



Telling Contexts

Archaeological and Textual Studies in Honor of
Elizabeth Bloch-Smith and Mark S. Smith

edited by
Julie B. Deluty
Heath D. Dewrell
F. W. Dobbs-Allsopp

Telling Contexts

Telling Contexts

Archaeological and Textual Studies
in Honor of Elizabeth Bloch-Smith and Mark S. Smith

Edited by

Julie B. Deluty
Heath D. Dewrell

and

F. W. Dobbs-Allsopp



Lockwood Press
Columbus, GA • 2026

Copyright © 2026 by Lockwood Press

All rights reserved, including rights for text and data mining and training of artificial intelligence technologies or similar technologies. No part of this work may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying and recording, or by means of any information storage or retrieval system, except as may be expressly permitted by the 1976 Copyright Act or in writing from the publisher. Requests for permission should be addressed in writing to Lockwood Press, PO Box 1080, Columbus, GA 31902 USA.

ISBN: 978-1-957454-63-4

Cover image: Samson carrying the gate of Gaza mosaic from the Huqoq synagogue. Photograph by Jim Haberman; reproduced with permission of Jodi Magness (copyright).

Cover design by Susanne Wilhelm

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Deluty, Julie B. editor | Dewrell, Heath D. editor | Dobbs-Allsopp, F. W., 1962- editor | Bloch-Smith, Elizabeth, 1952- honoree | Smith, Mark S., 1955- honoree

Title: Telling contexts : archaeological and textual studies in honor of Elizabeth Bloch-Smith and Mark S. Smith / edited by Julie B. Deluty, Heath D. Dewrell and F.W. Dobbs-Allsopp.

Description: Columbus, GA : Lockwood Press, 2026. | Includes bibliographical references and index. | Summary: «This volume honors the careers of Mark S. Smith (Helena Professor of Old Testament Literature and Exegesis, Princeton Theological Seminary) and Elizabeth Bloch-Smith (Princeton Theological Seminary) with contributions on the Hebrew Bible and Near Eastern archaeology by colleagues and students»— Provided by publisher.

Identifiers: LCCN 2026012231 (print) | LCCN 2026012232 (ebook) | ISBN 9781957454634 hardcover | ISBN 9781957454184 epub | ISBN 9781957454627 pdf

Subjects: LCSH: Bible. Old Testament—Criticism, interpretation, etc. | Bible. Old Testament—Antiquities | Middle East—Antiquities | LCGFT: Festschriften | Festschriften

Classification: LCC BS1171.3 .T45 2026 (print) | LCC BS1171.3 (ebook)

LC record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2026012231>

LC ebook record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2026012232>

CONTENTS

Preface	vii
List of Contributors	xi
Abbreviations	xiii

“The Glory of Children Is Their Parents:” Or, Putting the WAW in WAW Consecutive <i>Benjamin B. Smith, Rachel Baron-Bloch, Shula S. Smith</i>	1
--	---

Part I. Dimensions of Textuality

The Single-Copy Literary Manuscripts Found in the Qumran Caves <i>Sidnie White Crawford</i>	7
Baal’s Hurrian Children: A New Proposal for the Meaning of <i>hnr</i> in KTU 1.5.V:9 <i>Heath D. Dewrell</i>	35
The <i>wayyiqtol</i> s in Lamentations <i>F. W. Dobbs-Allsopp</i>	43
Psalm 85 <i>Thomas P. McCreesh</i>	57
The Threshold in the Old Testament <i>Aaron Schart</i>	71
Psalm 45: YHWH und das Königtum der Davididen <i>Hermann Spieckermann</i>	81

Part II. Judges

Three Blind Men <i>Susan Ackerman</i>	93
The Historical Philistines and the Samson Narrative <i>Daniel Master</i>	103
Anger or Adultery? Text-Critical Conundrums in Judges 19 <i>Sara Milstein</i>	115
Machir the Son of Manasseh and the Political History of Israel <i>Lauren Monroe</i>	125
A Study in the Ethics of Killing and Dying: Portrayals of the Heroic and Anti-Heroic in Judges <i>Susan Niditch</i>	137
Samson and the Fall of the Lion (Judg 14:6, 8): Manifold Contexts of a Mistranslated Metaphor <i>Tallay Ornan</i>	147

