

1 [...]° [°...]

2 [...]° ēne° [°...]

*7Q11 Frg. 1*

1 [...]°

2 ]ΩI<sup>38</sup>

3 ]ΣI<sup>39</sup>

7Q12<sup>40</sup> Frg. 1

1 ]OY<sup>41</sup>

2 ]È<sup>42</sup>

7Q13 Frg. 1

1 ][<sup>43</sup>

2 ]NΤΟ<sup>44</sup>

7Q14<sup>45</sup> Frg. 1

1 ]Ω<sup>46</sup>

2 ]È<sup>47</sup>

<sup>38</sup> An *omega* and *iota* are assured.

<sup>39</sup> A *sigma* is certain; the letter following appears to be an *iota*, though it is much lighter or finer than the one above it in line 2.

<sup>40</sup> The right margin is visible [ed.]. Final letters of lines and margin of the column (DJD 3).

<sup>41</sup> *ou* are certain. Puech (*RQ* 18 [1997] 317) posited a *tau* preceding these letters, but there is scant basis for this.

<sup>42</sup> An incompletely preserved *epsilon* seems certain. The letter is clearer on photograph PAM 42.358, where the finger of papyrus on the left has been placed back into the gap that appears in the photograph of the *editio princeps*.

<sup>43</sup> A few dots of ink appear, most prominently a small horizontal stroke at the apparent base of a letter. Puech's proposal (*RQ* 18 [1997] 321) to read νβι in this space cannot be verified.

<sup>44</sup> The first letter, a *nu*, is certain; its left vertical downstroke is clearer on PAM 42.358 (unless it is a shadow). The second letter retains the right portion of a long vertical crossbar at the top and the bottom hook (to the left) of a central shaft; no doubt it is a *tau*. The third letter survives as a tiny portion of a curved stroke abutting the crossbar of the preceding *tau*; it could well be an *omicron* (or an *omega*?).

<sup>45</sup> Smooth papyrus, somewhat thicker than the others (DJD 3).

<sup>46</sup> Remnants of two letters survive. The first appears to be the right portion of an *omega* (but the bottom of the curve, following an angular corner, seems to move to the left in a nearly horizontal fashion, rather than ascending). The second letter survives only in a short horizontal stroke which moves to the right edge of the papyrus (perhaps the left end of the crossbar of a *tau*, but it would be a very small letter) and perhaps a dot of ink below its center, at a level about halfway down the preceding stroke. Puech (*RQ* 18 [1997] 317) posited a *nu* but this has little basis in the fragment.

<sup>47</sup> An *epsilon* seems reasonably well assured from the connected median bar and the top half of the curved downstroke.

2 [...]*ōi*

3 [...]*si*

*7Q12 Frg. 1*

1 [...]*ou*

2 [...]*e*

*7Q13 Frg. 1*

1 [...]° [...]

2 [...]nto [...]

*7Q14 Frg. 1*

1 [...]ō° [...]

2 [...]e [...]

7Q15<sup>48</sup> Frg. 11 ]ĤΤΩΙ Ε<sup>o</sup>[<sup>49</sup>2 ]<sup>o</sup> [ ]<sup>o</sup>[<sup>50</sup>7Q16<sup>51</sup> Frg. 11 ]<sup>oo</sup>[<sup>52</sup>2 ]Ā<sup>oo</sup>Ī<sup>oo</sup>[<sup>53</sup>

## 7Q17 Frg. 1

1 ]Ā<sup>oo</sup>[<sup>54</sup>

<sup>48</sup> The script has a cursive tendency (DJD 3).

<sup>49</sup> The first letter as a *nu* (as in DJD and adopted by O'Callaghan, *Los papiros*, pp. 75–76) is doubtful (e.g., Baillet, *Bib* 53–54 [1972–73]). O'Callaghan admits it could be an *eta*, and the median bar is nearly horizontal and joins the vertical stroke on the right at a point nearer the top than the bottom. Moreover, the foot of this right vertical has a pronounced hook which does not suit a *nu* (Benoit, *RB* 80 [1973] 12), but does fit for an *eta*. The next four letters are certain. The *iota* is an ι-adscript = τϱ. The remnant of the final letter (after the *epsilon*) is a nearly vertical shaft on the edge of the papyrus, perhaps suggesting a *nu* rather than a *lambda* (Benoit, *RB* 80 [1973] 12; cf. Baillet, *Bib* 54 [1973] 346). Assured letters: ητῶιεν (Benoit, *RB* 80 [1973] 12); τῶιε (Aland, *NTS* 20 [1973–74] 364).

