

Collecting Practices and Opisthographic Collections in Qumran and Herculaneum

AYHAN AKSU

BRILL

Collecting Practices and Opisthographic Collections in Qumran and Herculaneum

Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah

Editors in Chief

George J. Brooke (*University of Manchester, UK*)

Jutta Jokiranta (*University of Helsinki, Finland*)

Editorial Board

Arjen Bakker (*University of Groningen, The Netherlands*)

Jonathan Ben-Dov (*Tel Aviv University, Israel*)

Charlotte Hempel (*University of Birmingham, UK*)

Judith Newman (*University of Toronto, Canada*)

Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar (*KU Leuven, Belgium*)

VOLUME 149

The titles published in this series are listed at brill.com/stdj

Collecting Practices and Opisthographic Collections in Qumran and Herculaneum

By

Ayhan Aksu



BRILL

LEIDEN | BOSTON



This is an open access title distributed under the terms of the CC BY-NC 4.0 license, which permits any non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author(s) and source are credited. Further information and the complete license text can be found at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

The terms of the CC license apply only to the original material. The use of material from other sources (indicated by a reference) such as diagrams, illustrations, photos and text samples may require further permission from the respective copyright holder.

The Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data is available online at <https://catalog.loc.gov>
LC record available at <https://lccn.loc.gov/2024052501>

Typeface for the Latin, Greek, and Cyrillic scripts: "Brill". See and download: brill.com/brill-typeface.

ISSN 0169-9962

ISBN 978-90-04-71623-0 (hardback)

ISBN 978-90-04-71624-7 (e-book)

DOI 10.1163/9789004716247

Copyright 2024 by Ayhan Aksu. Published by Koninklijke Brill BV, Leiden, The Netherlands. Koninklijke Brill BV incorporates the imprints Brill, Brill Nijhoff, Brill Schönningh, Brill Fink, Brill mentis, Brill Wageningen Academic, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Böhlau and V&R unipress. Koninklijke Brill BV reserves the right to protect this publication against unauthorized use.

This book is printed on acid-free paper and produced in a sustainable manner.

Now he is a name in books, a surname
Within parentheses his year of birth and death

Either at the bottom of the page, or a little further on
His works, when they were printed
A short, long list
The names of books
Like dying birds in your hands

BEHÇET NECATİGİL, *To Die in Books*



Contents

Acknowledgements XI

List of Tables XIII

Abbreviations XIV

Introduction 1

- 1 Opisthographs and Questions of Text Collections and Communities 3
- 2 Studying Ancient Manuscript Culture 8
- 3 Methods and Research Approaches 10
- 4 Comparative Approach 13
- 5 Outline of This Study 15

PART 1

The Material Variety of the Qumran Opisthographs

Introduction to Part 1 21

- 1 **Opisthographic Practices in the Dead Sea Scrolls 23**
 - 1 What Is an Opisthograph? 23
 - 2 Recto and Verso on Ancient Papyri 27
 - 3 Opisthographic Practices in the Dead Sea Scrolls 29
 - 4 Unidentified Opisthographic Manuscripts 32
 - 5 Qumran Tefillin 33
 - 6 Manuscripts Carrying Titles on the Verso 38
 - 7 Opisthograph with Continuous Text on Both Sides: 4Q504 42
 - 8 Documentary Opisthographs 43
 - 9 Documentary Opisthographs on the Verso of Literary Texts 44
 - 9.1 4Q201/4Q338 45
 - 9.2 4Q460 *Frag. 9*/4Q350 46
 - 9.3 4Q324/4Q355 48
- 2 **Five Literary Opisthographs from Qumran 50**
 - 1 Introduction 50
 - 2 Literary Opisthograph 4Q415/4Q414 50
 - 3 Literary Opisthograph 4Q433A/4Q255 54
 - 4 Literary Opisthograph 4Q499/4Q497 60

- 5 Literary Opisthograph 4Q503/4Q512 62
- 6 Literary Opisthograph 4Q509/4Q496/4Q506 65

- 3 The Palaeography of the Literary Opisthographs 67**
 - 1 Introduction 67
 - 2 4Q433a 70
 - 3 4Q255 71
 - 4 4Q499 72
 - 5 4Q497 72
 - 6 4Q503 73
 - 7 4Q512 74
 - 8 4Q509 75
 - 9 4Q496 75
 - 10 4Q506 76
 - 11 General Discussion 78
 - 12 Opisthographs and the Choice for Papyrus 81

- 4 Concluding Remarks to Part 1 88**

PART 2

Literary Diversity and the Opisthograph 4Q509/4Q496/4Q506: A Case Study

- Introduction to Part 2 93**

- 5 4Q509/4Q496/4Q506: Three Compositions and the Question of Classification 94**
 - 1 The Publication History of 4Q509/4Q496/4Q506 94
 - 2 4Q509: A Prayer Cycle of Festival Prayers 97
 - 3 General Reflections on Devorah Dimant's Model of Classification 100
 - 4 4Q509 and Its Classification According to Dimant 105
 - 5 4Q496: A Copy of the War Scroll 109
 - 6 4Q506: A Prayer Cycle for Days of the Week 121
 - 7 Words of the Luminaries: Sectarian, Non-Sectarian, Pre-Sectarian? 123

6 Opisthograph 4Q509/4Q496/4Q506 and the Question of Textual and Literary Diversity 129

- 1 The Opisthograph: An *Emic* Category? 129
- 2 A Codicological Analysis of 4Q509/4Q496/4Q506 133
- 3 Extracts and Excerpts 142
- 4 4Q509/4Q496/4Q506 and Literary Diversity 143
- 5 Graeco-Roman Reading Culture: Texts and Events 152
- 6 4Q509/4Q496/4Q506 as a Prayer Collection and Historical Reflection 155

PART 3

Collections and Textual Diversity: Graeco-Roman Evidence and the Villa of the Papyri

Introduction to Part 3 165

7 Conceptualizing Collections in Literary and Papyrological Sources 166

- 1 Library, Archive, and Collection: *Emic* and *Etic* Conceptions 166
- 2 Collection from a Comparative Perspective: Book Lists of Papyri Finds 173

8 The *Villa of the Papyri* and Graeco-Roman Practices of Collection 179

- 1 Herculaneum and the *Villa of the Papyri* 179
- 2 Deposition Context and 'Lived' Context 180
- 3 The Archaeology of the *Villa of the Papyri* 183
- 4 The Collection of Papyri 186
- 5 Diachronicity and Dynamism 189
- 6 Herculaneum as a Private, Scholarly Collection 192
- 7 Opisthograph P.Herc. 1021 as an 'Opisthographic Collection' 195

9 Comparing the *Villa*-Papyri and the Dead Sea Scrolls 199

- 1 Herculaneum and Qumran: Contrast and Correlation 199
- 2 4Q509/4Q496/4Q506 Revisited 207

Conclusion 212

- 1 The Qumran Opisthographs 213
- 2 Opisthographs: Manuscript Reuse or Collections of Valued Works? 215

- 3 Opisthograph 4Q509/4Q496/4Q506 and the Question of Classification 217
 - 4 Opisthograph 4Q509/4Q496/4Q506 as an Opisthographic Collection 219
 - 5 Collections and Collecting Practices: Herculaneum and Qumran 223
- Bibliography** 229
- Index of Ancient Sources** 258
- Index of Modern Authors** 268

Acknowledgements

This monograph represents a revised version of my doctoral dissertation, which I defended at the University of Groningen on 16 June 2022. The dissertation was supervised by Mladen Popović and Eibert Tigchelaar. The research conducted for this project was generously funded by the Dutch Research Council (NWO) as part of the research programme Cooperation Flanders. I also thank the NWO for the financial support that allowed this book to be published in Open Access.

This project would not have been completed without the guidance, patience, criticism, and friendship of many mentors, colleagues, and friends. My deepest gratitude goes out to Mladen and Eibert. It has been a long and winding road that started with three days in Groningen during the spring of 2016, and I will forever be proud to have Mladen and Eibert as my guides. Both my dissertation and this book would not have existed without their feedback, encouragement, and unfailing support throughout my PhD and beyond. The inaccuracies and misrepresentations that remain are my responsibility alone.

I have had the great pleasure of meeting many inspiring teachers within the field. The list of colleagues who offered their support and guidance throughout my journey is too long to include here, but I am very grateful to all. I am especially indebted to Hindy Najman for the incredible generosity of inviting me to Oxford not once but twice, and for her support and advice. I also want to thank George Brooke for his encouragement and the stimulating conversations during his stay in Groningen in 2018. A special thank you goes to Arjen Bakker, for all his help throughout the years. The dissertation committee consisted of Jutta Jokiranta, Charlotte Hempel, and Jacques van Ruiten. I am deeply indebted for their valuable remarks and constructive criticisms.

In Groningen, I had the great fortune of being surrounded by companions whose collegiality and friendship created a stimulating environment in which to work. I am especially grateful to Drew, Eelco, Gemma, Hans, Lambert, Lautaro, Maruf, and Ruwan. I also want to thank Luisa, Mau, Saara, Vivi, Welmoed, and all the others that made Groningen such a pleasant place to be.

I extend my gratitude to George and Jutta for accepting this book, and the anonymous reviewer for the invaluable comments. I am grateful to Brill, and Katerina Sofianou in particular, for their editorial support.

I feel blessed to be surrounded by such wonderful friends and family. I am especially thankful to my parents, who encouraged me to explore and study whatever captured my fascination. Finally, my greatest debt of love and gratit-

ude is to Mirthe. She has accompanied me through all the trials and triumphs of this journey, and to her I dedicate this book.

Ayhan Aksu

Amsterdam, September 2024

Tables

1	Unidentified opisthographic manuscripts	30
2	Opisthographic tefillin from Qumran	30
3	Manuscripts carrying titles on the verso	31
4	Qumran opisthographs	32
5	Opisthographs in the Leuven Database of Ancient Books	41
6	Palaeographic dates and notes	69
7	Correspondence 4Q496 and 1QM	98
8	Stages of the <i>Villa-papyri</i> according to Cavallo	190

Abbreviations

ABZ	<i>Assyrisch-babylonische Zeichenliste</i> . Rykle Borger. 3rd ed. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1986
Aeg	<i>Aegyptus</i>
AJP	<i>American Journal of Philology</i>
APSP	<i>American Philosophical Society Proceedings</i>
BA	<i>Biblical Archaeologist</i>
BASP	<i>Bulletin of the American Society of Papyrologists</i>
BibOr	Biblica et Orientalia
BJRL	<i>Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester</i>
BJS	Brown Judaic Studies
BNP	<i>Brill's New Pauly: Encyclopaedia of the Ancient World</i> . Edited by Hubert Cancik. 22 vols. Leiden: Brill, 2002–2011
BSIH	Brill's Studies in Intellectual History
BZA	Beiträge zur Altertumskunde
BZAW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
BZNW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft
CAD	<i>The Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago</i> . 21 vols. Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 1956–2010
CANE	<i>Civilizations of the Ancient Near East</i> . Edited by Jack M. Sasson. 4 vols. New York, 1995. Repr. in 2 vols. Peabody: Hendrickson, 2006
CCIS	Communications in Computer and Information Science
CdE	<i>Chronique d'Égypte</i>
CDP	Comparetti, Domenico, and Giulio De Petra. <i>La villa ercolanese dei Pisoni: I suoi monumenti e la sua biblioteca</i> . Turin, 1883. Repr. Naples, 1972.
CErc	<i>Cronache Ercolanesi</i>
CHANE	Culture and History of the Ancient Near East
CHL	Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum
ClQ	<i>Classical Quarterly</i>
COMSt Bulletin	<i>Comparative Oriental Manuscript Studies Bulletin</i>
CQS	Companion to the Qumran Scrolls
DJD	Discoveries in the Judaean Desert
DSD	<i>Dead Sea Discoveries</i>
ECDSS	Eerdmans Commentaries on the Dead Sea Scrolls
EJL	Early Judaism and Its Literature
FAT	Forschungen zum Alten Testament

HALOT	Koehler, Ludwig, Walter Baumgartner, and Johann J. Stamm. <i>The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament</i> . Translated and edited under the supervision of Mervyn E.J. Richardson. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill, 2001.
HSS	Harvard Semitic Studies
HUCA	<i>Hebrew Union College Annual</i>
ISACR	Interdisciplinary Studies in Ancient Culture and Religion
JAOS	<i>Journal of the American Oriental Society</i>
JANESCU	<i>Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society of Columbia University</i>
JBL	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
JCIT	Judaism, Christianity, and Islam—Tension, Transmission, Transformation
JCS	<i>Journal of Cuneiform Studies</i>
JEA	<i>Journal of Egyptian Archaeology</i>
JJS	<i>Journal of Jewish Studies</i>
JNES	<i>Journal of Near Eastern Studies</i>
JSJ	<i>Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman Periods</i>
JSJSup	Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism
JSOTSup	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series
JSPSup	Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement Series
LCL	Loeb Classical Library
LNTS	The Library of New Testament Studies
LSTS	The Library of Second Temple Studies
LWW	Library of the Written Word
MTK	Materiale Textkulturen
NovTSup	Supplements to Novum Testamentum
NTOA. SA	Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus. Series Archaeologica
NTS	<i>New Testament Studies</i>
OED	<i>Oxford English Dictionary</i> . 2nd ed. 20 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989.
OLA	Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta
OLD	Glare, P.G.W., ed. <i>Oxford Latin Dictionary</i> . Oxford: Clarendon, 1982.
PIASH	Proceedings of the Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities
PFES	Publications of the Finnish Exegetical Society
<i>Phil</i>	<i>Philologus</i>
RAC	<i>Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum</i> . Edited by Theodor Klauser et al. Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 1950–
RB	<i>Revue biblique</i>
RevQ	<i>Revue de Qumran</i>

<i>RHPR</i>	<i>Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses</i>
<i>RHR</i>	<i>Revue de l'histoire des religions</i>
<i>ScEs</i>	<i>Science et esprit</i>
<i>ScrHier</i>	<i>Scripta Hierosolymitana</i>
<i>SDSSRL</i>	Studies in Dead Sea Scrolls & Related Literature
<i>SJLA</i>	Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity
<i>SMC</i>	Studies in Manuscript Cultures
<i>STDJ</i>	Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah
<i>SUNT</i>	Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments
<i>TAPA</i>	<i>Transactions of the American Philological Association</i>
<i>TENTS</i>	Texts and Editions for New Testament Study
<i>TSAJ</i>	Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum
<i>TZ</i>	<i>Theologische Zeitschrift</i>
<i>VC</i>	<i>Vigiliae Christianae</i>
<i>VT</i>	<i>Vetus Testamentum</i>
<i>VTSup</i>	Supplements to Vetus Testamentum
<i>WAW</i>	Writings from the Ancient World
<i>WGRWSup</i>	Writings from the Greco-Roman World Supplement Series
<i>WLAW</i>	Wisdom Literature from the Ancient World
<i>WUNT</i>	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
<i>ZPE</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik</i>

Introduction

Someday in 1959 Roland de Vaux, at the time the head of the international team that edited the Dead Sea Scrolls, asked Maurice Baillet to sort out a large group of over 1600 papyrus fragments from Qumran Cave 4.¹ These fragments had originally been assigned to Claus-Hunno Hunzinger, who had published a first description in *Revue Biblique*.² However, De Vaux had difficulties in finding a team member that was willing to accept the task of providing their full publication. Baillet's initial refusal of De Vaux's request was not met with approval.³ He eventually conceded and Baillet started working on these manuscripts that same year. This must have been an enormous task, especially because many of these fragments contained little more than a few letters of writing. Baillet was slightly helped however by the fact that about 400 of the fragments assigned to him were inscribed on the reverse side as well, meaning that these fragments could be organized separately from the main body. After an initial delay of six years, these 400 fragments finally appeared in 1982 in volume 7 of the Discoveries in the Judaean Desert series (DJD), and were the first papyrus opisthographs from Cave 4 that were published.⁴ The present study is concerned with these and the other Dead Sea Scrolls opisthographs that were discovered at Qumran.⁵ What distinguishes this set of manuscripts from the other Dead Sea Scrolls is the fact that the opisthographs preserve different texts on two sides of a manuscript: texts that were intentionally written by ancient scribes on one text-bearing artefact. The central objective of this study is therefore to scrutinize the different ways in which these opisthographs can contribute to our understanding of ancient collecting practices, both in Qumran and elsewhere, and by extension to our understanding of the manuscript cultures of the ancient Medi-

1 Maurice Baillet, *Qumrân grotte 4.III (4Q482–4Q520)*, DJD 7 (Oxford: Clarendon, 1982), xi.

2 Claus-Hunno Hunzinger, "Le travail d'édition des fragments manuscrits de Qumrân (Communication de C.-H. Hunzinger)," *RB* 63 (1956): 67.

3 Baillet recalls the response by De Vaux: "Terrassé par les foudres qui s'abattirent sur moi." Baillet, DJD 7:xi.

4 Defining what an opisthograph is will be the central question of section 1.1 below. Here, we can understand an opisthograph as a manuscript that contains writing on both the front and the back side.

5 This study will primarily concentrate on opisthographs from the Dead Sea Scrolls that were found between about 1947 and 1956 in eleven caves in the vicinity of Qumran. Specific manuscripts from other sites in the area (such as Wadi Murabba'at and Masada) will be considered when relevant for the discussion. For a detailed account of the discovery of the scrolls, see Weston W. Fields, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A Full History*, Vol. 1 (Leiden: Brill, 2009).

terranean world. Special attention will be paid to the papyrus opisthograph 4Q509/4Q496/4Q506 in order to provide a comprehensive and consistent analysis of this opisthograph, while remaining attentive to its place within a rich ancient culture of reading and writing. In the final part, 4Q509/4Q496/4Q506 will be placed next to the opisthograph Papyrus Herculaneensis 1021.

It is important to examine not just the texts preserved on the opisthographic manuscripts, but also to understand how opisthographs ‘work’ as scribal artefacts. The point of departure here is the understanding that a scribe is not a passive agent in a straightforward movement from writer to reader but rather, as George Brooke reminds us, “an active transmitter of the text.”⁶ A scribe continually would have made conscious and subconscious decisions that determine how a text is read, spread, perceived, and understood, and which texts are collected, stored, and disseminated together. In order to investigate these processes, the Qumran opisthographs will be considered from as many different perspectives as possible, including literary analysis, materiality, scribal practices, and palaeography. This study moves forward from the idea that—when asking questions concerning scribal engagement with texts—a composition or text cannot be seen separately from the artefact on which it is inscribed. Or, as medievalist Matthew Driscoll recognized:

literary works do not exist independently of their material embodiments, and the physical form of the text is an integral part of its meaning; one needs therefore to look at ‘the whole book’, and the relationships between the text and such features as form and layout, illumination, rubrics and other paratextual features, and, not least, the surrounding texts.⁷

This study is motivated by the challenge to study the Dead Sea Scrolls in dialogue with “the surrounding texts.” In comparison with most medieval manuscript corpora it appears that scholars of the Dead Sea Scrolls are presented with a methodological challenge. In medieval codices many different compositions could have been written together or compiled and, as such, they provide a collection of related works.⁸ But what do we consider to be the surrounding

6 George J. Brooke, “The Qumran Scrolls and the Demise of the Distinction between Higher and Lower Criticism,” in *Reading the Dead Sea Scrolls: Essays in Method*, EJL 39 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2013), 1–17, at 12.

7 Matthew J. Driscoll, “The Words on the Page: Thoughts on Philology, Old and New,” in *Creating the Medieval Saga: Versions, Variability, and Editorial Interpretations of Old Norse Saga Literature*, ed. Judy Quinn and Emily Lethbridge (Odense: Syddansk Universitetsforlag, 2010), 87–104, at 90.

8 Malcolm B. Parkes, “The Influence of the Concepts of *Ordinatio* and *Compilatio* on the Devel-

texts of a Dead Sea Scroll? How do we know for the Dead Sea Scrolls which texts were read and collected together in antiquity? As will be discussed in chapter five, scholars have long used literary analysis to classify and organize the Dead Sea Scrolls.⁹ The opisthographs open up the possibility to approach this issue from the perspective of materiality, as they are among the very few types of manuscripts that preserve multiple compositions on one text-bearing artefact. Within a corpus consisting of hundreds of manuscripts that were passed down without helpful instruments such as a library catalogue and with very few clues about how they were understood in relation to each other, the opisthographic manuscripts provide an extraordinary perspective on ancient groupings of texts.

1 Opisthographs and Questions of Text Collections and Communities

As will be discussed in the second part of this study, scholars have long used literary analysis to classify and organize the Dead Sea Scrolls. Since the early days of Qumran scholarship there has been a trend to perceive the people behind the Dead Sea Scrolls as a sectarian movement, predominantly in line with the Essenes as described by Philo of Alexandria, Flavius Josephus, and Pliny the Elder.¹⁰ There is a shift in scholarship from the 1990s onwards, when new DJD volumes followed in quick succession and a broader scholarly audience gained access to a large body of previously unknown manuscripts. On the basis of new texts, scholars have been pushing back against the perception of the scrolls as the library of one sectarian movement located at the site of Khirbet Qumran. It came to light that especially the scroll material from Cave 4 presents a much more heterogenous picture of textual diversity. The debate about the Community Rule may serve as a case in point in this regard. The largest exemplar of this text, 1QS, had traditionally been interpreted as the rule text or ‘Manual of

opment of the Book,” in *Scribes, Scripts and Readers: Studies in the Communication, Presentation and Dissemination of Medieval Texts* (London: Hambledon, 1991), 35–70.

9 More specifically, this chapter will interact with the classifications proposed by Devorah Dimant.

10 A concise summary of this view can be found in John J. Collins, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A Biography* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2012), 52–56. Some of its earliest proponents include Frank Moore Cross, Józef T. Milik, and John Allegro: Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumrân and Modern Biblical Studies* (London: Duckworth, 1958); Milik, *Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea*, trans. John Strugnell (London: SCM, 1959); John M. Allegro, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A Reappraisal* (London: Penguin Books, 1964).

Discipline' of the presumed sectarian community.¹¹ However, the publication of the Cave 4 manuscripts of this composition has urged scholars to reconsider this position in favour of a more complex process of redactional evolution. To see 1QS as 'the' rule book of a sectarian community might be an oversimplification. By now most scholars accept the view that the composition in fact existed in multiple editions and prefer to write about 'Community Rules' or the 'Community Rule tradition.'¹² We will return to this issue in the discussion of 4Q255, the copy of the Community Rule that is preserved on an opisthograph.

Resistance to the framework of one single sectarian community located at Qumran also came from the publication of new texts. 4Q448, the Prayer for King Jonathan, provides one clear example. While most of the Dead Sea Scrolls are interpreted as expressing hostility towards the Hasmonaean dynasty that ruled over Judaea, 4Q448 may preserve a prayer text that calls on God to protect the Hasmonaean king Jonathan.¹³ Scholars such as Mladen Popović and Ben Wright have pointed to 4Q448, but also to Ben Sira, as texts that present world-views and ideas that are at odds with how the presumed community behind the scrolls is often configured.¹⁴

The notion of one sectarian community located at Qumran did provide scholars with a clear framework to understand the manuscripts. If we move away from this framework, what could then be the starting point of our reflection on the activities the people behind the scrolls organized around their manuscripts? Is there a way to find out which texts were copied, studied, read, or performed collectively by the scribes behind the scrolls? A particular complication in navigating these different texts is the fact that the Dead Sea Scrolls do not provide any explicit reflection on the notion of collecting texts, or the practice of communal reading. The internal perspective on the practice of collecting and classifying is difficult to trace back without the kind of evidence

11 For example in Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumrân*; Allegro, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*.

12 Charlotte Hempel, *The Community Rules from Qumran: A Commentary*, TSAJ 183 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2020).

13 The precise status of 4Q448 and especially its position towards king Jonathan is still the subject of debate. The main question is whether the preposition ⁷ל in col. B expresses support or disapproval. However, the editors of 4Q448 interpret the text as approving of king Jonathan; Esther Eshel et al., *Qumran Cave 4.VI: Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 1*, DJD 11 (Oxford: Clarendon, 1998), 410–411, 421–422. See also Hanan Eshel, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Hasmonaean State* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008), 103–104.

14 Mladen Popović, "Qumran as Scroll Storehouse in Times of Crisis? A Comparative Perspective on Judaeian Desert Manuscript Collections" *JSt* 43 (2012): 551–594, at 589; Benjamin G. Wright, "One 'Methodological Assumption' of the *Groningen Hypothesis* of Qumran Origins," in *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection*, ed. Gabriele Boccaccini, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 286–290.

that other fields have at their disposal, such as Mesopotamian literary catalogues, lists of books preserved on papyri, or descriptions of collections in literary sources. However, the Dead Sea Scrolls do provide us with indirect evidence. We find examples of extracting in manuscripts such as 4Q175 (Testimonia), and 4Q174 (Eschatological Commentary A).¹⁵ It has been argued that 4Q175 and 4Q174 provide evidence for the textual pluriformity of the Dead Sea Scrolls.¹⁶ The opisthographic manuscripts from Qumran present us with a new opportunity to re-evaluate the literary diversity encountered in the scrolls.

Opisthographs come in all shapes and sizes. As we will see in chapter one, what scholars consider to be an opisthograph may vary. What many opisthographs across different cultures and literacies do share however is the presence of different texts within one material setting.¹⁷ As such, they allow us to think through different practices of collection and classification and to sharpen our understanding of different forms of textual engagement in antiquity. Reference to a selection of opisthographs from comparative corpora may illustrate this. We can imagine many different scenarios behind an opisthograph, but for the sake of clarity these examples can broadly be organized in two categories: re-used opisthographs where a second text was inscribed because the first text ceased to be of interest, and opisthographs where the two texts were intentionally brought together on one manuscript.¹⁸

The first category includes manuscripts such as P.Lond.Lit. 108, a papyrus that contains Pseudo-Aristotle's *Athenaion Politeia* on the backside of two different compositions: an Egyptian farm account written in Greek and notes on the poem *Aetia* by Callimachus.¹⁹ This papyrus is of particular importance

15 Lutz Doering, "Excerpted Texts in Second Temple Judaism: A Survey of the Evidence," in *Selecta Colligere, 11: Beiträge zur Technik des Sammeln und Kompilierens griechischer Texte von der Antike bis zur Humanismus*, ed. Rosa M. Piccione and Matthias Perkams, *Hellenica* 18 (Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso, 2005), 1–38; Mladen Popović, "Reading, Writing, and Memorizing Together: Reading Culture in Ancient Judaism and the Dead Sea Scrolls in a Mediterranean Context," *DSD* 24 (2017): 447–470. Scribal practices such as extracting and note-taking will be discussed in more detail in chapter six.

16 These manuscripts will be further discussed in section 6.1.

17 The notion of 'literacy' in this context involves more than the ability to read and/or write. Following William A. Johnson, it is used here to refer to "text-oriented events embedded in particular sociocultural contexts"; William A. Johnson, "Introduction," in *Ancient Literacies: The Culture of Reading in Greece and Rome*, ed. William A. Johnson and Holt N. Parker (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 3–10, at 3.

18 The nuances of these distinction will be explored in chapter one.

19 Frederic G. Kenyon, *Aristotle on the Constitution of Athens*, 3rd ed. (London: The Trustees of the British Museum, 1892). See also the discussion of P.Lond.Lit. 108 in Ayhan Aksu,

because it preserves the most complete copy of the *Athenaion Politeia* from antiquity. The material characteristics of this manuscript strongly suggest that it was re-used when the farm account on the recto became defunct.²⁰ The manuscript was not discarded but revived when a text of a different genre was written on its verso: a treatise that offers an extensive description of the Athenian political system in the classical period.²¹

A similar example is provided by P.Oxy. 654: this papyrus contains a copy of the Gospel of Thomas on the verso of a Greek land register.²² In this case the documentary text is accompanied by a Greek sayings collection related to the New Testament gospels. It is worthwhile to think through the different scenarios behind this form of re-use. These two opisthographs indicate for example that re-use could take place in vastly different contexts and across different literacies. In one way or another, the communities between these different texts were connected through their use of the same manuscript.

With regard to examples of the second category of opisthographs, we turn to two opisthographs where similar texts are brought together: the papyri P.Oxy. 413 and P. Masada 721.²³ The first manuscript, P.Oxy. 413, preserves a small collection consisting of two Greek mimes from the second century CE. On the recto we encounter three columns of a composition called Charition (after the main character), and on the verso three columns of Moicheutria (“The Adulteress”).²⁴ These compositions were dated by their primary editors (Grenfell and Hunt) to the 2nd century CE on the basis of their palaeography.²⁵ It is particularly interesting that the witnesses of both Charition and Moicheutria on this manuscripts do not only contain the spoken texts of these mimes, but also stage directions concerning accompanying music, and specific instructions for

“Opisthographic Papyri and Practices of Collection in Ancient Egypt,” in *Instituciones locales, religión cívica y élites urbanas en el Egipto romano (s. II–IV d.C.)*, Vol. 1, ed. Luisa Lesage Gárriga and Antonio D. Pérez Zurita (Madrid, Ediciones Clásicas, 2021), 11–22, at 14.

20 William A. Johnson, *Bookrolls and Scribes in Oxyrhynchus* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2004), 157–158.

21 The pairing ‘recto’ and ‘verso’ will be defined in section 1.2 below.

22 Bernard P. Grenfell and Arthur S. Hunt, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, vol. 4 (London: Egypt Exploration Fund, 1904), 1. A more extensive discussion of this opisthograph is provided in: Ayhan Aksu, “Two Opisthographs and Scribal Practices in the Ancient Near Eastern World: Thoughts on Use and Reuse,” *Papers from the Institute of Archaeology* 33 (2022): 1–26.

23 See also the discussion of these manuscripts in Aksu, “Opisthographic Papyri and Practices of Collection in Ancient Egypt,” 15–16.

24 Bernard P. Grenfell and Arthur S. Hunt, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, vol. 3 (London: Egypt Exploration Fund, 1903), 41–57.

25 Grenfell and Hunt, *The Oxyrhynchus papyri*, vol. 3, 41.

the actors.²⁶ Stavros Tsitsiridis has hypothesized that the text of these two plays and the instructions were collected on an opisthograph in preparation of a specific performance.²⁷ It is possible that P.Oxy. 413 concerns the working manuscript of a ‘director’ that was involved to coordinate the production.²⁸

The second manuscript of this category is the papyrus P. Masada 721, which was discovered in Locus 1039 (“Locus of the Scrolls”) by Yigael Yadin during his excavations of Masada in 1963–1965.²⁹ Its deposition was most probably a result of the Roman conquest of Masada at the end of the Jewish Revolt (66–73 CE). P. Mas. 721 is a Latin manuscript consisting of (parts of) two compositions: an anonymous poetic fragment on the recto and a verse from book four of Virgil’s *Aeneid* on the verso.³⁰ This opisthograph was probably the property of a Roman soldier involved in the siege of Masada and must therefore have been written sometime during the Jewish Revolt. Hannah Cotton and Joseph Geiger propose that the author of the verse line on the recto intended to convey his disgust with the horrors of war.³¹ This theme is also present in the *Aeneid*. Though the verse found on P. Masada 721 is not specifically concerned with conflict, the epic as a whole does present a narrative that is deeply rooted in violence and warfare.³² Preserved together on a single sheet or scroll, these two verses constitute a small collection of Latin war literature on a portable manuscript.

These two opisthographs (P. Mas. 721 and P.Oxy. 413) present us intriguing instances of small, intentional collections of texts. Of course, ‘intention’ or ‘intentionality’ are difficult concepts to prove. In this context we can understand a scribal practice as intentional when we can infer that the practice served a particular function with regard to how the texts in question are transmitted and understood: for example, to highlight their interpretational connections, or to juxtapose their socio-religious attitudes. We can then think of a group of texts as an intentional collection when the most plausible explan-

26 Egill Rostrup, “Oxyrhynchos Papyri III.413,” *Oversigt over det Kongelige Danske Videnskabsbernes Selskabs Forhandlinger* 2 (1915): 63–107.

27 Stavros Tsitsiridis, “Greek Mime in the Roman Empire (P.Oxy. 413: Charition and Moicheutria),” *Logeion* 1 (2011): 184–232, at 200.

28 Tsitsiridis, “Greek Mime in the Roman Empire,” 211–212.

29 Hannah M. Cotton and Joseph Geiger, *Masada 11: The Yigael Yadin Excavations 1963–1965, Final Reports: The Latin and Greek Documents* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1989), 18–20.

30 Cotton and Geiger, *Masada 11: The Yigael Yadin Excavations 1963–1965*, 31–35.

31 Cotton and Geiger, *Masada 11: The Yigael Yadin Excavations 1963–1965*, 34.

32 Eugene Vance, “Warfare and the Structure of Thought in Virgil’s *Aeneid*,” *Quaderni Urbinate di Cultura Classica* 15 (1973): 111–162; Michèle Lowrie, “Vergil and Founding Violence,” in *A Companion to Vergil’s Aeneid and its Tradition*, ed. Joseph Farrell and Michael C.J. Putnam (Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), 391–403.

ation for this group is that a compiler-scribe consciously decided to preserve these texts together. Here, compositions of similar types or genres (Greek mime and Roman epic) appear to be brought together deliberately. These two opisthographs can be seen in opposition to manuscripts such as P.Lond.Lit. 108 and P.Oxy. 413, which are both understood to be instances of material reuse. These four opisthographic manuscripts display a remarkable variety in textual practices—they offer a starting point to reflect on the intertextual relations within collections, and reflect on the circumstances under which compositions could both be grouped together or rejected by ancient *collectionneurs*.

2 Studying Ancient Manuscript Culture

Book 13 of Pliny the Elder's *Natural History* contains a lengthy discussion on the manufacturing and the use of papyrus. The section ends with a telling passage about how emperor Tiberius, when the risk of widespread paper shortage became too imminent, chose to appoint a special senate committee to oversee its distribution. Pliny the Elder emphasizes the importance of this decision: "as otherwise life was completely upset."³³ Much like in modern society, writing and the availability of writing material was of crucial importance for daily life in antiquity. Pliny even suggests that running out of paper would have resulted in the collapse of public order. Historical sources present us with many similar anecdotes that confirm the importance of written texts not only on the level of everyday administration, but also from the perspective of politics, religion, culture, economics, and social life. Cicero would often go through the trouble of making multiple copies of important letters and sending them away with different couriers taking different routes to guarantee that his message would arrive safely.³⁴ Archaeological evidence of the Judaeen revolts against Rome in the first and second centuries CE demonstrates that bookrolls and important documentation were some of the valued and important belongings that refugees would take with them when they went into hiding.³⁵ Bookrolls could be among the most important possessions people had.

In the past decades scholarly interest has shifted from manuscripts as not only vehicles for the transmission of texts, but also as physical objects in their

33 "Alias in tumultu vita erat." Pliny the Elder, *Natural History*, 13.89 (Rackham, LCL).

34 Stephanie A. Frampton, *Empire of Letters: Writing in Roman Literature and Thought from Lucretius to Ovid* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), 3. Examples: Cicero, *Epistulae ad familiares*, 9.16.1; 10.5.1; 11.11.1; 12.12.1; and 12.30.7.

35 Popović, "Qumran as Scroll Storehouse in Times of Crisis?" 561.

own right. Objects that are part of a particular context: the milieu in which the manuscript “was and is produced, used and transmitted.”³⁶ Central in this debate has been the emergence of material philology as a field of study that aims to move beyond the abstract notion of ‘composition’ that had been the focal point of textual criticism in favour of a renewed appreciation of the manuscript. This term was first coined in Stephen Nichols’s “Philology in a Manuscript Culture,” his programmatic introduction to this issue, in which he propagates a return to the study of other aspects of medieval text production than just text and language. In Nichols words:

If we accept the multiple forms in which our artifacts have been transmitted, we may recognize that medieval culture did not simply live with diversity, it cultivated it. The “new” philology of the last decade or more reminds us that, as medievalists, we need to embrace the consequences of that diversity, not simply to live with it, but to situate it squarely within our methodology.³⁷

Building on the scholarly tradition started by Nichols, the present study aims to contribute to our understanding of the manuscript culture of the Dead Sea Scrolls from Qumran by exploring how and under which circumstances some of these manuscripts were produced and used. The scrolls offer us a rich corpus of the remnants of 900–1000 leather scrolls and papyri and allows us to ask new questions related to manuscript culture and scribal practices that are of interest to scholars of early Judaism, as well as of the ancient Mediterranean world at large.³⁸ I would maintain that the scrolls are of particular relevance in this regard as they display a remarkable variety in textual practices: we encounter different types of writing material (leather, papyrus, and, in one case, copper), used to write texts in different languages (Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek), with different scripts (Paleo-Hebrew, Hebrew square, Greek, Nabatean, and cryptic).

Following Brian Stock’s work on heretical and reformist groups in medieval Europe, Popović has characterized the people behind the Dead Sea Scrolls as

36 Jörg B. Quenzer, “Introduction,” in *Manuscript Cultures: Mapping the Field*, ed. Jörg B. Quenzer, Dmitry Bondarev, and Jan U. Sobisch, SMC 1 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2014), 1–7, at 2.

37 Stephen G. Nichols, “Introduction: Philology in a Manuscript Culture,” *Speculum* 65 (1990): 1–10, at 9.

38 The exact number of manuscripts is unclear, but most scholars estimate the total number to be somewhere between 900 and 1000. See Mladen Popović, “The Manuscript Collections: An Overview,” in *T&T Clark Companion to the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. George J. Brooke and Charlotte Hempel (London: T&T Clark, 2019), 37–50.

a textual community: “a micro-society in antiquity organized around a common understanding of texts.”³⁹ Regardless of how we conceptualize the group or groups behind the Dead Sea Scrolls, it is through their extant manuscripts that we can start thinking about some of their activities that were connected to bookrolls. This is the starting point of this study. Rather than focusing on one composition, this study deals with a type of manuscript and the practices related to it: opisthographs, i.e., manuscripts that contain writing on both sides. As such, this contribution is interested in both the production of manuscripts during this period and in the different ways in which people engaged with them; in the study of manuscripts as material artefacts, but also in their social and cultural contexts.

3 Methods and Research Approaches

The present work will take the opisthographs as an entry into the literary diversity within the Dead Sea Scrolls. It should be noted at the outset that this study does not offer new editions or commentaries to the opisthographs. Instead, I will foreground this small corpus of manuscripts to explore different practices related to them. These practices concern the act of collecting texts, but also copying, studying, (public) reading, and performing. In a way this work is not just about the opisthographs, but more specifically about their setting—the socio-religious context of these manuscripts and the people behind them.

The choice for the opisthographs as an object of research is on its own a methodological decision. The starting point of this project is not a particular text or composition, but a scribal practice: the practice of using the reverse side of a manuscript.

As we will see, the majority of the texts preserved on both sides of these literary opisthographs have survived in other copies as well, such as the Community Rule or the War Scroll. Most studies about these texts tend to prioritize the manuscript that is preserved in the best condition, while less attention is paid to fragmentary or poorly preserved manuscripts. Scholars such as Charlotte Hempel, Jutta Jokiranta and Hanna Vanonen have problematized this approach, as the state of preservation of a manuscript is “purely fortuitous and

39 Mladen Popović, “Multilingualism, Multiscripturalism, and Knowledge Transfer in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Graeco-Roman Judaea,” in *Sharing and Hiding Religious Knowledge in Early Judaism, Christianity, and Islam*, ed. Mladen Popović, Lautaro Roig Lanzillotta, and Clare Wilde, JCI 10 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2018), 46–71, at 48.

accidental.”⁴⁰ The significance of smaller, fragmentary copies of a composition can be lost when they are primarily used to reconstruct the best-preserved manuscript. An alternative approach would be to start our investigation with fragmentary editions, such as the opisthographs that are central here.

In order to arrive at a sustained analysis, this study will combine different research strategies. A starting point to investigate the scribal culture in which a particular manuscript emerged, would be to describe the manuscript from a material perspective. Delving from the field of material philology, I will assess the codicology and palaeography of each of the literary opisthographs. Codicology has historically been understood as the ‘archaeology’ of the manuscript, aiming to investigate all material and technical aspects of the production and lay-out of ancient book forms.⁴¹ Codicology is not restricted to the study of the ‘codex’, but deals with all text-bearing artefacts (including papyri, ostraca, and clay or wax tablets). Palaeography is concerned with the study of handwriting. Eibert Tigchelaar has qualified its aims as “characterizing and classifying ancient scripts” and “determining the time and place of origin of manuscripts on the basis of their handwriting.”⁴² Traditionally, the primary ‘purpose’ of codicology and palaeography has been to “assist in establishing the earliest and most authoritative versions of ancient texts.”⁴³ Though textual reconstruction has probably been the most prominent target of codicology and palaeography, both fields can assist in addressing other points in question as well. I will use palaeographic and codicological approaches as a starting point to rethink the setting of a manuscript, and to address the issues laid out in the section above. Some questions that we will return to are the following: Are the opisthographs related to particular scribal practices? How many scribes could be involved in the production of a manuscript? Can the opisthographs help us reconstruct

40 Hempel, *The Community Rules from Qumran*, 1. Cf. Jutta Jokiranta and Hanna Vanonen, “Multiple Copies of Rule Texts or Multiple Rule Texts? Boundaries of the S and M documents,” in *Crossing Imaginary Boundaries: The Dead Sea Scrolls in the Context of Second Temple Judaism*, ed. Mika S. Pajunen and Hanna Tervanotko, PFES 108 (Helsinki: The Finnish Exegetical Society, 2015), 11–60.

41 François Masai, “Paléographie et codicologie,” *Scriptorium* 4 (1950): 279–293; Bruce M. Metzger, *Manuscripts of the Greek Bible: An Introduction to Greek Palaeography*, rev. ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991), 3.

42 Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar, “Seventy Years of Palaeographic Dating of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *Sacred Texts and Disparate Interpretations: Qumran Manuscripts Seventy Years Later: Proceedings of the International Conference Held at the John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin, 24–26 October 2017*, ed. Henryk Drawnel, STDJ 133 (Leiden: Brill, 2020), 258–278.

43 Ralph W. Mathisen, “Palaeography and Codicology,” in *The Oxford Handbook of Early Christian Studies*, ed. Susan A. Harvey and David G. Hunter (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 140–168, at 160.

the period of time that a manuscript continued to be in use (its ‘useful life’)?⁴⁴ To analyse these manuscripts from a material perspective, I have consulted the high-resolution multi-spectral images of the Dead Sea Scrolls that were kindly provided to us by the Israel Antiquities Authority (IAA).⁴⁵ Some of the opisthographs I had the chance to inspect in person; this will be indicated in the relevant discussions.

Questions related to the setting of a text cannot be addressed on the basis of materiality alone. Each of the texts encountered on these opisthographs will be subject to literary and cultural-historical analysis. The objective here is not to provide a full and original interpretation of each of these compositions, but to understand these manuscripts as ‘opisthographs’ and to reflect on the circumstances under which the texts on the recto and verso could have been penned down together. Specifically, this entails an examination of the literary and stylistic connections between the two or more compositions and look for intertextual relationships and parallels in vocabulary and terminology.⁴⁶ Special consideration will be given to the approaches adopted by the scribes (and other users of these manuscripts) in order to engage with their materials—they adapted, interpreted, and thought through these texts through a range of different modes of textual engagement. This ties in with what Molly Zahn has conceptualized as different ‘compositional techniques’ to carefully describe and compare these strategies employed by scribes to rework their texts.⁴⁷

To deepen this analysis, one of the opisthographs, the papyrus 4Q509/4Q496/4Q506, has been selected as the focal point of a specific case-study. From a methodological perspective, case-studies can help us examine particular phenomena or units of study (such as people, artefacts, or events) within a broader

44 George W. Houston, “Papyrological Evidence for Book Collections and Libraries in the Roman Empire,” in *Ancient Literacies*, 233–267, at 248–251.

45 The photos are courtesy of the Leon Levy Dead Sea Scrolls Digital Library; photographer: Shai Halevi. I am very grateful to the staff of the IAA Dead Sea Scrolls Unit for their help and support.

46 Intertextuality famously popularized by especially Julia Kristeva, has been applied to describe a variety of phenomena. Here, intertextuality is understood as the complex ways in which a text is related to other texts and the processes through which meaning is shaped by this relationship. In its broadest sense, intertextuality concerns the totality of all possible relations between a text and any other linguistic expression. More specific variants of intertextual relations are for example allusion, citation, pastiche, and creative retelling. See Graham Allen, *Intertextuality*, 2nd ed. (London: Routledge, 2011).

47 Molly Zahn categorizes different forms of additions, omissions, and alterations of circulating texts in: *Rethinking Rewritten Scripture: Composition and Exegesis in the 4QReworked Pentateuch Manuscripts*, STDJ 95 (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 17–19.

context. Where close reading analysis is not feasible for large collections of texts, a selected case study of one manuscript allows us to study possible scenarios of a social reality behind it, while at the same time thinking through its broader implications for early Judaeen manuscript culture.

The final research approach employed in this study is the comparative approach. A recent search using the advanced function of the online database Trismegistos resulted in over 15,000 papyrus manuscripts written between 300 BCE and 100 CE, broadly contemporary with the Dead Sea Scrolls.⁴⁸ This extensive body of evidence offers the opportunity for all kinds of cross-cultural approaches, but has rarely been utilized. The comparison of the Dead Sea Scrolls with other manuscript traditions can provide a contextual background and illuminate the variety of textual practices across the region.⁴⁹ To be heuristically of value, is it important that the comparative investigation is confined to similar phenomena that existed under similar cultural conditions. While understanding that the topic is too extensive to treat here in all its facets, I would nevertheless like to reflect briefly on the comparative approach in the next section.

4 Comparative Approach

What do researchers do when they compare? And what exactly is ‘comparable’? Michael Stausberg’s work on comparison provides us with a good starting point to engage with these issues.⁵⁰ Stausberg observes that though scholars often refer to the comparative method, we cannot distinguish one single method but rather “a mode of analysis, a way to approach a given problem.”⁵¹ More specifically, Stausberg challenges us to think of comparison as “a research design, i.e. as a framework for the collection and analysis of data and the analysis of research problems.”⁵² Comparison is (though sometimes implicitly) embedded

48 Mark Depauw and Tom Gheldof, “Trismegistos: An interdisciplinary Platform for Ancient World Texts and Related Information,” in *Theory and Practice of Digital Libraries—TPDL 2013. Selected Workshops*, ed. Łukasz Bolikowski et al., CCIS 416 (Cham: Springer, 2014), 40–52.

49 A recent example of the comparison of Early Judaeen and Hellenistic manuscript traditions: Pieter B. Hartog, *Pesher and Hypomnema: A Comparison of Two Commentary Traditions from the Hellenistic and Roman Periods*, STDJ 121 (Leiden: Brill, 2017).

50 Michael Stausberg, “Comparison,” in *The Oxford Handbook of the Study of Religion*, ed. Michael Stausberg and Steven Engler (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), 21–39.

51 Stausberg, “Comparison,” 34.

52 Stausberg, “Comparison,” 34.

in many different research approaches, some of which we have seen above. For example, the analysis of the literary opisthographs presented in chapter two is the result of the comparison of data, in this case the different opisthographic practices encountered in the scrolls. Devorah Dimant's classification of the Dead Sea Scrolls, which will be discussed in chapter five, follows from the comparison of vocabulary, style, and socio-religious concepts. Such research activities can therefore be characterized as 'comparative', though they are generally not labelled as such. Indeed, as Stausberg notes, "comparison of data is standard practice in all scholarly methods."

In his study on the practice of comparison in history, religion, and society, Bruce Lincoln has introduced the distinction between "strong" and "weak" comparisons.⁵³ Strong comparisons are holistic in their ambitions: they claim to "reveal universal patterns," "demonstrate a genetic relation among specific peoples and phenomena," or "trace diffusion of certain traits from one group to others."⁵⁴ Lincoln is critical of these types of comparisons, which he sees as wide-ranging. The search for true universals will primarily result in broad generalizations and "an invitation to project one's favoured fantasies onto a relatively blank screen."⁵⁵

For Lincoln, the advantage of comparative research activities lies in weak comparisons, which consists of the following four elements: a) a focus on a relatively small number of comparanda, b) attentiveness to relations of similarity and those of difference, c) equal dignity and intelligence to all parties considered, d) attentiveness to social, historical, and political contexts and sub-texts.⁵⁶

Part 3 of this study will be dedicated to assessing the benefits of comparing different sources for manuscript collections, while trying to be mindful to these four elements outlined by Lincoln. In chapter eight and nine, I will introduce the *Villa of the Papyri* from Roman Herculaneum as a comparandum to the Dead Sea Scrolls. While considering both elements of connection and dis-

53 Bruce Lincoln, *Apples and Oranges: Explorations in, on, and with Comparison* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2018).

54 Lincoln, *Apples and Oranges*, 26.

55 Lincoln, *Apples and Oranges*, 26.

56 Lincoln, *Apples and Oranges*, 27. In the final chapters of his volume, Lincoln presents a number of case studies that further elaborate on what he considers to be successful weak comparisons. Some of these are situated within one historical context, such as his comparison of the Greeks and Scythians. Others, however, are trans-historical and explore the comparison of phenomena from different cultural and historical contexts, such as his comparison of Herodotus and the myth of Acoma Pueblo; *Apples and Oranges*, 84–95, 147–183.

connection, I will focus on the different collecting and scribal practices behind these two manuscript collections.

5 Outline of This Study

The present work is composed of three separate but related parts, each of which explores a different aspect related to the Qumran opisthographs and collecting practices of in the ancient world.

Part 1 consists of four chapters that provide both an introduction to the scribal phenomenon of opisthographic manuscripts, and a first analysis of the Qumran opisthographs from a number of different perspectives. The first sections of chapter one are dedicated to the question what scholars exactly mean when they write about an opisthograph. I will explore the origins of the term and its different uses. Section 1.2 explores in which ways the terms *recto* and *verso* have been used to address the different sides of a manuscript. Section 1.3 offers a classification of the different opisthographic practices preserved from Qumran and introduces the notion of 'literary opisthographs' for a group of five manuscripts from cave 4 that bear different literary texts on both the front-side and backside. The sections 1.4 to 1.9 each offer descriptions of the different types of opisthographs preserved from Qumran. 1.4 is dedicated to the unidentified opisthograph fragments, 1.5 concerns the tefillin preserved from Qumran, 1.6 discusses the manuscripts that bear the title of a composition on the verso, 1.7 deals with 4Q504, the only opisthograph with one continuous text on both the *recto* and *verso*. Section 1.8 discusses three examples of manuscripts that bear a documentary text on either side, and 1.9 focuses on the intriguing group of three manuscripts from Qumran with a literary composition on the *recto* and a documentary text on the *verso*.

Chapter two concerns the main body of this part and offers a first analysis of the five literary opisthographs: 4Q415/4Q414, 4Q433a/4Q255, 4Q499/4Q497, 4Q503/4Q512, and 4Q509/4Q496/4Q506. Sections 2.2 to 2.6 will present individual analyses of the first four of these opisthographs on the basis of their materiality and the literary and socio-religious connections between the different compositions they bear. The question asked here is how to understand these manuscripts as scribal artefacts. We will return to the different scenarios for an opisthograph introduced above, differentiating between opisthographs as re-used manuscripts and opisthographs bearing compositions that were intentionally brought together, in order to describe the scribal setting in which these manuscripts were produced, used, and circulated.

Chapter three will address two different questions concerning the materiality of the literary opisthographs. Sections 3.1 to 3.11 inquire after both the writing styles and the datings of the four papyrus opisthographs. 4Q433a/4Q255 is of specific importance in this regard, as this manuscript has recently been subject to radiocarbon dating; the results of which offer a benchmark for my palaeographic datings. Section 1.13 will concentrate on the issue of writing material. This section explores the dynamics behind these different types of material, and investigates how the apparent overrepresentation of papyrus among the opisthographs could be explained.

The short, final chapter four of this part provides concluding remarks in order to synthesize the discussions of both chapters two and three.

Part 2 provides a case study of one individual opisthograph: 4Q509/4Q496/4Q506, the only opisthograph preserved from Qumran that bears three individual compositions. The main objective is to investigate what can be inferred from the presence of these three texts in one context regarding our interpretation of each of them individually, and about the scribal practices related to opisthographs in general. By raising these questions, this chapter aims to further reflect on the very concept of the literary opisthograph—and explore the types of reading events that could have been organized around this manuscript.⁵⁷ Furthermore, I will ask how significant it is that we find these specific compositions together on one scroll and to which degree we could conceptualize this opisthograph as a collection of different texts.

This part is subdivided into two chapters: “Three Compositions and the Question of Classification,” and “Opisthograph 4Q509/4Q496/4Q506 and the Question of Textual and Literary Diversity.” In order to understand this opisthograph as a collection of texts, it is important to take a closer look at which three texts we are dealing with on this manuscript: Festival Prayers (4Q509) in section 5.2, the War Scroll (4Q496) in section 5.5, and Words of the Luminaries (4Q506) in section 5.6. How have these compositions been assessed and categorised individually? Section 5.3 will ask broader questions about scholarly approaches to the classification of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Dimant is among the scholars who thoroughly reflected on different criteria to classify the complete collection of texts from Qumran, rather than focusing on a particular genre such as rule texts or liturgy. In this way she articulated what is probably the

57 Following Johnson, the notion of ‘reading events’ is here used for the totality of activities organized around manuscripts (such as reading, studying, reciting, and praying): William A. Johnson, *Readers and Reading Culture in the High Roman Empire: A Study of Elite Communities* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010), 4–16.

most influential proposal for the literary classification of the scrolls. In section 5.4, I will consider 4Q509 for a more general reflection on the way in which texts are classified in Dimant's work. In section 5.7, I will use 4Q506 to demonstrate how scholars classify texts differently depending on the questions they ask, and on their understanding of how the people behind the Dead Sea Scrolls engaged with their own texts.

In chapter 6, I will turn to a number of conceptual questions concerning diversity and collection. Using the conceptual pairing *emic* and *etic* as a heuristic tool in section 6.1, I will assess whether the fact that these three compositions are found in one manuscript can help us to better understand how texts were grouped together in antiquity. After a codicological description of this manuscript in section 6.2, I will briefly consider the concept of an 'extract' or 'excerpt' in section 6.3. Section 6.4 will ask how the presence of these three texts together can contribute to our understanding of the diversity of textual and literary practices in the Dead Sea Scrolls. Section 6.5 provides an excursion by investigating what comparative evidence from the Graeco-Roman world can contribute to this. In the final section 6.6, I will explore whether we should understand this opisthograph as an intentional prayer collection.

Where Part 2 offers an attempt towards microhistory, Part 3 will be used to adopt a different approach in thinking through literary diversity and practices of collecting texts evidenced in the scrolls. In this part, I will turn from the examination of one opisthograph to the analysis of multiple manuscripts. Central to this chapter will be to inquire after the practice of collection in antiquity. The Qumran cache presents us with one or more collections of texts in a variety of genres and languages. I am interested not just in the scrolls as material artefacts, but also in the actors (scribes? scholars? readers? consumers?) behind these texts, and in the totality of practices that were organized around texts within their communities. These practices may include writing and copying, but also reading, discussing, reciting, and the broader process of bringing texts together. How can the material evidence help us think about these practices?

This part will be divided into three chapters. In chapter seven, I will trace different conceptualisations of manuscript collections in both historical sources, and in modern scholarship. How are groups of ancient manuscripts understood and on which basis have they been characterized as library, archive, or collection? In section 7.2, I will use the evidence provided by ancient book lists on papyri from Oxyrhynchus in order to assess the benefits of comparing different papyrological sources for our understanding of collecting practices.

In chapter eight, we will turn to another manuscript collection from the ancient world: the corpus from the *Villa of the Papyri* from Herculaneum. This collection will be introduced by providing a concise overview of its contents, archaeology, and history of scholarship in the sections 8.1 to 8.5. In section 8.6, I will argue that the *Villa*-collection can be conceptualised as a private, scholarly collection. In the final section of this chapter, I will sharpen my analysis by focusing on one particular scroll: the papyrus opisthograph Papyrus Herculaneensis 1021, because this manuscript presents a remarkable example of the collection of extracts from different sources in order to create a new composition.

The final chapter of this part will be dedicated to a comparison between the *Villa of the Papyri* and the Dead Sea Scrolls collections. While trying to be equally attentive to relations of similarity and of difference, I will specifically look for ways in which a comparison can illuminate the different collecting and scribal practices behind manuscript collections and the ways in which individual scribes engaged with their manuscripts with an eye to reading practices in the broadest sense. Finally, I will examine how Papyrus Herculaneensis 1021 can help to interpret the Qumran opisthograph 4Q509/4Q496/4Q506 and to understand the intertextual relationships presented by opisthographs as a collection.

PART 1

*The Material Variety
of the Qumran Opisthographs*



Introduction to Part 1

The Dead Sea Scrolls contain a range of opisthographic manuscripts that preserve different texts from a variety of genres and text types. In fact, it is possible that the very first of the scrolls to be discovered was an opisthograph. 1QS, one of the original seven scrolls found by Muhammed ed-Dib and his cousin Jum'a Muhammed, bears what seems to be a title on its reverse side. The Dead Sea Scrolls opisthographs also preserve biblical quotations, notes, signatures, and literary compositions of which no other copies have survived. This broad variety of material calls for further organization and classification.

This part intends to provide both an introduction to the Dead Sea Scrolls opisthographs and a first analysis. As we will see, Dead Sea Scrolls scholarship has applied the term 'opisthographs' to refer to a number of different scribal phenomena. In the first chapter, I will propose an understanding of opisthograph that covers its different manifestations. Subsequently, I will turn to the ways in which the terms *recto* and *verso* have been used to address the different sides of a manuscript. The main body of this part is devoted to the analyses of the opisthographic practices from Qumran. Section 1.3 provides an overview of these practices, the following sections 1.4 to 1.9 offer discussions of the different types of opisthographs passed down from Qumran. This study does not provide an exhaustive review of each of these manuscripts, but rather a discussion that is centred around the key issues laid out in the introduction: a contextual exploration of their material characteristics, scribal practices, and the texts they bear in order to situate these manuscripts within the reading culture they were a part of.

Central to this part are the sections dedicated to each of the five literary opisthographs from Qumran. This is the focal point of chapter two. The literary opisthographs will be examined from a combined material and literary perspective. The main question that will return for each of these opisthographs is how to understand the circumstances under which these two (or more) compositions could have been written together on one manuscript.

Chapter three will inspect two different material characteristics of these manuscripts separately. First, I will analyse the palaeography of the literary opisthographs in order to establish their relative chronology and to examine whether these manuscripts can be related to a particular writing style. Second, I will address the issue of writing material and consider the significance of the fact that most of the literary opisthographs were written on papyrus. Finally, in the concluding chapter of Part 1, I will reflect on the different opisthographic practices discussed in this chapter and address the questions how to under-

stand these manuscripts as scribal artefacts, and to which degree we can conceive of the literary opisthographs as a cluster of manuscripts. Parts from these chapters have appeared in earlier forms in two articles that were published in *Dead Sea Discoveries*, which will be pointed out in the relevant sections.

Opisthographic Practices in the Dead Sea Scrolls

1 What Is an Opisthograph?

What exactly do scholars mean when they call a manuscript an ‘opisthograph’? The term has been used by modern scholars to describe a range of different scribal phenomena, but pertains always to a writing medium. As such, opisthograph has been used to describe a variety of objects from the ancient Mediterranean world, ranging from ostraca and inscriptions to wood or clay tablets. For the purpose of this study, the focus is in particular on leather and papyrus manuscripts, though on occasion we will turn to other writing media when comparison is illuminating. The notion of a ‘manuscript’ is used in a variety of ways within scholarship, but when applied here it refers to the physical, text-bearing artefact.¹ In this section I will define the concept of the opisthograph by approaching it from both an *emic* and a modern perspective. ‘Opisthograph’ is one of the few codicological keywords that actually have an ancient origin. Where do we find its origin and how has it been used in the past? In addition to that, we will review the different ways in which it is applied in modern scholarship.

The first use of the term opisthograph that we know of appears in the Latin letter of Pliny the Younger to Baebius Macer, in which he remarks that the inheritance left to him by his uncle Pliny the Elder includes 160 “opisthographos,” written in minute handwriting on both sides of the page.² A few lines earlier Pliny the Younger had explained how his uncle would write down notes and extracts (“adnotabat excerpebatque”) in these books, so it is plausible that these opisthographs contained said notes and selected passages.³ Though we should not rush to conclusions on the basis of one reference, this reference provides some interesting clues regarding Roman scribal practices. First, the

-
- 1 On different definitions of ‘manuscript’ in the field of scrolls studies, see Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar, “Constructing, Deconstructing and Reconstructing Fragmentary Manuscripts: Illustrated by a Study of 4Q184 (4QWiles of the Wicked Woman),” in *Rediscovering the Dead Sea Scrolls: An Assessment of Old and New Approaches and Methods*, ed. Maxine L. Grossman (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 26–47, at 26–28.
 - 2 Pliny the Younger, *Epistulae*, 3.5.17. Both Betty Radice in her LCL edition and the translation by Peter Walsh translate ‘opisthographos’ here as ‘notebooks.’ Peter G. Walsh (ed.), *Pliny the Younger: Complete Letters* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016).
 - 3 Pliny the Younger, *Epistulae*, 3.5.10.

context in which the term opisthograph is employed here refers to a personal collection. These documents are the private property of Pliny the Elder, passed on to his cousin. Second, there is an element of conciseness to these opisthographs. Not only in the fact that they contain writing on both sides, but also because they are written in a small script and consist of selected passages. In antiquity the term opisthograph has been used in a variety of ways. Manfredo Manfredi has demonstrated that in Greek scribal culture opisthograph could refer both to a scroll on which the same text continues on the reverse side, and to a 'reused' scroll on which a different text was written on its verso.⁴ A manuscript that contains writing on the backside seems to have been uncommon enough to warrant the use of a specific term, so that ancient scribes and scholars could distinguish between opisthographs and other types of manuscripts.

The term continued to be used in Renaissance and Early Modern Europe. Erasmus (1466–1536) uses it in his letter to George Spalatin in 1519, where it seems to refer to the text on the reverse side of a letter.⁵ The Italian scholar Giglio Gregorio Giraldi (1479–1552) writes about *opisthographi libelli*, when he refers to something like a "handwritten book for private use with annotations, first drafts and excerpts."⁶ As far as could be traced back, its earliest occurrence in the English language was in Henry Cockeram's *English Dictionarie*, where it is defined as "a booke written on the back side."⁷

The origin of the term opisthograph is clearly rooted in classical history, but that does not mean that the practice was unknown elsewhere in the ancient Mediterranean world. Even though in Hebrew literature there does not seem to have been a particular term that was deployed for writing on the reverse side of a manuscript, the practice most certainly did exist. Ezekiel 2:9–10 describes how God extends a scroll containing writing on both sides to Ezekiel and commands him to eat it before prophesying to the Israelites.⁸ Revelation 5:1 describes a similar scene and should probably be read as a reference to the

4 Manfredo Manfredi, "Opistografo," *Parola del Passato* 38 (1983): 44–54.

5 Letter 1001. Desiderius Erasmus, *Opus Epistolarum Des. Erasmi Roterodami*, vol. 4: 1519–1521, ed. Percy S. Allen and Heathcote W. Garrod (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1922). Cf. 'opisthographia' in *Dictionary of Renaissance Latin from Prose Sources*, ed. René Hoven, 2nd ed. (Leiden: Brill, 2006).

6 Karl A.E. Enekel, "The Making of 16th-century Mythography: Giraldi's *Syntagma de Musis* (1507, 1511 and 1539), *De deis gentium historia* (ca. 1500–1548) and Julien de Havrech's *De cognominibus deorum gentilium* (1541)," *Humanistica Lovaniensia* 51 (2002): 9–53, at 15.

7 Henry Cockeram, *The English Dictionarie: or, An Interpreter of Hard English Words* (1623; repr., New York: Huntington, 1930).

8 According to Exod 32:15 also the stone tablets of Moses would have been double-sided.

Ezekiel passage, as here too it is an opisthograph that functions as the medium to transmit secret and divine revelation.

The concept of opisthograph was used in antiquity to indicate the particular scribal practice of writing on the reverse side of a manuscript. Today the term has lost its function in everyday life, but it is still used in scholarship to refer to ancient manuscripts. What do modern scholars mean when they write about opisthographs? David Diringer in his study on the history of the book characterizes the opisthograph as an uncommon type of papyrus that contained text on its reverse side, or verso.⁹ He associates opisthographs with private use and rough copies, and places them in opposition to papyri that were for sale and of which only one side would have been used. Though in Graeco-Roman writing culture literary texts rarely seem to be written on both sides of a manuscript, Diringer does point to the relative frequency of opisthographs among papyri from Egypt.¹⁰

The papyrologist Eric Turner has argued that the term opisthograph should be used for manuscripts on which the text on the front side, the recto, would continue on the back side, the verso.¹¹ This is presumably the type of manuscript that Pliny was referring to in his letter to Baebius Macer. The continuation of the text on the back of a manuscript is what Turner refers to as ‘a true opisthograph.’ This definition is preferred by both Jean-Luc Fournet and William Johnson, the latter of which defines an opisthograph as a “bookroll where the text is written on both front (recto) and back (verso),” and specifically notes that the term “does not apply when both sides are written upon because the papyrus has been reused.”¹²

However, this definition is not really congruent with the application of the term in many scholarly publications. For example, the Words of the Luminaries manuscript 4Q504 would, if we follow Turner, have been the only true opisthograph from Qumran, because the scribe seems to have run out of writing material and finished his text on the reverse side of the scroll. However, Maurice Baillet does not use the term in his publication of the manuscript in DJD 7, and

9 David Diringer, *The Book before Printing: Ancient, Medieval and Oriental* (New York: Dover, 1982), 137–138.

10 Diringer, *The Book before Printing*, 138.

11 Eric G. Turner, “The Terms Recto and Verso: The Anatomy of the Papyrus Roll,” in *Actes du xve Congrès International de Papyrologie*, vol. 1, ed. Jean Bingen and Georges Nachtergaele (Brussels: Fondation Égyptologique Reine Élisabeth, 1978), 8–10.

12 Jean-Luc Fournet, “Papyrus, Greco-Roman Period,” in *The Encyclopedia of Ancient History*, ed. Roger S. Bagnall et al. (Malden: Wiley-Blackwell, 2013), 5057–5058; Johnson, *Bookrolls and Scribes*, 342.

4Q504 is also not included in most of the different lists of opisthographs from Qumran that have been published throughout the years.¹³

The notion of opisthograph is more consistently used within Qumran scholarship for manuscripts which bear a different text on the verso.¹⁴ Also outside the study of the Judean Desert manuscripts, scholars often use the term for a scroll on which we find different texts on either side. This is the type of manuscript for which, for example, Larry Hurtado, AnneMarie Luijendijk, and Paul Foster use the term within New Testament studies.¹⁵

From this brief overview we can observe that there are two concurrent definitions of opisthograph used within scholarship, depending on whether it concerns the same composition or different texts on either side.¹⁶ In this study, I

13 The first of these lists was published by Michael Wise in 1994 and contains 16 opisthographs: Michael O. Wise, "Accidents and Accidence: A Scribal View of Linguistic Dating of the Aramaic Scrolls from Qumran," in *Thunder in Gemini: And Other Essays on the History, Language and Literature of Second Temple Palestine*, JSPSup 15 (Sheffield: JSOT, 1994), 103–151, at 133.

Emanuel Tov has published one in 1999 (14 opisthographs), and one in 2004 (21 opisthographs): Emanuel Tov, "Opisthographs from the Judean Desert," in *A Multiform Heritage: Studies on Early Judaism and Christianity in Honor of Robert A. Kraft*, ed. Ben G. Wright (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1999), 11–18; idem, *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert*, STDJ 54 (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 295–297. He does refer to 4Q504 as an opisthograph at *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 109 n. 145.

George Brooke lists in total 32 opisthographs (which includes 16 tefillin): George J. Brooke, "Between Scroll and Codex? Reconsidering the Qumran Opisthographs," in *On Stone and Scroll: Essays in Honour of Graham Ivor Davies*, ed. James K. Aitken, Katharine J. Dell, and Brian A. Mastin, BZAW 420 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2011), 123–138, at 126–127.

Daniel K. Falk and Antony Perrot do mention 4Q504 in their recent overviews of the Qumran opisthographs: Daniel K. Falk, "Material Aspects of Prayer Manuscripts at Qumran," in *Literature or Liturgy? Early Christian Hymns and Prayers in their Literary and Liturgical Context in Antiquity*, ed. Clemens Leonhard and Hermut Löhr, WUNT 363 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014), 33–88, at 45–56; Antony Perrot, "Reading an Opisthograph at Qumran," in *Material Aspects of Reading in Ancient and Medieval Cultures: Materiality, Presence and Performance*, ed. Anna Krauß, Jonas Leipziger and Friederike Schücking-Jungblut, MTK 26 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2020), 101–114.

14 See for example Jonathan Ben-Dov, Asaf Gayer, and Eshbal Ratzon, *Material and Digital Reconstruction of Fragmentary Dead Sea Scrolls: The Case of 4Q418a*, STDJ 136 (Leiden: Brill, 2022), 57.

15 Larry W. Hurtado, *The Earliest Christian Artifacts: Manuscripts and Christian Origins* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006), 31–32; AnneMarie Luijendijk, "Sacred Scriptures as Trash: Biblical Papyri from Oxyrhynchus," *VC* 64 (2010): 217–254; Paul Foster, "Papyrus Oxyrhynchus x 1224," in *Early Christian Manuscripts: Examples of Applied Method and Approach*, ed. Thomas J. Kraus and Tobias Nicklas, TENTS 5 (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 59–96, at 60–61.

16 Tiziano Dorandi distinguishes between an ancient understanding of 'opisthograph' that

will refrain from adopting one over the other and employ the term in its broadest sense, referring to both manuscripts on which the text of the recto continues on the verso, and manuscripts that contain different compositions on either side.¹⁷

2 Recto and Verso on Ancient Papyri

The terms *recto* and *verso* have been used in different ways to describe the two sides of a manuscript.¹⁸ Within the field of papyrology, the *recto* is considered to be the side on which the fibres of the papyrus plant run horizontally, parallel to the text. On the *verso* we often find the text written across the fibres, or *trans-versa charta*, because the layers of the papyrus plant with the fibres running in opposite directions would be pressed together to solidify the manuscript.

A common assumption is that the text found on the *verso* would be of secondary importance in the eyes of the scribes involved in the writing process, and that the second scribe reused the manuscript because the first, original text ceased to be of interest to him.¹⁹ There is good reason for this assumption. By far the majority of the papyri that survived contain writing on only the *recto*. This applies to many of the major papyrus collections from the ancient world, such as Oxyrhynchus, Herculaneum, and the discoveries from the Judean Desert. The reason for this is presumably that it would have been smoother to write

denotes “either a roll with a text which continued from the *recto* to the *verso* (...) or a roll with a text on the back of the papyrus,” and modern usage of the term, where ‘opisthograph’ is “used only when a papyrus roll or a roll fragment consisting of only one leaf had new text written on the *verso* shortly after the inscribing of the *recto*, usually without bearing any relation to the latter.” Tiziano Dorandi, “Opisthographos,” *BNP*.

- 17 A type of manuscript that will be excluded from this study concerns the loose leaves from codices that survived separate from the codex they were once a part of. Such a sheet may often look like an opisthograph to our eyes, but would probably have been something very different for ancient scribes and readers. The transition of scroll to codex has been a continuous subject for discussion, but in general we may assume that codices would have invited other forms of engagement than scrolls or sheets, if only because in the case of a codex different individual texts are generally embedded within a larger text-bearing artefact. See Colin H. Roberts and Theodore C. Skeat, *The Birth of the Codex* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983); Hurtado, *The Earliest Christian Artifacts*, 43–93; Brooke, “Between Scroll and Codex.”
- 18 The main difference in scholarly use occurs where the terms are defined by the content of the texts or by the physical properties of the material: Turner, “The Terms *Recto* and *Verso*.”
- 19 Florian Coulmas, “Opisthograph,” in *Blackwell Encyclopedia of Writing Systems* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1996), 371.

on the recto (along the fibres of the papyrus plant) than on the verso (across the fibres). However, what this practice signifies in relation to the scribe's or scribes' attitudes to the different texts of a manuscript is not entirely clear.

Some papyrologists simply assume that the text on the recto must have been written first, but this seems problematic in some regards. After all, we also have cases of papyri where the papyrological recto is left blank and only the verso with vertical fibres contains writing. P.Oxy. 1228, which is dated to the late third century CE, for example preserves fragments of two columns from the Gospel of John on the verso while the recto is blank.²⁰ A number of these manuscripts are also found among the Aramaic documents from Elephantine. The presence of such papyri problematizes the assumption to automatically date the text on the recto of an opisthograph as the oldest text.

It is true that establishing the direction of the fibres cannot be used on its own as a decisive (relative) dating method, but it is at least an indication that can be used alongside other evidence. This is apparent from comparative evidence. In his study on the time interval between writing on both sides of Greek papyri, Eric Turner concluded that the verso was usually inscribed between 1 and 100 years after the text on the recto had been written down, with the majority occurring within the first 25 years.²¹ This inquiry was based on 40 papyrus opisthographs from a variety of collections (15 of which originated from Oxyrhynchus), each containing an official document on the recto. As a general rule of thumb, we can assume that ancient scribes would start writing on the side with fibres in horizontal direction, which seems to have made it so easy to write straight that additional ruling was often not necessary.²² Nevertheless, in order to establish this with confidence for individual manuscripts, we would be required to date the texts on either side of the scroll on palaeographic grounds as well and provide a general assessment of the materiality of the manuscript.

20 Bernard P. Grenfell and Arthur S. Hunt, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, vol. 10 (London: Egypt Exploration Fund, 1914), 14–16.

21 Eric G. Turner, "Recto and Verso," *JEA* 40 (1954): 102–106.

22 Emanuel Tov, "Corpus of the Qumran Papyri," in *Semitic Papyrology in Context: A Climate of Creativity. Papers from a New York University Conference Marking the Retirement of Baruch A. Levine*, ed. Lawrence H. Schiffman, *CHANE* 14 (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 85–103, at 97. Turner is not familiar with any horizontal or vertical ruling in literary papyri from Egypt, except occasionally in school exercises: Eric G. Turner, *Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World*, ed. Peter J. Parsons, 2nd ed. (London: Institute of Classical Studies, 1987), 6. William Johnson however has identified a group of 13 papyri from Oxyrhynchus for which he argued that dots were used to arrange column alignment: Johnson, *Bookrolls and Scribes in Oxyrhynchus*, 93–99.

3 Opisthographic Practices in the Dead Sea Scrolls

We can now turn our attention to Qumran and ask which types of opisthographic manuscripts we exactly encounter among the Dead Sea Scrolls. We have observed above that there is a variety in the ways in which the term opisthograph has been applied, especially with regard to the distinction between manuscripts that bear one continuous text or different compositions on either side. Within the field of Qumran studies this has led to different categorisations.²³

Of particular importance for our purposes and for the research questions outlined in the introduction are those opisthographs that contain different literary compositions on either side. However, these texts were not composed and transmitted in isolation. They emerged within a textual culture and, as such, circulated in a context or in a relationship with other manuscripts. It is therefore important to analyse the opisthographs that carry literary compositions against the backdrop of other, similar opisthographic practices that may have been documented. The present section aims to provide an overview of the body of materials under consideration, in order to appreciate the significance of these manuscripts in terms of their scribal setting, usage, and potential circulation. The following sections will offer concise discussions of each of these individual manuscripts.

The opisthographs from Qumran can broadly be subdivided between several categories. The first group concerns the difficult group of unidentified manuscripts. This is a small set of three scrolls that are too fragmentary to assess the character of the texts they preserve (see table 1 below).

The second category is made up of two types of manuscripts that do contain some writing on the reverse side, but that are nevertheless generally not classified as opisthographs (also not according to our definition above): the tefillin and a group of manuscripts that carries a title on the reverse side.

The tefillin are physical objects, usually small leather cases, in which a leather slip would be placed containing passages from scripture. According to Rabbinic practice these leather cases would have to be worn on the head and arm. At least 17 of the leather strips identified to be tefillin are opisthographs: that is, they contain text on both the recto and verso.²⁴

23 Though the lists of opisthographs from Qumran presented by Wise, Tov, Brooke, Falk, and Perrot overlap to a large extent, the exact numbers are different. Only Brooke, for example, includes the tefillin in his classification, while only Falk and Perrot mention the 'true' opisthograph 4Q504. Cf. section 1.1.

24 For unclear reasons George Brooke does list 4Q139 (4QPhyl L) and 4Q141 (4QPhyl N) as

TABLE 1 Unidentified opisthographic manuscripts

1Q70	10 papyrus fragments in a cursive hand
4Q250	Fragments containing cryptic writing
4Q518/4Q519	68 fragments bearing a literary composition

TABLE 2 Opisthographic tefillin from Qumran

4Q128 (4QPhyl A)	4Q138 (4QPhyl K)
4Q129 (4QPhyl B)	4Q140 (4QPhyl M)
4Q131 (4QPhyl D)	4Q142 (4QPhyl O)
4Q132 (4QPhyl E)	4Q143 (4QPhyl P)
4Q133 (4QPhyl F)	4Q144 (4QPhyl Q)
4Q134 (4QPhyl G)	4Q145 (4QPhyl R)
4Q135 (4QPhyl H)	4Q148 (4QPhyl U)
4Q136 (4QPhyl I)	XQPhyl Slip 4
4Q137 (4QPhyl J)	

The third category concerns manuscripts where the title of the composition is written on the verso of the scroll. Though these manuscripts are not seen as opisthographs in the traditional sense, they do share the practice of carrying text on both sides. Emanuel Tov distinguishes five instances of this scribal practice, but some have been disputed.

Let us now turn to the central body of this study: the manuscripts from Qumran that traditionally have been classified as opisthographs. We can subdivide these opisthographs into four groups: one opisthograph with continuous text on both sides, opisthographs with documentary texts on the recto and verso, opisthographs with a literary text on the recto and a documentary text on the

opisthographs as well, but the versos of these slips are blank. See PAM images 43.455 (4Q139) and 43.457 (4Q141). Also, Józef Milik and Yehudah Cohn do not observe text on the versos; Brooke, "Between Scroll and Codex," 127; Roland de Vaux and Józef T. Milik, *Qumrân grotte 4.11*, DJD 6 (Oxford: Clarendon, 1977), 70, 72–74; Yehudah B. Cohn, *Tangled Up in Text: Tefillin and the Ancient World*, BJS 361 (Providence: Brown Judaic Studies, 2008), 65. See also Emanuel Tov, "The Tefillin from the Judean Desert and the Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible," in *Is There a Text in This Cave? Studies in the Textuality of the Dead Sea Scrolls in Honour of George J. Brooke*, ed. Ariel Feldman, Maria Cioată, and Charlotte Hempel, STDJ 119 (Leiden: Brill, 2017), 277–292.

TABLE 3 Manuscripts carrying titles on the verso

4Q249	Title written on the verso of probably the first inscribed sheet ^a
4Q504	Title written on the verso of the first inscribed sheet
1QS	Title written on the verso of the 'handle sheet' of the scroll
4QGen ^h -title	Title probably written on the recto or verso of the 'handle sheet' of a scroll ^b
4Q257	Something, probably a title, written on the verso of frag. 1

a Because of the fragmentary condition of this manuscript we do not know at which fragment the text exactly starts.

b The title is written on the hair side. James R. Davila suggests that this concerns the back of an opening handle sheet, but it could also be the recto of the first fragment of the manuscript; Eugene C. Ulrich and Frank Moore Cross, *Qumran Cave 4.VII: Genesis to Numbers*, DJD 12 (Oxford: Clarendon, 1994), 63.

verso, and finally opisthographs with literary texts on the recto and verso. The exact distinction between 'literary' and 'documentary' texts can be difficult to make and has regularly led to scholarly confusion. A case in point can be found in the genre of speeches. Public speeches and rhetorics have been preserved across different ancient literatures, but they often defy our textual classifications. A speech can be regarded as a form of literature but also as an administrative statement, depending on its literary context and whether or not the speech was actually given.²⁵ Here, I will follow the Italian classicist and papyrologist Italo Gallo, who defines documentary papyri as "concerning all aspects of everyday life, from letters to contracts, laws, record-books, lists, and so on."²⁶

Only one manuscript from Qumran, 4Q504, concerns a 'true' opisthograph with a single continuous composition on both the recto and verso. This indicates that this practice was very uncommon; it appears that if the scribes behind the Dead Sea Scrolls 'reused' the backside of a manuscript they preferred to do so for a different text. Interestingly, 4Q504 was already mentioned above because the title דברי המאורות was written on the reverse side.

From this overview we may surmise that the Dead Sea Scrolls opisthographs display quite some variation in the types of texts that were written down together on each side. We find literary opisthographs, documentary opisthographs, and a combination of the two with a literary text on the front. The only

25 Johannes Kramer, "Papyrologie: eine interdisziplinäre Altertumswissenschaft," in *Von der Papyrologie zur Romanistik*, *Archiv für Papyrusforschung und verwandte Gebiete* 30 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2011), 15–25, at 17.

26 Italo Gallo, *Greek and Latin Papyrology* (London: Institute of Classical Studies, 1986), 2.

TABLE 4 Qumran opisthographs

Opisthograph with continuous text on both sides	– 4Q504
Documentary text on recto and verso	– 4Q343 – 4Q345 – 4Q342 (disputed)
Literary text on recto and documentary text on verso	– 4Q201/4Q338 ^a – 4Q460 frag. 9/4Q350 – 4Q324/4Q355
Literary texts on recto and verso	– 4Q415/4Q414 – 4Q433a/4Q255 – 4Q499/4Q497 – 4Q503/4Q512 – 4Q509/4Q496/4Q506

a 4Q338 does not concern a documentary list in its traditional sense, but rather what seems to be a genealogical list based on Genesis 5. Cf. section 1.9.

type of manuscript that is not present is an opisthograph with a literary text on the back of a documentary text. The Dead Sea Scrolls differ in this regard from other ancient collections where this combination of types of texts is quite widely attested.²⁷ In the subsequent paragraphs we will consider each of these categories of documentary opisthographs from Qumran.

4 Unidentified Opisthographic Manuscripts

We will first briefly turn to three manuscripts (or perhaps: groups of fragments that were assembled together) that could not be identified because their state of preservation was too poor: 1Q70, 4Q250, and 4Q518/519.

- 1Q70 consists of 32 small papyrus fragments (33 if we follow Milik and include the fragment of 1Q70^{bis} to this manuscript as well), of which fragments 1–10 are opisthographic.²⁸ This papyrus is of a particular palaeographic importance because, in Milik's view, 1Q70 would have been the first example of a Jewish cursive manuscript. This concerns the verso all fragments, except frags. 13–19, where the cursive is found on the recto. Milik

27 Turner discusses a number of cases in Turner, "Recto and Verso."

28 Milik, DJD 1:148–149, 155. Tov (probably accidentally) mentions 1Q70 in a list of leather documents: Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 70.

distinguishes five different hands for 1Q70, of which the opisthographic fragments would have been written by two scribes: frags. 1–6 and 7–10.²⁹ However, this is difficult to establish with certainty. It cannot be excluded that some (or all) of these fragments belong to other opisthographic papyri. The few words that can be discerned suggest that at least some of these opisthographs are of a literary character.

- 4Q250 concerns the opisthographic fragments from a large group of papyrus fragments from Cave 4 that carry cryptic writing.³⁰ It is unclear how many compositions 4Q250 contains, though Pfann distinguishes 11 (4Q250, 4Q250 a–j), many of which are represented by only one or two tiny fragments.³¹ Pfann published 4Q250a as 4Qpap cryptA Text Concerning Cultic Service B?, and 4Q250b as 4Qpap cryptA Text Related to Isaiah 11, but the text on the other fragments remain unidentified.³²
- 4Q518/519 consists of 68 papyrus fragments, but much like 1Q70 they could belong to one or more other opisthographic manuscripts.³³ The composition is in Hebrew. The reconstruction of words such as שְׁוֹדֵר (frag. 32) and שְׁוֹדֵר (frag. 40) suggest a literary text, but little else can be remarked about it. Both Falk and Brooke point to the different scribal hands on recto and verso and to their different orientation, which does suggest that they represent different manuscripts.³⁴

5 Qumran Tefillin

The tefillin or phylacteries are excluded from most studies about opisthographs from Qumran.³⁵ This has to do with the fact that tefillin are not considered to be

29 Milik, DJD 1:148–149. This suggestion is also put forward in Wise, “Accidents and Accidence,” 130 n. 85; Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar, “The Material Variance of the Dead Sea Scrolls: On Texts and Artefacts,” *HTS Teologiese Studies/Theological Studies* 72 (2016): 1–6, at 4 n. 9.