Part III. Texts and Ideas

Religious Reading: The Rise of Study as Personal Piety in Deuteronomy and Its Significance <i>Pamela Barmash</i>	173
What People Make: Artisan­ship and Recycling in the Tabernacle Story <i>Elaine T. James</i>	183
Emotion and Imagination in the Early Israelite Monarchy <i>Kyle. H. Keimer</i>	195
Hope Amid a Groaning Creation: Powerful Pharaohs, Golden Calves, and the Holy Name of God <i>Dennis T. Olson</i>	209
Thinking about Thinking: Modes and Developments of Second Order Thinking in Ancient Israel <i>Konrad Schmid</i>	221
The Aliyah from Egypt and the Jacob Tradition <i>Karel van der Toorn</i>	233

Part IV. Archaeology

Judahite Burial Practices: The View from Tel ‘Eton <i>Avraham Faust and Eyal Baruch</i>	249
Trade across Borders in Times of Conflict <i>Seymour Gitin</i>	265
A Seal Impression on a Mud Stopper from Tel Gezer <i>Stefan Mün­ger, Steven M. Ortiz, and Samuel R. Wolff</i>	269
Index of Ancient Sources	285
Material Culture Index	293

PREFACE

The academic *Festschrift* is a genre traditionally reserved for recognizing and celebrating outstanding scholarly achievement over the course of a career. This volume's honorees, Elizabeth Bloch-Smith and Mark S. Smith, are most deserving of such recognition. "Each in their own way made important contributions to the field of Ancient Near Eastern studies"—Liz, in her "archaeological fieldwork and incisive analysis of ancient Near Eastern religion," and Mark, in his "extensive and ground-breaking work in the fields of Israelite religion, Hebrew Bible, and Ugaritic studies" (Gitin). In this central way, then, this volume finds its place in a revered scholarly tradition. And yet another of the impulses animating the volume is decidedly less traditional. The honorees are plural—two—and married to one another, and thus Mark and Liz's personal and professional lives for over forty years have been a deeply entangled affair—one enmeshed with the other, both with their children and extended families, with friends and colleagues. So another end in view for this volume is to luxuriate in these happily entangled lives. To do so we feel is entirely appropriate for Liz and Mark, who they are and how they have chosen to live their lives and pursue their careers. But such an angle of approach is not without its own intellectual claims to make. An awareness of how thoroughly our scholarship is shaped and informed by the persons we are is foundational to many post-Enlightenment modalities of knowledge. The essays gathered here, individually and collectively, testify to the satisfying and incisive nature of such a way of knowing.

Mark and Liz have known about and participated in this project from the beginning. Together they drew up the initial list of potential contributors. They decided to limit the invitations to colleagues who know them both equally well, personally and professionally. Of course, not everyone who was invited ended up contributing. The wisdom of Liz and Mark's selection criteria is borne out by the fact that the acuity of insight achieved in these essays is matched by the genuine affection that motivated them. No general theme was articulated for the volume as a whole. Instead, contributors were asked to write on a topic of their own choosing, something of scholarly interest to them. The thinking here is that the best way to honor excellence in scholarly achievement is with achieved scholarship itself. If the topics also happen to intersect with aspects of Mark and/or Liz's interests—as they often do—then so much the better.

In lieu of a proper introduction we open the volume with a contribution by the Smith children—Ben, Rachel, and Shula. In many ways, this essay epitomizes this volume, especially the angle of admiration at which it is pitched—"Mom and Dad, we love you and we are so proud of you." It offers witty and perceptive glimpses of moments in Liz and Mark's careers viewed from the vantage point of their children. The essay is notable as well for being one of two in the volume to take up the topic of the *waw*-consecutive (who knew this thinnest of Mark's stand-alone monographs would continue to be so generative after more than thirty years), and according to the essay's subtitle, "Or, Putting the WAW in WAW Consecutive," the authors appear to agree with Dobbs-Allsopp that the conjunctive *waw* in these formations remains productive (at least as late as Lamentations, see below).