<sup>50</sup> Remnants of the tops of a few letters are insufficient to be precise about identifications (Benoit, *RB* 80 [1973] 12). Three traces remain (rather than four as the *editio princeps* indicates). The first, under the *tau* of line 1, is a small stroke rising slightly, perhaps a top hook (?), though it requires verification, for it could be the shadow of a space between two fibers. The second trace, under the *omega* of line 1, is a stroke in the shape of a circumflex accent; it cannot be an *epsilon*. The third, under the *epsilon* of line 1, is an unidentifiable dot of ink (Baillet, *Bib* 54 [1973] 346), though at a higher level than the preceding traces.

<sup>51</sup> Practically unreadable (DJD 3).

<sup>52</sup> There are remnants of two (or three?) letters but they do not lend themselves to identification (could the +-shaped sign be a *psi*?). The second remains as an oblique, slightly curved stroke moving, from mid-height, to the right. A third letter, if present at all, remains only as a dot of ink.

<sup>53</sup> The first letter (remaining apex of an *alpha*?) has a horizontal stroke above it, perhaps an abbreviation mark (DJD 3), or possibly indicating the *alpha* to be read as the numeral one. The traces following, apparently representing two letters, are unclear as to identity, though the last letter survives as the top of a vertical stroke, perhaps an *iota*.

<sup>54</sup> Three or four letters are represented. The most certain, though not the most distinct, is the second: an outline of an *alpha* shows rather clearly on photograph PAM 42.358, even though only about three dots of ink remain. The more distinct strokes of the first and third letters are harder to identify. The horizontal stroke of the first letter touches the apex of the proposed *alpha*; the remnants below and at the left of the horizontal could be the downstroke of a *tau*, though that stroke seems rather to be slightly curved and to hook to the right at its base. The third letter appears to be a *gamma* or *pi*, depending on whether the tiny stroke at base-level below the right end of its horizontal is part of the third letter or begins a fourth, or whether remnants of both a third and a fourth letter remain at that point.

*7Q15 Frg. 1*

1 [...]ē<sup>◌</sup>tōi e<sup>◌</sup> [...]

2 [...] ° [...] [...]

*7Q16 Frg. 1*

1 [...] °° [...]

2 [...] a °° i [...]

*7Q17 Frg. 1*

1 [...] a °° [...]

7Q18<sup>55</sup> Frg. 11 ]<sup>°°</sup>Ε<sup>°</sup>[<sup>56</sup>2 ]<sup>°°</sup>[<sup>57</sup>

3 [

7Q19<sup>58</sup> Frg. 1 recto1 ]Η[<sup>59</sup>2 ]ΗΛΚ<sup>°</sup>[<sup>60</sup>3 ]ΚΤΑΙ ΑΠΟ Τ<sup>°</sup>Ο[Υ<sup>61</sup>4 Τ]ΗΣ ΚΤΙΣΕΩ[Σ<sup>62</sup>5 ]ΕΝ Τ<sup>°</sup>ΑΙΣ ΓΡΑΦΑ[ΙΣ<sup>63</sup>6 ]Ο<sup>°</sup>ΑΝ<sup>°</sup><sup>64</sup>

<sup>55</sup> The papyrus fibers are in large measure pulled out, perhaps resulting from prolonged contact with the earth, where the leaf has left its impression, as in the case of 7Q19 (DJD 3).