30 The group also includes the fragments attributed to 4Q249: Stephen Pfann, *Qumran Cave 4.XXVI: Cryptic Texts*; Philip S. Alexander et al., *Miscellanea, Part 1*, DJD 36 (Oxford: Clarendon, 2000), 515–701.

31 Falk notes that at least 4Q250 is not a real opisthograph, but that the text on the recto only concerns traces of ink from another papyrus layer. This might be the case for other fragments from 4Q250 as well: Falk, “Material Aspects of Prayer Manuscripts,” 45–46.

32 Pfann, DJD 36:680–682.

33 4Q518/4Q519 was published by Baillet in DJD 7:304–309.

34 Brooke, “Between Scroll and Codex,” 133 n. 61. Falk notes at least three different hands: Falk, “Material Aspects of Prayer Manuscripts,” 48 n. 56.

35 Interestingly, Tov does not list the tefillin in his appendix ‘Opisthographs from the Judean Deasert,’ but does discuss them in his discussion of opisthographs and palimpsests: Tov,

scrolls in the traditional sense of the term. The written texts are contained in a small leather box and cannot be consulted anymore when the tefillin is sealed. Nevertheless, the reason to include the tefillin in this study is two-fold. First, the tefillin are manuscripts in the sense that we are dealing with text-bearing artefacts. Some of them are, as we will see, undoubtedly opisthographic. In order to fully appreciate how to understand these opisthographs and the different reading practices related to them, all possible bodies of evidence should be taken into consideration. Second, the Qumran tefillin are the oldest examples that survived. They are the product of an intriguing scribal practice that may offer new perspectives on the circulation of manuscripts in the context of ritual. For these reasons, they deserve to be discussed here.

Tov lists in total 28 tefillin and 9 mezuzot from the Judean Desert.³⁶ The identification of the leather slips as tefillin or phylacteries is based on the 25 leather cases that were found, five of which still contained the leather slips inside.³⁷ Nevertheless, some reservation concerning their identification as tefillin is required, especially because of their uncertain provenance. These leather slips were sometimes discovered *in situ* by archaeologists, and sometimes they were purchased from the Bedouin that discovered the majority of the Dead Sea Scrolls and related artefacts.³⁸ The tefillin contain segments from Exodus and Deuteronomy, which is in accordance with Rabbinic practice.³⁹ The distinc-

Scribal Practices and Approaches, 68–73, 295–297. Also Michael Wise and Falk do not consider the tefillin as opisthographs: Wise, “Accidents and Accidence,” 133; Falk, “Material Aspects of Prayer Manuscripts,” 46.

36 25 of these tefillin would have originated from Qumran, 1 from Wadi Murabba’at, 1 from Nahal Hever, and 1 from Nahal Şe’elim. Of the mezuzot 8 would have originated from Qumran and 1 from Wadi Murabba’at: Emanuel Tov, “Categorized List of the ‘Biblical Texts,’” in *The Texts from the Judean Desert: Indices and an Introduction to the Discoveries in the Judean Desert Series*, DJD 39 (Oxford: Clarendon, 2002), 165–183, at 182–183.

The total number of tefilin and mezuzot however is contested because some illegible slips were ignored and others were grouped together as a single item. Yonatan Adler for example counts 23 leather tefillin cases from Qumran, while Yehuda Cohn’s overview includes as many as 45 leather slips from the Judean Desert that have been identified as either tefilin or mezuzot: Adler, “The Distribution of Tefillin Finds among the Judean Desert Caves”; Cohn, *Tangled Up in Text*, 55–102; idem, “Reading Material Features of Qumran Tefillin and Mezuzot,” in *Material Aspects of Reading in Ancient and Medieval Cultures*, 89–99.

37 Cohn, *Tangled Up in Text*, 56–59; idem, “Reading Material Features of Qumran Tefillin and Mezuzot,” 89–90.

38 Cohn, *Tangled Up in Text*, 59–60; Yonatan Adler, “The Distribution of Tefillin Finds among the Judean Desert Caves,” in *The Caves of Qumran*, 161–173.

39 Exodus 13:1–10; 11–16; Deuteronomy 6:4–9, 11:13–21. Some tefillin however carry different

tion between tefillin and mezuzot by scholars was based on material features: nine of the 45 leather slips were bigger, made of higher quality leather, and written in higher quality handwriting and were for that reason identified as mezuzot.⁴⁰ It has been argued that the scribes of the tefillin “may well have been unconcerned about the aesthetic features of tefillin slips,” because they could not have been read anyway as they were kept in their closed cases.⁴¹ Alternatively, because none of the cases or housings of mezuzot survived, it is also possible that the mezuzot were simply tefillin that were stored in larger cases.⁴²

At least 14 of the leather strips identified to be tefillin are opisthographs: that is, they contain text on both the recto and verso.⁴³ We do not know why both opisthographic and anopisthographic exemplars were produced. Because there is no mentioning in the Hebrew Bible of the verso of tefillin being inscribed as well, Tov assumes that the practice developed to save writing material and not for example as the result of a halakhic prescription.⁴⁴ The text on the verso of the tefillin is generally perpendicular to that of the recto, which means that the manuscript is flipped around and turned 90 degrees in a horizontal direction before the reverse side was penned down. The only exception to the perpendicular orientation is 4Q136 (4QPhyl I), where the leather slip is only flipped around, but not turned as well.

Milik observed that the perpendicular orientation that we encounter for the tefillin is throughout the Mediterranean world more common for papyri than for parchment manuscripts.⁴⁵ The most likely explanation for this is that by turning the manuscript 90 degrees the scribe would be able to write parallel to the fibres of the papyrus plant, which he could use as ruling lines. This advantage does not exist on leather. This scribal convention for the production of leather tefillin brings George Brooke to hypothesizing that the tefillin could

passages from these books. Hermann L. Strack and Günter Stemberger, *Introduction to the Talmud and Mishnah*, trans. Markus Bockmuehl, 2nd ed. (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996), 232; Cohn, *Tangled Up in Text*, 28–32, 65–67.

40 Cohn, *Tangled Up in Text*, 60–62; idem, “Reading Material Features of Qumran *Tefillin* and *Mezuzot*,” 90–91.

41 Cohn, “Reading Material Features of Qumran *Tefillin* and *Mezuzot*,” 91.

42 Cohn, *Tangled Up in Text*, 60, 62.

43 These are: 4Q128 (4QPhyl A), 4Q129 (4QPhyl B), 4Q134 (4QPhyl G), 4Q135 (4QPhyl H), 4Q136 (4QPhyl I), 4Q137 (4QPhyl J), 4Q138 (4QPhyl K), 4Q140 (4QPhyl M), 4Q142 (4QPhyl O), 4Q143 (4QPhyl P), 4Q144 (4QPhyl Q), 4Q145 (4QPhyl R), and 4Q148 (4QPhyl U), and XQPhyl Slip 4.

44 Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 70.

45 Milik, DJD 6:36.

have been written on papyrus in the past and that this practice survived the transition of the production of tefillin from papyrus to leather.⁴⁶

With regard to the palaeography of the Qumran tefillin published in DJD 6, Milik differentiates between two types of scribal hands: firstly, a number of tefillin is written in a literary hand. In this group we find one opisthograph: 4Q143 (4QPhyl P), both recto and verso indeed seem to be written in an early formal hand (“l’écriture presque calligraphique”).⁴⁷ The other opisthographic tefillin are all written in what Milik characterizes as a “remarkably constant semi-cursive,” which he calls “écriture de phylactère.”⁴⁸ The letterforms are rudimentary and often difficult to read, which is caused by occasional blotting of ink.⁴⁹ The letter size is tiny, to the degree that Falk calls it “micro-writing.”⁵⁰ The cursive elements might be an indication that the lines were written fast.⁵¹ It seems that both sides of the tefillin opisthographs are written by the same scribes. Due to their idiosyncratic script style it is difficult to date individual tefillin to a more narrow time frame than the second century BCE to the first century CE.⁵² A full palaeographic analysis of the tefillin thus far is missing: they are not discussed in the studies of the palaeography of the early Judean scripts by Cross, Joseph Naveh, or Émile Puech.⁵³

Brooke argued that “if the use of opisthographs is a reflection of personal use, then the Qumran tefillin, though hidden in cases, are artefacts that correspond

46 Brooke, “Between Scroll and Codex,” 131.

47 Milik, DJD 6:75.

48 Milik, DJD 6:37.

49 Milik was unable to decipher 4Q147 (4QPhyl T) and 4Q148 (4QPhyl U): DJD 6:37, 79. Preliminary editions of these two tefillin however have recently been published in Ariel Feldman and Faina Feldman, “4Q147: An Amulet?” *DSD* 26 (2019): 1–29; idem “4Q148 (4QPhylactère U): Another Amulet from Qumran?” *JSJ* 50 (2019): 197–222.

50 Falk, “Material Aspects of Prayer Manuscripts,” 77.

51 Peter T. Daniels, “A Calligraphic Approach to Aramaic Palaeography,” *JNES* 43 (1984): 55–68, at 59.

52 See also the discussion on the palaeography of the tefillin in Mladen Popović and Eibert Tigchelaar, “Assessing the Maresha Ostrakon as a Palaeographic Anchor Point for Dating the Nash Papyrus and Some of the Oldest Qumran Manuscripts,” *Forthcoming*.

53 Cross, “Development of the Jewish Scripts”; Joseph Naveh, *The Development of the Aramaic Script*, PIASH 5 (Jerusalem: Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1970); Puech, “La paléographie des manuscrits de la mer Morte.” The current research project “Comprehensive Analysis of the Ancient Tefillin Remains from the Judean Desert” by Yonatan Adler and Gemma Hayes aims to fill this scholarly lacuna. Hayes highlighted in private communication the remarkable diversity of the tefillin in terms of their scribal capacity, style, and typological dating: there are early and late examples written by both skilled and unskilled scribes.

with developments in private prayer.”⁵⁴ Falk has recently analysed the tefillin in the context of private textual artefacts. He concludes that the tefillin should be seen as personal copies on the basis of three reasons: (1) economy was a major concern in the production of the tefillin (more than size), (2) they seem to be made by an unskilled manufacturer, and (3) the lay-out and material features of the tefillin were very inconsistent.⁵⁵ Falk notes a difference in the aesthetics of the recto and verso that cannot be related to the content of the text. While the arrangement of the recto is quite orderly, the verso appears disorderly: the perpendicular orientation results in awkward columnisation, while the middle of the verso is often left blank, even when there is text on the top and the bottom of the slip.⁵⁶ The exact reason for their disorganized layout is unclear, and Falk argues that the “tefillin cannot be the product of professionals who are expert at producing tefillin.”⁵⁷ Some caution is warranted in this regard however. A disorganized layout does not necessarily have to mean that the scribe that produced the manuscript was unskilled: it can be difficult to determine whether sloppy writing is the result of a lack of professional training, or a conscious decision on the scribe’s part. Their disorderly production could be intentional. After all, the tefillin were never destined to be read, reviewed, or studied closely, which indicates that they most probably did not circulate as textual artefacts within reading communities. This quality sets them apart from the other opisthographic manuscripts discussed in chapter one and two, such as the literary opisthographs. The texts the tefillin bear were not intended to transfer meaning, but rather served a symbolic function. This means that it was not a problem if the tefillin were cramped and therefore difficult to read. Such an informally produced text on a small slip of leather probably drastically brought down financial costs, which suggests that tefillin could have been more affordable than regular scrolls. It is indeed possible that “*tefillin* and *mezuzot* may have been the only personal portions of scripture that many people had.”⁵⁸

Additional evidence for tefillin as private artefacts has been offered by Ariel Feldman and Faina Feldman. They inspected 4Q148, one of the two opisthographic leather slips that remained unpublished by Milik in DJD 6, and (tentatively) conclude that it indeed seems to have been a tefillin-like amulet.⁵⁹

54 Brooke, “Between Scroll and Codex,” 137.

55 Falk, “Material Aspects of Prayer Manuscripts,” 77–78.

56 Falk, “Material Aspects of Prayer Manuscripts,” 78.

57 Falk, “Material Aspects of Prayer Manuscripts,” 80.

58 Stephen Reed, “Physical Features of Excerpted Torah Texts,” in *Jewish and Christian Scripture as Artifact and Canon*, ed. Craig A. Evans and H. Daniel Zacharias, LSTS 70 (London: T&T Clark, 2009), 82–104, at 98.

59 Feldman and Feldman, “4Q148 (4QPhylactère U): Another Amulet from Qumran.”

Feldman and Feldman argue that the verso of the slip probably contained a legal document (a will seems a likely possibility), which probably would have been written before the literary text on the recto.⁶⁰ They offer a number of possible reconstructions, but all include the act of reusing a legal text for the manufacturing of a tefillin-like amulet. It seems very unlikely that a professional scribe would use someone's personal will in the production of a tefillin. Taking these different considerations in mind when examining the tefillin's materiality, palaeography, and their hypothesized function as devices to support prayer, it seems probable that the opisthographic tefillin were private artefacts.

6 Manuscripts Carrying Titles on the Verso

Among the Dead Sea Scrolls there are a number of manuscripts where the title of the composition is written on the verso of the scroll. Tov lists two instances of titles written on the verso of the first inscribed sheet (4Q249 and 4Q504), and two instances of the titles written on the so-called 'handle sheet' of the manuscript (1QS and 4QGen^{h-title}).⁶¹ The handle sheet was the protective sheet that could be stitched to the first inscribed sheet of the manuscript, much like the *protocollon* from the classical world.⁶² This handle sheet served a number of purposes: it serves as an outside layer of protection against deterioration, it facilitates readers to hold and navigate the manuscript without touching the actual inscribed text, and in the Byzantine period the sheet could be used to describe the contents of the scroll or provide bibliographical information.⁶³

In addition to these four instances, Tov includes a fifth manuscript where a title could have been written on the verso: 4Q257, 4QpapSerekh ha-Yahad'.⁶⁴ On the back of the first fragment, 12.4 centimetres from the right edge of this

60 Feldman and Feldman, "4Q148 (4QPhylactère U): Another Amulet from Qumran," 211–213.

61 Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 120–121.

62 Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 114. On different forms of handle sheets: Emanuel Tov, "Scribal Aspects of the Manufacturing and Writing of the Qumran Scrolls," in *Jewish Manuscript Cultures: New Perspectives*, ed. Irina Wandrey, SMC 13 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2017), 29–48.

63 Eric G. Turner, *Greek Papyri: An Introduction* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1968), 5; Hartmut Stegemann, "How to Connect Dead Sea Scrolls Fragments," in *Understanding the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. Hershel Shanks (New York: Vintage Books, 1993) 245–255, at 250; Michael B. Johnson, "Getting a Handle on 1QIsaiah^b: A New Proposal for the So-Called Handle Sheet of 1QHodayot^a," *DSD* 29 (2022): 1–26.

64 Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 121.

papyrus scroll, a few poorly legible letters are written down.⁶⁵ Philip Alexander and Géza Vermes in their principal edition read כִּיבו and לִיֹס, but Stephen Pfann proposed a reading of ל [חד]הי סרכ, which implies that the verso would have carried the title of the Community Rule.⁶⁶ However, the reading of the verso of 4Q257 is too insecure to determine with any certainty what it would have read. We may add here that Alexander and Vermes do remark that “the hand is clearly different from that on the recto.”⁶⁷ Therefore, if the text on the verso does not read the title of 4Q257, it probably concerns a different text and not a continuation of the text on the recto. We will now briefly consider each of the four manuscripts (4Q249, 4Q504, 1QS, and 4QGen^{h-title}) that bear a title on the verso.

- 4Q249 concerns the cryptic manuscript of Midrash Sefer Moshe. On the verso of the first column of the scroll we find the title written in an ordinary square script (so not in cryptic): מדרש ספר מושה. The writing direction is perpendicular to the text on the recto, following the papyrus fibres. Pfann dates this manuscript to no later than the first half of the second century BCE, but this date is based on only the letterforms of the eleven letters of the title and remains therefore very insecure.⁶⁸ However, the palaeographic analyses by Ben-Dov and Stökl Ben Ezra argued for not one but two scribes that would have penned the manuscript around 100 BCE.⁶⁹ C14 datings of the manuscript published in 1995 resorted to a two sigma dating to 242 BCE–6 CE.⁷⁰ 4Q249 is not the only cryptic text with the title written in the square script: the first line of 4Q298 gives the title in the square script, which was dated by Pfann to the Late Hasmonean or Early Herodian Period (50–1 BCE).⁷¹ It seems plausible that the writing down of titles of cryptic manuscripts in the square script played a role in the storage of the scrolls in antiquity, but this remains speculation.
- 4Q504 is one of the two manuscripts of Words of the Luminaries and carries the title on the verso of frag. 8: דברי המארות, which is written in perpendic-

65 Alexander and Vermes, DJD 26:65–82.

66 Alexander and Vermes, DJD 26:69–70; Stephen Pfann, DJD 35:1.

67 Alexander and Vermes, DJD 26:69.

68 Pfann, DJD 35:5–6.

69 Jonathan Ben-Dov and Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra, “4Q249 Midrash Moshe: A New Reading and Some Implications,” *DSD* 21 (2014): 131–149.

70 A.J. Timothy Jull, Douglas J. Donahue, Magen Broshi, and Emanuel Tov, “Radiocarbon Dating of Scrolls and Linen Fragments from the Judean Desert,” *Radiocarbon* 37 (1995): 11–19, at 14. This two sigma range has a probability of 92%, the second two sigma dating (380–354 BCE) has a probability of 8%.

71 Pfann, DJD 20:7–9.

ular direction. The column on the recto is generally taken to be the start of the composition. The title seems to be written in the same script style as the rest of the composition, but by a different scribe that wrote in a more angular fashion. Baillet leaves open the possibility that the title might have been added slightly later.⁷²

- 1QS carries the title [...][סר] הַיְיחַד וּמִן, “Rule of the Community and of” on the verso of the handle sheet, which was stitched to the first sheet of 1QS. The title is written perpendicular to the main composition and seems to be written in the same style. The addition of the preposition “מִן” is intriguing, possibly referring to the addition of 1QSa and 1QSB in the same manuscript.⁷³ It is unlikely that the “מִן” used to be part of the title of the Rule of the Community, because it is not present in the other attestations of the title (1QS col. 1, 1, 16; 4Q255 1, 1; 4Q256 2, 1).
- 4QGen^{h-title}, 4Q8c, is a small leather fragment that is grouped together with three other small manuscripts that are related to Genesis.⁷⁴ This fragment only reads the word בְּרִשִׁית, which is written in the middle of the fragment. Davila notes that the word occurs on the hair side of the manuscript, with the flesh side left blank. Because most scrolls were only inscribed on the hair side it is possible that this manuscript is not an opisthograph, but used to have a handle sheet with a title on the recto. Tov however speculates that the title was written on the verso of the manuscript.⁷⁵

In the case of 4Q249, 4Q504, and 1QS the title was written perpendicular to the script on the recto of the manuscript. This means that when these scrolls were rolled up and placed on a table or shelf the title could be read. This is less clear for 4QGen^h, where we do not know the orientation of the text following the title.

The inclusion of the titles on the verso could be an indication of library practices as they were intended “to help in the storage and retrieval of the scrolls.”⁷⁶ The presence of these titles is not an exclusively Judaean scribal phenomenon. Though the practice of writing titles either at the beginning of a text (*inscriptions*) or at the end of a text (*subscriptions*) is more widely attested, titles on

72 Baillet, DJD 7:138.

73 Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 120–121.

74 James R. Davila, DJD 12:61–64.

75 Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 120.

76 Sidnie W. Crawford, “Where Are All the Colophons? Colophons in the Ancient Near East and in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *Mighty Baal: Essays in Honor of Mark S. Smith*, ed. Stephen C. Russell and Esther J. Hamori, HSS 66 (Leiden: Brill, 2020), 101–118, at 111. See also Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 120–121.

TABLE 5 Opisthographs in the Leuven Database of Ancient Books

	Collection inventory No.	TM No.	Text on recto
1	P.Oxy. 2358	59063	Alcaeus, Unknown composition
2	P.Oxy. 2741	59787	Eupolis, <i>Maricas</i>
3	Zürich 1894	51507	Legal Contract
4	P.Herc 339	62406	Philodemus, <i>On the Stoics</i>
5	P.Ryl. 1 19	62836	Theopompus, <i>Philippica</i>
6	P.Oxy. 407	64310	Amulet with prayer
7	P.Laur. 3 56	65567	Unknown literary text
8	P.Acad. Inv. Nr. 6d	69033	Medical prescription
9	P.CtYBR inv. 4006	69034	Unknown literary text? (?)
10	P.Mich.inv. 3589	107778	Psalm 115
11	Private collection	107787	Theodorus, Letter
12	P.Chester Beatty Ac. 1495	108131	Horsiesios, Letter 4

the back scrolls can also be found in Graeco-Roman manuscript traditions.⁷⁷ This would have made it easier to identify the right manuscript when the scroll was rolled up. Mario Capasso and Menico Caroli explore different examples of these manuscripts from Egypt and Italy.⁷⁸ It is unclear if the title would have been immediately visible on the outside of the scroll. Capasso suggests that the title was covered by the left margin of the scroll to prevent deterioration from direct contact with the surface on which the scroll was placed.⁷⁹ The Leuven Database of Ancient Books lists a total of 12 examples of such manuscripts,

77 Among the Herculaneum papyri titles were generally placed at the end of the text: Guglielmo Cavallo, *Libri scritte scribi a Ercolano: Introduzione allo studio dei materiali greci*, Supplements to *CErc* 13 (Naples: Gaetano Macchiaroli, 1983), 22.

In addition to *inscriptions*, *subscriptions*, and titles on the verso, manuscripts could also have been provided with a *sillybon*: a small piece of papyrus or leather with the author and title that would be attached to the edge of the scroll: George W. Houston, *Inside Roman Libraries: Book Collections and Their Management in Antiquity* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2014), 9–10.

78 Mario Capasso, “I titoli nei papiri ercolanesi. III: i titoli esterni (PHerc 339, 1491 e “scorza” non identificata),” in *Atti del 11 convegno nazionale di egittologia e papirologia, Siracusa, 1–3 dicembre 1995* (Siracusa: Istituto internazionale del papiro, 1996), 137–155; Menico Caroli, *Il titolo iniziale nel rotolo librario greco-egizio: Con un catalogo delle testimonianze iconografiche greche e di area Vesuviana* (Bari: Levante, 2007), 23–28, 133–173.

79 Capasso, “I titoli nei papiri ercolanesi. III: i titoli esterni,” 149.

which suggests that noting a title on the papyrological verso was a shared practice across different collections and writing cultures:⁸⁰

7 Opisthograph with Continuous Text on Both Sides: 4Q504

Above, we briefly reflected on Turner's notion of the 'true opisthograph,' which he defines as a "continuation of same text on back."⁸¹ This understanding is shared by scholars such as Fournet and Johnson and applies to single sheets and scrolls, but also to, for example, ostraca and codices. Among the Dead Sea Scrolls only one such opisthograph has been preserved: the leather scroll 4Q504, 4QWords of the Luminaries. Esther G. Chazon's proposed reconstruction preserves about half of the original manuscript.⁸² It seems clear that both sides of the scroll were to be used simultaneously.

Frag. 8 of this manuscript carries דברי המארות on its back: generally translated as Words of the Luminaries, and understood to be the title of the composition. In addition to this title, we also encounter ten partially preserved lines on the verso of frag. 2. These lines are found at the outer edge of the fragment and appear to be a continuation of column VII on the recto of the fragment.⁸³ This lay-out would allow anyone wielding the scroll to continue reading by simply flipping the manuscript around in horizontal direction. 4Q504 is not mentioned in the lists of Qumran opisthographs by Tov and Wise, though Tov does refer to 4Q504 as an opisthograph elsewhere.⁸⁴ Falk does discuss 4Q504 as an example of a continuous opisthograph and argues that the scribe made a mistake in determining the size of the scroll and had to finish the column on the backside.⁸⁵ The careless columnisation of 4Q504 together with the absence of a handling sheet or fly-leaf is reason for Falk to consider 4Q504 as a personal copy, a conclusion that is shared by Antony Perrot and Mika Pajunen.⁸⁶

80 I am grateful to Prof. Mark Depauw of KU Leuven for his kind help in identifying these manuscripts.

81 Turner, "The Terms Recto and Verso," 8–10. Turner provides a preliminary list of such opisthographs on page 60.

82 Baillet, DJD 7:137–168; Esther G. Chazon, "A Liturgical Document from Qumran and Its Implications: Words of the Luminaries" (Hebrew) (PhD diss., Hebrew University, 1991).

83 This part of the composition preserves the prayer dedicated to Sabbath, as evidenced by the liturgical opening in column 7 line 4: הודות ביום השבת.

84 Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 295–297; Wise, "Accidents and Accidence," 133. In general the opisthograph nature of 4Q504 seems to have been largely overlooked: Falk, "Material Aspects of Prayer Manuscripts," 45–46.

85 Falk, "Material Aspects of Prayer Manuscripts," 51.

86 Perrot, "Reading an Opisthograph at Qumran," 103–104; Mika S. Pajunen, "Reading Psalm

The discussion of 4Q504 allows us to finally turn to the manuscripts that are traditionally understood to be opisthographs: scrolls that contain (parts) of different compositions on either side. A significant number of these carry documentary texts. These documentary opisthographs can be subdivided into two groups: manuscripts that carry documentary texts on both sides, and manuscripts that contain a documentary text on the verso of a literary text.

8 Documentary Opisthographs

The first group consists of three opisthographs: 4Q343, 4Q342, and 4Q345. It should be noted that the provenance of these manuscripts is insecure; scholars have proposed that they did not derive from Qumran at all.⁸⁷

- 4Q343, 4QLetter nab, was most probably a sheet made of leather of which only one fragment survived.⁸⁸ The recto consists of nine lines, and the verso of six lines that are written perpendicularly to the recto. Both recto and verso seem to be written by the same hand, which Ada Yardeni dates to “an early phase in the evolution of the Nabatean script, perhaps from the middle of the first century BCE.”⁸⁹ The text on both sides concerns a Nabatean Aramaic letter or economic document, the exact topic of which is unclear.⁹⁰ It seems probable that both sides of the manuscript are part of the same continuous text. Aramaic letters written on leather are usually not opisthographs, but Lutz Doering suggests that in the case of 4Q343 the scribe might not have had the space to continue anywhere else apart from the verso.⁹¹

and Prayer Manuscripts from Qumran,” in *Material Aspects of Reading in Ancient and Medieval Cultures: Materiality, Presence and Performance*, ed. Anna Krauß, Jonas Leipziger and Friederike Schücking-Jungblut, *MTK* 26 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2020), 55–70, at 65.

87 Hannah M. Cotton and Ada Yardeni, *Aramaic, Hebrew, and Greek Documentary Texts from Nahal Hever and Other Sites, with an Appendix Containing Alleged Qumran Texts*, *DJD* 27 (Oxford: Clarendon, 1997), 283; Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 47. Hanan Eshel does argue that at least a few of the economic texts come from Qumran: Hanan Eshel, “4Q348, 4Q343 and 4Q345: Three Economic Documents from Qumran Cave 4?” *JJS* 52 (2001): 132–135. For a discussion of the provenance of 4Q342 and 4Q343 see also Lutz Doering, *Ancient Jewish Letters and the Beginnings of Christian Epistolography*, *WUNT* 298 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012), 47–54.

88 Yardeni, *DJD* 27:286–288.

89 Yardeni, *DJD* 27:286.

90 The official publication by Yardeni classified 4Q343 as a letter, though Hanan Eshel refers to the manuscript as an economic document, Eshel, “4Q348, 4Q343 and 4Q345.”

91 Bezalel Porten notes that when the recto would be full, the scribe would turn the manuscript 90 degrees and continue to write along the right margin: Bezalel Porten, “Aramaic Papyri and Parchments: A New Look,” *BA* 42 (1979): 74–104, at 92. The Aramaic letter Khalili

- Whether or not 4Q342, 4QLetter? ar, is an opisthograph has caused some confusion. Tov includes 4Q342 in his list of opisthographs, but Yardeni does not observe remains of script on the verso.⁹² After inspection of the digital PAM image I also could not identify text on the verso.⁹³
- To the Nabatean letter we may add the double deed or *Doppelurkunde* 4Q345, 4QDeed A ar or heb.⁹⁴ The double deed is a standardized form of contracts that goes as far back as the fourth century BCE.⁹⁵ The contracts are written twice on one side of a manuscript and subsequently signed by the witnesses that were present. After this process the upper version of the two is folded and sealed, while the lower text remains visible. In case of disagreement about the authenticity of the document was it possible to open the upper, folded copy of the text so it could be verified by comparing it to the lower text. Yardeni reconstructs the names of *ישמעאל בר שמעון* and *הושעיה* on the verso of 4Q345.⁹⁶ This manuscript is excluded from Tov's list of opisthographs, but should be classified as such because of the presence of signatures on the verso.

9 Documentary Opisthographs on the Verso of Literary Texts

The second group of documentary opisthographs concerns documentary texts that are written on the verso of literary texts. This type of manuscripts is well

IA 15 from Ancient Bactria contains both text on the right margin of the recto, but also an address written down in perpendicular orientation on the verso: Joseph Naveh and Shaul Shaked, *Aramaic Documents from Ancient Bactria (Fourth Century BCE): From the Khalili Collections* (London: The Khalili Family Trust, 2012), 122–126. On 4Q343 see Doering, *Ancient Jewish Letters*, 50.

92 Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 296; Yardeni, DJD 27:285.

93 PAM Photo: M43.405, <https://www.deadseascrolls.org.il/explore-the-archive/image/B-284438>. Doering as well did not note any traces of text on the verso: Doering, *Ancient Jewish Letters*, 51. Tigchelaar suggested in private communication the reading of *נ* down on the left edge of the fragment.

94 Yardeni, DJD 27:292–295.

95 Uri Yiftach-Firanko, “Doppelurkunde,” in *The Encyclopedia of Ancient History*, 2209–2210. The practice of the double deed is described in Jeremiah 32:10–14 and m. B. Bat 10a:1–2. Studies on double deeds in the Judaeen Desert are provided by Elisabeth Koffmahn and Gregor Geiger: Elisabeth Koffmahn, *Die Doppelurkunden aus der Wüste Juda. Recht und Praxis der jüdischen Papyri des 1. und 2. Jahrhunderts n. Chr. samt Übertragung der Texte und deutscher Übersetzung*, STDJ 5 (Leiden: Brill, 1968); Gregor Geiger, “Die Doppelurkunden aus der Judäischen Wüste: Das Verhältnis vom oberen (inneren) und unteren (äusseren) Text,” *RevQ* 29 (2017): 247–279.

96 Yardeni, DJD 27:293.

documented in the ancient Mediterranean world.⁹⁷ We find many letters and accounts written on the verso of literary texts among the documents of the Heroninos Archive from Faiyum (253–306 CE), the largest business archive of Roman Egypt.⁹⁸ Three examples of such documentary texts on the back of biblical uncials are listed by Don Barker.⁹⁹ Among the Dead Sea Scrolls we find three scrolls that carry a literary composition on the recto and a documentary text on the verso:

9.1 4Q201/4Q338

This manuscript is the only Aramaic literary opisthograph from the Judean Desert. The recto bears 4Q201, 4QEn^a, which preserves parts of the first twelve chapters of the Aramaic version of the Book of Watchers.¹⁰⁰ On the backside of the section with the first three columns we encounter 4Q338, 4QGenealogical List?, a very fragmentary text that is largely faded. Whether or not 4Q338 actually concerns a documentary text in its traditional sense is a matter of debate.

97 Gallo, *Greek and Latin Papyrology*, 10. Literary texts on the back of documents are also common among ancient Mediterranean archives and collections. Mariachiara Lama lists at least 182 such scrolls from Oxyrhynchus alone, which excludes Christian texts and compositions dealing with magical-religious subjects: Mariachiara Lama, “Aspetti di tecnica libraria ad Ossirinco: Copie letterarie su rotoli documentari,” *Aeg* 71 (1991): 55–120. See also AnneMarie Luijendijk, “Books and Private Readers in Early Christian Oxyrhynchus: ‘A Spiritual Meadow and a Garden of Delight,’” *Books and Readers in the Premodern World: Essays in Honor of Harry Gamble*, ed. Karl Shuve, WGRWSup 12 (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2018), 101–135, at 117.

Curiously however, there are no literary texts on the back of documentary texts preserved from Qumran.

98 On the Archive of Heroninus: Dominic Rathbone, *Economic Rationalism and Rural Society in Third-century A.D. Egypt: The Heroninos Archive and the Appianus Estate* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991).

Willy Clarysse in his study of Heroninus’ archive notes that “several of his correspondents wrote their letters on the verso of used papyrus, usually a discarded document; but some did not shrink from cutting up a roll of Homer, Demosthenes, Menander, or using a fragment of Old Comedy, or even a philosopher.” Willy Clarysse, “Literary Papyri in Documentary Archives,” in *Egypt and the Hellenistic World: Proceedings of the International Colloquium Leuven*, 24–26 May 1982, ed. Edmond van ’t Dack et al., *Studia Hellenistica* 27 (Leuven: Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, 1983), 43–61, at 47.

99 P.Oxy. 20, where the verso of a manuscript with the second book of Homer’s *Iliad* in a calligraphic hand is used to note some accounts in a cursive hand. P.Ryl. 16, which had as letter on the verso of an unknown comedy. P.Oxy. 661 concerns a documentary text written in a cursive hand on the back of an exemplar of Callimachus’ collection of *Iambi*: Don Barker, “The Dating of New Testament Papyri,” *NTS* 57 (2011): 571–582, at 576.

100 Józef T. Milik, *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1976), 139–163, 340–343; Loren T. Stuckenbruck, *DJD* 36:3–7.

Both Milik and Cross read הוֹלִיד at least twice, on the basis of which Milik suggests that the text would have been a genealogical list of the patriarchs.¹⁰¹ It is noteworthy that the only place in the Hebrew Bible where the figure of Enoch is mentioned is the patriarchal genealogy in Genesis 5. It is possible that the list of 4Q338 could have referred to this genealogy from Genesis, but this remains speculation that is not supported by additional evidence.¹⁰² Alternatively, Tigchelaar has hypothesized that the repeating occurrence of הוֹלִיד could have been an attempt to list the seventy generations following Enoch (as mentioned in 1 Enoch 10:12).¹⁰³ Milik describes the leather of the manuscript as “very thick and very stiff; surface fairly smooth, partly damaged and flaking easily” and goes on to note that the recto “bears traces of wear, as a result of the scroll’s having been read many times.”¹⁰⁴ The fact that the damage patterns are so visible suggests not only continuous use over a longer period of time, but also that the scroll has been handled rather carelessly.

4Q338 on the verso appears to be an example of material reuse in Qumran. 4Q338 was written upside-down in relation to recto, so after both flipping the manuscript and turning it 180 degrees. Milik suggests that 4Q338 was inscribed when 4Q201 was rendered obsolete, about a century after it was written. 4Q338 is not in a condition to allow independent palaeographic dating. Based on the blots of ink on the verso Milik proposed that 4Q338 could have been a school-exercise.¹⁰⁵ Though certainly possible, this is by no means certain. Too little of the text is preserved to assess whether we are dealing with the hand of a student, and the scribal characteristics that could typically point to an educational context (guide-lines, punctuation, lectional signs) seem to be absent.¹⁰⁶

9.2 4Q460 frag. 9/4Q350

4Q460, 4Q Narrative Work and Prayer, is a Hebrew composition consisting of both a narrative presented in the third person, and a number of prayers in both the first and second person.¹⁰⁷ Erik Larson has proposed that the text is “a col-

101 Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, 139; Tov, DJD 36:290.

102 Cf. James Nati, “The Rolling Corpus: Materiality and Pluriformity at Qumran, with Special Consideration of the Serekh ha-Yahad,” *DSD* 27 (2020): 161–201, 186–187.

103 Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar, “Apocalyptic worldview and periodization of history in the Dead Sea Scrolls, with a focus on the Apocryphon of Jeremiah C and Danielic texts” (paper presented at the PEJ VII Seminário Internacional; Universidade de Brasília, 31-10-2012).

104 Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, 139.

105 Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, 139.

106 Raffaella Cribiore, “Education in the Papyri,” in *The Oxford Handbook of Papyrology*, 320–337, at 321–322.

107 Erik Larson, DJD 36:369–386.

lection of psalms somewhat akin to the Hodayot.”¹⁰⁸ Elsewhere Hannah Cotton and Larson suggested to read 4Q460 as either rewritten bible, or as a “collection of prayers with some historical elements embedded within them.”¹⁰⁹ Elisha Qimron has proposed to rename the text Words of Levi (דברי לוי), and suggested that frag. 7 deals with the election of Levi.¹¹⁰ On the verso of 4Q460 frag. 9 we find 4Q350, a Greek account listing different quantities of cereals.¹¹¹ 4Q350 was written upside-down in relation to 4Q460 on the recto, just as was the case with 4Q201/4Q338.

How these two seemingly unrelated texts ended up on the same manuscript is a question that has continued to intrigue scholars. 4Q460/4Q350 seems a clear illustration of material reuse in a different context. After all, it is improbable that the scribe of a Hebrew literary religious text would also keep record of Greek cereal accounts. What is unclear is whether the manuscript was reused by the same group that copied, read, studied, and otherwise engaged with the other manuscripts from Qumran. To put the matter differently, did the reuse take place within the same textual community?

Cotton and Larson point to the presence of the divine name or Tetragrammaton on the recto of frag. 9, and maintain that “it is simply inconceivable that a Jew would reuse for a profane purpose a scroll that contained the Tetragrammaton.”¹¹² They argue that the site must have been visited by a non-Judean occupant that entered Cave 4, used the verso of frag. 9 to write a list of objects that were stored there, and subsequently discarded the manuscript again in the cave. The most plausible scenario in the view of Cotton and Larson is that the manuscript was used as note-paper by an auxiliary unit in the Roman army that occupied the site after the destruction of Qumran in 68 CE.¹¹³

Popović is not fully convinced by this explanation and wonders why a Roman soldier would first enter Cave 4, take one manuscript to note down an administrative list and subsequently return the manuscript back to the cave.¹¹⁴ In his view opisthographs such as 4Q201/4Q338, discussed above, indicate that the reuse of writing material occurred already before the destruction of the site by Roman legionaries.

108 Larson, DJD 36:372.

109 Hannah Cotton and Erik Larson, “4Q460/4Q350 and Tampering with Qumran Texts in Antiquity?” in *Emanuel*, 113–125, at 115.

110 Elisha Qimron, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: The Hebrew Writings*, vol. 3 (Jerusalem: Yad Ben Zvi, 2014), 197.

111 Hannah Cotton, DJD 36:294–295.

112 Cotton and Larson, “4Q460/4Q350 and Tampering with Qumran Texts in Antiquity,” 122.

113 Cotton and Larson, “4Q460/4Q350 and Tampering with Qumran Texts in Antiquity,” 122.

114 Popović, “Roman Book Destruction in Qumran Cave 4,” at 249.

To this argument we could add that the reuse of scripture for administrative purposes is attested elsewhere as well.¹¹⁵ Even more: a study by Luijendijk describes the extensive practice of discarding Christian biblical manuscripts as garbage in ancient Oxyrhynchus.¹¹⁶ Also outside ancient Jewish and Christian communities there is evidence present for the reuse of manuscripts carrying culturally significant texts in a different context.¹¹⁷ The point at issue is whether we do know for sure if the divine name was so revered that a manuscript with the Tetragrammaton could not be reused. Though it appears that Tetragrammata were used sparsely in non-biblical texts, we do not know precisely what this means.¹¹⁸ Furthermore, it is possible that the reverse side of a text from Masada that contained the Tetragrammaton was reused, though the reading is fragmentary.¹¹⁹ In conclusion, we cannot exclude the possibility that also manuscripts carrying the Tetragrammaton could have been reused by the scribes behind the Dead Sea Scrolls.

9.3 4Q324/4Q355

This opisthograph is a leather manuscript of which two small fragments have survived. 4Q324, 4QMishmarot C, concerns a Hebrew calendrical text which, according to Shemaryahu Talmon and Jonathan Ben-Dov, “contained a register of dates of the Saturday afternoons on which the different priestly courses entered the Temple prior to the onset of their week of service on the following Sunday morning.”¹²⁰ 4Q324 is written by a hand from the late Hasmonaean

115 Cotton and Larson provide the example of P.Rylands 458, an early copy of the Septuagint that was first reused for an account of expenditures, and later on a second time as cartonnage in a mummy: Cotton and Larson, “4Q460/4Q350 and Tampering with Qumran Texts in Antiquity,” 121. Another example is P.Oxy 209, which presents a documentary text underneath a copy of Romans 1:1–7: AnneMarie Luijendijk, “A New Testament Papyrus and Its Documentary Context: An Early Christian Writing Exercise from the Archive of Leonides (‘P.Oxy.’ II 209/P10),” *JBL* 129 (2010): 575–596.

116 Luijendijk, “Sacred Scriptures as Trash.”

117 Turner for example lists four papyri that carry, among others, parts of the *Iliad* and Demosthenes’s *On the Crown*. These papyri were reused by businessmen to write letters on the back: Eric G. Turner, “Writing Material for Businessmen,” *BASP* 15 (1978): 163–169.

118 Martin Rösel, “Names of God,” in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 600–602.

119 Mas 10: Shemaryahu Talmon and Yigael Yadin, eds., *Masada VI, The Yigal Yadin Excavations 1963–1965, Final Reports* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1999), 138–147. Talmon argues that both sides were written by different scribes.

120 Shemaryahu Talmon, Jonathan Ben-Dov, and Uwe Glessmer, *Qumran Cave 4.XVI: Calendrical Texts*, DJD 21 (Oxford: Clarendon 2001), 103.

or Early Herodian period and reveals, according to the editors, “the hand of a trained scribe.”¹²¹ The script is regular and well legible.

On the verso of both fragments we find 4Q355, 4QAccount C ar or heb.¹²² Apart from a few isolated letters and numbers no text could be identified, although Yardeni suggests on the basis of the numerals that it concerns an account. While it might be possible to estimate the length of Mishmarot C, it is impossible to establish how long the text on the verso might have been. It is unclear if the text is Hebrew or Aramaic. The script is cursive, but could not be dated. Just as the other documentary opisthographs, 4Q355 was written upside-down in relation to 4Q324 on the recto.

None of the editors propose an explanation for the presence of these two texts together.¹²³ It is interesting to note that both 4Q324 and 4Q355 contain numbers. The numbers on 4Q324 all seem to concern dates and are written out, while 4Q355 uses numerals. This does not seem an indication that both texts are thematically related. Brooke argues that “there is no clear relationship between the compositions on the two sides, unless one envisages a priest making a calculation on the reverse of his rota.”¹²⁴ For now we would have to conclude that 4Q355 is an example of material reuse of the back of an unrelated text.¹²⁵

121 Talmon and Ben-Dov, DJD 21:104.

122 Yardeni, DJD 36:296.

123 The official publication of 4Q324 does not mention the presence of text on the verso.

124 Brooke, “Between Scroll and Codex,” 135.

125 Tigchelaar has speculated in private communication that 4Q324 either concerned an exercise or was rejected because the scribe misinterpreted the Aramaic numbers.

Five Literary Opisthographs from Qumran

1 Introduction

The final category of opisthographic manuscripts is of essential significance for the research questions that are central to this study. This group concerns the manuscripts that carry different literary compositions on either side and from here on will be referred to as 'literary opisthographs.' We will discuss each of these five opisthographs individually by assessing the materiality of the manuscript, the compositions on both the recto and verso, and finally evaluating possible literary and socio-religious connections between these two texts.

2 Literary Opisthograph 4Q415/4Q414

4Q415/4Q414 is the only leather scroll among this corpus of literary opisthographs. The recto carries 4QInstruction^a, one of eight exemplars of this composition.¹ On the verso we find Ritual of Purification A, a text that is closely related to a composition that survived on another opisthograph: 4Q512, Ritual of Purification B.² 4Q414 was written in vertical orientation, with the text on the verso written upside down in relation to the recto. In general, both sides share a similar height and width of columns and intercolumnar margins.³

Distinguishing recto and verso on leather manuscripts can be difficult. As we have seen above, the terms recto and verso within papyrology generally refer to the direction of the papyrus fibres on either side of the manuscript in relation to the writing. As leather scrolls do not contain such fibres, scholars instead

-
- 1 John Strugnell, Daniel J. Harrington, and Torleif Elgvin, *Sapiential Texts, Part 2: Cave 4.XXIV*, DJD 34 (Oxford: Clarendon, 1999), 41–71. Tigchelaar identifies 8 manuscripts as well, but groups 4Q418 and 4Q418c together while he considers 4Q418* to be a different manuscript: Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning for the Understanding Ones: Reading and Reconstructing the Fragmentary Early Jewish Sapiential Text 4QInstruction*, STDJ 44 (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 3–27. Cf. Jean-Sébastien Rey, *4QInstruction: Sagesse et eschatologie*, STDJ 81 (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 1–13; Matthew J. Goff, *4QInstruction*, WLAW 2 (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2013), 1–29.
 - 2 Joseph M. Baumgarten et al., *Qumran Cave 4.XXV: Halakhic Texts*, DJD 35 (Oxford: Clarendon, 1999), 135–154.
 - 3 Hila Dayfani, "Material Reconstruction, New Joins and Readings in 4Q415 (4QInstruction^a)," *RevQ* 33 (2021): 161–202, at 162, 179–180.

consider the hair and flesh side of the manuscript. To the extent of our current understanding it seems that most of the leather scrolls from Qumran are inscribed on only one side: the hair side.⁴ One could subsequently deduce that in the case of a leather opisthograph the flesh side would have been inscribed on second instance and should therefore be considered the verso.⁵ This line of reasoning is also visible in this manuscript: 4Q415 was inscribed on the hair side and therefore considered the recto.⁶

Turning to the compositions that are represented on this opisthograph, we note that Instruction on the recto is a difficult text to classify, as it touches on a varied range of topics and themes. Instruction is generally regarded to be part of the body of early Jewish wisdom literature, but also contains a range of instructions for different occasions.⁷ Devorah Dimant uses Instruction to illustrate the complexity of classification as she notes that the text “presents a new type of composition in that it contains elements both similar to and different from previously known sectarian works.”⁸ Eventually Dimant does consider Instruction as part of the corpus of sectarian sapiential works, a position which

4 Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 34–35; Ingo Kottsieper, “Physicality of Manuscripts and Material Culture,” in *T&T Clark Companion to the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 167–177, at 168.

There are presumably two exceptions. The first is the Temple Scroll (11QT^a), which concerns a manuscript of the *kelaph* type: the hide is split into two layers that are both prepared separately. *Kelaph* is written on the flesh side, which means that 11QT^a does not have a hair side. On the production of 11QT^a, see Roman Schuetz et al., “The Temple Scroll: Reconstructing an Ancient Manufacturing Practice,” *Science Advances* 5/9 (2019), doi:10.1126/sciadv.aaw7494.

The second exception concerns the tefillin. Yehudah Cohn has stated that “some slips were written on the hair side of the skin, others on the inside,” without further specifying which of the tefillin are produced in which way: “Reading Material Features of Qumran *Tefillin* and *Mezuzot*,” 93.

5 The problem with this is that there are some instances in which only the flesh side of a leather manuscript from the Dead Sea Scrolls contains text, such as the Temple Scroll mentioned above. Furthermore, many publications of leather scrolls do not mention the side on which the text was written.

6 Strugnell and Harrington, DJD 34:41. See also Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning for the Under-standing Ones*, 28–30.

7 For the position of the wisdom texts from the Dead Sea Scrolls in relation to other early Jewish literature see: Daniel J. Harrington, *Wisdom Texts from Qumran* (London: Routledge, 1996), 81–86.

8 Devorah Dimant, “The Library of Qumran in Recent Scholarship,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls at Qumran and the Concept of a Library*, ed. Sidnie W. Crawford and Cecilia Wassen, STDJ 116 (Leiden: Brill, 2016), 7–14, at 10. Such elements are its terminology, halakhic rules, and apocalyptic ideas (all of which Dimant considers sectarian), but also its practical instructions with regard to issues such as marriage and property.

is shared by scholars such as Daryl Jefferies and Jean-Sébastien Rey, but not by Eibert Tigchelaar, Matthew Goff and the original editors.⁹ As critical studies of the structure and themes of the composition have been provided elsewhere, our interest here is how to understand its relation to the second text on this opisthograph.¹⁰ On the verso of 4QInstruction^a we find 4Q414, Ritual of Purification A, a composition that is characterized by Eshel as a “halakhic-liturgical text, which includes a collection of rituals and prayers for persons who must undergo purification.”¹¹ The understanding of 4Q414 appears more straightforward: it is generally read as a prayer text and grouped together with 4Q512 as a collection of purification liturgies.¹² The central function of this text seems to provide instructions for ceremonial purifications for several occasions and from different forms of uncleanness, such as from interaction with a menstruating woman (frag. 7) or in preparation of a festival (frag. 1). Its liturgical character is visible in typical blessing formulae such as [תה אל ישראל], “He will answer and say: Blessed are yo[u God of Israel].” (Frag. 2 6).¹³

The circumstances under which these two compositions were penned down together on one scroll is still subject to discussion. From a literary-stylistic perspective, it seems that the connection between 4Q415 and 4Q414 is not a straightforward one: we do not observe clear parallels in vocabulary and terminology or intertextual relations that thematically link these two texts together. Nonetheless, 4Q415/4Q414 does not seem an evident example of material reuse in a different context, as was the case with some of the opisthographs discussed above that contain both a literary and a documentary text.

9 Devorah Dimant, “The Qumran Manuscripts: Contents and Significance,” in *History, Ideology and Bible Interpretation in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Collected Studies*, FAT 90 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014), 27–56, at 45; Daryl F. Jefferies, *Wisdom at Qumran: A Form-critical Analysis of the Admonitions in 4QInstruction* (Piscataway: Gorgias, 2002), 59–61; Rey, *4QInstruction: Sagesse et eschatologie*, 333–336; Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning for the Understanding Ones*, 247–248; Goff, *4QInstruction*, 27–29; Strugnell and Harrington, DJD 34:21–22.

10 Discussions of the content of Instruction are provided by Strugnell and Harrington, DJD 34:1–40; Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning for the Understanding Ones*; Goff, *4QInstruction*; Benjamin Wold, “Instruction,” in *T&T Clark Companion to the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 318–319.

11 Eshel, DJD 35:135.

12 According to James R. Davila, 4Q414 and 4Q512 concern “a collection of liturgies and instructions for rituals used to purify people from ceremonial uncleanness,” James R. Davila, *Liturgical Works*, ECDSS 6 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 267–293, at 267. Daniel K. Falk regards it “a collection of sectarian purification rituals”: Daniel K. Falk, “Liturgical Texts,” in *T&T Clark Companion to the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 423–434, at 426.

13 Parallel in 4Q512 frag. 42.

The key question is the status of the first text (4Q415) when the second text (4Q414) was written down. Was 4Q415 still actively read, studied or discussed, and 4Q414 deliberately added on its reverse side? Or was 4Q415 rendered obsolete as a manuscript and 4Q414 conveniently written on the blank side of a text that was not used anymore? There are two positions in this debate.

Falk considers this manuscript as part of a limited group of opisthographs for which the recto was not rejected, but rather that the owner added another text on the reverse of a scroll he owned and still valued.¹⁴ Falk bases this firstly on the fact that Instruction was still in circulation in Qumran, and secondly on the fact that 4Q415 on the recto was in very good condition. The latter consideration does not seem to be of primary relevance: there are plenty of examples of opisthographs from Oxyrhynchus that are preserved in fine condition, but where the recto nevertheless seems to have been rejected.¹⁵ Falk's observation that 4Q415 was still being copied, however, is interesting. The fact that the seven manuscripts (1Q26, 4Q415–418, 4Q418a, 4Q423) can all be dated to the first centuries BCE and CE seems to be an indication that Instruction was still very much in vogue during the time 4Q414 was written.

However, John Strugnell and Daniel Harrington, Tigchelaar, and Brooke take a different position and do not see a relationship between the two texts that would point towards an intentional effort at bringing these texts together. Strugnell and Harrington do not interact very much with the verso, but do assume that 4Q415 was rejected prior to the writing of 4Q414.¹⁶ In their view, it is possible that 4Q415 actually used to be a sheet of 4Q418, but after rejection had to be replaced with a new copy.¹⁷ This scenario could explain why a fine copy of a text such as 4Q415 was thrown away, while other copies were still being pro-

14 Falk, "Material Aspects of Prayer Manuscripts," 52. We will return to the issue of an opisthographic manuscript as a collection below.

15 We may think for example of the famous papyrus that has the *Athenaion Politeia*, P.Lond.Lit. 108, on the verso of P.Lond.Lit. 131, an Egyptian farm account written in a cursive hand. Though the papyrus is only partly preserved, it is nevertheless in good condition and the script of the recto is "of a good size and clear, in a fine and rather elegant semi-cursive hand," Frederic G. Kenyon, *Greek Papyri in the British Museum: Catalogue with Texts*, vol. 1 (London: British Museum, 1893), 169.

In this context one could also think of P.Oxy. 668, carrying part of an epitome by Livy, with P.Oxy. 657 (fragment of Letter of the Hebrews) on the verso: Grenfell and Hunt, *The Oxyrhynchus papyri*, vol. 4, 36–48, 90–116.

Finally Turner provides many examples of finely produced administrative texts that have been reused: Turner, "Recto and Verso."

16 Strugnell and Harrington, DJD 34:41.

17 Strugnell and Harrington, DJD 34:1.

duced.¹⁸ Tigchelaar agrees and, following Strugnell, remarks that the hands of 4Q415 and 4Q418 are “very similar, if not identical, and the interlinear spacing in 4Q415 corresponds to the average of 4Q418.”¹⁹ However, the suggestion that 4Q415 and 4Q418 belonged to the same manuscript is somewhat problematic because parts of the text of 4Q415 and 4Q418 do overlap.²⁰ Alternatively, Tigchelaar speculates that 4Q415 could have been rejected because the manuscript had been damaged, though it is not possible to demonstrate this.²¹ Brooke also does not see a direct relationship between 4Q415 and 4Q414 and hypothesizes that Instruction might have been of “wide educational interest.”²²

On the basis of the character of these two texts, there seems little ground to suppose that they were brought together to form an intentional collection on one manuscript. Rather, 4Q415/4Q414 seems to provide an instance of the material reuse of a rejected manuscript. One possible explanation for this could be that for some reason (perhaps related to damage or otherwise) 4Q415 got out of fashion, though this probably did not apply to the composition of Instruction in general.

3 Literary Opisthograph 4Q433a/4Q255

4Q433a/4Q255 concerns a literary opisthograph written on papyrus. There has been some scholarly misunderstanding about which of the two compositions was the first to be written on this scroll: 4Q433a, which carries 4QpapHodayot-like Text B, or 4Q255, 4QpapSerekh ha-Yahad^a. Elsewhere I argued that 4Q433a was most probably the first text on this scroll, on the basis of the quality of the scribal hand and the fact that it is written on the papyrological recto of the manuscript (with the fibres of the papyrus plant running in horizontal direction, parallel to the writing).²³ Where 4Q433a is written in a consistent and flowing semi-formal hand, 4Q255 is written in a much more irregular cursive script. 4Q255 is furthermore written on the papyrological verso of the scroll, with the papyrus fibres running perpendicular to the text.

18 However, we cannot exclude the possibility that part of 4Q415 was damaged already in antiquity. In that case the fragments that did survive could have been reused for 4Q414.

19 Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning for the Understanding Ones*, 30.

20 Dayfani, “Material Reconstruction, New Joins and Readings in 4Q415 (4QInstruction^a).”

21 Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning for the Understanding Ones*, 30. This suggestion was supported by Kottsieper, “Physicality of Manuscripts and Material Culture,” 175.

22 Brooke, “Between Scroll and Codex,” 135.

23 Ayhan Aksu, “A Palaeographic and Codicological (Re)assessment of the Opisthograph 4Q433a/4Q255,” *DSD* 26 (2019): 170–188.

4Q433a/4Q255 survived on four fragments. There is one scribal marking on this manuscript: a small sign at the beginning of 4Q433a frag. 2 2. Because the sign is followed by an indentation, the most probable explanation seems that it is used to indicate the start of a new section within the composition. There is no evidence for the use of markings on the verso of the scroll, but we do find one interlinear insertion on 4Q255 A, between lines 3 and 4.

4Q433a was published by Eileen Schuller in DJD 29 under the title Hodayot-like Text B, which tells us that scholars considered the text to be somewhat related to the Hodayot.²⁴ Schuller clarifies that “there are some similarities in content between this manuscript and the Hodayot, and for this reason it has been designated pseudo-Hodayot or Hodayot-like.”²⁵ 1QH^a and 4Q433a share some similarities with regard to the lay-out. It has been recognised early on that 1QH^a was written by (at least) two scribes.²⁶ Up to column XIX, 25 would have been written by the first scribe, after which the second scribe took over.²⁷ The first scribe used different spacings, often a *vacat* or an indentation, to indicate the individual psalms.²⁸ We see something similar in 4Q433a: the scribal

24 Esther G. Chazon et al., *Qumran Cave 4.XX: Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 2*, DJD 29 (Oxford: Clarendon, 1999), 237–245. Apart from 4Q433a this group consists of 4Hodayot-like Text A (4Q433), and 4QHodayot-like Text C (4Q440), though several other compositions have been associated with the Hodayot: John Strugnell and Eileen M. Schuller, “Further *Hodayot* Manuscripts from Qumran?” in *Antikes Judentum und frühes Christentum: Festschrift für Hartmut Stegemann zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. Bernd Kollmann, Wolfgang Reinbold, and Annette Steudel, BZNW 97 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1999), 51–72; Eileen M. Schuller, “The Classification Hodayot and Hodayot-like (with Particular Attention to 4Q433, 4Q433a and 4Q440),” in *Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetical Texts from Qumran*, ed. Daniel K. Falk, Florentino García Martínez, and Eileen M. Schuller, STDJ 35 (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 182–193, at 186, 189.

25 Schuller, DJD 29:239. More on the notion of *Hodayot*-like: Schuller, “The Classification Hodayot and Hodayot-like”; Strugnell and Schuller, “Further *Hodayot* Manuscripts from Qumran.”

26 This was observed already by Eleazar L. Sukenik, who edited the *editio princeps* of the Hodayot: Eleazar L. Sukenik, *The Dead Sea Scrolls of the Hebrew University* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1955).

27 See the section ‘Reconstruction of 1QH^a’ in Hartmut Stegeman and Eileen Schuller, DJD 40:13–53. Malachi Martin has argued that a third scribe was involved in the production of this manuscript. According to Martin this scribe wrote a few lines in column 19 before the final scribe took over and finished the text: Malachi B. Martin, *The Scribal Character of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, vol. 1 (Leuven: Publications Universitaires, 1958), 59–64.

28 Eileen M. Schuller and Carol A. Newsom, *The Hodayot (Thanksgiving Psalms): A Study Edition of 1QH^a*, EJL 36 (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2012), 9.

The columns written by the second scribe also contain two instances of a *vacat* (column 20 line 14 and column 21 line 31), but it is less clear if they indicate the start of a new section.

sign followed by an indentation in frag. 2 2 suggests that also this text was subdivided into different compositions, just as Hodayot consists of a collection of prayers.²⁹ This scribal sign in frag. 2 2 is placed before the formulaic לְמַשְׁכִּיל, “to the Maskil,” which also in 1QH^a occasionally functions to introduce a new section.³⁰

In addition to such scribal practices, several connections in themes and terminology also invite comparison to 1QH^a. In Schuller’s view the presence of לְמַשְׁכִּיל and the lengthy tree imagery in frag. 2, and the eschatological vocabulary of frags. 3 and 4 evoke similarities to several columns of 1QH^a.³¹ To the many parallels observed by Schuller between 4Q433a and Hodayot we may add one more: the concept of חֲרוֹן, the anger or wrath of God in frag. 3 4. This idea can also be found in Hodayot in, for example, column VII.³² However, there are also elements in which 4Q433a and Hodayot are distinct. Schuller in particular notes the absence of a first-person speaker and the fact that God is addressed in the third person in 4Q433a (while 1QH^a preserves an address in the second person).³³ Despite similarities “of vocabulary, theme, and form,” Schuller eventually prefers the classification of 4Q433a as “some type of extended sapiential-type reflection or instruction” over the classification as a hymn.³⁴

4Q255, 4QpapSerekh ha-Yahad^a, was published by Alexander and Vermes in DJD 26.³⁵ The Serekh ha-Yahad or Community Rule survived in 12 manuscripts. As such, the Community Rule is one of the texts from the Dead Sea Scrolls of which the most extant copies have been preserved. 4Q255 is one of the two papyrus exemplars of this composition, the other being 4Q257. 4Q255 is the only real opisthograph of the Community Rule, but it is possible that 4Q257 carries the title on the verso of frag. 1.³⁶

29 Also, in 1QH^a 20:6 a scribal sign in the margin is used to indicate a new section: Schuller and Newsom, *The Hodayot (Thanksgiving Psalms)*, 9.

30 We find the heading לְמַשְׁכִּיל in four occasions (col. 5 line 12, col. 7 line 21, col. 20 line 7 and col. 25 line 34). However, only in column 25 is this heading clearly preserved. See also Carol A. Newsom, “A Farewell to the Hodayot of the Community,” *DSD* 28 (2021): 1–19.

31 Schuller, DJD 29:239–240. Other concepts shared with Hodayot are נַחֲלֵי זֶפֶת in 4Q433a frag. 3 9 and בְּלִיעַל in frag. 4 2. See also Schuller, “The Classification Hodayot and Hodayot-like,” 189–193.

32 The theme of the חֲרוֹן קִצֵּי חֲרוֹן, “times of wrath” is prevalent throughout the Hodayot: columns 11:29, 22:9, and 24:15.

33 Schuller, DJD 29:239.

34 Schuller, “The Classification Hodayot and Hodayot-like,” 191–193.

35 Philip Alexander and Géza Vermes, *Qumran Cave 4.XIX: 4QSerekh Ha-Yahad*, DJD 26 (Oxford: Clarendon, 1998), 27–38.

36 Cf. section 1.6.

Frag. 1 corresponds to 1QS col. I, 1–5 and 4Q257 col. I, 1–2. This is the opening section of the Community Rule, which serves as an introduction to the composition. 4Q255 frag. 2 corresponds to 1QS col. III, 7–12 and 4Q257 frag. 3 10–14. This section enumerates the blessings that will befall those that are upright and humble and are accepted by God. 4Q255 frags. A and B (the verso of 4Q433a frags. 3 and 4) do not correspond to any other manuscript.³⁷ Alexander and Vermes do observe many correlations here to terminology and phrases from 1QS, which leads them to suggesting that frag. A might have contained a different recension of the Two Spirits Treatise in 1QS cols. III, 13–IV, 26.³⁸ Frag. B remains unidentified.³⁹

The size and dimensions of the scroll cannot be reconstructed.⁴⁰ It is not impossible that this manuscript would have carried the full text of the Community Rule, but this would mean that this scroll was far bigger than any other extant papyrus from Qumran.⁴¹ Alternative scenarios could be that 4Q255 only preserved the first columns of the composition, which seems to be the case for 4Q257.⁴² However, the fact that frags. A and B preserve some unidentified text

37 Alexander and Vermes, DJD 26:36–38; Hempel, *Community Rules from Qumran: A Commentary*, 31.

38 Alexander and Vermes, DJD 26:36–38. It is in this context relevant to note that some of the text that precedes the Treatise in 1QS is preserved in frag. 2.

39 Alexander and Vermes, DJD 26:36. Cf. Sarianna Metso, *The Textual Development of the Qumran Community Rule*, STDJ 21 (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 18–21; Hempel, *Community Rules from Qumran: A Commentary*, 31.

40 Alexander and Vermes estimate the height of the scroll at 11.8 cm, but how many papyrus sheets the manuscript would have constituted is unknown: Alexander and Vermes, DJD 26:18.

41 This is based on the following estimation: both Metso and Tov assess the length of 1QS to be about 1.87 meter (1QSa and 1QSB not included). Metso reconstructs the number of lines per column for 4Q255 to be about 20, while Alexander and Vermes estimate 26–27 lines per column for 1QS. Column widths are 98–180 mm for 1QS, and at least 115 mm for 4Q255.

1QS has 44–92 letter-spaces per line, while Alexander and Vermes reconstruct 26–41 for 4Q255. The letter-height for 4Q255 seems slightly larger: 3–5 mm versus 3 mm for 1QS. Top margins and line spacing are broadly comparable.

If we take the average of these numbers, we may assume that 4Q255 would need at least 1.5 times the writing material to cover the same amount of text as 1QS. The length of 4Q255 would then have to be close to 3 meters in order for the full composition of the Community Rule to fit on it. Though papyrus scrolls of this size are not uncommon in Egypt, there is no evidence that papyrus manuscripts of this size were in circulation in the Judaean Desert. Metso, *The Textual Development of the Qumran Community Rule*, 18–20; Alexander and Vermes, DJD 26:18.

42 4Q257 corresponds to the text of 1QS I until almost the end of the Two Spirits Treatise in IV 25; Alexander and Vermes, DJD 26:65–82.

(including a rare verbal form of פּרַד) seem to suggest that different textual units were brought together on this manuscript, or that 4Q255 contains a different recension of the Community Rule.⁴³

The circumstance that 4Q255 is penned down on the verso of a liturgical text is intriguing, and this fact brings us to the question how to understand this manuscript as an opisthograph. Falk argues, just as he did for 4Q415/4Q414, that 4Q433a and 4Q255 were written down together intentionally. He notes that “this scroll almost certainly represents a personal collection of some liturgical and instructional materials associated with the figure of the Maskil.”⁴⁴ The Maskil is, as we have seen, mentioned in 4Q433a frag. 2 2, but he does not occur in 4Q255, which would make this association tentative.⁴⁵

The intertextual relations between 4Q433a and 4Q255 are not straightforward. Both texts are of a different genre: 4Q433a was classified by Schuller as a sapiential-type reflection or instruction (or perhaps a hymn), while 4Q255 is a rule text. The two texts nevertheless do share a number of characteristics: both the Community Rule and the Hodayot and Hodayot related texts are widely represented among the Dead Sea Scrolls, and modern scholars therefore often consider them to have been important and perhaps also authoritative.⁴⁶

43 פּרַד occurs three times in the Hebrew Bible, but not in any other Dead Sea Scroll: Alexander and Vermes, DJD 26:38; Hempel, *Community Rules from Qumran: A Commentary*, 31.

44 Falk, “Material Aspects of Prayer Manuscripts,” 55.

45 Aksu, “Palaeographic and Codicological (Re)assessment,” 182. Though the opening of 1QS 1:1 has not been preserved, the line does start with a *lamed* which has led scholars to reconstruct the heading לְמַשְׁכִּיל for both 1QS 1:1 and 4Q255: Nati, “The Rolling Corpus: Materiality and Pluriformity at Qumran, 190.

On the Maskil as a key functionary community envisaged in the Community Rule: Charlotte Hempel, “Maskil(im) and Rabbim: From Daniel to Qumran,” in *Biblical Traditions in Transmission: Essays in Honour of Michael A. Knibb*, ed. Charlotte Hempel and Judith M. Lieu, JSJSup 111 (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 133–156; Newsom, “A Farewell to the Hodayot of the Community.”

46 Many copies over a significant period of time can be seen as an indication of continued interest in a text: Carol A. Newsom, “‘Sectually Explicit’ Literature from Qumran,” in *Rhetoric and Hermeneutics: Approaches to Text, Tradition and Social Construction in Biblical and Second Temple Literature*, ed. William Henry Propp et al., FAT 130 (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1990), 167–187; James C. VanderKam, “Authoritative Literature in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” *DSD* 5 (1998): 382–402.

Among others Hempel and Carol Newsom have argued for the importance of both the Community Rule and the collection of Hodayot and Hodayot-like texts: Charlotte Hempel, “Pluralism and Authoritativeness: The Case of The S Tradition,” in *Authoritative Scriptures in Ancient Judaism*, ed. Mladen Popović, JSJSup 141 (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 193–208;

The relationship of the different manuscripts of both the Community Rule and Hodayot has been re-evaluated in recent years. Instead of prioritizing the Cave 1 manuscript as some form of an *Urtext* and considering the other copies as variants, scholars now increasingly started thinking of the different manuscripts as part of a continuous tradition of S and H.⁴⁷ Furthermore, Schuller has pointed towards the relationship between the Community Hymns from the Hodayot and in particular the Two Spirits Treatise, while she characterizes the final psalm of 1QS as very “Hodayot-like.”⁴⁸ However, we have to be careful not to impose scholarly readings of the Hodayot directly on 4Q433a, a text that can at most be associated with it.

Because of the continued interest in the S-tradition, as demonstrated by the multiple manuscript copies over a significant period, we can suppose this tradition to have been an object of study for the community behind the texts. It is particularly significant that 1QS col. vi, 6–8 explicitly mentions the importance of reading and studying texts together.⁴⁹ It is possible that manuscripts such as the opisthograph 4Q433a/4Q255 functioned as the product of scholarly readers

Carol A. Newsom, *The Self as Symbolic Space: Constructing Identity and Community at Qumran*, STDJ 52 (Leiden: Brill, 2004).

On the authority of texts from the Dead Sea Scrolls in general: Timothy Lim, “Authoritative Scriptures and the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. Timothy Lim and John J. Collins (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 303–322; Kelley Coblenz Bautch and Jack Weinbender, “Authoritative Scriptures: Other Texts,” in *T&T Clark Companion to the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 280–285.

47 In the view of scholars such as Schuller, Hempel, Alison Schofield, Jutta Jokiranta, Hanna Vanonen, Judith Newman, and James Nati the different manuscripts can be considered to be individual manifestations of the compositional development of these traditions: Eileen M. Schuller, “Some Contributions of the Cave Four Manuscripts (4Q427–432) to the Study of the Hodayot,” *DSD* 8 (2001): 278–287; “The Classification Hodayot and Hodayot-like”; Hempel, “Pluralism and Authoritativeness”; Hempel, *Community Rules from Qumran: A Commentary*; Alison Schofield, *From Qumran to the Yahad: A New Paradigm of Textual Development for The Community Rule*, STDJ 77 (Leiden: Brill, 2009); Jokiranta and Vanonen, “Multiple Copies of Rule Texts”; Judith H. Newman, *Before the Bible: The Liturgical Body and the Formation of Scriptures in Early Judaism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018), 107–139; James Nati, *Textual Criticism and the Ontology of Literature in Early Judaism: An Analysis of the Serekh ha-Yahad*, STDJ 198 (Leiden: Brill, 2022).

48 Eileen M. Schuller, “Recent Scholarship on the Hodayot 1993–2010,” *CurrBR* 10 (2011): 119–162, at 143. In Schuller’s view this relationship is visible in a range of shared themes between the two compositions, such as a “deterministic worldview” and an emphasis on “eschatological judgment.”

49 George J. Brooke, “Reading, Searching and Blessing: A Functional Approach to the Genres of Scriptural Interpretation in the Yahad,” in *The Temple in Text and Tradition: A Festschrift in Honour of Robert Hayward*, ed. R. Timothy McLay, LSTS 83 (London: Bloomsbury, 2015), 140–156, at 140; Popović, “Reading, Writing, and Memorizing Together,” 452.

of the scrolls that tried to bring texts that were meaningful to them together.⁵⁰ We should note however that 4Q255 is preserved in a crudely written cursive hand.⁵¹ Though little can be said about this manuscript with great confidence, the poorly readable text does not seem intended for a public setting such as communal reading.⁵² The most probable explanation for at least the addition of 4Q255 on the verso seems therefore that it was produced for personal reading or study.⁵³

4 Literary Opisthograph 4Q499/4Q497

The two compositions on this papyrus opisthograph from Qumran were published by Baillet in DJD 7, a volume that contains many fragmentary liturgical texts from Cave 4.⁵⁴ As such, it is the first literary opisthograph that we encounter of which the texts on the recto and verso were both published by the same scholar, though in the edition they are separated by 4Q498, *Fragments hymniques ou sapientiels (?)*.⁵⁵

4Q497 on the verso of this manuscript is written in horizontal orientation, which means that the scroll was flipped horizontally and that the upper and lower margins on both sides correspond to the same end of the manuscript. The manuscript has survived in a poor condition, even in comparison with most other Qumran opisthographs. In particular on the verso the ink is faded, which

50 Popović, "Reading, Writing, and Memorizing Together." See also Charlotte Hempel's recent commentary on the Community Rules, in which she argued, especially on the basis of her analysis of 4Q255 frag. A, that both 4Q255 and 4Q257 "testify to the period when the framework of the Long Text of the Community Rules as most fully preserved in 1QS was being drafted." She sees in particular the unidentified fragments of 4Q433a/4Q255 as evidence for the efforts of scribes to collect and gather material for this framework: Hempel, *Community Rules from Qumran: A Commentary*, 34. Cf. Idem, "The Long Text of the *Serekh* as Crisis Literature," *RevQ* 27 (2015): 3–23.

51 Mladen Popović, "Book Production and Circulation in Ancient Judaea: Evidenced by Writing Quality and Skills in the Dead Sea Scrolls Isaiah and Serekh Manuscripts," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Ancient Media Culture*, ed. Travis B. Williams, Chris Keith, and Loren Stuckenbruck, STDJ 144 (Leiden: Brill, 2023), 199–265, at 247–250.

52 Aksu, "Palaeographic and Codicological (Re)assessment," 174–177. See also the section on the palaeography of 4Q255 below.

53 We will return to the issue of the Qumran opisthographic papyri as personal copies with some more detail below.

54 Baillet, DJD 7:69–72; 74–77. 4Q497, though on the verso, is published before 4Q499 in the edition.

55 Baillet, DJD 7:73–74.

might be an indication that the manuscript was rolled. The manuscript is preserved in 54 fragments. The presence of 4Q499 on the recto was crucial for the identification of 4Q497, because many of the fragments probably would not have been assembled together if it wasn't for the text on the other side. Baillet suggested that some fragments might have belonged to the opisthograph 4Q503/512, but chose to maintain the selection that was passed down to him by the original team.⁵⁶ Tigchelaar readdressed this question in relation to 4Q499 and concluded that "not all letters of the fragments of 4Q499 are shaped in exactly the same manner, but the differences do not of necessity indicate a different hand."⁵⁷ There is no evidence for scribal markings, though both sides of the manuscript contain one interlinear insertion.

The identification of both texts has been difficult. 4Q499 on the recto was published as *Hymnes ou prières*. Baillet did not provide much contextualization for 4Q499 other than the title, which points towards the potential function of the text as a hymn or a prayer.⁵⁸

Crucial for the identification of this manuscript however proved to be the larger frags. 47 and 48. Tigchelaar has noted that these fragments "preserve an almost complete overlap with 4Q369 (4QPrayer of Enosh)."⁵⁹ It is interesting to note that 4Q369 is a leather manuscript, which demonstrates that Prayer of Enosh was copied on both leather and papyrus.⁶⁰ Due to the fragmentary

56 The papyrus opisthograph 4Q499/4Q497 switched hands a few times before its eventual publication by Maurice Baillet in DJD 7. Józef Milik first assembled the fragments, together with the War texts 4Q491–495, after which they were assigned for publication to Claus-Hunno Hunzinger. Baillet in the meantime had identified another copy of the War Scroll (4Q496), and eventually all War Texts would be assigned to him. Baillet, DJD 7:xi–xiv; Jean Duhaime, *The War Texts: 1QM and Related Manuscripts*, CQS 6 (London: T&T Clark, 2004), 6.

57 Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar, "4Q499 48+47 (par 4Q369 1 ii): A Forgotten Identification," *RevQ* 70 (1997): 303–306, at 305.

58 4Q499 preserves a number of verbs and suffixes in the second person, which are common in a number of liturgical compositions from the Dead Sea Scrolls such as Festival Prayers, Daily Prayers, and some of the prayers of Words of the Luminaries. Dimant for some reason classified 4Q499 twice: once under 'Miscellaneous liturgical pieces' and once under 'Various small fragments'; Dimant, "Qumran Manuscripts: Contents and Significance," 44, 47. See also the discussion in Justin L. Pannkuk, "Prayers of the Antediluvian Patriarchs: Revisiting the Form and Function of 4Q369 Prayer of Enosh," *DSD* 24 (2017): 38–58.

59 Tigchelaar, "4Q499 48+47 (par 4Q369 1 ii)," 303. Most fragments of 4Q499 only preserve (the remains of) a few words, but Tigchelaar observes some other correspondences to the vocabulary of 4Q369.

60 Prayer of Enosh is not included on Tov's list of fifteen non-biblical compositions that survived on both leather and papyrus. Most of these texts are very well represented (up to 10 or 11 copies). Prayer of Enosh and Words of the Luminaries are the only two texts that are present on only one papyrus and one leather manuscript. Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 48.

state of the manuscript, 4Q499 otherwise contributes little to our understanding of the composition.

The verso of this manuscript contains 4Q497. Following Baillet, scholarship continued to refer to this text as 4QpapWar Scroll-Like Text A. Baillet still considered 4Q497 as the seventh exemplar of the War Scroll in his 1972 overview of the Cave 4 War Scroll material.⁶¹ In DJD 7, however, he titled it “Texte ayant quelque rapport avec la règle de la guerre (?)” Baillet observed some overlap with the War Scroll, but the majority of fragments do not demonstrate any correspondence.⁶² A number of scholars have expressed their reservation regarding the identification of 4Q497 with any other composition.⁶³

Both Brooke and Falk consider this manuscript to be some form of a collection, but that assessment is primarily based on the fact that both compositions are often classified as prayer texts.⁶⁴ Unfortunately the compositions on either side are too fragmentary to allow for a critical analysis of their textual relations.⁶⁵

5 Literary Opisthograph 4Q503/4Q512

We have briefly touched on 4Q503/4Q512 above due to the difficulty in determining whether individual fragments belong to this opisthograph or to 4Q499/4Q497. 4Q503/4Q512 also concerns a papyrus manuscript of which the verso is written after turning the scroll over in horizontal direction, which means that the writing starts on both sides at the same end of the manuscript. 4Q512 is written on the verso, with the fibres running perpendicular to the text. It is a very fragmentary manuscript, of which 232 fragments have been preserved.

61 Maurice Baillet, “Les manuscrits de la Règle de la Guerre de la grotte 4 de Qumran,” *RB* 79 (1972): 217–226, there 224–225.

62 Baillet, DJD 7:69. Baillet argued that the first three fragments contain some correspondence to the vocabulary of 1QM xiv 5–8, xii 14, and xi 17, while frag. 47 could be associated with 1QM xiii 7–8. In many cases however the snippets do not correspond to any War Scroll manuscript, which leads us to conclude that these identifications are very tentative.

63 Martin G. Abegg, “4Q471: A Case of Mistaken Identity,” in *Pursuing the Text: Studies in Honor of Ben Zion Wacholder on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday*, ed. John C. Reeves and John Kampen, JSOTSup 184 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1994), 136–147; Duhaime, *The War Texts*, 7; “War Scroll,” 81–82; Brian Schultz, *Conquering the World: The War Scroll (1QM) Reconsidered*, STDJ 76 (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 27.

64 Brooke, “Between Scroll and Codex,” 135; Falk, “Material Aspects of Prayer Manuscripts,” 53–54.

65 The only lexeme shared between both texts is דרבים in 4Q499 and דרבי in 4Q497 6.

Both texts on this manuscript have been edited by Baillet in DJD 7. 4Q503 was published as *Prières Quotidiennes* and is commonly referred to as *Daily Prayers*.⁶⁶ It is the only manuscript of a collection of liturgies that are to be recited daily for a month during dawn and sunset. Its liturgical character can be established by pointing to recurring blessing formulae, such as ברוך אל ישראל and שלום עליכה ישראל.⁶⁷ The frequent repetition of these formulae allowed scholars to reconstruct the opening and closure of some of these prayers, estimate the size of the entire collection, and conclude that the prayers are probably dedicated to the first or seventh month.⁶⁸ *Daily Prayers* has received some scholarly attention on the grounds that the composition seems to uphold a lunar calendar.⁶⁹ As most scholars assume that the majority of calendars found at Qumran adhere to the 364-day solar year, this has led to questions about the compatibility of the solar and lunar calendar.⁷⁰ In order to make the evidence compatible, Jonathan Ben-Dov has suggested that we should read 4Q503 as evidence that “the moon was an important natural object worthy of praise, but not a calendrical marker.”⁷¹ Lawrence Schiffman however ponders whether this could either mean that the people behind the scrolls used two calendars or that the lunar calendar expressed in 4Q503 could reflect some form of an outsider perspective.⁷²

On the verso of this manuscript, we find 4Q512, 4QpapRitual of Purification B, which is generally regarded to be one of two closely related Ritual of Purification texts that survived among the Dead Sea Scrolls.⁷³ The other composition is 4Q414, which we discussed above as part of the leather opisthograph

66 Baillet, DJD 7:105–136.

67 Falk provides an overview of blessing formulae in Daniel K. Falk, *Daily, Sabbath, and Festival Prayers in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, STDJ 27 (Leiden: Brill, 1998), 36–37.

68 Falk, *Daily, Sabbath, and Festival Prayers*, 29–54; Falk, *Material Aspects of Prayer Manuscripts*, 52–53; Davila, *Liturgical Works*, 209–210.

69 Joseph M. Baumgarten, “4Q503 (Daily Prayers) and the Lunar Calendar,” *RevQ* 12 (1986): 399–407.

70 Evidence for a 364-day solar year can be found in Enoch and Jubilees: Sacha Stern, “Qumran Calendars and Sectarianism,” in *Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 232–253.

71 Jonathan Ben-Dov, “Lunar Calendars at Qumran? A Comparative and Ideological Study,” in *Living the Lunar Calendar*, ed. Jonathan Ben-Dov, Wayne Horowitz, and John M. Steele (Oxford: Oxbow, 2012), 173–189, at 183. See also Jonathan Ben-Dov, *Head of All Years: Astronomy and Calendars at Qumran in Their Ancient Context*, STDJ 78 (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 132–139.

72 Lawrence H. Schiffman, *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls: The History of Judaism, the Background of Christianity, the Lost Library of Qumran* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1994), 305.

73 Baillet, DJD 7:262–286.

4Q415/4Q414. 4Q512 and 4Q414 share a close affinity. Eshel in the edition of 4Q414 points to a range of parallels between the two texts: shared phrases and vocabulary, shared topics and a common pattern of immersions and purifications accompanied by a prayer.⁷⁴ 4Q512 frags. 42–44 and 4Q414 frag. 2 furthermore present parallel versions of the same purification ritual and blessing formula. Due to the fragmentary condition of both manuscripts, we cannot confirm if we are dealing with two copies of the same work, or rather with two closely related versions of a text.⁷⁵

This brings us to the circumstances under which these texts were written down together on one manuscript. In the case of 4Q503/4Q512 we can approach this question from two perspectives: with consideration of the materiality of the manuscript and of the intertextual relations between the two compositions. Starting with the material features, we may observe the presence of the fish hook sign on both recto and verso. There are in total 22 occurrences of the fish hook sign on this manuscript (16 on the recto and 6 occurrences on the verso), and its strategic placement seems to indicate that the sign was used as a division marker. This fish hook sign is also present on 4Q414. Furthermore, we encounter a range of different scribal corrections on this manuscript. On 4Q503 the scribe at different places washed out previous writing, corrected erroneously written letters, and placed interlinear insertions. On 4Q512 the scribe (or scribes?) that corrected the text did so repeatedly between the lines. Other codicological features such as column size and the lines per column are inconsistent on both texts.

From the perspective of content as well, the two compositions display a range of relationships that are suggestive of a similar socio-liturgical setting. Both 4Q503 and 4Q512 can be classified as liturgical texts: they contain collections of prayers for specific occasions or times (often introduced by the notion of *בוֹעֵד*, “appointed time”). In the case of 4Q503 these occasions concern evening and morning prayers, while the prayers of 4Q512 are dedicated to purification rituals. Both compositions can be subdivided into individual prayers and

74 Eshel, DJD 35:136–139. Baillet does not comment on the relationship between 4Q512 and 4Q414.

75 Davila and Dimant argue for two copies of the same text, but Esther Eshel concludes that “these texts are similar but not identical, and as such are two versions of one composition.” Davila, *Liturgical Works*, 267–270; Dimant, “Qumran Manuscripts: Contents and Significance,” 44 n. 80; Esther Eshel, “4Q414 Fragment 2: Purification of a Corpse-Contaminated Person,” in *Legal Texts and Legal Issues: Proceedings of the Second Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Cambridge, 1995, Published in Honour of Joseph M. Baumgarten*, ed. Moshe Bernstein et al., STDJ 23 (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 3–10, at 4; Eshel, DJD 35:136.

as such they follow a fixed structure, which is evidenced through some shared similar blessing formulae: ברוך אתה אל ישראל and ברוך אל ישראל. It is on the basis of these similarities between 4Q503 and 4Q512 that we can think of this manuscript as a collection of related compositions, as has been argued by Falk before.⁷⁶ It should be remarked in this context that the palaeography of both texts suggests a short time frame for the writing of 4Q503 and 4Q512, perhaps even by the same scribe.⁷⁷ It seems therefore that the collection of purification rituals was added on the back of Daily Prayers very shortly after it was written. On the basis of these literary and material considerations we can conclude that of the manuscripts discussed thus far in this chapter 4Q503/4Q512 seems to be the clearest example of an opisthographic collection.