The editors have organized the submitted contributions into four sections. This has been done mostly as a convenience for readers. Many of the essays could be fitted into multiple sections. The first section, *Dimensions of Textuality*, offers an eclectic mix of textual studies

ranging from the Dead Seas Scrolls (Crawford) to lexical and grammatical inquiries (Dewrell, Dobbs-Allsopp, Schart) to readings of two psalms (McCreesh, Spieckermann). The inspiration for the section comes from Sara Milstein’s reminiscence about Mark in the classroom and his “delighting in every grammatical conundrum” and “proclivity for lingering however-long-it-takes on a single word”—all “fueled by the largest cup of coffee I had ever seen someone ingest in one sitting.” The “delight” in lingering over various textual “conundrums” (large and small) is what binds this group of studies together.

The second section, simply entitled *Judges*, unsurprisingly is very much the heart of the volume. There may be no more tangible sign of Mark and Liz’s “formidable partnership” (Gitin) than their *Judges* commentary for the *Hermeneia* series. The first volume has been published (2021), coming in at 744 pages (plus front matter). And they are now at work on the second volume, which no doubt will be just as monumental as the first and, as the Smith children shrewdly observe, may well take them “the rest of their lives.” As befitting any good commentary, the essays here are wide-ranging in focus, from text criticism (Milstein), a misunderstood metaphor (Ornan), and history (Master, Monroe) to ethics (Niditch), including an essay on “Three Blind Men” (Ackerman). These studies do not so much seek to compete with Liz and Mark as to collaborate with them, to participate in a small way in this masterwork of their later lives. Something of this sensibility is captured well by Susan Ackerman in the closing paragraph of her contribution:

I ask this question, along with the others I have posed, at a time when the honorees of this collection of essays ... are jointly engaged in writing the second volume of a commentary on *Judges*. I don’t necessarily expect them to take up my questions about *Judges* 16, and even if they do, I don’t necessarily expect they will provide me (and all of us) with answers. But I know if anyone can take this discussion further, it is Mark and Liz, who throughout their careers have done so much to advance our understanding of the Bible and the greater biblical world.

Text may be read to many different ends. In the third section, *Texts and Ideas*, the ends in view in the essays gathered here are largely ideational in nature—personal piety (Barmash), creativity (James), emotion (Keime), hope (Olson), second order thinking (Schmid), and the Aliyah from Egypt (van der Toorn). That is, these essays, to larger and lesser degrees, query aspects of “Israel’s intellectuality” (Schmid).

The final section consists of three archaeological studies—Faust and Baruch on “Judah’s Burial Practices”; Gitin on “Trade”; and Münger, Ortiz and Wolff on a “Seal Impression on a Mud Stopper” from Gezer. Archaeology and material culture figure in other essays in the volume, but here they are the heart of the matter. If the volume’s initial section finds its inspiration in Mark’s delight in lingering over every textual conundrum, this one is rooted in the dirt and Liz’s love of fieldwork. This is epitomized by a fragment of a memory lodged in the mind of one of the editors. In the summer of 1988, Chip Dobbs-Allsopp, taking a break from jackhammering through Byzantine layers in 38 upper at Ashkelon, wandered over to look down on the Iron Age layers of 38 lower where he longed to work. And it was Liz who looked up at him. She was squatting down, with a big, brimmed hat on her head, a trowel or fine brush in her hand, and a blissful smile that engulfed the whole of her face—this was a woman in her element. The opening and closing sections, like the figures of their incitement—Mark with his coffee lingering over words and Liz with her trowel working happily in the dirt, form a diptych that encloses the volume and fashions it into a whole.