<sup>56</sup> The contours of an *epsilon* are sufficiently apparent, though more so on PAM 42.358 than 42.961. The identification of the remnants before and after is difficult. Whether one or two letters precede the *epsilon* is not certain. What remains at the left is an oblique stroke moving down to the right, where it meets a very short vertical stroke that reaches the height of the *epsilon*'s median; then, a short horizontal stroke moves to the right from the base of the vertical toward the *epsilon* at a level above the baseline of the other letters. Above this horizontal is a dot of ink. The final letter seems to remain only as an upper and a lower dot of ink.

<sup>57</sup> No identifications possible.

<sup>58</sup> The Greek letters are mirror images from papyrus on clay [ed.].

<sup>59</sup> The *eta* seems assured: like most other vertical shafts in this fragment, the left vertical here has a straight, horizontal foot extending to the left; unfortunately, this feature is not entirely clear in the *eta* of line 2 and is distorted in the *eta* in line 4.

<sup>60</sup> ηλκ are assured. Only a few dots of a fourth letter remain.

<sup>61</sup> The first word, whose four final surviving letters are clear, is a verb in the perfect passive tense, followed by a prepositional phrase introduced by *ἀπό* (which is also certain; DJD 3). The remaining two letters are partially preserved. The base of a vertical shaft, with the left-ward foot is distinct, a *tau* is likely (though nothing remains of the crossbar). Both an upper and a (larger) lower arc of what is undoubtedly an *omicron* are also distinct, though the two arcs seem not to meet. Given the letters τo, τοῦ can be surmised as the genitive article following the preposition.

<sup>62</sup> The genitive phrase, τῆς κτίσεως, seems likely, although only the tops of the five initial letters survive.

<sup>63</sup> εν is on the edge and the reading is certain (DJD 3), as are the following two words. αἱ γραφαί is not a Septuagint phrase, but is normal in the New Testament to refer to the Hebrew Bible, though the exact phrase as here (with a definite article) occurs in the New Testament only in Mt 21:42.

<sup>64</sup> Three more letters are on the edge of the earthen clump; the first may be an *omicron*, *sigma*, or *epsilon*; the third is a *nu* or *lambda* (DJD 3); the second, *alpha*, is certain.

*7Q18 Frg. 1*1 [...]<sup>oo</sup> e<sup>o</sup> [...]2 [...]<sup>oo</sup> [...]

3 [...]

*7Q19 Frg. 1 recto*1 [...]*ē* [...]2 [...]*ēlk*<sup>o</sup> [...]3 [...]*ktai* from th[e ...]

4 [...] of [t]he creatio[n ...]

5 [...]in the writing[s<sup>1</sup> ...]

6 [...]oan

<sup>1</sup> See Mt 21:42.

*Frg. 1 verso*<sup>65</sup>

1 ]°ΣΠ[<sup>66</sup>

*Frg. 2 recto*<sup>67</sup>

1 ]İĖ[<sup>68</sup>

2 ]İĖ[<sup>69</sup>

*Frg. 3 recto*

1 ]ἸΟΝ[<sup>70</sup>

*Frg. 3 verso*

1 ]°Å[<sup>71</sup>

<sup>65</sup> Contains two or three letters in a script that appears to be different from frg. 1 *recto* (DJD 3).

<sup>66</sup> σπ are certain.

<sup>67</sup> The imprints could come from two different documents (DJD 3).

<sup>68</sup> Part of a vertical downstroke remains, perhaps an *iota*; the second letter is an *epsilon* or *sigma* (DJD 3).

<sup>69</sup> The upper half of a vertical stroke is clear, perhaps an *iota*; and the upper part of an *epsilon* seems certain.

<sup>70</sup> The first letter, with a clear vertical shaft and crossbar, could be a *tau* or possibly a *pi*. The *omicron* is certain. The third letter has a vertical stroke, with a hook to the left, and the beginning of a stroke that moves from the top of the vertical to the right and may be descending; in that case it would be a *nu*.

<sup>71</sup> Portions, apparently, of two letters, are very unclear; the latter is perhaps an *alpha* (DJD 3).

*Frg. 1 verso*

1 [...]sp[...]

*Frg. 2 recto*

1 [...]ie[...]

2 [...]ie[...]

*Frg. 3 recto*

1 [...]ton[...]

*Frg. 3 verso*

1 [...]a[...]