The fact that 4Q503/4Q512 is an opisthograph might also contribute to our understanding of the relationship between Daily Prayers and the wider collection of Dead Sea Scrolls. As we have seen above, it has been argued on the basis of the lunar calendar in 4Q503 that this composition might be of a different provenance.⁷⁸ However, the fact that 4Q503 is written together with 4Q512 on one scroll is cause to revisit this proposition. Both texts share similar scribal practices (fish hook sign, scribal corrections) and display further affinities in genre, topics, and terminology. From a broader perspective we may observe that the purification rituals of 4Q512 continued to be of interest to the people behind the scrolls, as is evidenced by the fact that 4Q512 should be dated before 4Q414, Ritual of Purification A, to which it is closely related.

6 Literary Opisthograph 4Q509/4Q496/4Q506

The final literary opisthograph that survived on a papyrus is the only opisthograph from Qumran that preserves three different compositions, all of which have survived in at least one other witness. On the recto we find 4Q509, one of the four copies of Festival Prayers. The verso contains two texts: 4Q496, one of the seven copies of the War Scroll, and 4Q506, one of the two copies of Words of the Luminaries. According to the official edition by Baillet the recto of this

76 Falk argues for a “common setting for the copying and use of these texts”: “Material Aspects of Prayer Manuscripts,” 56.

77 The palaeography of the literary opisthographs will be discussed below.

78 Some scholars have argued for a non-sectarian setting of 4Q503: Esther G. Chazon, “The Function of the Qumran Prayer Texts: An Analysis of the Daily Prayers (4Q503),” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Fifty Years after Their Discovery, Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20–25, 1997*, ed. Lawrence H. Schiffman, Emanuel Tov, and James C. VanderKam (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2000), 217–225.

scroll would also include 4Q505, which he classifies as another exemplar of Words of the Luminaries.⁷⁹ However, among others, Florentino García Martínez and Falk have demonstrated that the ten fragments assigned to 4Q505 actually belong to 4Q509.⁸⁰ The character of the compositions on this scroll and the setting of the opisthograph itself will be discussed in detail in the chapter five.

79 Baillet, DJD 7:168–170.

80 Florentino García Martínez, “Review of Maurice Baillet, Discoveries in the Judaean Desert VII. Qumrân Grotte 4 III (4Q482–4Q520),” *JSJ* 15 (1984): 157–164; Falk, *Daily, Sabbath, and Festival Prayers*, 59–61; idem, “Material Aspects of Prayer Manuscripts,” 47, 53.

The Palaeography of the Literary Opisthographs

1 Introduction

In this chapter we will consider the palaeography of the literary opisthographs that were introduced in the preceding sections of this chapter.¹ In the absence of internally dated documents, palaeographic studies have been central to our ability to date the scrolls. Handwriting analysis has been used to a far less extent to distinguish between different writing styles and gain new insights into the scribal practices of the scrolls. Here both these perspectives will be addressed: in what follows the palaeographic datings of the manuscripts will be examined in order to establish a relative chronology, and to investigate whether the opisthographic practice can be related to a particular writing style.

I will start with a few general remarks on palaeography and the palaeographic method, followed by a short overview of previous scholarly discussions of the handwriting of the literary opisthographs. The main body of this section will consist of a discussion of the four papyrus opisthographs. The leather manuscript 4Q415/4Q414 will be left out of the discussion here, as its handwriting has been analysed extensively by Strugnell and Harrington in DJD 34, and Eshel in DJD 35. The general discussion at the end will provide both a summary and a synthesis of my findings, as well as a reflection on the notion of writing style.

Since the discovery of the first Dead Sea Scrolls in the 1940s many scholars have contributed to the study of their handwriting.² The majority of the earliest publications offer the analysis of the handwriting of one or a small corpus of manuscripts; the first to present more comprehensive studies on the development of the script of the scrolls were Nahman Avigad and Frank Moore Cross.³ In particular Cross's programmatic 1961 article has heavily influenced

1 The palaeographic analyses of the four papyrus scrolls have appeared in three previous publications in *Dead Sea Discoveries*, as will be indicated in the respective discussions below.

2 A recent overview of the history of the palaeography of the Dead Sea Scrolls is provided in Tigchelaar, "Seventy Years of Palaeographic Dating."

3 Nahman Avigad, "The Palaeography of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Documents," *ScrHier* 4 (1958): 56–87; Frank M. Cross, "The Development of the Jewish Scripts," in *The Bible and the Ancient Near East: Essays in Honor of William Foxwell Albright*, ed. George E. Wright (Garden

the palaeography of the early Jewish scripts, in particular with regard to the formal script. Based on the typological analysis of a selection of manuscripts Cross proposed a relative development of different script types and argued that these could be narrowed down within “fifty years in terms of absolute dates, or even to a generation in terms of relative (typological) relationships.”⁴ Cross divided the typological development of the Dead Sea Scrolls into three chronological phases (Archaic, Hasmonaeon, and Herodian), and created a framework for the palaeography of the scrolls that would allow scholars to date individual manuscripts within concrete historical periods. Later palaeographic studies tend to be largely or exclusively based on this framework.⁵ However, scholars have also reflected critically on Cross’s chronology, and in recent years a few alternative approaches have been developed to reassess the model presented by Cross.⁶ Nevertheless, Cross’s typology remains the most influential model for the palaeographic analyses of Early Jewish scripts and will therefore function as the starting point of discussion here. One aspect of Cross’s model that does require further reflection concerns his understanding of the semi-formal script style, which will be addressed in section 3.11.

City: Doubleday, 1961), 133–202. Here I will refer to the slightly revised reprint of this article in *Leaves from an Epigrapher’s Notebook: Collected Papers in Hebrew and West Semitic Palaeography and Epigraphy*, HSS 51 (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2003), 3–42.

4 Cross, “Development of the Jewish Scripts,” 6.

5 Tigchelaar has summarized Dead Sea Scrolls palaeography after Cross: Tigchelaar: “Seventy Years of Palaeographic Dating,” 265–268. The brief section on palaeography in the introduction of DJD 14, which might serve as a general preface to the series, states that “the palaeographic descriptions of the manuscripts in the Jewish scripts and the dates assigned to them are based primarily on the programmatic study by F.M. Cross,” Eugene C. Ulrich et al, *Qumran Cave 4.IX: Deuteronomy to Kings*, DJD 14 (Oxford: Clarendon, 1995), 3.

6 Critical reflections on Cross’s model: Bruce E. Zuckerman and Lynn Swartz Dodd, “Pots and Alphabets: Refractions of Reflections on Typological Method,” *Maarav* 10 (2003): 89–133; Tigchelaar, “Seventy Years of Palaeographic Dating,” 269–271; Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar and Drew G. Longacre, “4.1.3.2.1 Hebrew and Aramaic Palaeography (Ancient),” in *Textual History of the Bible*, ed. Armin Lange (Leiden: Brill, 2017), http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2452-4107_thb_COM_225895; Drew G. Longacre, “Reconsidering the Date of the En-Gedi Leviticus Scroll (EGLev): Exploring the Limitations of the Comparative-Typological Paleographic Method,” *Textus* 27 (2018): 44–84.

Alternative approaches: Maruf A. Dhali et al., “Feature-extraction Methods for Historical Manuscript Dating Based on Writing Style Development,” *Pattern Recognition Letters* 131 (2020): 413–420; idem, “A Digital Palaeographic Approach towards Writer Identification in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *Proceedings of the 6th International Conference on Pattern Recognition Applications and Methods—Volume 1: ICPRAM, 693–702, 2017, Porto, Portugal*, 693–702; Drew G. Longacre, “Disambiguating the Concept of Formality in Palaeographic Descriptions: Stylistic Classification and the Ancient Jewish Hebrew/Aramaic Scripts,” *COMSt Bulletin* 5 (2019): 101–128.

Recent developments in scholarship invite us to turn to the handwriting of the literary opisthographs with fresh eyes. We observed earlier that the DJD volumes are published by composition, not by manuscript. This often makes little difference, as the majority of manuscripts bear only one composition, but in the case of an opisthograph it means that the different texts on either side of the manuscript are discussed separately from each other. This has led to the circumstance that the recto and verso of many of the Qumran opisthographs are published in different DJD editions and other publications. The following table brings these different datings concisely together. Right below this table I will present my palaeographic discussion of each of the nine texts preserved on the four literary papyrus opisthographs, not taking 4Q415/4Q414 into account.

TABLE 6 Palaeographic dates and notes

MS	Palaeographic date and notes
4Q415 (recto)	DJD (Strugnell and Harrington) Early Herodian formal hand. No keraiai have developed yet. Close to 4Q418 and 4Q418a, two other 4QInstruction manuscripts. Indicators of an early date: final <i>mem</i> (open), <i>he</i> (semi-formal), <i>aleph</i> (three strokes), and indistinguishable <i>vav</i> and <i>yod</i> . ⁷
4Q414 (verso)	DJD (Eshel) Herodian. Written in a thick ductus. Ink has run through at places. ⁸
4Q433a (recto)	DJD (Schuller) Around 75 BCE. Hasmonaean semi-formal. Very similar to, e.g., 4Q503, 4Q512, and 4Q509. ⁹
4Q255 (verso)	DJD (Alexander and Vermes) Early cursive hand of 2nd half 2nd century BCE. ¹⁰ Crude, early cursive hand. Considerable variation in letter size and shape. ¹¹

7 Strugnell and Harrington, DJD 34:42, 214–217. Tigchelaar has dated this manuscript to the Early Herodian period: Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning for the Understanding Ones*, 30.

8 Eshel, DJD 35:135. Tichelaar has dated this manuscript to the Early Herodian period, but notes that the hand is different from 4Q415: Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning for the Understanding Ones*, 29–30.

9 Schuller, DJD 29:238. Elsewhere I have dated this manuscript around 100 BCE to early 1st century BCE: Aksu, “Palaeographic and Codicological (Re)assessment,” 178–179.

10 Frank M. Cross, “Appendix: Paleographical Dates of the Manuscripts,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations, vol. 1: Rule of the Community and Related Documents*, ed. James H. Charlesworth (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1994), 57.

11 Alexander and Vermes, DJD 26:29–30. A few alternative dates have been proposed:

Ada Yardeni has dated 4Q255 to the first century BCE: Ada Yardeni, *Textbook of Aramaic, Hebrew and Nabataean Documentary Texts from the Judaean Desert and Related Material, vol. A: The Documents* (Jerusalem: The Ben-Zion Dinur Center for Research in Jewish History, 2000), 251.

TABLE 6 Palaeographic dates and notes, page 58–60 (*cont.*)

MS	Palaeographic date and notes
4Q499 (recto)	DJD (Baillet) Around 75 BCE. Slightly older than the verso. ¹²
4Q497 (verso)	DJD (Baillet) Around 50 BCE. Slightly younger than the recto. The black ink has survived well, but is grainy (<i>poussiéreuse</i>) at places. ¹³
4Q503 (recto)	DJD (Baillet) Hasmonaeen calligraphic hand, 100–75 BCE. The black ink has faded slightly, but is generally free of grains. ¹⁴
4Q512 (verso)	DJD (Baillet) Early 1st century BCE. Similar style as recto, but not the same hand. Some forms are more archaic, but others more evolved. ¹⁵
4Q509 (recto)	DJD (Baillet) Late Hasmonaeen, around 70–60 BCE ¹⁶
4Q496 (verso)	DJD (Baillet) Pre-herodian hand, slightly before 50 BCE. Difficult to date. ¹⁷
4Q506 (verso)	DJD (Baillet) Middle of 1st century CE. Very evolved hand. Some letter forms are similar to forms from post-herodian ossuaries. ¹⁸

2 4Q433a¹⁹

The handwriting preserved on this opisthograph is slightly idiosyncratic, as the texts on both recto and verso are written in different styles. This papyrus is the only manuscript from Qumran where this is the case. 4Q433a on the recto is written in a semi-formal character that shows a certain waviness in curvy strokes that run diagonally.²⁰ Most letters are equally sized. Sometimes they

Émile Puech dated 4Q255 to the last quarter of the 2nd century BCE: Émile Puech, “La paléographie des manuscrits de la mer Morte,” in *The Caves of Qumran: Proceedings of the International Conference, Lugano 2014*, ed. Marcello Fidanzio, STDJ 118 (Leiden: Brill, 2016), 96–105, at 102.

Elsewhere I have dated 4Q255 around 100 BCE to early 1st century BCE: Aksu, “Palaeographic and Codicological (Re)assessment,” 174–177, 179.

12 Baillet, DJD 7:74.

13 Baillet, DJD 7:69.

14 Baillet, DJD 7:105.

15 Baillet, DJD 7:262.

16 Baillet, DJD 7:184.

17 Baillet, DJD 7:58.

18 Baillet, DJD 7:170.

19 The analysis of 4Q433a/4Q255 presented here concerns a concise version of my earlier discussion of this manuscript: Aksu, “Palaeographic and Codicological (Re)assessment,” 174–179.

20 We will reflect further on the notion of ‘semi-formal’ in the general discussion of this section below.

touch each other, which occasionally creates a flowing, curving line. Looking at letter forms, most are written in a Hasmonaean style: 4Q433a preserves the large final *mems* and *tavs* that are often found in manuscripts of this script type. Other typical features are the small head of the *kaph*, the long descender of the *qoph*, the long base stroke of the *nun*, and big *ayins*. The execution of some letter forms however is quite inconsistent, *shins* for example are written with left strokes that curve both in and out.

Elsewhere I have argued that the handwriting of 4Q433a should be placed firmly within the semi-formal tradition, and compared it with a range of other semi-formal manuscripts such as 4Q109 and 4Q504, which are the earliest examples of the script style.²¹ On the basis of this traditional palaeographic approach I have argued for a dating around 100 BCE, with a preference for the early 1st century BCE. Independent of this palaeographic dating, recent C14-dating of the manuscript resulted in an age range of 170–50 BCE.²² The palaeographic assessment presented here is within the range of these dates. I would therefore propose to date this manuscript around the first century BCE; in absolute dates this would result in a time frame of about 125–75 BCE.

3 4Q255

4Q255 is written in the cursive script. The handwriting is crude and irregular and quite difficult to read, which could indicate that it was written rapidly. The execution of letter forms (such as the *aleph*) often varies a lot. The *dalet* of 4Q255 however is written more consistently and can be compared to those we find in 4Q76, 4Q398, and 4Q448. The *hes* have clear cursive elements with the left 'leg' of the letter descending in diagonal direction (quite like 4Q212). Both *pe* and *shin* are more developed. The *pe* is more angled and has a thickened head, while the *shin* does not protrude below the base line. Cross has dated

21 Aksu, "Palaeographic and Codicological (Re)assessment," 178–179.

22 Mladen Popović, Maruf A. Dhali, Lambert Schomaker, Johannes van der Plicht, Kaare Lund Rasmussen, Jacopo La Nasa, Ilaria Degano, Maria Perla Colombini, and Eibert Tigchelaar, "Dating Ancient Manuscripts Using Radiocarbon and AI-based Writing Style Analysis," *Forthcoming*.

A C14 measurement does not directly provide a calendar date. For technical reasons, a C14 date is reported in its own defined unit of time which has to be calibrated into calendar time. This results in a calendar age range probability distribution. The numbers shown statistically represent an age range with a confidence level of 2-sigma (or 95.4%). On the methodology of C14 dating: Johannes van der Plicht, "Radiocarbon Dating and the Dead Sea Scrolls: A Comment on "Redating"," *DSD* 14 (2007): 77–89.

the script of 4Q255 to the second half of the second century BCE.²³ However, the cursive hand in general is a script type that is difficult to locate within a typological tradition because relatively few cursive manuscripts have survived from Qumran. 4Q255 does invite comparison with the semicursive manuscripts 4Q212, 4Q398, and 4Q448. Another manuscript that 4Q255 does resemble is the Murabba'at Ostrakon 72, though some of the forms of 4Q255 are typologically more developed. It is on the basis of these features that I would place this hand rather at the far end of the time frame suggested by Cross and propose a dating around 100 BCE.

4 4Q499²⁴

The manuscript 4Q499/4Q497 is probably the most poorly preserved literary opisthograph from Qumran. Only a handful of complete words have been preserved on the 54 fragments of this manuscript. The writing that did survive is nevertheless well readable, which allows us to get an impression of the character of the handwriting. 4Q499 is generally written with curvy strokes, particularly in the downstrokes of the *kaph*, *tav*, and the right descender of *khet*. The left descender of the *tav* bends outward. The downstroke or 'tail' of the *ayin* tends to protrude almost in horizontal direction. There is variation in the execution of individual letter forms: a noteworthy example of this are the 'curls' in two successive *lameds* in frag. 48, which we do not find anywhere else in this manuscript. *Gimel* is broad and with a curved right leg. The final *mems* of 4Q499 have a horizontal stroke that extends to the left and sometimes upwards, a feature this manuscript shares with 4Q433a. Frag. 10 2 preserves the remains of a cursive final *tsade* that can be compared to a similar one in 4Q433a frag. 3.

5 4Q497

While the recto of this papyrus is quite well readable despite the poor state of the manuscript, this is less the case for 4Q497 on the verso. Because the ink has faded out in many places, only a few letters per fragment are fully preserved. However, we do observe some of the typical curving downstrokes in the exe-

23 Cross, "Appendix: Paleographical Dates of the Manuscripts."

24 This analysis of 4Q499/4Q497 was published in a slightly adjusted form in Ayhan Aksu, "The Qumran Opisthographic Papyri as a Scribal Cluster of Manuscripts," *DSD* 30 (2023): 235–261.

cution of letters such as the *he*, *kaph*, and *tav*. Several letter forms seem to be comparable to those in 4Q499, such as the final *mem* and *ayin*, with a downstroke extending horizontally. The open *qoph* in frag. 9 is similar in shape to the two examples in 4Q433a frag. 1. Particularly noteworthy furthermore is the cursive or semi-cursive *tet* in frag. 6, which is paralleled in 4Q433a frag. 3. Baillet in DJD 7 remarks that the script on the verso of this papyrus is slightly later than the recto and for this reason he dates 4Q497 about 25 years later.²⁵ However, the letter forms of 4Q497 do not seem to be more evolved than those on the recto, but rather very similar. It could be possible that both texts were written by the same scribe, but this cannot be demonstrated due to the poor condition of the manuscript.

6 4Q503²⁶

The recto of this manuscript presents us with a text written in an easily readable scribal hand. The letters are unshaded, though the letter strokes are sometimes quite thick. The size of the letters is inconsistent, but Falk estimates the average letter height at 2–3 mm.²⁷ Not all letters are perfectly aligned: there are occasions, for example, where downstrokes extend below the writing of other words, as we see with the *resh* in עשר in frag. 2 line 14 or אשר in frag. 4 line 7. There is significant variation in the execution of letter forms, which can be illustrated by considering multiple *alephs* and *hes* next to each other. Some *alephs* have an almost cursive feel to them, while others are made up of three straight strokes. On some occasions the left ‘leg’ of the *he* touches the ‘roof,’ but often it does not. The right leg of the *he* may or may not curve in.

Most letter forms are simple and straightforward, but generally executed nicely, with typical long, thinly written wavy downstrokes, visible in particular in letters such as *lamed* and *kaph*, but also in the right stroke of *dalet*. This is one of the most distinguishable features of this scribal hand, and perhaps of this style in general. The *lamed* for example is written in the fluid, curving stroke of the semi-formal tradition that we also encounter in older manuscripts such as 4Q109. The final *kaph* is also written with a long, slightly curving downstroke that bends in at the end, reminiscent of the similar letter to be found in 4Q504. Medial and final letter forms are generally well distinguished in 4Q503,

25 Baillet, DJD 7:69, 74.

26 This analysis of 4Q503/4Q512 was published in a slightly adjusted form in Aksu, “Qumran Opisthographic Papyri as a Scribal Cluster.”

27 Falk, “Material Aspects of Prayer Manuscripts,” 65.

though frag. 14 preserves a final *kaph* in medial position. The final *mems* are still quite large, not always closed, and with a curving base stroke. The *bets* in 4Q503 are broad. Especially the horizontal base stroke often touches the next letter, a feature we will see return in a number of other hands. The cursive *tsade* is comparable to the ones we see in 4Q433a and 4Q499. The *tav* is also similar in form to those in 4Q433a and 4Q499, with both downstrokes curving to the left. One example in frag. 9 allows us to reconstruct the stroke order: first the left descender, followed by the ‘roof’ and the right descender in one movement. Overall, the letter forms of 4Q503 are much like those preserved in 4Q433a and 4Q499/4Q497, though 4Q503 does seem slightly less formal in its execution.

7 4Q512

The hand preserved on the verso is very similar to the hand of the recto. Many of the letter forms described above under 4Q503 are present in this text as well. We encounter for example similar large final *mems*, wavy *kaphs*, and similarly shaped *tavs* with curvy downstrokes. The typically shaped *tsade* is also present in this hand. We observed in the other manuscripts discussed above that there is often an inconsistency in the way letters are written within the same manuscript. Letter size can vary, and in 4Q503 and 4Q512, for example, we also find both open and closed *qophs* and final *mems*. It is possible that this is a characteristic of this writing style. There are certainly differences between the handwriting of both texts on this manuscript, but these concern the execution of letters rather than their form: the size of the letters on 4Q512 is larger, and generally more inconsistent. Falk is right in his observation that “letter size and thickness, line spacing, and margins are all a bit larger on 4Q512.”²⁸ 4Q512 appears to be a sloppy or careless version of the hand of 4Q503. However, to me these differences do not seem significant enough to be certain that the verso was written by a different scribe (as argued by Falk). Alternatively, the difference in quality between the script of 4Q503 and 4Q512 could also have to do with the materiality of the manuscript.²⁹ As 4Q512 is written on the papyrological verso, the messy appearance of the text could be a consequence of having to write across the vertical fibres of the papyrus.

28 Falk, “Material Aspects of Prayer Manuscripts,” 52, 65. The average letter size of 4Q512 measures about 3–3.5 mm.

29 Suggested by Tigchelaar in private communication.

8 4Q509³⁰

The opisthograph 4Q509/4Q496/4Q506 has survived in about 300 fragments. 4Q509 on the recto is in a better condition than 4Q496 and 4Q506 on the verso. Also on the recto do we find only a handful of fragments that preserve more than a few words from the same line. This poor state of preservation makes it difficult to assess the general character of the script. However, we are able to have a closer look at individual letter forms. The average letter size is about 2.5–3 mm.³¹ There is variation in the ways in which individual letters are written, which may again be illustrated by considering *aleph* and *he*. The roof of the *he* is irregular in length and thickness, while the legs can be both straight and curvy. The different *alephs* are difficult to classify, but some look almost cross-shaped. A number of features that we observed above in relation to 4Q433a return in this hand as well, such as the large *mem* and the cursive looking *tsade*. The wavy descenders of the *kaph* and *lamed* in 4Q509 can be compared to 4Q433a and 4Q503 as well. The flowing way in which וְתַבְדֵּי is written in frag. 213 illustrates that the hand of 4Q509 should be located in the semi-formal tradition. Here we also find an example of the characteristically broad *bet* of 4Q509, with a long base stroke that occasionally pokes into the next letter. However, if we place 4Q509 next to 4Q503, we immediately can observe the presence of even more curving downstrokes in the latter manuscript. Though both these manuscripts are written in a similar script style, it appears that 4Q509 preserves a slightly less wavy handwriting.

9 4Q496

Much of the text has faded out and even most of the larger fragments preserve few letter forms without signs of deterioration. This is certainly the poorest preserved text on any of the literary opisthographs, which means that all our attempts towards dating or classifying the scribal hand are with some reservation. Why the verso survived in a poorer state than the recto is unclear; this could have to do with the quality of the ink that was used, or perhaps with the position in which the manuscript was deposited in the cave, which might have left the verso more exposed to the natural elements.

30 This analysis of 4Q509/4Q496/4Q506 was published in a slightly adjusted form in Ayhan Aksu, "The Qumran Opisthograph 4Q509/4Q496/4Q506 as an Intentional Collection of Prayers," *DSD* 29 (2022): 292–324.

31 Falk, "Material Aspects of Prayer Manuscripts," 65.

The average letter size of 4Q496 is 3 mm, comparable to 4Q509.³² The letter forms of 4Q496 are similar in style to 4Q509 on the recto, but they do not appear to be written by the same scribe. The *he* of 4Q496 is more regular in shape than those we encounter in 4Q503 or 4Q509, though the right leg tends to vary in both length and thickness. There is little consistency in the execution of the *aleph*. Although 4Q496 in general presents quite some variation in letter forms, we do find a range of the typically wavy downstrokes, particularly in the *lamed*. 4Q496 preserves the broadly written *bet* that often touches the next letter, or stretches out under it. The *tsade* is drawn in one flowing movement. There is variation in the execution of the *tav*, but in most instances do we find both descenders curling to the left.

10 4Q506

The second text on the verso of this papyrus stands out with regard to the other manuscripts discussed here. The average letter height is about 4–5 mm; a bit larger than the other texts of this manuscript.³³ 4Q506 is certainly written by a different hand that preserves letter forms in a different style. The long, wavy downstroke characteristic of the other hands on the literary opisthographs are not present here. Unfortunately, no final *kaphs* survived on this manuscript, but the final *nun* has shrunk considerably. In fact, the scribe of 4Q506 does not seem to distinguish between medial and final *nun*, but draws an s-shaped *nun* in both positions. We find this letter form also in 4Q255 frag. 2 line 4. The few final *mems* that did survive in 4Q506 are of average size. The *hes* are consistently penned with the roof and left leg drawn in one stroke, similar to the reversed-‘k’ form evidenced in 4Q212 and 4Q255.³⁴ The right leg of the *tav* does not bend anymore. The left leg of the *tav* is s-shaped with the top of the stroke curving to the right. The shape of the *aleph* is quite straightforward with a diagonal, a straight left leg running diagonally, and a right arm that has a slight tendency to curve upwards. Some instances of the *shin* have a tail where the left downstroke breaks through below the right ‘arm’ of the letter. *Tsade* is penned in a developed shape with two arms now curving towards each other. It is easy to distinguish between *vav* and *yod*, a feature that tends to be more prevalent on later manuscripts.³⁵ It is on the basis of these features that we should push the date of 4Q506 to a later timeframe than 4Q433a.

32 Falk, “Material Aspects of Prayer Manuscripts,” 65.

33 Falk, “Material Aspects of Prayer Manuscripts,” 65.

34 Cross, “Development of the Jewish Scripts,” 40.

35 Cross, “Development of the Jewish Scripts,” 34.

4Q506 is a very difficult manuscript to assign to a particular period, partly because of its very fragmentary condition. Baillet suggests a date in the middle of the first century CE. He does not provide a palaeographic analysis or a description of letters, but remarks that the script is “une calligraphie très évoluée” with letter forms that are similar to those found in post-Herodian ossuaries.³⁶ However, with regard to a comparison with ossuaries two issues need to be borne in mind. First, comparing individual hands across different writing materials comes with certain difficulties. The differences between the use of a brush and reed pen for example has received quite some scholarly attention and we can expect these differences to be even bigger when it comes to papyrus and limestone ossuaries.³⁷ Carving a limestone is a significantly different experience from writing on a scroll or sheet that would require a different posture and distinct writing implements and techniques.

Second, the amount of evidence for the post-Herodian period is very scarce, as ossuaries largely disappear after 70 CE.³⁸ Moreover, the ossuaries that did survive are mostly either plain (without inscription), or inscribed in Greek.³⁹ To my knowledge, no ossuary bearing a Hebrew or Aramaic inscription survived that can securely be dated to about 70–135 CE.⁴⁰ We do not know why ossuaries largely disappeared in this period, but Jodi Magness hypothesized that the Jerusalemite elites that would have used the tombs in which the ossuaries were

36 Baillet, DJD 7:170.

37 Willy Clarysse, “Egyptian Scribes Writing Greek,” *CdE* 68 (1993): 186–201; Stephen Kidd, “Written Greek but Drawn Egyptian: Script Changes in a Bilingual Dream Papyrus,” in *Writing as Material Practice: Substance, Surface and Medium*, ed. Kathryn E. Piquette and Ruth Whitehouse (London: Ubiquity, 2013), 239–252. More generally on the influence of writing surfaces on the appearance of a text: Drew G. Longacre, “Comparative Hellenistic and Roman Manuscript Studies (CHRoMS): Script Interactions and Hebrew/Aramaic Writing Culture,” *COMSt Bulletin* 7 (2021): 7–50; Alan Johnston, “Straight, Crooked and Joined-up Writing: An Early Mediterranean View,” in *Writing as Material Practice*, 193–212.

38 Levi Y. Rahmani, *A Catalogue of Jewish Ossuaries in the Collections of the State of Israel* (Jerusalem, Israel Antiquities Authority, 1994) 23; Jodi Magness, “Ossuaries and the Burials of Jesus and James,” *JBL* 124 (2005): 121–154, at 129; Amos Kloner and Boaz Zissu, *The Necropolis of Jerusalem in the Second Temple Period*, ISACR 8 (Leuven: Peeters, 2007), 120.

39 See for example the four ossuaries with Greek inscriptions that were discovered in 1997 at Horbat Zefiyya: Walter Ameling et al., eds., *Corpus Inscriptionum Iudaeae/Palaestinae*, vol. 4: *Iudaea/Idumaea, Part 1: 2649–3324* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2018), 697–700.

40 A number of ossuaries recorded in the *Corpus Inscriptionum Iudaeae/Palaestinae* (CIIP) are dated to 1 c. BCE–2 c. CE, a time frame that is too broad to be of assistance in dating manuscripts: e.g. Ameling et al., *CIIP*, vol. 4/Part 1, 717–718. Furthermore, ossuaries in burial caves that contain evidence of use after 70 CE most probably predate the destruction of the Second Temple: Kloner and Zissu, *The Necropolis of Jerusalem*, 120.

found were either dead or had left.⁴¹ One ossuary has been dated to this period by Levi Rahmani, but Jonathan Price and Ada Yardeni date it between the first century BCE and first century CE.⁴² The inscription only contains the name לוי בר מנשה בגפיה (“Levi, son of Menashe, by himself”), but the letter forms preserved here are different from 4Q506.⁴³ As it is unclear which features of 4Q506 reminded Baillet of the post-Herodian ossuaries, there does not seem much ground to push the date of 4Q506 towards this period. The text of 4Q506 is most probably written after 4Q509 and 4Q496, the other texts on this manuscript, which is apparent from both its position on the papyrus (on the verso, below 4Q496) and the letter forms. I would therefore propose a dating around the middle of the 1st century BCE or later.

11 General Discussion

The scribal hands of the literary opisthographs 4Q433a, 4Q499, 4Q497, 4Q503, 4Q512, 4Q509, and 4Q496 discussed above are strikingly similar, with the exception of 4Q255 and 4Q506. These manuscripts appear to be written in a semi-formal style that can be characterised by the presence of fluid, curving downstrokes and inconsistency in the execution of letter forms. These hands are generally quite easy to read, despite occasional cursive influences.

4Q433a/4Q255 was dated in the discussion above to around the time frame of 125–75 BCE, a dating that can find support in recent C14-datings. On the basis of these palaeographic considerations, a dating within a half century of 4Q433a seems probable for the other semi-formal hands (i.e. 4Q499, 4Q497, 4Q503, 4Q512, 4Q509, and 4Q496).

It should be emphasized that palaeographic datings are not set in stone. Aside from some of the more general methodological complications observed by scholars such as Tigchelaar and Drew Longacre with regard to the typological framework developed by Cross, the datings of these literary opisthographs are further complicated by their poor state of preservation, especially 4Q499/4Q497.⁴⁴ However, these palaeographic analyses can at least provide a

41 Jodi Magness, *Stone and Dung, Oil and Spit: Jewish Daily Life in the Time of Jesus* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011), 154.

42 Israel Museum, Jerusalem, inv. no. 1975–710. That is no. 610 in Rahmani, *Catalogue of Jewish Ossuaries*, 208–209; Ameling et al., *C1IP*, vol. 4/Part 1, 61–62.

43 As becomes clear from comparing for example *he*, *yod*, or *shin*.

44 Tigchelaar, “Seventy Years of Palaeographic Dating,” 269–276; Longacre, “Disambiguating the Concept of Formality.”

relative chronology as it has become apparent that the scribal hands of these literary opisthographs most probably date from the same period. The similarities between these hands becomes particularly noticeable if we juxtapose them to manuscripts from this period that are written in a different script type. We may think in this regard of Hasmonaean formal hands such as those preserved in 4Q30, 4Q31, or 1QIsa^a.⁴⁵ These manuscripts are all written by different scribes, which means there is quite some variation between them.⁴⁶ Nevertheless, they share a consistency in letter size and forms and absence of the wavy downstrokes that we have observed in the scribal hands of the literary opisthographs. It is clear that these opisthographs are distinctly different, both in the general character of the script and in letter forms.

In this section I have referred to the writing style of these papyri as semi-formal. However, the status and character of semi-formal as a separate script type is debatable. According to Cross's palaeographic framework, the semi-formal has been influenced by both the formal and cursive tradition and is attested in the Archaic, Hasmonaean, and Herodian periods.⁴⁷ Both Tigchelaar and Longacre in recent contributions have identified a number of problems with the notions of semi-formal, though both do not fully move away from its use.⁴⁸ In Greek palaeography it is not common practice to distinguish a semi-formal-like tradition.⁴⁹ It seems difficult to divide less formal handwriting into strictly defined

45 4Q30 and 1QIsa^a are extensively discussed by Cross as typical examples of the Hasmonaean formal script: Cross, "Development of the Jewish Scripts," 27–31. A palaeographic description based on Cross's model of 4Q31 is provided in Sidnie White Crawford, DJD 14:35.

46 Writer identification on the basis of artificial intelligence has even resulted in the identification of two scribes that were responsible for 1QIsa^a: Mladen Popović, Maruf A. Dhali, and Lambert Schomaker, "Artificial Intelligence Based Writer Identification Generates New Evidence for the Unknown Scribes of the Dead Sea Scrolls Exemplified by the Great Isaiah Scroll (1QIsa^a)," *PLoS ONE* 16 (2021), <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0249769>.

47 Cross, "Development of the Jewish Scripts," 22.

48 Tigchelaar maintains that semi-formal can be used for heuristic reasons, while Longacre reserves it for "borderline cases" between formal and informal hands: Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar, "Scribal Practices as Attested in the Dead Sea Scrolls Manuscripts Written in a So-Called Rustic Semi-Formal Tradition" (paper presented at the International SBL, St. Andrews, 8 July 2013); Longacre, "Disambiguating the Concept of Formality," 110.

49 Eric Turner in his study of Greek manuscripts from the first till the fourth century CE for example classifies literary hands into three styles that are contemporary and "cross-fertilize and hybridize easily:" 1) informal round hands, 2) formal round hands, and 3) mixed hands. None of these script types seem readily comparable to Cross's semi-formal. Turner, *Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World*, 20–23.

styles. Therefore, rather than as a clearly defined script type, the notion of semi-formal can be used here heuristically to refer to the writing style of a group of manuscripts written in the tradition of 4Q504 and 4Q109.⁵⁰

This brings us to the question how significant it is when a set of manuscripts is written in a particular writing style. What does it mean that these literary opisthographs are written in the semi-formal? It is problematic that scholarship thus far has not been able to establish whether modern stylistic classifications are a reflection of ancient scribal culture. However, this does not prevent us from hypothesizing about the circumstances that could give rise to different writing styles. I would propose the following three possibilities:

The writing style of a particular manuscript could be the result of an intentional decision on behalf of the scribe. The fact that a group of manuscripts was written in, for example, the semi-formal could in that case indicate that these manuscripts were either produced in a similar context, or intended to be used in a similar context. The idea that manuscripts could be written in a specific style in order to serve a particular purpose is not without parallel in ancient scribal culture as William Johnson argued for the presence of “*éditions de luxe*” among the Oxyrhynchus papyri from Egypt.⁵¹ In his view some particular manuscripts could deliberately be written in a large, elegant script and with large margins to differentiate this type of manuscript from “those found in everyday productions.”⁵² However, we are unable to establish whether the scribes of these opisthographs deliberately intended to write their texts in a specific style.

Alternatively, we can imagine that the types of writing that nowadays are distinguished as writing styles were actually the result of scribal education. The similarities between the hands of manuscripts such as 4Q499, 4Q503, and 4Q509 have led Schuller to write about “a school of hands which is frequently represented in the 4Q papyri.”⁵³ The notion of a ‘school of hands’ suggests that the scribes wrote these manuscripts according to a particular convention. It is indeed possible that the texts on the literary opisthographs were not written in the semi-formal with the intention to differentiate these manuscripts

50 Cross, “Development of the Jewish Scripts,” 22; Eugene C. Ulrich et al., *Qumran Cave 4.XI: Psalms to Chronicles*, DJD 16 (Oxford: Clarendon, 2000), 221–226; Baillet, DJD 7:137–168.

51 Johnson, *Bookrolls and Scribes in Oxyrhynchus*, 155–156. See also the discussion on ‘*de luxe* editions’ in section 3.12.

52 Johnson, *Bookrolls and Scribes in Oxyrhynchus*, 155.

53 Schuller, DJD 29:129. According to Schuller this ‘school’ consists of not only opisthographs, but also other manuscripts such as 4Q428 and 4Q500.

from those written in another style, but simply because that was the script style the scribes were trained in.

Finally, it is possible that the flowing writing style of these opisthographs could be the result of scribes not trying to produce high-level manuscripts, but rather something practical for everyday use. The informality of these hands could be an indication of more day-to-day writing without particular artifice. This proposition is much in line with Longacre's recent analysis of the concept of formality in palaeography, as he associated informal writing with efficiency and argued that informal hands would generally be "suitable only for personal use or interaction with familiar readers or professional colleagues."⁵⁴ Based on the current state of evidence, I would consider this the most plausible explanation for the palaeography of the literary opisthographs. However, such an assessment would have to be based on more features than palaeography alone, but also on issues such as lay-out and writing material.

12 Opisthographs and the Choice for Papyrus

One aspect of these opisthographs that has not received much consideration yet in this chapter is the issue of the choice of writing material. The Dead Sea Scrolls in general contain both leather and papyrus manuscripts.⁵⁵ Unfortunately, the texts in the scrolls or Second Temple period texts transmitted otherwise do not offer any clues regarding how both materials were perceived. For example, we do not know whether the terminology deployed to refer to a scroll distinguished between leather and papyrus.⁵⁶ The absence of evidence for reflection at the time in Judaea on these issues could to some extent be com-

54 Longacre, "Disambiguating the Concept of Formality," 123.

55 The most significant exceptions in this regard are the archaeological evidence (ostraca, pottery inscriptions) listed by André Lemaire and 3Q15, the Copper Scroll; André Lemaire, "Inscriptions du khirbeh, des grottes 'Ain Feshkha," in *Khirbet Qumrân et 'Ain Feshkha 11: Études d'anthropologie, de physique et de chimie*, ed. Jean-Baptiste Humbert and Jan Gunneweg, NTOA. SA 3 (Fribourg: Presses Universitaires; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2003), 341–388. Recent discussions on 3Q15: Émile Puech, *The Copper Scroll Revisited*, STDJ 112 (Leiden: Brill, 2015); Jesper Høgenhaven, "Copper Scroll," in *T&T Clark Companion to the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 304–305; Høgenhaven, *The Cave 3 Copper Scroll: A Symbolic Journey*, STDJ 132 (Leiden: Brill, 2020).

56 The terms used for scroll מגלה and ספר, do not seem to be connected to a particular writing medium. However, Akkadian does employ the determinative KUŠ (Akkadian 'mašku') to refer to a leather manuscript: *ABZ*, 58. See also Raymond P. Dougherty, "Writing upon Parchment and Papyrus among the Babylonians and the Assyrians," *JAOs* 48 (1928): 109–135, at 110–128.

pensated by sources from elsewhere. For this, we need to briefly consider how different writing materials in other parts of the ancient Mediterranean world were perceived.⁵⁷

It is difficult to assess to what degree the evidence that did survive is representative for the distribution of different writing surfaces in antiquity, but the extant evidence from the Persian period onwards suggests that papyrus was most commonly in use in both Egypt and Italy. Egyptian papyrus would be shipped throughout the Mediterranean and became the dominant writing material in the classical world.⁵⁸ Greek and Roman sources provide some information on how papyrus was perceived in relation to other writing media. Literary and archaeological evidence suggest that, at least during certain periods and in particular regions, papyrus was considered appropriate for literary works of the educated elites.⁵⁹ This notion has deeply influenced scholarly attitudes towards different writing materials. Thomas Kraus has shown that New Testament scholars tend to prioritize papyri over parchment manuscripts that carry New Testament texts, to the degree that papyri are often accepted “as superior to other categories and as more significant for the reconstruction of the Greek New Testament.”⁶⁰ At the same time there is a plethora of evidence from both Egypt and Italy of papyri being used for note-keeping, school exercises, and personal copies as well, which suggests that papyrus was not

57 In this discussion we will focus on papyrus and leather, as these media dominate the main manuscript collections from the Persian period onwards. However, it should be noted that many other materials were used for writing, such as linen, wax, wood, clay, and stone.

58 To what degree the term monopoly is applicable for the production of papyrus in Egypt is debated. This notion seems to imply a form of state intervention into economic production that was foreign to ancient societies. Cf. Cornelia Römer, “The Papyrus Roll in Egypt, Greece, and Rome,” in *A Companion to the History of the Book*, ed. Simon Eliot and Jonathan Rose, 2nd ed. (Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2020), 191–202.

59 We have papyrus fragments bearing the works of all major authors from classical antiquity, such as Homer, Virgil, Herodotus, Thucydides, Cicero, and the Greek tragedians, which tells us that papyrus was considered to be the appropriate writing medium for the transference of Greek and Latin literary texts. The list of selected electronic resources of *The Oxford Handbook of Papyrology* provides a number of databases where these papyri can be found, such as the Leuven Database of Ancient Books (LDAB) on Trismegistos.org, papyri.info, and the *Mertens-Pack*, a digitally updated database of Roger A. Pack’s *The Greek and Latin Literary Texts from Greco-Roman Egypt*, 2nd ed. (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1965); Roger S. Bagnall, “Internet Resources,” in *The Oxford Handbook of Papyrology* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), xv–xvi.

60 Thomas J. Kraus, “Parchment Or Papyrus?: Some Remarks About The Significance Of Writing Material When Assessing Manuscripts,” in *Ad Fontes: Original Manuscripts and Their Significance for Studying Early Christianity: Selected Essays*, TENTS 3 (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 13–24, at 16.

exclusively the medium of high literature.⁶¹ The mention of texts being written on leather goes back to at least the Fourth Dynasty in Egypt.⁶² While leather was nowhere the only writing material that was used, it appears that leather (for texts in Aramaic) together with clay tablets (for texts in cuneiform scripts) developed to become the preferred medium for the Persian bureaucracy, as is visible from the Khalili collection of Aramaic documents from Bactria (353–324 BCE) and the letters from the satrap Arshama in the fifth century.⁶³ There is evidence for the presence of papyrus texts during the Persian period as well: a collection of about 180 papyri survived in Elephantine, while the use of papyrus for legal documents is also attested in the Wadi Daliyeh papyri.⁶⁴

The Dead Sea Scrolls provide us with an interesting case in this regard. Manuscripts written on both leather and papyrus are present, but not in equal numbers. Leather texts are far more common, though the number of papyri seems nevertheless to be significant.⁶⁵ It could be possible that the choice for one or the other was completely random and that scribes just used whatever writing material they could lay their hands on, but scholars often assume that selecting papyrus or leather was a conscious decision.

61 Both Luijendijk and Johnson provide multiple examples from Oxyrhynchus: Luijendijk, “Sacred Scriptures as Trash”; Johnson, *Bookrolls and Scribes in Oxyrhynchus*.

62 Ronald Reed, *Ancient Skins, Parchments and Leathers* (London: Seminar Press, 1972), 3.

63 Dougherty, “Writing upon Parchment and Papyrus,” 110–128; Menahem Haran, “Book-Scrolls at the Beginning of the Second Temple Period: The Transition from Papyrus to Skins,” *HUCA* 54 (1983): 111–122; Amélie Kuhrt, “State Communications in the Persian Empire,” in *State Correspondence in the Ancient World: From New Kingdom Egypt to the Roman Empire*, ed. Karen Radner (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 112–140.

64 The presence of papyrus in Elephantine can be explained by the fact that Egypt was the main production centre for papyrus in antiquity.

65 There are no reliable numbers regarding the distribution of papyrus among the Dead Sea Scrolls. Tov estimates the total at about 131 scrolls, which would account for about 14% of all manuscripts from Qumran. However, Tov, following Stephen Pfann, considers 4Q249 as 27 different papyri, and 4Q250 as 11 papyri, though each of these reconstructed manuscripts might only constitute one manuscript. See: Jonathan Ben-Dov, Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra, and Asaf Gayer, “Reconstruction of a Single Copy of the Qumran Cave 4 Cryptic-Script Serekh haEdah,” *RevQ* 29 (2017): 21–77; Perrot, “Reading an Opisthograph at Qumran,” 110–111.

Furthermore, Tov does count each text on the opisthographs as a separate papyrus, which further inflates the total number: Tov, “The Corpus of the Qumran Papyri”; Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 45; 289–294. For a further discussion of Tov’s estimation cf. George J. Brooke, “Choosing Between Papyrus and Skin: Cultural Complexity and Multiple Identities in the Qumran Library,” in *Jewish Cultural Encounters in the Ancient Mediterranean and Near Eastern World*, ed. Mladen Popović, Myles Schoonover, and Marjijn Vandenberghe, *JJS*Sup 178 (Leiden: Brill, 2017), 119–135.

We observed in our treatment of the literary opisthographs, that most of them were written on papyrus. This raises the suspicion that papyrus is overrepresented among the opisthographs. How does this impression translate into statistics? What is the ratio papyrus opisthographs vs. leather opisthographs and how does this number compare to the general distribution of papyrus and leather manuscripts across the Dead Sea Scrolls?

The total number of literary opisthographs is five. This is evidently a very small number, but nevertheless interesting to consider more closely. Four out of five of these opisthographs are written on papyrus, which amounts to 80%.⁶⁶

The general ratio of papyrus vs. leather is difficult to establish, because the numbers diverge widely per cave. Cave 7 for example contains only texts written on papyrus, while about half of the manuscripts from Cave 6 are papyri. Here we will focus on Cave 4, because that is the cave where all our opisthographs are from. Tigchelaar estimates the number of papyri from Cave 4 to be between 40 and 50.⁶⁷ It is unknown how many manuscripts Cave 4 would have yielded in total, but scholars estimate this number to be around 700.⁶⁸ Our most secure number (though still arbitrary) is 589, which is the number of manuscripts included by Tov in his Revised List.⁶⁹

Based on these numbers we would estimate that papyrus is the writing material of between 6.8% and 8.5% of manuscripts from Cave 4. That is a strikingly low number compared to the 80% for the literary opisthographs. To look at these numbers from a different perspective: out of all papyrus manuscripts from Cave 4 about 8–10% concern literary opisthographs. Out of all leather manuscripts from Cave 4 about 0.18% are literary opisthographs. Again, five literary opisthographs is evidently a very small dataset when one considers the total number of manuscripts from Cave 4. These numbers should therefore be considered with some reservation. However, despite this small sample, the ostensible overrepresentation of papyrus among the opisthographs is so significant that it requires explanation. More specifically, it raises the question whether the choice for papyrus was coincidental, or rather the result of a particular preference by the scribes behind these opisthographs. Was the choice for papyrus deliberate? And if so, what might have been the underlying motivations?

66 Papyrus: 4Q433a/4Q255, 4Q499/4Q497, 4Q503/4Q512, 4Q509/4Q496/4Q506.
Leather: 4Q415/4Q414.

67 Tigchelaar, "The Material Variance of the Dead Sea Scrolls," 4.

68 Dimant, "Qumran Manuscripts: Contents and Significance"; Popović, "The Manuscript Collections: An Overview," 39. Sidnie White Crawford has placed the number at 550–600: Sidnie W. Crawford, *Scribes and Scrolls at Qumran* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2019), 132.

69 Emanuel Tov, *Revised Lists of the Texts from the Judaean Desert* (Leiden: Brill, 2010).

First, we can observe that papyrus and leather are different in one significant regard: it is much easier to use the backside of a papyrus. One could simply flip the scroll or sheet around and continue writing on the verso, across the vertical papyrus fibres. Depending on the quality of the papyrus, this might have made writing slightly more inconvenient but probably not much: there are extant papyri where for some reason only the side with vertical fibres contained writing.⁷⁰ The backside of leather however was not instantly ready to write upon, but needed additional preparation.⁷¹ This would have made it much easier to use the verso of a papyrus than the flesh side of leather. Furthermore, in our discussion of the individual opisthographs we observed that those on leather generally contain only very little text on the flesh side instead of full compositions.⁷² By its very character it is much easier to bring different texts together on papyrus. As a writing material, papyrus appears therefore to be quite suitable for collections of compositions. Comparative evidence from other collections points in this direction too: the early Aramaic leather manuscripts published by Godfrey Driver are generally written on only one side, while many papyri from Oxyrhynchus and Elephantine contain writing on both sides.⁷³ Furthermore, apart from the opisthographs mentioned above in this chapter, the Leuven Database of Ancient Books lists only three other leather opisthographs (from Avroman, Wadi Murabba'at, and Dura-Europos) that are dated before the 5th century, none of which contain a literary text.⁷⁴ This would make 4Q415/4Q414 the only literary opisthograph written on leather from the ancient world that survived. This circumstance might explain the overrepresentation of papyrus opisthographs among the Dead Sea Scrolls: leather manuscripts were only very rarely reused for opisthographs.

70 See the discussion in section 1.2.

71 Kottsieper, "Physicality of Manuscripts and Material Culture."

72 4Q414 is the only leather opisthograph that preserves a significant amount of text.

73 Godfrey R. Driver, *Aramaic Documents of the Fifth Century*, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Clarendon, 1957); Bezalel Porten and Ada Yardeni, *Textbook of Aramaic Documents from Ancient Egypt. Newly Copied, Edited and Translated into Hebrew and English*, 4 vols. (Jerusalem: Hebrew University, 1989–1999); Julian Krüger estimates at least 400 papyrus opisthographs from Oxyrhynchus: Julian Krüger, *Oxyrhynchos in der Kaiserzeit: Studien zur Topographie und Literaturrezeption* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1990), 161.

74 These three opisthographs are: Jur.Pap. 36 (TM 97889), a Parthian double deed with a few lines on the verso summarizing the sale of a vineyard; Mur 105 (TM 27008), which concerns an *iōta* and *ōmega* and possibly remains of other letters written on the back of Mur 97, an Account of Cereals; P.Dura. 48 (TM 17234), a Greek list of women's names on the back of a Roman military account. Depauw and Gheldof, "Trismegistos."

Second, it has been suggested that the Dead Sea Scroll papyri are mainly intended for private or personal copies.⁷⁵ The notion of personal copies has been employed in different ways in scholarship, but often it is used as opposed to professional copies. However, the dynamics of manuscript production are probably more diverse than this opposition would suggest. A professional scribe could also produce a personal copy, while we can imagine a non-professional scribe producing a high quality manuscript if he has the required level of skill. Here, we think of personal copies in line of Malachi Beit-Arié's "personal, user-produced books, copied by educated persons or scholars for their own use."⁷⁶

The association of the Qumran papyri with personal copies can be supported by the fact that very few texts written in formal handwriting survived on papyrus, and by the absence of papyrus versions of the large, high quality manuscripts that Tov has designated as "de luxe editions."⁷⁷ Some caution is required here, however. Many of the papyri from the Dead Sea Scrolls contain texts in semi-formal hands, including the majority of the literary opisthographs. We have no reason to suppose that the semi-formal was only used for personal copies. Furthermore, many of the Qumran papyri survived in very poor conditions, making a full codicological analysis impossible. Indicators of high quality manuscripts such as margin size and columnisation can often not be reconstructed. The poor state of preservation is not unsurprising; very few papyrus collections have survived outside Egypt, where conditions were slightly more favourable. If the scribes behind the Dead Sea Scrolls reserved their papyri for personal copies, then that seems to have been a local scribal practice. There is ample evidence for artfully produced literary papyri from Egypt.⁷⁸ Furthermore, leather was also used for scribal activities that could be associated with personal copies, such as the collection of extracts (4Q174

75 Wise, "Accidents and Accidence," 125–137; Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 32; Falk, "Material Aspects of Prayer Manuscripts," 42.

76 Malachi Beit-Arié, "Transmission of Texts by Scribes and Copyists: Unconscious and Critical Interferences," *BJRL* 75/3 (1993): 33–51, at 39.

Alternatively, we could think of these manuscripts as "working" manuscripts, a term Sidnie White Crawford reserves for manuscripts that had "a draft-like quality, which may indicate that they were working notes of some kind." Crawford considers opisthographs to be "working" manuscripts: Crawford, *Scribes and Scrolls at Qumran*, 143–146.

77 Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 125–129. Popović and Tigchelaar have offered a different approach to the question of *de luxe* or high-quality manuscripts of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Whereas Tov considers large margin size as the main criterion for such scrolls, Popović and Tigchelaar also take handwriting quality into consideration: Popović and Tigchelaar, "The Quality of Hasmonaean Biblical Manuscripts," *DSD* 30 (2023): 189–212.

78 See William Johnson's category of "*éditions de luxe*" with large and elegant scripts from Oxyrhynchus: Johnson, *Bookrolls and Scribes in Oxyrhynchus*, 155–156.

and 4Q175), writing exercises (4Q341), and compiling lists (4Q338, 4Q339, and 4Q340). In order to assess whether the Qumran papyri were indeed personal copies we would have to know how the quality of these manuscripts relate to papyri from other ancient collections. For example, are the papyrus Dead Sea Scrolls of a higher, lower, or similar quality than the Oxyrhynchus papyri? Before such comparative data becomes available, we have to be careful when we try to link the choice of writing material to particular motivations.⁷⁹

79 Brooke has associated the choice for papyrus to broader socio-religious dynamics from a different perspective. He suggested that the Egyptian origin of the literary papyri from Qumran may have been a deliberate decision of scribes to connect their manuscripts to the priestly liturgical papyri from Egypt. In this way, the choice for papyri could have been “a choice with some possible markers of high culture, and elements of a non-Jewish sort:” Brooke, “Choosing Between Papyrus and Skin,” 135.

However, as Tigchelaar has noted, we know too little about both the provenance and the quality of the Qumran papyri to fully assess this proposed association to the Egyptian priesthood. Furthermore, there is no evidence that papyrus was perceived as such an Egyptian priestly medium in other non-Egyptian writing cultures: Tigchelaar, “The Material Variance of the Dead Sea Scrolls.”

Concluding Remarks to Part 1

In this part we have explored the different opisthographic practices present among the Dead Sea Scrolls. We observed the presence of (1) tefillin, (2) manuscripts with a title on the verso, (3) one opisthograph with a continuous composition on both sides, (4) and opisthographs with different texts on recto and verso. The group of opisthographs that bear different texts can be subdivided into manuscripts that carry documentary texts on both sides, a documentary and a literary text on either side, and literary texts on both sides.

While the majority of the Dead Sea Scrolls is written on only the hair side of a leather scroll, this overview may serve as a reminder that behind what appears to be a homogenous collection of manuscripts in fact lies a spectrum of different textual practices. Because the research questions of this study are primarily concerned with the literary opisthographs, each of these five manuscripts was treated individually, followed by their palaeographic analyses and a discussion of their writing material.

After having laid down the groundwork, we turned to the question how to understand these manuscripts as scribal artefacts. The opisthographs introduced in this chapter challenge us to think about the relationship between the different texts they bear. In which different ways can we understand the presence of two or more compositions on one manuscript and what does the character of these two compositions tell us about the setting of the manuscript? In our discussion of the individual opisthographs we have distinguished between, first, reused manuscripts for which the original text ceased to be of interest so that its reverse side was used to write down an unrelated composition, and, second, opisthographs where the two or more texts seem to be brought together intentionally. For some of the opisthographs from Qumran it is unclear to which of these two forms of reuse they belong, as distinguishing between them can be difficult. The above survey indicates that the evidence for the scribal setting of these opisthographs is diverse.

Despite some shared characteristics and intertextual similarities, the thematic and formal connections between the two compositions preserved on 4Q415/4Q414 and on 4Q433a/4Q255 do not seem to point straightforwardly to an intentional collection. 4Q415/4Q414 seems the clearest example of the reuse of a manuscript where the original text was defunct. It is the only leather opisthograph with a sizeable literary text on the back.

The absence of comparable manuscripts from Qumran does urge caution in drawing broad conclusions. Nevertheless, based on earlier suggestions by

Strugnell and Harrington and Tigchelaar I have argued that, when 4Q415 on the recto went out of fashion, the verso of the manuscript was reused for 4Q414. 4Q433a/4Q255 presents a slightly different case. The Community Rule (4Q255) is widely represented among the manuscripts from Qumran and, as such, we have no reason to suppose that interest in this composition ceased. 4Q433a, in a similar vein, shares themes and terminology with the tradition of the Hodayot. However, 4Q255 and 4Q433a are texts of a different character without evident thematic or intertextual relations. The fact that 4Q255 is preserved in an irregular, crudely written cursive hand invites us to think about this manuscript as a personal copy, possibly intended for personal use such as reading or studying.

The literary opisthographs 4Q503/4Q512, 4Q509/4Q496/4Q506, and perhaps 4Q499/4Q497 seem to belong to the type of opisthograph on which two or more texts were brought together intentionally.¹ 4Q503/4Q512 presents a collection of liturgical prayers that are dedicated to specific occasions or times. The structural and thematic similarities are suggestive of a similar socio-liturgical setting. In order to examine the dynamics of the opisthograph as an intentional collection I will analyse 4Q509/4Q496/4Q506 in more detail in the next chapter. It is possible that 4Q499/4Q497 preserves an intentional collection of a similar type. Both 4Q499 and 4Q497 have been classified as prayers or hymns, which would suggest a liturgical setting for the manuscript. However, the poor condition of the papyrus does not allow us to examine the structural and literary connections between the two texts.

This overview of the literary opisthographs furthermore leads to the conclusion that 4Q499/4Q497, 4Q433a/4Q255, 4Q503/4Q512, and 4Q509/4Q496/4Q506 all share a number of material features: with the exception of 4Q506 are they all written on papyrus in semi-formal scribal hands that, on the basis of palaeographic analysis, should be dated to the same period. As much as the poor condition in which they survived allows us to assess, we can note that they have some codicological characteristics in common as well, such as the absence of ruling and irregular columnisation, and the presence of marginal signs and scribal corrections.² We should note however that the orientation of the texts on either side in relation to each other differs: the verso of 4Q499/4Q497 and

1 See the discussion of P. Mas. 721 and P.Oxy. 413 in the introduction, two comparable examples from different contexts.

2 It should be noted that none of the papyrus manuscripts from Qumran are ruled. However, as there is some evidence for ruled papyri elsewhere we do not know how significant the decision was not to add ruling to the Qumran papyri. See the discussion in section 6.2. Marginal signs and scribal corrections can be found on only a limited number of other Qumran papyri.

4Q503/4Q512 are written after flipping the manuscript over in horizontal direction, the verso of 4Q433a/4Q255 and 4Q509/4Q496/4Q506 after flipping in vertical direction.

There seems to be ground to consider these scrolls as some form of a cluster of manuscripts that appears to have been copied and studied during the same period and, sometimes, within a similar setting.³ We will return to this issue in the final part of this study, but first it is important to try to think through the different scenarios in which these opisthographic manuscripts could have been composed. In order to do so we will turn our attention in the next chapter to one papyrus opisthograph specifically: 4Q509/4Q496/4Q506.

3 The place of 4Q415/4Q414 in relation to the other literary opisthographs is intriguing: the presence of 4Q414, Ritual of Purification A, seems to connect the manuscript to 4Q503/4Q512, where on the verso we find Ritual of Purification B. However, 4Q415/4Q414 should be regarded separately from 4Q499/4Q497, 4Q433a/4Q255, and 4Q503/4Q512 on material grounds. The manuscript is leather instead of papyrus, and on palaeographic grounds should be dated significantly later than the other opisthographs.

PART 2

Literary Diversity and the Opisthograph
4Q509/4Q496/4Q506: A Case Study



Introduction to Part 2

The focus of this part is on the papyrus opisthograph that carries the texts 4Q509, 4Q496, and 4Q506. This opisthograph is among the very few manuscripts from Qumran with extant evidence for three different compositions.¹ This remarkable circumstance alone would have validated particular scholarly interest into this opisthograph, but scholarship has not paid much attention to the three compositions on this scroll as part of one artefact. This issue is closely connected to the way in which the compositions on this scroll have been published separately, without much appreciation for the scroll as a material artefact in its own right.

The main body of this part functions as a case study and approaches this opisthograph from two perspectives. Chapter five discusses the three compositions preserved on this opisthograph individually, with specific attention to modern methods for the classification of the texts of the Dead Sea Scrolls and models of community. Chapter 6 will use this opisthograph to reflect on literary diversity and collecting practices behind manuscript collections, and ask if we can understand this papyrus as a collection of prayers.²

Before we turn to these central questions of this chapter, it is important to consider the publication history of this manuscript in order to understand some of the consequences of the separate publication history for scholarly understandings of the three compositions.

1 Another example of one manuscript containing three compositions is found in the leather scroll of 1QS, 1QSa, and 1QSB, though this scroll concerns a different type of collection. For a list of manuscripts from Qumran that preserve multiple compositions on one scroll see Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 39.

2 Parts of the sections 6.3, 6.4, and 6.6 of this chapter were published in adjusted form in Aksu, “Qumran Opisthographic Papyri as a Scribal Cluster.”

4Q509/4Q496/4Q506: Three Compositions and the Question of Classification

1 The Publication History of 4Q509/4Q496/4Q506

In 1953–1954 the international editorial team under supervision of Roland de Vaux was charged with the publication of the many manuscript fragments from Cave 4. The 313 fragments of opisthograph 4Q509/4Q496/4Q506 were among the large group of papyrus fragments “trop peu intéressants” that were left over after the larger and better-preserved manuscripts had been distributed among the other members.¹ In 1959 an unnamed member of De Vaux’s team suggested to hand them over for publication to Maurice Baillet, who spent most of the coming decade ordering, sorting, and reconstructing the 1659 fragments into manuscripts.² The first composition he identified was the War Scroll copy 4Q496, parts of which he subsequently published in 1964, together with fragments from 4Q509, which we now know under the English title Festival Prayers, and 4Q506, now known as *Divrei Ha-me’orot* or Words of the Luminaries.³ All fragments of this opisthograph were finally published in DJD 7 in 1982.⁴

Festival Prayers survived in total in four witnesses. The first edition of a copy of this text was the publication of 1Q34 by Milik in DJD 1 as a “recueil de prières liturgiques.”⁵ DJD 1 also included 1Q34bis, two fragments of which Milik was almost (though not fully) certain that they belonged to the same scroll.⁶

1 Baillet, DJD 7:xi.

2 We see this process develop by comparing the different PAM photographs. These papyrus fragments were labelled 4QpapUnid 1–13 in the series PAM 42.057–042.073, which were taken by Najib Anton Albina from January to May 1956. In PAM’s 43 series (taken in June 1960) the label had become 4QBT. This label was provisional as Baillet was waiting for the definitive serial number to be assigned to the manuscript: Maurice Baillet, “Un recueil liturgique de Qumrân, grotte 4: ‘Les paroles des luminaires,’” *RB* 68 (1961): 195–250, at 195 n. 2.

3 Maurice Baillet, “Débris de textes sur papyrus de la grotte 4 de Qumrân,” *RB* 71 (1964): 353–371 and pls. XIV–XV.

4 Baillet mentions 6 May 1976 as the date of his final revisions to the manuscript: Baillet, DJD 7:xii.

5 Dominique Barthélemy and Józef T. Milik, *Qumran Cave 1*, DJD 1 (Oxford: Clarendon, 1955), 136, 152–155, pl. XXXI.

6 Milik, DJD 1:152.

This identification was confirmed in a republication of 1Q34 and 1Q34bis by John Trever, who completed the publication of the Cave 1-fragments of Festival Prayers.⁷ The version of this composition that we are concerned with here is 4Q509, one of the three copies from Cave 4 that were published in DJD 7 under the French title *Prières pour les Fêtes*.⁸ The other copies are 4Q507, and 4Q508.⁹ This composition was quickly recognized as consisting of liturgical prayers. Baillet characterized it as “un recueil destiné aux fêtes.”¹⁰

4Q496, 4QpapM^f, is the second text on this opisthograph. It was written on 122 fragments on the verso of this papyrus manuscript. It is one of the seven witnesses of the War Scroll, or Serekh ha-Milhama (1QM, 4Q491–496). Below I will provide a brief overview of modern scholarly interpretations of this composition in order to understand how this text is received.

The third text on this scroll is 4Q506, a second witness of Words of the Luminaries, the composition that was also passed down to us on 4Q504. De Vaux allocated 4Q504 for publication to Jean Starcky in January 1954.¹¹ The publication history of 4Q504 starts with a brief comment by Starcky in a 1956 article in which he characterizes the text as a “recueil d’hymnes liturgiques.”¹² It was one of the five manuscripts that Starcky eventually handed over for publication to Baillet in June 1958.¹³ Baillet provided a preliminary publication in 1961, in which he introduced its French title “Les paroles des luminaires.”¹⁴ His final

7 John C. Trever, “Completion of the Publication of Some Fragments from Qumran Cave 1,” *RevQ* 5 (1965): 323–344 at 333, pl. iv. This identification was supported by the photographic evidence provided by Trever.

8 Baillet, DJD 7:184–215.

9 As we have seen in the previous chapter, 4Q505 on the recto of this opisthograph was misidentified by Baillet as a copy of Words of the Luminaries, while it actually seems to be part of the same composition as 4Q509. Since 4Q505 probably belongs to 4Q509, it is not an additional copy of the text.

10 Baillet, DJD 7:57; in his preliminary publication of frag. 2 in 1964 Baillet already called it “prières liturgiques:” “Débris de textes sur papyrus,” 360–365, pl. xiv.

11 Émile Puech, “Qumran Research: Contribution of the École Biblique et Archéologique Française in Jerusalem,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Scholarly Perspective: A History of Research*, ed. Devorah Dimant, STDJ 99 (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 403–432, at 422.

12 Jean Starcky, “Le travail d’édition des fragments manuscrits de Qumrân (Communication de J. Starcky),” *RB* 63 (1956): 66–67.

13 The other 4 being 4Q508, 4Q511, 4Q513, and 4Q514: Baillet, DJD 7:xi.

14 Baillet, “Un recueil liturgique de Qumrân.” The title, which derived from the words דברי המארות written on the outside of the scroll across the back of the first column, has been subject to speculation, but is now understood as a reference to the intended time of use of these prayers during sunrise and/or sunset: Falk, *Daily, Sabbath, and Festival Prayers*, 61.

edition of both 4Q504 and 4Q506 would follow in DJD 7 in 1982.¹⁵ Baillet did not offer an extensive interpretation of the text, but remarked that 4Q504 should be read as a document intended for liturgical use in the context of the days of the week.¹⁶

When overseeing the publication history of 4Q509/4Q496/4Q506, the first thing that strikes us is the fact that the compositions on this opisthograph were published separately, without any reflection on the significance of the presence of multiple compositions on one artefact. Though understandable, this also led to a range of problems. Due to the very nature of the publication principles of the Dead Sea Scrolls, individual texts on an opisthograph are not viewed in their codicological context. The DJD volumes are published according to individual composition, instead of as three texts on a single manuscript. For most scrolls this does not matter much, but specifically in the case of an opisthograph it does force the editors to view the two or more texts on the scroll in question in isolation. Baillet's accomplishment in editing and publishing over 1600 often miniscule papyrus fragments is undeniably a tour de force of scholarship, but he was not very concerned with their subsequent interpretation.

In the case of this particular opisthograph all three texts were at least published within the same volume, DJD 7, and the introduction to 4Q496 does address the composite nature of the manuscript.¹⁷ Nonetheless, the three texts are separated from each other and placed in different sections of the volume.¹⁸ 4Q496, 4QM^f, is published with the other War Scrolls and War Scroll-related manuscripts in the second section, 'La Guerre des Fils de Lumière contre les Fils de Ténèbres.' 4Q509 and 4Q506 can be found in the section 'Textes Liturgiques,' together with the other copies of Words of the Luminaries and Festival Prayers. This is an editorial decision that is understandable when we consider that scholarly investigation has historically been concentrated on compositions rather than on manuscript. The academic interest in 4Q496 for example mostly concerned questions about its relation to 1QM, and the literary and textual development of the War Scroll.

15 Baillet, DJD 7:137–168.

16 Baillet, "Un recueil liturgique de Qumrân"; DJD 7:137.

17 Baillet, DJD 7:57.

18 However, the plates containing the images of the recto and verso of each manuscript were published together.

2 4Q509: A Prayer Cycle of Festival Prayers

4Q509 is one of the four manuscripts of Festival Prayers (1Q34, 4Q507, 4Q508), a text consisting of different liturgical prayers dedicated to festivals throughout the Jewish liturgical year. Regulations concerning Jewish liturgical practices are rarely explicated in the Hebrew Bible. As summarized by Bilha Nitzan: “The Bible provides only fragmentary information concerning the function and practice of prayer and its “sitz im leben.””¹⁹ Though many religious festivals are of course mentioned in the Hebrew Bible, it does not provide any rule about what to pray exactly on which particular occasions. It seems that Festival Prayers is one of the compositions that aims to fill this lacuna.²⁰ In order to arrive at an adequate understanding of the text, it is important to comprehend the order of the different festivals addressed in it.

The reconstruction of Festival Prayers is based on a comparison of the four different manuscripts. Each of these is either very fragmentary or preserves only a small part of the composition. The fact that 4Q509 concerns the recto of an opisthograph is beneficial in this regard. The reconstruction of 4Q509 can be assisted by considering the order of the fragments of 4Q496, 4Qpap-WarScroll^f, on the verso of this manuscript. The War Scroll survives in very good condition in 1QM, which is very helpful in the arrangement of 4Q496. Most scholars assume that, despite minor variations, 4Q496 follows largely the same structure as 1QM.²¹ The first 16 fragments in general correspond well to 1QM, though Brian Schultz did note that frags. 8–12, 15, and 16 only fit when the length of the lines would have been inconsistent.²² Except for Schultz’s reservation concerning these fragments, the table below is accepted by both him and Duhaime.²³

These overlaps with 1QM allow us to rearrange the first 16 fragments of 4Q496. This in turn can be used to reconstruct 4Q509 on the recto. As we have seen above, the verso was written upside down in relation to the recto, which means that the same fragment that contains the start of a column on one side

19 Bilha Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer and Religious Poetry*, STDJ 12 (Leiden: Brill, 1994), 1.

20 Davila, *Liturgical Works*, 15–40.

21 Jean Duhaime argues that “When the text of 4QM^f overlaps with 1QM, they are quite similar, except for small variations in arrangement and contents,” Duhaime, *The War Texts*, 23; see also Jean Duhaime, “War Scroll,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek Texts with English Translations.*, vol. 1: *The Damascus Document, War Scroll and Related Documents*, ed. James H. Charlesworth (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1995), 80–203, at 81–82.

22 Schultz, *Conquering the World*, 26.

23 Duhaime, *The War Texts*, 42; Schultz, *Conquering the World*, 18.

TABLE 7 Correspondence 4Q496 and 1QM

4Q496 Fragment number	Correspondence 1QM
3	I 4–9
2 + 1	I 11–17
7	II 5–6
6 + 5	II 9–12
4	II 9–10
13	II 13–14
9	II 17
8	II (ending)—III 2
12	III 6–7
11	III 9–11
10	III 11–15
16	III (ending)—IV 2

will bear the end of a column on the other side. Therefore, since this reconstruction of the first column on the verso starts with frag. 3, which is subsequently followed by frags. 2 and 1, one can deduce that the reconstruction of the column on the recto should start with frag. 1 and end with frag. 3. By analysing these fragments, we can associate their terminology with one or more Jewish festivals and therefore reconstruct which one was placed first in the liturgical calendar of the community in which these texts circulated.

Both Milik and Baillet already associated the first two columns of 4Q509 with the New Year, without providing a close reading analysis.²⁴ Falk cautiously agrees with this assessment on the basis of a number of indications in the text.²⁵ Both the image of rain and growing grass are reminiscent of autumn and would therefore favour a festival that is set during that season. The formula “you make us rejoice” in both line 3 and 8 does not fit with how the Day of Atonement is perceived, but does evoke New Year (see also 11QT^a 25:9).²⁶ Eventually, New Year and Sukkot are the two most likely possibilities, where New Year is preferred because in 1Q34 it is followed directly by a prayer for the Day of Atonement in 1Q34 frag. 2 + 1 6–7. The actual prayer formula תפלה ליום כפורים

24 Milik, *DNJ* 1:153; Baillet, *DNJ* 7:185.

25 Falk's caution is expressed in the question mark behind New Year in his table with the order of prayers in *Festival Prayers: Falk, Daily, Sabbath, and Festival Prayers*, 162.

26 Falk, *Daily, Sabbath, and Festival Prayers*, 164.

is not preserved in 4Q509, but the correspondence with 1Q34 is secure enough to conclude that it is the Day of Atonement that is referred to here as well.²⁷ This allows us to reconstruct the first column with some confidence, starting with the New Year prayer and ending with the Day of Atonement at the lower end of the column. The next liturgical holiday that Falk recognizes is Sukkot in 4Q509 8.²⁸ The succession New Year—Day of Atonement—Sukkot strongly points towards a chronological arrangement of these prayers. This ordering in accordance with the Jewish liturgical calendar is what Baillet proposed for the complete composition. He places the identified religious festivals in calendrical order, also when the fragments cannot be joined together on material grounds (which is the case for Passover and Shavuot). Falk, Chazon and David Hamidović have expressed some caution regarding this method. It is possible that Baillet's chronological ordering is correct, but the arrangement of all festivals in calendrical order cannot be assumed.²⁹ A slightly adjusted reconstruction of Festival Prayers is offered by Francis Schmidt, who argues that the first fragments preserve a prayer concerned with the celebration of the turning of the seasons, which is mentioned in Jubilees 6:23.³⁰ The other prayers reconstructed by Schmidt follow the same order as the reconstruction by Baillet (Day of Atonement—Sukkot—Passover—Shavuot).

Summarizing we conclude that 4Q509 is one of the four copies of a liturgical prayer cycle consisting of prayers dedicated to festivals throughout the Jewish liturgical year. If we consider 4Q509 together with 1Q34, 4Q507, and 4Q508 we can reconstruct prayers dedicated to New Year, Day of Atonement, Sukkot, Passover, and Weeks. These prayers follow a particular pattern. They start with the formula ... תפלה ל, "Prayer for ...," followed by זכור אדוני, "Remember Lord ..." and closed off with אמן אמן, "Amen Amen." These phrases suggest a very formulaic structure for these festival prayers. This provides us with a reasonable understanding of both the content and the arrangement of (some of) the prayers. However, how to interpret the place of Festival Prayers within the wider col-

27 Falk, *Daily, Sabbath, and Festival Prayers*, 165.

28 Falk, *Daily, Sabbath, and Festival Prayers*, 169.

29 Chazon, "A Liturgical Document from Qumran and Its Implications.," Falk, *Daily, Sabbath, and Festival Prayers*, 159–160; David Hamidović, "The First Prayer of *Festival Prayers* (1Q34 + 1Q34bis, 4Q508, 4Q509): A Prayer for the Beginning of the Quarter?" in *Qumran Cave 1 Revisited: Texts from Cave 1 Sixty Years after Their Discovery: Proceedings of the Sixth Meeting of the IQG in Ljubljana*, ed. Daniel K. Falk et al., STDJ 91 (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 259–275, at 261.

30 Francis Schmidt, "Pour une reconstitution du cycle liturgique annuel dans les *Prières pour les fêtes* (1Q34, 4Q507–509): L'apport du papyrus opisthographe," *RHPR* 93 (2013): 77–91.

lection of Dead Sea Scrolls is a different matter. Concerning the classification of individual compositions within the wider collection, the model proposed by Devorah Dimant has been particularly influential. In the following sections we will examine her methodology more closely and explore its application to 4Q509.

3 General Reflections on Devorah Dimant's Model of Classification

Throughout her scholarly work, Dimant developed a classification that “constitutes a necessary prerequisite for the accurate appreciation of the Qumran literature and its character and purpose.”³¹ Such an “analytical overview of the Qumran collection” was, in Dimant’s words, “indispensable for the understanding of the Qumran phenomenon.”³² The starting point of Dimant’s approach is that the Qumran scrolls form one integral and coherent collection that she refers to as a “library of a specific circle or school.”³³

From the outset it appears that the overview offered by Dimant does raise a number of methodological questions, which I will briefly reflect on here. Point of departure will be Dimant’s assessment of the relationship between 4Q509 and the wider collection from Qumran, which has been subject of some debate. First however, I will address some more general considerations concerning Dimant’s model.

31 Devorah Dimant, “The Vocabulary of the Qumran Sectarian Texts,” in *History, Ideology and Bible Interpretation*, 57–100, at 100.

32 Dimant, “Qumran Manuscripts: Contents and Significance,” 27.

33 Dimant, “Qumran Manuscripts: Contents and Significance,” 40.

See for Dimant on the Qumran scrolls as “an integral collection,” and on “the coherence of the library” for example: “Vocabulary of the Qumran Sectarian Texts,” 65; “Qumran Manuscripts: Contents and Significance,” 35.

It seems to me that Dimant in her recent work in some respects slightly nuanced her earlier view of the Qumran manuscripts as a fully homogenous library: “Given the variety manifested in the Qumran library as a whole, some of which is surveyed above, the question may be asked whether we are still entitled to view the Qumran library as one, homogeneous entity. In my judgment the general character of the collection still justifies this characterization, but with important qualifications. On the one hand the picture of the library as a complete entity should be re-drawn, taking into account the recent substantial additions to the collection. Thus, the unifying broad contours of the library, and the inter-connections among its components, may be better assessed. On the other hand, the unifying features revealed by the library’s content should be measured against the various modes of expression that articulate it,” Devorah Dimant, “The Library of Qumran: Variety versus Unity,” *Henoah* 40 (2018): 49–56, at 56.

Dimant's model should be placed within the framework of a larger discussion on the meaning of sectarianism in relation to the presumed Qumran community or communities. Jokiranta, building on the work of Carol Newsom, distinguishes four different ways to understand the notion of a sectarian text: (1) the use of a text by the Qumran community, (2) the authorship of the text by the Qumran community, (3) the distinctive content and terminology of the text, and (4) the presence of clear evidence of a sectarian stance, which she defines as "the self-understanding as uniquely legitimate, and of the negative tension with the social environment."³⁴ Dimant's model can be connected to the third level of understanding, as she developed a classification based on (1) the terminology and lexical features present in the sectarian scrolls and, (2) their worldview and religious ideas. Dimant is not very concerned with articulating possible formations of this group, or with explaining the social relations and tensions with its environment. Rather, the point of departure of her work is that there is one sectarian community whose worldview, regulations, and socio-religious ideas are directly reflected in this set of sectarian texts.³⁵ Tigchelaar already pointed towards a problem when he questioned "in what manner, if at all, can one correlate one or more groups of texts from the collection of Dead Sea Scrolls with one or more discrete sociological groups?"³⁶ The assumption that a socio-religious group automatically presents itself coherently in the texts they compose, is not self-evident. Concerning her assessment of the sectarian texts, it seems that this assumption is closely related to the choice of Dimant's "core corpus of compositions that contains prominent and unique sectarian elements consensually attributed to the scrolls community."³⁷ This core corpus consists of the Community Rule, Rule of the Congregation, Rule of Blessings, the War Scroll, Damascus Document, Hodayot, and the pesharim. Dimant does not argue why she chose this particular core corpus other than that they "were

34 Jutta Jokiranta, "'Sectarianism' of the Qumran 'Sect': Sociological Notes," *RevQ* 78 (2001): 223–239, at 237. See also Newsom, "'Sectually Explicit' Literature," 172–179.

35 See for example the following quote: "Since the Qumran scrolls are literary texts, the correct procedure for determining their sectarian character lies in identifying distinctive lexical and syntactical features that are peculiar to the sectarian group. The community's particular regulations, polemics, and worldview, portrayed in unique linguistic and conceptual fashion, should constitute the guide for determining sectarian provenance. Despite a certain variety in formulation and emphasis, a group of compositions marked by these peculiarities is clearly recognizable within the Qumran corpus." Dimant, "Vocabulary of the Qumran Sectarian Texts," 64.

36 Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar, "Classifications of the Collection of Dead Sea Scrolls and the Case of *Apocryphon of Jeremiah C*," *JSJ* 43 (2012): 519–550, at 528–529.

37 Dimant, "Vocabulary of the Qumran Sectarian Texts," 67.

also among the first known to scholars and thus served as a foundation for the basic definitions.”³⁸ But the fact that these texts were discovered first and therefore known to scholars first is purely accidental.³⁹ Furthermore, Gwynned de Looijer has challenged the idea that the absence of certain texts within (parts of) a collection could be seen as evidence for its presumed homogeneity.⁴⁰ There are many reasons other than deliberate exclusion that could explain why a text might be absent, such as coincidence or post-depositional processes.⁴¹ For De Looijer, the notion that some texts would have been excluded from the collection deliberately “is colored by sociological presuppositions of the particular religious outlook of a sectarian group in charge of the Qumran library and feeds the idea that our contemporary collection of manuscripts is representative of the original Qumran collection.”⁴²

This does raise the question that if another group of texts would have been discovered first, would that have meant that Dimant’s core group and therefore her criteria would have been different? Dimant attributes a particular authority to a small corpus of texts (as carriers of the sectarian worldview and identity). This authority however is not grounded in the texts themselves; after all, we cannot prove why this set of texts would be a more accurate reflection of the ideas of a particular community than another group.

To press this argument further, I would argue that it is imaginable that a different set of texts from the start would have led to a different conceptualization of the people behind these texts. How would scholarship have conceptualised the presumed groups behind the manuscripts if for example Cave 1 would have been the last cave to be discovered, several years after the other caves?⁴³ In

38 Dimant, “Vocabulary of the Qumran Sectarian Texts,” 67.

39 In addition: the fact that they are found in Cave 1 is for Dimant not significant, because she views all manuscript caves as fundamentally homogeneous “in both their contents and generic configuration”: “Qumran Manuscripts: Contents and Significance,” 35.

40 Gwynned de Looijer, *The Qumran Paradigm: A Critical Evaluation of Some Foundational Hypotheses in the Construction of the Qumran Sect*, EJL 43 (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2015).

41 See the discussion on post-depositional processes in section 8.2.

42 De Looijer, *The Qumran Paradigm*, 55–56.

43 This hypothetical question has also been posed by Edna Ullmann-Margalit without answering it in detail: Edna Ullmann-Margalit, *Out of the Cave: A Philosophical Inquiry into the Dead Sea Scrolls Research* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1996), 58 n. 30. Variations on this thought experiment have been conducted by Norman Golb and Stephen Pfann.

Golb’s alternative scenario imagines that all manuscript collections from the Judean Desert would have been discovered in reverse order (so the manuscripts from Masada and En Gedi first, and the Qumran caves last). According to Golb, these manuscript finds would have established the idea that libraries and collections existed in ancient Judaea

such a scenario I imagine that, due to the sheer number of manuscripts, Cave 4 would have provoked the most scholarly interest. How would scholarship have developed if that cave would have been the first cave to be discovered, and if the texts from Cave 4 would have been the first to reach an academic audience? In this cave scholars would have encountered a large and diverse collection of texts and probably would have developed different classification strategies to make sense of it all. Scholars would probably hypothesize about a community that accepted a wider variety of texts, rather than prioritizing the seven texts from Cave 1 that were discovered first. Though we would be familiar with (fragmentary witnesses of) the Community Rule and the War Scroll, it is possible that there would be less of an incentive to place these compositions in the centre of the ideology of the community. Rather, we would probably perceive these texts as being a part of one or more collections that reflect a broader stream of literature of ancient Judaism.