Telling Contexts is a title that signifies in layers, not unlike an ancient Levantine tell or an old Hebrew poem. At base the title focalizes the two primary disciplines of our honorees, archaeology (*tell*) and textual studies (*texts*). The use of italics permits each to mean on their own and in their own way. And yet as *tell* and *texts* become mashed up together phrasally, there is equally an insistence on their meaningful entanglement. Archaeology and the material culture it uncovers provides the extra-textual *context* that is critical to any surpassing and maximally enfleshed reading of an ancient text. And *texts*, as they preserve bits of human language mediated through writing, importantly are articulate and *telling* in ways that are uniquely legible, and thus are equally critical to the interpretive work of archaeology in an effort to know more fully the people and events that produced the material remains archaeology recovers. *Texts* and *contexts* are mutually *telling*. And then there is the personal and professional mash-up of Liz with Mark and Mark with Liz that forms the larger *contexts* of their lives, lives lived with space for the one and the other and the two together, blended, entangled, happy, *telling*. Such lives as these we join to honor and celebrate. Liz and Mark, *lehayim!*

* * *

Julie Deluty and Heath Dewrell—with an assist from Matt Green—have borne the brunt of the editorial work for this volume. Chip Dobbs-Allsopp’s participation has been more circumscribed than originally anticipated, given the decline in his eyesight in recent years. The editors thank the contributors for their fine contributions to the volume and for their patience as we have worked to pull the volume together. We also thank Billie Jean Collins for her willingness to publish the volume—Billie Jean has her own longstanding relationship with our honorees, and thus publishing the volume with Lockwood Press seems most fitting.

The Editors

LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS

Susan Ackerman, Preston H. Kelsey Professor of Religion, emerita, Dartmouth College

Pamela Barmash, professor of Hebrew Bible and Biblical Hebrew, Washington University in St. Louis

Rachel Baron-Bloch, assistant professor of history and Teller Family Chair in Jewish History, University of California, Irvine

Eyal Baruch, Martin (Szusz) Department of Land of Israel Studies and Archaeology and the Helene and Paul Shulman School for Basic Jewish Studies, Bar-Ilan University

Sidnie White Crawford, Willa Cather Professor of Hebrew Bible, emerita, University of Nebraska-Lincoln

Julie B. Deluty, assistant professor of Hebrew Bible, Saint Joseph's University

Heath D. Dewrell, assistant professor, Department of Middle Eastern Studies, University of Texas at Austin

F. W. Dobbs-Allsopp, James Lenox Librarian and Professor of Old Testament, Princeton Theological Seminary

Avraham Faust, professor, Department of General History, Bar-Ilan University

Seymour Gitin, Dorot director and professor of archaeology, emeritus, W. F. Albright Institute of Archaeological Research, Jerusalem

Elaine T. James, associate professor of Old Testament, Princeton Theological Seminary.

Kyle H. Keimer, adjunct professor of archaeology and biblical studies at Jerusalem University College and Pillar Seminary

Daniel M. Master, Jonathan Blanchard Professor of Archaeology, Wheaton College

Thomas P. McCreesh, O.P., associate professor of theology, theology department, Providence College

Sara Milstein, professor of Hebrew Bible and ancient Near Eastern studies, Department of Ancient Mediterranean and Near Eastern Studies, University of British Columbia

Lauren A. S. Monroe, associate professor, Department of Near Eastern Studies, Cornell University

Stefan Münzer, associate professor for the archaeology of ancient Israel and its neighboring cultures, Institute of Jewish Studies, University of Bern, Switzerland

Susan Niditch, Samuel Green Professor of Religion, Amherst College

Dennis T. Olson, Charles T. Haley Professor of Old Testament Theology, emeritus, Princeton Theological Seminary

Tallay Ornan, professor emerita of ancient Near Eastern art and archaeology, the Institute of Archaeology, Mt. Scopus, Hebrew University, Jerusalem

Steven M. Ortiz, director, Lanier Center for Archaeology, Lipscomb University

Aaron Schart, Professor für Altes Testament und Neues Testament, Institut für Evangelische Theologie, Fakultät für Geisteswissenschaften, Universität Duisburg-Essen

Konrad Schmid, professor of Hebrew Bible and ancient Judaism at the University of Zurich, Switzerland

Benjamin B. Smith, independent scholar, Houston, Texas

Shula S. Smith, independent scholar, Be'er Sheva, Israel

Hermann Spieckermann, Professor für Altes Testament an der Universität Göttingen (retired)

Karel van der Toorn, Faculty Professor of Religion and Society in the Faculty of Humanities at the University of Amsterdam

Samuel R. Wolff, senior associate fellow, Albright Institute of Archaeological Research, Jerusalem

ABBREVIATIONS

1cs	first-person common singular
2ms	second-person masculine singular
3fs	third-person feminine singular
3mp	third-person masculine plural
3ms	third-person masculine singular
ÄAT	Ägypten und Altes Testament
AB	Anchor (Yale) Bible
ABD	Freedman, David Noel, ed. <i>Anchor Bible Dictionary</i> . 6 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
ABRL	Anchor (Yale) Bible Reference Library
ABS	Archaeology and Biblical Studies
ADAJ	<i>Annual of the Department of Antiquities of Jordan</i>
ADPV	Adhandlungen des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins
AeL	<i>Ägypten und Levante</i>
AHw	Von Soden, Wolfram von. <i>Akkadisches Handwörterbuch</i> . 3 vols. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1965–1981.
AJA	<i>American Journal of Archaeology</i>
AKM	Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes
ANEM	Ancient Near Eastern Monographs
ANESSup	Ancient Near Eastern Studies Supplement Series
ANET	Pritchard, James B., ed. <i>Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament</i> . 3rd ed. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1969.
AnOr	Analecta Orientalia
AOAT	Alter Orient und Altes Testament
AOS	American Oriental Series
ArBib	The Aramaic Bible
ATD	Das Alte Testament Deutsch
BAR	<i>Biblical Archaeology Review</i>
BASOR	<i>Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research</i>
BBRSup	Bulletin for Biblical Research Supplement
BDB	Brown, Francis, S. R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs. <i>A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament</i> . Oxford: Clarendon, 1907.
BETL	Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium
BH	Biblical Hebrew
BHK	Kittel, Rudolf, ed. <i>Biblia Hebraica</i> . Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1905–1906.
BHS	Elliger, Karl, and Wilhelm Rudolph, eds. <i>Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia</i> . Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1983.
BHQ	Biblia Hebraica Quinta
Bib	<i>Biblica</i>
BibInt	<i>Biblical Interpretation</i>
BibInt	Biblical Interpretation Series
BibOr	Biblica et Orientalia

BibSem	The Biblical Seminar
BJSUCSD	Biblical and Judaic Studies from the University of California, San Diego
BKAT	Biblischer Kommentar: Altes Testament
BN	<i>Biblische Notizen</i>
BRL2	Galling, Kurt, ed. <i>Biblisches Reallexikon</i> . 2nd ed. HAT 1/1. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1977.
BWANT	Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament
BZAW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
CAD	Gelb, Ignace J., et al., eds. <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.
CAT	Cuneiform Alphabetic Texts
CBQ	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
CBQMS	Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series
CC	Continental Commentaries
CHANE	Culture and History of the Ancient Near East
ChS	Corpus der hurritischen Sprachdenkmäler
CM	Cuneiform Monographs
ConBOT	Coniectanea Biblica: Old Testament Series
COS	Hallo, William W., and K. Lawson Younger Jr., eds. <i>The Context of Scripture</i> . 4 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1997–2016.
CTAT	Barthélemy, Dominique. <i>Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament</i> . 5 vols. Fribourg: Academic Press; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982–2015.
DCH	Clines, David J. A., ed. <i>Dictionary of Classical Hebrew</i> . 9 vols. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 1993–2016.
DDD	Toorn, Karel van der, Bob Becking, and Pieter van der Horst, eds. <i>Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible</i> . 2nd ed. Leiden: Brill; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999.
DJD	Discoveries in the Judean Desert
DMOA	Documenta et Monumenta Orientis Antiqui
DNWSI	Hoftijzer, Jacob, and Karen Jongeling. <i>Dictionary of the North-West Semitic Inscriptions</i> . 2 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
DSD	<i>Dead Sea Discoveries</i>
DULAT ³	Olmo Lete, Gregorio del, and Joaquín Sanmartín. <i>A Dictionary of the Ugaritic Language in the Alphabetic Tradition</i> . Translated and edited by W. G. E. Watson. 3rd ed. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill, 2015.
EBR	Klauck, Hans-Josef, et al., eds. <i>Encyclopedia of the Bible and Its Reception</i> . Berlin: de Gruyter, 2009–.
EJL	Early Judaism and Its Literature
EncJud	Skolnik, Fred, and Michael Berenbaum, eds. <i>Encyclopedia Judaica</i> . 2nd ed. 22 vols. Detroit: Macmillan Reference USA, 2007.
ErIsr	<i>Eretz Israel</i>
ET	English translation
FAT	Forschungen zum Alten Testament
FOTL	Forms of Old Testament Literature