For the sake of argument, we could explore this idea a bit further. Recently, Kelley Coblenz Bautch and Jack Weinbender have articulated a number of factors as a point of departure to consider the authority of ancient writings.⁴⁴ Works that meet many of these criteria include the Temple Scroll, Jubilees, and Enoch.⁴⁵ The Enochic manuscripts from Cave 4, for example, preserve a solar-lunar calendar that is found in several other Qumran manuscripts. Furthermore, several other compositions from Qumran contain references to Enoch

in the same way as elsewhere in the Mediterranean world. The Cave 1 manuscripts would not have challenged this view. Instead, this discovery “would have confirmed the earlier finding, based on the Cave 4 discoveries, that a wide spectrum of doctrines and ideas, incorporated at least partly in several religious movements, were represented by the discoveries of the Judaean Wilderness”; Norman Golb, *Who Wrote the Dead Sea Scrolls? The Search for the Secret of Qumran* (New York: Scribner, 1995), 149–150.

Pfann hypothesized that if Cave 11 would have been our only manuscript find, the scholarly perception of the collection would have been very different. The Temple Scroll would have been the main frame of reference to reconstruct the life of the people behind the texts, and the Essene hypothesis might not have been proposed. However, Tigchelaar’s analysis of Cave 11 in relation to the other Qumran Caves has resulted in a different outcome as he argued that “The data of Cave 11Q are too limited to draw large conclusions.” Stephen Pfann, “The Ancient “Library” or “Libraries” of Qumran: The Specter of Cave 1Q,” in *Dead Sea Scrolls at Qumran and the Concept of a Library*, 168–213; Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar, “Revisiting the Manuscripts and Fragments from Qumran Cave 11Q,” in *Khirbet Qumrân and Ain Feshkha IV A: Qumran Cave 11Q: Archaeology and New Scroll Fragments*, ed. Jean-Baptiste Humbert and Marcello Fidanzio, NTOA. SA 8 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2019), 249–261, at 257.

44 Coblenz Bautch and Weinbender, “Authoritative Scriptures: Other Texts,” 280–285.

45 It should be noted that Dimant’s model classifies none of these texts as sectarian.

or to themes preserved in 1 Enoch.⁴⁶ It is these circumstances that indicate that the Enochic works could have carried a significant status for the people behind the Dead Sea Scrolls and perhaps reflected ideas that are representative for their own worldview. James VanderKam in his 1998 study on authoritative literature had arrived at a similar conclusion, as he considers the Enochic works and Jubilees to be “the two clearest examples of books that seem to have been regarded as authoritative at Qumran but which later were not considered part of the Hebrew (and Aramaic) Bible.”⁴⁷

The Enochic manuscripts from Cave 4 are in Aramaic, but elsewhere Enochic works have survived in Greek, Ge‘ez, and Coptic: if the Enochic manuscripts would have been the first of the Dead Sea Scrolls to receive scholarly attention, then it is likely that the groups behind these manuscripts would have been conceptualised by scholars as more outward-looking and connected to other literacies. The discovery of the small fragments of the Book of Giants (1Q23 and 1Q24) from Cave 1, a composition that is closely related to the cycle of Enochic literature, might in that case have been read as a confirmation of this view. These approaches towards alternative history present a difficult project: after all, seven scrolls from Cave 1 were discovered first and we can only speculate about alternative scenarios. Nevertheless, in support of the scenario put forward here, it should be noted that this scenario does not change the historical events themselves, but only the order in which they occurred. The number of caves and the contents of the manuscripts in them remains the same. This thought experiment only calls attention to the significance of issues such as transmission history and history of discovery for the scholarly perception of the collection as a whole. These alternative scenarios may shed light on the circumstances that cause particular views to become dominant in modern scholarship. When we think through such scenarios, it is imaginable that a different set of texts from the start would have led to a different conceptualization of the people behind these texts.

46 Coblentz Bautch and Weinbender, “Authoritative Scriptures: Other Texts,” 283.

47 VanderKam points to the authority of Enoch on the basis of three main arguments: (1) the reuse of the Enochic story about the sinning angels in other Qumran texts, (2) the Enochic calendar, (3) and the fact that 4Q247 preserves what seems to be a commentary on the Apocalypse of Weeks. VanderKam, “Authoritative Literature in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 396–398. See also Lim, “Authoritative Scriptures and the Dead Sea Scrolls.” Crawford furthermore argues that the “scholar-scribes” behind the Dead Sea Scrolls would have had a particular interest in Enochic literature because Enoch is described “as a scribe (ספרא) with far-ranging functions.” Crawford, *Scribes and Scrolls at Qumran*, 233.

Leaving these considerations, both Tigchelaar and Davies have observed that Dimant's approach is vulnerable for circular reasoning.⁴⁸ Dimant first assigns importance to the terms and vocabulary employed in a particular set of texts, and subsequently groups texts together when she sees these features confirmed in them. This raises the question if such a classification of texts can indeed be based on linguistic features. Does that mean by necessity that the sectarian community could not have written texts without this distinct terminology, or even approve of them?⁴⁹ A particular concern of Tigchelaar is "the danger of drawing conclusions on the basis of the attestations of a limited sampling of words in a text," which we indeed will see now in the case of 4Q509.⁵⁰

4 4Q509 and Its Classification According to Dimant

Dimant presents three different sets of criteria to distinguish the sectarian from non-sectarian texts. In Dimant's words "writings that explicitly describe the scrolls community's unique structure and organizational framework form the basis for the identification of compositions belonging to this group."⁵¹ She therefore coined the first and most significant category 'Terms Related to the Community and its Organizational Structure.' It can be subdivided into three groups:

- (1) Epithets for the community in general: עדה, יחד, עצה, קודש, תמים בית,⁵²
 - (2) Designations of the community members: אנשי היחד, מתנדבים/נדבים, תורה, תמים
 - (3) Designations for the community's institutions: סרך, מבקר, תכון, רבים
- Overseeing 4Q509, it appears that none of these terms appear in this text or any of the other witnesses of Festival Prayers, or at least not in the same context.

48 Tigchelaar, "Classifications of the Collection of Dead Sea Scrolls," 529 n. 40; Philip R. Davies, "Sects from Texts: On the Problems of Doing a Sociology of the Qumran Literature," in *New Directions in Qumran Studies*, ed. Jonathan G. Campbell, William J. Lyons, and Lloyd K. Pietersen, LSTS 52 (London: T&T Clark, 2005), 69–82, at 72.

49 Jokiranta would probably disagree with this, as she argues against a "direct relationship between a text and a historical community." In her view, the Qumran communities "probably had varying sociological positions, and some of these might be reflected within one document." Jokiranta, "'Sectarianism' of the Qumran 'Sect,'" 238.

50 Tigchelaar, "Classifications of the Collection of Dead Sea Scrolls," 530.

51 Dimant, "Vocabulary of the Qumran Sectarian Texts," 67.

52 According to Dimant, the term בית acquires a distinct meaning when it is used in particular construct expressions, such as בית האמת בישראל, "the house of truth in Israel" in 1QS 5.

Partly this has to do with the genre of the text. As a prayer document, Festival Prayers is not concerned with community structure or organizational regulations. This raises the question if the criteria formulated by Dimant on the basis of terminology and religious genre can be applied to the corpus of liturgical texts from Qumran. Dimant's model distinguishes between different genres. The group of sectarian works for example can be divided into community rules, halakhic rulings, liturgy and poetry, and sapiential works.⁵³ However, the terminology that this classification is based on is not genre-specific. Dimant does not engage with the question if texts of different genres would not imply the use of different terminology. Rather, she looks for the same vocabulary as a marker of sectarianism across different genres. It seems to me that specific terminology could occur frequently in one genre (e.g., liturgy), but far less so in another (e.g., community rules). If and how a particular term is used is very much dependent on the context. 4Q509 does at one instance in frag. 3 5 refer to עדתנו, "our assembly" or "our congregation," but it is unlikely that the term is applied here in its sectarian sense. More often in 4Q509 do we find עמכה (frags. 1, 22, and 184). However, it does seem that 4Q509 does not address a narrow community, but rather the entirety of the people of Israel. 4Q509 frag. 3 in particular calls on the diaspora community; the occurrence of ונפוצוהינו ("and our scattered ones") here is unlike the more self-referential terminology of the corpus of texts proposed by Dimant.⁵⁴

Dimant's second set of criteria to define if a text belongs to the sectarian corpus concerns 'Terms related to the Community's History and Controversies'. Here Dimant lists terms that mainly concern the sectarian method to interpret historical figures and events in light of biblical prophecy. The appropriate genre for these types of exegetical interpretations of the history of the community was the peshar. It is for this reason that Dimant's examples are mostly drawn from either the pesharim or from the Damascus Document: מורה הצדק ("Teacher of Righteousness"), הכוהן הרשע ("the Wicked Priest"), מטיף הכזב ("the Spouter of Lies"). This type of terminology is not found in 4Q509, which does not follow the fixed literary structure of the pesharim.⁵⁵ That is not to say that Festival Prayers is not in dialogue with the Hebrew Bible, but references to for example Sukkot in Leviticus 23 are used to embed the prayer cycle to festivals

53 Dimant, "Qumran Manuscripts: Contents and Significance," 38.

54 Esther G. Chazon, "'Gather the dispersed of Judah:' Seeking a Return to the Land as a Factor in Jewish Identity of Late Antiquity," in *Heavenly Tablets: Interpretation, Identity and Tradition in Ancient Judaism*, ed. Lynn LiDonnici and Andrea Lieber, JSJSup 119 (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 159–175, at 161–166.

55 To this we may add that this terminology is also not present in 1QS.

alluded to in scripture.⁵⁶ 4Q509 does otherwise not contain exegetical terminology, nor does it contain the polemic terminology that is characteristic of the pesharim and other sectarian texts.

The third set of criteria as formulated by Dimant, ‘Terms Related to the Worldview of the Community,’ does not contain the clear terminology related to the community’s organization, structure, and history. Here, we will be looking for theological concepts and terms and expressions that are exemplary for the worldview displayed in the sectarian texts. Dimant expresses some caution here, as she notices that some of these concepts are not unique for Qumran sectarian texts. She attributes this to the “conceptual affinity between the authors of the sectarian literature and those of works produced by certain circles outside the Qumran community.”⁵⁷ This raises the question how it is possible that the community could share religious ideas with groups outside the community, but not its terminology. Dimant does not discuss this issue, but maintains that the accumulation of such terms and concepts together with the occurrence of nomenclature under her first and second criteria is necessary to demonstrate the sectarian origin of a given text.

She distinguishes three “major conceptual topics related to the community’s outlook: dualism, the doctrine of predestination, and the religious obligations imposed on the community members.”⁵⁸ Expressions related to dualism, such as the binary oppositions אור וחושך (“Light and Darkness”) or צדק ועול (“righteousness and wickedness”), are not encountered in 4Q509.

The doctrine of predestination is, in Dimant’s view, associated with קצים, designating a sequence of historical periods or eras and often used in conjunction with other terms (e.g. קצי אל “Periods of God” or קצי שלום “Periods of Peace”). קץ also occurs in biblical texts, but there it is most often used as a designation for time.⁵⁹ Dimant argues that in the sectarian view, “the course of history is embodied in a sequence of periods that were predetermined by the divine blueprint for the created world. This idea is intimated by such expressions as אל קצי (“God’s periods”).”⁶⁰ In 1Q34bis we indeed find קץ רצונך (“time of your goodwill”), which is reason for Dimant to classify Festival Prayers as a sectarian composition. However, I doubt if the single usage of this term is enough to justify such classification. Dimant ostensibly seems to agree with this hesitation, as she observes that this concept of historical periodization is

56 Falk, *Daily, Sabbath, and Festival Prayers*, 171–172.

57 Dimant, “Vocabulary of the Qumran Sectarian Texts,” 80.

58 Dimant, “Vocabulary of the Qumran Sectarian Texts,” 80–81.

59 HALOT, s.v. “קָץ.”

60 Dimant, “Vocabulary of the Qumran Sectarian Texts,” 84.

already present in early apocalyptic compositions such as Daniel and Enoch.⁶¹ This leads her to the conclusion that the term “should be considered a sectarian marker only when it occurs in conjunction with additional sectarian expressions.”⁶² Other terms that carry a specific sectarian significance related to predestination such as רז (“secret, mystery”), תכוך (“measurement or arrangement”), or גורל (“lot”) are not found in Festival Prayers. We are reminded here of Tigchelaar’s concern regarding “the danger of drawing conclusions on the basis of the attestations of a limited sampling of words in a text.”⁶³ For this reason, even according to Dimant’s own model, it appears that the composition should not be allocated to the sectarian corpus.

As Dimant notices, the locution יסורי כבוד (“lessons of glory”) is found in 1Q34bis, but this is the only occurrence of that expression in Festival Prayers so it would be very limited evidence for sectarian origin.⁶⁴ Terms articulating the concept of predestination are not present in Festival Prayers. As an example of a liturgical text that does convey this concept we may think of the fifth song from the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice, which is passed down to us in the 4Q402 frag. 4 and in Mas 1k from Masada. Unlike 4Q509, here we do find what Newsom calls “a highly parallelistic account of God’s predestination of all events.”⁶⁵ The third conceptual topic distinguished by Dimant concerns ‘Terms pertaining to the conduct and practices required of the sectaries.’ This is reflected in the use of terms such as תמים in its metaphorical use as “complete, perfect, impeccable,” especially in conjunction with דרך, “way.” The adjective תמים does not occur in 4Q509.

Thus, if we apply Dimant’s model to this text and look for the terminology, vocabulary, and religious ideas that are specific for the Community, we find little ground to classify 4Q509 as a sectarian composition.

61 Dimant, “Vocabulary of the Qumran Sectarian Texts,” 84. Among the Scrolls we find similar uses of קץ in the Enoch manuscripts 4Q204 and 4Q206.

62 Dimant, “Vocabulary of the Qumran Sectarian Texts,” 85.

63 Tigchelaar, “Classifications of the Collection of Dead Sea Scrolls,” 530.

64 Dimant, “Qumran Manuscripts: Contents and Significance,” 43 n. 67. Dimant associates this locution with sectarianism because it would be used as well in CD VII, 5, 8 and 4Q266. However, here we only find the noun יסור, not the full locution יסורי כבוד.

65 Carol A. Newsom, *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice: A Critical Edition*, HSS 27 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985), 9; also discussed in Philip Alexander, “Predestination and Free Will in the Theology of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *Divine and Human Agency in Paul and His Cultural Environment*, ed. John M.G. Barclay and Simon J. Gathercole, LNTS 335 (London: T&T Clark, 2006), 27–49, at 41–42.

5 4Q496: A Copy of the War Scroll

4Q496, 4QpapM^f, is the second text on this opisthograph.⁶⁶ As mentioned, the composition survived in six other exemplars, including 1QM, which was one of the first seven Qumran scrolls that were found in Cave 1 in 1947 and among the manuscripts that received the most scholarly attention. 1QM is a leather scroll with a length of about 2.9 meter. Despite that the final columns and the lower part of all columns have not been preserved, the 19 remaining columns survived in relatively good condition. The average height of the scroll is about 16 cm, it has a large top margin of about 3 cm, and interlinear margins of about 7 mm. On the basis of its codicology (primarily the size of the top and bottom margins), Emanuel Tov lists it as a *de luxe* edition, a category of manuscripts that are relatively large and of high quality. 1QM shares this classification with 19 other manuscripts from Qumran: 12 of which contain texts from the Hebrew Bible and 7 non-biblical texts.⁶⁷ Apart from features related to format and layout (such as the quality of writing material and the regular column arrangement), Tov argues that these scrolls also share a fine calligraphy and “only limited amount of scribal intervention.”⁶⁸ A term such as ‘calligraphic’ is difficult to apply to early Hebrew writing practices, because it would imply that the scribe paid special attention to the aesthetics of his letter-forms.⁶⁹ We do not know if ancient scribes, next to legibility, also actively pursued a beautiful appearance. However, I would agree with Tov that the scribal hand of 1QM is straight and very regular. Cross qualifies 1QM as an “excellent example of the delicate, usually miniscule, formal script.”⁷⁰

66 The bibliography concerning the War Scroll is too extensive to sum up here. However, the following editions and studies should be mentioned: André Dupont-Sommer, “‘Règlement de la guerre des fils de lumière’: traduction et notes,” *RHR* 148 (1955): 141–180; Jean Carmignac, *La Règle de la Guerre des fils de Lumière contre les fils de Ténèbres* (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1958); Johannes P.M. van der Ploeg, *Le Rouleau de la Guerre*, STDJ 2 (Leiden: Brill, 1959); Yigael Yadin, *The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light Against the Sons of Darkness*, trans. Batya and Chaim Rabin (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1962); Philip R. Davies, *1QM, the War Scroll from Qumran: Its Structure and History*, BibOr 32 (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1977); Martin G. Abegg, “The War Scroll from Qumran Caves 1 and 4: A Critical Edition” (PhD diss., Hebrew Union College, 1992); Duhaime, “War Scroll”; idem, *The War Texts*, 13–21; Schultz, *Conquering the World*; Elisha Qimron, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: The Hebrew Writings*, vol. 1 (Jerusalem: Yad Ben Zvi, 2010); and Hanna Vanonen, *War Traditions from the Qumran Caves: Re-Thinking Textual Stability and Fluidity in the War Text Manuscripts*, STDJ 139 (Leiden: Brill, 2022).

67 Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 125–129.

68 Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 126.

69 Ada Yardeni, *The Book of Hebrew Script: History, Palaeography, Script Styles, Calligraphy and Design* (London: The British Library, 2002), 293.

70 Cross, “Development of the Jewish Scripts,” 32.

4Q496, one of the six copies of the War Scroll from Cave 4, is preserved on 122 fragments on the verso of 4Q509. 4Q496 most probably did not preserve the complete text of the War Scroll but rather selected passages or extracts.⁷¹ Many of the fragments of 4Q496 contain little more than the remains of at most a handful of characters, but frags. 1 to 13, and 16 are reasonably legible. These fragments correspond to the opening columns of 1QM.⁷² 4Q496 frags. 1 to 3 can be paralleled to 1QM col. I, frags. 4 to 7 and 13 can be paralleled to 1QM col. II, and frags. 8, 10, 11, and 12 to 1QM col. III. Frag. 16 finally seems to correspond to the end of 1QM col. III and the opening of col. IV. The identifications of the remaining fragments discussed by Baillet, Duhaime, and Schultz are tentative.⁷³ Readings are insecure because of the poor condition of the handwriting, but there is ground to assume that frag. 15 can be paralleled to 1QM col. IX, frags. 18 and 35 to column IV, and frag. 97 to column XII. Concerning the other fragments of 4Q496, some text (usually isolated words) can be reconstructed on frags. 17, 24, 26, 31, 32, 49, 57, and 76 but they cannot be placed within the text of 1QM. However, with regard to the reading of frag. 17, Abegg has remarked that “there are no consecutive words within the text of 1QM which satisfy the possibility of this line.”⁷⁴

Turning to the character of the composition, it is clear that the War Scroll offers a description of the final apocalyptic war between the Sons of Light and the Sons of Darkness, the latter of which are led by Belial.⁷⁵ The opening column introduces many of the ideas that are developed later on in the composition. It provides both what seems to be some sort of an overview of this apocalyptic war and a historical introduction. Through its reworking of Daniel 11–12, this column seems to be in dialogue with broader themes in apo-

71 The concept of an ‘extract’ refers to a passage (or, in its broadest sense, a textual unit) that is taken from a larger text. As such, it is used here synonymously with excerpt. The question of the relation of 4Q496 to the War Scroll will be addressed further in the codicological discussion of the manuscript below in section 6.2.

72 Duhaime, *The War Texts*, 22–23; Schultz, *Conquering the World*, 18–19; Vanonen, *War Traditions from the Qumran Caves*, 204–212.

73 Baillet, DJD 7:56–68; Duhaime, *The War Texts*, 22–23, 43; Schultz, *Conquering the World*, 18–19, 24–26. Baillet creatively proposes a number of other parallels, but too little text remains for a somewhat secure identification. Hanna Vanonen limits her discussion to the better preserved fragments 3 and 1 + 2 of 4Q496: Vanonen, *War Traditions from the Qumran Caves*, 204–212.

74 Abegg, “The War Scroll from Qumran Caves 1 and 4,” 92.

75 I provide a very concise overview of the content of 1QM here, for more extensive discussion see: Duhaime, *The War Texts*, 13–20; Schultz, *Conquering the World*, 42–85; Schultz, “Milḥamah (M),” in *T&T Clark Companion to the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 322–324.

calyptic literature of the period.⁷⁶ This part continues until the blank line after column II line 14. Column II until the end of column IX deals with different organizational and tactical elements in preparation of the final war, such as regulations for battle standards or battalion formations. Column X until the end of column XIV provides a cycle of prayers dedicated to the different phases of the battle, starting at the military encampment and continuing until after the victory. The last five columns offer a more detailed description of the battle against the Kittim and the army of Belial. Though this part merges different sections of the earlier text (most notably cols. III–IX and X–XIV) it is often read as a separate part of the composition, starting with a short introduction and continuing until a description of the victory celebrations after the war.

In order to appreciate the relationship of 4Q496 to 1QM, it is important to briefly reflect on the compositional history of the War Scroll. It has been observed early on in scholarship that 1QM misses a clear and coherent structure.⁷⁷ This could indicate that the text is not the product of one single author or editor, and point towards a longer process of editorial involvement. The first 9 columns of 1QM concerning the pre-battle organization and military tactics show many inconsistencies, while the prayer cycle of cols. X–XIV and the battle of the Kittim in the final five columns form two parts that are distinct from the opening half of the composition. This, together with the textual differences between 1QM and the manuscripts from Cave 4, has led scholars to conclude that the War Scroll is in fact a composite text and as such the end result of a long literary development.⁷⁸ It is for this reason that, rather than one composition, scholarship often refers to M, Milhama, or the M tradition.⁷⁹ Hanna Vanonen in her monograph on the War Scroll manuscripts distinguishes at least three different types of relationships between the manuscripts that can be included in the M tradition: manuscripts that show literary dependence (e.g.

76 David Flusser, "Apocalyptic Elements in the War Scroll," in *Judaism of the Second Temple Period, vol. 1: Qumran and Apocalypticism*, trans. Azzan Yadin (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 140–158; Schultz, *Conquering the World*, 93–102.

77 Yadin in his influential study on the War Scroll considered 1QM to be one coherent work that originated in the Qumran sect. However, this view has been problematized early on by Dupont-Sommer and Van der Ploeg: Dupont-Sommer, "Règlement de la guerre des fils de lumière"; Van der Ploeg, *Le Rouleau de la Guerre*, 7–22.

78 Duhaime, *The War Texts*, 60–61. Duhaime himself distinguishes a number of different recensions: cf. 13–31.

79 See for example Schultz, *Conquering the World*; Charlotte Hempel, *Qumran Rule Texts in Context: Collected Studies*, TSAJ 154 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), 204; Vanonen, *War Traditions from the Qumran Caves*.

1QM cols. XIV–XVII and 4Q491), manuscripts that were produced as part of the production process of another manuscript (e.g. 4Q492 as a draft version of 1QM col. XII), and manuscripts that were not copied from each other but that are related thematically (e.g. 4Q493 and 1QM).⁸⁰ Recently, scholars such as Schultz and Vanonen refer to an author/compiler rather than just to an author of 1QM.⁸¹

1QM cols. I and II play a central role in the debate regarding the compositional history of the War Scroll. Both present significant differences in their description of the eschatological war, a few of which will be highlighted here: col. I for example introduces the opposite forces of the Sons of Light and Darkness, but these two camps are not mentioned anymore in col. II. Col. I presents the enemies of the sons of light as the Kittim, while col. II maintains that the war is directed at the descendants of Noah: Shem, Ham, and Japheth (who as such represent the nations of the known world). Furthermore, while col. I maintains that the final battle will be fought while the sons of light are exiled in the wilderness (line 2–3), col. II describes how the war would begin only after Israel is restored and in control of the temple, where the sacrificial cult will be performed. Finally, the direct influence of Daniel 11–12 on 1QM col. I has been widely recognised.⁸² However, this connection is not present in col. II.⁸³

Several suggestions have been proposed to understand the relationship of col. I to col. II–IX. These could broadly be divided into two positions: scholars maintaining that 1QM col. I is older than the rest of 1QM, and scholars arguing that it is younger.⁸⁴

The view that considers col. I to be the oldest part of 1QM has been defended by scholars such as Peter von der Osten-Sacken and Matthias Krieg. Von der Osten-Sacken in his study on dualism in Qumran maintains that col. I preserves the oldest instance of eschatological dualism at Qumran and the basis of the remainder of 1QM.⁸⁵ Krieg has analysed 1QM as a cultic drama (“Kultdrama”)

80 Vanonen, *War Traditions from the Qumran Caves*, 308.

81 E.g., Schultz, *Conquering the World*, 368; Vanonen, *War Traditions from the Qumran Caves*, 41 n. 54.

82 Duhaime, *The War Texts*, 65–72; Schultz, *Conquering the World*, 91–102; Hanna Vanonen, “The Textual Connections between 1QM 1 and the Book of Daniel,” in *Changes in Scripture: Rewriting and Interpreting Authoritative Traditions in the Second Temple Period*, ed. Hanne von Weissenberg, Juha Pakkala, and Marko Marttila, *BZAW* 419 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2011), 223–245.

83 An extensive analysis of the differences between cols. 1 and 2 is provided by Schultz: *Conquering the World*, 170–239.

84 According to Duhaime, it is not clear whether col. 1 belongs to an early or a late “redactional stratum”: *The War Texts*, 98.

85 Peter von der Osten-Sacken, *Gott und Belial: Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zum*

that can be subdivided into three parts: an older “Fabel” in col. I, a subsequent “Regel” in cols. II–XIV, and finally “Drama” in cols. XV–XIX.⁸⁶ Krieg suggests a Hellenistic setting for col. I, but places col. II–IX in a younger period. These columns present a more concrete enemy image and developed terminology that is influenced by Roman warfare. Cols. XV–XIX preserved a cultic drama that the presumed Qumran community would have ritually performed in anticipation of the final eschatological war. Krieg hypothesizes that the three parts were brought together in the Roman period.⁸⁷ Though Krieg provides a rich integration of literary analysis and drama theory, his final proposal is somewhat tendentious and without supporting evidence that demonstrate the existence of such cultic dramas in Qumran.⁸⁸

Philip Davies is the primary proponent of the view that 1QM col. I was a later editorial addition to cols. II–XIX. According to Davies, 1QM is the final result of a long editorial process (from the Maccabean wars to the Roman period) in which three documents were brought together (cols. II–IX, X–XIV, and XV–XIX). Col. I would have been added in the final stage to serve as an introduction to the composition.⁸⁹ Apart from Davies, this view has been shared by Vanonen.⁹⁰

The most extensive recent analysis of the relationship between 1QM cols. I and II was performed by Schultz, who puts forward the question whether one should read such differences as the end result of combining two different traditions about the eschatological war, or rather as a description of two different stages of the same war.⁹¹ Schultz favours the second option and argues that the war is envisioned as consisting of two phases, the “War against the Kittim” and the “War of the Divisions,” a distinction that is present throughout the rest of the composition.⁹² The first nine columns of 1QM describe different aspects of this two-stage war but nevertheless form a literary unity. This is not the case for columns X–XIX. The final five columns seem to reach back to the first stage of

Dualismus in den Texten aus Qumran, SUNT 6 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1969), 28–115. For an extensive critique of this approach: Philip R. Davies, review *Gott und Belial*, by Peter von der Osten-Sacken, *RB* 78 (1971): 447–450; idem, *1QM, the War Scroll from Qumran*, 19–20.

86 Matthias Krieg, “Mo’ed Naqam—ein Kultur drama aus Qumran: Beobachtungen an der Kriegsrolle,” *TZ* 41 (1985): 3–30, at 24–30.

87 Krieg, “Mo’ed Naqam,” 28–30.

88 See also the critique of Krieg in Duhaime, *The War Texts*, 56–57.

89 Davies, *1QM, the War Scroll from Qumran*, 21, 25–26.

90 Vanonen, “The Textual Connections between 1QM 1 and the Book of Daniel,” 226 n. 17.

91 Brian Schultz, “Compositional Layers in the War Scroll (1QM),” in *Qumran Cave 1 Revisited*, 153–164, at 154.

92 Schultz, *Conquering the World*, 240–305; “Compositional Layers in the War Scroll (1QM).”

the war, the “War against the Kittim,” but do so by including new material from a different tradition and by presenting the war not just as a regional battle, but also as a heavenly one.⁹³ The same applies to the prayer cycle of cols. x–xiv, where new material is reworked such as the references found in 1QM col. xi to the war against Gog in Ezekiel 38–39.⁹⁴ These literary features are the result of a complex literary development: cols. x–xix are, in Schultz’ view, “an addition to a more primitive document now represented by cols. i–ix.”⁹⁵

Returning to 4Q496 we notice that the first fragments follow the text of 1QM cols. i, ii, and iii quite closely. 4Q496 clearly represents a copy of the composition on which 1QM cols. i and ii are united. If we follow the argument proposed by Davies and consider 1QM col. i to be a later addition to the War Scroll, then this would suggest that 4Q496 preserves the text after the compositional phase of the War Scroll was finished.

Alternatively, if we follow Schultz’ line of thought, then we conclude that 4Q496 preserves parts of both of the stages of the eschatological war he identified: the “War against the Kittim” and the “War of the Divisions,” because it contains parallels with both 1QM cols. i and ii. Schultz argues therefore that 4Q496, just as the other War Scroll manuscripts, can be traced back to a common source in which these two traditions were already united (if they ever were separated).⁹⁶ References to cols. x–xix, the later redactional layer of the composition, are not present in 4Q496, but we cannot exclude that the relevant fragments of 4Q496 have simply become illegible. Schultz does highlight however an interlinear correction in frag. 10, where נשיא, “prince,” is included between lines 3–4, and proposes with some caution that this figure might be related to the “prince of the congregation,” נשיא העדה, whom we find once in 1QM col. v, 1, but who is also mentioned in 1QSb, 4Q161, and *Sefer ha-Milhamah* (4Q285 and 11Q14).⁹⁷ We may conclude that 4Q496 only contains text that can be paralleled to the opening columns of 1QM, which Schultz would consider to be the older redactional layer of the composition. However, especially the

93 Cols. 15–19 also present the war as a “war against all the nations” (מלחמה בכול הגויים): Schultz, “Compositional Layers in the War Scroll (1QM),” 160.

94 Schultz, *Conquering the World*, 275.

95 Schultz, “Compositional Layers in the War Scroll (1QM),” 162.

96 Schultz, “Compositional Layers in the War Scroll (1QM),” 162.

97 Schultz hypothesizes that “It may be that this updating of the text reflects an evolution in the thinking of the sect with respect to this leader’s role during the eschatological war. If so, then it is particularly noteworthy that these changes were not incorporated into M,” Schultz, *Conquering the World*, 370.

fragments towards the end of the manuscript are preserved in very poor condition, which holds us from arguing that the manuscript could be a reflection of an early compositional phase.

We can only speculate about the motivations of the scribe of 4Q496 to record these particular passages from the War Scroll. Interest in especially column I could have to do with the fact that this column provides an introduction to the rest of the composition: the opening column introduces themes and subject matter that are developed in later parts of the War Scroll. Furthermore, all the fragments of 4Q496 that can be paralleled to 1QM with some certainty, can be placed within the opening four columns of 1QM. Links of other fragments of 4Q496 with 1QM col. IX (frag. 15) and col. XII (frag. 97) have been suggested by Baillet, but these identifications remain insecure. As far as researchers have been able to reconstruct, it appears that the scribe of 4Q496 had a specific interest in the first half of the composition of the War Scroll. Abegg concluded that "4Q496 represents a work whose remains consist of a similar introduction, specifying the preparations for battle (4Q496 frags. 1–7, 13), with a variant or more extensive section detailing the naming of the trumpets and banners (4Q496 frags. 8, 10–12, 15, 35)."⁹⁸

An alternative interpretation of the relationship between 4Q496 and 1QM is offered by Rony Yishai. Of particular relevance to our discussion of 4Q496 is her (unpublished) dissertation from 2006, in which she offers a detailed comparison between 1QM and the Cave 4 materials related to the War Scroll (4Q491–4Q496).⁹⁹ Yishai diverges from the scholars mentioned above, because she maintains that the Cave 4 manuscripts are not copies of 1QM, and might not even be recensions or versions of the same composition.¹⁰⁰ Rather, she sees 1QM and 4Q491–4Q496 as compositions that in different ways engage with the topic of the future, eschatological war, and process shared materials related to war literature. Yishai explains direct parallels between different manuscripts by pointing to the reuse of literary unites (often prayers) from this shared tradition of war literature.

Yishai interprets 4Q496 in a similar fashion. In her view, very little text can be read, but the few fragments that are legible only maintain a general affinity to the War Scroll while not a single fragment directly corresponds to 1QM.¹⁰¹ Her

98 Abegg, "The War Scroll from Qumran Caves 1 and 4," 82.

99 Rony Yishai, "מהדורה ופירושי) 4Q496–4Q491 כתבי היד בקומראן: המלחמה בקומראן (1QM) ושהשוואתם למגילת המלחמה (1QM)" (PhD diss., University of Haifa, 2006).

100 Yishai, "ספרות המלחמה בקומראן," 326–327.

101 Yishai, "ספרות המלחמה בקומראן," 284–302.

conclusion therefore is that 4Q496 belongs to the broader genre of War literature, but does not constitute a copy of the War Scroll, or even another version or adaptation of this composition.¹⁰²

Yishai is sceptic towards the majority of the identifications proposed by Baillet. This minimalist attitude often leads to insightful perspectives on the question of the compositional nature of the War Scroll. However, Yishai's readings of 4Q496 seem, to me, a bit too conservative at times. Her interpretation of fragment 3 might provide a case in point. According to Baillet's edition, this fragment displays enough correspondences to 1QM I 4–9 to regard it a copy of this section.¹⁰³ Yishai remains unconvinced and states that the only legible word on this plate is בליעל ("Belial") in line 5, and even that reading is very problematic. Yishai proceeds by arguing that the name Belial is very common in the War Scroll and therefore not sufficient evidence for a parallel with 1QM I, which is a fair point. According to Yishai, only a few other letters are preserved and also their reading is very doubtful.

However, it should be noted that Yishai based her interpretations on the plates included in DJD 7, and on the PAM photos 40.628, 42.063, and 43.865. Scholars that work on these fragments today are at an advantage: the images provided by the Leon Levy Digital Library offer much more detail. After inspection of both these images and the actual fragments, it seems to me that a bit more text on fragment 3 is legible. Line 4 for example, just above Belial in line 5, preserves a clear *resh* on the edge, followed by an *aleph* with a damaged middle stroke, followed by a clearly legible *lamed*. There seems little doubt to me that these letters preserve the ending of ישראל. The line above, line 3 on this fragment, provides a challenge. However, we can discern a diagonal stroke on the edge, followed by a *dalet* (similar to the *dalet* in line 8 of this fragment), a *vav* with a distinct head, a broken *lamed*, and a clear *he*. The downstroke at the start of this line can be reconstructed to a *gimel*, which allows us to follow Baillet and read גדולה here. This gives us in the consecutive lines 3, 4, and 5 of this fragment: ישראל, גדולה, and בליעל. If we compare this fragment to 1QM col. 1, then we note that 1QM I 4 reads בחמה גדולה. Line 5 has a tear at the place where we could expect to read ישראל, but at the end of this line we do find גורל בליעל. In short: 4Q496 frag. 3 does not offer much to read, but the little we can reconstruct corresponds to 1QM I. Similar arguments can be raised against some of Yishai's other readings of 4Q496. For example, she argues that frag. 2 line 2 can-

102 Yishai, "ספרות המלחמה בקומראן," 302.

103 Baillet, DJD 7:58. It should be noted that these identifications are largely confirmed by Abegg and Vanonen: Abegg, "The War Scroll from Qumran Caves 1 and 4," 82–83; Vanonen, *War Traditions from the Qumran Caves*, 207.

not read *tsade* (as proposed by Baillet), but offers no alternative reading and does not compare its letter form to other examples of *tsade* (for example the one preserved in frag. 59).

Furthermore, as mentioned above, in Yishai's view 1QM and the Cave 4 manuscripts share a number of characteristics, but not enough to determine that they are depended on each other. Yishai therefore assumes that the similar literary units found in both 1QM and the Cave 4 manuscripts are based on a shared body of literature about the final war that, presumably, was not preserved. As indicated by Schultz, it is just as well possible that these literary units originated in one of these texts and were subsequently selected and reused in one of the other compositions. In Schultz's words: "the similarities would not be due to their common reliance upon a shared body of war literature no longer extant as suggested by Yshai, but because of their interdependence."¹⁰⁴ Both these scenarios are at the same time possible but both at the same time cannot be proven. However, Schultz's proposition does not involve a hypothesized body of literature whose existence remains uncertain and seems therefore more convincing.¹⁰⁵

At the same time, Yishai offers important reflections on the relationship between the different War literature manuscripts, but also on the issue of authorship. Instead of thinking of 1QM and 4Q491–4Q496 as a series of individual compositions, Yishai highlights them as the products of a process of creation and adaptation of shared literature that continued at least throughout the first century BCE. It is the practices related to these compositional and editorial activities that will feature again later in this chapter.

There is a continuous scholarly debate regarding many different aspects of the War Scroll, such as its genre, compositional history, and the relationship of 1QM to the other manuscripts from Cave 4. What is important to note here is that the War Scroll is generally read as one of the compositions that are central to the group of sectarian literature. Within Dimant's model, the War Scroll is classified in the group of documents "Employing Terminology Connected to the Qumran Community."¹⁰⁶ For example, it is one of a limited number of compositions

¹⁰⁴ Schultz, *Conquering the World*, 36.

¹⁰⁵ See also the questions raised by Vanonen in this context: Vanonen, *War Traditions from the Qumran Caves*, 294–295.

¹⁰⁶ Dimant, "Qumran Manuscripts: Contents and Significance," 38; see also Devorah Dimant, "Between Sectarian and Non-Sectarian: The Case of the *Apocryphon of Joshua*," in *Reworking the Bible: Apocryphal and Related Texts at Qumran*, ed. Esther G. Chazon, Devorah Dimant, and Ruth A. Clements, STDJ 58 (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 105–134.

that uses the term 'serekh.' Since the term is not known from classical Hebrew, but appears in many of the texts that are traditionally interpreted as sectarian, such as 1QS, 1QSa, and D, it is often thought to have originated at Qumran.¹⁰⁷ The text is also thought to incorporate a number of socio-religious concepts that are typical for the Qumran sectarian worldview. An on-going debate in this regard concerns the relationship between the War Scroll and Early Jewish apocalyptic literature; among others, Flusser pointed to elements of apocalypticism in the text and argued that "the War Scroll seems to be building on a sophisticated eschatological doctrine."¹⁰⁸ The symbolic opposition between the Sons of Light and Darkness in the War Scroll, together with the Treatise on the Two Spirits from 1QS III, 13–IV, 26, are often read as clear examples of the dualistic system of thought that is assumed to be typical for the Qumran movement.¹⁰⁹

Regarding the ways in which the War Scroll potentially was read, several suggestions have been proposed.¹¹⁰ Apart from the interpretation of the work as an apocalyptic text or a rule text for the preparation of the final war, which goes back to Yigael Yadin, scholars have also read the composition as a liturgical document.¹¹¹ This idea was already proposed by Robert North in response to Yadin's discussion of 1QM, and by Jean Carmignac, who interpreted the representation of battle in the text as a liturgical celebration.¹¹² Krieg, as discussed above, interpreted cols. xv–xix as a cultic celebration of the eschatological war.¹¹³ John Zhu-En Wee also saw a "literary-liturgical" function for at least part of the War Scroll as he understood the columns xv–xix to be a reworking of the columns x–xiv and "its primary contents being hymns instead of historical

107 Jutta Jokiranta, *Social Identity and Sectarianism in the Qumran Movement*, STDJ 105 (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 3, at 2.

108 Flusser, "Apocalyptic Elements in the War Scroll," 158; Schultz, *Conquering the World*, 91–102. The reading of the War Scroll as an apocalyptic text is shared by among others John J. Collins: "The Mythology of Holy War in Daniel and the Qumran War Scroll: A Point of Transition in Jewish Apocalyptic," *VT* 25 (1975): 596–612. See also: Jean Duhaime, "La Règle de la Guerre de Qumrân et l'apocalyptique," *ScEs* 36 (1984): 67–88.

109 Von der Osten-Sacken, *Gott und Belial*; Philip R. Davies, "Dualism in the Qumran War Texts," in *Dualism in Qumran*, ed. Géza G. Xeravits, LSTS 76 (London: T&T Clark, 2010), 8–19.

110 Overviews are provided by Duhaime, *The War Texts*, 45–63, and Vanonen, "Stable and Fluid War Traditions."

111 On the War Scroll as an apocalyptic text: Duhaime, "La Règle de la Guerre de Qumrân et l'apocalyptique."

112 Robert North, "'Kittim' War or 'Sectaries' Liturgy?" *Biblica* 39 (1958): 84–93; Carmignac, *La Règle de la Guerre*.

113 Krieg, "Mo'ed Naqam."

narration.¹¹⁴ The proposals put forward by North, Carmignac, Krieg, and Wee could not fully convince Duhaime, who argues that their explanation needs “a more substantial demonstration and a comparison with similar material to be really convincing.”¹¹⁵ A comparison of the War Scroll with other prayer texts from Qumran has been provided by Falk, who recently returned to the matter to argue for the liturgical use of M.¹¹⁶ Falk’s reasoning can be used as a model to discuss to what degree a composition may have had a liturgical function. It is therefore beneficial to engage with his argument in a bit more detail.

First, Falk considered the liturgical formulae found in Qumran prayers and observes “a tendency toward consistency in the use of blessing formulas to frame the prayers.”¹¹⁷ He distinguishes three different prayer patterns, with the third, בְּרוּךְ אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל, “Blessed be the God of Israel,” being present in both 1QM and 4Q491.¹¹⁸ The blessing formula hardly occurs outside the scrolls, but can be found in several compositions that are associated with liturgy, including in a number of texts that we have on opisthographs: 4QRitual of Purification A (4Q414), 4QRitual of Purification B (4Q512), and Daily Prayers (4Q503). In Falk’s view, this indicates at the very least “that these prayers in the War Scroll are modelled on common prayer patterns, but it also highlights that these prayers could be appropriate as prayers for regular use by the community.”¹¹⁹

Second, Falk pointed at the two versions of the prayer that he classified as the Prayer Before Battle in both 1QM columns XII and XIX. Rather than a form of literary adaptation or borrowing, he sees this as a reflection of “liturgical re-use”: the prayer is adapted to a new context.¹²⁰ Falk does raise the question what place a liturgical text has in the context of warfare. Ancient Near Eastern literature has a long tradition of prayers dedicated to war: Falk points at 1 and 2 Maccabees, but looking at Mesopotamian war rituals we can trace this tradition even further back.¹²¹ Falk furthermore argues that the Qumran community

114 John Zhu-En Wee, “A Model for the Composition and Purpose of Columns xv–xix of the “War Scroll” (1QM),” *RevQ* 21 (2003): 263–283, at 283.

115 Duhaime, *The War Texts*, 56–57.

116 Falk, *Daily, Sabbath, and Festival Prayers*, 259–263; idem, “Prayer, Liturgy, and War,” in *The War Scroll, Violence, War and Peace in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature*, ed. Kipp Davis et al., STDJ 115 (Leiden: Brill, 2015), 275–294.

117 Falk, “Prayer, Liturgy, and War,” 278.

118 Falk, “Prayer, Liturgy, and War,” 279.

119 Falk, “Prayer, Liturgy, and War,” 280.

120 Falk, “Prayer, Liturgy, and War,” 280–285.

121 War rituals are well attested in Babylonian and Assyrian literary and epigraphical sources. These often concern kings appealing to the gods for a successful campaign. For example, the fragmentary seventh-century Assyrian ritual preserved on Ki 1904-10-9, 18 (BM 98989) requests the gods to safeguard the king against his enemies. Parts of the Babylonian Poem

in its self-presentation in compositions such as the War Scroll, but also S, D, and liturgical texts is structured as an army, which leads him to the conclusion that warfare in the scrolls often functioned “as spiritual warfare.”¹²²

Falk’s argument for the liturgical setting for the War Scroll is supported by a recent contribution of Rebekah Haigh, who understands 1QM as a spoken text and argues that “its present form crystallized in view of an ongoing performance context.”¹²³ She sees the prayers scattered throughout the columns XV–XIX, and the prayer cycle in columns X–XIV, as particular evidence for a performative function. But this function is also reflected in many other aspects of the composition, such as its prayer titles and rubrics, explicit references to reading out prayer texts before battle, the presence of direct speech and dialogue, repetitive prayer formulae and phrases (perhaps even rhythmic patterns), and organizational aids that serve as mnemonic devices (such as its numerically organization around the numbers three and seven).¹²⁴ Haigh does not connect 1QM to a particular type of reading event, whereas Krieg for example interpreted cols. XV–XIX as a liturgical drama intended to ritually dramatize the eschatological war.¹²⁵ Haigh’s performance remains unspecified. Rather, she is looking for literary elements that are indicative of a text that anticipates oral performance within a textual community. For the purposes of this study, it should be noted that Haigh also finds such features in the parts of 1QM that are paralleled in 4Q496. Both 1QM col. III and 4Q496 frags. 8–12 and 16 preserve regulations on the use of trumpets and banners in the final war. She in particular points to the rhythmic repetition of the phrase על הצוצרות (“on the trumpets”) ... יכתובו (“they will write”) in this section, which she considers to be an aural technique suggestive of oral performance.¹²⁶ Whether these elements are sufficient to demonstrate the War Scroll’s performativity remains doubtful, but they at least invite us to think of the composition as embedded in

of Erra and Ishum, which describes the horrors of warfare as the god Erra rages through the land, were recited and written on amulets as a petition for divine protection. On the Assyrian ritual: Daniel Schwemer, “Witchcraft and War: The Ritual Fragment Ki 1904-10-9, 18 (BM 98989),” *Iraq* 69 (2007): 29–42. On the poem: Jean-Jacques Glassner, *Mesopotamian Chronicles*, ed. Benjamin R. Foster, WAW 19 (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2004), 26–27; Andrew R. George, “The Poem of Erra and Ishum: A Babylonian Poet’s View of War,” in *Warfare and Poetry in the Middle East*, ed. Hugh Kennedy (London: I.B. Tauris, 2013), 39–71.

122 Falk, “Prayer, Liturgy, and War,” 285–289.

123 Rebekah Haigh, “Oral Aspects: A Performative Approach to 1QM,” *DSD* 26 (2019): 189–219, at 211.

124 Haigh, “Oral Aspects,” 199–211.

125 Krieg, “Mo’ed Naqam.”

126 Haigh, “Oral Aspects,” 205–207.

an oral culture. Or, as Haigh concludes, 1QM “should at least be ‘heard’ within the broader performative culture of the ancient Mediterranean world.”¹²⁷ In this way, her approach ties in with approaches that aim to think through how ancient texts would have functioned in an oral context.¹²⁸ Mladen Popović has stressed in this context the social aspects of interacting with texts together in a textual community and argued that the people behind the scrolls may have read and recited scrolls together; debated, studied and reworked their contents; and engaged with their texts in a range of other sociocultural activities.¹²⁹ In a similar vein, Johnson has shown in his analysis of a selected number of papyri from Oxyrhynchis how circles of literary specialists copied and shared texts amongst each other and with other literary circles.¹³⁰ We shall return to this matter later on.

6 4Q506: A Prayer Cycle for Days of the Week

4Q506 is a second witness of Words of the Luminaries, the composition that also was passed down to us on the leather manuscript 4Q504. Both 4Q504 and 4Q506 were among the manuscripts from Cave 4 that eventually were published by Baillet in DJD 7 in 1982.

4Q504 is extensively discussed by Cross in his seminal work on the development of Early Jewish palaeography.¹³¹ He sees this manuscript as one of the typical representatives of the Archaic or Early Hasmonaean semi-formal character and dated it to 175–150 BCE.¹³² This would place 4Q504 at the end of the Archaic period and therefore among the oldest scrolls from Qumran. Both Baillet and Émile Puech follow Cross in this regard and consider 4Q504 to be one of the oldest scrolls as well.¹³³

Baillet did not offer an extensive interpretation of the text, but remarked that 4Q504 should be read as a prayer document intended for liturgical use in the

127 Haigh, “Oral Aspects,” 211.

128 Johnson, *Readers and Reading Culture in the High Roman Empire*; Mladen Popović, “Reading, Writing, and Memorizing Together.”

129 Popović, “Reading, Writing, and Memorizing Together,” 456–466.

130 Johnson, *Readers and Reading Culture in the High Roman Empire*, 179–199.

131 Cross, “Development of the Jewish Scripts,” 22–23.

132 Cross, “Development of the Jewish Scripts,” 7. It should be noted that Cross dates 4Q504 to 175–125 BCE in the 1961 version of his article: “Development of the Jewish Scripts,” (Wright), 137.

133 Puech dates 4Q504 to around the middle of the 2nd century: “La paléographie des manuscrits de la mer Morte,” 100.

context of the days of the week.¹³⁴ This interpretation has been widely accepted by scholarship ever since. Esther Chazon in her 1992 dissertation analysed the literary arrangement of the prayer cycle, differentiating between weekday prayers and the shorter hymns dedicated to the Sabbath.¹³⁵

Furthermore, she exposed the common structure of the weekday prayers. Each starts with a superscription announcing both the type and occasion for the prayer, followed by an appeal to God to remember his past covenant with Israel, a petition, a benediction and the closure of “amen, amen.” The structure of these prayers with their repetitive liturgical formulae is very similar to 4Q509, as we have observed above. Within the context of this opisthograph it is significant that we find two compositions on the same manuscript that display such a common arrangement. We will return to this matter shortly. Though these prayers may ostensibly seem separate literary units, Chazon also argued for their commonly shared underlying themes of (1) revelation of hidden knowledge, (2) God’s forgiveness of Israel, and (3) its spiritual perseverance and continuation.

Daniel Falk has also investigated the form and structure and in the majority of the cases agreed with Chazon.¹³⁶ Their most significant point of disagreement concerns the relation between Words of the Luminaries and Daily Prayers, a liturgical text that survived on the recto of the papyrus opisthograph 4Q503/4Q512. Where Chazon classifies both Words of the Luminaries and Daily Prayers as “collections of communal prayers for recitation at fixed times of the day, week and year,” Falk suggests a different form, function and socio-liturgical setting for the two and argues for a sectarian provenance for Daily Prayers.¹³⁷ But before we digress and delve into Daily Prayers, we will return to Words of the Luminaries and ask the question how this text is understood in relation to the wider collection.

134 Baillet, “Un recueil liturgique de Qumrân”; DJD 7:137.

135 Chazon, “A Liturgical Document from Qumran and Its Implications.”

136 One of the instances where Chazon and Falk disagree for example is on the level of the individual interpretation of the prayers. Chazon distinguishes the prayers for Sunday and Thursday (in her view dedicated to forgiveness and repentance) from those for the other week days (dedicated to deliverance from stress). Falk maintains that the prayers have not survived in such a state that would allow for such a rigid distinction, and that this opposition is not visible in those parts that are still in good condition: Falk, *Daily, Sabbath, and Festival Prayers*, 69–71.

137 Esther G. Chazon, “Hymns and Prayers in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*, ed. Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam (Leiden: Brill, 1998), 244–270, at 259; Falk, *Daily, Sabbath, and Festival Prayers*, 89–93.

7 **Words of the Luminaries: Sectarian, Non-Sectarian, Pre-Sectarian?**

An important issue in the scholarly debate concerning Words of the Luminaries remains its origin in relation to the community or communities behind the scrolls. There are three different positions discernable within scholarship: Words of the Luminaries is on occasion read as a sectarian, a non-sectarian, or a pre-sectarian composition.

Dimant classifies 4Q504 and 4Q506 in the category of sectarian liturgical works, together with texts such as Songs of the Maskil, Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice, and many of the liturgical papyri from Cave 4.¹³⁸ She does so partly on the basis of Falk's observation that Festival Prayers and Words of the Luminaries share a similar structure and form, and should therefore be of the same (in his view non-sectarian) provenance.¹³⁹ Dimant, as we have seen, goes the other direction for 4Q509 and therefore classifies both as sectarian texts. Next to that, she recognizes one instance of a sectarian locution in Words of the Luminaries: *וליהבינו לתעודות* in 4Q504 frag. 1 ii 17, "and to make us understand the testimonies," which according to her approach confirms this assessment.¹⁴⁰ Some of the basic issues with the model proposed by Dimant, especially in relation to Festival Prayers, have been discussed above.

Baillet does not elaborate extensively on the milieu of origin of Words of the Luminaries. On the basis of the manuscript's early palaeographic date (around 150 BCE) and the absence of a distinct sectarian character ("caractère sectaire") he places the origins of 4Q504 among the Hasidean movement, which Baillet understood to be the "spiritual heirs" of the Essenes.¹⁴¹ Baillet stood not alone here; this proposition had been put forward by a number of other scholars as well.¹⁴² This causes the scrolls to be perceived from a particular socio-religious framework. The fact that the Hasideans were seen as the predecessors of the Essenes meant that the older manuscripts from the Dead Sea Scrolls had to be attributed to the Hasideans as well, a hypothesis that is generally not shared by scholars after the first phase of Qumran research.¹⁴³

138 Dimant, "Qumran Manuscripts: Contents and Significance," 43–44.

139 Falk, *Daily, Sabbath, and Festival Prayers*, 63.

140 Dimant, "Qumran Manuscripts: Contents and Significance," 43 n. 65.

141 Baillet, DJD 7:137.

142 This hypothesis was already proposed by Milik, Cross, and John Allegro: Milik, *Ten Years of Discovery*, 80–82; Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumrân*, 54 n. 33, 107 n. 66, 148; Allegro, *The Dead Sea Scrolls. A Reappraisal*, 106.

143 Dimant aligns this view with the first phase of Qumran Research (1950–1980): Devorah Dimant, "Introductory Essay: The Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls—Past and Present," in *History, Ideology and Bible Interpretation*, 1–24, at 5.

Falk is among the scholars that rejects the widely held suggestion of a sectarian provenance for Words of the Luminaries.¹⁴⁴ Rather, Falk argues, the “non-exclusivistic” prayer practice in the composition suggests a different setting from Daily Prayers and therefore one that was probably not sectarian.¹⁴⁵ Instead of concentrating on terminology, Falk seems implicitly to be interested in the intended audience of this prayer cycle. Which groups could this text be addressed to? Words of the Luminaries seems to be directed towards a broader Jewish audience. Furthermore, its connections with rabbinic prayers bring Falk to hypothesize a provenance close to the temple in Jerusalem.¹⁴⁶ Newsom also sees Words of the Luminaries as a non-sectarian composition, since it gives “no particular evidence of sectarian authorship or special affinity with theological themes characteristic of the Qumran community.”¹⁴⁷

The most extensive discussion of the classification of this composition is performed by Chazon. She is regularly quoted as claiming a non-sectarian origin, but her final verdict is actually much more reserved. Chazon uses Words of the Luminaries as a case study to examine the criteria needed to demonstrate whether a scroll is of sectarian authorship. She starts by distinguishing four major criteria:¹⁴⁸

1. Features of a distinct scribal school
2. Palaeographical dating
3. Identity with a non-sectarian text
4. Terminology and ideas

The first criterion applies Tov’s theory of the “Qumran Scribal Practice” (henceforth QSP), which surmises that a large number of manuscripts from the collection would be written following the orthography and scribal practices of a particular scribal school at the settlement of Qumran.¹⁴⁹ Tov considers both 4Q504 and 4Q509 to be written according to QSP, a conclusion that is shared by Chazon.¹⁵⁰ However, for Chazon this does not necessarily mean that the

144 Falk, *Daily, Sabbath, and Festival Prayers*, 61.

145 Falk, *Daily, Sabbath, and Festival Prayers*, 91.

146 Falk, *Daily, Sabbath, and Festival Prayers*, 91–94.

147 Newsom, “‘Sectually Explicit’ Literature,” 171.

148 Esther G. Chazon, “Is *Divrei Ha-me’orot* a Sectarian Prayer?” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research*, ed. Devorah Dimant and Uriel Rappaport, STDJ 10 (Leiden: Brill, 1992), 3–17, at 4.

149 Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*. A critical assessments of this theory can be found in Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar, “Assessing Emanuel Tov’s ‘Qumran Scribal Practice,’” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Transmission of Traditions and Production of Texts*, ed. Sarianna Metso, Hindy Najman, and Eileen Schuller. STDJ 92 (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 173–207.

150 Chazon, “Is *Divrei Ha-me’orot* a Sectarian Prayer?” 7.

composition originated at Qumran or that the manuscript was copied there. Chazon's cautiousness in this regard ties in with her second criterion to determine sectarian origin, which concerns palaeography. There is a scholarly consensus to date 4Q504 around the middle of the second century BCE.¹⁵¹ This is significantly earlier than the generally accepted starting date of the occupation phase of Qumran.¹⁵² It should be noted in this context that, for Chazon, the notion of sectarian as a social concept is connected to the settlement of Qumran. Her presupposition here is that there can be no sectarian texts that predate the settlement at Qumran, which means that "Qumranic" and "sectarian" are basically used interchangeably.¹⁵³ For now, it suffices that Chazon accepts this dating with the appropriate reservation that the palaeographic dates are always a proximation due to the evolutionary development of the script.¹⁵⁴ Combining the two dates, Chazon argues that "the palaeographical and archaeological data must be pushed to their limits in order to place the document at Qumran."¹⁵⁵ Though this is not impossible, it does not seem to be the most likely scenario, especially when we consider that 4Q504 might very well not have been the autograph, which would push the date of composition even earlier. Again, Chazon is careful not to overstate the importance of these dates. In order to estimate if 4Q504 is indeed sectarian or non-sectarian, the material and orthographical evidence would have to be considered next to the character of the composition, which is the aim of the last two criteria.

For her third criterion, Chazon tries to explore if the prayers represented in 4Q504 were in general usage during its time of composition, which would suggest circulation in non-sectarian circles. Her investigation remains inconclusive, but Chazon does note various similarities with non-sectarian, Jewish liturgical texts, such as the use of concluding benedictions, the proclamation of divine justice and the petition for knowledge.¹⁵⁶ The question of sectarian terminology, Chazon's final criterion, has a similar outcome: though no elements of the text appear to be in contradiction with sectarian belief, the absence of sectarian terminology is conspicuous, especially since the theme of the historical reconstruction of Israel's post-exilic past seems almost to invite such

151 Baillet, DJD 7:137.

152 Jodi Magness, *The Archaeology of Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, 2002), 47–72; Dennis Mizzi, "Archaeology of Qumran," *T&T Clark Companion to the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 17–36.

153 The same applies to the concepts "non-Qumranic" and "non-sectarian": Chazon, "Is *Divrei Ha-me'orot* a Sectarian Prayer?" 3 n. 2.

154 Chazon, "Is *Divrei Ha-me'orot* a Sectarian Prayer?" 8.

155 Chazon, "Is *Divrei Ha-me'orot* a Sectarian Prayer?" 9.

156 Chazon, "Is *Divrei Ha-me'orot* a Sectarian Prayer?" 12.

terminology. Eventually Chazon concludes that the composition provides a difficult case: “neither the content nor the form betray sectarian or non-sectarian authorship.”¹⁵⁷ This line of thought is concluded by remarking that Words of the Luminaries “might best be understood in the context of a pre-Qumranic phenomenon—whether of the immediate precursors of the sect which eventually settled at Qumran or of a different group or religious movement which assessed its spiritual and physical situation similarly.”¹⁵⁸ She is followed in this regard by Hanan Eshel and Eileen Schuller.¹⁵⁹ A similar conclusion is also reached by Hartmut Stegemann, who observes that despite its parabolic stance, Words of the Luminaries (as well as other extrabiblical compositions) “nicht notwendigerweise zugleich als Produkte der Qumrangemeinde betrachtet werden müssen.”¹⁶⁰

In a recent article Chazon reassessed the question about the relationship of Words of the Luminaries to the community behind the scrolls from a different perspective as she aims to think through the question of diachronicity: how could one liturgical text have been read “by two diachronically and ideologically different audiences: the implied audience of the pre-Qumranic author and the actual audience of the Yaḥad community at Qumran?”¹⁶¹ Chazon still considers the composition to be originally a non-Qumranic text, which she argues on the basis of a number of themes and motifs that all give expression to a “pan-Israelite perspective,” and which “are seemingly at variance with sectarian ideology and identity.”¹⁶² In the second part of her article, Chazon explores how Words of the Luminaries would have been read by the people behind the Dead Sea Scrolls, and how they would have harmonized these themes with their own sectarian identity.¹⁶³ The pan-Israelite perspective expressed in Words of the Luminaries was, in Chazon’s view, not unfamiliar enough to regard the composition unacceptable to sectarian thought. She concludes that through the

157 Chazon, “Is *Divrei Ha-me’orot* a Sectarian Prayer?” 17.

158 Chazon, “Is *Divrei Ha-me’orot* a Sectarian Prayer?” 17.

159 Hanan Eshel, “*Dibre Hame’orot* and the Apocalypse of Weeks,” in *Things Revealed: Studies in Early Jewish and Christian Literature in Honor of Michael E. Stone*, ed. Esther G. Chazon, David Satran, and Ruth A. Clements, JSJSup 89 (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 149–154; Eileen M. Schuller, “Prayers and Psalms from the Pre-Maccabean Period,” *DSD* 13 (2006): 306–318.

160 Hartmut Stegemann, “Die Bedeutung der Qumranfunde für die Erforschung der Apokalyptik,” in *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East*, ed. David Hellholm (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1983), 495–530, there 511.

161 Esther G. Chazon, “Prayer and Identity in Varying Contexts: The Case of the *Words of the Luminaries*,” *JSJ* 46 (2015): 484–511, at 484–485.

162 These themes are Historical Recollections, Election, Covenant, Sin and Forgiveness, and Knowledge: Chazon, “Prayer and Identity in Varying Contexts,” 489–499.

163 Chazon, “Prayer and Identity in Varying Contexts,” 499–510.

shared notions of a common past and foundational narrative (especially with regard to the Torah) the sectarian community would be able to appropriate such an originally non-sectarian liturgical composition. If we push this argument further, we could argue that the ways in which texts were read do not have to be stable and unchanging. The fact that a composition originated within a particular sectarian or non-sectarian context does not have to mean that the development of a different understanding of this text was out of the ordinary. From this view, the people behind the scrolls were, to some extent at least, able to negotiate the differences between their own socio-religious ideas and worldviews, and the ideas expressed in some of the texts in their collection. According to Chazon, the texts encountered in the collection do not need to have a sectarian origin in order to be read, studied, and copied by the same people that read, studied, and copied the compositions that scholars now often classify as sectarian.

We may conclude from this brief overview that *Words of the Luminaries* is a very difficult text to classify with regard to its social origin, and that scholarly attempts to do so have led to a variety of results. The problem is not that there is disagreement concerning the interpretation of the text. After all, most scholars broadly agree and consider it to be a liturgical cycle with prayers dedicated to different days of the week. The difficulty is to establish its relation with the wider collection. The outcome of Chazon's exploration (or rather, the absence of a definite outcome) is significant: at the end of the day, it is impossible to set firm boundaries between sectarian ideology, and notions or concepts that are thought to be non-sectarian. The result of such an endeavour is therefore somewhat subjective, because to a large degree this depends on one's presupposed understanding of the collection as a whole. The question if a particular text is or is not compatible with the worldview and religious ideas that are dominant in the collection as a whole is a judgment call based in part on how the presumed Qumran community is conceived, but also on the way in which individual Jewish scribes are conceived as having engaged with their manuscripts. Does this conceptualisation presume that all prayer texts from Qumran must have been recited in the liturgy of the sectarian movement? Or are we dealing with a collection that reflects broader Jewish intellectual trends of the time? The discussion concerning the classification of *Words of the Luminaries* illustrates these dynamics. Dimant for example attaches great importance to sectarian locutions and terminology. We have seen above that according to her model, one example of a parallel locution shared between 4Q504 and 1QS might be enough to consider the former a sectarian work. Chazon by contrast in her own inquiry of sectarian terminology and ideas does not see clear indications of sectarian authorship. But for Chazon, that does not mean that a composition like

Words of the Luminaries could not be accepted by the people behind the sectarian texts: they were able to negotiate these differences and read this text in a way that was meaningful to their own socio-religious ideas.

Both of these results, together with the others presented above, demonstrate a perfectly valuable outcome of a particular analysis. I have argued here that these analyses by Dimant and Chazon, however, were performed with a particular model in mind, a preconceived conceptualisation of how the people behind the Dead Sea Scrolls saw their socio-religious ideas reflected in their collection.¹⁶⁴

¹⁶⁴ As Dimant remarks: “The community’s particular regulations, polemics, and worldview, portrayed in unique linguistic and conceptual fashion, should constitute the guide for determining sectarian provenance.” Dimant, “Vocabulary of the Qumran Sectarian Texts,” 64.

Opisthograph 4Q509/4Q496/4Q506 and the Question of Textual and Literary Diversity

1 The Opisthograph: An *Emic* Category?

In the preceding sections I addressed the different ways in which the three compositions on this opisthograph have individually been read, interpreted, and classified. Each of these texts presents its own set of questions and problems. For instance, a liturgical setting for both Festival Prayers and Words of the Luminaries is generally accepted. Both texts present a collection of prayers with particular themes that seem intended for liturgy on set times. As we have seen above, our classifications of the Dead Sea Scrolls are often calibrated to sectarian texts. Within this model a text such as the War Scroll can be understood as the reflection of the worldview of a particular sectarian community settled at Qumran. Compositions of a different genre, especially prayer texts, can problematize such an approach. The question that remains open for both Festival Prayers and Words of the Luminaries is how these texts are understood in relation to the wider collection, especially concerning the corpus of sectarian literature. These are liturgical texts, but whose liturgy are we talking about? The War Scroll however is challenging in a different way. Ever since the discovery of 1QM in Cave 1, the composition is perceived to be one of the core texts of the sectarian community at Qumran, regardless of the way scholars choose to conceptualize this community. Scholarship is still contesting though how this text would have functioned. The War Scroll as a liturgical text, a position we have discussed with a bit more detail, is just one of the points of view in this debate, the others diverging from a rule text to a battle narrative.

The varying assessments of these texts illustrate how the literary heterogeneity on many different levels in the collection at times defies straightforward classification. Among the Dead Sea Scrolls we find such a range of different texts when it comes to terminology, structure, literary themes, religious ideas, and orthography that scholars have to prioritize based on the model of the community they envisage behind the texts. To make sense of this all, they will focus on a number of questions that serves their investigation. Daniel Falk for example is interested in the origins of synagogue liturgy and therefore adopts a diachronic approach, looking for similarities with later prayers in Jewish his-

tory.¹ Once scholars move from the level of literary analysis into a social reality we get different results, here reflected in different views on the presumed sectarian provenance of Festival Prayers and Words of the Luminaries. In this way, the place of an individual composition within the reconstructed history of the collection is a matter of how literary heterogeneity is understood. Which ideas and perspectives reflected in the texts do scholars assess as important? Many of these methods aim to group and classify clusters of texts within the corpus at large by *a priori* establishing criteria. These approaches can be characterised as *etic*.

The conceptual pairing *emic* and *etic* has been coined by Kenneth Pike for the linguistic opposition between ‘phonemic’ and ‘phonetic,’ and further developed for cultural analysis by (among others) anthropologist Marvin Harris.² Within the field of Early Judaism it has been applied by Steve Mason to think through the categories “Judaism” and “Jewishness,” by Popović to understand a group’s self-understanding as expressed in texts vis-à-vis the concept of a textual community, and by Jutta Jokiranta and Alison Schofield in the context of sociological models for the Qumran community.³ Here, I will follow George Brooke’s use of the terms *emic* for “insider” and “cultural specific,” and *etic* for “outsider” and “culturally neutral.”⁴ My interest is with ways in which to group together and categorize the texts of the Dead Sea Scrolls that would follow under the *emic* category. But how do we come to such a perspective? The question is how to demonstrate that the same scribe engaged with two or more compositions. Is there a way to find out which texts were copied, studied, read, or performed together by the scribes behind the scrolls? The *emic* point of view is difficult to trace back without the kind of evidence that other fields have at their disposal, such as Sumerian and Akkadian literary catalogues, lists of books preserved on papyri, or descriptions of book collections in ancient lit-

1 In the context of Words of the Luminaries, this means comparing the text with rabbinic prayers such as the Tahanunim and Amidah: Falk, *Daily, Sabbath, and Festival Prayers*, 73–78.

2 Kenneth L. Pike, *Language in Relation to a Unified Theory of Structure of Human Behavior*, 2nd ed. (The Hague: Mouton, 1967); Marvin Harris, “History and Significance of the Emic/Etic Distinction,” *Annual Review of Anthropology* 5 (1976): 329–350.

3 Steve N. Mason, “Jews, Judaeans, Judaizing, Judaism: Problems of Categorization in Ancient History,” *JSJ* 38 (2007): 457–512; Popović, “Reading, Writing, and Memorizing Together,” 452; Jokiranta, *Social Identity and Sectarianism in the Qumran Movement*, e.g. 8–9; Alison Schofield, “Forms of Community,” in *T&T Clark Companion to the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 533–546.

4 George J. Brooke, “From Florilegium or Midrash to Commentary: The Problem of Re-Naming an Adopted Manuscript,” in *The Mermaid and the Partridge: Essays from the Copenhagen Conference on Revising Texts from Cave Four*, ed. George J. Brooke and Jesper Høgenhaven, STDJ 96 (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 129–150, at 130 n. 6.

erary sources, all of which would fall under the *emic* category. In the Dead Sea Scrolls we find no explicit reflection on the notion of collection or the practice of reading.

However, that does not mean that we are left empty-handed. Though lists of compositions are indeed absent, through our manuscript evidence we may be able to get a very basic idea of the texts that were grouped together. In this context we are looking for an *emic* understanding of the engagement with different texts collectively. How does this work? Do we have evidence under which circumstances and with which purpose texts were brought together? Indeed, we find examples of extracts, quotations, and note-taking in manuscripts such as 4Q175 (Testimonia), 4Q265 (Miscellaneous Rules), and 4Q174 (Eschatological Commentary A).⁵

It has been argued that these manuscripts shed light on the many dimensions of a scribal culture that was centred around reading, writing, and studying ancient texts. We will consider these three examples briefly, starting with 4Q175. This manuscript presents us with a compilation of four passages from Exodus, Deuteronomy, Numbers, and the Psalms of Joshua (4Q379) and as such provides us with evidence for textual practices of both quotation and collection.⁶ Among others Tigchelaar, Lutz Doering, Popović, and Molly Zahn have argued that different textual traditions are brought together on one manuscript.⁷ Tigchelaar has demonstrated that the scribe of 4Q175 copied his *Vorlagen* without standardizing the orthography, which led to a collection of different scriptural passages that are written in both QSP and non-QSP. This feature, together with the undisciplined script of 4Q175, has brought Tigchelaar to suggest that the manuscript “was written for private use.”⁸ 4Q175 gives us an insight into the practice of collection and demonstrates that texts do not necessarily have to be brought together because of a shared setting or function, but also, as Popović has suggested, as a “result of a reading culture in which reading, writ-

5 Brooke, “From Florilegium or Midrash to Commentary”; Popović, “Qumran as Scroll Storehouse in Times of Crisis?” 577; “Reading, Writing, and Memorizing Together,” 466; Charlotte Hempel, “Cutting the Cord with the Familiar: What Makes 4Q265 *Miscellaneous Rules* Tick?” in *Sibyls, Scriptures, and Scrolls: John Collins at Seventy*, ed. Joel S. Baden, Hindy Najman, and Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar, JSJSup 175 (Leiden: Brill, 2016), 509–516.

6 Eva Mroczek, “Testimonia,” in *T&T Clark Companion to the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 358–361.

7 Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar, “In Search of the Scribe of 1QS,” in *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov*, ed. Shalom M. Paul et al., VTSup 94 (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 439–452; Doering, “Excerpted Texts in Second Temple Judaism”; Popović, “Reading, Writing, and Memorizing Together,” 463; Molly Zahn, “Beyond ‘Qumran scribal practice’: The case of the Temple Scroll,” *RevQ* 29 (2017): 185–203.

8 Tigchelaar, “In Search of the Scribe of 1QS,” 451.

ing, and memorizing were interlinked, and writing and memorizing were not mutually exclusive in terms of oral versus written culture.”⁹

Similar dynamics are visible in 4Q265 (Miscellaneous Rules), which also does not present us with a traditional narrative, but can rather be read as a collection of excerpts of different legal texts from the Dead Sea Scrolls.¹⁰ Also here the relationship between these excerpts is not directly clear, but it seems probable that they were brought together to be read and studied together.¹¹ We can imagine that legal rules could be the subject of discussion and how a scribe could note down the collection of these excerpts for such a session.

In addition to 4Q175 and 4Q265, we could also consider 4Q174, which seems to be some form of a collection or anthology of several biblical passages. Scholars have been able to identify at least Deuteronomy 33, 2 Samuel 7, and several Psalms. Where 4Q174 differs from both 4Q175 and 4Q265 is that each text is complemented with an interpretation or midrash, which seems similar to the pesharim.¹² However, where the pesharim develop a historical narrative on the basis of the scriptural interpretation of one biblical text (e.g. Habakkuk or Isaiah), 4Q174 presents us a number of passages from different biblical texts that are brought together because of their thematic association.¹³ Brooke has proposed the title Eschatological Commentary A for this manuscript, because through the act of extracting parts from different compositions, the author is both constructing textual relations with other texts and commenting on earlier traditions.¹⁴ If we accept Brooke’s proposition, which I am inclined to do, then we may conclude that 4Q174 gives us an interesting insight in one of the many interpretational activities that the people behind the scrolls undertook: bringing together passages from different sources and, through investigation and study (or *drš*), opening up interpretational relations between them.

9 Popović, “Reading, Writing, and Memorizing Together,” 463.

10 Hempel, “Cutting the Cord with the Familiar,” 510–513.

11 Popović, “Reading, Writing, and Memorizing Together,” 469.

12 Annette Steudel, *Der Midrasch zur Eschatologie aus der Qumrangemeinde (4QMidrEschat^{a-b}): Materielle Rekonstruktion, Textbestand, Gattung und traditionsgeschichtliche Einordnung des durch 4Q174 („Florilegium“) und 4Q177 („Catena A“) repräsentierten Werkes aus den Qumranfunden*, STDJ 13 (Leiden: Brill, 1994).

13 Hartog, *Pesher and Hypomnema*, 136–182. Dimant has argued that the several passages quoted in 4Q174 develop the idea of an eschatological Temple: Devorah Dimant, “4QFlorilegium and the Idea of the Community as a Temple,” in *History, Ideology and Bible Interpretation*, 269–288.

14 Brooke, “From Florilegium or Midrash to Commentary”; idem, “Controlling Intertexts and Hierarchies of Echo in Two Thematic Eschatological Commentaries from Qumran,” in *Reading the Dead Sea Scrolls: Essays in Method*, ed. George Brooke, EJL 39 (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2013), 85–97.

In this way, 4Q174 shows us one potential purpose for the collection and extraction of passages from different sources, even if those isolated passages do not seem to form a coherent narrative when they were brought together. What does that tell us when we consider manuscripts such as 4Q175 and 4Q265? It remains speculation, but could it be that the scriptural quotations from 4Q175 were studied and investigated just like the passages from 4Q174, but that their interpretations, the results of this investigation, were simply not written down? In other words: would it be possible that the inclusion of the commentary in 4Q174 is the result of an interpretative step that was conducted within an oral or aural study context for 4Q175 and 4Q265, and perhaps other manuscripts? Regardless of the ways in which we look at the parallels between these three manuscripts, we can at least conclude that 4Q174 tells us that collection is not a passive act, but one outcome of an active engagement with texts. We will return to this issue of collection below.

Manuscripts such as 4Q175, 4Q265, and 4Q174 provide a glimpse into some of the dynamics of the scribal culture that the Dead Sea Scrolls are part of. They offer an *emic* perspective on the engagement with texts, and allow us to recognize that among the people behind the scrolls we might not only find copyists, but also readers, students, and commentators. I would maintain that the corpus of opisthographic manuscripts from Qumran presents us with a similar opportunity. The manuscript 4Q509/4Q496/4Q506 can function as a case in point. It is not a scholarly construct or particular literary framework that results in scholars grouping these different texts together, but rather the tangible manuscript evidence. The *emic* perspective that this manuscript offers may seem quite obvious, but opens up a range of research questions that will be addressed in the next paragraphs: 4Q509, 4Q496, and 4Q506 were written down together on the same manuscript by ancient scribes. What can we infer from that tangible evidence for these texts being grouped together in antiquity? What kind of grouping or collection can we imagine this to be? Can we hypothesize about a particular setting or purpose that brought these texts together? What consequence could this have for how we conceive of ancient text collecting practices?

2 A Codicological Analysis of 4Q509/4Q496/4Q506

The main point I wish to emphasise is that the three compositions on this opisthograph were grouped together by the scribes behind the scrolls in antiquity, not by modern scholars. This is a material certainty: they are collected on the same manuscript. The first thing we may infer from the fact that multiple texts

occur on the same scroll is that at least the scribe that wrote the texts on the verso was aware of the other texts on this scroll. However, that does not tell us much about how to perceive the relation between these three compositions. For what purpose were these texts grouped together? Apart from their material proximity on the same manuscript, are there features that connect these texts to each other? In order to answer these questions we have to re-examine the nature of the opisthographic practice in the scribal culture of the ancient Mediterranean, because these issues are related to the conditions under which the manuscript was 'reused' after the text on the recto was written.

Daniel Falk has succinctly addressed the question of the nature of material reuse. He distinguishes two main forms: (1) "Instances where the reuse signifies that the original text is defunct" and (2) "where it is a case of creating a collection of valued works."¹⁵ The distinction between these two forms of reuse is to a certain degree artificial. After all, we can imagine both forms occurring at the same time. The original function of the first text on the recto of an opisthograph, as far as we are allowed to speak of a single function of a text of course, may have become obsolete. That does not mean however that the text cannot serve a different purpose in a different context. Meanings can change and the proximity of one text to another text can open up different interpretational relations that were not anticipated by the first author. It is certainly possible that the text that was written first on a manuscript continued to be of value, even though it was read differently and for example performed in a different context.

Nevertheless, Falk's distinction can be helpful as a starting point and raises the question which of the two forms of reuse would apply to our opisthograph: do we have evidence for reuse where the original is defunct or for the creation of a collection? We can approach this question both from a material and from a textual perspective. In this section we will start with the first.

The material analysis of manuscripts can be distinguished between palaeography and codicology, though the two fields of research are very much related.¹⁶ In order to assess the nature of the reuse of this manuscript we have to compare the scribal practices on both the recto and the verso. Apart from their palaeography we should inquire after aspects such as layout, stichometry, and the presence of scribal markings and corrections. An important question is the consistency of the scribal practices on both recto and verso. How do they compare? Do we encounter similarities or differences between material

¹⁵ Falk, "Material Aspects of Prayer Manuscripts," 51.

¹⁶ The quality of a scribal hand for example is influenced by the choice and quality of writing material.

features of both sides on an opisthograph? In the case of our manuscript: do we see a consistent use of scribal practices across 4Q509, 4Q496, and 4Q506? The underlying hypothesis here is that discrepancies between the material features of these three texts could be indicative of a changed or changing setting of the manuscript. To provide an example, we can imagine how the presence of an inconsistently written cursive text on the verso of a scroll with a text penned in a calligraphic book hand on the recto might be an indication that the manuscript was used in a different context, and perhaps served a different purpose.¹⁷ However, if we follow this line of reasoning, we should also be open to considering the opposite scenario. Could the continuation of the material features of the recto of an opisthograph onto its verso not be an indication for a similar scribal setting for both texts, and perhaps for a similar purpose for the manuscript? A similar lay-out and writing style was probably intentional: it would make it easier to handle the scroll and to navigate between the different texts on both sides. In our analysis of the different texts on an opisthograph we should inquire after these consistencies and discrepancies between the scribal practices on both sides, in order to understand under which circumstances a given manuscript was used and reused.

As we have seen in chapter one, from the perspective of palaeography there is some ground to group these texts together. 4Q509, 4Q496, and 4Q506 are written in the same subcategory of script: the semi-formal character. We should not overstate the importance of this. Whether the semi-formal script existed apart from the formal hand as a fully independent tradition is contested. Furthermore, we have no reason to assume that the semi-formal was used for a particular type of texts: among the manuscripts that are classified as being written in a semi-formal hand we find books from the Hebrew Bible, so-called sectarian works, and other types of compositions. There does not seem to be a correlation between the semi-formal and any of our literary classifications of the Dead Sea Scrolls. In other words, the fact that different scrolls bear texts that are written in the same script type would normally not be convincing evidence

17 The recto of 4Q460/4Q350 for example concerns a Hebrew composition, while the verso of frag. 9 bears a Greek account listing quantities of cereals. Cf. Chapter one.

As a comparative example from a different collection, one could consider P.Oxy. 20, which survived in twelve fragments. The recto of this manuscript, which presumably was written first, concerns the parts of four columns from the second century CE. This text was written in a calligraphic uncial. The verso concerns some form of an administrative account written in a cursive hand. This is one of the examples of a manuscript from Oxyrhynchus where a second scribe used the reverse side of a literary composition as scrap paper: Bernard P. Grenfell and Arthur S. Hunt, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, vol. 1 (London: Egypt Exploration Fund, 1898), 46–47.

that these manuscripts were part of a class or cluster of similar texts. However, in the case of our opisthograph we encounter the presence of texts written in a similar writing style on the same manuscript, which I consider to be meaningful, because it demonstrates some form of consistency in the scribal practices across 4Q509, 4Q496, and 4Q506. Equally important is the aspect of chronology: on the basis of palaeography we would date both 4Q509 and 4Q496 to the first half of the first century BCE. Both scribal hands seem contemporary. 4Q506 preserves letter forms in a different style.¹⁸ This text was probably added by a different scribe some time after the other two texts on this manuscript.

Turning to the codicological features of the opisthograph, we observe firstly that the manuscript is too fragmentary to determine size, lay-out, or stichometry precisely. 4Q509 col. III survived in 6 fragments (8–13) that have been preserved well enough to allow some form of a reconstruction: Baillet counts approximately 36 to 41 lines here and places frag. 13 at the lower end of the manuscript, which is confirmed by the presence of a margin of about 2.1 cm.¹⁹ However, this number of lines remains very tentative: only of about 22 lines is some writing legible, often little more than a single letter. This part of the composition is not preserved on any of the other copies of Festival Prayers, so we do not know the length of the text. Falk disagrees with Baillet and argues for at most 30 lines per column for 4Q509.²⁰ He does so on the basis of the text of 4Q496 on the verso of this column, which can be compared to 1QM II, 13–III, 2. Because the text of the first four columns of 4Q496 and the text of three columns of 1QM correspond and 1QM has 20 lines per column, Falk deduces that 4Q496 also must have had about 20 lines. The fact that 4Q496 needs an extra column to cover roughly the same amount of text can be explained through its larger letter size and interlinear margins. I agree with Falk that if 4Q496 had closer to 40 lines per column, we would expect it to cover significantly more text per column than 1QM. However, there is no reason why the columns on both the recto and verso should have the exact same number of lines. Some variation in this aspect might be possible, especially when we consider other aspects of the column formation of this manuscript. There are no guiding lines to direct the writing on either side of the manuscript.²¹ The width

18 As argued above, I do not see a reason to date 4Q506 a century later than the two other texts on this manuscript as Baillet does: see section 3.10.