FRLANT	Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments
GKC	Gesenius, Wilhelm. <i>Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar</i> . Edited by Emil Kautzsch. Translated by Arthur E. Cowley. 2nd ed. Oxford: Clarendon, 1910.
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.
HAT	Handbuch zum Alten Testament
HeBAI	<i>Hebrew Bible and Ancient Israel</i>
HBM	Hebrew Bible Monographs
HBT	<i>Horizons in Biblical Theology</i>
HCOT	Historical Commentary on the Old Testament
HdO	Handbuch der Orientalistik
HeBAI	<i>Hebrew Bible and Ancient Israel</i>
HS	<i>Hebrew Studies</i>
HSS	Harvard Semitic Studies
HThKAT	Herders Theologischer Kommentar zum Alten Testament
HUCA	<i>Hebrew Union College Annual</i>
IBHS	Waltke, Bruce K., and Michael Patrick O'Connor. <i>An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax</i> . Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990.
IAAR	Israel Antiquities Authority Reports
ICC	International Critical Commentary
IDB	Buttrick, George A. <i>The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible</i> . 4 vols. New York: Abingdon, 1962.
IEJ	<i>Israel Exploration Journal</i>
impf.	imperfect
ISBL	Indiana Studies in Biblical Literature
JANER	<i>Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Religions</i>
JANES	<i>Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Studies</i>
JAOS	<i>Journal of the American Oriental Society</i>
JBL	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
JCS	<i>Journal of Cuneiform Studies</i>
JEOL	<i>Jaarbericht van het Vooraziatische-Egyptisch Genootschap, Ex Oriente Lux</i>
JETS	<i>Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society</i>
JHNES	Johns Hopkins Near Eastern Studies
JHS	<i>Journal of Hebrew Studies</i>
JNES	<i>Journal of Near Eastern Studies</i>
JNSL	<i>Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages</i>
JSOT	<i>Journal of Old Testament Studies</i>
JSOTSup	Journal of Old Testament Studies Supplement Series
JSS	<i>Journal of Semitic Studies</i>
KAI	Donner, Herbert, and Wolfgang Röllig. <i>Kanaanäische und aramäische Inschriften</i> . 2nd ed. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1966–1969.
KAT	Kommentar zum Alten Testament

KTU	Dietrich, Manfred, Oswald Loretz, and Joaquín Sanmartín. <i>Die keilalphabetischen Texte aus Ugarit, Ras: Hani und anderen Orten</i> . 3rd ed. AOAT 360. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2013.
LAI	Library of Ancient Israel
LAPO	Littératures anciennes du Proche-Orient
LASBF	<i>Liber Annus Studii Biblici Franciscani</i>
LHBOTS	Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies
LSAWS	Linguistic Studies in Ancient West Semitic
MGWJ	<i>Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums</i>
NAC	New American Commentary
Nat.	Pliny, <i>Naturalis historia</i>
NEA	<i>Near Eastern Archaeology</i>
NEchtB	Neue Echter Bibel
NS	new series
NTOA	Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus
OBO	Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis
OBOSA	Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis Series Archaeologica
OBT	Overtures to Biblical Theology
OIP	Oriental Institute Publications
OJA	<i>Oxford Journal of Archaeology</i>
OLA	Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta
Or	<i>Orientalia</i> NS
ORA	Orientalische Religionen in der Antike
OTE	<i>Old Testament Essays</i>
OTL	Old Testament Library
OTR	Old Testament Readings
OTS	Old Testament Studies
PEQ	<i>Palestine Exploration Quarterly</i>
pers.	person
pf.	perfect
pl(s).	plate(s)
PTSDSSP	Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project
Qad	<i>Qadmoniot</i>
QD	Quaestiones Disputatae
RA	<i>Revue d'Assyriologie et d'archéologie orientale</i>
RB	<i>Revue Biblique</i>
RevQ	<i>Revue de Qumrân</i>
RHA	<i>Revue hittite et asianique</i>
RHPR	<i>Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses</i>
SAHL	Studies in the Archaeology and History of the Levant
SAOC	Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilizations
SBH	Standard Biblical Hebrew
SBLDS	Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series
SBLMS	Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series
SBLStBL	Society of Biblical Literature Studies in Biblical Literature