19 Baillet, DJD 7:190.

20 Falk, "Material Aspects of Prayer Manuscripts," 65 n. 105.

21 The papyri from Qumran were typically not ruled. However, ruling lines or ruling dots do occur on at least some of the Oxyrhynchus papyri: Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 57; Turner, *Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World*, 4; Johnson, *Bookrolls and Scribes in Oxyrhynchus*, 91–99.

of the intercolumnar margins is inconsistent. Frags. 10, 12, 23, 49, 97–99, 131, 184, and 277 all contain the margin in between two columns, which allows us to compare how the text on both sides is aligned. Since 4Q509 frag. 184 is rather elongated, it allows us to get an idea how accurately the letters at the start of a column are placed under each other. This appears to be done quite neatly, although this cannot be said of the right part of the margin that preserves the end of the column. The scribe clearly did not trouble himself with ending his lines at the same point. The absence of consistent line spacing is also apparent on frag. 184: the space between lines 3–4 for example is about a millimetre bigger than between lines 4–5. This lack of alignment and inconsistent line spacing makes a disorderly impression.²²

For our research questions it is relevant to note that the inconsistent column arrangement continues throughout the different texts on the manuscript, though this is difficult to assert for 4Q506 due to its fragmentary nature. It does not look as if more attention was put into the lay-out of 4Q509 on the recto of the manuscript than into the other two texts. If we step away from Qumran and return to the issue of the opisthograph practice from a cross-cultural perspective, as addressed in the first chapter, we may note that this was unconventional. Many opisthographs from Graeco-Roman collections carried a combination of a literary text and a documentary text that are produced with different degrees of attention to lay-out and handwriting.²³ Particularly frequent are examples of an official document that was apparently not of interest anymore, after which a literary text was written on its verso.²⁴ It does on occasion happen that both sides contain relatively nicely written texts, but in many cases we find student exercises or the notes and personal copies of a scribe on the back that are written in a much less elegant hand than the text on the recto.²⁵ After all, because the recto ceased to be of significance, the scribe did not have to make the effort of trying to preserve the same degree of elegance in his writing. In these examples a discontinuity of the quality of the scribal hands on both sides is an indication of the first of the two forms of material reuse distinguished by Falk: reuse that signifies that the original text is defunct. It is clear that such an interruption in the quality of lay-out of both sides is not present on our Qumran

22 However, we should note that many of the Dead Sea Scrolls display inconsistent column alignment and line spacing: Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 82–83; 104–105.

23 Turner, “Recto and Verso”; idem, “The Terms Recto and Verso,” 11–12.

24 According to George Houston, at least 182 such manuscripts are preserved from Oxyrhynchus: Houston, *Inside Roman Libraries*, 7.

25 Lama, “Aspetti di tecnica libraria ad Ossirinco.”

opisthograph: 4Q509 on the recto makes an equally disorganized impression as the texts on the verso.

Next to issues related to the format of the manuscript we should consider the presence of scribal markings and corrections. Both Baillet and Falk observe in total five examples of the fish hook paragraphus sign: four are preserved on 4Q509 on the recto and one on 4Q496 on the verso. Of special significance is the fish hook sign in the right margin of 4Q496 frag. 10 2, because the same text is preserved in 1QM col. 111: סרך אותות כול העדה, “the rule of the banners of all of the congregation ...” This overlap is interesting, because it allows us to compare the scribal practices of these different manuscripts with each other. Where 4Q496 has an intermarginal marking, 1QM uses an empty line, which we can interpret as a section division.²⁶ This points towards a similarity in the production of the two texts: in both instances the part concerning the rule of the banners was viewed as a separate section in the composition that was significant enough to be reflected in the lay-out of the scroll. It also points to a striking difference: for some reason these section divisions were indicated in a different way. We do not know why this happened, but we can speculate that it could have something to do with either the size, quality, or purpose of the manuscript.²⁷ As we have seen, Tov classifies 1QM under the category of the high *de luxe* editions, while Cross characterizes the scribal hand as a “delicate” Herodian formal hand.²⁸ Indeed 1QM seems by most standards a finely produced manuscript that was intended to signal a certain aesthetic quality. Could it be that different types of section divisions (for example paragraphus signs and empty lines) were associated in antiquity with different grades of quality of a manuscript?²⁹ Turning to the presence of scribal corrections a rather similar

26 Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 146–147.

27 Falk has recently examined the manuscripts in which section divisions and marginal markings occur. Concerning the fish hook or paragraphus sign, his overview presents an evident overrepresentation of Hasmonaean prayer manuscripts. In fact, the sign is present on only two developed Herodian manuscripts (1QpHab and 4Q90), and in both instances it is unclear if it concerns a marking of the paragraphus type, or another (unique) type of marking. This overview does indeed indicate that the sign is hardly—if ever—used on calligraphic manuscripts. Daniel K. Falk, “In the Margins of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *Bible as Notepad: Tracing Annotations and Annotation Practices in Late Antique and Medieval Biblical Manuscripts*, ed. Liv I. Lied and Marilena Maniaci, *Manuscripta Biblica* 3 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2018), 10–38, at 20, 26.

28 Cross, “Development of the Jewish Scripts,” 32.

29 An alternative explanation for these different types of section divisions could be that they were a result of scribal practices changing over time. The fact that the majority of the preserved paragraphus signs occur on Hasmonaean manuscripts suggests that this sign was

picture emerges. On this manuscript we encounter a variety of scribal interactions that seem to be intended to modify or correct previous writing. There are a number of instances in both 4Q509 and 4Q496 of both the erasing and blotting out of the first layer of text and of interlinear and intermarginal corrections.³⁰ 4Q506 does not contain visible scribal markings, corrections or otherwise signs of scribal interference, but that could be a result of the fragmentary condition of this manuscript.

At the start of this section, we returned to Falk's distinction between two forms of material reuse. Subsequently, we observed that an analysis of the consistencies and discrepancies between the material features on both sides of the manuscript can help us determine with which of the two forms of reuse we could be dealing with. On the basis of a range of these features such as palaeography, column arrangement, and scribal markings and corrections, we can indeed conclude that the different texts across this scroll share the same scribal practices. 4Q506 might to a certain degree be an outsider, but that could be caused by its poor preservation. Overall, the continuity of scribal practices on both recto and verso seems to be intentional. Interlinear corrections and scribal markings do not contribute to the aesthetic quality of a manuscript, but they can be useful. For example, the consistent use of a paragraphus sign as a section division on both sides would make it convenient for the person using this scroll to navigate between different parts of the text and to find the right passage. It is the homogenous presence of such scribal characteristics that opens up the possibility that the three compositions on this opisthograph are part of a collection. This becomes particularly apparent when we compare 4Q509/4Q496/4Q506 to the other opisthographs from Qumran.³¹

simply the preferred section marker during this period. However, given that some Hasmonaean manuscripts (4Q504, 4Q163, and the palaeo-Hebrew 4Q511) also use empty lines, it seems that the choice for the type of section division was deliberate.

30 Erasure and blotting out of original layer of writing in 4Q509 frags. 3, 54, 98, 131, 184, and 194. Interlinear and intermarginal corrections are found in frags. 23, 30, 55, 105, and twice in 183. In 4Q496 interlinear additions and insertions are present in frags. 3, 10 (twice), 26, and 43. See also Aksu, "The Qumran Opisthograph 4Q509/4Q496/4Q506 as an Intentional Collection of Prayers."

31 4Q201/4Q338, 4Q460 frag. 9/4Q350, and 4Q324/4Q355, the three manuscripts that contain a literary text on the recto and a documentary text on the verso, do not share similar palaeographic characteristics and scribal practices across both sides.

As we have seen in chapter one, the evidence regarding manuscripts with literary texts on both sides is mixed. Similar palaeography and scribal practices are encountered on both sides of 4Q503/4Q512, but less so for 4Q415/4Q414 and 4Q433a/4Q255. 4Q499/4Q497 is difficult to judge due to the poor state of preservation.

Another indication for this is the fact that this opisthograph does not seem to preserve the full texts of each of the compositions, but rather extracts.³² We can tell so primarily by considering the verso of 4Q509. Though 4Q509 survived on around 310 fragments, the reverse side of the last 130 fragments are left blank. This tells us that the top part of the manuscript's verso was inscribed, but that the bottom part was not used. 4Q496 on the verso survived on about 115 fragments, but many of these contain no more than a few letters.³³ Because this concerns a manuscript belonging to the tradition of War Scroll literature, we can compare it to 1QM and notice that the text preserved in 4Q496 corresponds to only the opening columns of 1QM. This begs the question: how does the shorter text of 4Q496 relate to the larger composition as preserved in 1QM? Palaeographic dating places 4Q496 before the manuscript of 1QM. On the other hand, the date of composition of the War Scroll is usually placed somewhere in the second century BCE: before the production of 4Q496.³⁴ However, we may question how secure this dating exactly is. Realistically we are not able identify the exact phase of composition of the War Scroll at the time when 4Q496 was written. The materiality of 4Q496 does indicate that it probably does not contain a full composition, but rather an extract or excerpt. The question then becomes: an extract of what exactly? This does not necessarily have to be the full composition as preserved in 1QM. It is also possible that 4Q496 represents some kind of a draft or a model for the War Scroll.

Scholarship on the compositional history of the War Scroll leaves this possibility open; we have seen in section 5.5 that Davies and Vanonen argue that the introductory first column of 1QM (which we find in 4Q496) was possibly a later addition to the composition.

4Q506 seems to present a similar case: it survived next to 4Q496 on the verso on 62 mostly miniscule fragments. We can compare 4Q506 to the other witness of Words of the Luminaries, 4Q504, and assert that it most probably did

32 The suggestion that specifically 4Q496 might concern an excerpt of the War Scroll was first proposed in Falk, "Material Aspects of Prayer Manuscripts," 53.

33 It is difficult to exactly allocate all these fragments to 4Q496 and 4Q506. Some of them are tiny and contain only traces of letters on both recto and verso. The safest conclusion is that 4Q496 survived on between 110 and 120 fragments.

34 Hartmut Stegemann, *Die Essener, Qumran, Johannes der Täufer und Jesus: Ein Sachbuch* (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1993), 157; Hanan Eshel, "The Kittim in the War Scroll and in the Pesharim," in *Historical Perspectives: From the Hasmoneans to Bar Kokhba in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. David Goodblatt, Avital Pinnick, and Daniel R. Schwartz, STDJ 37 (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 29–44, at 37; Duhaime, *The War Texts*, 97–101; Schultz, *Conquering the World*, 102.

not contain the full composition.³⁵ We have no evidence that this opisthograph was anywhere near the roughly 4.5–5 meter that would have been required to fully write down the War Scroll and Words of the Luminaries.³⁶ 4Q509 provides a slightly more complicated picture, because we do not have a witness of Festival Prayers that is as well preserved as 1QM or 4Q504. We therefore do not know how long the composition would have been and if it would have fitted on the recto of our opisthograph in its entirety. However, my proposition would be to take as point of departure the fragments that did survive, many of which do not overlap with any of the other witnesses of Festival Prayers.³⁷ Therefore, based on our extant evidence, we conclude that also 4Q509 only contained parts of Festival Prayers.

The presence of extracts of different texts on one scroll points towards a particular form of manuscript use. Scribal activity in the ancient world is often conceptualized as that of a copyist who tried to preserve the text of his *Vorlage* by transmitting it to a new manuscript. Opisthographs such as 4Q509/4Q496/4Q506 allow us to contemplate different forms of scribal activity: we can think about the scribe as a *collectionneur* who purposely selected passages from different texts that were for some reason relevant. This dynamic engagement with texts is reflected in the many scribal markings in the margins and scribal corrections we encounter on this manuscript.

However, before we can assess the nature of this collection of selected passages and before we can think through how this manuscript can contribute to

35 It is improbable that 4Q506 would consist of a draft from an early phase of composition of Words of the Luminaries, because 4Q504 concerns one of the oldest scrolls preserved from Qumran and most probably predates 4Q506 significantly.

36 This length is a very rude estimation based on the length of 1QM (2.9 meter) and 4Q504 (1.7 meter), and the construction of the lay-out of this opisthograph in Falk, “Material Aspects of Prayer Manuscripts,” 65–66.

The content of the first four columns of 4Q496 correspond to about three columns of 1QM. According to Falk both manuscripts had about 20 lines per column, but the letter size of 4Q496 (3 mm) would have been slightly larger than of 1QM (2–2.5 mm). 1QM measures about 2.9 meter. Assuming that 4Q496 contained the same text of the War Scroll in the same lay-out as the first columns, then 4Q496 would have to be over 3.5 meter.

As we cannot determine the number of lines per column for 4Q506, we may assume that it's about the same as the 20 of 4Q496. 4Q504 has about 22 lines per column. However, the letter size of 4Q506 (about 4 mm) is slightly larger than of 4Q504 (2–2.5 mm). Altogether we may assume that the size of 4Q506 would have to be similar to the 1.7 meter of 4Q504, especially when we consider that the scribe of 4Q504 had to add the final two columns on the verso.

37 1Q34bis and 4Q509 for example, though both copies of Festival Prayers, preserve different parts of the composition.

our conception of ancient text collecting practices, we first have to approach the texts on this manuscript as literary compositions. This will be the topic of the next sections of this chapter.

3 Extracts and Excerpts

Before moving on to 4Q509/4Q496/4Q506 and the question of collection, we should briefly reflect on the concept of an ‘extract’ or ‘excerpt’—as these terms are pertinent to the present discussion on this manuscript. What do we exactly mean when we write about an ‘extract,’ and which potential scenarios should we keep in mind in this context? An extract refers to a passage, section, or, in its broadest sense, any textual unit that is taken from a larger composition. As such, it is used here synonymously with excerpt. Broadly similar definitions have been employed by Hartmut Stegemann, Lutz Doering, Emanuel Tov, Sidnie White Crawford, and Hila Dayfani.³⁸ Crawford observes that the “underlying assumption of this definition is that there existed an earlier “complete” text of the book in question, from which the scribe chose the passages to excerpt.”³⁹ Though it is doubtful whether we can always speak of such a fully ‘complete’ text, a central characteristic of excerpts and extracts is that they correspond to parts of a larger composition that exists in a different setting. These extracts can serve a variety of functions. Julie Duncan, Doering, Crawford, and Dayfani have each pointed to the uses of extracted passages in the context of study purposes, liturgy, or private reading because it is easier to navigate between different textual units on a smaller manuscript.⁴⁰

38 Hartmut Stegemann, “Weitere Stücke von 4QpPsalm 37, von 4Q Patriarchal Blessings und Hinweis auf eine unedierte Handschrift aus Höhle 4Q mit Exzerpten aus dem Deuteronomium,” *RevQ* 6 (1967): 193–227; Doering, “Excerpted Texts in Second Temple Judaism”; Emanuel Tov, “Excerpted and Abbreviated Biblical Texts from Qumran,” in *Hebrew Bible, Greek Bible, and Qumran: Collected Essays*, TSAJ 121 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 27–41; Sidnie White Crawford, “The Excerpted Manuscripts from Qumran, with Special Attention to 4QReworked Pentateuch D and 4QReworked Pentateuch E,” in *Scribal Practice, Text and Canon in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Essays in Memory of Peter W. Flint*, ed. John J. Collins and Ananda Geysler-Fouché, STDJ 130 (Leiden: Brill, 2019), 247–268; Hila Dayfani, “4Q37 and Excerpted Texts of Deuteronomy from Qumran,” *DSJ* 30 (2023): 213–234.

39 Crawford, “The Excerpted Manuscripts from Qumran,” 248 n. 2.

40 Julie A. Duncan, “Excerpted Texts of *Deuteronomy* at Qumran,” *RevQ* 18 (1997): 43–62; Doering, “Excerpted Texts in Second Temple Judaism,” 37; Dayfani, “4Q37 and Excerpted Texts,” 226–227; Crawford, “The Excerpted Manuscripts from Qumran,” 259–260.

Examples can be found in manuscripts such as 4Q175 (Testimonia), 4Q265 (Miscellaneous Rules), and 4Q174 (Eschatological Commentary A), which we have considered above. However, among others Tov has noted that many of the excerpted texts preserved on Greek manuscripts appear to have been made for educational purposes.⁴¹ A parallel in this regard can be found in Sumerian and Babylonian manuscript traditions, where large bodies of cuneiform tablets containing extracts were found that were produced as part of a basic scribal education.⁴² Next to that, we know that Babylonian scribes reedited larger, authoritative works into smaller collections of extracted texts in order to be used as an ‘abridged edition’ for quick reference.⁴³ A key issue for our understanding of these extract texts is how the extract or excerpt in question relates to the larger text, and to which degree the original composition is evoked in a new context. Of course: the Babylonian tablets are the product of a scribal culture that is different from the Dead Sea Scrolls, but these comparative materials can increase our attentiveness for different scenarios and contexts of use.

4 4Q509/4Q496/4Q506 and Literary Diversity

On the basis of the material analysis of this manuscript we have come to two observations. First, we observed that this opisthograph preserves selected passages from three compositions that survived in other copies as well and, second, we noticed that the manuscript shares similar scribal features on both its recto and verso. These material considerations have led us to hypothesize that this manuscript constituted a collection of valued works. The question is how the manuscript being a collection of valued works contributes to our understanding of the literary compositions that we find on this opisthograph. If we consider the types of compositions that we find on 4Q509/4Q496/4Q506, what then could we infer from this opisthograph about the practice of collection in antiquity?

41 Tov, “Excerpted and Abbreviated Biblical Texts,” 39. Tov builds here on Henry Chadwick “Florilegium,” *RAC* 7 (1969): 1131–1160. See also David M. Carr, *Writing on the Tablet of the Heart: Origins of Scripture and Literature* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 177–199.

42 Petra D. Gesche, *Schulunterricht in Babylonien Im Ersten Jahrtausend v. Chr.* (Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2001); Paul Delnero, “Sumerian Extract Tablets and Scribal Training,” *JCS* 62 (2010): 53–69.

43 An example is the UGU extract series: a collection of extracts from the diagnostic series, a large collection of Mesopotamian medicine texts. These extract tablets were probably used as a practical tool to keep useful material within arm’s reach: JoAnn Scurlock, *Sourcebook for Ancient Mesopotamian Medicine*, WAW 36 (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2014), 295, 329.

Until so far the notion of the creation of a collection on a single manuscript remained a rather abstract concept. It would be fruitful to briefly reflect on a few comparative cases that can help illustrate how such a collection could have looked like and which types of texts were likely to be brought together.

We first turn our attention to the Oxyrhynchus papyri from ancient Egypt, a corpus of roughly half a million fragmentary manuscripts that can be dated between about 300 BCE and 700 CE. There are multiple papyri from Oxyrhynchus that carry more than one composition and that seem to intend to bring related texts together.⁴⁴ One opisthograph preserves P.Oxy. 1075 on its recto, which consists of the final 7 verses of Exodus, and P.Oxy. 1079 on its verso, consisting of the first 7 verses of Revelation.⁴⁵ It is clear that this manuscript aims to bring parts of different scriptural works together. The intertextual relations between the two texts are not immediately clear, but Eldon Jay Epp has pointed to a number of parallels between Exodus 39–40, and Revelation 1.⁴⁶ Exodus for example narrates about the consecration of the tabernacle and the installation of Aaron and his sons as priests. Revelation 1:6, which is preserved on this manuscript, refers to Jesus and “priests serving his God and Father.” Epp furthermore observes that both passages describe the presence of God within a cloud. It seems that this opisthograph was intended to bring thematically related passages from different authoritative texts together. It remains speculation, but we should not exclude the possibility that these compositions were collected on one manuscript for both reading and studying purposes, and perhaps to come to a shared interpretation for the two texts.

Our next example unfortunately did not survive as an extant manuscript, but is mentioned in a book list preserved on a papyrus. In the next chapter we will interact more closely with these book lists on papyri, but as it is related to our discussion here, it is fruitful to consider one example. Rosa Otranto has collected 19 such lists and on one of them, list 16, we find the mentioning of one manuscript that would have contained two dialogues by Plato (*Hippias Major* and *Hippias Minor*), and by Aristotle (*Eudemus*). Where P.Oxy. 1075/1079 tried to bring parts of different biblical books together, in this list it is philosophical

44 Among the papyri of Oxyrhynchus we possess at least 400 opisthographs in a variety of genres, such as the exercises of students, but also literary texts written in scribal bookhands. How many of these concern manuscripts that could be qualified as collections of valued works is unclear. Krüger, *Oxyrhynchos in der Kaiserzeit*, 161.

45 Arthur S. Hunt, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, vol. 8 (London: Egypt Exploration Fund, 1911), 5–6, 13–14.

46 Eldon J. Epp, “The Oxyrhynchus New Testament Papyri: ‘Not without Honor except in Their Hometown?’” *JBL* 123 (2004): 5–55, at 19.

texts that are being compiled. The scribe of this manuscript wanted to bring these different works together on one scroll and perhaps to create some form of a collection of authoritative dialogues.

Returning to the Dead Sea Scrolls, we could consider the leather scroll of 1QS (Community Rule), 1QSa (Rule of the Congregation), and 1QSB (Rule of Blessings) as an example of collecting related compositions.⁴⁷ 1QS can, somewhat impressionistically, be considered to be a collection on its own: the composite nature of the composition reflected in this manuscript is widely acknowledged. At present, most scholars see 1QS as the product of a long and pluriform history of textual development.⁴⁸ 1QSa ('The Rule of the Congregation') and 1QSB ('The Rule of Blessings') are often referred to as 'annexes' to 1QS.⁴⁹ On the surface, 1QSB appears to be a text of a different character from 1QS and 1QSa. Contrary to the other two compositions on this manuscript, 1QSB is not a rule text but presents four blessings that follow a similar structure.⁵⁰ However, the close relationship between 1QS, 1QSa, and 1QSB was already proposed by Alexander and Vermes, and further expanded by scholars such as Hempel, Newman, and Michael Johnson among others based on vocabulary, and thematic and structural categories.⁵¹ The materials brought together in the composite document of 1QS-1QSa-1QSB unite a variety of themes and genres such as organizational instructions, rules, cosmic contemplations, and liturgy. What they do share is that they offer different reflections on an imagined future, eschatological community. The contribution of 1QSB is intriguing: the blessings it presents seem to envisage an eschatological time after the community described in 1QS has been realized.

Hartmut Stegemann understood the manuscript to be a *Schriftensammlung*.⁵² Because these three texts were written on the same side of the scroll, this manuscript reminds us that the practice of collection building is not lim-

47 The major recent contributions that assess the question of the pluriform history of S are mentioned in section 2.3.

48 Milik, DJD 1:107–108; Charlotte Hempel, "Pluralism and Authoritativeness," 195.

49 Milik, DJD 1:107–108; Charlotte Hempel, "Pluralism and Authoritativeness," 195.

50 Newman remarks that the title 'Rule of Blessings' is "misleading because nowhere does the term 'rule' (serekh) appear": Judith Newman, "Rule of Blessings (Sb)," in *T&T Clark Companion to the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 339–340, at 339.

51 Alexander and Vermes, DJD 26:9–12; Hempel, *Qumran Rule Texts in Context*, 109–119; idem, *Community Rules from Qumran: A Commentary*; Newman, "Rule of Blessings (Sb)"; Michael B. Johnson, "One Work or Three? A Proposal for Reading 1QS-1QSa-1QSB as a Single Composite Work," *DSD* 25 (2018): 141–177.

52 Hartmut Stegemann, "Zu Textbestand und Grundgedanken von '1QS' III, 13–IV, 26," *RevQ* 13 (1988): 95–131.

ited to opisthographs. Interestingly, in the case of this scroll it seems that it was the same scribe that intended to bring these related texts together on a single scroll.⁵³ 1QS, 1QSa and 1QSB touches on the problem whether the presence of multiple compositions on one manuscript would allow the possibility of the creation of a new work.⁵⁴ This issue will be subject to further reflection in Part 3.

The three examples presented here illustrate that several ancient contexts offer precedents for the collection of different texts on one manuscript. It seems fruitful to consider the opisthograph 4Q509/4Q496/4Q506 from a similar perspective. The proposition to consider this manuscript as a collection has already been put forward by Falk, as he argued:

What is especially intriguing about this scroll is that the prayers on both sides are form-critically of the same type, with a statement of occasion (“Prayer for the festival of n.”; “Prayer for the n day”), opening with the prayer formula “Remember, O Lord ...,” and concluding with the benediction form “Blessed be the Lord who ...” It is by no means accidental that these two collections of prayers with the same form for different occasions end up on front and back of the same scroll: they constitute an intentional collection in a personal scroll.⁵⁵

For Falk, the foremost argument in favour of the understanding of this opisthograph as an intentional collection concerns the form-critical similarities between 4Q509 and 4Q506.

This observation ties in with our discussion of the genre of 4Q509 and 4Q506 and their relation to the wider collection at the start of this chapter. We have characterized both texts as prayer cycles that are dedicated to fixed moments in time: Festival Prayers to festivals throughout the Jewish liturgical year and Words of the Luminaries to different days of the week. We reflected on the different ways both compositions have been classified in scholarship. Scholars working on prayer texts such as Chazon and Falk have stressed the interpretational relations between the two texts and have generally grouped these texts together.⁵⁶ As we have seen, there is good reason for this. Both compositions

53 Tigchelaar, “In Search of the Scribe of 1QS.”

54 Johnson, “One Work or Three?”

55 Falk, “Material Aspects of Prayer Manuscripts,” 53.

56 Take for example the catalogue of hymns and prayers from the Dead Sea Scrolls by Chazon; both Festival Prayers and Words of the Luminaries are part of the same class of ‘Liturgies for Fixed Prayer Times’: “Hymns and Prayers in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 259–260.

display a similar arrangement of prayers, and share a number of underlying themes. Also when it comes to terminology do we observe striking similarities; Falk rightly pointed to the repetitive occurrence of identical blessing formulae.

4Q509 is found on the recto of this manuscript, 4Q506 at the lower end on its verso. On the basis of these literary similarities, we can imagine how these two texts would be part of a collection of related works: it remains speculation, but I consider it probable that both Festival Prayers and Words of the Luminaries were read and studied in a similar setting. As Falk has noted (“the same form for different occasions”), the two texts are to a certain degree complimentary to each other: Words of the Luminaries is dedicated to the different days of the week, while the prayers of Festival Prayers are reserved for the special occasions of religious festivals. It seems to make good sense to keep such prayer cycles together.

From this perspective, we can imagine how someone with an interest in prayers dedicated to fixed times would bring these two compositions together. However, on this opisthograph we find a third text as well: 4Q496, a copy of the War Scroll, which has been written down on the upper part of the verso, after turning the manuscript upside down. This text is therefore ‘sandwiched’ between 4Q509 on the recto, and 4Q506 on the lower part of the verso.⁵⁷ Because of its position on the manuscript, we can safely assume that it was intentionally placed as part of this collection. It shares a range of scribal practices with especially 4Q509, and the scribe of 4Q506 could not have written his text down without being aware of the presence of 4Q496.

In our discussion in the first part of this chapter we have seen how scholars have developed different opinions with regard to the character of the War Scroll. It seems scholars broadly hold different positions on the overall characterisation of the text: should the War Scroll primarily be seen as an apocalyptic rule text, or rather as a liturgical document? The proposition to read the War Scroll as a liturgical text is primarily based on the presence of a prayer cycle in the columns x–xiv. The issue how this prayer cycle both relates to and is distinct from the prayers in Festival Prayers and Words of the Luminaries, will be addressed below.

One question that remains is how the three compositions on this manuscript are understood in relation to the wider collection. We have observed above that the War Scroll is generally read as one of the core texts of the presumed sectarian cluster of texts. How Festival Prayers and Words of the Luminaries

57 See also the discussion in section 5.2.

are understood in relation to the wider collection is much less straightforward: we have seen above how many scholars prefer a pre-sectarian or non-sectarian classification for these texts.

Notions such as sectarian and non-sectarian are based on the use of a distinct vocabulary and a set of socio-religious concepts that convey a particular worldview. Especially within the work of Dimant, the notion of sectarian gives expression to a particular conceptualisation of a community with a shared ideology regarding issues as dualism, predestination, and a range of religious obligations.⁵⁸ In this way the concept of sectarian functions as a scholarly model of the presumed community behind the Dead Sea Scrolls. Dimant argues for example that the idea of תמים (“complete, free of blemish, perfect”) is an important concept within the sectarian texts to describe “the lifestyle and behaviour of the Qumran community.”⁵⁹ Within the sectarian model, תמים is foregrounded as a concept for perfect and blameless conduct. We encounter this concept for example within the prayer cycle in 1QM, as column XIV, 7 contains: ובתמימי דרך יתמו כול גויי רשעה, “By those whose path is blameless will all the evil nations be destroyed.” However, the term does not occur anywhere in Festival Prayers and Words of the Luminaries, even though these texts also very much engage with the idea of the right conduct and religious obligations, which is reflected for example in the many references to blessing, remembering the covenant, and rejecting the wicked.⁶⁰ Does it matter for our classification of a text as sectarian or non-sectarian that such terms as תמים, which are perceived by scholars as important for sectarian self-understanding, are absent within a text? This opisthograph seems to imply that it does not matter, because the continued scribal practices across 4Q509, 4Q496, and 4Q506 suggest that the texts were copied, read, and studied together.

The questions that this line of thinking leads to are both fundamentally historical and methodological, because they are related to the broader issue of how scholarly conceptualizations on macro- or meso-level (for example regarding the outlook or worldview of a particular society or community) influence the different questions we ask on micro-level (for example concerning the

58 Dimant, “Vocabulary of the Qumran Sectarian Texts,” 81. We have seen above how the War Scroll meets several of these criteria. It is one of the few texts that uses the term ‘serekh,’ while the binary opposition between the Sons of Light and the Sons of Darkness would be an example of the dualistic thought system that is considered specific for the sectarian texts.

59 Dimant, “Vocabulary of the Qumran Sectarian Texts,” 88.

60 As we observed in the first part of this chapter, other elements associated to sectarian thought such as dualism and predestination do also not occur in 4Q509 and 4Q506.

particular setting of one manuscript or reading event). What are the implications of these characterisations when we move between different levels of analysis? More specifically, and returning to the discussion of this opisthograph, I would ask if categories such as sectarian, non-sectarian, and pre-sectarian are meaningful for our understanding of the ways ancient scribes engaged with their manuscripts. To what degree were the reading practices of the people behind the scrolls influenced or dictated through these notions? Does the concept of a collection of sectarian texts affect the ways in which we imagine the reading events around these texts to have taken place? And should we then assume that the people behind these scrolls primarily or exclusively organized these reading events around the sectarian texts?

It is through the analysis of manuscripts such as this opisthograph that these questions can be raised. This manuscript demonstrates in a tangible way that compositions that are classified from a modern perspective as sectarian and non-sectarian circulated together and could be put into operation within a similar setting. This raises the question how meaningful our understanding of a community as sectarian is when we know that compositions with both sectarian and non-sectarian terminology and socio-religious ideas did not only exist together, but were read and studied next to each other.

Furthermore, the study of opisthographic practices informs us about ancient collecting practices. Manuscripts that contain multiple compositions provide modern scholars the opportunity to study an *emic* grouping of texts: texts that are not clustered because of the use of terms or concepts that modern scholars attach importance to, but that are clustered as a result of the collecting practices of ancient scribes. Prioritizing the manuscript evidence over preconceived classifications challenges us to rethink the setting in which these texts could have been read together. In order to do so we will first return to two aspects of this opisthograph here in the broader context of the Qumran collection.

First of all, the presence of what is perceived in scholarship as non-sectarian works among the Qumran collection can always be explained by arguing that this concerns literature that the people behind the scrolls had simply inherited.⁶¹ However, the fact that the three texts are together on this scroll, although they have also been preserved in other manuscripts as well, precludes an explanation for their presence arguing that these texts were simply inherited.

61 As noted for example in Henry W.M. Rietz, "Identifying Compositions and Traditions of the Qumran Community: Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice, a Case Study," in *Qumran Studies: New Approaches, New Questions*, ed. Michael T. Davis and Brent A. Strawn (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 29–52.

The presence of these texts together tells us something about the collecting practices that underlie the manuscript corpus.

In this regard, the fact that we encounter texts on this opisthograph that we know from other manuscripts from Qumran is striking. Texts from the Dead Sea Scrolls that existed in multiple copies have been regarded by scholars with special interest, as it is often argued that those texts must have been considered to be of special importance to the people behind the scrolls.⁶² I would argue that this argument is especially valid for extracted texts. Following Johnson and David Konstan, Popović has argued how collecting selected passages is an indication that these texts were actively read and studied, perhaps in a communal context. Excerpting texts, he maintains, was “the normal mode of reading through a scroll. What people did when they read was to note down and to make extracts of passages that interested them.”⁶³ Selecting passages from compositions that we have in multiple copies is evidence that these texts were considered to be meaningful. 4Q506, which preserves part of Words of the Luminaries, can be dated to the first century CE, which is at least two centuries younger than 4Q504, our other copy of the same composition. This implies that the people behind the scrolls continued to organize their reading events around certain texts for a significant period of time.

Second, though the identification of 4Q496 with the War Scroll is undisputed, Brian Schultz has pointed towards the many differences with the text that passed down to us in 1QM.⁶⁴ We are not only dealing with extracts, but also with different redactions. In this way the manuscript evidence demonstrates a continuous active engagement with different versions of compositions. This situation is analogue to how Charlotte Hempel has characterized the dynamic and living traditions of the Community Rule. In her view, the “textually pluralistic picture attested for the Rule texts is part and parcel of the mind-set that gave us a pluriform picture of other Second Temple literature.”⁶⁵ All of these different practices that we pointed at above (note-taking, correcting, textual variety, the collecting of extracts) would contribute to this textually pluralistic picture and are evidence for textual engagement on a high-level.⁶⁶

62 Newsom, “‘Sectually Explicit’ Literature”; VanderKam, “Authoritative Literature in the Dead Sea Scrolls.”

63 Popović, “Reading, Writing, and Memorizing Together,” 462.

64 “The changes necessary to rectify this are too significant to allow for 4Q496 to be considered of the same recension as M”: Schultz, *Conquering the World*, 26.

65 Hempel, *Qumran Rule Texts in Context*, 271–299; idem, “Reflections on Literacy, Textuality, and Community in the Qumran Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *Is There a Text in This Cave*, 69–82, at 72.

66 Popović, “Reading, Writing, and Memorizing Together.”

4Q509/4Q496/4Q506 can therefore be characterized as the product of a 'living' interaction with 'living' texts. The notion of 'living,' first of all, refers to the observable forms of everyday engagement with texts that is practiced and experienced by scribes, readers, and other 'consumers' within a socio-religious context. In this context it is furthermore connected with how texts are perceived in scholarship from two different perspectives. The first one has to do with the perception of authorship. Though the search for the *Urtext* has largely been abandoned, there is still a tendency to scrutinize different manuscripts diachronically in order to arrive at a more original version of a text. Fragmentary or more coarsely produced exemplars are often used by scholarship to reconstruct better preserved manuscripts in order to get to an original version of a given text, but much less often are they seen as autonomous representatives of a living tradition in their own right. To provide just one example: the War Scroll manuscripts from Cave 4 have regularly been inspected primarily to facilitate the reading of 1QM, while paying less attention to questions pertaining to their particular function and to the reading events organized around these manuscripts. In the past decades however, scholars have increasingly focused on textual pluriformity instead of stability.⁶⁷ Hempel for example has argued that texts such as the Community Rule "were not authored from beginning to end by the charismatic Teacher of Righteousness—as once suggested by some—but rather reflect complex literary developments of the kind frequently proposed with reference to biblical texts."⁶⁸

The second perspective is somewhat related. The underlying assumption of the notion of a fixed and stable text is that the reading practices related to the text, and therefore also the way in which ancient scribes engaged with their manuscripts, were also fixed and stable. The heterogeneity that is embedded in ancient reading culture is in this way neglected. Historically, scholarly investigation has often been concentrated on compositions rather than manuscripts. Scholarship on this opisthograph as well has often been directed at illuminating the composition of a better-preserved manuscript.⁶⁹ However, the perception of a text can change over generations, and so do the different reading events that are concentrated around that text. While one particular manuscript

67 Hans Debel, "Rewritten Bible, Variant Literary Editions and Original Text(s): Exploring the Implications of a Pluriform Outlook on the Scriptural Tradition," in *Changes in Scripture*, 65–91.

68 Hempel, "Pluralism and Authoritativeness," 193.

69 We see this reflected in their publication in DJD 7. The three texts of this opisthograph are not published in order of the manuscript, but grouped together with other copies of the same composition. So 4Q496 for example is presented as the last of six copies of the War Scroll (4Q491–496), and is followed by 4Q497 (War Scroll-like Text A).

of a composition might have been produced for public display or communal reading, another exemplar of the same text might be copied in order to be privately studied or to be collected together with other texts. The close-reading of manuscripts such as this opisthograph can shed light on some of these dynamics. Comparative evidence from the broader Graeco-Roman world can help us to further rethink the diversity of reading practices in the ancient Mediterranean world.

5 Graeco-Roman Reading Culture: Texts and Events

In recent years more attention has been paid to the social reality of reading practices and events centred around manuscripts in antiquity. Comparative evidence from the Graeco-Roman world can help shed light on different aspects of scribal engagement with texts in both the Dead Sea Scrolls and other ancient collections. Such an investigation can be instructive on different levels. In the next chapters, I will consider the collection of the *Villa of the Papyri* from Herculaneum and focus on how a comparison of opisthographic practices in both Qumran and Herculaneum can be mutually illuminating. Here, I will take a broader approach and think through how events related to the reading of texts are deeply social events.

Scholars such as Raymond Starr and Johnson have demonstrated how different reading practices were deeply influenced by the sociocultural dynamics of ancient reading culture.⁷⁰ Johnson has argued how both (1) the reading of different types of texts and (2) the reading of a given text in different contexts can lead to different reading events.⁷¹ This concurs with many of our own reading practices today. Reading scripture alone leads to a vastly different experience from for example the liturgical context of a service in a synagogue, church, or mosque. In an academic context we might appreciate the same text in even another way and, for example, ask specific questions about its structure or textual development. What Johnson has observed is that “reading is not simply the cognitive processing by the individual of the technology of writing, but rather *the negotiated construction of meaning within a particular sociocultural con-*

70 Raymond J. Starr, “The Circulation of Literary Texts in the Roman World,” *ClQ* 37 (1987): 213–223; idem, “The Used-Book Trade in the Roman World,” *Phoenix* 44 (1990): 148–157; William A. Johnson, “Toward a Sociology of Reading in Classical Antiquity,” *AJP* 121 (2000): 593–627; idem, *Readers and Reading Culture in the High Roman Empire*; idem, “Constructing Elite Reading Communities in the High Empire,” in *Ancient Literacies*, 320–330.

71 Johnson, *Readers and Reading Culture in the High Roman Empire*, 4–16.

*text.*⁷² Despite the contextual differences within which different manuscripts could have been read, studied, and performed, scholarship often groups the different redactions of the War Scroll together as one text within a corpus of sectarian literature, neglecting the possibility that there could be different reading practices connected to each of these manuscripts. A scroll such as 1QM might invite a different type of scribal engagement than a version on an opisthograph. Popović, building on Johnson, has shown how also within the domain of Early Jewish texts there is evidence for recitation and group reading as communal activities.⁷³ Popović applies the concept of a textual community, developed by medievalist Brian Stock to describe “groups of people whose social activities are centred around texts, or more precisely, around a literate interpreter of them.”⁷⁴ Popović uses this concept for two reasons.⁷⁵ First, he wants to remind us that the scrolls that are the object of our study are material artefacts. It is around these actual manuscripts that social activities in the form of reading events were centred. Popović envisions a

... lived, sociocultural context in which the presence of a substantial number of literary texts at a certain place, be that the settlement of Qumran or elsewhere, drew in people who through common study and common life formed a shared frame of reference. Reading and studying texts together would then have contributed to a continuous formation and discipline of identity and community.⁷⁶

Second, he argues that “the continuous study of texts is presented as a constituent element of the community’s collective life.”⁷⁷ This is implied in for example 1QS col. VI, 7, but also reflected in the practice of excerpting texts or marking passages that are of particular interest. Evidence from the Roman world may again provide an idea of how these reading events could have taken place. We know that it was a common practice among circles of elite Roman intellectuals to send copies of newly written works to friends to comment on.⁷⁸ One would usually first send a draft to a close friend and if the criticism received was indeed favourable, more drafts would be spread among a larger circle of

72 Johnson, *Readers and Reading Culture in the High Roman Empire*, 12.

73 Popović, “Reading, Writing, and Memorizing Together.”

74 Brian Stock, *The Implications of Literacy: Written Language and Models of Interpretation in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983), 522.

75 Popović, “Reading, Writing, and Memorizing Together,” 451–452.

76 Popović, “Reading, Writing, and Memorizing Together,” 451.

77 Popović, “Reading, Writing, and Memorizing Together,” 452.

78 Starr, “The Circulation of Literary Texts in the Roman World.”

friends or one would invite a small group at home to recite the work together and comment on it. Pliny the Younger for example describes how consul and poet Silius Italicus would recite his work before his circle of friends:

and so passed his days in cultured conversation whenever he could spare time from his writing. He took great pains over his verses, though they cannot be called inspired, and frequently submitted them to public criticism by the readings he gave.⁷⁹

Public recitations are also mentioned by Horace and attributed to Virgil by Aelius Donatus.⁸⁰ The scholarly community of Cicero is in particular well-documented, especially in his letters to his friend Atticus. It seems that these gatherings were meant to read and recite finished works together, but also to collectively revise texts.⁸¹ These reading sessions in which works were discussed together were not institutionalized, but rather organized informally along networks of friends. Above all it were texts that brought different people together in antiquity. The production and dissemination of texts was generally not a commercial enterprise, but a social activity.⁸² Texts were spread among friends and private channels. Often Roman books were disseminated as a gift and in the process strengthened relationships between individuals, together with the other dynamics of gift-exchange.⁸³ As Steve Mason has summarized: “making books public in the Roman world was a matter of disseminating the work orally and in draft copies through ever widening circles of friends and associates: it was local and social.”⁸⁴ It is all these practices around which textual communities were shaped, also in Roman Judaea. When conceptualizing these activities, we may think of Brooke’s argument that reading (out), investigating, and blessing were interpretational activities organized around texts that were fully intertwined for the people behind the scrolls.⁸⁵ These can all be con-

79 Pliny the Younger, *Epistulae*, 3.7.5 (Radice, LCL).

80 Horace, *Satires*, 1.4.74–78; Donatus, *Vita Vergilii*, 33.

81 As for example argued by Gurd: Sean A. Gurd, *Work in Progress: Literary Revision as Social Performance in Ancient Rome* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012), 49–76.

82 Starr, “The Circulation of Literary Texts”; Charles W. Hedrick, “Literature and Communication,” in *The Oxford Handbook of Social Relations in the Roman World*, ed. Michael Peachin (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 167–190.

83 Hedrick, “Literature and Communication,” 185.

84 Steve N. Mason, “Of Audience and Meaning: Reading Josephus’ *Bellum Judaicum* in the Context of a Flavian Audience,” in *Josephus and Jewish History in Flavian Rome and Beyond*, ed. Joseph Sievers and Gaia Lembi, JSJSup 104 (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 71–100, at 84.

85 Brooke, “Reading, Searching and Blessing.”

sidered reading events that were central to their textual community. Popović observed in this context how “people may gather texts for a variety of reasons, but texts also have the ability to attract or gather people around them. Thus, a collection of texts can create an intellectual community, whether real or one that only exists in the imagination.”⁸⁶

Reading events were socially dynamic activities in antiquity. We can observe this in real life through a range of material features, such as the involvement of multiple scribal hands on one manuscript, scribal markings and corrections, or the noting down of extracts of relevant passages. It is through these little clues that we get a peek into the lived context of a manuscript. When considering the materiality of 4Q509/4Q496/4Q506, it seems that there is evidence for a likewise engagement of this opisthograph in a communal setting. It is around manuscripts such as these that particular reading events would have been centred. The intention was not only to store or to preserve different texts together, but also to actively read and study them. However, the three different texts of this manuscript might also reveal another dynamic. People gather texts and vice versa. But is it also possible that texts also gather other texts around them?

6 4Q509/4Q496/4Q506 as a Prayer Collection and Historical Reflection

In the preceding sections of this chapter, I have argued that this opisthograph should be considered as a collection of valued works. The scribal characteristics of the manuscript together with the shared literary affinities of the different compositions demonstrate that these texts were intentionally brought together. Furthermore, from a comparative perspective I examined a number of manuscripts that present such intentional collections elsewhere in the ancient Mediterranean world and, subsequently, briefly considered Graeco-Roman reading events to argue that this opisthograph might have been read and studied in a communal setting.

In this section we return to the opisthograph 4Q509/4Q496/4Q506 as a scribal artefact. The central question is how we can move from the analyses of individual compositions to the social reality in which this manuscript would have functioned. My proposition would be to think about this opisthograph as a prayer collection.

86 Popović, “Qumran as Scroll Storehouse in Times of Crisis?” 588. As Popović argued, the manuscript collection may “reflect a real or an imagined scholarly community” that could have existed only at Qumran or also at other sites. *Ibid.*, 590.

What exactly constitutes a collection? This question has been raised by Hindy Najman and Tigchelaar when they explore the concept and try to understand how the process of collecting can be recognized in the extant artefacts of ancient scribes.⁸⁷ They provide a working definition of the concept of collection for “artefacts or for texts that contain at least two different textual or literary units or objects which originally existed separately from one another.”⁸⁸

A collection could possibly also exist of parts of textual or literary units, which is suggested by Tigchelaar and Najman in their discussion of 4Q175 (*Testimonia*) and the War Scroll-manuscript 4Q491. 4Q175, which consists of excerpts of other works, and 4Q491, in which the Self-Glorification Hymn from the Hodayot is included, can both be recognized as a collection. Whether these existed as individual textual units—as separate literary entities—is unclear, but it does seem that they ended up as part of an intentional collection nevertheless. Hodayot can in its own right also be considered a collection of about 30 liturgical compositions that would have been brought together by one or more editors.⁸⁹

A similar characterization is plausible for our opisthograph as well. The extracts circulated as parts of different literary units (compositions we now know as Festival Prayers, the War Scroll, and Words of the Luminaries) and are here deliberately brought together on one manuscript. We can argue so based on both the material characteristics of this manuscript, and by pointing at the content of the compositions. From a material perspective they form a clear unity: above we considered features such as the presence of the fish-hook sign in both 4Q509 and 4Q496, and the similar methods of scribal corrections as evidence of their affiliation. As we have seen in chapter one, the three texts are all written in a semi-formal style and display full orthography.⁹⁰ Above we have viewed the compositions from a socio-religious perspective and observed how both Festival Prayers and Words of the Luminaries present similar collections of communal prayers. The different literary units that we can distinguish, the extracts of 4Q509, 4Q496, and 4Q506, existed already in different manuscripts. We may, therefore, assume that the full compositions (Festival Prayers, War Scroll, and Words of the Luminaries) were known by the people behind this manuscript. This is an important methodological consideration: the different

87 Hindy Najman and Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar, “Interpreting Collection in the Dead Sea Scrolls” (paper presented at 10th Meeting of the IQS, Aberdeen, 5 August 2019).

88 Najman and Tigchelaar, “Interpreting Collection in the Dead Sea Scrolls.”

89 Schuller, “The Classification Hodayot and Hodayot-like”; Esther G. Chazon, “Liturgical Function in The Cave 1 Hodayot Collection,” in *Qumran Cave 1 Revisited*, 135–149.

90 Based on Tov’s analysis of the orthography of the Judean Desert manuscripts: Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*.

literary units that we can distinguish within a collection already existed in a separate context, for example in a different manuscript. We can think about the relations between 4Q509, 4Q496, and 4Q506 not only as far as this opisthograph in particular is concerned, but also where it concerns the other extant exemplars of the three compositions in the opisthograph. It is on the basis of these considerations, which pertain to both the materiality of the manuscript and the character of the texts that are preserved, that we can start thinking about this opisthograph as a liturgical collection. The next step here would be to further reflect on the interpretative connections between these texts. Is it possible that the reading of one text on an opisthograph is shaped by the other texts on the same manuscript?

I have discussed how scholars as Falk and Chazon are in particular convinced by the form-critical similarities of Festival Prayers on the recto and Words of the Luminaries on the verso. Indeed, the similarities between the two texts are noteworthy. We encounter these similarities not only on the level of recurring formulae, as commented on by Falk, but also in the themes expressed in the composition.⁹¹ On a basic level we can characterize both as liturgical cycles dedicated to fixed moments in time. If we look further we find closer similarities: both Festival Prayers and Words of the Luminaries represent petitionary prayers.

Prayers come in different shapes, and with all kinds of cultural and socio-religious motives and intentions, such as thanksgiving or the desire to communicate with God. The texts on this opisthograph preserve an interesting set of petitionary prayers, which can broadly be defined through the shared characteristic that the praying subject requests something from the divine.⁹² One of the scholars outside of scrolls scholarship that explored the character of petitionary prayers is the philosopher of religion Scott Davison, who in a 2017 volume distinguished three different components to these prayers.⁹³ There is

91 Falk, *Daily, Sabbath, and Festival Prayers*, 79, 183; "Material Aspects of Prayer Manuscripts," 53.

92 Studies on petitionary prayer in the scrolls do not provide an explicit definition, but generally adhere to this characteristic: Israel Knohl, "Between Voice and Silence: The Relationship between Prayer and Temple Cult," *JBL* 115 (1996): 17–30; Eileen M. Schuller, "Petitionary Prayer and the Religion of Qumran," in *Religion in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. John J. Collins and Robert A. Kugler, SDBSRL (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 29–45, at 34–35; Daniel K. Falk, "Petition and Ideology in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Prayer and Poetry in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature: Essays in Honor of Eileen Schuller on the Occasion of Her 65th Birthday*, ed. Jeremy Penner, Ken M. Penner, and Cecilia Wassen, STDJ 98 (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 135–159.

93 Scott A. Davison, *Petitionary Prayer: A Philosophical Investigation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), 24–42.

(1) the subject that makes the request, (2) the object that he requests, and (3) the action of the subject's requests (such as recital or meditation). Festival Prayers and Words of the Luminaries are not only both petitionary in the sense that they express a request for something, they on occasion also share similar objects. For example, the opening formulae of prayers in both compositions directly appeal to God to remember his actions in the past:

וזכרתה את נפלאותיכה אשר עשיתה לעני גוים

Remember the wonders that you performed while the nations looked on
4Q504 1–2 II, 11–12 (Words of the Luminaries)

תפלה ליום כפורים זכור[א] דוני מ[ועד רחמיד]

Prayer for the Day of Atonement: Remember, Lord, the festival of your mercies

1Q34bis 1–2, 6; 4Q508 2, 2 (Festival Prayers)

In both instances the petitioning subject, עמכה, “your people” (4Q504 6, 6; 4Q509 184, 3), appeals to God to remember his acts (the object that is requested). The action of the subject's requests would be the reading or performance of this prayer text in a particular setting. Eileen Schuller in her study of the petitionary prayers from Qumran has pointed to the range of imperatives in 4Q504: God is asked to “teach the law” and “deliver from evil.”⁹⁴ Both compositions also thematise God's mercy for his people. Several prayers shared by both Words of the Luminaries and Festival Prayers express the request for forgiveness of past iniquities or sins, or specifically draw attention to the mercy and compassion that God showed to Israel in the past:⁹⁵

אתה פדינו וסלח [נא] לעווננו ולח[טתנו]

May you redeem us, and forgive us our iniquities and sins

4Q504 4, 7 (Words of the Luminaries)
4Q506 131–132, 14 (Words of the Luminaries)

94 Schuller, “Petitionary Prayer and the Religion of Qumran,” 44.

95 More similarities between supplications in the two texts are provided by Nitzan, who assumes these appeals to represent “a kind of crystallized model of the needs of the people, consistently repeated,” Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer and Religious Poetry*, 104–111.

ותחס עליהמה באהבתכה אותם ולמען בריתכה

And you had pity on them because of your love and because of you covenant

4Q504 1–2 II, 8–9 (Words of the Luminaries)

[ואל תז]כור לנו עוונות רשונים

[And re]member not to hold against us the iniquities or our forebears

4Q504 4, 6 (Words of the Luminaries)

תפלה ליום כפורים זכו[ר א]דוני מ[ועד רחמיד

Prayer for the Day of Atonement: Remember, Lord, the festival of your mercies

1Q34bis 1–2, 6; 4Q508 2, 2 (Festival Prayers)⁹⁶

The most occurring imperative however is the appeal to remember. Implicit in this request to God to remember his acts is the understanding that the divine actions in the biblical past carry their influence up until the present. The implication is that the performance of these prayer cycles can persuade God to remember and thereby act favourably towards his people. Among others, Brooke has pointed at the special position taken up by liturgical poetry in the realization of memory: it is through cultic performances of texts that the shared past of a group or community is both formed and passed on.⁹⁷

This opisthograph raises a different question that is related to the concept of predeterminism. Petitionary prayers have regularly been discussed in relation to predeterminism, because it is the expression of a particular theological perspective.⁹⁸ The key question that the issue of predeterminism poses is to

96 We could add here Baillet's reconstruction of 4Q508 30, 1: לכה לכפר עליו על כול, "For you to atone for him for all." However, because of the poor condition of this fragment this reading is insecure.

97 George Brooke argues specifically that the re-use of and allusions to Psalms 105 and 106 in other texts from the scrolls can play a notable part in the process of identity formation: George J. Brooke, "Praying History in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Memory, Identity, Fulfilment," in *Functions of Psalms and Prayers in the Late Second Temple Period*, ed. Mika S. Pajunen and Jeremy Penner, BZAW 486 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2017), 305–319.

98 Schuller, "Petitionary Prayer and the Religion of Qumran"; Russell C.D. Arnold, "Repentance and the Qumran Covenant Ceremony," in *Seeking the Favor of God, vol. 2: The Development of Penitential Prayer in the Second Temple Period*, ed. Mark J. Boda, Daniel K. Falk,

which degree man is capable to manipulate his own fate.⁹⁹ Can we still speak of deterministic theology when it is possible to exercise influence on both presence and future through supplications directed at God? Indeed, as Schuller asks: “What is the point of petitioning the God of knowledge who has determined all things from the beginning?”¹⁰⁰ This question is too far-reaching to be fully dealt with here, but it can be brought back to the assumption that if we indeed understand Festival Prayers and Words of the Luminaries as petitionary prayers, then that would also lead us to assume that these petitions were intended to achieve a particular effect. These petitions were directed to God in the hope that their requests (such as deliverance from evil or remembrance of the covenant) would be granted. Following this line of thought, it seems to me that Festival Prayers and Words of the Luminaries share a stronger association than only that of a similar liturgical setting; rather they can both be conceived as the product of a particular understanding of the relationship between God, providence, and human’s ability to impact his or her circumstances.

How does the War Scroll tie into this conversation? I have argued above that there are good reasons to suppose a liturgical setting for this text, but can we also read (parts of) this composition as a an appeal to God? There may be evidence pointing in that direction. Festival Prayers and Words of the Luminaries both use the designation תפלה, which Schuller understands to refer not just to prayer, but more specifically to petitionary prayers.¹⁰¹ She observes that the term is also used in 1QM col. xv, 5, which describes how the Chief Priest in preparation of the final eschatological battle will read out the תפלת מועד המלחמה, “the prayer for the appointed time of the war.” Though the text of this prayer is not preserved, we may assume that it concerns an appeal: a request for victory in the coming battle. Falk agrees with Schuller and hypothesizes whether this petition could be similar to the prayers preserved in columns XI–XII, XIV, and XVIII–XIX.¹⁰² This remains speculation, but one which is justified by the occasion envisaged in the text: as we have seen, both column XII and XIX preserve versions of a prayer dedicated to the moment before battle that calls on God to

and Rodney A. Werline, *EJL* 22 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2007), 159–175; Falk, “Petition and Ideology in the Dead Sea Scrolls.”

99 For a discussion of different deterministic ideas in the scrolls and ancient Judaism at large: Mladen Popović, “Apocalyptic Determinism,” in *The Oxford Handbook of Apocalyptic Literature*, ed. John J. Collins (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 255–270.

100 Schuller, “Petitionary Prayer and the Religion of Qumran,” 37.

101 Schuller, “Petitionary Prayer and the Religion of Qumran,” 43.

102 Falk, “Petition and Ideology in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 151.

execute judgement over his enemies.¹⁰³ Next to that, this prayer makes ample use of the second person to address God, much like Festival Prayers and Words of the Luminaries. It is through these connections that we can conceive 4Q496 as part of a collection of texts, together with the other texts on this opisthograph. If we read the War Scroll liturgically here, does that mean that we have to read 1QM as a prayer text as well? This is possible and has been argued for in the past, but this opisthograph invites us also to think about the possibility of multiple genres.¹⁰⁴ Could we not think of the War Scroll both as a rule text or as a battle narrative and as a liturgical document depending on the other texts that we read next to it? In this way, consumers of a text can re-interpret and even re-appropriate their text in the context of different reading events.

A next step is asking what would happen if we challenge ourselves to read this opisthograph with fresh eyes—without the contextual and interpretational histories described in sections 5.2–5.7. In other words: what are the connecting features we might discern between 4Q509, 4Q496, and 4Q506 when we abandon our preconceived notions regarding the larger traditions that these texts originate from? What immediately stands out is that this opisthograph displays a particular attitude towards its historical past. The text it preserves continuously reaches back to biblical history, particularly as it is recounted in Genesis and Exodus. It presents (and by extension revives) Moses (4Q509 frag. 2, 4; 4Q506 frag. 122, 1), Aron (4Q496 frag. 10, 4) Isaac and Jacob (4Q506 frag. 124, 6), and the sons of Japeth, Ishmael and Keturah (4Q496 frag. 13), but also the historical regions of Uz and Aram-Naharaim (4Q496 frag. 5 + 6). This opisthograph informs its readers that these names are not part of a distant past, but shape current realities. In this sense, the opisthograph reflects an emerging historical consciousness: it presents significant personages, locations, and events in Israel's past that are foundational for its future. The text repeatedly calls on to 'remember' (זכר in 4Q509 and 4Q506), and to look forward to a designated time (מועד in 4Q509; מועד and עת in 4Q496). There are noticeable differences too: 4Q509 frag. 4 promises to recount, remember, or celebrate (the exact term is not preserved) the wonders of God "from generation to generation," while 4Q496 prepares the way for the imminent fight against the enemies from biblical history, such as Ishmael and Keturah. 4Q509 and 4Q506 do not share 4Q496's language of urgency in light of impending war. But what con-

103 E.g. 1QM 14:16: רומה רומה אל אלים והנשא בעון; Falk, "Petition and Ideology in the Dead Sea Scrolls," 151. On the petitionary elements in 1QM 9–14 see also: Falk, "Prayer, Liturgy, and War," 281–283.

104 Hindy Najman, "The Idea of Biblical Genre: From Discourse to Constellation," in *Prayer and Poetry in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature*, 301–321.

nects the three texts is that they convey the notion that the future is shaped by the past, and that through preparation and reflection on this history a positive future can be embodied.

In the process of bringing different texts together and 'reviving' them on a different manuscript and within the context of a different reading event, new meaning can be created. Texts are always influenced by the texts around them, which is how literary diversity is generated. I would propose that something similar is happening for the Qumran opisthograph. We can evaluate this manuscript not only as an intentional collection, but also one that invites a way of reading of itself. The three compositions on this opisthograph to a certain degree function both as each other's pre-texts and as each other's con-texts. Collecting different texts together reinforces the interpretative connections between those texts. This process is also active in this opisthograph. A reading and interpretation of a given text is guided by context, which always constitutes both the material features and the nature of the surrounding texts. The presence of extracts from the War Scroll together with extracts from prayer texts for fixed occasions compels us to think about this manuscript as a liturgical collection.

PART 3

Collections and Textual Diversity:
Graeco-Roman Evidence
and the Villa of the Papyri



Introduction to Part 3

This part expands on the question of ancient collecting practices from a different angle. Where Part 2 can be read as an attempt towards microhistory, the present part will turn to analysis on meso-level by juxtaposing the Dead Sea Scrolls with Graeco-Roman papyrological evidence.

This part is subdivided into three chapters. Chapter seven is concerned with conceptualisations of manuscript collections in different ancient sources, and the analysis of lists of books that have been preserved on papyri. Chapter eight, the main body of this part, deals with the *Villa of the Papyri* from Herculaneum. The point of departure of this chapter is the fact that the particular context in which the papyri from Herculaneum are preserved allows us to investigate the notion of private, scholarly manuscript collections in antiquity. Furthermore, the *Villa of the Papyri* preserves a small corpus of opisthographic manuscripts that can complement our analysis of the Qumran opisthographs. The final chapter of this study will be dedicated to a comparison between the *Villa*-papyri and the Dead Sea Scrolls, with particular attention for the papyrus opisthograph P.Herc. 1021.

Conceptualizing Collections in Literary and Papyrological Sources

1 Library, Archive, and Collection: *Emic* and *Etic* Conceptions

Collections of manuscripts go back to the start of the historical record. Reflections on these collections in written texts, however, do not. Modern scholarly thinking about the questions laid out in the introduction has been shaped by the perception of libraries that survived in the classical tradition. The most prominent of these is the Library of Alexandria, which, as Roger Bagnall puts it, had become “a symbol of universality of intellectual inquiry and of the collection of written text.”¹ It is telling that a recent survey of ancient Near Eastern libraries was titled *Libraries before Alexandria*, which illustrates the significance of Alexandria as a representation of the quintessential library of antiquity.² An unintended consequence of this pre-eminence of Alexandria is that our understanding of the broader function and structure of manuscript collections and libraries in antiquity is often shaped to a large extent by the evidence provided by the classical sources. However, in recent years different perspectives have emerged among scholars. A number of collected volumes have appeared that, inspired by modern library studies, aim to think about libraries and manuscript traditions from a comparative perspective and to offer a synthesis of classical and Near Eastern scholarship.³

What do researchers mean when they refer to a group of manuscripts as a library, archive, or collection? And, importantly, to which degree are our modern conceptualisations of these institutions different from how they existed in antiquity? In the previous part the conceptual pairing *emic* and *etic* was introduced as a tool to distinguish between the “insider” and “outsider” perspective

1 Roger S. Bagnall, “Alexandria: Library of Dreams,” *APSP* 146 (2002): 348–361, at 361.

2 Kim Ryholt and Gojko Barjamovic, eds., *Libraries before Alexandria: Ancient Near Eastern Traditions* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019).

3 In addition to the above-mentioned *Libraries before Alexandria* one could also think of Lionel Casson, *Libraries in the Ancient World* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001); Jason P. König, Katerina Oikonomopoulou, and Greg Woolf, eds., *Ancient Libraries* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013); Sidnie White Crawford and Cecilia Wassen, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls at Qumran and the Concept of a Library*, *STDJ* 116 (Leiden: Brill, 2016).

on the classification of texts. In order to trace back the *emic* point of view, we should start by exploring ancient terminology to establish how they differentiated between different types of manuscript collections. As it appears, both archive and library can in this way be traced back to Greek origins.⁴

Archive in its modern sense usually applies to collections of documentary and administrative material (as opposed to literary compositions), such as decrees and legal texts.⁵ The term itself derived from the Greek ἀρχεῖον, which refers to a town hall or the residence of a city's rulers or magistrates. According to James Sickinger, the meaning of archive at one point expanded to not only the building itself, but also the objects and documents that were kept inside it.⁶ However, there is no evidence that the term was applied specifically for administrative records.⁷ Though the practice of record-keeping undoubtedly existed, the use of archive to refer to collections of records or administrative documents seems to be anachronistic.⁸

Library is the English equivalent of the Greek βιβλιοθήκη and Latin 'bibliotheca,' which in many of our classical sources is the term applied for the famous institutions from antiquity that we now know as libraries.⁹ It is for this reason that classical scholarship preferred 'library' over other concepts to refer to ancient collections of books. However, this is not without problems. Libraries have not remained unaltered throughout antiquity: Hellenistic and Roman

4 Though *collectio* is a Latin word, it is the abstract noun of *colligo*, to "gather," "collect," and "pick up." *Collectio* does not have a specific connotation in relation to manuscripts, but is generally used for "a bringing together," "accumulation," "enumeration," and "inference." *OLD*, s.v. "collectio."

5 Cf. *OED*, s.v. "archive": "A place in which public records or other important historic documents are kept."

6 James P. Sickinger, *Public Records and Archives in Classical Athens* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1999), 6.

7 Richard Neudecker has shown that Roman libraries could preserve both literary and documentary texts: Richard Neudecker, "Archives, Books and Sacred Space in Rome," in *Ancient Libraries*, 312–331.

8 Ernst M. Posner, *Archives in the Ancient World* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1972), 1–11; Maria Brosius, "Ancient Archives and Concepts of Record-Keeping: An Introduction," in *Ancient Archives and Archival Traditions: Concepts of Record-Keeping in the Ancient World* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 1–16; Bart van Beek, "Ancient Archives and Modern Collections: The Leuven Homepage of Papyrus Archives and Collections," in *Proceedings of the 24th International Congress of Papyrology. Helsinki, 1–7 August 2004*, ed. Jaakko Frösén, Tiina Purola Purola and Erja Salmenkivi, *CHL 122* (Helsinki: Societas Scientiarum Fennica, 2007), 1033–1044.

9 An overview of the occurrence of βιβλιοθήκη in Greek papyri and literary sources is provided by Thomas Hendrickson, "The Invention of the Greek Library," *TAPA* 144 (2014): 371–413, at 387–393. He traces the first occurrence back to the fourth century BCE.

libraries are different from each other in architecture, structure, and content, and both of these are of course significantly distinct from the institution as it is understood today.¹⁰ Furthermore, βιβλιοθήκη is not used consistently but rather in a variety of meanings, such as bookshelf, the storage room in which books were kept, or just to refer to the collection of scrolls.¹¹

More significantly, the notion of a “public” library as it is known today (that is, an institution that is publicly funded) did not exist in antiquity.¹² George Houston observes rather that “where we have evidence on the funding of municipal libraries, the funds come from endowments established by wealthy citizens of the town.”¹³ An additional characteristic of classical libraries that is not (or to a much lesser extent) conveyed by the modern notion of library is the close connection with prestige and the display of power. For the Hellenistic kings such prestige seems to have been an important motivation for the foundation of libraries. Monica Berti argues that the Alexandrian, Seleucid, and Attalid libraries became a way to legitimize the ruling government and to eclipse the rule of rival dynasties.¹⁴ David Petrain describes Rome’s public libraries as “spaces designed to effect the transmutation of the literary tradition’s prestige into visual experience and the assertion of power.”¹⁵ Though the present-day library may be historically (and in many European languages etymologically) derived from βιβλιοθήκη, the two are culturally very much distinct.

10 For an overview of the diachronic development of libraries in classical history see the contributions in Casson, *Libraries in the Ancient World*. One noteworthy difference between Greek and Roman libraries for example is that only in Roman times structures were designed specifically to house libraries rather than using existing buildings: David Petrain, “Visual Supplementation and Metonymy in the Roman Public Library,” in *Ancient Libraries*, 332–346; Popović, “Qumran as Scroll Storehouse in Times of Crisis?” 586–587.

11 Hendrickson, “The Invention of the Greek Library,” 388. Christian Jacob notes that for the Library of Alexandria, βιβλιοθήκη is used to refer to the storage furniture in which the scrolls were kept, while συναγωγή is used for the collection of scrolls itself; Christian Jacob, “Fragments of a History of Ancient Libraries,” in *Ancient Libraries*, 57–81, at 64.

12 To what degree the notion of ‘public’ in this context means that these libraries were publicly accessible is a separate matter. It is often assumed that access to book collections was restricted to learned elites and trusted visitors. However, Matthew Nicholls has argued on the basis of the architecture of surviving libraries that Roman libraries from the Imperial period were designed to be accessed by a broad audience; Matthew C. Nicholls, “Roman Libraries as Public Buildings in the Cities of the Empire,” in *Ancient Libraries*, 261–276.

13 Houston, *Inside Roman Libraries*, 4 n. 10.

14 Monica Berti, “Greek and Roman Libraries in the Hellenistic Age,” *The Dead Sea Scrolls at Qumran and the Concept of a Library*, 33–54.

15 Petrain, “Visual Supplementation and Metonymy,” 346.

As an *emic* category, βιβλιοθήκη cannot one-on-one be translated as library, on the grounds that the ancient term comes with a range of connotations that are lost in its modern usage.

This problem becomes more pressing when one moves away from the classical context to scholarship of the ancient Near East, as there is no real equivalent of the term in Semitic languages. Akkadian ‘bīt tuppim,’ tablet house, and ‘girginakku,’ which the *Chicago Assyrian Dictionary* translates as library, each come with their own problems.¹⁶ Though it is quite common in scholarship to refer to cuneiform finds as libraries, the term then does not function as a translation of an Akkadian or Sumerian concept equivalent to βιβλιοθήκη, but rather as an *etic* category. Cuneiform libraries are defined by scholars as collections of texts, in particular consisting of literary compositions.¹⁷ In order to get closer to the *emic* perspective, one will have to look for other conceptualizations of manuscript collections.

As we are considering the Dead Sea Scrolls here, our first impulse would be to look for descriptions of libraries, archives, or other collections in ancient Judaeon sources. In a 2016 contribution Corrado Martone has listed a handful of references to libraries in the Hebrew Bible.¹⁸ Among the clearest references are the mention of the offices of מזכיר and ספר, which seem related to record-keeping, and the copying and composing of texts. The much-discussed passage in 2 Maccabees 2:13–14 tells us that Nehemiah founded a royal library (“βιβλιοθήκη”) in which the books of the kings and prophets, and the writings of David were preserved. It is partly based on these verses that Karel van der Toorn has argued extensively for the perception of the Hebrew Bible as a collection of books that constitutes a (perhaps portable) library.¹⁹ However, Van der Toorn is primarily interested in how the formation of book collections and libraries opened up the possibility for the emergence of literary canons, and much less

16 CAD 5, s.v. “girginakku.” On the problems with these terms: Kim Ryholt and Gojko Barjamovic, “Libraries before Alexandria,” in *Libraries before Alexandria*, 1–66, at 8; Eleanor Robson and Kathryn Stevens, “Scholarly Tablet Collections in First-Millennium Assyria and Babylonia, c. 700–200 BCE,” in *Libraries before Alexandria*, 317–364, at 320.

17 Ryholt and Barjamovic, “Libraries before Alexandria,” 8, for example, use the term library “to refer to any collection of non-documentary texts found together, without regard to its purpose, access, and ownership.” See also Olof Pedersén, *Archives and Libraries in the Ancient Near East, 1500–300 BC* (Bethesda: CDL, 1998), 1–9.

18 Corrado Martone, “The Qumran Library and Other Ancient Libraries: Elements for a Comparison,” *The Dead Sea Scrolls at Qumran and the Concept of a Library*, 55–77, at 62–66; idem “From Universal to Sectarian. The Zadokites, Qumran, the Temple and Their Libraries,” *Henoch* 40 (2018): 21–32.

19 Karel van der Toorn, *Scribal Culture and the Making of the Hebrew Bible* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2007), 236–244.

in how such collections were shaped on manuscript level. Other references to the practice of collecting texts outside the Hebrew Bible, such as the Letter of Aristeas and Jubilees, are too short to contribute to our objective here.²⁰

There does potentially exist an *emic* conceptualisation for a cache of manuscripts: *genizah*, a repository (generally the storage area of a synagogue) designated to store worn-out or obsolete copies of the Hebrew Bible or other important compositions. The proposition that (some of) the caves in which the Dead Sea Scrolls were discovered could be identified as genizot goes back to the early phase of scrolls scholarship: Eleazar Sukenik suggested that Cave 1 might have functioned as a genizah.²¹ More recently, Brooke (for Cave 1) and Joan Taylor (for the artificial caves, but especially Cave 4) have re-examined this proposition.²² Above all, it should be noted that, with the current state of our evidence, none of these potential functions can be fully excluded. However, the attribution of a genizah does raise certain questions.

First, we do not know which institution (synagogue? temple?) these hypothetical cave-genizot would have belonged to. The location of Cave 1 is curious from this perspective: it is isolated and difficult to enter due to the uneven and inhospitable terrain. The Cairo Genizah had been in continuous use as a repository for centuries, but this is hard to see for Cave 1, which is more suggestive of a single deposit.²³ Finally, as indicated by Crawford, some of the manuscripts preserved in Cave 1 are in excellent condition which makes it difficult to imagine why they would have been rejected in a genizah.²⁴

20 Letter of Aristeas 9–10; Jubilees 45; on Aristeas: Berti, “Greek and Roman Libraries,” 43; Martone, “The Qumran Library and Other Ancient Libraries,” 62–66.

21 Sukenik, *The Dead Sea Scrolls of the Hebrew University*, 22–24. Cf. the discussion by Godfrey Driver in *The Judaean Scrolls: The Problem and a Solution* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1965), 386–393. However, scholars such as Milik and De Vaux subsequently argued against the genizah-theory: Milik, *Ten Years of Discovery*, 20; Roland de Vaux, *Archaeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Schweich Lectures 1959, Revised Edition in an English Translation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1973), 55–56, 103.

22 George J. Brooke, *Qumran and the Jewish Jesus: Reading the New Testament in the Light of the Scrolls* (Cambridge: Grove Books, 2005), 9; Joan E. Taylor, “Buried Manuscripts and Empty Tombs: The Qumran Genizah Theory Revisited,” in *‘Go Out and Study the Land’ (Judges 18:2): Archaeological, Historical and Textual Studies in Honor of Hanan Eshel*, ed. Aren M. Meir, Jodi Magness, and Lawrence H. Schiffman, JSJSup 148 (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 269–315.

23 Florentino García Martínez, “The Contents of the Manuscripts from the Caves of Qumran,” in *The Caves of Qumran*, 67–79.

24 Sidnie White Crawford, “Qumran: Caves, Scrolls and Buildings,” in *A Teacher for All Generations: Essays in Honor of James C. VanderKam*, vol. 1, ed. Eric F. Mason et al., JSJSup 153 (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 253–273, at 271.

Cave 4 presents a different scenario: a period of continuous depositions seems possible there. However, another objection remains: it is unclear if genizot already existed in antiquity—it is very well possible that our use of this concept for the turn-of-the-era is anachronistic.²⁵ The existence of a genizah presupposes a significant conceptual and intellectual reconfiguration: the development of the belief that some manuscripts possess an inherent set of unique properties that necessitate their disposal through a designated ceremony. Furthermore, Crawford has extensively argued that the types of materials that survived from Cave 4 indicate an active engagement with texts and traditions. She argues that we can “witness scribal work on texts that help to demonstrate that the Qumran collection was a living collection, not simply a depository for collected texts or a genizah for manuscripts no longer in circulation.”²⁶ To conclude, we cannot fully rule out the possibility that Cave 4 functioned as a genizah. But if it did serve in such a capacity, it would likely have been a genizah that is very different from the genizot that survived from later periods.

Most scholars base their definition of libraries in the ancient Near East on modern conceptualisations and classifications. Here, libraries and archives are generally perceived to be separate institutions.²⁷ Menahem Haran has argued similarly for ancient Judaeon scribal culture. In his view both these institutions share the feature of presenting a collection of texts, but Haran argues that “archival tablets were arranged according to their sort and date of writing, whereas in libraries the tablets were arranged according to subjects, and colophons were added to facilitate location of a tablet.”²⁸ For Haran, this distinc-

25 Popović, “Qumran as Scroll Storehouse in Times of Crisis?” 584.

26 Crawford, *Scribes and Scrolls at Qumran*, 238.

27 Menahem Haran, “Archives, Libraries and the Order of the Biblical Books,” *JANESCU* 22 (1993): 52–61. See for similar approaches e.g. Jeremy A. Black and John W. Tait, “Archives and Libraries in the Ancient Near East,” in *CANE*, 4:2197–2209; Brosius, *Ancient Archives and Archival Traditions*; Jaqueline S. Du Toit, *Textual Memory: Ancient Archives, Libraries and the Hebrew Bible* (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2011); Eleanor Robson, “Reading the Libraries of Assyria and Babylonia,” in *Ancient Libraries*, 38–56.

28 Haran, “Archives, Libraries and the Order of the Biblical Books,” 52.

For Haran, apart from their differing methods of arrangement of manuscripts, both institutions are also rooted in a different historical background. He perceives archives as the result of any form of organized administration. Libraries, however, are a product of a growing interest in books and book culture, and a general rise in the standard of living resulted in the foundation of institutions dedicated to the collection of important literary works. It should be noted here that Van der Toorn remains unconvinced by this distinction between libraries and archives, because public libraries in the modern sense of the word did not exist: Van der Toorn, *Scribal Culture and the Making of the Hebrew Bible*, 238.

tion is also meaningful for our understanding of ancient Judaeen history: royal archives existed in ancient Israel just as in other ancient Near Eastern states, as is evidenced in the Hebrew Bible.²⁹ The presence of royal archives in the Herodian period is attested by Flavius Josephus, who writes that they were moved to Sepphoris when that city submitted to Rome in the Jewish War.³⁰ Archaeological evidence for the presence of archives can be found in the private archives from the caves of Bar Kokhba, which largely consist of documentary texts such as legal papyri and letters that can be associated with one family or individual.³¹ While the presence of archives is well-established, in Haran's view there is no evidence for the existence of libraries from the Second Temple period through the Talmudic period. He argues that the corpus of Judaeen literature from the time was simply not big enough to require such an institution to order and preserve its manuscripts. The Dead Sea Scrolls seem to pose a problem here: because they do not fit in either category Haran prefers to refer to the scrolls as an assemblage of books, without providing a clear definition what this means.³² The absence of *emic* references to the Dead Sea Scrolls has caused scholars to resort to a range of different approaches. Armin Lange, for example, does consider the Dead Sea Scrolls to be a library, because he sees connections with ancient Near Eastern temple 'libraries.'³³ A recent collected volume dedicated to this question has resulted in scholars both arguing for and against the proposition to see the Dead Sea Scrolls as an ancient library, depending on each particular understanding of what a library is and how it would have functioned in antiquity.³⁴

The issue at stake is that it is simply beyond our knowledge how the collection as a whole was perceived by the people behind the scrolls. We do not find the names of scribes, colophons, or other forms of evidence that could illuminate the practice of collection behind the corpus. Collection catalogues or lists

29 E.g., 1 Kings 14:19, 29; 15:7, 23, 31.

30 Josephus, *Life*, 38.

31 Haran, "Archives, Libraries and the Order of the Biblical Books," 56; Popović, "Qumran as Scroll Storehouse in Times of Crisis?" 565–570.

32 Haran, "Archives, Libraries and the Order of the Biblical Books," 58.

33 Armin Lange, "The Qumran Dead Sea Scrolls—Library or Manuscript Corpus?" in *From 4QMMT to Resurrection: Mélanges qumraniens en hommage à Émile Puech*, ed. Florentino García Martínez, Annette Steudel, and Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar STDJ 61 (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 177–193. Lange builds here on previous scholarship: Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran*; Milik, *Ten Years of Discovery*.

34 Sidnie W. Crawford, "The Qumran Collection as a Scribal Library," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls at Qumran and the Concept of a Library*, 109–131; Martone, "The Qumran Library and Other Ancient Libraries," 62–66.

of compositions are also missing. Furthermore, no sound archaeological evidence has survived for a physical space in which the manuscripts would have been preserved. Even if one accepts the hypothesis that Pliny the Elder in his *Natural History* and Flavius Josephus were writing about the people behind the Dead Sea Scrolls, it would provide little insight into their practices of collection and scribal engagement with their manuscripts. Martone succinctly identified the problem when he remarked: “In short, we have a collection of texts, but we do not know for sure where they were actually held. We encounter an abstract library which belonged to a group which we are not able to precisely define.”³⁵

In order to get closer to the ‘lived’ context of the Qumran manuscripts—the different ways in which the people behind the scrolls copied, read, studied, and otherwise engaged with the broad variety of texts they had at their disposal—one potentially fruitful avenue can be found in comparative evidence for collectioning or collecting practices in the Graeco-Roman world.

2 Collection from a Comparative Perspective: Book Lists of Papyri Finds

The introduction to this study discussed the work conducted by Michael Stausberg and Bruce Lincoln on the comparative approach, and referred to the four elements of weak comparisons developed by Lincoln. In the remainder of this part I will proceed with assessing the benefits of comparing different sources for manuscript collections, while trying to be mindful to these four elements. For our purposes, this means avoiding the selection of phenomena for comparison that are broad and wide-ranging to the extent that its results become generalizing. Rather than aspiring to compare the entirety of ancient Judaeian and Graeco-Roman scribal culture, I will focus on particular aspects of those cultures that can be described and analysed closely: individual manuscripts, clusters consisting of small groupings of manuscripts, and manuscript collections that survived within a particular context.

Bearing all of this in mind, there are broadly speaking two types of evidence for collection and collecting practices that could be helpful here: descriptions of libraries and collections in literary sources, and papyrological evidence. Thomas Hendrickson distinguishes the first type broadly into two separate categories: (1) descriptions of libraries that give practical aid about the acquisition

35 Martone, “The Qumran Library and Other Ancient Libraries,” 73.

and management of books, and (2) legends and anecdotes about libraries.³⁶ Concerning the tradition of legends and anecdotes we may think of short references such as those that frame the sixth century Athenian tyrant Pisistratus as a founder of a public library.³⁷ Though these literary representations do provide a valuable window on how the origin of the library is perceived in later sources, they are also largely apocryphal and therefore of no great help here.³⁸ The practical writings about the acquisition and management of books brings us to compositions such as the *Pinakes* by Callimachus, which is considered to be a kind of reference work of the Library of Alexandria and from which about 24 fragments survived.³⁹ It should be emphasized that no material evidence from the Library of Alexandria survived to modern times. Both the architectural structure of the library and the roughly 500,000 scrolls it once housed are completely absent from the historical record, so researchers are largely dependent on literary sources about the library. The most notable description of the Library of Alexandria is provided by the Greek philosopher and historian Strabo in his *Geographica*.⁴⁰ It is also reported in a letter by Jerome that Varro wrote a three-volume treatise in the first century BCE called *De bibliothecis*, which dealt with the history of libraries.⁴¹ Unfortunately only a few fragments of the work survived, though it seems likely that both Pliny and Suetonius consulted it for their own work.⁴² Suetonius furthermore tells us that Julius Caesar commissioned Varro to organise the first public library of Rome.⁴³ Greg Woolf sees Caesar's project as a testament to "a growing sense in the late Republic of the centrality of libraries for both the history of books and for contemporary reading cultures."⁴⁴ These literary sources present a picture of a growing movement towards the institutionalization of manuscript collections in the Roman period, but offer less evidence about the practices behind these collections.

36 Thomas Hendrickson, *Ancient Libraries and Renaissance Humanism: The De bibliothecis of Justus Lipsius*, BSIH 265 (Leiden: Brill, 2017), 6–12.

37 Hendrickson lists the sources where Pisistratus is presented as the founder of such a library: Hendrickson, "The Invention of the Greek Library," 373 n. 7. See also Yun L. Too, *The Idea of the Library in the Ancient World* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 19–49.

38 Hendrickson, "The Invention of the Greek Library"; idem, *Ancient Libraries and Renaissance Humanism*, 11–12.

39 Hendrickson, *Ancient Libraries and Renaissance Humanism*, 7–8.

40 Strabo, *Geographica*, 17.1.2–10.

41 Jerome, *Epistulae*, 33.2.

42 Thomas Hendrickson, "An Emendation to a Fragment of Varro's *De bibliothecis* (Fr. 54 GRF Funaioli)," *ClQ* 65 (2015): 395–397.

43 Suetonius, *Divus Julius*, 44.2.

44 Greg Woolf, "Introduction: Approaching the Ancient Library," in *Ancient Libraries*, 1–20, at 2.

For the second type of evidence of collecting practices we should turn to the work of George Houston, who has distinguished two forms of papyrological evidence for libraries and book collections from the Roman world: (1) lists of books preserved in papyri, and (2) concentrations of papyri found together in archaeological sites.⁴⁵ Since his work bears relevance for our purposes here, we will have a closer look at his conclusions.

For his discussion of the papyri that contain lists of books Houston expands on the work of Rosa Otranto, who analysed nineteen lists of non-Christian books.⁴⁶ These lists vary in length, and it remains uncertain whether any of them are exhaustive. What is interesting is that many of these lists contain duplicate titles (indicating more than one exemplar existed of a given text in the collection) and possibly also opisthographic manuscripts. This indicates that these lists represent the inventories of real book collections.⁴⁷ The total number of nineteen book lists is too low to provide a statistically significant sample and to examine the distribution of books across the wider population, but it does allow us to ask qualitative questions regarding their particular contexts. Houston's analysis leads to a number of significant observations:⁴⁸

First, it appears that book collections could be very diverse in size, ranging from as few as five texts to several thousand volumes.⁴⁹ It is not uncommon to find multiple copies of the same composition within a collection.⁵⁰

45 Houston, "Papyrological Evidence for Book Collections and Libraries."

46 Rosa Otranto, *Antiche liste di libri su papiro*, Sussidi eruditi 49 (Rome: Edizioni di storia e letteratura, 2000). Christoph Marksches has collected and evaluated twenty book-lists with Christian books ("Bibliotheks-Listen auf Papyrus"): Christoph Marksches, "Neue Forschungen zur Kanonisierung des Neuen Testaments," *Apocrypha* 12 (2001): 237–262, at 243–249, 262.

47 It is very unlikely that a book list concerns a bibliography or educational reading list when the same title occurs repeatedly. Potential settings for such a list could be an inheritance or the book collection of an individual or group: Houston, "Papyrological Evidence for Book Collections and Libraries," 236–237.

48 Houston, *Inside Roman Libraries*, 39–86. A more extensive discussion of these book lists is provided in Aksu, "Opisthographic Papyri and Practices of Collection in Ancient Egypt," 16–19.

49 An example of a book list with only five titles is provided by Houston list number 4 (which corresponds to Otranto list number 14, P.Turner 39). Houston's fifth list (Otranto list 6, P.Oxy. 2659) is an opisthograph that records a very extensive book collection that may have belonged to a "municipal, institutional, or very large private library": Houston, *Inside Roman Libraries*, 67.

50 For instance, Otranto list number 16 (PSI Laur. inv. 19662 verso) contains three copies of Plato's *Alcibiades* and two copies each of the *Philebus*, *Protagoras*, and the *Gorgias*. There could be various reasons for this duplication. The owner might have intended to compare different editions of a text. Otranto, *Antiche liste di libri su papiro*, 89–95; Houston, *Inside Roman Libraries*, 76–77.

Second, these book lists often cover similar themes and subjects. Otranto list 6 exclusively features works of comedy, whereas Otranto lists 15 (P.Ross.Georg. 1.22) and 17 (P.Vars. 5 verso) seem to consist of philosophical works. Other papyri such as Otranto lists 3, 16, and 18 (P.Turner 9) contain collections of ‘classics’ with titles by authors like Homer and Plato. However, this does not mean that these book lists are fully homogenous: even the more specialized lists include titles that appear unrelated to their overall theme.⁵¹ These papyrus book lists present compelling evidence for the collection of literary works during the Graeco-Roman period, a practice that extended beyond public libraries. They provide clear evidence that individuals brought together books that aligned with their specific personal or professional interests within thematically organized collections.⁵² It is from this perspective interesting to consider the private document P.Oxy. 4365 (“Letter about Christian Books”), which was published by John R. Rea.⁵³ This fourth-century text only reads six lines: “To my dearest lady sister, greetings in the Lord. Lend me the Ezra, since I lent you the Little Genesis. Farewell in God from us.” The short phrasing and the absence of further information such as names can be understood as strong evidence that the exchange of texts took place between interested individuals—the lending process is arranged between a (male or female) sender and a female addressee.⁵⁴ These were readers/users/collectors of manuscripts from a Christian background that engaged with their literature on a private level.

Returning to the book lists, Houston has argued that opisthographic manuscripts are often specifically mentioned in these lists (sometimes in an abbreviation).⁵⁵ Other papyri provide indirect evidence for opisthographs, such as Otranto list 16. This papyrus, initially published by Medea Norsa in 1921, presents what seems to be the catalogue of a predominantly philosophical collection.⁵⁶ One entry refers to a manuscript with three dialogues: Plato’s *Hippias*

51 List 15 includes a single medical work within an otherwise philosophical collection.

52 Houston, *Inside Roman Libraries*, 78–80. We should note in this context that the *Pinakes* by Callimachus is often understood as the library catalogue of the Library of Alexandria. This text does record different texts according to their genre: Hendrickson, *Ancient Libraries and Renaissance Humanism*, 7–8; Too, *The Idea of the Library in the Ancient World*, 55–56.

53 John R. Rea, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, vol. 63 (London, 1996), 44–45.

54 Epp, “The Oxyrhynchus New Testament Papyri,” 21–35; Thomas J. Kraus, “The Lending Of Books In The Fourth Century C.E. P.Oxy. LXIII 4365—A Letter On Papyrus And The Reciprocal Lending Of Literature Having Become Apocryphal,” in *Ad Fontes*, 185–206.

55 Houston, *Inside Roman Libraries*, 60.

56 Medea Norsa, “Elenco di opere letterarie,” *Aeg* 2 (1921): 17–20. The back of this book list preserves a land register from the third century CE: Rosario Pintaudi, “SB V 7633: Registro di terreni,” *Aeg* 88 (2008): 121–126.

Major, *Hippias Minor*, and Aristotle's *Eudemus*.⁵⁷ Two other manuscripts mention pairs of dialogues (one with Plato's *Meno* and *Menexenus*, the other with Plato's *Parmenides* and *Anacharsis* by Lucian of Samosata). Both Houston and Enzo Puglia understand these booklist entries featuring multiple titles as references to opisthographic manuscripts.⁵⁸ Puglia gives two, related reasons for this. First, he argues that there is simply no evidence for the presence of multiple texts by different authors on a single side of a papyrus from Oxyrhynchus (or any other collection of classical papyri). Second, other booklists frequently indicate that when multiple titles are listed together, they refer to opisthographs.⁵⁹ Therefore, Puglia assumes that Otranto list 16 follows a similar scribal convention. Regarding the manuscript with three Platonic dialogues, Puglia suggests that it is more plausible for a scribe to have written *Hippias Major* and *Hippias Minor* on the front and *Eudemus* on the verso of a large scroll.⁶⁰

No material remains have passed down to us of the manuscripts mentioned on these book lists, so some reservation is required in our analysis of them. Their material characteristics remain unknown to us, and we can't ascertain whether they contained full compositions or only extracts. However, based on these titles, we can speculate about possible connections between the compositions we encounter on these 'hypothetical opisthographs.' All the compositions mentioned on Otranto list 16 that share the same manuscript with another text are Platonic dialogues. If these are indeed opisthographs, then it seems highly likely that they represent intentional collections. These manuscripts recall the opisthograph 4Q509/4Q496/4Q506 discussed in Part 2, on which extracts from several compositions were assembled. However, we should not exclude the possibility that this concerns manuscripts on which these compositions were written continuously, perhaps comparable to Stegemann's characterization of 1QS, 1QSa, and 1QSB as a *Sammelhandschrift*.⁶¹ The scribe/user/collector behind list 16 likely had a scholarly interest in philosophical literatures and perhaps wanted to compare different versions of his

57 Houston, "Papyrological Evidence for Book Collections and Libraries" 234–237; Houston, *Inside Roman Libraries*, 78; Enzo Puglia, "Il catalogo di un fondo librario di Ossirinco del III d. C. (PSILaur. inv. 19662)," *ZPE* 113 (1996): 51–65, at 56–58.

58 Puglia, "Il catalogo di un fondo librario," 56–58; Houston, "Papyrological Evidence for Book Collections and Libraries," 236.6.

59 Puglia gives the book catalogue on the verso of P.Vars 5 as an example: "Il catalogo di un fondo librario," 58.

60 Puglia, "Il catalogo di un fondo librario," 58.

61 Stegemann, "Zu Textbestand und Grundgedanken von "1QS" III,13–IV, 26," 96. Alternatively, it is possible that the manuscripts listed on Otranto list 16 constituted the working copies of a scribe with a particular interest in Platonic philosophy.

texts.⁶² In this way, these book lists on papyrus may offer us a glimpse into the interests, concerns and motivations behind the collections they represent. These assemblages of books are often specifically compiled to serve a specific purpose, be it private, personal, or scholarly in nature.

For material artefacts we have to turn to Houston's second type of evidence: concentrations of papyri found together in archaeological sites.⁶³ The study of ancient societies has profited in many different ways from the manuscript finds of the late 19th and 20th centuries. They provided not only a wealth of new compositions, but also the opportunity to study manuscripts from material and archaeological perspectives. I am not only interested in manuscript finds in isolation, but rather in collecting practices and the management of books from a broader, comparative perspective, especially where it can contribute to our understanding of the scribal cultures of ancient Judaism. In the next chapter of this study, our attention will therefore be redirected towards Herculaneum in Southern Italy. As will be discussed, the collection discovered in the *Villa of the Papyri* has the benefit that the papyri were discovered in an archaeological context that allows us to think through the dynamics of collecting practices in new ways.

62 Otranto, *Antiche liste di libri su papiro*, 95.

63 Houston offers an overview of the most significant concentrations from Egypt and at Herculaneum. As he is primarily interested in papyri, his contribution leaves out the finds from the Cairo Genizah, Nag Hammadi, and the Dead Sea Scrolls. Houston, "Papyrological Evidence for Book Collections and Libraries," 249.

The *Villa of the Papyri* and Graeco-Roman Practices of Collection

1 Herculaneum and the *Villa of the Papyri*

In the Bay of Naples, buried between about twenty meters of volcanic material and debris, lie the Roman cities of Pompeii and Herculaneum. Ever since the eruption of the Vesuvius in 79 the two cities have functioned almost like a time capsule; preserving a snapshot of daily life in Roman times within a thick cover of dust and ash. The rediscovery of Herculaneum commenced in 1709, when news spread that local well-diggers discovered ancient art and statues buried in the ground, presumably from Herculaneum's ancient theatre.¹ The excavations of the area started with Prince Emmanuel d'Elboeuf taking over from the well-diggers and starting a search for more sculptures and other artefacts that European elites could acquire to decorate their houses.

For our purposes here, 1750 is even more significant, because in that year Karl Weber, the Swiss army engineer and architect that had joined the excavations the year before, investigated a marble floor that turned out to be part of the structure that is now known as the *Villa of the Papyri*, a large villa similar to the other suburban residences in Herculaneum, Pompeii, and Stabiae where Roman elites came to escape the commotion of the capital. The exploration of the *Villa* was largely motivated by the potential to acquire bronze and marble statues, but Weber explored the site very systematically and the measurements he took in the excavation tunnels allow us to get some idea of the size of the structure.² The construction of the *Villa* is, with some variety, generally dated to the second half of the first century BCE.³ The main building was arranged

-
- 1 The rediscovery of Pompeii, Herculaneum, and other sites in the region is described in detail in Christopher C. Parslow, *Rediscovering Antiquity: Karl Weber and the Excavation of Herculaneum, Pompeii, and Stabiae* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995); overviews of more recent archaeological research are provided in Mantha Zarmakoupi, ed., *The Villa of the Papyri at Herculaneum: Archaeology, Reception, and Digital Reconstruction*, *Sozomena* 1 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2010).
 - 2 David Sider, *The Library of the Villa dei Papi at Herculaneum* (Los Angeles: Getty Publications, 2005), 4, 18.
 - 3 Houston, *Inside Roman Libraries*, 88; Antonio De Simone argues on the basis of a comparison with other elite residences in the area that the *Villa* was built around the middle of the first

according to the plan of a classical Roman atrium, and surrounded by a very large garden of 94×32 m, and a smaller one of 21×21 m.⁴ Antonio De Simone characterized the *Villa* as “one of the clearest and most significant examples of this phenomenon of regal residences,” which is supported by the presence of significant collections of about 90 statues, wall paintings, metal objects.⁵ The clearest indication of the extraordinary status of the *Villa* however is the large papyri collection it would be named after.

2 Deposition Context and ‘Lived’ Context

Our main literary source for the destruction of Herculaneum is found in two letters Pliny the Younger wrote to Tacitus in which he provides us with an eyewitness account of the eruption of the Vesuvius. He had witnessed the disaster from Misenum in the Bay of Naples, where his uncle Pliny the Elder was stationed.⁶ Though Pliny’s account mainly focuses on the heroics of his uncle, it at the same time evokes a scene of complete terror and bewilderment. From one moment to the next the roughly 20,000 inhabitants of Pompeii and Herculaneum were struck by an event they could not understand. The tragic circumstance that people were trapped during their daily lives provides scholars today the opportunity to access a first century Roman site that is undisturbed by later events. The unique circumstance of discovering an ancient urban centre unhampered by centuries of occupation is an important characteristic of the site of Herculaneum that contributes to the significance of the *Villa of the Papyri*.

The discovery of the *Villa of the Papyri* is of importance for the study of book collections in antiquity and for understanding the ways in which ancient scribes and readers engaged with their texts. Here, I wish to focus on the relevance of deposition and lived contexts. In his analyses of the Dead Sea Scrolls and other Judaeian Desert manuscript collections, Popović developed the dis-

century BCE: “Rediscovering the Villa of the Papyri,” in *The Villa of the Papyri at Herculaneum: Archaeology, Reception, and Digital Reconstruction*, 1–20, at 11. A study of the pavements and wall paintings by Maria P. Guidobaldi and Domenico Esposito dates the first phase of the *Villa* to the third quarter of the first century BCE: “New Archaeological Research at the Villa of the Papyri in Herculaneum,” in *The Villa of the Papyri at Herculaneum: Archaeology, Reception, and Digital Reconstruction*, 21–61, at 40–41.

4 Sider, *The Library of the Villa dei Papi*, 4.

5 De Simone, “Rediscovering the Villa of the Papyri,” 18.

6 Pliny the Younger, *Epistulae*, 6.16 and 6.20; Pliny the Younger, *Letters*, Volume 1: Books 1–7, Translated by Betty Radice, LCL 55 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1969).

inction between the manuscripts' deposition context, which he defines as "the evidence that caused manuscripts being deposited in the places where they were found," and their 'lived' context, "the use and the owners of the Dead Sea Scrolls before they were deposited or left behind."⁷ As Popović notes, this distinction is to a certain degree arbitrary because the archaeological records in general only preserve the deposition context, leaving the challenge to researchers in order to reason back to the lived context.⁸ Nevertheless, it serves as a point of departure and heuristic tool by allowing scholars to arrive at a more sustained analysis of their evidence by separating the interpretation of these two contexts in order to think through the different scenarios in which the manuscripts were used and disseminated.

It is important to first get to a careful description of the deposition context in which historical artefacts were discovered. This is not self-evident. Archaeologists have traditionally distinguished between 'primary' and 'secondary' contexts to refer to the degree of disturbance since objects were deposited.⁹ Artefacts that have not been disturbed or transformed after their deposition are said to be in their primary context. However, many different factors can affect objects after their original abandonment. Jürgen Zangenberg refers to these factors as post-depositional processes and points to the many natural (such as erosion or collapse), animal-made (silverfish or bat guano), and human (looting or demolition) causes that impact the condition in which a site survives before modern archaeologists first inspect it.¹⁰ Artefacts that have been affected by such post-depositional processes are said to be in their secondary context. The distinction between these different contexts is to a certain extent a scholarly construct. A completely primary context seems utopian, because objects under normal conditions are continuously influenced by their surroundings. However, the degree to which these post-depositional processes take place is very much context-dependent. Pompeii and Herculaneum are very unusual in this regard: the thick layer of volcanic ash has allowed both sites to be preserved in extraordinary conditions, and to be much less affected by post-depositional processes than otherwise would have been the case. This is evidenced by the fact that Herculaneum is one of the very few locations where a

7 Popović, "Qumran as Scroll Storehouse in Times of Crisis?" 553; idem, "The Manuscript Collections: An Overview," 44.

8 Popović, "Qumran as Scroll Storehouse in Times of Crisis?" 553.

9 See for example Colin Renfrew and Paul G. Bahn, *Archaeology: Theories, Methods and Practice*, 6th ed. (London: Thames & Hudson, 2012), 49–72.

10 Jürgen Zangenberg, "The Functions of the Caves and the Settlement of Qumran: Reflections on a New Chapter of Qumran Research," in *The Caves of Qumran*, 195–209.

sizable papyrus concentration has survived outside Egypt (where natural conditions are much more favourable for the preservation of organic material). The absence of significant post-depositional interference in Herculaneum allows us to move much closer to the primary depositional context. In the case of the *Villa of the Papyri* this constitutes the situational context in which the manuscripts were left behind.

Subsequently, when the depositional context is understood as best as possible, one can move forward and try to think through the ‘lived’ context of the site, the circumstances under which our artefacts were deposited, and part of the social reality of the people that were involved. As we will see, the deposition context can provide different direct and indirect forms of evidence that can help us contemplate the lived context.

Of course, in most cases only the deposition context has been preserved to base our enquiries on. The deposition context of the Oxyrhynchus papyri is a trash dump where the manuscripts were discarded together with other rubbish ranging from keys and textile to broken pottery.¹¹ This does not mean that the archaeological context is of no value: which types of manuscripts were disposed in such a prosaic fashion can tell us more about how particular manuscripts were perceived at a certain moment. However, the deposition context of Oxyrhynchus does not provide a clear window on how the papyri were used before they were deposed, which manuscripts were collected together, and which types of reading events the people behind the papyri organized around them.

Nevertheless, regarding the Dead Sea Scrolls, Popović argues that under certain circumstances it is “possible to reason back from the deposition context to the lived context.”¹² To provide an example of scrolls that were possibly discovered in their original, lived context Popović points to the Psalms manuscript Mas 1f (MasPsalms-b) and Ben Sira manuscript Mas 1h (MasSir) that were found at Masada.¹³ These manuscripts were discovered in rooms where individual families resided during the years of the Jewish Revolt, which indicates that they were part of the property of a small family rather than for example a library

11 Many of the objects other than manuscripts that were discovered at Oxyrhynchus are listed in Donald M. Bailey, “Objects from Oxyrhynchus in the British Museum and the Victoria and Albert Museum,” in *Oxyrhynchus: A City and Its Texts*, ed. Alan K. Bowman et al. (London: Egypt Exploration Society, 2007), 369–381.

12 Popović, “Qumran as Scroll Storehouse in Times of Crisis?” 553.

13 Ehud Netzer, *Masada 111: The Yigael Yadin Excavations 1963–1965 Final Reports: the Buildings, Stratigraphy and Architecture* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1991), 554–556, 564–565.

or institution.¹⁴ Such evidence is important to consider when thinking about the dissemination of book possession. One can safely infer, for example, that book possession was not restricted to libraries or other institutions, but that individuals or families could own at least a limited corpus of manuscripts as well.¹⁵ More specifically, the deposition context of these Masada manuscripts indicates that such book possession extended not only to legal documents, but also to literary manuscripts. These privately owned manuscripts were apparently considered to be of such value that refugees took them with them on their search for safety.

3 The Archaeology of the *Villa of the Papyri*

The *Villa of the Papyri* seems to present us with the rare occasion of both deposition and lived context virtually overlapping, because the manuscripts were discovered inside the structure in which they were housed during at least the period leading up to the eruption of the Vesuvius. Before we hypothesize about the use of the manuscripts and their relation to the building, we should first try to describe their deposition context as closely as we can.

The exact locations of discovery are difficult to recover, because the earliest archaeological records from the 18th century do not present us with a fully reliable account.¹⁶ As was addressed above, during the first decades after the rediscovery of Herculaneum explorers were mostly occupied with the search for statues and other treasures to add to their antiquarian collections. The location of discovery of these artefacts is therefore usually unknown, because excavation reports were hardly managed and excavation tunnels would sometimes run right through stratigraphic layers.¹⁷ Nevertheless, it is possible to reconstruct where the papyri were discovered with some degree of certainty.

In October 1752 excavations were going on inside the *tablinum* of the building when workers discovered carbonized wooden shelves against the wall with

14 Popović, "Qumran as Scroll Storehouse in Times of Crisis?" 568.

15 Studies of ancient literacy and manuscript circulation tend to be concentrated on either institutions or on priestly and scribal elites, while families or individuals are often not considered. However, Michael Wise has recently argued that Roman Judaea might have had a reasonably large group of relatively wealthy householders that were literate: Michael O. Wise, *Language and Literacy in Roman Judaea: A Study of the Bar Kokhba Documents* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2015), 279–355.

16 Some accounts and logbooks were published in Michele Ruggiero, *Storia degli scavi di Ercolano ricomposta su' documenti superstiti* (Naples, 1885).

17 Sider, *The Library of the Villa dei Papiri*, 17.

what seemed to be charcoal objects that were thrown aside in search for valuable items.¹⁸ Karl Weber, the excavation leader, identified writing on some of them and discovered that they actually were papyri carrying ancient texts. Apart from the *tablinum*, scrolls were found in at least three other rooms:¹⁹

- The majority of manuscripts were unearthed in a small room which in Weber’s floor plan is numbered “v.” The room is located close to the living quarters of the *Villa* and offers a view on the courtyard. The scrolls in this room were found both in cabinets against the wall, and piled up on the floor. David Sider reconstructs a table here on which the papyri could have been read.²⁰ Scholars sometimes refer to this room as the library of the *Villa*.²¹
- A room of about half the size of the ‘library,’ which Weber numbered “xvi.” This room is located next to the dining room and has an entry into the peristylum-garden. The floor was decorated with a mosaic pavement. Here scrolls were found both in piles on the ground and in *capsae*, a kind of bucket-shaped leather case that was used to carry scrolls.²² It has been suggested that these leather cases were filled with papyri by people who wanted to bring them in safety before the *Villa* would be destroyed by ash and pumice from the volcano eruption.²³
- Next to the doorway that connects Weber’s room “xvi” to a small peristyle, an uncovered porch. Also, here papyri were discovered in both *capsae* and in piles on the ground.

The exact number of manuscripts uncovered at the *Villa* is unclear. Many scrolls were probably disposed in the 18th century, or were otherwise destroyed upon unrolling.²⁴ Marcello Gigante’s overview of all papyri lists 1826, but this number is probably too high because it includes many smaller fragments of scrolls as

18 Sandra Sider, “Herculaneum’s Library in 79 A.D.: The Villa of the Papyri,” *Libraries and Culture* 25 (1990): 534–542, at 536.

19 Sider, “Herculaneum’s Library in 79 A.D.,” 537; Houston, *Inside Roman Libraries*, 88; David Sider provides a map on which the findspots are indicated: *The Library of the Villa dei Papiri*, 62.

20 Sider, *The Library of the Villa dei Papiri*, 62, figure 64.

21 Carlo Gallavotti, “La libreria di una villa romana ercolanese,” *Bollettino istituto di patologia del libro* 3 (1941): 129–145. This room was immediately after its discovery in 1754 identified as a library. Camillo Paderni mentions it in a letter to his English friend Thomas Hollis that is dated 27 April 1754: *CDP*, 242.

22 Menahem Haran, “Book-Scrolls at the Beginning of the Second Temple Period,” 116 n. 9.

23 Francesca Longo Auricchio and Mario Capasso, “I rotoli della Villa ercolanese: Dislocazione e ritrovamento,” *CERC* 17 (1987): 37–47.

24 Sider, *The Library of the Villa dei Papiri*, 64.

separate manuscripts.²⁵ The total collection is now generally accepted to number between 800 and 1100 scrolls.²⁶

The excavators in the 18th century unfortunately did not record which manuscript was found at which findspot, but we do know that the bulk of the corpus was found in Weber's room v, or the 'library.' The evidence is unclear concerning the further arrangement of this room, especially because apart from the scrolls other items such as furniture did not stand the test of time. However, later sources do provide some anecdotal evidence. Johann Winckelmann, who had visited Herculaneum several times, describes in a letter from 1764 a shelf-like structure or table in the middle of the room "designed to hold texts on either side so that one could walk around it. The wood of these shelves was burnt to charcoal, and, as one can easily imagine, they collapsed upon being touched."²⁷ Unfortunately Winckelmann's report does not offer further details about its dimensions or traces of use. If one cautiously accepts this brief testimony by Winckelmann, one can surmise that the table appears to have functioned as a desk, on which manuscripts could be read, studied, and maybe even copied.²⁸ Thin metal sheets were discovered in and around this room, which originally would have carried an inscription that may have been used as a label for the bookshelves on which the papyri were stored.²⁹

The collection was multilingual: the majority of manuscripts contained texts in Greek, but also a sizable collection of about sixty to eighty Latin papyri has

-
- 25 Marcello Gigante, *Catalogo dei papiri ercolanesi* (Naples: Bibliopolis, 1979); Houston, *Inside Roman Libraries*, 99.
- 26 Richard Janko, *Philodemus: "On Poems," Book 1. Edited with Introduction, Translation and Commentary* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 4; idem, "The Herculaneum Library: Some Recent Developments," *Estudios Clásicos* 121 (2002): 25–41; Sider, *The Library of the Villa dei Papiri*, 64.
- 27 Carol C. Mattusch, *Johann Joachim Winckelmann: Letter of Report on the Discoveries at Herculaneum* (Los Angeles: The J. Paul Getty Museum, 2011), 117. To my knowledge, Winckelmann's letter offers the only description of this table.
- 28 This would, however, be a unique circumstance: there is no archaeological evidence for the presence of a table or desk in Graeco-Roman libraries. See the discussion by Jocelyn P. Small, *Wax Tablets of the Mind: Cognitive Studies of Memory and Literacy in Classical Antiquity* (London: Routledge, 1997), 133–137, 143. There is, however, iconographic evidence: the relief of an orator from the 4th century CE preserved in the Museo Ostiense (Inv. 130). This relief depicts two scribes sitting at tables and writing on what seems to be tablets, while a figure on a stage is orating in the middle: Lucio Del Corso, "L'Insegnamento alla luce delle testimonianze iconografiche," in *L'Enseignement supérieur dans les mondes antiques et médiévaux*, ed. Henri Huggonard-Roche, *Textes et traditions* 16 (Paris: Vrin, 2008), 307–331, at 327.
- 29 Sider, "Herculaneum's Library in 79 A.D.," 538.

been discovered.³⁰ The issue of multilingualism in manuscript collections will be discussed in some detail below. With regard to the archaeology of the site it is important to note that there is some evidence that Roman libraries tended to store Greek and Roman papyri in different departments.³¹ It is possible that a different library with Latin works was housed in a part of the *Villa* that has not yet been excavated.³² However, Greek and Latin papyri were discovered next to each other in room v, the ‘library’, and probably in the tablinum as well, which would suggest that works in both languages were stored side by side in the *Villa*.³³

4 The Collection of Papyri

The association of the *Villa* papyri with the Epicurean philosopher and poet Philodemus of Gadara and Epicurean philosophy in general goes back to the first decades after their discovery.³⁴ The first type of evidence that pointed historians in this direction, the three sculptures of Epicurus and two of the Epicurean philosopher Hermarchus that were unearthed in the *Villa*, was shortly followed by the discovery of papyri containing works by Philodemus.³⁵ This

30 Houston, *Inside Roman Libraries*, 97.

31 Greek and Latin texts were stored in separate locations within the library of the Baths of Caracalla. Furthermore, Suetonius tells us that Augustus added a Latin and a Greek library to the Temple of Apollo: Suetonius, *Augustus*, 29.3. Cf. T. Keith Dix, “‘Public Libraries’ at Rome: Ideology and Reality,” *Libraries and Culture* 29 (1994): 282–296; Casson, *Libraries in the Ancient World*, 81; Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra, “Old Caves and Young Caves: A Statistical Reevaluation of a Qumran Consensus,” *DSD* 14 (2007): 313–333, at 323. Arguments against this suggestion are provided in Popović, “Qumran as Scroll Storehouse in Times of Crisis?” 571.

32 Sider, *The Library of the Villa dei Papiri*, 43.

33 Houston, *Inside Roman Libraries*, 88 n. 4.

34 David Sider designates Camillo Paderni, curator of the Museum Herculaneum in Portici, to be the first to report about the philosophical nature of the collection: Sider, *The Library of the Villa dei Papiri*, 20–23, 60.

35 Overview of the sculptures: Carol C. Mattusch, *The Villa dei Papiri at Herculaneum: Life and Afterlife of a Sculpture Collection* (Los Angeles: The J. Paul Getty Museum, 2005), 289–296.

According to Winckelmann’s overview of discovery from 1762 the first four rolls that were fully unrolled all belonged to Philodemus: Johann J. Winckelmann, *Critical account of the situation and destruction by the first eruptions of Mount Vesuvius of Herculaneum, Pompeii, and Stabia* (London, 1771). Translation of *Lettre de M. L’Abbé Winckelmann, à Monsieur le Comte de Brihl, Sur les Découvertes d’Herculaneum* (Paris, 1764). By the early 19th century the Epicurean nature of the collection was evident: David Sider, “The Books of the Villa of the Papyri,” in *The Villa of the Papyri at Herculaneum: Archaeology, Reception, and Digital Reconstruction*, 115–127, at 122.

categorization is still commonplace in scholarship and probably rightly so. However, some footnotes need to be added here. First, this qualification primarily applies to the Greek texts. The much smaller Latin corpus is less uniform and cannot straightforwardly be associated with Epicurean philosophy, though it is possible that it included at least one copy of Lucretius' Epicurean poem *De rerum natura*.³⁶ Correspondingly, one cannot exclude the possibility that non-philosophical literature was stored in parts of the *Villa* that have not yet been explored. Finally, we should note that according to Houston only about half of the titles from the collection have been identified thus far.³⁷ To summarize the challenge: our current assessment could be based on only part of the collection, and even that part is not completely understood.

Despite these reservations, with the evidence that is available to us there is good reason to characterize at least the Greek papyri as an Epicurean collection. All works are related to Hellenistic philosophy and the majority to Epicureanism with Philodemus as the most eye-catching name.³⁸ On the basis of the papyri's *subscriptions*, the title and/or author of the composition given at the end of the manuscript, Houston estimates that about 58% of the manuscripts contain compositions by Philodemus.³⁹ Among these, many of his philosophical treatises have been preserved that are dedicated to a particular topic, such as *On Music*, *On Death*, *On Rhetoric*, and *On Poems*. Eighteen of his texts survived in multiple copies in the *Villa*, such as his large work *History of the Philosophers*, which we will return to later.⁴⁰

Due to the considerable representation of his works among the papyri, Philodemus has become the focal point of many studies on the *Villa* collection. A recent article by Houston foregrounds the manuscripts by authors other than Philodemus. Unsurprisingly these include a number of Epicurean writers starting with Epicurus himself. Seven books from his 37-volume work *On Nature* are present among the papyri (some in two or three copies), but interestingly no other of his titles even though Diogenes Laertius attributes about 40 works

36 Identified by Knut Kleve in "Lucretius in Herculaneum," *CERC* 19 (1989): 5–27. This identification remains tentative however: Houston, *Inside Roman Libraries*, 98 n. 57.

37 Houston, *Inside Roman Libraries*, 99–100.

38 Sider, *The Library of the Villa dei Papiri*, 73.

39 This is based on the fact that Philodemus is mentioned as the author for 44 of the surviving 75 *subscriptions*: George W. Houston, "The non-Philodemus Book Collection in the Villa of the Papyri," in *Ancient Libraries*, 183–208, at 184–185.

40 More detailed overviews of Philodemus' works found in the *Villa* are provided by Gigante, David Sider and Houston: Marcello Gigante, *Philodemus in Italy: the Books from Herculaneum*, trans. Dirk Obbink (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1995); Sider, *The Library of the Villa dei Papiri*, 78–95; Houston, *Inside Roman Libraries*, 92–96.

to Epicurus.⁴¹ At least six other Epicurean writers are represented: Carneiscus, Colotes, Demetrius Laco, Metrodorus of Lampsacus, Polystratus, and Zeno of Sidon. Their writings fall under the genre of philosophical treatises, but deal with a wide range of topics, such as ethics, textual criticism, and geometry. Houston observes that if his estimation that 58% of manuscripts of the collection are indeed by Philodemus is correct, then the collection as it survived today could not possibly have included all works by the major Epicurean writers that are mentioned in Diogenes Laertius' *Lives of the Philosophers*.⁴² The *Villa* collection therefore either was far from complete, or deliberately only preserves a selection of Epicurean philosophy.

There are also a few works that ostensibly are not related to Epicurean philosophy. The clear outliers are at least three and perhaps up to five manuscripts by the Stoic philosopher Chrysippus represented in the collection.⁴³ One explanation offered is that this composition would serve to find arguments against Stoicism.⁴⁴ This is certainly possible, but remains speculation. It seems to me that the broad interest in Hellenistic philosophy of the people behind the *Villa* collection is enough to warrant the presence of Stoic works. It should be noted in this regard that the *Villa* also housed many statues of non-Epicureans. So if we characterize the *Villa* papyri as Epicurean, we have to admit that it's not only an Epicurean collection, but also to some degree a reflection of other philosophical trends of the time.

As noted above, the about sixty to eighty Latin scrolls form a less coherent corpus. They survived mostly in a very fragmentary state. The most complete papyrus is the anonymous epic hexameter poem *Carmen de bello Actiaco* (P.Herc. 817), which concerns a retelling of the Battle of Actium.⁴⁵ Three other papyri seemingly contain speeches, while Knut Kleve's identification of works by Ennius, Caecilius Statius, and Lucretius remains tentative.⁴⁶

41 Houston, "The non-Philodemus Book Collection in the Villa of the Papyri," 186.

42 Houston, *Inside Roman Libraries*, 100.

43 Houston, *Inside Roman Libraries*, 90. Houston also attributes the anonymous P.Herc. 1158 to a Stoic author: *ibid.* 97.

44 Philodemus does attack Stoics on several occasions and often polemically refers to Chrysippus and other Stoic philosophers, but also to Plato and Aristotle. Janko, "The Herculaneum Library: Some Recent Developments," 32; Sider, *The Library of the Villa dei Papyri*, 79–81, 87. For mentions of works by other authors in Philodemus' work: Daniel Delattre, "Les mentions de titres d'œuvres dans les livres de Philodème," *CÉrc* 26 (1996): 143–168.

45 Edition: Giovanni Garuti, *C. Rabirius, Bellum Actiacum e papyro Herculansensi 817* (Bologna: N. Zanichelli, 1958).

46 Houston, *Inside Roman Libraries*, 98.

5 Diachronicity and Dynamism

One aspect that has not yet been addressed is the issue of diachronicity. In order to date the *Villa-papyri* researchers rely on the assessment of scribal hands, which results in a chronology ranging from the third century BCE to the first century CE, within which the individual manuscripts can be placed.⁴⁷ These palaeographic datings can help us think through the practice of collection building in antiquity. The underlying assumption is that the older manuscripts entered the collection earlier, while the younger papyri were added later perhaps with the intention to enrich the library, or to reflect the changing interest of the *collectionneurs*. One cannot take this sequence of events for granted, but such a scenario is worthwhile to think through.

Many of the scribal hands of the *Villa-papyri* have been analysed individually, but the most extensive synthesis of all manuscripts together has been provided by Guglielmo Cavallo in his *Libri scritte scribi a Ercolano*.⁴⁸ Cavallo subdivided the scripts of the papyri into 17 different groups and furthermore identified at least 34 scribal hands that would have copied two or more different manuscripts. Cavallo is interested not only in palaeographic typologies, but also in how they can help us understand the evolution of the collection. In this way, he reconstructs a history of the collection that can be divided in three different stages (see table 8).⁴⁹

Cavallo's reconstruction starts with a core cluster of thematically related compositions, around which the wider collection was shaped. This core cluster with the oldest manuscripts consists of works associated with Epicureanism.⁵⁰

47 It should be noted that palaeographic datings by their very nature offer approximations. In the most favourable scenario, they will still give us a timeframe of at least several decades. One should therefore be careful not to attach too much importance to the dating of individual papyri. However, the palaeographic analysis of the scribal hands of a large manuscript corpus over a significant period of time can give us a good indication of tendencies in datings and stylistic developments; and can allow us to identify different palaeographic periods.

48 Cavallo, *Libri scritte scribi a Ercolano*. Cavallo draws on Eric Turner's study of Greek papyri from Egypt as a comparative model: Turner, *Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World*; idem, "Ptolemaic Bookhands and Lille Stesichorus," *Scrittura e Civiltà* 4 (1980): 19–40.

Cavallo's analysis of the *Villa-papyri* has contributed significantly to our understanding of Greek palaeography, but his typology should nevertheless be treated with some caution. His classification is still the only full treatment of the palaeography of the Herculaneum papyri and has never been critically assessed in its entirety.

49 Cavallo, *Libri scritte scribi a Ercolano*, 28–46, 58–66.

50 More manuscripts with works by other authors than Philodemus were dated to the second

TABLE 8 Stages of the *Villa*-papyri according to Cavallo

Stage 1	Early manuscripts (from the third century until the early first century BCE) that consist of a core collection of basic Epicurean works; including manuscripts by Epicurus, Demetrius Laco, Carneiscus, Polystratus, and Metrodorus. This core collection would have consisted of up to 200 scrolls. ^a
Stage 2	The majority of the manuscripts that were made in the first century BCE, in particular the works by Philodemus. Main body of papyri dates from this period.
Stage 3	The manuscripts that were dated after Philodemus's death; consists of Epicurean works, but also the majority of Latin works and the compositions by Chrysippus. ^b

a This reconstruction suggests that part of the *Villa*-collection precedes the *Villa of the Papyri* and perhaps also Philodemus. Cavallo in fact hypothesizes that the older manuscripts were produced in Greece or the eastern Mediterranean and later ended up in the hands of Philodemus (perhaps as part of an inheritance); Guglielmo Cavallo, "I rotoli di Ercolano come prodotti scritti: Quattro riflessioni," *Scrittura e Civiltà* 8 (1984): 5–30, at 5–12; Gigante, *Philodemus in Italy*, 18.

b The Latin works that certainly date to this stage include P.Herc. 817 and P.Herc. 1067. P.Herc. 817, mentioned above, concerns a poem on the Battle of Actium which took place in 31 BCE. P.Herc. 1067 is a historical work that contains references to one of the emperors and was recently associated with Seneca the Elder: Valeria Piano, "Il PHerc. 1067 latino: Il rotolo, il testo, l'autore," *CErc* 47 (2017): 163–250.

Paolo Radiciotti has dated a number of the other Latin manuscripts palaeographically to the first century BCE, which means that they could also belong to stage 2: Paolo Radiciotti, "Osservazioni paleografiche sui papiri latini di Ercolano," *Scrittura e Civiltà* 22 (1998): 353–370, at 365–370. As far as I know no Latin papyri have been dated to stage 1.

We have to be careful not to overstate the evidence, but the inclusion of non-Epicurean works in the later stage of the collection could indicate that Epicureanism lost popularity in the region, or perhaps that the *Villa* and the collection ended up in different hands that did not share the exclusive interest of the former owners in Epicureanism.⁵¹

However, this scenario also poses a number of problems. First, there is the aforementioned uncertainty regarding palaeographic datings in general, which can only provide estimations. Next to that, it is important to reiterate that such a palaeographic date is not the same as the date that the scroll became part of the collection. It is possible that these were unrelated events. We cannot exclude the possibility that the *collectionneurs* behind the *Villa*-papyri acquired manuscripts that, at the time, already were several decades or perhaps even centuries old.⁵² Additionally, Houston has rightly noted in this context that it

century BCE than to any other century; Houston, "The non-Philodemus Book Collection in the Villa of the Papyri," 188.

51 Declining interest in Epicureanism in the region: Houston, *Inside Roman Libraries*, 123; *Villa* changed hands: Mario Capasso, *Manuale di papirologia ercolanese* (Galatina: Congedo, 1991), 198.

52 The palaeographic dates of the papyri that are grouped in stage 1 by Cavallo predate the

is unknown to us which manuscripts were removed from the collection in the several centuries of its existence, as “texts might have been damaged and discarded, given away as presents, lent and not returned, or sold.”⁵³ One therefore has to be careful when attempting to make definite statements about the nature of the collection in earlier phases. Second, Cavallo’s thesis is centred around the assumption that the collection was shaped by Philodemus personally while working in the *Villa*. Whether or not the death of Philodemus really inaugurated a new phase in the evolution of the collection remains doubtful. As we will see in the next section, we have no decisive evidence that demonstrates this connection of Philodemus to the *Villa*.⁵⁴

Nevertheless, and despite these caveats, this periodization presents us with an impression of dynamism. The character of the papyri collection changes over the course of time, and interests sharpen out. The worldviews and socio-religious beliefs of the people behind the *Villa of the Papyri* were not stable and unchanging, but developing. To provide just one example: all the six manuscripts carrying compositions by the Greek Stoic philosopher Chrysippus are dated to the latest stage of the collection (from the late first century BCE onwards).⁵⁵ These manuscripts are among the *Villa*’s very few non-Epicurean Greek papyri, which is interesting, especially because from an Epicurean perspective Stoicism was regarded to be a competing ideology. It is possible that the people that engaged with the collection and tried to expand it around the turn of the millennium, sought to broaden their horizon by including works from other philosophic traditions. Alternatively, one can imagine that they wanted to intensify their polemics with Stoicism through the study of their intellectual opposition. Whatever the reason, on the basis of our evidence we can conclude that something changed: over time the collection displays a growing heterogeneity, allowing manuscripts to be included that in earlier stages did not have a place. In this way, scholars become increasingly aware of the broader dynamism of ancient manuscript collections. Ancient manuscript collections are selective and the result of ongoing adaptation, for example, to the chan-

Villa by at least several decades. The exact moment that these manuscripts were brought together into one collection is impossible to reconstruct. Gigante argues that “the most ancient core of the library was formed outside Campania. It was probably brought from Athens to Herculaneum by Philodemus himself, where he had formed it or inherited it from his master or masters.” Gigante, *Philodemus in Italy*, 18.

53 Houston, *Inside Roman Libraries*, 123.

54 Houston, *Inside Roman Libraries*, 124–125. Houston also discusses a number of alternative reconstructions.

55 Houston, “The non-Philodemus Book Collection in the Villa of the Papyri,” 198.

ging interests of the owner, or perhaps to what was available on the market. The pre-*Villa*-collection in the second century BCE is something different from the *Villa*-collection in the first century CE. One may perceive ‘collections’ as stable entities from our present-day perspective, but we have to be open to the possibility that in reality we are dealing with continuously changing constellations. Herculaneum is a wonderful case that reminds us of these dynamics and presents us with the opportunity to ask particular questions concerning, for example, the formation of manuscript collections or the scribal setting, use, and potential circulation of manuscripts. We take these questions with us when we consider other corpora and are, in this way, challenged to examine our material from a new perspective. However, before we take this exploration to a next level, we return to the unfinished task of gauging the lived context of the *Villa*-papyri.

6 Herculaneum as a Private, Scholarly Collection

In the preceding sections we have looked at both the deposition context and the corpus of *Villa*-papyri itself. The question I would like to ask here is how we should understand the lived context in which these texts were meaningful to people? What do the characteristics of the Herculaneum scrolls and their archaeological context, as described above, tell us about the people behind the collection that used the *Villa* and read, studied, and collected the manuscripts?

There are a few points that need recapitulation. We have concluded that the papyri were discovered around the living quarters of a typical Roman residential villa; this means that they were found in what we can safely characterize as a private setting. As Houston has argued as well, ‘public’ and ‘private’ are difficult concepts to apply to the ancient world, because they are joined by a set of modern connotations that cannot easily be translated to the distant past (such as the premise that public institutions are funded through public taxes, which most probably was not the case).⁵⁶ When considering the *Villa of the Papyri*, however, there is no reason to suggest that we are dealing with a building that served a public function. The archaeology of the site can safely be identified as a classical atrium house that fits very well with other regional country houses occupied by Roman elites. Its residential character is evidenced through the two peristyle gardens, the elaborate mosaic pavements, and

⁵⁶ Houston, *Inside Roman Libraries*, 3–4.

the sizable collection of bronze and marble statues. Furthermore, excavations in the 21st century have demonstrated that the *Villa* complex is larger than previously assumed: on the lower terrace outside the main structure a smaller seaside pavilion was discovered that included a pool and a monumental hall.⁵⁷ Though this villa is unusually big, it probably was not beyond the financial means of one of Rome's ruling families. The chamber that housed the majority of papyri is not a storage room or an archive, but a room where the manuscripts could be read, studied, and perhaps even composed or copied.⁵⁸ The fact that Greek and Roman literatures were kept together (which is unusual for Roman public libraries) confirms this. When we zoom in on the papyri themselves we are struck by the fact that the corpus is not a random intersection of classical literature of the time or the type of manuscript corpus that we associate with a school. Rather we are dealing with a specialized, philosophical collection that displays a general interest in Epicureanism. The Bay of Naples is known to have been the location of many Epicurean centres, so the presence of such a collection would certainly fit a broader regional pattern.⁵⁹

In conclusion, these aspects of the archaeological evidence of the *Villa* lead us to suggest for the papyri that we are dealing with a private, scholarly collection dedicated to Epicurean philosophy. We may characterize the manuscript corpus as a 'living' collection: the many scribal practices visible in the manuscript evidence testify to a continuous engagement with texts on a high level. We find examples of opisthographs, papyri with scribal interventions such as notes and marginal annotations, and manuscripts consisting of quotations or extracts.⁶⁰ A particular strong indication that we are dealing with a scholarly collection is the fact that some of Philodemus's texts that survived

57 Guidobaldi and Esposito, "New Archaeological Research at the Villa of the Papyri in Herculaneum." The remainders of at least four pieces of furniture were discovered here as well.

58 As discussed above, according to Winckelmann's testimony there would have been a working desk in this room.

59 John H. D'Arms, *Romans on the Bay of Naples and Other Essays on Roman Campania* (Bari: Edipuglia, 2003), 64–67.

60 Overview of the opisthographs found among the *Villa*-papyri: Mario Capasso, "I papiri ercolanesi opistografi," in *Atti del v convegno nazionale di egittologia e papirologia, Firenze, 10–12 dicembre 1999*, ed. Simona Russo (Florence: Istituto Papirologico G. Vitalli, 2000), 5–25. On marginal markings: Houston, "The non-Philodemus Book Collection in the Villa of the Papyri," 191. P.Herc. 118a is an example of a manuscript consisting of extracts: Cesira Militello, *Filodemo. Memorie epicuree (PHerc. 1418 e 310): Edizione, traduzione e commento* (Naples: Bibliopolis, 1997), 82–83.

among the *Villa-papyri* are based on his notes on lectures by his teacher Zeno of Sidon: his *On Frank Criticism*, which survived on P.Herc. 1471, contains the phrase ἐκ τῶν Ζήνωνος σχολῶν, “from Zeno’s classes.”⁶¹

The manuscripts were meaningful to the people who owned them. It is in this regard very relevant that a number of papyri were discovered in *capsae*, portable leather boxes, in what seems to be a last-minute attempt to save them from destruction. We do not know which and how many manuscripts were stored there, but the very act of deposition in those boxes demonstrates how meaningful the texts were for the people behind the collection. If the *capsae* were indeed intended to rescue the papyri from the volcanic eruption, then it evokes a possible resemblance to Qumran. It is widely assumed that the Dead Sea Scrolls were deposited in the caves around the settlement of Qumran in an attempt to safeguard them from Roman soldiers.⁶² In this way, both sites demonstrate the significance of manuscripts: texts belong to the essential set of belongings that people would try to bring into safety even in life-threatening circumstances.

The palaeographical datings of the Herculaneum papyri range to a vast period from roughly the third century BCE to the early first century CE. The most likely explanation is that the people behind the collection had a continued interest in Epicurean philosophy that extended beyond the lifetime of one single *collectionneur*. However, we cannot exclude the possibility that all manuscripts were acquired at one moment in time (though that would mean that papyri that at that time were already 300 years old would have been exchanged).

61 L. Michael White, “A Measure of Parrhesia: The State of the Manuscript of Pherc. 1471,” in *Philodemus and the New Testament World*, ed. John T. Fitzgerald, Dirk Obbink, and Glenn S. Holland, *NovTSup* 111 (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 103–130. This phrase also occurs on P.Herc. 1003 and P.Herc. 1389.

62 An elaborate reconstruction of this scenario can be found in Stegemann, *Die Essener, Qumran, Johannes der Täufer und Jesus*, 93–101. Many variations on this view have been proposed. For example, among others Dimant and Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra have argued that Cave 4 served as a library to the people living at the settlement (a suggestion that goes back to Cross); Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumrân*, 26; Dimant, “Qumran Manuscripts: Contents and Significance,” 36; Stökl Ben Ezra, “Old Caves and Young Caves.” Cave 7 was characterized by Crawford as a “residential cave” that would have belonged to a single inhabitant with a particular interest in Greek manuscripts: Crawford, “Qumran: Caves, Scrolls and Buildings,” 259, 265. However, Popović has pushed back against this assumption: “Qumran as Scroll Storehouse in Times of Crisis?” 571–572. More recently Crawford proposed an alternative explanation and suggested that the scrolls from Cave 7 “came from the Greek section of the originating library”; Crawford, *Scribes and Scrolls at Qumran*, 147.

The question to whom both the *Villa* and the manuscript collection belonged is difficult to answer, but Lucius Calpurnius Piso Caesoninus (ca. 100–ca. 43 BCE) is generally regarded to be the most likely candidate. Piso Caesoninus was known to be a follower of Epicureanism, which would explain his interest in the manuscripts. Furthermore, being both a Roman senator and the father-in-law of Julius Caesar, he was in a position that would have presented him with the financial resources to own and maintain the *Villa*.⁶³ As we have seen, scholarly estimations propose that over half of the manuscripts from the collection would have contained compositions by Philodemus. This, together with the fact that Piso Caesoninus is known to have been his patron, makes it appealing to locate Philodemus in Herculaneum as well and to consider the manuscript collection as his working library. It should be noted that there is only circumstantial evidence that points in this direction. We do not have any data that can concretely connect Philodemus to the *Villa*. However, we do have other evidence that links Philodemus more closely to the manuscript collection, as there are indications that the working draft of at least one of the texts attributed to Philodemus was discovered in Herculaneum. Aside from this connection to Philodemus, this particular manuscript can contribute to our questions regarding the different collecting and scribal practices behind the *Villa*-papyri from another perspective as well. As we are concerned here with different forms of textual engagement, a working draft can provide a window onto compositional strategies that are concealed in a final work. Could such a manuscript help us to get closer to the reading events that were concentrated around these texts, and subsequently to the different ways in which a manuscript could be experienced? With this question in mind, I will discuss this Herculaneum papyrus strongly associated with Philodemus, the opisthograph P.Herc. 1021.

7 Opisthograph P.Herc. 1021 as an ‘Opisthographic Collection’

The Greek manuscript Papyrus Herculaneum 1021 (P.Herc. 1021) is one of the two exemplars of the *History of the Academy* by Philodemus, whose work is, as we have seen, very much associated with the *Villa* collection.⁶⁴

63 Sider extensively discusses the main candidates and concludes that Piso Caesoninus remains the most likely owner of the *Villa*: Sider, *The Library of the Villa dei Papiri*, 5–8.

64 Editions: Siegfried Mekler, *Academicorum philosophorum index herculanensis* (Berlin: Weidmann, 1902), Tiziano Dorandi, *Storia dei filosofi: Platone e l'Accademia: (PHerc. 1021 e 164)* (Naples: Bibliopolis, 1991), and Konrad Gaiser, *Philodems Academica*, Supplementum

This composition deals with the history of Plato's academy from its foundation until the Platonic philosopher Antiochos of Ascalon (125–68 BCE). P.Herc. 1021 is the most complete manuscript and can be characterized by its informal and hastily written script.⁶⁵ It is generally taken to be either Philodemus's own autograph, or otherwise dictated by him. We find evidence for active scribal involvement such as additions, corrections, and transposition signs made by what seem to be two different hands.⁶⁶ A number of marginal annotations and additions were placed both above and below the columns, which were to be processed into a final version. This final edition is most probably preserved in P.Herc. 164, a very fragmentary and palaeographically younger manuscript of the same composition that takes the revisions of P.Herc. 1021 into account.

P.Herc. 1021 is an opisthograph. The text on the verso consists of several columns that were probably intended to supplement or replace the text on the recto.⁶⁷ In this way, the opisthograph can provide an insight into the compositional strategies of ancient scribes. We observe for example that P.Herc. 1021 does not preserve a full narrative, but rather presents extracts from many different authors that wrote on Plato and the Academy, such as Hermippus of Smyrna.⁶⁸ Many of these extracts follow the literal wording of their base texts, but sometimes they are reworked. The practice of note-taking and collecting of extracts for personal use is well established in classical literature, such as in the works of for example Plutarch and Clement of Alexandria, who reworked notes and excerpts when they composed their treatises.⁶⁹ Luc Van der Stockt

Platonicum I (Stuttgart: Frommann-Holzboog, 1988). Gaiser's edition is confined to the parts that concern the Old Academy, which is 26 of the 49 columns of P.Herc. 1021. I am aware of the problems concerning the title. Though it is commonly referred to as *Index Academicorum*, Gaiser prefers the title *Academica*.

65 Cavallo, *Libri scritte scribi a Ercolano*, 33; Dorandi, *Storia dei filosofi: Platone e l'Academia*, 104.

66 Cavallo, *Libri scritte scribi a Ercolano*, 61.

67 Unfortunately, it is not possible to read the verso directly from the manuscript, because the backside was glued unto cardboard ('cartoncino'), which was a common preservation method in the 18th century. Before this was done however drawings were made of the 12 columns on the verso, which are now stored in the Bodleian Library in Oxford: Aurélie Tourmié et al., "Ancient Greek Text Concealed on the Back of Unrolled Papyrus Revealed through Shortwave-infrared Hyperspectral Imaging," *Science Advances* 5/10 (2019), <https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.aav8936>.

68 Hermippus is being referred to in column 10:40–12:41. Other authors include Dicaearchus of Messana, Antigonos of Carystus, and Apollodoros of Athens. See Gaiser for an overview of Philodemus' sources: *Philodems Academica*, 97–133. Kilian Fleischer, "Melanthios von Rhodos in Apollodors Chronik (P.Herc. 1021, col. xxx1)," *Phil* 162 (2018): 15–24.

69 Annewies van den Hoek, "Techniques of Quotation in Clement of Alexandria: A View of

argued that Plutarch for his *De tranquillitate animi* had his *hypómneia* (notes, annotations, and comments) within reach and consulted them when necessary, a working method he probably also used for other treatises.⁷⁰ We have earlier looked at Pliny the Younger's letter to Baebius Macer and how he would have used opisthographs to copy or mark down relevant passages, resulting in a scroll that consists of a collection of excerpts from different compositions. We have seen in the previous part that there is also evidence for these practices in a number of Dead Sea Scrolls.

P.Herc. 1021 seems to correspond very well to these types of textual practices. Tiziano Dorandi sees "a sample of how Pliny *commentarii* could look like in P.Herc. 1021, a roll treasuring a collection of excerpta taken from different sources, brought together by Philodemus in prevision of his work on *Academicus philosophus* included in *Collection of the Philosophers*."⁷¹ Dorandi hypothesizes how Philodemus would have read a range of sources during which he (or an assistant) would have noted down the passages that caught his interest on a separate manuscript.⁷² The recto of P.Herc. 1021 would have been the first result of such an investigation, additional excerpts were later added on the verso, including many parallel passages with the front side. P.Herc. 1021 demonstrates how an opisthograph could function as (1) a collection of texts from many different sources, and (2) as a rough draft of a new composition. Additionally, this opisthograph ties Philodemus more closely to the *Villa-papyri*, especially when we consider P.Herc. 1021 in relation to P.Herc. 164. This allows us to establish that the papyri do not just constitute a collection of someone with a particular interest in Epicureanism and Philodemus in particular, but that they are directly associated with Philodemus' working library. The most likely explanation seems that it concerns Philodemus' own autograph or a text dictated by him directly. But if this was not the case than at least the papyrus must have originated from the same circle of scribes in which he was working.

However, the main point here is that P.Herc. 1021 presents us with a striking parallel for the collection of extracts from different texts on one opisthograph with the intention to compose a new text. For this type of scrolls, manuscripts that collect parts of texts from different sources on both recto and verso, I would

Ancient Literary Working Methods," *VC* 50 (1996): 223–243; Luc van der Stockt, "A Plutarchan Hypomnema on Self-Love," *AJP* 120 (1999): 575–599.

70 Van der Stockt, "A Plutarchan Hypomnema on Self-Love," 596.

71 Tiziano Dorandi, "Notebooks and Collections of Excerpts: Moments of *ars excerptendi* in the Greco-Roman World," in *Forgetting Machines: Knowledge Management Evolution in Early Modern Europe*, ed. Alberto Cevolini, *LWW* 53 (Leiden: Brill, 2016), 35–57, at 42.

72 Based on this manuscript Dorandi proposes a schematic reconstruction of Philodemus' working method: Dorandi, "Notebooks and Collections of Excerpts," 49.

like to introduce the term ‘opisthographic collection.’ I think this term could be useful, because it acknowledges both the codicology of the manuscript and the nature of the (extracts of the) compositions it carries. It is in this context relevant to think back of book list 16 from Rosa Otranto’s *Antiche Liste di Libri su Papiro*, which we discussed above. This list raised our attention, because it mentions three different papyri that would have carried multiple works of Plato’s dialogues on one manuscript, which indicates that we might be dealing with an example of a similar ‘opisthographic collection.’ Whether or not these dialogues were partly or fully copied is unknown, though it seems unlikely that one papyrus would have had the length to contain three full compositions by Plato.

Returning to P.Herc. 1021, we notice that the diversity of sources collected is also meaningful. The *Villa of the Papyri* in general, and Philodemus’ works in particular, are associated with Epicureanism. But P.Herc. 1021 presents a text that offers a perspective on a different intellectual tradition—that of Plato’s Academy, and as such draws on a variety of philosophical sources in order to create a new text. We will return to this in the final chapter of this part.

Up to this point we have considered Graeco-Roman ‘collections’ from a variety of perspectives and aimed to be mindful of different types of evidence: literary sources, papyri, and in the context of the *Villa of the Papyri*, the archaeological record. Furthermore, we have moved from the formation of the collection on a macrolevel to the analysis of an individual opisthograph on a microlevel. In the final part I will explore in which ways a comparison with the *Villa of the Papyri* could (or could not) be meaningful for how we think about the Dead Sea Scrolls as a collection or in terms of collecting practices.

Comparing the *Villa-Papyri* and the Dead Sea Scrolls

1 Herculaneum and Qumran: Contrast and Correlation

There have been few scholarly attempts to compare the Herculaneum papyri and the Dead Sea Scrolls with each other, or even to consider both collections together when asking specific questions concerning ancient scribal culture. One reason for this is that Herculaneum and the scrolls historically are considered to be part of different ancient cultures and therefore of different modern-day fields of research.¹

Nevertheless, Roland de Vaux already early on saw a potential parallel between the two sites, as he considered both to be examples of private libraries.² And more recently Hayim Lapin has pointed to the *Villa*-collection as “one almost entirely unutilized body of material for comparison.”³ Indeed, in terms of both the size and date of the collection, the *Villa of the Papyri* provides the closest parallel to Qumran (if we specifically consider manuscript corpora from which at least a sizeable part survived into modern times). Turning back to Lincoln’s distinction between weak and strong comparisons (which was discussed in the introduction), it seems that both collections could provide good ground for a weak comparison.⁴

1 This is indeed why Houston omits the Dead Sea Scrolls from his study of ancient book collections: Houston, *Inside Roman Libraries*, 3.

2 De Vaux, *Archaeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 32 n. 2.

3 Hayim Lapin, “Dead Sea Scrolls and the Historiography of Ancient Judaism,” in *Rediscovering the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 108–127, at 126.

Comparison of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the *Villa of the Papyri* has also been encouraged by Alexander and Popović: Philip Alexander, “Literacy Among Jews in Second Temple Palestine: Reflections on the Evidence from Qumran,” in *Hamlet on a Hill: Semitic and Greek Studies Presented to Professor T. Muraoka on the Occasion of His Sixty-fifth Birthday*, ed. Martin F.J. Baasten and Wido T. van Peursen, OLA 118 (Leuven: Peeters, 2003), 3–24, at 24; Popović, “Qumran as Scroll Storehouse in Times of Crisis?” 590.

4 The number of comparanda is relatively small and straight-forward. Rather than comparing the entirety of Graeco-Roman and early Judaeen scribal culture with each other, the focus of this comparative exercise will be put on two collections (the scrolls and the *Villa*-collection) that were discovered at two particular sites within a similar time frame, which allows us to be attentive to social and historical contexts.

Furthermore, from a more general perspective I would argue that the most important feature that makes the *Villa of the Papyri* such a relevant site for the study of ancient manuscript cultures and textual engagement is the fact that the eruption of the Vesuvius in 79 CE caused the entire settlement, including the many manuscripts stored inside the *Villa*, to be closed off from outside interference. Following Zangenberg, I applied the notion of post-depositional processes above to refer to the different factors, both natural and human, that can affect the artefacts on a site after their original deposition.⁵ For the *Villa of the Papyri* (and most of the settlement of Herculaneum), these post-depositional processes seem to have been minimal, which caused the deposition context to remain undisturbed until the eighteenth century. This is a certainty regarding the archaeological context not encountered for many other ancient manuscript collections. These post-depositional processes are much less clear for a collection such as the Dead Sea Scrolls. We do not know for example if we are dealing with one deposition or rather several phases of deposition during which the scrolls were left in the caves, and to which degree the conditions of or motivations for these deposition phases changed over time.⁶ Additionally, there is some evidence that the site was disturbed by Roman legionaries.⁷ Whether or not either the settlement at Qumran or the caves in which the manuscripts were deposited had any visitors in the period between the Jewish Revolt against Rome and the twentieth century is a question we simply do not know the answer to.⁸ As such, we move on uncertain

5 Zangenberg, "The Functions of the Caves and the Settlement of Qumran," 206–209.

6 The most widely shared hypothesis about the deposition of the scrolls is that the caves around Qumran functioned as an emergency hiding place during the Roman destruction of Qumran in 68 CE. However, this assumption has been questioned by scholars such as Stökl Ben Ezra and Popović: Stökl Ben Ezra, "Old Caves and Young Caves"; Popović, "Qumran as Scroll Storehouse in Times of Crisis?"

7 The settlement and the surrounding caves should be distinguished here. The devastation of Khirbet Qumran by the Romans is widely accepted on the basis of Roman weaponry such as iron arrowheads and javelins, and the traces of violent destruction apparent in the settlement. Among others Roland de Vaux and Jodi Magness have argued that Qumran would have been occupied by a small Roman garrison for some years after 68 CE (during the so-called third occupation period): De Vaux, *Archaeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 41–45; Magness, *The Archaeology of Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 62–63; Mladen Popović, "Roman Book Destruction in Qumran Cave 4 and the Roman Destruction of Khirbet Qumran Revisited," in *Qumran und die Archäologie: Texte und Kontexte*, ed. Jörg Frey, Carsten Claußen, and Nadine Kessler; WUNT 278 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 239–291.

Roman presence inside the caves is less secure. The most important manuscript evidence is provided by the opisthograph 4Q460/4Q350.

8 Several historical sources mention earlier discoveries of manuscripts in the region. Eusebius (ca. 260–ca. 340 CE) writes that Origen (ca. 185–ca. 254 CE), for the compilation of his *Hexapla*,

ground when, for example, we try to utilize De Vaux's account of Cave 4 after its discovery to make inferences of the scrolls' deposition context.

However, in the case of the *Villa of the Papyri*, meters of dust and ash protected an actively used manuscript collection within its ancient context. Insights inferred from the deposition context of the *Villa* may be significant for our understanding of not only other surviving manuscript corpora, but also ancient reading culture at large. One such insight concerns the fact that the Herculaneum scrolls were not kept in a separate, closed off area of the *Villa* but rather stored in the living quarters where they would be within reach.⁹ Whether or not this was also the case for Qumran remains open, but it opens up a possibility to explore.

One of the first points of connection between the two sites concerns Philodemus himself, who according to Strabo originated from Gadara in present-day Jordan, not far from Qumran, and in his later life moved to Athens and Rome.¹⁰ It is tempting to hypothesize whether Philodemus would have been familiar with the Dead Sea Scrolls, a manuscript collection that was situated not far from his place of birth.¹¹ If that were the case, then Philodemus' own journey

made use of a Psalm manuscript that would have been found in a jar (ἐν πίθῳ) in Jericho; Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History*, 6.16.3. This discovery is also mentioned by Pseudo-Athanasius and Epiphanius (ca. 315–ca. 403 CE). About 600 years later the Nestorian patriarch Timotheus I (ca. 728–823 CE) reports in his 47th letter of the discovery of scrolls of the Hebrew Bible and other Hebrew texts by an Arab hunter; for a translation and study of this letter see Sebastian P. Brock, *A Brief Outline of Syriac Literature*, 2nd ed. (Kottayam: SEERI, 2009), 240–245.

- 9 The location of book collections within private residences elsewhere is subject to debate. There does not seem to be a specific architectural tradition with regard to the presence of Roman private libraries, but there is some evidence that books were often stored separately from the living quarters. One specific room in the House of Menander in Pompeii has been identified as a library room on the basis of the presence of what seem to be bookshelves, while Vitruvius notes that libraries ("bybliothecae") should be located specifically in the east of the residence to take advantage of the morning light: Vitruvius, *De architectura* 6.4.1; Amedeo Maiuri, *La casa del Menandro e il suo tesoro di argenteria*, vol. 1 (Rome: La Libreria dello Stato, 1933), 87–89. See the discussion of these and other sources in Thomas Hendrickson, "The Invention of the Greek Library."
- 10 Strabo, *Geographica*, 16.2.29. Discussion: Tiziano Dorandi, "La patria di Filodemo," *Phil* 131 (1987): 254–256; Lapin, "Dead Sea Scrolls and the Historiography of Ancient Judaism," 126.
- 11 The city of Gadara, close to modern Umm Qais, is about 100 kilometres from the site of Qumran in the West Bank. Whether or not a 1st century philosopher from Gadara would have had an interest in Judaean literature is an interesting question. Gadara at the time was a Hellenistic city in which daily life was probably dominated by Greek. However, sometime during Philodemus' childhood the city was conquered by Alexander Jannaeus and stayed in Hasmonaeian hands until Pompey's annexation of Syria in 64–63 BCE. Philodemus' fellow Gadarene Meleager was (apart from Greek) familiar with Syrian and Phoen-

could provide a starting point for an exploration of direct influence and the transmission of ideas between both collections. However, according to the current state of scholarship, we have no grounds to assume his familiarity with the scrolls and no reason to believe that people from Qumran, Gadara or Herculaneum were in direct contact. Nevertheless, Philodemus is a reminder of the close proximity yet also separateness of different literary milieus across the Mediterranean. In our days, we may conceptualize both manuscript collections as located in two geographically distant places, but this does not have to be the perceived social reality in the past.¹² Both books and scholars have always travelled.

Ian Werrett has recently distinguished five points of connection between the sites of Herculaneum and Qumran.¹³ Werrett starts by noting that (1) both Herculaneum and Qumran were private residences, and that (2) the bulk of papyri from the *Villa* were found in what seems to have been the storage room, room v, with smaller numbers of manuscripts deposited in nearby chambers. In Werrett's view, this is reminiscent of Qumran, where the majority of the scrolls were discovered in Cave 4 and smaller numbers coming from other caves. I consider these two points of connection proposed by Werrett to be the least convincing. There remains little doubt about the identification of the *Villa* as a private residence, but the evidence for Qumran is less certain. Jodi Magness has argued extensively against the identification of Qumran as a private villa or manor house after comparing the site with contemporary villas in the region.¹⁴ Also

ician and it seems likely that Philodemus got in touch with Semitic languages as well. Nevertheless, Philodemus' work does not reveal knowledge of any language apart from Greek. John T. Fitzgerald, "Gadara: Philodemus' Native City," in *Philodemus and the New Testament World*, 343–397.

- 12 Woolf, "Introduction: Approaching the Ancient Library," 11. There are several indications for interactions between Judaea and Gadara during the Roman period. Matthew 8:28 sets one of Jesus' exorcisms in Gadara. Edith Mary Smallwood lists Gadara as one of the cities with a large Judaeian minority during the Jewish War, while the Gadarene philosopher Abnomos is described in the Talmud as having extensive knowledge of Jewish scripture: Edith M. Smallwood, *The Jews Under Roman Rule: From Pompey to Diocletian*, SJLA 20 (Leiden: Brill, 1981), 357; Menahem Luz, "Oenomaus and Talmudic Anecdote," *JSJ* 23 (1992): 42–80, at 53–57. On Gadara in the Roman period see also Fitzgerald, "Gadara: Philodemus' Native City."
- 13 Ian Werrett, "Is Qumran a Library?" in *The Dead Sea Scrolls at Qumran and the Concept of a Library*, 78–105, at 99–100.
- 14 Magness qualifies the features that Qumran shares with elite villas (such as the presence of a water system, courtyards, and dining rooms) as "too generic and utilitarian," while in particular the "almost complete absence of interior decoration" would point to a different function for Qumran: *The Archaeology of Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, at 99. Full discussion on 90–104. See also the recent arguments put forward by Dennis Mizzi and

the suggestion that the locations of the deposits of both the *Villa* and Qumran would be similar does not seem very persuasive to me: storage in different rooms within the same building is not really comparable to different caves that are located over more than a kilometre from each other.¹⁵

Werrett proceeds by arguing that (3) the palaeographic time frame of both collections is remarkably similar. The oldest manuscripts from both Herculaneum and Qumran seem to date to about three centuries before the destruction of the sites, indicating that these collections are institutions that outlive the lifespan of an individual *collectionneur* or individual households. A point that is left undiscussed by Werrett is what this tells about the useful life of manuscripts in Graeco-Roman antiquity.¹⁶ Both the *Villa*-papyri and the Dead Sea Scrolls seem to indicate that manuscripts could occasionally remain in use for at least 250 years.¹⁷ These time frames concur with a statement by Pliny the Elder claiming to have seen documents written by Tiberius and Gaius Gracchus that were, at the time, almost 200 years old.¹⁸ As far as we can generalize based on these collections, there seems little reason to assume that papyri had a shorter lifespan than leather manuscripts. According to Popović, the useful life of literary manuscripts, “indicates that they were possibly handed down from generation to generation, confirming the value attached to them.”¹⁹ The palaeographic datings of both Herculaneum and Qumran indeed demonstrate the continued importance of these ancient manuscript collections over significant periods of time. (4) There is a remarkable underrepresentation of documentary texts, as both corpora seem to contain almost exclusively literary material. (5) Finally, both collections are multilingual. The *Villa*-papyri carry texts in both Greek and Latin. From Qumran we find texts in Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek; the three most widespread languages of Roman Judaea.

Crawford: Dennis Mizzi, “From the Judaeian Desert to the Great Sea: Qumran in a Mediterranean Context,” *DSD* 24 (2017): 378–406; Crawford, *Scribes and Scrolls at Qumran*, 215.

15 Magness, *The Archaeology of Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 1.

16 Houston determines the useful life of manuscript by considering their age “at the time the collections to which they belonged were thrown out or destroyed”; Houston, “Papyrological Evidence for Book Collections and Libraries,” 248. In this context ‘useful’ has a broad meaning: it does not have to signify that the manuscript was continuously read or studied, but rather that it was available within the collection.

17 Houston, “Papyrological Evidence for Book Collections and Libraries,” 248–251; Popović, “Qumran as Scroll Storehouse in Times of Crisis?” 562–564. It is possible that their useful life could have been even longer as it is unknown how long these manuscripts would have remained in use if the events of 68 and 79 CE had not taken place.

18 Pliny the Elder, *Natural History*, 13.83.

19 Popović, “Qumran as Scroll Storehouse in Times of Crisis?” 554.

This final observation by Werrett concerning multilingualism in both the scrolls and the *Villa*-papyri is of significance from a number of perspectives. The presence of manuscripts in different languages is an indication of the diversity of linguistic practices of both collections. We have seen above that Latin and Greek texts were stored together in the *Villa*. Also, for Qumran, we have no reason to suspect that manuscripts in different languages were stored separately from each other. This could be interpreted as an indication that both the *Villa* and the scrolls texts were collected primarily in order to be actively studied, read, and used in reading events together. However, there is some evidence that Greek and Latin literatures were stored in separate locations within Roman public libraries.²⁰ It is difficult to assess how significant it is that the Dead Sea Scrolls and the *Villa of the Papyri* had an arrangement that differed from how we assume that Roman public libraries were organized.²¹

Another perspective on this issue is offered by Popović, who sees the multilingual formation of the Dead Sea Scrolls as cause to reconsider the binary oppositions between centre versus periphery, and city versus countryside.²² It is a common frame to view ancient literary culture as primarily concentrated in a multilingual urban centre of literary production and activities (for example Rome or Jerusalem). Sites such as Herculaneum and Qumran provide a counterweight to this model and demonstrate that also elites outside the major population centres had access to and interests in multilingual collections of texts.

A point of agreement on a different level can be found in the possibility that both the Dead Sea Scrolls and the *Villa*-papyri reflect the literary collection of one or more particular movements that shaped the manuscript corpus according to their beliefs and interests. Both represent what is left of a deliberate collection of texts that were meaningful for the people that organized their reading events around them. Lapin notes that “in some way that is hard to specify this library is connected with the flourishing of Epicurean study and association at Herculaneum, much as the Qumran scrolls are related to a group

20 Cf. section 8.3.

21 One potential explanation is that Roman public libraries were often prestige projects by the Roman elites intended to display power and to present Rome as an intellectual centre of scholarship. Dix goes even as far as proposing that Roman libraries “could have served as a kind of Roman counterpart to the Library of Congress, an official repository for a nation’s literary production.” It is possible that the specific presentation of Latin literature separate from works in Greek contributed to this objective. Dix, “Public Libraries’ at Rome: Ideology and Reality,” 289. See also the discussion in section 7.1.

22 Popović, “Multilingualism, Multiscripturalism, and Knowledge Transfer,” 49–57.

at Qumran.”²³ Indeed, both the Dead Sea Scrolls and the *Villa of the Papyri* share a remarkable sense of intentionality. They do not just present us with a cross-section of Graeco-Roman and Judaeian literature of the time, but rather offer a selection. However, there seems to be more to this connection between the two sites. Heuristically the analysis of the *Villa of the Papyri* can focus our attention on particular issues such as multilingualism or the useful life of manuscripts (both discussed above). At the same time, it can help us sharpen our thinking concerning other sites, for example regarding the status of Qumran as a scholarly collection located in the countryside. These new perspectives are the real benefit of such a comparison.

It is noteworthy that among both the Dead Sea Scrolls and the *Villa-papyri*, we find multiple exemplars of the same composition, with both textual diversity (as evidenced in for example the different Serekh manuscripts or the copies of Philodemus’ *On Rhetoric*) and differences in palaeography and codicology.²⁴ These differences may shed light on the different ways in which manuscripts could be used. Furthermore, in the previous chapters, attention was drawn to the importance of compositions that exist in multiple copies, as they demonstrate a continued interest in that composition by the group behind the collection. I argued that such manuscripts continued to be the object of study over a longer period of time, especially where it concerns manuscripts that contain scribal interventions such as marginal markings, transposition signs, and multiple scribal hands. As we have seen, both collections demonstrate such a scholarly engagement with texts on a high level.

If we push this argument further, we note that manuscripts that survived in multiple copies can shed light on different compositional strategies, especially if one of those manuscripts collects extracts that are reworked in another exemplar. Houston provides a list of eight compositions by Philodemus that are present in multiple copies.²⁵ Dorandi hypothesizes that some of these copies might have been drafts that Philodemus would have distributed among his

23 Lapin, “Dead Sea Scrolls and the Historiography of Ancient Judaism,” 126.

24 On the textual differences of *On Rhetoric*: Federica Nicolardi, “Beyond the Scribal Error: Clues on the History of Philodemus’ *On Rhetoric*, Book 1,” in *Defining Authorship, Debating Authenticity Problems of Authority from Classical Antiquity to the Renaissance*, ed. Roberta Berardi, Martina Filosa, and Davide Massimo, BZA 385 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2020), 139–149.

25 These eight are *On Flattery* (P.Herc. 222 and 1457), *On the Gods* (P.Herc. 26 and 1076), *On Poems* (P.Herc. 1425 and 1538), *On Rhetoric*, Book 2 (P.Herc. 1674 and 1672), *On Rhetoric*, Book 3, (P.Herc. 1506 and 1426), *On Rhetoric*, Book 4 (P.Herc. 220 and 1007 + 1673 + 224 + 1077a + 1114 + 1677a), *Sketches of Epicureans* (P.Herc. 239a + 1787 and 1418), *On the Stoics* (P.Herc. 155 and 339), *History of the Academy* (P.Herc. 1021 and 164): Houston, *Inside Roman Libraries*, 95.

friends for discussion, in order to rework their comments in a final edition.²⁶ This suggestion invites comparison with the Dead Sea Scrolls that survived in multiple copies. It is possible that these manuscripts, in a similar fashion, provide a glimpse into the sociocultural dynamics of manuscript production, consumption, and distribution. For example, Part 2 proposed to consider the opisthograph 4Q509/4Q496/4Q506 as a liturgical collection. It is possible that this manuscript was produced to function in a similar communal setting.

Apart from multiple exemplars of the same composition, both the Dead Sea Scrolls and the *Villa of the Papyri* also share a wide variety in the quality of the extant manuscripts. Delicately produced scrolls with generous margins and low levels of scribal interventions are in both collections found side by side with simple sheets containing notes or extracts. I argued above that an elegantly written scroll such as 1QM might invite very different reading activities than a crudely produced opisthograph. Variety in manuscript production can be seen as an indication of variety in manuscript use. The *Villa* presents us with a similar material and palaeographic diversity. Manuscripts such as P.Herc. 113a, characterized by Richard Janko as written by “an expert and well-trained copyist,” are found next to manuscripts written in much more irregular hands.²⁷ If we follow this line of thought, then we suppose that collections such as the Dead Sea Scrolls and the *Villa*-papyri do not only display heterogeneity in the types of manuscripts and texts that are brought together, but also in the types of reading events that are organized by the people behind these manuscripts. Private copies, for example, might indicate that a manuscript was produced for a scribe’s own use, while in Part 2 we considered evidence for communal activities such as recitation or group reading.

This section presented a weak comparison of these two contemporary manuscript collections from the Graeco-Roman period. Though they preserve texts in different languages and from different manuscript cultures, both Qumran and the *Villa* can be characterized as intentional manuscript collections that reflect the specific interests and socio-religious ideas of the groups behind the manuscripts. Moreover, both the Dead Sea Scrolls and the *Villa*-papyri

26 Tiziano Dorandi, *Nell'officina dei classici: Come lavoravano gli autori antichi* (Rome: Carocci, 2007), 68–77. However, some caution is required here. We have seen that the scholarly community around Cicero is relatively well-documented in his letters, but this is less the case for Philodemus. We do not know if Philodemus similarly distributed drafts of his works among his friends.

27 Richard Janko, “New fragments of Epicurus, Metrodorus, Demetrius Laco, Philodemus, the *Carmen de bello Actiaco* and other texts in Oxonian *Disegni* of 1788–1792,” *CERC* 38 (2008): 5–95, at 82. On the variety in the quality of the *Villa*-papyri: Houston, *Inside Roman Libraries*, 105–111.

demonstrate the scholarly engagement of ancient scribes with texts on a variety of levels, with high quality manuscripts preserved side by side with personal copies. This aspect of both collections is deserving of further analysis. In the next section I will turn back to the two manuscripts that featured before, 4Q509/4Q496/4Q506 and P.Herc. 1021, and compare these two opisthographic collections.

2 4Q509/4Q496/4Q506 Revisited

As I have argued in the previous chapter, the Qumran opisthograph 4Q509/4Q496/4Q506 displays a form of textual variety that is very similar to P.Herc. 1021. We can also think of the Qumran papyrus as an ‘opisthographic collection.’ In the case of this opisthograph, extracts were selected and brought together from different compositions (both sectarian and non-sectarian) on one manuscript, which indicates that these texts were not only deposited together, but also actively read and discussed by different people together. Also within the scribal and reading culture of the Dead Sea Scrolls there is evidence for recitation and group reading as communal activities.²⁸ The fact that several scribal hands were involved in the copying of the texts on this opisthograph also suggests the collective engagement of groups of scribes.²⁹

Opisthography in these instances testifies to a diversity in the scribal engagement of texts that a more general overview of collections often does not seem to account for. After all, scholarship generally groups different redactions of a given composition together as one text within a corpus of literature. However, in this way no attention is paid to the possibility that there could be different reading practices connected to each of these manuscripts.³⁰ As I have argued, a scroll such as 1QM might invite different types of reading activities than a version of the War Scroll on an opisthograph.³¹ In line with Longacre’s

28 Popović, “Reading, Writing, and Memorizing Together,” 456–466.

29 See the discussion of the palaeography of 4Q509/4Q496/4Q506 in chapter three.

30 This was highlighted in a recent study on the Dead Sea Psalm scrolls by Drew Longacre. He observed “correlations between script, manuscript format, and textual contents” and subsequently argued for functional differences; Drew G. Longacre, “Paleographic Style and the Forms and Functions of the Dead Sea Psalm Scrolls: A Hand Fitting for the Occasion?” *VT* 72 (2022): 67–92., <https://doi.org/10.1163/15685330-bja10019>.

31 We could point to the Community Rule manuscripts 1QS and 4Q255 as another example. 4Q255 is part of the opisthograph 4Q433a/4Q255. I have proposed elsewhere to read this manuscript as a personal copy. There is no indication that 1QS was a personal copy as well. See section 2.3; Aksu, “Palaeographic and Codicological (Re)assessment.”

analysis of the Psalm manuscripts from Qumran, a “large, prestigious high-register” manuscript such as 1QM could have been intended for communal reading.³² On the other hand, a small, compact manuscript written in semi-formal such as 4Q509/4Q496/4Q506 is easier to transport and more suitable for study purposes. These considerations also open up important questions about our understanding of genre and the *Sitz im Leben*, as this was possibly also determined by the concrete manuscript forms, in terms of format and scripts, that compositions were mediated through; questions how the interpretations of the 4Q509, 4Q496, and 4Q506 were influenced by their proximity on the same manuscript.

Texts that circulated together on a single text-bearing artefact, were read together and, as such, became subject to interpretational processes—what scholars such as Zahn have called ‘exegetical techniques.’³³ Of special interest in this regard are manuscripts that preserve multiple compositions (either in extracted form or in their entirety) that eventually would become part of the Hebrew Bible. The implication of this study would be that, much like the compositions we encounter on opisthographic manuscripts, also the reception of works from the Hebrew Bible are facilitated by the material circumstances of their transmission. I think this is very plausible, but difficult to reconstruct in detail without the presence of corresponding evidence. For most of the time of the composition of the books from the Hebrew Bible no material has survived that allows us to evaluate how these texts were understood and which reading events they became a part of. However, a number of manuscripts preserve evidence that allows us to get closer to the exegetical techniques of ancient scribes as they engaged with biblical materials.³⁴

An interesting example is offered by the Reworked Pentateuch manuscripts from Cave 4.³⁵ The five exemplars that passed down to us differ in the exact materials they preserve, but each contains a collection of different fragments from the Pentateuch that in some instances are combined with exegetical remarks that were added to provide an interpretative framework. Zahn in her 2011 study of these texts has demonstrated the different methods of textual reworking that are employed within the Reworked Pentateuch manuscripts,

32 Longacre, “Paleographic Style and the Forms and Functions,” 16.

33 Zahn, *Rethinking Rewritten Scripture*, 12–14.

34 Tov has provided a helpful table of scrolls that contain multiple works from the Hebrew Bible: Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 75. It should be noted that Tov’s table is limited to manuscripts that only consist of biblical works and not, for example, excerpts that are quoted in larger compositions, or collections of extracts (such as 4Q175).

35 4Q158 was published as ‘Biblical Paraphrase: Genesis, Exodus’ by Allegro in DJD 5:1–6. 4Q364–367 were published by Crawford as ‘Reworked Pentateuch’ in DJD 13:187–351.

distinguishing between varying categories of compositional techniques such as omission, rearrangement, paraphrasing, and the addition of both new material and material from elsewhere.³⁶ The latter distinction between new material and material from elsewhere is important for Zahn, but is difficult to make for the opisthograph 4Q509/4Q496/4Q506.³⁷ Nevertheless, the purposes of these techniques are very comparable: both the Reworked Pentateuch manuscript 4Q158 and the Qumran opisthograph harmonize extracted passages at the level of their syntax and/or vocabulary (see for example the similar blessing formulae present in both 4Q509 and 4Q506), but they also reinforce the connections between different (past or future) events. This highlights that these exegetical techniques coupled with a dynamic engagement with extant manuscripts are present across what we perceive to be literary genres and traditions (such as Bible, rewritten scripture, and liturgy).

We have seen how on the Herculaneum opisthograph P.Herc. 1021 extracts from different compositions were collected in order to create a new composition. In the process of bringing different texts together and ‘reviving’ them in a different manuscript and within the context of a different reading event, new meanings could be created. Texts are always influenced by the texts around them, and it is the intertextual processes of reading texts in different settings and with different contexts that new and original readings and interpretations are established. A manuscript such as P.Herc. 1021 challenges us to consider these aspects also for the Dead Sea Scrolls. I would propose that similar processes—the collection of extracts from different texts on one manuscript in order to influence how these extracts are read—take place for the Qumran opisthograph 4Q509/4Q496/4Q509 on different levels.

Some of these processes have been addressed in Part 2, in which I argued that the Qumran opisthograph constituted an intentional collection of valued works, a conclusion that was reached on the basis of the material features of the manuscript and the content of the different extracts it bears. This opisthograph allows us to conceptualize these intertextual relationships from other perspectives as well. 4Q496, for example, derives meaning from at least two different intertextual dimensions. First, meaning is created from the surrounding texts, which can be understood here in very material terms: 4Q509 and 4Q506, which are placed on the same manuscript. These dynamics were discussed in some detail above; the form-critical similarities between Festival Prayers and

36 Zahn, *Rethinking Rewritten Scripture*, 17–19.

37 See also the comments on this distinction by Crawford in “Review of *Rethinking Rewritten Scripture: Composition and Exegesis in the 4QReworked Pentateuch Manuscripts* by Molly M. Zahn,” *DSD* 20 (2013): 175–177.

Words of the Luminaries suggest a liturgical reading for 4Q496 as well. After all, someone's understanding and interpretation of a text is also shaped by virtue of the texts surrounding it. But there is also a more vertical dimension to it: the texts collected on this opisthograph are not unique compositions, but part of a broader body of texts. 4Q496, for example, stands in a tradition of War Scroll literature and is influenced by this tradition. This relationship can be described with the classical intertextual notions of allusion and quotation; the battle narrative found in 4Q496 might not preserve the texts of 1QM cols. 1 and 11 word for word, it evidently alludes to it. We can understand 1QM as a 'pre-text' that 4Q496 refers to: any interpretation of 4Q496 will be motivated by previous readings of the War Scroll. In a similar fashion Words of the Luminaries manuscript 4Q504 might function as a pre-text to 4Q506. Though 4Q506 contains only extracts from Words of the Luminaries, it alludes to the larger prayer cycle that is preserved in 4Q504 and this, in turn, informs how 4Q506 could have been understood. In this way, both 4Q504 and 1QM perform as a 'second voice' that resonates in the opisthograph. The fact that a significant part of 1QM consists of a prayer collection inspires a liturgical reading of 4Q496 too. These different intertextual processes, both on a horizontal and on a vertical level, are cooperating forces that determine how texts are read. We can evaluate this manuscript therefore not just as an intentional collection, but also one that imposes a way of reading on itself. However, in this context we should not lose sight of the material reality. The palaeography of the manuscript suggests—at least to some degree—to distinguish between different texts. As argued in chapter one, the three sets of extracts were penned by different scribes, and 4Q506 seems to have been written at a later period.³⁸

Nevertheless, these material concerns do not influence the fact that collecting different texts together reinforces the interpretative connections between those texts. This process is especially active in an opisthograph. The fact that parts of Festival Prayers, of War Scroll, and of Words of the Luminaries are positioned next to each other influences how each of these texts are read in their own right. In this way we can conceive the 'opisthographic collection' as greater than the sum of its parts; the opisthograph can function as a tool to construct a new text through selection, extraction, and note-taking.

The presence of extracts from the War Scroll together with extracts from prayer texts for fixed occasions compels us to think about this manuscript as a

38 This is one aspect in which the Qumran opisthograph differs from P.Herc. 1021: the extracts brought together on the Herculaneum opisthograph do seem to be written during the same period.

liturgical document.³⁹ But if we read the War Scroll liturgically here, does that mean that we have to read 1QM as a prayer text as well?⁴⁰ This is possible and has been argued for in the past, but this opisthograph invites us also to think about the possibility of multiple genres. Could we not think of the War Scroll both as a rule text or as a battle narrative and as a liturgical document depending on the other texts that we read next to it?

Clustering and categorizing ancient texts are not neutral affairs, certainly not for the Dead Sea Scrolls. How we group different texts together influences our perception of each of those texts individually. The perception of literary homogeneity or literary diversity is therefore a result of the conceptual framework we choose to operate with when we think about the collection as a whole. However, opisthographs can provide internal collections of texts, and as such help us to critically think about our methods of both clustering and separating texts from each other based on considerations from content and genre alone. In this way the study of scribal activity on manuscript level can help us to further reflect on the literary diversity of ancient collections.

39 See section 6.2. Alternative history remains a speculative proposition, but my suggestion would be that if scholars would have encountered this opisthograph without the parallel scrolls for Festival Prayers, the War Scroll, and Words of the Luminaries, this is how the manuscript would have been read: as a liturgical collection that brings together different petitionary texts.

40 Intertextuality works simultaneously in different ways. The concept of ‘reverse intertextuality,’ might be useful to illustrate this. Selena Wisnom in her recent essay on intertextuality in Akkadian epic has coined this notion, which takes place “when an allusion in one text engages with an earlier text in a way that changes the way the earlier text is interpreted. That is, text B projects itself back onto text A to influence how we read text A.” It is possible that these processes are active in the opisthograph as well and that interpretations of 1QM are influenced by 4Q496 just as much as the other way around. Selena Wisnom, “Blood on the Wind and the Tablet of Destinies: Intertextuality in *Anzû*, *Enūma eliš*, and *Erra and Išum*,” *JAOs* 139 (2019): 269–286, at 279.

Conclusion

There are many directions from which to approach the history of ancient manuscript cultures and to conceptualize the different groups behind manuscripts—be it Jewish, Hellenistic, or Roman. The present study was, first, driven by a fascination for a scribal practice and the artefacts that result from it: opisthographic manuscripts from the Dead Sea Scrolls. Second, it was motivated by the need to address a problem that is at the core of many investigations into ancient manuscript collections—the fact that it is so often unknown to us how the peoples behind these manuscripts understood the collection they engaged with. The present study showed that the close-reading of multi-text manuscripts such as opisthographs can represent an important step in addressing this question.

This choice of research topic presents a methodological decision. This study aimed to demonstrate that foregrounding manuscripts and manuscript practices in scholarship opens up new avenues of historical research on both texts as artefacts, and on the ways in which scribes, readers, and other ‘consumers’ of texts in antiquity organized their different reading activities around them. The Dead Sea Scrolls opisthographs are of particular importance in this regard as they are among the very few manuscripts from Qumran that preserve different texts together on one text-bearing artefact. In absence of sources such as library catalogues (or other reflections on groups of texts), these opisthographs offer fresh perspectives on ancient manuscript collections. As such, this study was concerned with the question in which different ways these opisthographs can contribute to our understanding of ancient collecting practices. In order to treat this question systematically, this study has been subdivided into three parts. Part 1 provided an explanation of the terminology related to opisthographic manuscripts, and offered an assessment of the opisthographs preserved from Qumran, with a more comprehensive codicological and palaeographic discussion of the five literary opisthographs. Part 2 presented a micro-study of the Qumran opisthograph 4Q509/4Q496/4Q506 in order to re-examine modern scholarly models of classification, and to reflect on the literary diversity and collecting practices present in the scrolls. Part 3 offered a different perspective on these collecting practices by focusing on comparative papyrological evidence: ancient book lists on papyri from Oxyrhynchus, and the *Villa of the Papyri* from Herculaneum. Now it is time to summarize the main results of this investigation.

1 The Qumran Opisthographs

The term 'opisthograph' goes at least as far back as the letters of Pliny the Younger, where it is used to refer to manuscripts with handwriting on both sides. Modern scholarship uses the term for two circumstances: a manuscript with a continuous text on both sides, and a manuscript that contains different texts on both sides. Papyrologists generally refer to the side on which the fibres of the papyrus plant run in horizontal direction as the recto, and the side with papyrus fibres in vertical direction as the verso. In order to establish which text would have been written first on a papyrus opisthograph, it is important to consider not only the direction of the papyrus fibres, but also both the palaeographic datings of the texts and the general materiality of the manuscript.

The Dead Sea Scrolls preserve manuscripts that employ a variety of opisthographic practices: 17 tefillin are opisthographic, 5 manuscripts carry a title on the reverse side (2 of which are uncertain), and a further 12 manuscripts contain (parts of) a composition on the verso.¹ The diverse practices and material features related to these different manuscripts is presented in chapter one. 5 of the 12 opisthographs from the last category are of particular interest as they contain different literary texts on recto and verso: 4Q415/4Q414, 4Q433a/4Q255, 4Q499/4Q497, Q503/4Q512, and 4Q509/4Q496/4Q506. Chapter two provided a discussion of the palaeography and materiality of these manuscripts, and literary and structural analyses of the compositions they bear.

4Q415/4Q414 is a leather scroll that contains 4QInstruction^a (4Q415) on the recto and Ritual of Purification A (4Q414) on the verso. Both hands were dated to the Herodian period by Strugnell and Harrington (4Q415), and by Esther Eshel (4Q414). The classification of 4Q415, which concerns a version of Instruction, is difficult, but most scholars regard the text as related to early Jewish wisdom literature. Dimant, Jefferies, and Rey consider Instruction to be sectarian, but Tigchelaar, Goff, and the original editors do not. 4Q414 on the verso is a halakhic-liturgical prayer ritual that gives instructions for purification. The text is generally grouped together with Ritual of Purification B (4Q512), and both are classified as a collection of purification liturgies.

4Q433a/4Q255 concerns a papyrus opisthograph that preserves two texts: 4QpapHodayot-like Text B (4Q433a) on the papyrological recto and 4QpapSe-rekh ha-Yahad^a (4Q255) on the papyrological verso. Both hands should on palaeographic grounds be dated to the Hasmonaean period, around 100 BCE. These dates are confirmed by recent C14-datings of the manuscript. 4Q433a is

1 See the different tables in section 1.3 on opisthographic practices from Qumran.

written in the semi-formal script, 4Q255 is written in an irregular and crudely written cursive script. There are some points of connection regarding themes and terminology that invite comparison between 4Q433a and 1QH^a. However, Schuller favours the classification of 4Q433a as “some type of extended sapiential-type reflection or instruction.”² 4Q255 is the only copy of the Community Rule that has been preserved on a real opisthograph. Frags. 1 and 2 correspond to 1QS cols. I and III, but frags. A and B could not be associated with parts of S preserved elsewhere.

4Q499/4Q497 is a papyrus opisthograph that bears a text on the recto that was published by Baillet as ‘Hymnes ou prières.’ However, Tigchelaar later demonstrated that 4Q499 concerns a copy of Prayer of Enosh (4Q369). Both texts should be dated to the Hasmonaean period, but this manuscript is preserved in such poor condition that any palaeographic dating should be tentative. It is possible that both texts were written by the same scribe. Though Baillet initially grouped 4Q497 together with War Scroll related literature, recent scholarship has been more hesitant in associating 4Q497 with any other composition.

4Q503/4Q512 is a papyrus manuscript containing Daily Prayers (4Q503) on the papyrological recto, and Ritual of Purification B (4Q512) on the verso. 4Q503 is written in a neat and easily readable script, 4Q512 is slightly more inconsistent. 4Q503 is the only copy of Daily Prayers: a collection of liturgies that are to be recited daily for a month during dawn and sunset. The recurring blessing formulae are clearly intended to demarcate different liturgical units. The calendar represented in Daily Prayers is a lunar calendar. Ritual of Purification B on the verso is closely related to Ritual of Purification A (4Q414) with regard to its structure, terminology, and vocabulary. It is possible that both manuscripts preserve copies of the same work, though this has not yet been demonstrated conclusively.

4Q509/4Q496/4Q506 concerns a papyrus opisthograph that bears a copy of Festival Prayers (4Q509) on the papyrological recto, and both a copy of the War Scroll (4Q496) and of Words of the Luminaries (4Q506) on the verso. 4Q509 and 4Q496 should be dated to the Hasmonaean period and preserve a similar slightly wavy script style. 4Q506 is written in a different script style and should be dated later, most probably between the Hasmonaean and Herodian periods.

The scribal hands preserved in the literary opisthographs from Qumran display considerable similarity. Though there can be quite some variation in the execution of letter forms, 4Q433a, 4Q499, 4Q497, 4Q503, 4Q512, 4Q509, and

² Schuller, “The Classification Hodayot and Hodayot-like,” 193.

4Q496 are all written in a Hasmonaeen semi-formal hand. 4Q255 and 4Q506 are the exceptions in this regard.³ There is no single straightforward explanation for the similarity in writing style of the literary opisthographs. In chapter three I discussed three possibilities. First, it is possible that the opisthographs were either produced in a similar context, or intended to be used in a similar context. Second, the writing style could be the result of the particular education received by the scribes behind these manuscripts. Third, the informality of these scribal hands could be an indication of personal use: manuscripts that were written in a more day-to-day writing style without particular artifice. I consider this final suggestion to be the most plausible explanation for these manuscripts.

Four out of five opisthographs were written on papyrus, a writing material that has been associated with the production of personal copies in the past. However, this connection is by no means straightforward. The choice for papyrus seems to have been motivated by the fact that papyrus, in contrast to leather, does not need additional preparation before the backside could be used. On the basis of these codicological and palaeographic features, there is reason to consider the four literary opisthographs on papyrus (4Q499/4Q497, 4Q433a/4Q255, 4Q503/4Q512, and 4Q509/4Q496/4Q506) as some form of a manuscript cluster consisting of manuscripts that were produced, circulated, and studied during the same period.

2 Opisthographs: Manuscript Reuse or Collections of Valued Works?

A structural and literary analysis of the different compositions encountered on these manuscripts may bring us closer to their setting: the particular social context in which they were produced, circulated, and in which reading activities around them were organized. An important aspect for the interpretation of these opisthographs is the status of the text on the recto of the scroll at the exact moment when the text on the verso was written down. Following Daniel Falk, we may broadly distinguish two different possibilities: either the text on the recto was defunct and the manuscript was reused in order to write down an unrelated text on the verso, or the text on the verso was intentionally written down on the same manuscript as the recto in order to create a collection of valued texts.⁴ It follows from the discussions presented

3 4Q255 is contemporary but written in a cursive writing style, while 4Q506 appears to be written later.

4 Falk, "Material Aspects of Prayer Manuscripts," 51.

in chapter two that Qumran opisthographs can be found in both categories. The intertextual and socio-liturgical relations between the composition preserved on either side of both 4Q415/4Q414 and 4Q433a/4Q255 are not straightforward and there is little reason to assume that these manuscripts were the result of an attempt at creating an intentional collection. This is different for 4Q503/4Q512 and 4Q509/4Q496/4Q506, while the evidence for 4Q499/4Q497 remains inconclusive. I will briefly summarize my discussion of each of these manuscripts.

4Q415 and 4Q414 do not share significant connections in terminology and phraseology. Also, thematically there is little to link these texts together: 4Q415 is usually classified as a wisdom text, while 4Q414 concerns an instruction for purification rituals. I would maintain that 4Q415/4Q414 provides an instance of the material reuse of a rejected manuscript. The exact reason for the rejection of 4Q415 is unclear but could potentially be a consequence of damage to 4Q418, as 4Q415 most probably was a sheet of this manuscript.

From the perspective of terminology, structure, and intertextual relations, there are few points of connection between 4Q433a and 4Q255 that suggest that both compositions were intentionally placed together on one manuscript in order to form a collection. However, the material evidence from Qumran does indicate a continued interest in the Community Rule. These circumstances invite us to think about this opisthograph (or at least the text on the verso) as a manuscript intended for personal use such as reading or studying.

4Q503 and 4Q512 display connections from a number of perspectives that are suggestive of a similar socio-liturgical setting. Both texts concern collections of prayers dedicated for specific occasions. Both compositions follow a fixed structure that can be subdivided into individual prayers. Furthermore, both texts share some of the same blessing formulae. On the basis of these similarities, it seems highly likely that this opisthograph constituted an intentional collection of two valued works, which is supported by the fact that both texts should be dated to the same time frame.

Both 4Q509 and 4Q506 display clear affiliations in vocabulary, structure, and intertextual relations. These compositions concern prayer cycles that are dedicated to fixed moments in time. The connections with 4Q496, placed above 4Q506 on the verso of the manuscript, are less straightforward. However, because of its position on the manuscript we can with some confidence assume that it was intentionally written as part of this collection. Though the extracts from the War Scroll preserved in 4Q496 do not contain distinct liturgical terminology, other sections do, most notably the liturgical cycle from columns XV–XIX.

3 Opisthograph 4Q509/4Q496/4Q506 and the Question of Classification

Part 2 of this study presented a micro-study of the opisthograph 4Q509/4Q496/4Q506, which constitutes the only opisthograph from Qumran that preserves three different texts: a copy Festival Prayers (4Q509), a copy of the War Scroll (4Q496), and a copy of Words of the Luminaries (4Q506). These three texts were published by Baillet in DJD 7, but he did not offer much reflection on the significance of the presence of multiple compositions on one artefact. However, this is precisely what makes this opisthograph so interesting: these three texts were placed together by ancient scribes and, as such, this manuscript presents us with valuable insight into ancient practices of collection and classification. Chapter five was dedicated to the investigation of these three compositions individually, with specific attention to theories of classification and models of communities.

4Q509 is a liturgical text consisting of different prayers devoted to Jewish festivals throughout the liturgical year. The reconstruction of 4Q509 was aided by the fact that the top part of the verso of this papyrus contains 4Q496, the first 16 fragments of which correspond to 1QM. A comparison of 4Q509 with the other copies of Festival Prayers allowed scholars to reconstruct prayers dedicated to New Year, Day of Atonement, Sukkot, Passover, and Weeks. These prayers follow a consistent pattern, starting and closing off different sections with recurring blessing formulae. It is possible that these festival prayers were presented in calendrical order (as proposed by Baillet), but this is not certain.

The parts of the War Scroll preserved on 4Q496 start with a historical introduction and overview of the eschatological war, and continue with discussing different organizational and tactical elements in anticipation to the final battle. The compositional history of the War Scroll is very complicated: the absence of a consistent structure indicates that the text was not the product of a single author or editor, but rather the result of a process of editorial involvement. Recent scholars tend to refer to an author/compiler (instead of just an author) of M or the M tradition (rather than the War Scroll as one single composition). The precise relationship of 1QM col. 1 to the rest of 1QM is not clear: some scholars have argued that col. 1 would have been older than the other columns, while others have proposed a younger dating.

4Q506 is the second text we encounter on the reverse side of 4Q509 and presents a second witness of Words of the Luminaries, a liturgical cycle consisting of prayers dedicated to different days of the week. Words of the Luminaries is closely related to Festival Prayers, as is evidenced from the similar arrangement of both compositions.

How to understand these three texts in relation to the other manuscripts from the Dead Sea Scrolls is a matter of debate. Dimant has developed an influential model to classify the individual compositions within the wider collection and to determine their relation to the (sectarian) community or communities behind the scrolls. However, this approach has received some criticism from, among others, Tigchelaar and Davies, who questioned the model for its susceptibility to circular reasoning. Furthermore, Tigchelaar pointed to the methodological problems posed by the assumption that groups of texts can be correlated to discrete sociological groups behind these texts.

A different problem with this model is presented by Dimant's selection of the core group of sectarian texts that, in her view, represent the worldview and religious ideas of the community. It is not possible to demonstrate why this particular group of texts offers a more accurate reflection of this worldview than another group. We can imagine that the selection of a different set of texts from the outset would have resulted in different conceptualizations of the people behind these texts and their worldview and ideas.

Dimant uses three different sets of criteria to distinguish the sectarian from non-sectarian texts, all of which are concerned with terminology and vocabulary. It is on the basis of these criteria that Dimant classifies Festival Prayers as a sectarian text. However, when we analyse the exact occurrences of these terms within Festival Prayers, then it appears that the three locutions present offer very little evidence that points towards a sectarian origin. Clear indications that point to any of the "major conceptual topics related to the community's outlook" distinguished by Dimant are simply not present. We would therefore have to conclude that, when applying Dimant's model to Festival Prayers, there is little reason to classify the text as a sectarian composition.

The classification of the War Scroll appears to pose a different set of problems. The War Scroll is generally read as one of the compositions that are central to the group of sectarian literature, which is reflected in both the terminology it employs, and the worldview and socio-religious ideas it incorporates. However, there is a continuous debate regarding its genre and, arising from this, its intended function. The War Scroll has been read as an apocalyptic text and a rule text in preparation for the final war. The columns x–xiv have furthermore been read as a liturgical cycle that at one point in the War Scroll's compositional history was brought together with other parts of the text. Though it is difficult to connect this composition to a particular type of reading event, there is some evidence pointing to a performative function for the War Scroll, such as the presence of recurring prayer formulae, the use of direct speech, and explicit references to the recitation of prayer texts before battle.

Words of the Luminaries concerns a prayer cycle. Its relation to the community or communities behind the scrolls is very much subject of debate. It is possible to distinguish three different positions: scholars maintain that Words of the Luminaries concerns a sectarian (e.g., Dimant), a non-sectarian (e.g., Falk), or a pre-sectarian (e.g., Baillet) composition. The most extensive discussion of the classification of the War Scroll has been offered by Chazon, who concludes that it would have been read by “two diachronically and ideologically different audiences: the implied audience of the pre-Qumranic author and the actual audience of the Yaḥad community at Qumran.”⁵ Chazon argues that the sectarian community would have been able to appropriate such an originally non-sectarian liturgical composition. It was possible for the people behind the scrolls to negotiate the differences between their own socio-religious ideas and outlooks, and those ideas found in some of the texts in their collection.

Scholarly attempts to classify Words of the Luminaries have yielded a range of different results. In this way this text importantly illustrates the limits of our ability to categorize texts and to infer which meaning they would have had to particular groups in the past. The question if a text such as Words of the Luminaries would have been compatible with the socio-religious ideas that are dominant in the collection is a judgment call based on both one’s particular conceptualisation of the presumed Qumran community and on the way in which one conceptualises the engagement of ancient scribes with their manuscripts.

4 Opisthograph 4Q509/4Q496/4Q506 as an Opisthographic Collection

Each of the texts encountered on 4Q509/4Q496/4Q506 presents its own difficulties with regard to its genre, its intended function, or its relationship with the broader collection of Dead Sea Scrolls. This opisthograph demonstrates how the literary diversity that we encounter on different levels within the collection at times defies straightforward classification. The texts preserved within the scrolls offer such a wide variety in terminology, structure, themes and motives, and religious ideas that researchers have to base their analysis on a particular model of the community they envisage behind the texts.⁶ These models

5 Chazon, “Prayer and Identity in Varying Contexts,” 484–485.

6 Section 5.3 for example discusses Devorah Dimant’s model of classification and shows how this model departs from the notion that the Dead Sea Scrolls present a coherent collection that belonged to a sectarian community. This community would have made use of particular

will lead to different results when scholars move from the literary analysis of individual compositions to the reconstruction of a social reality in which these compositions circulated, as became evident from the diverging views on the presumed sectarian origin of Festival Prayers and Words of the Luminaries. Scholars generally group and classify texts on the basis by *a priori* establishing criteria. We can understand these approaches as *etic*.

A central question to this study has been to think through a method to group together and categorize the texts of the Dead Sea Scrolls that would follow under the *emic* category. Contrary to, for example, Mesopotamian literary catalogues or lists of books preserved on papyri, the Dead Sea Scrolls do not offer explicit reflections on collecting practices. However, there is some evidence that may provide an *emic* understanding of textual engagement, such as manuscripts that contain examples of extracts or quotations. This study has argued that the literary opisthographs from Qumran provide a similar opportunity. Opisthographs preserve multiple compositions within the context of one and the same material artefact and, as such, offer groupings of texts based on tangible manuscript evidence instead of on literary models of classification. A close analysis of opisthographic manuscripts allows us to contextualize scholarly groupings of texts and critically reflect on our understanding of collection and collecting practices.

The three texts that survived on the opisthograph 4Q509/4Q496/4Q506 were grouped together by the scribes behind the scrolls in antiquity and not by modern scholars. This circumstance leads to the question of how to understand the relationship between these three texts: as an instance of manuscript reuse where the original text is defunct, or as an intentional collection of valued works? This issue has been assessed from a material and textual a perspective.

The material analysis of a manuscript can be separated between palaeography and codicology. In the case of an opisthograph, an important question is how the scribal practices on both the recto and verso compare. Differences between the material features of the different texts on this manuscript could be indicative of a changed or changing setting of the manuscript. From the perspective of palaeography, there is reason to group these texts together: all three texts are written in the semi-formal character and 4Q509 and 4Q496 should be dated to the first half of the first century BCE, though 4Q506 preserves letter forms from a later stage. There is also some consistency in the codicological

terminology and lexical features in their texts in order to articulate their worldview and religious ideas. According to Dimant, the analysis of the terminology and ideas expressed within the scrolls allows us to develop a classification of the complete manuscript corpus.

features of the texts on the recto and verso, particularly with regard to the presence of scribal markings and corrections in 4Q509 and 4Q496.⁷ This continuity of scribal practices seems to be intentional; the use of the paragraphus sign for example could have made it easier for the user of the scroll to move between its different sections. Furthermore, this opisthograph does not seem to preserve the full texts of each of the compositions, but rather extracts from compositions that survived in other copies as well. This dynamic engagement with texts points towards a particular form of manuscript use: this opisthograph invites us to conceptualise the scribe as a *collectionneur* who purposefully created a collection of selected passages from different texts that were of interest to him. From a cross-culture survey we may observe that this scribal practice did exist elsewhere: both the Oxyrhynchus papyri (P.Oxy. 1075/1079) and the Dead Sea Scrolls (the *Schriftensammlung* consisting of 1QS, 1QSa, and 1QSb) offer precedents for the collection of different texts on one manuscript.

Both 4Q509 and 4Q506 display a range of form-critical similarities that support the proposition that this opisthograph constitutes an intentional collection. Both compositions can be characterized as prayer cycles that are dedicated to fixed moments in time: they share a similar arrangement of prayers and are thematically closely related. These characteristics indicate that both texts circulated in a similar setting. 4Q496 is placed on the upper part of the verso, and therefore 'sandwiched' between the recto, and 4Q506 on the lower part of the verso. Based on its position on the manuscript, we can safely assume that it was intentionally placed as part of this collection.

The discussion in chapter five indicated that the War Scroll is generally read as a sectarian text, but this is less certain for Festival Prayers and Words of the Luminaries. This opisthograph demonstrates that compositions that are classified by modern scholarship as sectarian and non-sectarian circulated together and could operate within a similar setting. This raises the question how meaningful our conceptualisation of a community as sectarian is when we know that both sectarian and non-sectarian compositions did not only exist together, but were read and studied next to each other.

The study of opisthography may furthermore illuminate our understanding of ancient collecting practices. It allows scholars to study *emic* groupings of texts that are clustered as a result of practices of collection by ancient scribes. It is significant that this opisthograph preserves texts that exist in other

⁷ As far as can be determined, there are no visible scribal markings or corrections on 4Q506, but that could be a consequence of the poor state of preservation of this manuscript.

manuscripts from Qumran as well. Selecting extracts from compositions that survived in multiple copies implies that these texts were considered to be important, which indicates that the people behind the scrolls continued to organize their reading events around certain texts for a significant period of time.

The opisthograph 4Q509/4Q496/4Q506 can be understood as the product of a 'living' engagement with 'living' texts, signifying the everyday practices and experiences of scribes engaging with manuscripts. The notion of 'living' in this context is connected with the ways in which texts are perceived in scholarship from different perspectives. First, scholars often use fragmentary or poorly preserved exemplars in order to reconstruct better preserved manuscripts and to get to an original version of a given text. Much less often are these exemplars regarded as autonomous representatives of a living tradition in their own right. Second, the understanding of a text as fixed and stable implies that the reading practices related to that text, and therefore ancient scribal engagement in general, were also fixed. The heterogeneity of ancient reading culture is in this way disregarded. However, the perception of a text can alter over time, and with it the different reading events that are concentrated around that text. A careful analysis of manuscripts such as this opisthograph can illuminate these dynamics.

The next step in the analysis of 4Q509/4Q496/4Q506 was to further examine the interpretative connections between these three texts, and subsequently to ask to which degree the reading of a text on an opisthograph is influenced by the other texts present on the same manuscript. Both Festival Prayers and Words of the Luminaries have been characterized as liturgical cycles dedicated to fixed moments in time. More specifically, these texts can be understood as petitionary prayers that share a number of motives. Both Festival Prayers and Words of the Luminaries express a request for something (such as God's mercy or his remembrance of his actions in the past). There is some evidence suggesting that the War Scroll could also be read as a petitionary prayer: the liturgical cycle in 1QM cols. x–xiv presents a divine request for victory in the coming battle. The opisthograph does not contain text from this prayer cycle, but the extracts preserved in 4Q496 nevertheless invite us to read it liturgically. The reading of texts is continuously influenced by the texts around them. This manuscript can be regarded not only as an intentional collection, but also one that imposes a way of reading on itself. The three compositions on this opisthograph function, to some extent, both as pre-texts and as con-texts to each other. Bringing different texts together reinforces the interpretative connections between those texts. These reading processes are active in this opisthograph: the presence of extracts from the War Scroll together with extracts

from the liturgical cycles Festival Prayers and Words of the Luminaries challenges us to think about this manuscript as a liturgical collection consisting of petitionary prayers.

5 Collections and Collecting Practices: Herculaneum and Qumran

Moving on from the Qumran opisthographs for a moment, Part 3 has offered a different perspective by focusing on Graeco-Roman papyrological evidence for collecting practices. The notion of both archive and library can be traced back to Greek origins and has largely been shaped by its most famous example: the Library of Alexandria. However, the classical sources paint a picture of Graeco-Roman libraries that is fundamentally different from the present-day institutions, as the ancient notion bears a range of connotations that are lost in its modern usage.

The absence of *emic* references to libraries has resulted in a modern understanding of ancient Near Eastern libraries that is almost exclusively based on scholarly conceptualisations and classifications. Whether or not the Dead Sea Scrolls should be considered a library is determined by one's preconceived model of how the institution would have functioned as there is no evidence available that illuminates how the manuscript collection as a whole was perceived by the people behind the scrolls. One avenue that is worthwhile to explore in order to think through the 'lived' context of the Qumran manuscripts is offered by comparative evidence from Graeco-Roman scribal culture. These sources can be subdivided between descriptions of libraries and collections in literary sources, and papyrological evidence. The descriptions in literary sources—such as Strabo and Suetonius—give valuable insight into the process of the increasing institutionalisation of the acquisition and management of manuscript collections during the Roman period, but have less to say with regard to ancient collecting practices. The papyrological evidence can be distinguished between book lists preserved on papyri, and concentrations of papyri discovered in archaeological sites. These book lists provide evidence that people collected manuscripts with compositions that corresponded to their particular personal or professional interests, and that these titles were arranged thematically. On some occasions do we find multiple titles given for one entry on a booklist, which suggests that these entries refer to opisthographic manuscripts on which several compositions were brought together in order to build a collection.

Chapter eight has been devoted to an analysis of the *Villa of the Papyri* from Herculaneum and a comparison with the Dead Sea Scrolls collections. The *Villa*

of the Papyri is of particular importance to scholarship on ancient reading culture because the absence of significant post-depositional processes (such as looting or natural erosion) at the site has allowed researchers to move much closer to the primary depositional context and, subsequently, to think through the lived context of the site: the circumstances under which these manuscripts were deposited, and the social reality of the people involved.

Estimates of the number of papyri discovered at the *Villa of the Papyri* range roughly between 800 and 1100 scrolls. Though the bulk of the manuscripts contains texts in Greek, the *Villa* also housed a significant number of Latin papyri. It seems that manuscripts in both languages were stored side by side. A 1764 letter by Johann Winckelmann describes the collapse of a structure in the room in which the majority of papyri were found, suggesting that manuscripts could have been read, studied, and perhaps copied in this room.

Researchers have associated the Herculaneum collection, or at least the Greek section of the collection, with the Epicurean philosopher Philodemus of Gadara and with Epicurean philosophy in general. Over half of the compositions that could be identified are works by Philodemus, many of which concern specialised treatises dedicated to a specific topic such as rhetoric or poetry. Many of the other works are also written by Epicurean philosophers, though the collection also contains several non-Epicurean works. Among these we find a number of manuscripts by the Stoic philosopher Chrysippus, which illustrates that the *Villa*-collection, though undoubtedly of an Epicurean character, was also concerned with other philosophical trends of the time.

The *Villa*-papyri have been dated palaeographically from the third century BCE to the first century CE. Guglielmo Cavallo has provided a history of the collection in three stages. Each of these stages saw the expansion of the collection with a different body of manuscripts. Though this proposed reconstruction is not without its problems, it nevertheless conveys a sense of dynamism: the interests and socio-religious beliefs of the *collectionneurs* behind the *Villa*-collection were not fixed, but developing. The collection displays a growing heterogeneity, and in later years allowed manuscripts to be included that did not have a place in earlier stages. The extant manuscript evidence demonstrates that the pre-*Villa*-collection in the second century BCE was different from the *Villa*-collection in the first century CE. As such, Herculaneum provides us a helpful illustration that ancient manuscript collections were selective and continuously changing according to, for example, the developing interests of the owners.

How then should we understand the lived context in which these texts were meaningful to people? Two issues are of importance in this regard: the archaeology of the *Villa of the Papyri* and the character of the collection of papyri.

Archeologically, the *Villa* has a residential character and can be identified as a classical atrium house. The corpus of papyri does not present a random selection of literature of the time, but rather a specialized philosophical collection with a specific interest in Epicureanism. These two characteristics indicate that we are dealing with a private, scholarly collection dedicated to Epicurean philosophy. The significance the collection had to the people behind it is suggested by the fact that a number of papyri were discovered in leather boxes, in what seems to be a final effort to rescue them from the destructive volcanic eruption. The manuscripts themselves demonstrate a continuous scribal engagement with texts on a high level, as evidenced by the presence of papyri with extracts and marginal annotations, notes on lectures by Philodemus' teacher Zeno of Sidon, and opisthographs.

One opisthograph has been analysed in some detail in chapter eight: the Greek Papyrus Herculaneum 1021 (P.Herc. 1021), which concerns one of the two exemplars of the *History of the Academy* by Philodemus, a text that sets forth a history of Plato's academy. The papyrus is generally understood to be either Philodemus' autograph, or dictated by him. A final edition of this composition is most probably preserved in P.Herc. 164. The verso of P.Herc. 1021 preserves several columns that were probably intended to replace the text on the recto. The papyrus presents extracts from a range of different authors that wrote on Plato and the Academy. These extracts often follow the literal wording of their base texts, but sometimes they are reworked. Dorandi argues that Philodemus studied a range of different sources during which he wrote down passages that were of interest to him on this opisthograph.⁸ P.Herc. 1021 presents us with a striking example for the collection of extracts from different texts on one opisthograph with the intention to compose a new text. We can understand these types of manuscripts, which aim to collect parts of texts from different sources on both recto and verso, as 'opisthographic collections.'

When considering the size and date of both collections, the *Villa of the Papyri* provides the closest parallel to the Dead Sea Scrolls, that is with regard to manuscript corpora from which at least a sizeable part has been preserved. There are a number of points of connection between the two sites that are important: the time frame within which both collections were palaeographically dated is strikingly similar (ca. third century BCE to first century CE), both collections contain almost exclusively literary material while very few documentary texts have been preserved, and both collections are multilin-

⁸ Dorandi, "Notebooks and Collections of Excerpts," 49.

gual, which signifies the diversity of the textual practices of both collections. As such, Herculaneum and Qumran (both located outside major cities) push back against the widely shared frame that ancient literary culture was primarily located in the multilingual urban centres (most notably Rome and Jerusalem).⁹

Furthermore, both the Dead Sea Scrolls and the *Villa*-papyri represent intentional collections of manuscripts. They reflect the results of the collecting practices of one or more groups of people that shaped these manuscript corpora according to their interests and socio-religious ideas. Both collections demonstrate a scholarly engagement with texts on a high level, which is visible in the many examples of scribal interventions (such as markings, corrections, multiple scribal hands), the presence of multiple copies of the same composition, and evidence pointing towards different collecting practices. Both collections also display a wide variety in the quality of the extant manuscripts (written by both very skilled and irregular hands), which testifies to the diversity in the types of reading events that were organized around these manuscripts.

This study focused on the analyses of two opisthographic collections: the Qumran papyrus 4Q509/4Q496/4Q506, and the Herculaneum papyrus P.Herc. 1021. These two opisthographs preserve intentional collections. Extracts from different manuscripts were selected and brought together on one artefact, demonstrating that the source texts were actively read and studied.

It is apparent that P.Herc. 1021 collects extracts from different compositions that deal with Plato's Academy in order to create a new composition. Collecting different texts together reinforces the interpretative connections between those texts. This study proposes that these processes are also active in the Qumran opisthograph. Both 4Q509 on the recto and 4Q506 on the verso of the papyrus display clear form-critical and thematic similarities: both texts concern prayer texts of a similar type dedicated to fixed moments in time. The inclusion of 4Q496, containing extracts from the War Scroll, on a manuscript between these extracts from prayer cycles inspires a liturgical reading for this text as well. This is further prompted by the fact that a significant part of 1QM consists of a prayer collection: this manuscript may have functioned as a 'pre-text' that motivates the reading of 4Q496 as a liturgical document. Through these intertextual processes can we understand this opisthographic collection

9 However, this does not mean that the two sites are comparable in every aspect. For example, contrary to Qumran, many of the residents of Herculaneum were elites from Rome that spent only part of the year in the city's suburban villas. The archaeological matrix of Qumran does not suggest an elite context in exactly the same manner, cf. section 9.1, and see also Mizzi, "Archaeology of Qumran."

as greater than the sum of its parts; the opisthograph can function as an instrument in the construction or composition of new texts through selection, extraction, and note-taking.

It is through an increased understanding of these dynamics that the study of opisthographic practices enriches our image of the scribes behind the Dead Sea Scrolls—and the culture of reading and writing in which they operated. While engaging with different texts and navigating between different types of texts, a scribe working on a manuscript could act as writer, excerptor, composer, and *collectionneur*.

Bibliography

- Abegg, Martin G. "The War Scroll from Qumran Caves 1 and 4: A Critical Edition." PhD diss., Hebrew Union College, 1992.
- Abegg, Martin G. "4Q471: A Case of Mistaken Identity." Pages 136–147 in *Pursuing the Text: Studies in Honor of Ben Zion Wacholder on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday*. Edited by John C. Reeves and John Kampen. JSOTSup 184. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1994.
- Adler, Yonatan. "The Distribution of Tefillin Finds among the Judean Desert Caves." Pages 161–173 in *The Caves of Qumran: Proceedings of the International Conference, Lugano 2014*. Edited by Marcello Fidanzio. STDJ 118. Leiden: Brill, 2016.
- Aksu, Ayhan. "A Palaeographic and Codicological (Re)assessment of the Opisthograph 4Q433a/4Q255." *DSD* 26 (2019): 170–188.
- Aksu, Ayhan. "Two Opisthographs and Scribal Practices in the Ancient Near Eastern World: Thoughts on Use and Reuse." *Papers from the Institute of Archaeology* 33 (2022): 1–26.
- Aksu, Ayhan. "Opisthographic Papyri and Practices of Collection in Ancient Egypt." Pages 11–22 in *Instituciones locales, religión cívica y élites urbanas en el Egipto romano (s. II–IV d.C.), Vol. I*. Edited by Luisa Lesage Garriga and Antonio D. Pérez Zurita. Madrid: Ediciones Clásicas, 2022.
- Aksu, Ayhan. "The Qumran Opisthograph 4Q509/4Q496/4Q506 as an Intentional Collection of Prayers." *DSD* 29 (2022): 292–324.
- Aksu, Ayhan. "The Qumran Opisthographic Papyri as a Scribal Cluster of Manuscripts." *DSD* 30 (2023): 235–261.
- Alexander, Philip. "Literacy Among Jews in Second Temple Palestine: Reflections on the Evidence from Qumran." Pages 3–24 in *Hamlet on a Hill: Semitic and Greek Studies Presented to Professor T. Muraoka on the Occasion of His Sixty-fifth Birthday*. Edited by Martin F.J. Baasten and Wido T. van Peursen. OLA 118. Leuven: Peeters, 2003.
- Alexander, Philip. "Predestination and Free Will in the Theology of the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 27–49 in *Divine and Human Agency in Paul and His Cultural Environment*. Edited by John M.G. Barclay and Simon J. Gathercole. LNTS 335. London: T&T Clark, 2006.
- Alexander, Philip, and Géza Vermes. *Qumran Cave 4.XIX: 4QSerekh Ha-Yahad*. DJD 26. Oxford: Clarendon, 1998.
- Allegro, John M. *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A Reappraisal*. London: Penguin Books, 1964.
- Allegro, John M. *Qumran Cave 4.I (4Q158–4Q186)*. DJD 5. Oxford: Clarendon 1968.
- Allen, Graham. *Intertextuality*. 2nd ed. London: Routledge, 2011.
- Ameling, Walter, et al., eds. *Corpus Inscriptionum Iudaeae/Palaestinae. Vol. 4: Iudaea/Idumaea, Part 1: 2649–3324*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2018.

- Arnold, Russell C.D. "Repentance and the Qumran Covenant Ceremony." Pages 159–175 in *Seeking the Favor of God, vol. 2: The Development of Penitential Prayer in the Second Temple Period*. Edited by Mark J. Boda, Daniel K. Falk, and Rodney A. Werline. EJL 22. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2007.
- Attridge, Harold W., et al. *Qumran Cave 4.VIII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 1*. DJD 13. Oxford: Clarendon, 1994.
- Avigad, Nahman. "The Palaeography of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Documents." *ScrHier* 4 (1958): 56–87.
- Bagnall, Roger S. "Alexandria: Library of Dreams." *APSP* 146 (2002): 348–361.
- Bagnall, Roger S. "Internet Resources." Pages xv–xvi in *The Oxford Handbook of Papyrology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Bailey, Donald M. "Objects from Oxyrhynchus in the British Museum and the Victoria and Albert Museum." Pages 369–381 in *Oxyrhynchus: A City and Its Texts*. Edited by Alan K. Bowman et al. London: Egypt Exploration Society, 2007.
- Baillet, Maurice. "Un recueil liturgique de Qumrân, grotte 4: 'Les paroles des luminaires.'" *RB* 68 (1961): 195–250.
- Baillet, Maurice. "Débris de textes sur papyrus de la grotte 4 de Qumrân." *RB* 71 (1964): 353–371.
- Baillet, Maurice. "Les manuscrits de la Règle de la Guerre de la grotte 4 de Qumran." *RB* 79 (1972): 217–226.
- Baillet, Maurice. *Qumrân grotte 4.III (4Q482–4Q520)*. DJD 7. Oxford: Clarendon, 1982.
- Barker, Don. "The Dating of New Testament Papyri." *NTS* 57 (2011): 571–582.
- Barthélemy, Dominique, and Józef T. Milik. *Qumran Cave 1*. DJD 1. Oxford: Clarendon, 1955.
- Baumgarten, Joseph M. "4Q503 (Daily Prayers) and the Lunar Calendar." *RevQ* 12 (1986): 399–407.
- Baumgarten, Joseph M., et al. *Qumran Cave 4.XXV: Halakhic Texts*. DJD 35. Oxford: Clarendon, 1999.
- Beek, Bart van. "Ancient Archives and Modern Collections: The Leuven Homepage of Papyrus Archives and Collections." Pages 1033–1044 in *Proceedings of the 24th International Congress of Papyrology, Helsinki, 1–7 August 2004*. Edited by Jaakko Frösén, Tiina Purolo Purolo and Erja Salmenkivi. CHL 122. Helsinki: Societas Scientiarum Fennica, 2007.
- Beit-Arié, Malachi. "Transmission of Texts by Scribes and Copyists: Unconscious and Critical Interferences." *BJRL* 75/3 (1993): 33–51.
- Ben-Dov, Jonathan. *Head of All Years: Astronomy and Calendars at Qumran in Their Ancient Context*. STDJ 78. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- Ben-Dov, Jonathan. "Lunar Calendars at Qumran? A Comparative and Ideological Study." Pages 173–189 in *Living the Lunar Calendar*. Edited by Jonathan Ben-Dov, Wayne Horowitz, and John M. Steele. Oxford: Oxbow, 2012.

- Ben-Dov, Jonathan, and Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra. "4Q249 Midrash Moshe: A New Reading and Some Implications." *DSD* 21 (2014): 131–149.
- Ben-Dov, Jonathan, Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra, and Asaf Gayer. "Reconstruction of a Single Copy of the Qumran Cave 4 Cryptic-Script Serekh ha'Edah." *RevQ* 29 (2017): 21–77.
- Ben-Dov, Jonathan, Asaf Gayer, and Eshbal Ratzon. *Material and Digital Reconstruction of Fragmentary Dead Sea Scrolls: The Case of 4Q418a*. STDJ 136. Leiden: Brill, 2022.
- Berti, Monica. "Greek and Roman Libraries in the Hellenistic Age." Pages 33–54 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls at Qumran and the Concept of a Library*. Edited by Sidnie W. Crawford and Cecilia Wassen. STDJ 116. Leiden: Brill, 2016.
- Black, Jeremy A., and John W. Tait. "Archives and Libraries in the Ancient Near East." Pages 2197–2209 in *CANE*. Vol. 4.
- Brock, Sebastian P. *A Brief Outline of Syriac Literature*. 2nd ed. Kottayam: SEERI, 2009.
- Brooke, George J. *Qumran and the Jewish Jesus: Reading the New Testament in the Light of the Scrolls*. Cambridge: Grove Books, 2005.
- Brooke, George J. "Between Scroll and Codex? Reconsidering the Qumran Opisthographs." Pages 123–138 in *On Stone and Scroll: Essays in Honour of Graham Ivor Davies*. Edited by James K. Aitken, Katharine J. Dell, and Brian A. Mastin. BZAW 420. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2011.
- Brooke, George J. "From Florilegium or Midrash to Commentary: The Problem of Renaming an Adopted Manuscript." Pages 129–150 in *The Mermaid and the Partridge: Essays from the Copenhagen Conference on Revising Texts from Cave Four*. Edited by George J. Brooke and Jesper Høgenhaven. STDJ 96. Leiden: Brill, 2011.
- Brooke, George J. "The Qumran Scrolls and the Demise of the Distinction between Higher and Lower Criticism." Pages 1–17 in *Reading the Dead Sea Scrolls: Essays in Method*. EJL 39. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2013.
- Brooke, George J. "Controlling Intertexts and Hierarchies of Echo in Two Thematic Eschatological Commentaries from Qumran." Pages 85–97 in *Reading the Dead Sea Scrolls: Essays in Method*. EJL 39. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2013.
- Brooke, George J. "Reading, Searching and Blessing: A Functional Approach to the Genres of Scriptural Interpretation in the Yahad." Pages 140–156 in *The Temple in Text and Tradition: A Festschrift in Honour of Robert Hayward*. Edited by R. Timothy McLay. LSTS 83. London: Bloomsbury, 2015.
- Brooke, George J. "Choosing Between Papyrus and Skin: Cultural Complexity and Multiple Identities in the Qumran Library." Pages 119–135 in *Jewish Cultural Encounters in the Ancient Mediterranean and Near Eastern World*. Edited by Mladen Popović, Myles Schoonover, and Marijn Vandenbergh. JSJSup 178. Leiden: Brill, 2017.
- Brooke, George J. "Praying History in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Memory, Identity, Fulfillment." Pages 305–319 in *Functions of Psalms and Prayers in the Late Second Temple Period*. Edited by Mika S. Pajunen and Jeremy Penner. BZAW 486. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2017.

- Brosius, Maria. "Ancient Archives and Concepts of Record-Keeping: An Introduction." Pages 1–16 in *Ancient Archives and Archival Traditions: Concepts of Record-Keeping in the Ancient World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Bülów-Jacobsen, Adam, Hélène Cuvigny, and Klass A. Worp. "Litura: ἀλειφάς, Not ἀλειφάρ, and Other Words for 'erasure!'" *ZPE* 130 (2000): 175–182.
- Capasso, Mario. *Manuale di papirologia ercolanese*. Galatina: Congedo, 1991.
- Capasso, Mario. "I titoli nei papiri ercolanesi. III: i titoli esterni (PHerc 339, 1491 e "scorza" non identificata)." In *Atti del II convegno nazionale di egittologia e papirologia, Siracusa, 1–3 dicembre 1995*. Siracusa: Istituto internazionale del papiro, 1996.
- Capasso, Mario. "I papiri ercolanesi opistografi." Pages 5–25 in *Atti del V convegno nazionale di egittologia e papirologia, Firenze, 10–12 dicembre 1999*. Edited by Simona Russo. Florence: Istituto Papirologico G. Vitalli, 2000.
- Carmignac, Jean. *La Règle de la Guerre des fils de Lumière contre les fils de Ténèbres*. Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1958.
- Caroli, Menico. *Il titolo iniziale nel rotolo librario greco-egizio: Con un catalogo delle testimonianze iconografiche greche e di area Vesuviana*. Bari: Levante, 2007.
- Carr, David M. *Writing on the Tablet of the Heart: Origins of Scripture and Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Casson, Lionel. *Libraries in the Ancient World*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001.
- Cavallo, Guglielmo. *Libri scritte scribi a Ercolano: Introduzione allo studio dei materiali greci*. Supplements to *CERC* 13. Naples: Gaetano Macchiaroli, 1983.
- Cavallo, Guglielmo. "I rotoli di Ercolano come prodotti scritti: Quattro riflessioni." *Scrittura e Civiltà* 8 (1984): 5–30.
- Chadwick, Henry. "Florilegium." *RAC* 7 (1969): 1131–1160.
- Chazon, Esther G. "A Liturgical Document from Qumran and Its Implications: Words of the Luminaries" (Hebrew). PhD diss., Hebrew University, 1991.
- Chazon, Esther G. "Is *Divrei Ha-me'orot* a Sectarian Prayer?" Pages 3–17 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research*. Edited by Devorah Dimant and Uriel Rappaport. STDJ 10. Leiden: Brill, 1992.
- Chazon, Esther G. "Hymns and Prayers in the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 244–270 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*. Edited by Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- Chazon, Esther G. "The Function of the Qumran Prayer Texts: An Analysis of the Daily Prayers (4Q503)." Pages 217–225 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Fifty Years after Their Discovery, Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20–25, 1997*. Edited by Lawrence H. Schiffman, Emanuel Tov, and James C. VanderKam. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2000.
- Chazon, Esther G. "'Gather the dispersed of Judah:' Seeking a Return to the Land as a Factor in Jewish Identity of Late Antiquity." Pages 159–175 in *Heavenly Tablets: Inter-*

- pretation, Identity and Tradition in Ancient Judaism*. Edited by Lynn LiDonnici and Andrea Lieber. JSJSup 119. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Chazon, Esther G. "Liturgical Function in The Cave 1 Hodoyot Collection." Pages 135–149 in *Qumran Cave 1 Revisited: Texts from Cave 1 Sixty Years after Their Discovery: Proceedings of the Sixth Meeting of the IQS in Ljubljana*. Edited by Daniel K. Falk et al. STDJ 91. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- Chazon, Esther G. "Prayer and Identity in Varying Contexts: The Case of the *Words of the Luminaries*." JSJ 46 (2015): 484–511.
- Chazon, Esther G., et al. *Qumran Cave 4.XX: Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 2*. DJD 29. Oxford: Clarendon, 1999.
- Clarysse, Willy. "Literary Papyri in Documentary Archives." Pages 43–61 in *Egypt and the Hellenistic World: Proceedings of the International Colloquium Leuven, 24–26 May 1982*. Edited by Edmond van 't Dack et al. Studia Hellenistica 27. Leuven: Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, 1983.
- Clarysse, Willy. "Egyptian Scribes Writing Greek" *CdE* 68 (1993): 186–201.
- Coblentz Bautch, Kelley, and Jack Weinbender. "Authoritative Scriptures: Other Texts." Pages 280–285 in *T&T Clark Companion to the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by George J. Brooke and Charlotte Hempel. London: T&T Clark, 2019.
- Cockeram, Henry. *The English Dictionarie: or, An Interpreter of Hard English Words*. 1623. Repr., New York: Huntington, 1930.
- Cohn, Yehudah B. *Tangled Up in Text: Tefillin and the Ancient World*. BJS 361. Providence: Brown Judaic Studies, 2008.
- Cohn, Yehudah B. "Reading Material Features of Qumran *Tefillin* and *Mezuzot*." Pages 89–99 in *Material Aspects of Reading in Ancient and Medieval Cultures: Materiality, Presence and Performance*. Edited by Anna Krauß, Jonas Leipziger and Friederike Schücking-Jungblut. MTK 26. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2020.
- Collins, John J. "The Mythology of Holy War in Daniel and the Qumran War Scroll: A Point of Transition in Jewish Apocalyptic." *VT* 25 (1975): 596–612.
- Collins, John J. *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A Biography*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2012.
- Cotton Hannah M., and Joseph Geiger. *Masada 11: The Yigael Yadin Excavations 1963–1965, Final Reports: The Latin and Greek Documents*. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1989.
- Cotton, Hannah M., and Ada Yardeni. *Aramaic, Hebrew, and Greek Documentary Texts from Nahal Hever and Other Sites, with an Appendix Containing Alleged Qumran Texts*. DJD 27. Oxford: Clarendon, 1997.
- Cotton Hannah M., and Erik Larson. "4Q460/4Q350 and Tampering with Qumran Texts in Antiquity?" Pages 113–125 in *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov*. Edited by Shalom M. Paul et al. VTSup 94. Leiden: Brill, 2003.

- Coulmas, Florian. "Opisthograph." Page 371 in *Blackwell Encyclopedia of Writing Systems*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1996.
- Crawford, Sidnie W. "Qumran: Caves, Scrolls and Buildings." Pages 253–273 in *A Teacher for All Generations: Essays in Honor of James C. VanderKam*. Vol. 1. Edited by Eric F. Mason et al. JSJSup 153. Leiden: Brill, 2011.
- Crawford, Sidnie W. "Review of Rethinking Rewritten Scripture: Composition and Exegesis in the 4QReworked Pentateuch Manuscripts by Molly M. Zahn." *DSD* 20 (2013): 175–177.
- Crawford, Sidnie W. "The Qumran Collection as a Scribal Library." Pages 109–131 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls at Qumran and the Concept of a Library*. Edited by Sidnie W. Crawford and Cecilia Wassen. STDJ 116. Leiden: Brill, 2016.
- Crawford, Sidnie W. *Scribes and Scrolls at Qumran*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2019.
- Crawford, Sidnie W. "The Excerpted Manuscripts from Qumran, with Special Attention to 4QReworked Pentateuch D and 4QReworked Pentateuch E." Pages 247–268 in *Scribal Practice, Text and Canon in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Essays in Memory of Peter W. Flint*. Edited by John J. Collins and Ananda Geysler-Fouché. STDJ 130. Leiden: Brill, 2019.
- Crawford, Sidnie W. "Where Are All the Colophons? Colophons in the Ancient Near East and in the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 101–118 in *Mighty Baal: Essays in Honor of Mark S. Smith*. Edited by Stephen C. Russell and Esther J. Hamori. HSS 66. Leiden: Brill, 2020.
- Criboire, Raffaella. "Education in the Papyri." Pages 320–337 in *The Oxford Handbook of Papyrology*. Edited by Roger S. Bagnall. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Cross, Frank M. *The Ancient Library of Qumrân and Modern Biblical Studies*. London: Duckworth, 1958.
- Cross, Frank M. "Appendix: Paleographical Dates of the Manuscripts." Page 57 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations, vol. 1: Rule of the Community and Related Documents*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1994.
- Cross, Frank M. "The Development of the Jewish Scripts." Pages 3–43 in *The Bible and the Ancient Near East: Essays in honor of William Foxwell Albright*. Edited by George E. Wright. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1961, 133–202. Reprinted with some revisions in *Leaves from an Epigrapher's Notebook: Collected Papers in Hebrew and West Semitic Palaeography and Epigraphy*. HSS 51. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2003.
- Daniels, Peter T. "A Calligraphic Approach to Aramaic Palaeography." *JNES* 43 (1984): 55–68.
- D'Arms, John H. *Romans on the Bay of Naples and Other Essays on Roman Campania*. Bari: Edipuglia, 2003.
- Davies, Philip R. "Review of Gott und Belial, by Peter von der Osten-Sacken." *RB* 78 (1971): 447–450.

- Davies, Philip R. *1QM, the War Scroll from Qumran: Its Structure and History*. BibOr 32. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1977.
- Davies, Philip R. "Sects from Texts: On the Problems of Doing a Sociology of the Qumran Literature." Pages 69–82 in *New Directions in Qumran Studies*. Edited by Jonathan G. Campbell, William J. Lyons, and Lloyd K. Pietersen. LSTS 52. London: T&T Clark, 2005.
- Davies, Philip R. "Dualism in the Qumran War Texts." Pages 8–19 in *Dualism in Qumran*. Edited by Géza G. Xeravits. LSTS 76. London: T&T Clark, 2010.
- Davila, James R. *Liturgical Works*. ECDSS 6. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.
- Davison, Scott A. *Petitionary Prayer: A Philosophical Investigation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017.
- Dayfani, Hila. "Material Reconstruction, New Joins and Readings in 4Q415 (4QInstruction^a)." *RevQ* 33 (2021): 161–202.
- Dayfani, Hila. "4Q37 and Excerpted Texts of Deuteronomy from Qumran." *DSD* 30 (2023): 213–234.
- Debel, Hans. "Rewritten Bible, Variant Literary Editions and Original Text(s): Exploring the Implications of a Pluriform Outlook on the Scriptural Tradition." Pages 65–91 in *Changes in Scripture: Rewriting and Interpreting Authoritative Traditions in the Second Temple Period*. Edited by Hanne von Weissenberg, Juha Pakkala, and Marko Marttila. BZAW 419. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2011.
- Delattre, Daniel. "Les mentions de titres d'œuvres dans les livres de Philodème." *CErc* 26 (1996): 143–168.
- Del Corso, Lucio. "L'Insegnamento alla luce delle testimonianze iconografiche." Pages 307–331 in *L'Enseignement supérieur dans les mondes antiques et médiévaux*. Edited by Henri Huggonard-Roche. Textes et traditions 16. Paris: Vrin, 2008.
- Delnero, Paul. "Sumerian Extract Tablets and Scribal Training." *JCS* 62 (2010): 53–69.
- Depauw, Mark, and Tom Gheldof. "Trismegistos: An interdisciplinary Platform for Ancient World Texts and Related Information." Pages 40–52 in *Theory and Practice of Digital Libraries—TPDL 2013. Selected Workshops*. Edited by Łukasz Bolikowski et al. CCIS 41. Cham: Springer, 2014.
- De Simone, Antonio. "Rediscovering the Villa of the Papyri." Pages 1–20 in *The Villa of the Papyri at Herculaneum: Archaeology, Reception, and Digital Reconstruction*. Edited by Mantha Zarmakoupi. Sozomena 1. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2010.
- Dhali, Maruf A., et al. "A Digital Palaeographic Approach towards Writer Identification in the Dead Sea Scrolls." In *Proceedings of the 6th International Conference on Pattern Recognition Applications and Methods—Volume 1: ICPRAM, 693–702, 2017*. Porto, 2017.
- Dhali, Maruf A., et al. "Feature-extraction Methods for Historical Manuscript Dating Based on Writing Style Development." *Pattern Recognition Letters* 131 (2020): 413–420.

- Dimant, Devorah. "Between Sectarian and Non-Sectarian: The Case of the *Apocryphon of Joshua*." Pages 105–134 in *Reworking the Bible: Apocryphal and Related Texts at Qumran*. Edited by Esther G. Chazon, Devorah Dimant, and Ruth A. Clements. STDJ 58. Leiden: Brill, 2005.
- Dimant, Devorah. "4QFlorilegium and the Idea of the Community as a Temple." Pages 269–288 in *History, Ideology and Bible Interpretation in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Collected Studies*. FAT 90. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014.
- Dimant, Devorah. "Introductory Essay: The Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls—Past and Present." Pages 1–24 in *History, Ideology and Bible Interpretation in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Collected Studies*. FAT 90. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014.
- Dimant, Devorah. "The Qumran Manuscripts: Contents and Significance." Pages 27–56 in *History, Ideology and Bible Interpretation in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Collected Studies*. FAT 90. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014.
- Dimant, Devorah. "The Vocabulary of the Qumran Sectarian Texts." Pages 57–100 in *History, Ideology and Bible Interpretation in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Collected Studies*. FAT 90. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014.
- Dimant, Devorah. "The Library of Qumran in Recent Scholarship." Pages 7–14 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls at Qumran and the Concept of a Library*. Edited by Sidnie W. Crawford and Cecilia Wassen. STDJ 116. Leiden: Brill, 2016.
- Dimant, Devorah. "The Library of Qumran: Variety versus Unity." *Henoch* 40 (2018): 49–56.
- Diringer, David. *The Book before Printing: Ancient, Medieval and Oriental*. New York: Dover, 1982.
- Dix, T. Keith. "'Public Libraries' at Rome: Ideology and Reality." *Libraries and Culture* 29 (1994): 282–296.
- Doering, Lutz. "Excerpted Texts in Second Temple Judaism: A Survey of the Evidence." Pages 1–38 in *Selecta Colligere, II: Beiträge zur Technik des Sammelns und Kompilierens griechischer Texte von der Antike bis zur Humanismus*. Edited by Rosa M. Piccione and Matthias Perkams. Hellenica 18. Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso, 2005.
- Doering, Lutz. *Ancient Jewish Letters and the Beginnings of Christian Epistolography*. WUNT 298. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012.
- Dorandi, Tiziano. "La patria di Filodemo." *Phil* 131 (1987): 254–256.
- Dorandi, Tiziano. *Storia dei filosofi: Platone e l'Accademia: (PHerc. 1021 e 164)*. Naples: Bibliopolis, 1991.
- Dorandi, Tiziano. "Opisthographos." *BNP*.
- Dorandi, Tiziano. *Nell'officina dei classici: Come lavoravano gli autori antichi*. Rome: Carocci, 2007.
- Dorandi, Tiziano. "Notebooks and Collections of Excerpts: Moments of ars excerpendi in the Greco-Roman World." Pages 35–57 in *Forgetting Machines: Knowledge Management Evolution in Early Modern Europe*. Edited by Alberto Cevoloni. LWV 53. Leiden: Brill, 2016.

- Dougherty, Raymond P. "Writing upon Parchment and Papyrus among the Babylonians and the Assyrians." *JAOs* 48 (1928): 109–135.
- Driscoll, Matthew J. "The Words on the Page: Thoughts on Philology, Old and New." Pages 87–104 in *Creating the Medieval Saga: Versions, Variability, and Editorial Interpretations of Old Norse Saga Literature*. Edited by Judy Quinn and Emily Lethbridge. Odense: Syddansk Universitetsforlag, 2010.
- Driver, Godfrey R. *Aramaic Documents of the Fifth Century*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Clarendon, 1957.
- Driver, Godfrey R. *The Judaean Scrolls: The Problem and a Solution*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1965.
- Duhaime, Jean. "La Règle de la Guerre de Qumrân et l'apocalyptique." *ScEs* 36 (1984): 67–88.
- Duhaime, Jean. "War Scroll." Pages 80–203 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek Texts with English Translations, vol. 2: The Damascus Document, War Scroll and Related Documents*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1995.
- Duhaime, Jean. *The War Texts: 1QM and Related Manuscripts*. CQS 6. London: T&T Clark, 2004.
- Duncan, Julie A. "Excerpted Texts of *Deuteronomy* at Qumran." *RevQ* 18 (1997): 43–62.
- Dupont-Sommer, André. "Règlement de la guerre des fils de lumière: traduction et notes." *RHR* 148 (1955): 141–180.
- Enenkel, Karl A.E. "The Making of 16th-century Mythography: Giraldu's *Syntagma de Musis* (1507, 1511 and 1539), *De deis gentium historia* (ca. 1500–1548) and Julien de Havrech's *De cognominibus deorum gentilium* (1541)." *Humanistica Lovaniensia* 51 (2002): 9–53.
- Epp, Eldon J. "The Oxyrhynchus New Testament Papyri: 'Not without Honor except in Their Hometown?'" *JBL* 123 (2004): 5–55.
- Erasmus, Desiderius. *Opus Epistolarum Des. Erasmi Roterodami*. Vol. 4: 1519–1521. Edited by Percy S. Allen and Heathcote W. Garrod. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1922.
- Eshel, Esther. "4Q414 Fragment 2: Purification of a Corpse-Contaminated Person." Pages 3–10 in *Legal Texts and Legal Issues: Proceedings of the Second Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Cambridge, 1995, Published in Honour of Joseph M. Baumgarten*. Edited by Moshe Bernstein, Florentino García Martínez, and John Kampen. STDJ 23. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- Eshel, Esther, et al. *Qumran Cave 4.VI: Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 1*. DJD 11. Oxford: Clarendon, 1998.
- Eshel, Hanan. "4Q348, 4Q343 and 4Q345: Three Economic Documents from Qumran Cave 4?" *JJS* 52 (2001): 132–135.
- Eshel, Hanan. "The Kittim in the War Scroll and in the Pesharim." Pages 29–44 in *Historical Perspectives: From the Hasmoneans to Bar Kokhba in Light of the Dead Sea*

- Scrolls*. Edited by David Goodblatt, Avital Pinnick, and Daniel R. Schwartz. STDJ 37. Leiden: Brill, 2001.
- Eshel, Hanan. "Dibre Hame'orot and the Apocalypse of Weeks." Pages 149–154 in *Things Revealed: Studies in Early Jewish and Christian Literature in Honor of Michael E. Stone*. Edited by Esther G. Chazon, David Satran, and Ruth A. Clements. JSJSup 89. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- Eshel, Hanan. *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Hasmonean State*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008.
- Falk, Daniel K. *Daily, Sabbath, and Festival Prayers in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. STDJ 27. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- Falk, Daniel K. "Petition and Ideology in the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 135–159 in *Prayer and Poetry in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature: Essays in Honor of Eileen Schuller on the Occasion of Her 65th Birthday*. Edited by Jeremy Penner, Ken M. Penner, and Cecilia Wassen. STDJ 98. Leiden: Brill, 2012.
- Falk, Daniel K. "Material Aspects of Prayer Manuscripts at Qumran." Pages 33–88 in *Literature or Liturgy? Early Christian Hymns and Prayers in their Literary and Liturgical Context in Antiquity*. Edited by Clemens Leonhard and Hermut Löhr. WUNT 363. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014.
- Falk, Daniel K. "Prayer, Liturgy, and War." Pages 275–294 in *The War Scroll, Violence, War and Peace in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature*. Edited by Kipp Davis et al. STDJ 115. Leiden: Brill, 2015.
- Falk, Daniel K. "In the Margins of the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 10–38 in *Bible as Notepad: Tracing Annotations and Annotation Practices in Late Antique and Medieval Biblical Manuscripts*. Edited by Liv I. Lied and Marilena Maniaci. Manuscripta Biblica 3. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2018.
- Falk, Daniel K. "Liturgical Texts." Pages 423–434 in *T&T Clark Companion to the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by George J. Brooke and Charlotte Hempel. London: T&T Clark, 2019.
- Feldman, Ariel, and Faina Feldman. "4Q147: An Amulet?" *DSD* 26 (2019): 1–29.
- Feldman, Ariel, and Faina Feldman. "4Q148 (4QPhylactère U): Another Amulet from Qumran?" *JSJ* 50 (2019): 197–222.
- Fields, Weston W. *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A Full History*. Vol. 1. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- Fitzgerald, John T. "Gadara: Philodemus' Native City." Pages 343–397 in *Philodemus and the New Testament World*. Edited by John T. Fitzgerald, Dirk Obbink, and Glenn S. Holland. NovTSup 111. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- Fleischer, Kilian. "Melanthios von Rhodos in Apollodors Chronik (P.Herc.1021, col. xxx1)." *Phil* 162 (2018): 15–24.
- Flusser, David. "Apocalyptic Elements in the War Scroll." Pages 140–158 in *Judaism of the Second Temple Period, vol. 1: Qumran and Apocalypticism*. Translated by Azzan Yadin. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.

- Foster, Paul. "Papyrus Oxyrhynchus x 1224." Pages 59–96 in *Early Christian Manuscripts: Examples of Applied Method and Approach*. Edited by Thomas J. Kraus and Tobias Nicklas. TENTS 5. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- Fournet, Jean-Luc. "Papyrus, Greco-Roman Period." Pages 5057–5058 in *The Encyclopedia of Ancient History*. Edited by Roger S. Bagnall et al. Malden: Wiley-Blackwell, 2013.
- Frampton, Stephanie A. *Empire of Letters: Writing in Roman Literature and Thought from Lucretius to Ovid*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019.
- Gaiser, Konrad. *Philodems Academica*. Supplementum Platonicum I. Stuttgart: Frommann-Holzboog, 1988.
- Gallavotti, Carlo. "La libreria di una villa romana ercolanese." *Bollettino istituto di patologia del libro* 3 (1941): 129–145.
- Gallo, Italo. *Greek and Latin Papyrology*. London: Institute of Classical Studies, 1986.
- García Martínez, Florentino. "Review of Maurice Baillet, Discoveries in the Judean Desert VII. Qumrân Grotte 4 III (4Q482–4Q520)." *JStJ* 15 (1984): 157–164.
- García Martínez, Florentino. "The Contents of the Manuscripts from the Caves of Qumran." Pages 67–79 in *The Caves of Qumran: Proceedings of the International Conference, Lugano 2014*. Edited by Marcello Fidanzio. STDJ 118. Leiden: Brill, 2016.
- Garuti, Giovanni. *C. Rabirius, Bellum Actiacum e papyro Herculanensi 817*. Bologna: N. Zanichelli, 1958.
- Geiger, Gregor. "Die Doppelurkunden aus der Judäischen Wüste: Das Verhältnis vom oberen (inneren) und unteren (äusseren) Text." *RevQ* 29 (2017): 247–279.
- George, Andrew R. "The Poem of Erra and Ishum: A Babylonian Poet's View of War." Pages 39–71 in *Warfare and Poetry in the Middle East*. Edited by Hugh Kennedy. London: I.B. Tauris, 2013.
- Gesche, Petra D. *Schulunterricht in Babylonien Im Ersten Jahrtausend v. Chr.* AOAT 275. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2001.
- Gigante, Marcello. *Catalogo dei papiri ercolanesi*. Naples: Bibliopolis, 1979.
- Gigante, Marcello. *Philodemus in Italy: the Books from Herculaneum*. Translated by Dirk Obbink. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1995.
- Glassner, Jean-Jacques. *Mesopotamian Chronicles*. Edited by Benjamin R. Foster. WAW 19. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2004.
- Goff, Matthew J. *4QInstruction*. WLaw 2. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2013.
- Golb, Norman. *Who Wrote the Dead Sea Scrolls? The Search for the Secret of Qumran*. New York: Scribner, 1995.
- Grenfell, Bernard P., and Arthur S. Hunt. *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*. Vol. 1. London: Egypt Exploration Fund, 1898.
- Grenfell, Bernard P., and Arthur S. Hunt. *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*. Vol. 3. London: Egypt Exploration Fund, 1903.
- Grenfell, Bernard P., and Arthur S. Hunt. *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*. Vol. 4. London: Egypt Exploration Fund, 1904.

- Grenfell, Bernard P., and Arthur S. Hunt. *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*. Vol. 10. London: Egypt Exploration Fund, 1914.
- Guidobaldi, Maria P., and Domenico Esposito. "New Archaeological Research at the Villa of the Papyri in Herculaneum." Pages 21–60 in *The Villa of the Papyri at Herculaneum: Archaeology, Reception, and Digital Reconstruction*. Edited by Mantha Zarmakoupi. Sozomena 1. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2010.
- Gurd, Sean A. *Work in Progress: Literary Revision as Social Performance in Ancient Rome*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Haigh, Rebekah. "Oral Aspects: A Performative Approach to 1QM." *DSD* 26 (2019): 189–219.
- Hamidovic, David. "The First Prayer of Festival Prayers (1Q34+1Q34Bis, 4Q508, 4Q509): A Prayer for the Beginning of the Quarter?" Pages 259–275 in *Qumran Cave 1 Revisited: Texts from Cave 1 Sixty Years after Their Discovery: Proceedings of the Sixth Meeting of the 10QS in Ljubljana*. Edited by Daniel K. Falk et al. STDJ 91. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- Haran, Menahem. "Book-Scrolls at the Beginning of the Second Temple Period: The Transition from Papyrus to Skins." *HUCA* 54 (1983): 111–122.
- Haran, Menahem. "Archives, Libraries and the Order of the Biblical Books." *JANESCU* 22 (1993): 52–61.
- Harrington, Daniel J. *Wisdom Texts from Qumran*. London: Routledge, 1996.
- Harris, Marvin. "History and Significance of the Emic/Etic Distinction." *Annual Review of Anthropology* (5) 1976: 329–350.
- Hartog, Pieter B. *Pesher and Hypomnema: A Comparison of Two Commentary Traditions from the Hellenistic and Roman Periods*. STDJ 121. Leiden: Brill, 2017.
- Hedrick, Charles W. "Literature and Communication." Pages 167–190 in *The Oxford Handbook of Social Relations in the Roman World*. Edited by Michael Peachin. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Hempel, Charlotte. "Maskil(im) and Rabbim: From Daniel to Qumran." Pages 133–156 in *Biblical Traditions in Transmission: Essays in Honour of Michael A. Knibb*. Edited by Charlotte Hempel and Judith M. Lieu. JSJSup 111. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- Hempel, Charlotte. "Pluralism and Authoritativeness: The Case of The S Tradition." Pages 193–208 in *Authoritative Scriptures in Ancient Judaism*. Edited by Mladen Popović. JSJSup 141. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- Hempel, Charlotte. *Qumran Rule Texts in Context: Collected Studies*. TSAJ 154. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013.
- Hempel, Charlotte. "The Long Text of the *Serekh* as Crisis Literature." *RevQ* 27 (2015): 3–23.
- Hempel, Charlotte. "Cutting the Cord with the Familiar: What Makes 4Q265 *Miscellaneous Rules* Tick?" Pages 509–516 in *Sibyls, Scriptures, and Scrolls: John Collins at Seventy*. Edited by Joel S. Baden, Hindy Najman, and Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar. JSJSup 175. Leiden: Brill, 2016.

- Hempel, Charlotte. "Reflections on Literacy, Textuality, and Community in the Qumran Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 69–82 in *Is There a Text in This Cave? Studies in the Textuality of the Dead Sea Scrolls in Honour of George J. Brooke*. Edited by Ariel Feldman, Maria Cioatǎ, and Charlotte Hempel. STDJ 119. Leiden: Brill, 2017.
- Hempel, Charlotte. *The Community Rules from Qumran: A Commentary*. TSAJ 183. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2020.
- Hendrickson, Thomas. "The Invention of the Greek Library." *TAPA* 144 (2014): 371–413.
- Hendrickson, Thomas. "An Emendation to a Fragment of Varro's *De bibliothecis* (Fr. 54 *GRF* Funaioli)." *ClQ* 65 (2015): 395–397.
- Hendrickson, Thomas. *Ancient Libraries and Renaissance Humanism: The De bibliothecis of Justus Lipsius*. BSIH 265. Leiden: Brill, 2017.
- Hoek, Annewies van den. "Techniques of Quotation in Clement of Alexandria: A View of Ancient Literary Working Methods." *VC* 50 (1996): 223–243.
- Høgenhaven, Jesper. "Copper Scroll." Pages 304–305 in *T&T Clark Companion to the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by George J. Brooke and Charlotte Hempel. London: T&T Clark, 2019.
- Høgenhaven, Jesper. *The Cave 3 Copper Scroll: A Symbolic Journey*. STDJ 132. Leiden: Brill, 2020.
- Houston, George W. "Papyrological Evidence for Book Collections and Libraries in the Roman Empire." Pages 233–267 in *Ancient Literacies: The Culture of Reading in Greece and Rome*. Edited by William A. Johnson and Holt N. Parker. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Houston, George W. "The non-Philodemus Book Collection in the Villa of the Papyri." Pages 183–208 in *Ancient Libraries*. Edited by Jason P. König, Katerina Oikonomopoulou, and Greg Woolf. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- Houston, George W. *Inside Roman Libraries: Book Collections and Their Management in Antiquity*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2014.
- Hoven, René, ed. *Dictionary of Renaissance Latin from Prose Sources*. 2nd ed. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- Hunt, Arthur S. *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*. Vol. 8. London: Egypt Exploration Fund, 1911.
- Hunzinger, Claus-Hunno. "Le travail d'édition des fragments manuscrits de Qumrân (Communication de C.-H. Hunzinger)." *RB* 63 (1956): 67.
- Hurtado, Larry W. *The Earliest Christian Artifacts: Manuscripts and Christian Origins*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006.
- Jacob, Christian. "Fragments of a History of Ancient Libraries." Pages 57–81 in *Ancient Libraries*. Edited by Jason P. König, Katerina Oikonomopoulou, and Greg Woolf. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- Janko, Richard. *Philodemus: "On Poems," Book 1. Edited with Introduction, Translation and Commentary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

- Janko, Richard. "The Herculaneum Library: Some Recent Developments." *Estudios Clásicos* 121 (2002): 25–41.
- Janko, Richard. "New fragments of Epicurus, Metrodorus, Demetrius Laco, Philodemus, the *Carmen de bello Actiaco* and other texts in Oxonian *Disegni* of 1788–1792." *CErc* 38 (2008): 5–95.
- Jefferies, Daryl F. *Wisdom at Qumran: A Form-critical Analysis of the Admonitions in 4QInstruction*. Piscataway: Gorgias, 2002.
- Johnson, Michael B. "One Work or Three? A Proposal for Reading 1QS-1QSa-1QSB as a Composite Work." *DSD* 25 (2018): 141–177.
- Johnson, Michael B. "Getting a Handle on 1QIsaiah^b: A New Proposal for the So-Called Handle Sheet of 1QHodayot^a." *DSD* 29 (2022): 1–26.
- Johnson, William A. "Toward a Sociology of Reading in Classical Antiquity." *AJP* 121 (2000): 593–627.
- Johnson, William A. *Bookrolls and Scribes in Oxyrhynchus*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2004.
- Johnson, William A. *Readers and Reading Culture in the High Roman Empire: A Study of Elite Communities*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Johnson, William A. "Constructing Elite Reading Communities in the High Empire." Pages 320–330 in *Ancient Literacies: The Culture of Reading in Greece and Rome*. Edited by William A. Johnson and Holt N. Parker. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Johnson, William A. "Introduction." Pages 3–10 in *Ancient Literacies: The Culture of Reading in Greece and Rome*. Edited by William A. Johnson and Holt N. Parker. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Johnston, Alan. "Straight, Crooked and Joined-up Writing: An Early Mediterranean View." Pages 193–212 in *Writing as Material Practice: Substance, Surface and Medium*. Edited by Kathryn E. Piquette and Ruth Whitehouse. London: Ubiquity, 2013.
- Jokiranta, Jutta. "'Sectarianism' of the Qumran 'Sect': Sociological Notes." *RevQ* 78 (2001): 224–239.
- Jokiranta, Jutta. *Social Identity and Sectarianism in the Qumran Movement*. STDJ 105. Leiden: Brill, 2013.
- Jokiranta, Jutta, and Hanna Vanonen. "Multiple Copies of Rule Texts or Multiple Rule Texts? Boundaries of the S and M Documents." Pages 11–60 in *Crossing Imaginary Boundaries: The Dead Sea Scrolls in the Context of Second Temple Judaism*. Edited by Mika S. Pajunen and Hanna Tervanotko. PFES 108. Helsinki: The Finnish Exegetical Society, 2015.
- Jull, A.J. Timothy, Douglas J. Donahue, Magen Broshi, and Emanuel Tov. "Radiocarbon Dating of Scrolls and Linen Fragments from the Judean Desert." *Radiocarbon* 37 (1995): 11–19.
- Kenyon, Frederic G. *Aristotle on the Constitution of Athens*. 3rd ed. London: The Trustees of the British Museum, 1892.

- Kenyon, Frederic G. *Greek Papyri in the British Museum: Catalogue with Texts*. Vol. 1. London, British Museum, 1893.
- Kidd, Stephen. "Written Greek but Drawn Egyptian: Script Changes in a Bilingual Dream Papyrus." Pages 239–252 in *Writing as Material Practice: Substance, Surface and Medium*. Edited by Kathryn E. Piquette and Ruth Whitehouse. London: Ubiquity, 2013.
- Kleve, Knut. "Lucretius in Herculaneum." *CErc* 19 (1989): 5–27.
- Kloner, Amos, and Boaz Zissu. *The Necropolis of Jerusalem in the Second Temple Period*. ISACR 8. Leuven: Peeters, 2007.
- Knohl, Israel. "Between Voice and Silence: The Relationship between Prayer and Temple Cult." *JBL* 115 (1996): 17–30.
- Koffmahn, Elisabeth. *Die Doppelurkunden aus der Wüste Juda. Recht und Praxis der jüdischen Papyri des 1. und 2. Jahrhunderts n. Chr. samt Übertragung der Texte und deutscher Übersetzung*. STDJ 5. Leiden: Brill, 1968.
- König, Jason P., Katerina Oikonomopoulou, and Greg Woolf, eds. *Ancient Libraries*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- Kottsieper, Ingo. "Physicality of Manuscripts and Material Culture." Pages 167–177 in *T&T Clark Companion to the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by George J. Brooke and Charlotte Hempel. London: T&T Clark, 2019.
- Kramer, Johannes. "Papyrologie: Eine interdisziplinäre Altertumswissenschaft." Pages 15–25 in *Von der Papyrologie zur Romanistik*. Archiv für Papyrusforschung und verwandte Gebiete 30. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2011.
- Kraus, Thomas J. *Ad Fontes: Original Manuscripts and Their Significance for Studying Early Christianity: Selected Essays*. TENTS 3. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Kraus, Thomas J. "The Lending Of Books In The Fourth Century C.E. P.Oxy. LXIII 4365—A Letter On Papyrus And The Reciprocal Lending Of Literature Having Become Apocryphal." Pages 185–206 in *Ad Fontes: Original Manuscripts and Their Significance for Studying Early Christianity: Selected Essays*. TENTS 3. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Krieg, Matthias. "Mo'ed Naqam—ein Kulturdrama aus Qumran: Beobachtungen an der Kriegsrolle." *TZ* 41 (1985): 3–30.
- Krüger, Julian. *Oxyrhynchos in der Kaiserzeit: Studien zur Topographie und Literaturrezeption*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1990.
- Kuhrt, Amélie. "State Communications in the Persian Empire." Pages 112–140 in *State Correspondence in the Ancient World: From New Kingdom Egypt to the Roman Empire*. Edited by Karen Radner. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.
- Lama, Mariachiara. "Aspetti di tecnica libraria ad Ossirinco: Copie letterarie su rotoli documentari." *Aeg* 71 (1991): 55–120.
- Lange, Armin. "The Qumran Dead Sea Scrolls—Library or Manuscript Corpus?" Pages 177–193 in *From 4QMMT to Resurrection: Mélanges qumraniens en hommage à Émile Puech*. Edited by Florentino García Martínez, Annette Steudel, and Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar. STDJ 61. Leiden: Brill, 2006.

- Lapin, Hayim. "Dead Sea Scrolls and the Historiography of Ancient Judaism." Pages 108–127 in *Rediscovering the Dead Sea Scrolls: An Assessment of Old and New Approaches and Methods*. Edited by Maxine L. Grossman. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010.
- Lemaire, André. "Inscriptions du khirbeh, des grottes 'Ain Feshkha." Pages 341–388 in *Khirbet Qumrân et 'Ain Feshkha II: Études d'anthropologie, de physique et de chimie*. Edited by Jean-Baptiste Humbert and Jan Gunneweg. NTOA. SA 3. Fribourg: Presses Universitaires; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2003.
- Lim, Timothy. "Authoritative Scriptures and the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 303–322 in *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Timothy Lim and John J. Collins. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Lincoln, Bruce. *Apples and Oranges: Explorations in, on, and with Comparison*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2018.
- Longacre, Drew G. "Reconsidering the Date of the En-Gedi Leviticus Scroll (EGLv): Exploring the Limitations of the Comparative-Typological Paleographic Method." *Textus* 27 (2018): 44–84.
- Longacre, Drew G. "Disambiguating the Concept of Formality in Palaeographic Descriptions: Stylistic Classification and the Ancient Jewish Hebrew/Aramaic Scripts." *COMSt Bulletin* 5 (2019): 101–128.
- Longacre, Drew G. "Comparative Hellenistic and Roman Manuscript Studies (CHRoMS): Script Interactions and Hebrew/Aramaic Writing Culture." *COMSt Bulletin* 7 (2021): 7–50.
- Longacre, Drew G. "Paleographic Style and the Forms and Functions of the Dead Sea Psalm Scrolls: A Hand Fitting for the Occasion?" *VT* 72 (2022): 67–92. <https://doi.org/10.1163/15685330-bja10019>.
- Longacre, Drew G., and Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar. "4.1.3.2.1 Hebrew and Aramaic Palaeography (Ancient)." In *Textual History of the Bible*. General Editor Armin Lange. Leiden: Brill, 2017. http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2452-4107_thb_COM_225895.
- Longo Auricchio, Francesca, and Mario Capasso. "I rotoli della Villa ercolanese: Dislocazione e ritrovamento." *CErc* 17 (1987): 37–47.
- Looijer, Gwynned de. *The Qumran Paradigm: A Critical Evaluation of Some Foundational Hypotheses in the Construction of the Qumran Sect*. EJL 43. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2015.
- Lowrie, Michèle. "Vergil and Founding Violence." Pages 391–403 in *A Companion to Vergil's Aeneid and its Tradition*. Edited by Joseph Farrell and Michael C.J. Putnam. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010.
- Luijendijk, AnneMarie. "A New Testament Papyrus and Its Documentary Context: An Early Christian Writing Exercise from the Archive of Leonides ('P.Oxy.' 11 209/P10)." *JBL* 129 (2010): 575–596.
- Luijendijk, AnneMarie. "Sacred Scriptures as Trash: Biblical Papyri from Oxyrhynchus." *VC* 64 (2010): 217–254.

- Luijendijk, AnneMarie. "Books and Private Readers in Early Christian Oxyrhynchus: "A Spiritual Meadow and a Garden of Delight,"" Pages 101–135 in *Books and Readers in the Premodern World: Essays in Honor of Harry Gamble*. Edited by Karl Shuve. WGRWSup 12. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2018.
- Luz, Menahem. "Oenomaus and Talmudic Anecdote." *JSJ* 23 (1992): 42–80.
- Magness, Jodi. *The Archaeology of Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, 2002.
- Magness, Jodi. "Ossuaries and the Burials of Jesus and James." *JBL* 124 (2005): 121–154.
- Magness, Jodi. *Stone and Dung, Oil and Spit: Jewish Daily Life in the Time of Jesus*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011.
- Maiuri, Amedeo. *La casa del Menandro e il suo tesoro di argenteria*. Vol. 1. Rome: La Libreria dello Stato, 1933.
- Manfredi, Manfredo. "Opistografo." *Parola del Passato* 38 (1983): 44–54.
- Markschies, Christoph. "Neue Forschungen zur Kanonisierung des Neuen Testaments." *Apocrypha* 12 (2001): 237–262.
- Martin, Malachi B. *The Scribal Character of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Vol. 1. Leuven: Publications Universitaires, 1958.
- Martone, Corrado. "The Qumran Library and Other Ancient Libraries: Elements for a Comparison." Pages 55–77 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls at Qumran and the Concept of a Library*. Edited by Sidnie W. Crawford and Cecilia Wassen. STDJ 116. Leiden: Brill, 2016.
- Martone, Corrado. "From Universal to Sectarian. The Zadokites, Qumran, the Temple and Their Libraries." *Henoch* 40 (2018): 21–32.
- Masai, François. "Paléographie et codicologie." *Scriptorium* 4 (1950): 279–293.
- Mason, Steve N. "Of Audience and Meaning: Reading Josephus' *Bellum Judaicum* in the Context of a Flavian Audience." Pages 71–100 in *Josephus and Jewish History in Flavian Rome and Beyond*. Edited by Joseph Sievers and Gaia Lembi. JSJSup 104. Leiden: Brill, 2005.
- Mason, Steve N. "Jews, Judaeans, Judaizing, Judaism: Problems of Categorization in Ancient History." *JSJ* 38 (2007): 457–512.
- Mathisen, Ralph W. "Palaeography and Codicology." Pages 140–168 in *The Oxford Handbook of Early Christian Studies*. Edited by Susan A. Harvey and David G. Hunter. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Mattusch, Carol C. *The Villa dei Papiri at Herculaneum: Life and Afterlife of a Sculpture Collection*. Los Angeles: J. Paul Getty Museum, 2005.
- Mattusch, Carol C. *Johann Joachim Winckelmann: Letter of Report on the Discoveries at Herculaneum*. Los Angeles: J. Paul Getty Museum, 2011.
- Mekler, Siegfried. *Academicorum philosophorum index herculanensis*. Berlin: Weidmann, 1902.
- Metso, Sarianna. *The Textual Development of the Qumran Community Rule*. STDJ 21. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

- Metzger, Bruce M. *Manuscripts of the Greek Bible: An Introduction to Greek Palaeography*. Rev. ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 1991.
- Milik, Józef T. *Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea*. Translated by John Strugnell. London: SCM, 1959.
- Milik, Józef T. *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1976.
- Militello, Cesira. *Filodemo. Memorie epicuree (PHerc. 1418 e 310): Edizione, traduzione e commento*. Naples: Bibliopolis, 1997.
- Mizzi, Dennis. "From the Judaeen Desert to the Great Sea: Qumran in a Mediterranean Context." *DSD* 24 (2017): 378–406.
- Mizzi, Dennis. "Archaeology of Qumran." Pages 17–36 in *T&T Clark Companion to the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by George J. Brooke and Charlotte Hempel. London: T&T Clark, 2019.
- Mroczek, Eva. "Testimonia." Pages 358–361 in *T&T Clark Companion to the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by George J. Brooke and Charlotte Hempel. London: T&T Clark, 2019.
- Najman, Hindy. "The Idea of Biblical Genre: From Discourse to Constellation." Pages 301–321 in *Prayer and Poetry in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature: Essays in Honor of Eileen Schuller on the Occasion of Her 65th Birthday*. Edited by Jeremy Penner, Ken M. Penner, and Cecilia Wassen. *STDJ* 98. Leiden: Brill, 2012.
- Najman, Hindy, and Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar. "Interpreting Collection in the Dead Sea Scrolls." Paper presented at 10th Meeting of the 10QS, Aberdeen, 5 August 2019.
- Nati, James. "The Rolling Corpus: Materiality and Pluriformity at Qumran, with Special Consideration of the Serekh ha-Yahad." *DSD* 27 (2020): 161–201.
- Nati, James. *Textual Criticism and the Ontology of Literature in Early Judaism: An Analysis of the Serekh ha-Yahad*. *STDJ* 198. Leiden: Brill, 2022.
- Naveh, Joseph. *The Development of the Aramaic Script*. *PIASH* 5. Jerusalem: Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1970.
- Naveh, Joseph, and Shaul Shaked. *Aramaic Documents from Ancient Bactria (Fourth Century BCE): From the Khalili Collections*. London: The Khalili Family Trust, 2012.
- Netzer, Ehud. *Masada III: The Yigael Yadin Excavations 1963–1965 Final Reports: The Buildings, Stratigraphy and Architecture*. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1991.
- Neudecker, Richard. "Archives, Books and Sacred Space in Rome." Pages 312–331 in *Ancient Libraries*. Edited by Jason P. König, Katerina Oikonomopoulou, and Greg Woolf. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- Newman, Judith H. *Before the Bible: The Liturgical Body and the Formation of Scriptures in Early Judaism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018.
- Newsom, Carol A. *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice: A Critical Edition*. *HSS* 27. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985.
- Newsom, Carol A. "'Sectually Explicit' Literature from Qumran." Pages 167–187 in *Rhetoric and Hermeneutics: Approaches to Text, Tradition and Social Construction in Bib-*

- lical and Second Temple Literature*. Edited by William H. Propp et al. FAT 130. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1990.
- Newsom, Carol A. *The Self as Symbolic Space: Constructing Identity and Community at Qumran*. STDJ 52. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- Newsom, Carol A. "A Farewell to the Hodayot of the Community." *DSD* 28 (2021): 1–19.
- Nicholls, Matthew C. "Roman Libraries as Public Buildings in the Cities of the Empire." Pages 261–276 in *Ancient Libraries*. Edited by Jason P. König, Katerina Oikonomopoulou, and Greg Woolf. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- Nichols, Stephen G. "Introduction: Philology in a Manuscript Culture." *Speculum* 65 (1990): 1–10.
- Nicolardi, Federica. "Beyond the Scribal Error: Clues on the History of Philodemus' *On Rhetoric*, Book 1." Pages 139–149 in *Defining Authorship, Debating Authenticity: Problems of Authority from Classical Antiquity to the Renaissance*. Edited by Roberta Berardi, Martina Filosa, and Davide Massimo. BZA 385. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2020.
- Nitzan, Bilha. *Qumran Prayer and Religious Poetry*. STDJ 12. Leiden: Brill, 1994.
- Norsa, Medea. "Elenco di opere letterarie." *Aeg* 2 (1921): 17–20.
- North, Robert. "'Kittim' War or 'Sectaries' Liturgy?" *Biblica* 39 (1958): 84–93.
- Osten-Sacken, Peter von der. *Gott und Belial: Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zum Dualismus in den Texten aus Qumran*. SUNT 6. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1969.
- Otranto, Rosa. *Antiche liste di libri su papiro*. Sussidi eruditi 49. Rome: Edizioni di storia e letteratura, 2000.
- Pack, Roger A. *The Greek and Latin Literary Texts from Greco-Roman Egypt*. 2nd ed. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1965.
- Pajunen, Mika S. "Reading Psalm and Prayer Manuscripts from Qumran." Pages 55–70 in *Material Aspects of Reading in Ancient and Medieval Cultures: Materiality, Presence and Performance*. Edited by Anna Krauß, Jonas Leipziger and Friederike Schücking-Jungblut. MTK 26. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2020.
- Pannkuk, Justin L. "Prayers of the Antediluvian Patriarchs: Revisiting the Form and Function of 4Q369 Prayer of Enosh." *DSD* 24 (2017): 38–58.
- Parkes, Malcolm B. "The Influence of the Concepts of Ordinatio and Compilatio on the Development of the Book." Pages 35–70 in *Scribes, Scripts and Readers: Studies in the Communication, Presentation and Dissemination of Medieval Texts*. London: Hambledon, 1991.
- Parslow, Christopher C. *Rediscovering Antiquity: Karl Weber and the Excavation of Herculaneum, Pompeii, and Stabiae*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Pedersén, Olof. *Archives and Libraries in the Ancient Near East, 1500–300 BC*. Bethesda: CDL, 1998.
- Perrot, Antony. "Reading an Opisthograph at Qumran." Pages 101–114 in *Material Aspects of Reading in Ancient and Medieval Cultures: Materiality, Presence and Performance*.

- Edited by Anna Krauß, Jonas Leipziger and Friederike Schücking-Jungblut. MTK 26. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2020.
- Petrain, David. "Visual Supplementation and Metonymy in the Roman Public Library." Pages 332–346 in *Ancient Libraries*. Edited by Jason P. König, Katerina Oikonomopoulou, and Greg Woolf. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- Pfann, Stephen. *Qumran Cave 4.XXVI: Cryptic Texts*; Philip S. Alexander et al. *Miscellanea, Part 1*. DJD 36. Oxford: Clarendon, 2000.
- Pfann, Stephen. "The Ancient "Library" or "Libraries" of Qumran: The Specter of Cave 1Q." Pages 168–213 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls at Qumran and the Concept of a Library*. Edited by Sidnie W. Crawford and Cecilia Wassen. STDJ 116. Leiden: Brill, 2016.
- Piano, Valeria. "Il PHerc. 1067 latino: Il rotolo, il testo, l'autore." *CErc* 47 (2017): 163–250.
- Pike, Kenneth L. *Language in Relation to a Unified Theory of Structure of Human Behavior*. 2nd ed. The Hague: Mouton, 1967.
- Pintaudi, Rosario. "SB V 7633: Registro di terreni." *Aeg* 88 (2008): 121–126.
- Plicht, Johannes van der. "Radiocarbon Dating and the Dead Sea Scrolls: A Comment on "Redating"." *DSD* 14 (2007): 77–89.
- Ploeg, Johannes P.M. van der. *Le Rouleau de la Guerre*. STDJ 2. Leiden: Brill, 1959.
- Popović, Mladen. "Roman Book Destruction in Qumran Cave 4 and the Roman Destruction of Khirbet Qumran Revisited." Pages 239–291 in *Qumran und die Archäologie: Texte und Kontexte*. Edited by Jörg Frey, Carsten Claußen, and Nadine Kessler. WUNT 278. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011.
- Popović, Mladen. "Qumran as a Scroll Storehouse in Times of Crisis? A Comparative Perspective on Judaean Desert Manuscript Collections" *JSJ* 43 (2012): 551–594.
- Popović, Mladen. "Apocalyptic Determinism." Pages 255–270 in *The Oxford Handbook of Apocalyptic Literature*. Edited by John J. Collins. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.
- Popović, Mladen. "Reading, Writing, and Memorizing Together: Reading Culture in Ancient Judaism and the Dead Sea Scrolls in a Mediterranean Context." *DSD* 24 (2017): 447–470.
- Popović, Mladen. "Multilingualism, Multiscripturalism, and Knowledge Transfer in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Graeco-Roman Judaea." Pages in 46–71 *Sharing and Hiding Religious Knowledge in Early Judaism, Christianity, and Islam*. Edited by Mladen Popović, Lautaro Roig Lanzillotta, and Clare Wilde. JCIT 10. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2018.
- Popović, Mladen. "The Manuscript Collections: An Overview." Pages 37–50 in *T&T Clark Companion to the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by George J. Brooke and Charlotte Hempel. London: T&T Clark, 2019.
- Popović, Mladen. "Book Production and Circulation in Ancient Judaea: Evidenced by Writing Quality and Skills in the Dead Sea Scrolls Isaiah and Serekh Manuscripts." Pages 199–265 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Ancient Media Culture*. Edited by Travis B. Williams, Chris Keith, and Loren Stuckenbruck. STDJ 144. Leiden: Brill, 2023.

- Popović, Mladen, Maruf A. Dhali, and Lambert Schomaker. "Artificial Intelligence Based Writer Identification Generates New Evidence for the Unknown Scribes of the Dead Sea Scrolls Exemplified by the Great Isaiah Scroll (1QIsaa)." *PLoS ONE* 16 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0249769>.
- Popović, Mladen, Maruf A. Dhali, Lambert Schomaker, Johannes van der Plicht, Kaare Lund Rasmussen, Jacopo La Nasa, Ilaria Degano, Maria Perla Colombini, and Eibert Tigchelaar. "Dating Ancient Manuscripts Using Radiocarbon and AI-based Writing Style Analysis." *Forthcoming*.
- Popović, Mladen, and Eibert Tigchelaar. "The Quality of Hasmonaean Biblical Manuscripts." *DSD* 30 (2023): 189–212.
- Popović, Mladen, and Eibert Tigchelaar. "Assessing the Maresha Ostrakon as a Palaeographic Anchor Point for Dating the Nash Papyrus and Some of the Oldest Qumran Manuscripts." *Forthcoming*.
- Porten, Bezalel. "Aramaic Papyri and Parchments: A New Look." *BA* 42 (1979): 74–104.
- Porten, Bezalel, and Ada Yardeni. *Textbook of Aramaic Documents from Ancient Egypt. Newly Copied, Edited and Translated into Hebrew and English*. 4 vols. Jerusalem: Hebrew University, 1989–1999.
- Posner, Ernst M. *Archives in the Ancient World*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1972.
- Puech, Émile. "Qumran Research: Contribution of the École Biblique et Archéologique Française in Jerusalem." Pages 403–432 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Scholarly Perspective: A History of Research*. Edited by Devorah Dimant. STDJ 99. Leiden: Brill, 2012.
- Puech, Émile. *The Copper Scroll Revisited*. STDJ 112. Leiden: Brill, 2015.
- Puech, Émile. "La paléographie des manuscrits de la mer Morte." Pages 96–105 in *The Caves of Qumran: Proceedings of the International Conference, Lugano 2014*. Edited by Marcello Fidanzio. STDJ 118. Leiden: Brill, 2016.
- Puglia, Enzo. "Il catalogo di un fondo librario di Ossirinco del III d. C. (PSILaur. inv. 19662)." *ZPE* 113 (1996): 51–65.
- Qimron, Elisha. *The Dead Sea Scrolls: The Hebrew Writings*. Vol. 1. Jerusalem: Yad Ben Zvi, 2010.
- Qimron, Elisha. *The Dead Sea Scrolls: The Hebrew Writings*. Vol. 3. Jerusalem: Yad Ben Zvi, 2014.
- Quenzer, Jörg B. "Introduction." Pages 1–7 in *Manuscript Cultures: Mapping the Field*. Edited by Jörg B. Quenzer, Dmitry Bondarev, and Jan U. Sobisch. SMC 1. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2014.
- Radiciotti, Paolo. "Osservazioni paleografiche sui papiri latini di Ercolano." *Scrittura e Civiltà* 22 (1998): 353–370.
- Rahmani, Levi Y. *A Catalogue of Jewish Ossuaries in the Collections of the State of Israel*. Jerusalem, Israel Antiquities Authority, 1994.
- Rathbone, Dominic. *Economic Rationalism and Rural Society in Third-century A.D.*

- Egypt: The Heroninos Archive and the Appianus Estate*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- Rea, John R. *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*. Vol. 63. London: Egypt Exploration Fund, 1996.
- Reed, Ronald. *Ancient Skins, Parchments and Leathers*. London: Seminar Press, 1972.
- Reed, Stephen. "Physical Features of Excerpted Torah Texts." Pages 82–104 in *Jewish and Christian Scripture as Artifact and Canon*. Edited by Craig A. Evans and H. Daniel Zacharias. LSTS 70. London: T&T Clark, 2009.
- Renfrew, Colin, and Paul G. Bahn. *Archaeology: Theories, Methods and Practice*. 6th ed. London: Thames & Hudson, 2012.
- Rey, Jean-Sébastien. *4QInstruction: Sagesse et eschatologie*. STDJ 81. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- Rietz, Henry W.M. "Identifying Compositions and Traditions of the Qumran Community: Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice, a Case Study." Pages 29–52 in *Qumran Studies: New Approaches, New Questions*. Edited by Michael T. Davis and Brent A. Strawn. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.
- Roberts, Colin H., and Theodore C. Skeat. *The Birth of the Codex*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983.
- Robson Eleanor. "Reading the Libraries of Assyria and Babylonia." Pages 38–56 in *Ancient Libraries*. Edited by Jason P. König, Katerina Oikonomopoulou, and Greg Woolf. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- Robson Eleanor, and Kathryn Stevens. "Scholarly Tablet Collections in First-Millennium Assyria and Babylonia, c. 700–200 BCE." Pages 317–364 in *Libraries before Alexandria: Ancient Near Eastern Traditions*. Edited by Kim Ryholt and Gojko Barjamovic. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019.
- Römer, Cornelia. "The Papyrus Roll in Egypt, Greece, and Rome." Pages 191–202 in *A Companion to the History of the Book*. Edited by Simon Eliot and Jonathan Rose. 2nd ed. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2020.
- Rösel, Martin. "Names of God." Pages 600–602 in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Rostrup, Egill. "Oxyrhynchus Papyri III.413." *Oversigt over det Kongelige Danske Videnskaberne Selskabs Forhandling* 2 (1915): 63–107.
- Ruggiero, Michele. *Storia degli scavi di Ercolano ricomposta su' documenti superstiti*. Naples, 1885.
- Ryholt, Kim, and Gojko Barjamovic, eds. *Libraries before Alexandria: Ancient Near Eastern Traditions*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019.
- Ryholt, Kim, and Gojko Barjamovic. "Libraries before Alexandria." Pages 1–66 in *Libraries before Alexandria: Ancient Near Eastern Traditions*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019.
- Schiffman, Lawrence H. *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls: The History of Judaism, the*

- Background of Christianity, the Lost Library of Qumran*. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1994.
- Schmidt, Francis. "Pour une reconstitution du cycle liturgique annuel dans les Prières pour les fêtes (1Q34, 4Q507–509): L'apport du papyrus opisthographe." *RHPR* 93 (2013): 77–91.
- Schofield, Alison. *From Qumran to the Yahad: A New Paradigm of Textual Development for The Community Rule*. STDJ 77. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- Schofield, Alison. "Forms of Community." Pages 533–546 in *T&T Clark Companion to the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by George J. Brooke and Charlotte Hempel. London: T&T Clark, 2019.
- Schuetz, Roman, et al. "The Temple Scroll: Reconstructing an Ancient Manufacturing Practice." *Science Advances* 5/9 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.aaw7494>.
- Schuller, Eileen M. "Petitionary Prayer and the Religion of Qumran." Pages 29–45 in *Religion in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by John J. Collins and Robert A. Kugler. SDRSL. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.
- Schuller, Eileen M. "The Classification Hodayot and Hodayot-like (with Particular Attention to 4Q433, 4Q433a and 4Q440)." Pages 182–193 in *Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetical Texts from Qumran*. Edited by Daniel K. Falk, Florentino García Martínez, and Eileen M. Schuller. STDJ 35. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- Schuller, Eileen M. "Some Contributions of the Cave Four Manuscripts (4Q427–432) to the Study of the Hodayot." *DSD* 8 (2001): 278–287.
- Schuller, Eileen M. "Prayers and Psalms from the Pre-Maccabean Period." *DSD* 13 (2006): 306–318.
- Schuller, Eileen M. "Recent Scholarship on the Hodayot 1993–2010." *CurrBR* 10 (2011): 119–162.
- Schuller, Eileen M., and Carol A. Newsom. *The Hodayot (Thanksgiving Psalms): A Study Edition of 1QHa*. EJL 36. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2012.
- Schultz, Brian. *Conquering the World: The War Scroll (1QM) Reconsidered*. STDJ 76. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- Schultz, Brian. "Compositional Layers in the War Scroll (1QM)." Pages 153–164 in *Qumran Cave 1 Revisited: Texts from Cave 1 Sixty Years after Their Discovery: Proceedings of the Sixth Meeting of the IQS in Ljubljana*. Edited by Daniel K. Falk et al. STDJ 91. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- Schultz, Brian. "Milhamah (M)." Pages 322–334 in *T&T Clark Companion to the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by George J. Brooke and Charlotte Hempel. London: T&T Clark, 2019.
- Schwemer, Daniel. "Witchcraft and War: The Ritual Fragment Ki 1904-10-9, 18 (BM 98989)." *Iraq* 69 (2007): 29–42.
- Scurlock, JoAnn. *Sourcebook for Ancient Mesopotamian Medicine*. WAW 36. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2014.

- Sickinger, James P. *Public Records and Archives in Classical Athens*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1999.
- Sider, David. *The Library of The Villa dei Papiri at Herculaneum*. Los Angeles: J. Paul Getty Museum, 2005.
- Sider, David. "The Books of the Villa of the Papyri." Pages 115–127 in *The Villa of the Papyri at Herculaneum: Archaeology, Reception, and Digital Reconstruction*. Edited by Mantha Zarmakoupi. Sozomena 1. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2010.
- Sider, Sandra. "Herculaneum's Library in 79 A.D.: The Villa of the Papyri." *Libraries and Culture* 25 (1990): 534–542.
- Small, Jocelyn P. *Wax Tablets of the Mind: Cognitive Studies of Memory and Literacy in Classical Antiquity*. London: Routledge, 1997.
- Smallwood, Edith M. *The Jews Under Roman Rule: From Pompey to Diocletian*. SJLA 20. Leiden: Brill, 1981.
- Starcky, Jean. "Le travail d'édition des fragments manuscrits de Qumrân (Communication de J. Starcky)." *RB* 63 (1956): 66–67.
- Starr, Raymond J. "The Circulation of Literary Texts in the Roman World." *CIQ* 37 (1987): 213–223.
- Starr, Raymond J. "The Used-Book Trade in the Roman World." *Phoenix* 44 (1990): 148–157.
- Stausberg, Michael. "Comparison." Pages 21–39 in *The Oxford Handbook of the Study of Religion*. Edited by Michael Stausberg and Steven J. Engler. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016.
- Stegemann, Hartmut. "Weitere Stücke von 4QpPsalm 37, von 4Q Patriarchal Blessings und Hinweis auf eine unedierte Handschrift aus Höhle 4Q mit Exzerpten aus dem Deuteronomium." *RevQ* 6 (1967): 193–227.
- Stegemann, Hartmut. "Die Bedeutung der Qumranfunde für die Erforschung der Apokalypstik." Pages 495–530 in *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East*. Edited by David Hellholm. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1983.
- Stegemann, Hartmut. "Zu Textbestand und Grundgedanken von "1QS" III, 13–IV, 26." *RevQ* 13 (1988): 95–131.
- Stegemann, Hartmut. "How to Connect Dead Sea Scrolls Fragments." Pages 245–255 in *Understanding the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Hershel Shanks. New York: Vintage Books, 1993.
- Stegemann, Hartmut. *Die Essener, Qumran, Johannes der Täufer und Jesus: Ein Sachbuch*. Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1993.
- Stern, Sacha. "Qumran Calendars and Sectarianism." Pages 232–253 in *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Timothy Lim and John J. Collins. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Studel, Annette. *Der Midrasch zur Eschatologie aus der Qumrangemeinde (4QMidrEschat^{a,b}): Materielle Rekonstruktion, Textbestand, Gattung und traditions-geschicht-*

- liche Einordnung des durch 4Q174 („Florilegium“) und 4Q177 („Catena A“) repräsentierten Werkes aus den Qumranfunden. STDJ 13. Leiden: Brill, 1994.
- Stock, Brian. *The Implications of Literacy: Written Language and Models of Interpretation in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983.
- Stockt, Luc van der. “A Plutarchan Hypomnema on Self-Love.” *AJP* 120 (1999): 575–599.
- Stökl Ben Ezra, Daniel. “Old Caves and Young Caves: A Statistical Reevaluation of a Qumran Consensus.” *DSD* 14 (2007): 313–333.
- Strack, Hermann L., and Günter Stemberger. *Introduction to the Talmud and Mishnah*. Translated by Markus Bockmuehl. 2nd ed. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996.
- Strugnell, John, Daniel J. Harrington, and Torleif Elgvin. *Sapiential Texts, Part 2: Cave 4.XXIV*. DJD 34. Oxford: Clarendon, 1999.
- Strugnell, John, and Eileen M. Schuller. “Further *Hodayot* Manuscripts from Qumran?” Pages 51–71 in *Antikes Judentum und frühes Christentum: Festschrift für Hartmut Stegemann zum 65. Geburtstag*. Edited by Bernd Kollmann, Wolfgang Reinbold, and Annette Steudel. BZNW 97. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1999.
- Sukenik, Eleazar L. *The Dead Sea Scrolls of the Hebrew University*. Jerusalem: Magnes, 1955.
- Talmon, Shemaryahu, and Yigael Yadin, eds. *Masada VI, The Yigal Yadin Excavations 1963–1965, Final Reports*. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1999.
- Talmon, Shemaryahu, Jonathan Ben-Dov, and Uwe Glessmer. *Qumran Cave 4.XVI: Calendrical Texts*. DJD 21. Oxford: Clarendon, 2001.
- Taylor, Joan E. “Buried Manuscripts and Empty Tombs: The Qumran Genizah Theory Revisited.” Pages 269–315 in *‘Go Out and Study the Land’ (Judges 18:2): Archaeological, Historical and Textual Studies in Honor of Hanan Eshel*. Edited by Aren M. Meir, Jodi Magness, and Lawrence H. Schiffman. JSJSup 148. Leiden: Brill, 2011.
- Tigheelaar, Eibert J.C. “4Q499 48 + 47 (par 4Q369 1 ii): A Forgotten Identification.” *RevQ* 70 (1997): 303–306.
- Tigheelaar, Eibert J.C. *To Increase Learning for the Understanding Ones: Reading and Reconstructing the Fragmentary Early Jewish Sapiential Text 4QInstruction*. STDJ 44. Leiden: Brill, 2001.
- Tigheelaar, Eibert J.C. “In Search of the Scribe of 1QS.” Pages 439–452 in *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov*. Edited by Shalom M. Paul et al. VTSup 94. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- Tigheelaar, Eibert J.C. “Assessing Emanuel Tov’s ‘Qumran Scribal Practice.’” Pages 173–207 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Transmission of Traditions and Production of Texts*. Edited by Sarianna Metso, Hindy Najman, and Eileen Schuller. STDJ 92. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- Tigheelaar, Eibert J.C. “Constructing, Deconstructing and Reconstructing Fragmentary Manuscripts: Illustrated by a Study of 4Q184 (4QWiles of the Wicked Woman).”

- Pages 26–47 in *Rediscovering the Dead Sea Scrolls: An Assessment of Old and New Approaches and Methods*. Edited by Maxine L. Grossman. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010.
- Tigchelaar, Eibert J.C. “Classifications of the Collection of Dead Sea Scrolls and the Case of *Apocryphon of Jeremiah C*.” *JSJ* 43 (2012): 519–550.
- Tigchelaar, Eibert J.C. “Apocalyptic worldview and periodization of history in the Dead Sea Scrolls, with a focus on the *Apocryphon of Jeremiah C* and Danielic texts.” Paper presented at the PEJ VII Seminário Internacional; Universidade de Brasília, 31-10-2012.
- Tigchelaar, Eibert J.C. “Scribal Practices as Attested in the Dead Sea Scrolls Manuscripts Written in a So-Called Rustic Semi-Formal Tradition.” Paper presented at the International SBL. St. Andrews, 8 July 2013.
- Tigchelaar, Eibert J.C. “The Material Variance of the Dead Sea Scrolls: On Texts and Artefacts.” *HTS Teologiese Studies/Theological Studies* 72 (2016): 1–6.
- Tigchelaar, Eibert J.C. “Revisiting the Manuscripts and Fragments from Qumran Cave 11Q.” Pages 249–261 in *Khirbet Qumrân and Aïn Feshkha IV A: Qumran Cave 11Q: Archaeology and New Scroll Fragments*. Edited by Jean-Baptiste Humbert and Marcello Fidanzio. NTOA. SA 8. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2019.
- Tigchelaar, Eibert J.C. “Seventy Years of Palaeographic Dating of the Dead Sea Scrolls.” Pages 258–278 in *Sacred Texts and Disparate Interpretations: Qumran Manuscripts Seventy Years Later: Proceedings of the International Conference Held at the John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin, 24–26 October 2017*. Edited by Henryk Drawnel. STDJ 133. Leiden: Brill, 2020.
- Toit, Jaqueline S. Du. *Textual Memory: Ancient Archives, Libraries and the Hebrew Bible*. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2011.
- Too, Yun L. *The Idea of the Library in the Ancient World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Toorn, Karel van der. *Scribal Culture and the Making of the Hebrew Bible*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2007.
- Tournié, Aurélie, et al. “Ancient Greek Text Concealed on the Back of Unrolled Papyrus Revealed through Shortwave-infrared Hyperspectral Imaging.” *Science Advances* 5/10 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.aav8936>.
- Tov, Emanuel. “Opisthographs from the Judean Desert.” Pages 11–18 in *A Multiform Heritage: Studies on Early Judaism and Christianity in Honor of Robert A. Kraft*. Edited by Ben G. Wright. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1999.
- Tov, Emanuel. “Correction Procedures in the Texts from the Judean Desert.” Pages 232–263 in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts and Reformulated Issues*. Edited by Donald W. Parry and Eugene C. Ulrich. STDJ 30. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- Tov, Emanuel. “Categorized List of the ‘Biblical Texts.’” Pages 165–183 in *The Texts from*

- the Judaean Desert: Indices and an Introduction to the Discoveries in the Judaean Desert Series.* DJD 39. Oxford: Clarendon, 2002.
- Tov, Emanuel. "The Corpus of the Qumran Papyri." Pages 85–103 in *Semitic Papyrology in Context: A Climate of Creativity. Papers from a New York University Conference Marking the Retirement of Baruch A. Levine*. Edited by Lawrence H. Schiffman. CHANE 14. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- Tov, Emanuel. *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert*. STDJ 54. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- Tov, Emanuel. "Excerpted and Abbreviated Biblical Texts from Qumran." Pages 27–41 in *Hebrew Bible, Greek Bible, and Qumran: Collected Essays*. TSAJ 121. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.
- Tov, Emanuel. *Revised Lists of the Texts from the Judaean Desert*. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- Tov, Emanuel. "The Tefillin from the Judean Desert and the Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible." Pages 277–292 in *Is There a Text in This Cave? Studies in the Textuality of the Dead Sea Scrolls in Honour of George J. Brooke*. Edited by Ariel Feldman, Maria Cioată, and Charlotte Hempel. STDJ 119. Leiden: Brill, 2017.
- Tov, Emanuel. "Scribal Aspects of the Manufacturing and Writing of the Qumran Scrolls." Pages 29–47 in *Jewish Manuscript Cultures: New Perspectives*. Edited by Irina Wandrey, SMC 13. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2017.
- Trever, John C. "Completion of the Publication of Some Fragments from Qumran Cave 1." *RevQ* 5 (1965): 323–344.
- Tsitsiridis, Stavros. "Greek Mime in the Roman Empire (P.Oxy. 413: Charition and Moicheutria)." *Logeion* 1 (2011): 184–232.
- Turner, Eric G. "Recto and Verso." *JEA* 40 (1954): 102–106.
- Turner, Eric G. *Greek Papyri: An Introduction*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1968.
- Turner, Eric G. "Writing Material for Businessmen." *BASP* 15 (1978): 163–169.
- Turner, Eric G. "The Terms Recto and Verso: The Anatomy of the Papyrus Roll." In *Actes du xve Congrès International de Papyrologie*. Vol. 1. Edited by Jean Bingen and Georges Nachtergaeel. Brussels: Fondation Égyptologique Reine Élisabeth, 1978.
- Turner, Eric G. "Ptolemaic Bookhands and Lille Stesichorus." *Scrittura e Civiltà* 4 (1980): 19–40.
- Turner, Eric G. *Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World*. Edited by Peter J. Parsons. 2nd rev. ed. London: Institute of Classical Studies, 1987.
- Ullmann-Margalit, Edna. *Out of the Cave: A Philosophical Inquiry into the Dead Sea Scrolls Research*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1996.
- Ulrich, Eugene C., and Frank Moore Cross. *Qumran Cave 4.VII: Genesis to Numbers*. DJD 12. Oxford: Clarendon, 1994.
- Ulrich, Eugene C., et al. *Qumran Cave 4.IX: Deuteronomy to Kings*. DJD 14. Oxford: Clarendon, 1995.

- Ulrich, Eugene C., et al. *Qumran Cave 4.XI: Psalms to Chronicles*. DJD 16. Oxford: Clarendon, 2000.
- Vance, Eugene. "Warfare and the Structure of Thought in Virgil's Aeneid." *Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica* 15 (1973): 111–162.
- VanderKam, James C. "Authoritative Literature in the Dead Sea Scrolls." *DSD* 5 (1998): 382–402.
- Vanonen, Hanna. "The Textual Connections between 1QM 1 and the Book of Daniel." Pages 223–245 in *Changes in Scripture: Rewriting and Interpreting Authoritative Traditions in the Second Temple Period*. Edited by Hanne von Weissenberg, Juha Pakkala, and Marko Marttila. BZAW 419. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2011.
- Vanonen, Hanna. *War Traditions from the Qumran Caves: Re-Thinking Textual Stability and Fluidity in the War Text Manuscripts*. STDJ 139. Leiden: Brill, 2022.
- Vaux, Roland de. *Archaeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Schweich Lectures 1959, Revised Edition in an English Translation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1973.
- Vaux, Roland de, and Józef T. Milik. *Qumrân grotte 4.II*. DJD 6. Oxford: Clarendon, 1977.
- Walsh, Peter G., ed. *Pliny the Younger: Complete Letters*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016.
- Wee, John Zhu-En. "A Model for the Composition and Purpose of Columns XV–XIX of the "War Scroll" (1QM)." *RevQ* 21 (2003): 263–283.
- Werrett, Ian. "Is Qumran a Library?" Pages 78–105 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls at Qumran and the Concept of a Library*. Edited by Sidnie W. Crawford and Cecilia Wassen. STDJ 116. Leiden: Brill, 2016.
- White, L. Michael. "A Measure of Parrhesia: The State of the Manuscript of Pherc. 1471." Pages 103–130 in *Philodemus and the New Testament World*. Edited by John T. Fitzgerald, Dirk Obbink, and Glenn S. Holland. NovTSup 111. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- Winckelmann, Johann J. *Critical account of the situation and destruction by the first eruptions of Mount Vesuvius of Herculaneum, Pompeii, and Stabia*. London, 1771. Translation of *Lettre de M. L'Abbé Winckelmann, à Monsieur le Comte de Brühl, Sur les Découvertes d'Herculanum*. Paris, 1764.
- Wise, Michael O. "Accidents and Accidence: A Scribal View of Linguistic Dating of the Aramaic Scrolls from Qumran." Pages 103–151 in *Thunder in Gemini: And Other Essays on the History, Language and Literature of Second Temple Palestine*. JSPSup 15. Sheffield: JSOT, 1994.
- Wise, Michael O. *Language and Literacy in Roman Judaea: A Study of the Bar Kokhba Documents*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2015.
- Wisnom, Selena. "Blood on the Wind and the Tablet of Destinies: Intertextuality in *Anzû*, *Enûma eliš*, and *Erra and Išum*." *JAOs* 139 (2019): 269–286.
- Wold, Benjamin. "Instruction." Pages 318–319 in *T&T Clark Companion to the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by George J. Brooke and Charlotte Hempel. London: T&T Clark, 2019.
- Wolf, Greg. "Introduction: Approaching the Ancient Library." Pages 1–20 in *Ancient*

- Libraries*. Edited by Jason P. König, Katerina Oikonomopoulou, and Greg Woolf. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- Wright, Benjamin G. "One 'Methodological Assumption' of the *Groningen Hypothesis* of Qumran Origins." Pages 286–290 in *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005.
- Yadin, Yigael. *The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light Against the Sons of Darkness*. Translated by Batya and Chaim Rabin. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1962.
- Yardeni, Ada. *Textbook of Aramaic, Hebrew and Nabataean Documentary Texts from the Judean Desert and Related Material, vol. A: The Documents*. Jerusalem: The Ben-Zion Dinur Center for Research in Jewish History, 2000.
- Yardeni, Ada. *The Book of Hebrew Script: History, Palaeography, Script Styles, Calligraphy and Design*. London: The British Library, 2002.
- Yiftach-Firanko, Uri. "Doppelurkunde." Pages 2209–2210 in *The Encyclopedia of Ancient History*. Edited by Roger S. Bagnall et al. Malden: Wiley-Blackwell, 2013.
- Yishai, Rony. "ספרות המלחמה בקומראן: כתבי היד 4Q496–4Q491 (מהדורה ופירוש) והשוואתם (1QM) למגילת המלחמה." PhD diss., University of Haifa, 2006.
- Zahn, Molly. *Rethinking Rewritten Scripture: Composition and Exegesis in the 4QRe-worked Pentateuch Manuscripts*. STDJ 95. Leiden: Brill, 2011.
- Zahn, Molly. "Beyond 'Qumran scribal practice': The case of the Temple Scroll." *RevQ* 29 (2017): 185–203.
- Zangenberg, Jürgen. "The Functions of the Caves and the Settlement of Qumran: Reflections on a New Chapter of Qumran Research." Pages 195–209 in *The Caves of Qumran: Proceedings of the International Conference, Lugano 2014*. Edited by Marcello Fidanzio. STDJ 118. Leiden: Brill, 2016.
- Zarmakoupi, Mantha, ed. *The Villa of the Papyri at Herculaneum: Archaeology, Reception, and Digital Reconstruction*. Sozomena 1. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2010.
- Zuckerman, Bruce E., and Lynn Swartz Dodd. "Pots and Alphabets: Refractions of Reflections on Typological Method." *Maarav* 10 (2003): 89–133.

Index of Ancient Sources

1 Hebrew Bible

Genesis	40, 161	Isaiah	132
5	32, 46	Jeremiah	
Exodus	34, 131, 144, 161	32:10–14	44 <i>n</i> 95
13:1–6	34 <i>n</i> 39	Ezekiel	
32:15	24 <i>n</i> 8	2:9–10	24–25
39–40	144	38–39	114
Leviticus		Habakkuk	132
23	106	Psalms	132, 182, 200 <i>n</i> 8, 207–208
Numbers	131	105	159 <i>n</i> 97
Deuteronomy	34, 131	106	159 <i>n</i> 97
6:4–9; 11:13–21	34, 34 <i>n</i> 39	115	41
33	132	Daniel	108
2 Samuel		11–12	110, 112
7	132	Ezra	176
1 Kings			
14:19, 29	172 <i>n</i> 29		
15:7, 23, 31	172 <i>n</i> 29		

2 New Testament

Matthew		Hebrews	53 <i>n</i> 15
8:28	202 <i>n</i> 12	Revelation	144
John	28	1	144
Romans		5:1	24
1:1–7	48 <i>n</i> 115		

3 Qumran Dead Sea Scrolls

D (Damascus Document)	101, 106, 118, 120	1QpHab (Peshar Habakkuk)	138 <i>n</i> 27
1QIsa^a (Isaiah^a)	79	1Q23 (EnGiants^a ar)	104
		1Q24 (EnGiants^b ar)	104

1Q26 (Instruction)	53	II-XIV	113
		III	110-114, 120, 138
1QS (Community Rule)	3-4, 10, 31, 32-33, 32n28, 33n29, 38-40, 56-60, 89, 93n1, 101, 103, 106n55, 118, 120, 127, 145-146, 150-151, 177, 207n31, 214, 216, 221	III, 6-7 III, 9-11 III, 11-15 III-IV, 2 III-IX IV V VI VII VIII IX X	98 98 98 98 111 110-114 105n52, 111-114 111-114 111-114 111-114 110-115, 161m103 111, 114, 118, 120, 147, 161m103, 218, 222
I	214	X-XIV	111, 113-114, 118, 120, 147, 218, 222
I, 1	58n45	X-XIX	113-114
I, 1-5	57	XI	111, 114, 118, 120, 147, 160, 161m103, 218, 222
III	214	XI, 17	62
III, 7-12	57	XI-XII	160
13-IV, 26	57, 118	XII	110-115, 118-120, 147, 160, 161m103, 218, 222
VI, 6-8	59, 153	XII 14	62
		XIII	111, 114, 118, 120, 147, 161m103, 218, 222
1QSa (Rule of the Congregation)	40, 93n1, 101, 118, 145-146, 177, 221	XIII, 7-8	62
		XIV	111-114, 118, 120, 147-148, 160, 161m103, 218, 222
1Qsb (Rule of Blessings)	40, 93n1, 101, 114, 145-146, 177, 221	XIV, 5-8	62
		XIV, 16	161m103
1QM (War Scroll)	10, 62, 65-66, 94-98, 101, 103, 109-110, 109n66, 110n71, 111n77, 112-121, 129, 136, 138, 140-141, 147-148, 150-151, 156, 160-162, 206-208, 210-211, 214, 216-218, 221-222, 226	XIV-XVII	112
I	110, 112-116, 140, 210, 217	XV	111-114, 118, 120, 160, 216
I, 4-9	98, 116	XV-XIX	113, 118, 120, 216
I, 11-17	98	XVI	111-114, 118, 120, 216
I-IX	114	XVII	111-114, 118, 120, 216
II	110-114, 210	XVIII	111, 114, 118, 120, 160, 216
II, 5-6	98	XVIII-XIX	160
II, 9-10	98	XIX	111, 114, 118, 119-120, 160, 216
II, 9-12	98		
II, 13-14	98		
II, 13-III, 2	136		
II, 17	98		
II-III, 2	98		
II-IX	111, 112-113	1Q34 (Festival Prayers)	94-99
		Frgs. 2+1	98

1Q34bis (Festival Prayers)	94–95, 107–108, 141n37	4Q141 (Phyl N)	29n24
Frgs. 1–2	158–159	4Q142 (Phyl O)	30, 35n43
1QH ^a (Hodayot)	55–56, 58–59, 89, 101, 156, 214	4Q143 (Phyl P)	30, 35n43, 36
1Q70 (Unclassified Frags.)	30, 32, 32n28	4Q144 (Phyl Q)	30, 35n43
3Q15 (Copper Scroll)	81n55	4Q145 (Phyl R)	30, 35n43
4Q8c (Gen ^h -title)	31, 38–40	4Q147 (Phyl T)	36n49
4Q30 (Deut ^c)	79	4Q148 (Phyl U)	30, 35n43, 36n49, 37–38
4Q31 (Deut ^d)	79	4Q158 (Reworked Pentateuch ^a)	208–209, 208n34
4Q76 (XII ^a)	71	4Q161 (pIsa ^a)	114
4Q90 (Ps ^h)	138n27	4Q163 (pIsa ^c)	138n29
4Q109 (Qoh ^a)	71, 73, 80	4Q174 (Florilegium)	5, 86, 131–133, 143
4Q128 (Phyl A)	30, 35n43	4Q175 (Testimonia)	5, 87, 131–133, 143, 156, 208n33
4Q129 (Phyl B)	30, 35n43	4Q201 (En ^a ar)	32, 45–47, 139n31
4Q131 (Phyl D)	30	4Q204 (En ^c ar)	108n61
4Q132 (Phyl E)	30	4Q206 (En ^e ar)	108n61
4Q133 (Phyl F)	30	4Q212 (En ^g ar)	71–72, 76
4Q134 (Phyl G)	30, 35n43	4Q247 (ApocWeeks)	104n47
4Q135 (Phyl H)	30, 35n43	4Q249 (cryptA MSM)	31, 38–40, 83n65
4Q136 (Phyl I)	30, 35, 35n43	4Q250 a–j (crypt A texts)	30, 32–33, 33n31, 83n65
4Q137 (Phyl J)	30, 35n43	4Q255 (S ^a)	4, 15–16, 32, 40, 54–60, 69, 69n11, 70n19, 71–72, 76, 78, 84n66, 88–90, 139n31, 207n31, 213–216, 215n3
4Q138 (Phyl K)	30, 35n43		
4Q139 (Phyl L)	29n24		
4Q140 (Phyl M)	30, 35n43		

- 4Q256 (S^b) 40
- 4Q257 (S^c) 31, 38–39, 56–57, 57*n*42, 60*n*50
- 4Q265 (Miscellaneous Rules) 131–133, 143
- 4Q266 (D^a) 108*n*64
- 4Q285 (SM) 114
- 4Q298 (cryptA Words of the Maskil) 39
- 4Q324 (Calendrical Doc C^c) 32, 48–49
- 4Q338 (Genealogical List) 32, 45–47, 87, 139*n*31
- 4Q339 (List of False Prophets ar) 87
- 4Q340 (List of Netinim) 87
- 4Q341 (List of proper names) 87
- 4Q342 (Letter? ar) 32, 43–44, 139*n*31
- 4Q343 (Letter nab) 32, 43–44
- 4Q345 (Deed A ar or heb) 32, 43–44
- 4Q350 (Account of Cereal) 32, 46–48, 135*n*17, 139*n*31, 200*n*7
- 4Q355 (Account C) 32, 48–49, 139*n*31
- 4Q364–367 (Reworked Pentateuch^{b-e}) 208–209, 208*n*34
- 4Q369 (Prayer of Enosh^a) 61, 214
- 4Q379 (apocrJoshua^a) 131
- 4Q398 (MMT^c) 72
- 4Q400–4Q407 (ShirShabb^{a-h}) 108, 123
- 4Q414 (RitPur A) 15, 32, 50–54, 58, 63–65, 67, 69, 84*n*66, 85, 85*n*72, 88–89, 90*n*3, 119, 213–214, 216
- 4Q415 (Instruction^a) 15, 32, 50–54, 58, 64, 67, 69, 69*n*8, 84*n*66, 85, 88–89, 90*n*3, 213, 326
- 4Q416 (Instruction^b) 53
- 4Q417 (Instruction^c) 53
- 4Q418 (Instruction^d) 50*n*1, 53–54, 69
- 4Q418a (Instruction^e) 53, 69
- 4Q418c (Instruction^f) 50*n*1
- 4Q423 (Instruction^g) 53
- 4Q428 (Hodayot^b) 80*n*53
- 4Q433 (Hodayot-like text A) 55*n*24
- 4Q433a (Hodayot-like text B) 15–16, 32, 54–60, 69–76, 78, 84*n*66, 88–90, 139*n*31, 207*n*31, 213–216
- 4Q440 (Hodayot-like text C) 55*n*24
- 4Q448 (Apocryphal Psalm and Prayer) 4, 4*n*13, 71–72
- 4Q460 frag. 9 (Narrative Work and Prayer) 32, 46–48, 135*n*17, 139*n*31, 200*n*7

- | | | | |
|----------------------------------|---|--|--|
| 4Q491 (War Scroll ^a) | 6m56, 95–96, 112, 115,
117, 119, 151n69, 156 | Frag. 31 | 110 |
| | | Frag. 32 | 110 |
| | | Frag. 35 | 110, 115 |
| 4Q492 (War Scroll ^b) | 6m56, 95–96, 112, 115,
117, 151n69 | Frag. 43 | 139n30 |
| | | Frag. 49 | 110 |
| | | Frag. 57 | 110 |
| 4Q493 (War Scroll ^c) | 6m56, 95–96, 112, 115,
117, 151n69 | Frag. 59 | 117 |
| | | Frag. 76 | 110 |
| | | Frag. 97 | 110, 115 |
| 4Q494 (War Scroll ^d) | 6m56, 95–96, 115, 117,
151n69 | | |
| 4Q495 (War Scroll ^e) | 6m56, 95–96, 115, 117,
151n69 | | |
| 4Q496 (War Scroll ^f) | 2, 12, 15–16, 18, 32,
6m56, 65–66, 70,
75–76, 78, 84n66,
89–90, 93–98,
109–111, 110n71,
114–117, 120, 133,
135–136, 138–143,
146–148, 150–151,
155–157, 161, 177,
206–210, 211n39, 213–
217, 219, 220–222,
226 | 4Q497 (War Scroll-like
Text A) | 15, 32, 60–62, 70, 72–
74, 78, 84n66, 89–90,
96, 139n31, 151n69,
213–216 |
| Frag. 2 + 1 | 98, 110, 110n73, 115–
116 | 4Q498 (Sap/Hymn) | 60 |
| Frag. 3 | 98, 110, 110n73, 115–
116, 139n30 | 4Q499 (Prayer of
Enosh ^b) | 15, 32, 60–62, 70, 72–
74, 78, 80, 84n66,
89–90, 139n31, 213–
216 |
| Frag. 4 | 98, 110, 115 | 4Q500 (Benediction) | 80n53 |
| Frag. 6 + 5 | 98, 110, 115, 161 | 4Q503 (Daily Prayers) | 15, 32, 61n58, 62–
65, 69, 70, 73–76, 78,
80, 84n66, 89–90,
119, 122, 124, 139n31,
213–216 |
| Frag. 7 | 98, 110, 115 | 4Q504 (Words of the
Luminaries) | 15, 25, 26m13, 29n23,
31, 32, 38–40, 42–43,
61n58, n60, 65–66,
71, 73, 80, 94–95, 121–
128, 129–130, 138n29,
140–141, 146–148,
150, 156–161, 210,
214, 217, 219–221,
223 |
| Frag. 8 | 97–98, 99, 110, 115,
120 | Frag. 1 ii 17 | 124 |
| Frag. 9 | 97–98, 110, 120 | Frag. 1–2 | 158–159 |
| Frag. 10 | 97–98, 110, 114, 115,
120, 138, 139n30,
161 | Frag. 4 | 158–159 |
| Frag. 11 | 97–98, 110, 115, 120 | Frag. 6 | 158 |
| Frag. 12 | 97–98, 110, 115, 120 | 4Q505 (Words of the
Luminaries ^b) | 66, 95n9 |
| Frag. 13 | 115, 161 | | |
| Frag. 15 | 97, 110, 115 | | |
| Frag. 16 | 97–98, 110, 120 | | |
| Frag. 17 | 110 | | |
| Frag. 18 | 110 | | |
| Frag. 24 | 110 | | |
| Frag. 26 | 110, 139n30 | | |

4Q506 (Words of the Luminaries^c)	2, 12, 15–18, 32, 65–66, 70, 75–78, 84 <i>n</i> 66, 89–90, 93–96, 121, 124, 133, 135–137, 139–143, 146–151, 155–157, 161, 177, 206–210, 213–217, 215 <i>n</i> 3, 219, 220–222, 226	Frag. 22 Frag. 23 Frag. 30 Frag. 49 Frag. 54 Frag. 55 Frag. 97 Frag. 98 Frag. 99 Frag. 105 Frag. 131 Frag. 183 Frag. 184 Frag. 194 Frag. 277	106 137, 139 <i>n</i> 30 139 <i>n</i> 30 137 139 <i>n</i> 30 139 <i>n</i> 30 137 137, 139 <i>n</i> 30 137 139 <i>n</i> 30 137, 139 <i>n</i> 30 139 <i>n</i> 30 106, 137, 139 <i>n</i> 30 139 <i>n</i> 30 137
Frag. 122	161		
Frag. 124	161		
Frag. 131–132	158		
4Q507 (Festival Prayers^a)	95–97, 99		
4Q508 (Festival Prayers^b)	95–97, 95 <i>n</i> 13, 99	4Q510–4Q511 (Shir^{a-b})	95 <i>n</i> 13, 123, 138 <i>n</i> 29
Frag. 2	158–159	4Q512 (RitPur B)	15, 32, 50, 52, 52 <i>n</i> 12–13, 62–65, 69, 70, 73 <i>n</i> 26, 74, 78, 84 <i>n</i> 66, 89–90, 119, 122, 139 <i>n</i> 31, 213–216
Frag. 30	159 <i>n</i> 96		
4Q509 (Festival Prayers^c)	2, 12, 15–18, 32, 61 <i>n</i> 58, 65–66, 69, 70, 75–76, 78, 80, 84 <i>n</i> 66, 89–90, 93–100, 105–108, 110, 122–124, 129–130, 133, 135–143, 146–148, 151, 155–161, 177, 206–210, 213–223, 226	4Q513 (Ord^b)	95 <i>n</i> 13
Frag. 1	106	4Q514 (Ord^c)	95 <i>n</i> 13
Frag. 2	161	4Q518 (Unclassified Frags.)	30, 32–33, 33 <i>n</i> 33
Frag. 3	106, 139 <i>n</i> 30	4Q519 (Unclassified Frags.)	30, 32–33, 33 <i>n</i> 33
Frag. 4	161	11Q14 (SM)	114
Frag. 8	136	11Q19 (T^a)	51 <i>n</i> 4–5, 102 <i>n</i> 43, 103
Frag. 9	136	25:9	98
Frag. 10	136–137	XQPhyl Slip 4	30, 35 <i>n</i> 43
Frag. 11	136		
Frag. 12	136–137		
Frag. 13	136		
4 Other Judean Desert Writings			
Mas 1f (Ps^b)	182	Mas 10 (Text of Sam. Origin)	48 <i>n</i> 19
Mas 1h (Sir)	182	Mas 721 (Virgil lat)	6–7
Mas 1k (ShirShabb)	108		

Mur 72 (Ostrakon ar) 72

Mur 97 (Account of
Cereals gr) 85n74

Mur 105 (Corners and
Edges of Leather gr) 85n74

5 Other Jewish Sources

Ben Sira 4, 182

CD (Damascus
Document) 101, 106, 118, 120
VII, 5, 8 108n64

1 Enoch 45–46, 63n70, 103–
104, 108, 108n61

Josephus 172–173
Life, 38 172n30

Jubilees (Little
Genesis) 63n70, 103–104, 170,
176

6 Rabbinic Sources

Mishnah
B. Bat. 10:1–2 44n95

7 Greek and Roman Sources

Aelius Donatus 154
Vita Vergilii 154n80

Alcaeus 41

Antigonus of Carystus 196n68

Antiochos of Askalon 196

Apollodorus of Athens 196n68

Aristotle 144, 188n44
Eudemus 144, 176–177

Caecilius Statius 188

6:23 99
45 170n20

Letter of Aristeas 170
9–10 170n20

1 Maccabees 119

2 Maccabees 119
2:13–14 169

Philo of Alexandria 3

Callimachus 5
Aetia 5
Iambi 45n98
Pinakes 174, 176n52

Carneiscus 188, 190

Chrysippus 188, 188n44, 190–191,
224

Cicero 8, 82n59, 154, 206n26
Epistulae ad familiares 8n34

Clement of
Alexandria 196

- | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------|--|--|
| Colotes | 188 | Lucretius | 188 |
| Demetrius Laco | 188, 190 | <i>De rerum natura</i> | 187 |
| Demosthenes | 45n98 | Meleager of Gadara | 201n11 |
| <i>On the Crown</i> | 48n117 | Menander | 45n98 |
| Dicaearchus of
Messana | 196n68 | Metrodorus of Lampsacus | 188, 190 |
| Diogenes Laertius | 187 | Origen | 200n8 |
| <i>Lives of the
Philosophers</i> | 188 | <i>Hexapla</i> | 200n8 |
| Ennius | 188 | Philodemus of Gadara | 186–187, 188n44,
190–191, 190n52,
193, 195–198, 201–
202, 201n11, 205,
206n26, 224–
225 |
| Epicurus | 186–188, 190 | <i>History of the Academy</i> | 198, 205n25, 225 |
| <i>On Nature</i> | 187 | <i>History of the
Philosophers</i> | 187 |
| Epiphanius | 200n8 | <i>On Death</i> | 187 |
| Eupolis | | <i>On Flattery</i> | 205n25 |
| <i>Maricas</i> | 41 | <i>On the Gods</i> | 205n25 |
| Eusebius | 200n8 | <i>On Frank Criticism</i> | 194 |
| <i>Ecclesiastical History</i> | | <i>On Music</i> | 187 |
| 6.16.3 | 200n8 | <i>On Poems</i> | 187, 205n25 |
| Flavius Josephus | 3 | <i>On Rhetoric</i> | 187, 205, 205n24,
n25 |
| Hermarchus | 186 | <i>On the Stoics</i> | 41, 205n25 |
| Hermippus of Smyrna | 196, 196n68 | <i>Sketches of Epicureans</i> | 205n25 |
| Herodotus | 14n56, 82n59 | Plato | 176, 188n44, 196, 198,
225–226 |
| Homer | 45n98, 82n59, 176 | <i>Alcibiades</i> | 175n50 |
| <i>Iliad</i> | 45n99, 48n117 | <i>Gorgias</i> | 175n50 |
| Horace | 154 | <i>Hippias Major and
Minor</i> | 144, 176–177 |
| <i>Satires</i> | 154n80 | <i>Menexenus</i> | 177 |
| Jerome | 174 | <i>Meno</i> | 177 |
| <i>Epistulae</i> | | <i>Parmenides</i> | 177 |
| 33.2 | 174n41 | <i>Philebus</i> | 175n50 |
| Livy | 53n15 | <i>Protagoras</i> | 175n50 |
| Lucian of Samosata | | Pliny the Elder | 3, 8, 180, 204 |
| <i>Anacharsis</i> | 177 | <i>Natural History</i> | 173, 174 |
| | | 13 | 8 |
| | | 13.83 | 203n18 |
| | | 13.89 | 8n33 |

Pliny the Younger	154, 180, 197, 213	<i>Augustus</i>	
<i>Epistulae</i>	23, 23n2-3, 25, 154n79, 180n6	29.3	186n31
Plutarch	196-197	Theopompus	
<i>De tranquillitate animi</i>	197	<i>Philippica</i>	41
Polystratus	188, 190	Thucydides	82n59
Pseudo-Aristotle	5	Timotheus I	200n8
<i>Athenaion Politeia</i>	5-6, 43n15	Varro	
Pseudo-Athanasius	200n8	<i>De bibliothecis</i>	174
Seneca the Elder	190	Virgil	7, 82n59, 154
Silius Italicus	154	<i>Aeneid</i>	7
Strabo	174, 201	Vitruvius	201n9
<i>Geographica</i>		<i>De architectura</i>	
17.1.2-10	174n40	6.4.1	201n9
16.2.29	201n10	Zeno of Sidon	188, 194, 225
Suetonius	174, 186n31		
<i>Divus Julius</i>			
44.2	174n43		
8 Papyri			
Jur.Pap. 36	85n74	339	41, 205n25
P.Acad. Inv. Nr. 6d	41	817	188, 190
P.Chester Beatty		1003	194n61
Ac. 1495	41	1007 + 1673 + 224 + 1077a + 1114 + 1677a	205n25
P.CtYBR inv. 4006	41	1021	2, 18, 165, 195-198, 205n25, 207, 209, 210n37, 225-226
P.Dura. 48	85n74	1067	190
P.Herc.		1076	205n25
26	205n25	113a	206
118a	193n60	1158	188n43
155	205n25	1389	194n61
164	196-197, 205n25, 225	1418	205n25
220	205n25	1425	205n25
222	205n25	1426	205n25
239a + 1787	205n25	1457	205n25
		1471	194
		1506	205n25

P.Herc. (cont.)		1079	144, 221
1538	205n25	1228	28
1672	205n25	2358	41
1674	205n25	2659	175n49
		2741	41
P.Laur. 3 56	41	4365	176
P.Lond.Lit.		P.Ross.Georg. i.22	176
108	5, 8, 53n15		
131	53n15	P.Ryl.	
		119	41
P.Mich.inv. 3589	41	16	45n99
		458	48n15
P.Oxy.		Psi Laur. inv. 19662	
20	45n99, 135n17	verso	175n49, 176-177
209	48n15		
407	41	P.Turner	
413	6-8	9	176
654	6	39	175n49
661	45n99	P.Vars. 5 verso	176
657	53n15		
668	53n15		
1075	144, 221		

9 Other Sources

<i>Carmen de bello</i>		Ki 1904-10-9, 18	
<i>Actiaco</i>	188	(BM 98989)	119n121
Gospel of Thomas	6	The Poem of Erra and	
		Ishum	119n121
Horsiesios' Letter 4	41	UGU extract series	143n43

Index of Modern Authors

- Abegg, Martin G. 62n63, 109n66, 110n74, 115, 115n98, 116n103
- Adler, Yonatan 34n36, n38, 36n53
- Aksu, Ayhan 5n19, 6n22–23, 54n23, 58n45, 60n52, 69n9, n11, 70n19, 71n21, 72n24, 73n26, 75n30, 139n30, 175n48, 207n31
- Albina, Najib A. 94n2
- Alexander, Philip S. 33n30, 39, 39n65–67, 56n35, 57, 57n37–42, 58n43, 69, 69n11, 108n65, 145, 145n51, 199n3
- Allegro, John M. 3n10, 4n11, 123n142, 208n34
- Allen, Graham 12n46
- Ameling, Walter 77n39–40, 78n42
- Arnold, Russell C.D. 159n98
- Avigad, Nahman 67, 67n3
- Bagnall, Roger S. 82n59, 166, 166n1
- Bahn, Paul G. 181n9
- Bailey, Donald M. 182n11
- Baillet, Maurice 1, 1n1, n3, 25, 33n33, 40, 40n72, 42n82, 60–63, 60n54–55, 61n56, 62n61–62, 63n66, n73, 64n74, 65, 66n79, 70, 70n12–18, 73, 73n25, 77–78, 77n36, 80n50, 94–96, 94n1–4, 95n8, n10, n13–14, 96n15–17, 98, 98n24, n10, 110n73, 116–117, 116n103, 121–122, 122n134, 123, 123n141, 125n151, 136, 136n18–19, 159n96, 214, 217, 219
- Barjamovic, Gojko 166n2, 169n16, n17
- Barker, Don 45, 45n99
- Barthélemy, Dominique 94n5
- Baumgarten, Joseph M. 50n2, 63n69
- Beek, Bart van 167n8
- Beit-Arié, Malachi 86, 86n76
- Ben-Dov, Jonathan 26n14, 39, 39n69, 48, 48n120, 49n121, 63, 63n71, 83n65
- Berti, Monica 168, 168n14, 170n20
- Black, Jeremy A. 171n27
- Brock, Sebastian P. 200n8
- Brooke, George J. 2, 2n6, 26n13, 27n17, 29n23, n24, 33, 33n34, 35–36, 36n46, 37n54, 49, 49n124, 53–54, 54n22, 59n49, 62, 62n64, 83n65, 87n79, 130, 130n4, 131n5, 132, 132n14, 154, 154n85, 159, 159n97, 170, 170n22
- Broshi, Magen 39n70
- Brosius, Maria 167n8, 171n27
- Capasso, Mario 41, 41n78–79, 184n23, 190n51, 193n60
- Carmignac, Jean 109n66, 118–119, 118n112
- Caroli, Menico 41, 41n78
- Carr, David M. 143n41
- Casson, Lionel 166n3, 168n10, 186n31
- Cavallo, Guglielmo 41n77, 189–191, 189n48–49, 190n52, 196n65–66, 224
- Chadwick, Henry 143n41
- Chazon, Esther G. 42, 42n82, 55n24, 65n78, 99, 99n29, 106n54, 122, 122n135–137, 124–128, 124n148, n150, 125n153–156, 126n157–158, n161–163, 146, 146n56, 156n89, 157, 219, 219n5
- Clarysse, Willy 45n98, 77n37
- Coblentz Bautch, Kelley 58n46, 103, 103n44, 104n46
- Cockeram, Henry 24, 24n7
- Cohn, Yehudah B. 29n24, 34n36–42, 51n4
- Collins, John J. 3n10, 118n108
- Colombini, Maria Perla 71n22
- Cotton, Hannah M. 7, 7n29–31, 43n87, 47, 47n109, n111–113, 48n115
- Coulmas, Florian 27n19
- Crawford, Sidnie W. 40n76, 79n45, 84n68, 86n76, 104n47, 142, 142n38–40, 166n3, 170–171, 170n24, 171n26, 172n34, 194n62, 202n14, 208n34, 209n36
- Cribiore, Raffaella 46n106
- Cross, Frank Moore 3n10, 4n11, 31, 36, 36n53, 46, 67–68, 67n3, 68n4–6, 69n10, 71–72, 72n23, 76n34–35, 78–79, 79n45, n47, n49, 80n50, 109, 109n70, 121, 121n131–132, 123n142, 138, 138n28, 172n33, 194n62
- Daniels, Peter T. 36n51
- D'Arms, John H. 193n59
- Davies, Philip R. 105, 105n48, 109n66, 112n85, 113–114, 113n89, 118n109, 140, 218
- Davila, James R. 31, 40, 40n74, 52n12, 63n68, 64n75, 97n20

- Davison, Scott A. 157n93
 Dayfani, Hila 50n3, 54n20, 142, 142n38,
 n40
 Debel, Hans 151n67
 Degano, Ilaria 71n22
 Delattre, Daniel 188n44
 Del Corso, Lucio 185n28
 Delnero, Paul 143n42
 Depauw, Mark 13n48, 42n80, 85n74
 De Simone, Antonio 179n3, 180, 180n5
 Dhali, Maruf A. 68n6, 71n22, 79n46
 Dimant, Devorah 3n9, 14, 16–17, 51,
 51n8, 52n9, 61n58, 64n75, 84n68,
 100–108, 100n31–33, 101n35, n37,
 102n38–39, 103n45, 105n51–52,
 106n53, 107n57–58, n60, 108n61–
 62, n64, 117, 117n106, 123, 123n138,
 n140, n143, 127–128, 128n164, 132n13,
 148, 148n158–59, 194n62, 213, 218–219,
 219n6
 Diringer, David 25, 25n9, n10
 Dix, T. Keith 186n31, 204n21
 Dodd, Lynn Swartz 68n6
 Doering, Lutz 5, 5n15, 43, 43n87, n91, 44n93,
 131, 131n7, 142, 142n38, n40
 Donahue, Douglas J. 39n70
 Dorandi, Tiziano 26n16, 195n64, 196n65,
 197, 197n71–72, 201n10, 205, 206n26,
 225, 225n8
 Dougherty, Raymond P. 81n56, 83n63
 Driscoll, Matthew J. 2, 2n7
 Driver, Godfrey R. 85n73, 170n21
 Duhaime, Jean 61n56, 62n63, 97, 97n21,
 n23, 109n66, 110, 110n72–73, n75, 111n78,
 112n82, n84, 113n88, 118n108, 1110–111,
 119, 119n115, 140n34
 Duncan, Julie A. 142, 142n40
 Dupont-Sommer, André 109n66, 111n77

 Elgvin, Torleif 50m1
 Enenkel, Karl A.E. 24n6
 Epp, Eldon J. 144, 144n46, 176n54
 Erasmus, Desiderius 24, 24n5
 Eshel, Esther 4n13, 52, 52n11, 64, 64n74–75,
 67, 69, 69n8, 213
 Eshel, Hanan 4n13, 43n87, n90, 126, 126n159,
 140n34
 Esposito, Domenico 179n3, 193n57

 Falk, Daniel K. 26n13, 29n23, 33, 33n31,
 n34–35, 36, 36n50, 37, 37n55–57, 42,
 42n84–85, 52n12, 53, 53n14, 58, 58n44,
 62, 62n64, 63n67–68, 65–66, 65n76,
 66n80, 73–74, 73n27, 74n28, 75n31,
 76n32–33, 86n75, 95n14, 98n25–26, 99,
 99n27–29, 107n56, 119–120, 119n116–120,
 120n122, 122–124, 122n136–137, 123n139,
 124n144–146, 129, 130n1, 134, 134n15,
 136–137, 136n20, 138n27, 139, 140n32,
 141n36, 146–147, 146n55, 157, 157n91–
 92, 159n98, 160, 160n102, 161n103, 215,
 215n4, 219
 Feldman, Ariel 36n49, 37–38, 37n59, 38n60
 Feldman, Faina 36n49, 37–38, 37n59, 38n60
 Fields, Weston W. 1n5
 Fitzgerald, John T. 201n11, 202n12
 Fleischer, Kilian 196n68
 Flusser, David 111n76, 118, 118n108
 Foster, Paul 26n15
 Fournet, Jean-Luc 25, 25n12, 42
 Frampton, Stephanie A. 8n34

 Gaiser, Konrad 195n64, 196n68
 Gallavotti, Carlo 184n21
 Gallo, Italo 31, 31n26, 45n97
 García Martínez, Florentino 66, 66n80,
 170n23
 Garuti, Giovanni 188n45
 Gayer, Asaf 26n14, 83n65
 Geiger, Gregor 44n95
 Geiger, Joseph 7, 7n29–31
 George, Andrew R. 119n121
 Gesche, Petra D. 143n42
 Gheldof, Tom 13n48, 85n74
 Gigante, Marcello 184, 185n25, 187n40, 190,
 190n52
 Glassner, Jean-Jacques 119n121
 Glessmer, Uwe 48n120
 Giraldi, Giglio G. 24
 Goff, Matthew J. 50m1, 52n9–10, 213
 Golb, Norman 102n43
 Grenfell, Bernard P. 6, 6n22, n24–25, 28n20,
 53n15, 135n17
 Guidobaldi, Maria P. 179n3, 193n57
 Gurd, Sean A. 154n81

 Haigh, Rebekah 120–121, 120n123–124, n126,
 121n127

- Hamidovic, David 99, 99n29
 Haran, Menahem 83n63, 170n24, 171–172,
 171n27, n28, 172n31–32, 184n22
 Harrington, Daniel J. 50m1, 51n6–7, 52,
 52n9–10, 53, 53n16–17, 67, 69, 69n7,
 89, 213
 Harris, Marvin 130, 130n2
 Hartog, Pieter B. 13n49, 132n13
 Hayes, Gemma 36n53
 Hedrick, Charles W. 154n82–83
 Hempel, Charlotte 4n12, 10, 11n40, 57n37,
 n39, 58n43, n45–46, 59n47, 60n50,
 11n79, 13n5, 132n10, 145, 145n48–49,
 n51, 150–151, 150n65, 151n68
 Hendrickson, Thomas 167n9, 168m11, 173,
 174n36–39, n42, 176n52, 201n9
 Hoek, Anniewies van den 196n69
 Høgenhaven, Jesper 81n55
 Houston, George W. 12n44, 41n77, 137n24,
 168, 168n13, 175–178, 175n45, n47–50,
 176n52, n55, 177n57–58, 178n63, 179n3,
 184n19, 186n30, n33, 187, 187n36–37,
 n39–40, 188, 188n41–43, n46, 189n50,
 190–192, 190n51, 191n53–55, 192n56,
 193n60, 199n1, 203n16–17, 205, 205n25,
 206n27
 Hoven, René 24n5
 Hunzinger, Claus-Hunno 1, 1n2, 61n56
 Hunt, Arthur S. 6, 6n22, n24–25, 28n20,
 53n15, 135n17, 144n45
 Hurtado, Larry W. 26, 26n15, 27n17

 Jacob, Christian 168n11
 Janko, Richard 185n26, 188n44, 206,
 206n27
 Jefferies, Daryl F. 52, 52n9, 213
 Johnson, Michael B. 38n63, 145, 145n51,
 146n54
 Johnson, William A. 5n17, 6n20, 16n57, 25,
 25n12, 28n22, 42, 80, 80n51–52, 83n61,
 86n78, 121, 121n128, n130, 136n21, 150,
 152–153, 152n70–71
 Johnston, Alan 77n37
 Jokiranta, Jutta 10, 11n40, 59n47, 101, 101n34,
 105n49, 118n107, 130, 130n3
 Jull, A.J. Timothy 39n70

 Kenyon, Frederic G. 5n19, 53n15
 Kidd, Stephen 77n37

 Kleve, Knut 187n36, 188
 Kloner, Amos 77n38, n40
 Knohl, Israel 157n92
 Koffmahn, Elisabeth 44n95
 König, Jason P. 166n3
 Konstan, David 150
 Kottsieper, Ingo 51n4, 54n21, 85n71
 Kramer, Johannes 31n25
 Kraus, Thomas J. 82, 82n60, 176n54
 Krieg, Matthias 112–113, 113n86–88, 118–120,
 118n113, 120n125
 Krsteva, Julia 12n46
 Krüger, Julian 85n73, 144n44
 Kuhrt, Amélie 83n63

 Lama, Mariachiara 45n97, 137n25
 La Nasa, Jacopo 71n22
 Lange, Armin 172n33
 Lapin, Hayim 199, 199n3, 201n10, 204–205,
 205n23
 Larson, Erik 46–47, 46n107, 47n108–109,
 n112–113, 48n115
 Lemaire, André 81n55
 Lim, Timothy 58n46, 104n47
 Lincoln, Bruce 14, 14n53–56, 173, 199
 Longacre, Drew G. 68n6, 77n37, 78–79,
 78n44, 79n48, 81, 81n54, 207–208,
 207n30, 208n32
 Longo Auricchio, Francesca 184n23
 Looijer, Gwynned de 102, 102n40, n42
 Lowrie, Michèle 7n32
 Luijendijk, AnneMarie 26, 26n15, 45n97, 48,
 48n115–116, 83n61
 Luz, Menahem 202n12

 Magness, Jodi 77–78, 77n38, 78n41, 125n152,
 200n7, 202, 202n14, 203n15
 Maiuri, Amedeo 201n9
 Manfredi, Manfredino 24, 24n14
 Marksches, Christoph 175n46
 Martin, Malachi B. 55n27
 Martone, Corrado 169, 169n18, 170n20,
 172n34, 173, 173n35
 Masai, François 11n41
 Mason, Steve N. 130, 130n3, 154, 154n84
 Mathisen, Ralph W. 11n43
 Mattusch, Carol C. 185n27, 186n35
 Mekler, Siegfried 195n64
 Metso, Sarianna 57n39, n41

- Metzger, Bruce M. 11241
- Milik, Józef T. 3210, 29224, 32–33, 32228, 33229, 35, 35245, 36, 36247–49, 37, 45–46, 452100, 462101, 2104–105, 61256, 9425–6, 98, 98224, 145248–49, 170221, 172233
- Militello, Cesira 193260
- Mizzi, Dennis 1252152, 202214
- Mroczek, Eva 13216
- Najman, Hindy 156, 156287–88, 1612104
- Nati, James 462102, 58245, 59247, 1232142
- Naveh, Joseph 36, 36253, 43291
- Netzer, Ehud 182213
- Neudecker, Richard 16227
- Newman, Judith H. 59247, 145, 145250–51
- Newsom, Carol A. 55228, 56229–30, 58245–46, 101, 101234, 108, 108265, 124, 1242147, 150262
- Nicholls, Matthew C. 168212
- Nichols, Stephen G. 9, 9237
- Nicolardi, Federica 205224
- Nitzan, Bilha 97, 97219, 158295
- Norsa, Medea 176, 176256
- North, Robert 118–119, 1182112
- Oikonomopoulou, Katerina 16623
- Osten-Sacken, Peter von der 112, 112285, 1182109
- Otranto, Rosa 144, 175–177, 175246, 249–50, 177, 178262, 198
- Pack, Roger A. 82259
- Pajunen, Mika S. 42, 42286
- Pannkuk, Justin L. 61258
- Parkes, Malcolm B. 228
- Parslow, Christopher C. 179211
- Pedersén, Olof 169217
- Perrot, Antony. 26213, 29223, 42, 42286, 83265
- Petrain, David 168, 168210, 215
- Pfann, Stephen J. 33, 33230–32, 39, 39266, 268, 271, 83265, 102243
- Piano, Valeria 190
- Pike, Kenneth L. 130, 13022
- Pintaudi, Rosario 176256
- Plicht, Johannes van der 71222
- Ploeg, Johannes P.M. van der 109266, 112277
- Popović, Mladen 4, 4214, 5215, 8235, 9, 9238, 10239, 36252, 47, 472114, 59249, 60250–51, 71222, 79246, 84268, 86277, 121, 1212128–129, 130–131, 13023, 13125, 27, 13229, 211, 150, 150263, 266, 155, 155286, 160299, 168210, 171225, 172231, 180–182, 18127–8, 182212, 183214, 186231, 194262, 19923, 20026–7, 203–204, 203217, 219, 204222, 207228
- Porten, Bezalel 43291, 85273
- Posner, Ernst M. 16728
- Price, Jonathan 78
- Puech, Émile 36253, 69211, 81255, 96211, 121, 121233
- Puglia, Enzo 177, 177257–60
- Qimron, Elisha 46–47, 472110, 109266
- Quenzer, Jörg B. 9236
- Radiciotti, Paolo 190
- Rahmani, Levi Y. 77238, 78, 78242
- Rasmussen, Kaare L. 71222
- Rathbone, Dominic 45298
- Ratzon, Eshbal 26214
- Rea, John R. 176, 176253
- Reed, Ronald 83262
- Reed, Stephen 37258
- Renfrew, Colin, 18229
- Rey, Jean-Sébastien 50211, 5229, 213
- Rietz, Henry W.M. 149261
- Roberts, Colin H. 27217
- Robson, Eleanor 169216, 171227
- Römer, Cornelia 82258
- Rösel, Martin 48218
- Rostrup, Egill 7226
- Ruggiero, Michele 183216
- Ryholt, Kim 16622, 169216, 217
- Schiffman, Lawrence H. 63, 63272
- Schmidt, Francis 99, 99230
- Schofield, Alison 59247, 130, 13023
- Schomaker, Lambert 71222, 79246
- Schuetz, Roman 5124
- Schuller, Eileen M. 55–56, 55224–25, 227–28, 56229, 231, 233–34, 59, 59247–48, 6929, 80, 80253, 126, 1262159, 156289, 157292, 158, 158294, 159298, 160, 1602100–101, 214, 21422

- Schultz, Brian 62n63, 97, 97n22–23, 109n66,
110, 110n72–73, n74, 111n79, 112–114,
112n81–83, 113n91–92, 114n93–97, 117,
117n104, 118n108, 140n34, 150, 150n64
- Schwemer, Daniel 119n21
- Scurlock, JoAnn 143n43
- Shaked, Shaul 43n91
- Sickinger, James P. 167, 167n6
- Sider, David 179n2, 180n4, 183n17, 184,
184n19–20, n24, 185n26, n29, 186n32,
n34–35, 187n38, n40, 188n44, 195n63
- Sider, Sandra 184n18–19
- Skeat, Theodore C. 27n17
- Small, Jocelyn P. 185n28
- Smallwood, Edith M. 202n12
- Starcky, Jean 95, 95n12
- Starr, Raymond J. 152, 152n70, 154n82
- Stausberg, Michael 13, 13n50–52, 173
- Stegemann, Hartmut 38n63, 55n27, 126,
126n60, 142, 142n38, 145, 145n52, 177,
177n61, 194n62
- Stemberger, Günter 34n39
- Stern, Sacha 63n70
- Studel, Annette 132n12
- Stevens, Kathryn 169n16
- Stock, Brian 9
- Stockt, Luc van der 196–197, 196n69, 197n70
- Stökl Ben Ezra, Daniel 39, 39n69, 83n65,
186n31, 194n62, 200n6
- Strack, Hermann L. 34n39
- Strugnell, John 50n1, 51n6, 52, 52n9–10, 53–
54, 53n16–17, 55n24–25, 67, 69, 69n7,
89, 213
- Stuckenbruck, Loren T. 45n100
- Sukenik, Eleazar L. 55n26, 170, 170n21
- Tait, John W. 171n27
- Talmon, Shemaryahu 48, 48n119–120,
49n121
- Taylor, Joan E. 170, 170n22
- Tigheelaar, Eibert J.C. 11, 11n42, 23n1, 33n29,
36n52, 44n93, 46, 46n103, 49n125, 50n1,
51n6, 52n9–10, 53–54, 54n19, n21, 61,
61n57, n59, 67n2, 68n5–6, 69n7–8,
71n22, 74n29, 78–79, 78n44, 79n48,
84, 84n67, 86n77, 87n79, 89, 101, 101n36,
102n43, 105, 105n48, n50, 108, 108n63,
124n149, 131, 131n7–n8, 146n53, 156,
156n87–88, 213–214, 218
- Toit, Jacqueline S. Du 171n27
- Too, Yun L. 174n37, 176n52
- Toorn, Karel van der 169, 169n19, 171n28
- Tournié, Aurélie 196n67
- Tov, Emanuel 26n13, 28n22, 29n23, n24, 30,
32n28, 33n35, 34, 34n36, 35, 38, 38n61–
62, n64, 39n70, 40, 40n73, n73, n75–76,
42, 42n84, 43n87, 44, 44n92, 46n101,
51n4, 57n41, 61n60, 83n65, 84, 84n69,
86, 86n75, n77, 109, 109n67–68, 124,
124n149, 136n21, 137n22, 138, 138n26,
142–143, 142n38, 143n41, 156n90,
208n33
- Treuer, John C. 95, 95n7
- Tsitsiridis, Stavros 7, 7n27–28
- Turner, Eric G. 25, 25n11, 27n18, 28, 28n21,
n22, 32n27, 38n63, 42, 42n81, 48n117,
53n15, 79n49, 136n21, 137n23, 189n48
- Ullmann-Margalit, Edna 102n43
- Ulrich, Eugene C. 31, 68n5, 80n50
- Vance, Eugene 7n32
- VanderKam, James C. 58n46, 104, 104n47,
150n62
- Vanonen, Hanna 10, 11n40, 59n47, 109n66,
110n72–73, 111, 111n79, 112, 112n80–82,
113, 113n90, 116n103, 117n105, 118n110,
140
- Vaux, Roland de 1, n3, 29n24, 94, 170n21,
199, 199n2, 200n7, 201
- Vermes, Géza 39, 39n65–68, 56, 56n35, 57,
57n37–42, 58n43, 69, 69n11, 145, 145n51
- Walsh, Peter G. 23n2
- Wassen, Cecilia 166n3
- Wee, John Zhu-En 118–119, 119n114
- Weinbender, Jack 58n46, 103, 103n44,
104n46
- Werrett, Ian 202–204, 202n13
- White, L. Michael 194n61
- Winckelmann, Johann J. 185, 185n27,
186n35, 193n58, 224
- Wise, Michael O. 26n13, 29n23, 33n29, n35,
42, 42n84, 86n75, 183n15
- Wisnom, Selena 211n39
- Wold, Benjamin 52m10
- Wolf, Greg 166n3, 174, 174n44, 202n12
- Wright, Benjamin G. 4, 4n14

- Yadin, Yigael 7, 48*n*119, 109*n*66, 111*n*77, 118
Yardeni, Ada 43–44, 43*n*87–90, 44*n*94, *n*96,
49, 49*n*122, 69*n*11, 78, 85*n*73, 109*n*69
Yiftach-Firanko, Uri 44*n*95
Yishai, Rony 115–117, 115*n*99–101, 116*n*102
Zahn, Molly 12, 12*n*47, 131, 131*n*7, 208–209,
209*n*35
Zangenberg, Jürgen 181, 181*n*10, 200, 200*n*5
Zarmakoupi, Mantha 179*n*1
Zissu, Boaz 77*n*38, *n*40
Zuckerman, Bruce E. 68*n*6

In *Collecting Practices and Opisthographic Collections in Qumran and Herculaneum*, Ayhan Aksu offers a new perspective on practices of collection in both the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Herculaneum papyri. This study focuses on the intriguing question how ancient scribes and scholars used manuscripts to bring different texts in conversation with each other. Central to Aksu's approach are opisthographic manuscripts – scrolls that contain text on both the front and back side. Comparative research of the rich papyrus collection from Herculaneum reveals that scribes across various regions of the Mediterranean developed dynamic approaches to engage with their texts.

AYHAN AKSU, *Ph.D. (2022, University of Groningen)*, is a postdoctoral researcher at the KU Leuven. His research focuses on ancient Judaism and the Dead Sea Scrolls, with special attention to ancient manuscript practices.



9 789004 716230

ISBN 978-9004-71623-0

ISSN 0169-9962

brill.com/stdj