SCS	Septuagint and Cognate Studies
SEL	<i>Studi epigrafici e linguistici sul Vicino Oriente antico</i>
<i>Sem</i>	<i>Semitica</i>
SemeiaSt	Semeia Studies
sg.	singular
SHAJ	<i>Studies in the History and Archaeology of Jordan</i>
SHR	Studies in the History of Religions
SMA	Studies in Mediterranean Archaeology
SMNIA	Tel Aviv University Sonia and Marco Nadler Institute of Archaeology Monograph Series
STDJ	Studies in the Texts of the Desert of Judah
SUNT	Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments
SWBA	Social World of Biblical Antiquity
TA	<i>Tel Aviv</i>
TAPS	Transactions of the American Philosophical Society
TBN	Themes in Biblical Narrative
TDOT	Botterweck, G. Johannes, Helmer Ringgren, and Heinz-Josef Fabry, eds. <i>Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament</i> . Translated by John T. Willis et al. 17 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974–2021.
THAT	Jenni, Ernst, with assistance from Claus Westermann, eds. <i>Theologisches Handwörterbuch zum Alten Testament</i> . 2 vols. Munich: Kaiser; Zurich: Theologischer Verlag, 1971–1976.
ThWAT	Botterweck, G. Johannes, Helmer Ringgren, and Heinz-Josef Fabry, eds. <i>Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament</i> . 10 vols. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1970–2000.
tg.	targum
TLZ	<i>Theologische Literaturzeitung</i>
TRu	<i>Theologische Rundschau</i> NS
TSAJ	Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism
TUAT	Kaiser, Otto, et al, eds. <i>Texte aus der Umwelt des Alten Testaments</i> . Gütersloh: Mohn; Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1984–.
ThW	Theologische Wissenschaft
UF	<i>Ugarit-Forschungen</i>
v(v).	verse(s)
VT	<i>Vetus Testamentum</i>
VTSup	Supplements to Vetus Testamentum
WAW	Writings from the Ancient World
WAWSup	Writings from the Ancient World Supplement Series
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary
WMANT	Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament
WO	<i>Die Welt des Orients</i>
WS	West Semitic
ZAH	<i>Zeitschrift für Althebräistik</i>
ZAW	<i>Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>
ZDPV	<i>Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins</i>

“THE GLORY OF CHILDREN IS THEIR PARENTS”: OR, PUTTING THE WAW IN WAW CONSECUTIVE

BENJAMIN B. SMITH
HOUSTON, TEXAS

RACHEL BARON-BLOCH
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, IRVINE

SHULA S. SMITH
BE’ER SHEVA, ISRAEL

With the publication of this exciting *Festschrift*, we feel that the best way to honor our parents, Mark and Liz, is with the gift of our collective scholarship.¹ As their three favorite children, we share between us a vast and unparalleled body of early and late documentation of life with Drs. Bloch-Smith and Smith, and feel that our newly released, groundbreaking academic work charts new directions in the field. Our research is structured by a periodization of three main historical ages: early life (Stone Age), our time at New York University (Bronze Age), and our adult lives (Iron Age).

During the Stone Age, we spent many of our formative childhood summers in Israel. Our parents would take us around on riveting tours of different archaeological sites, while dad cosplayed as the monster in Hezekiah’s water tunnels in Hazor. But we spent most of our time on the archaeological dig in Ashkelon. Mom always wanted to share her passion for archaeology with us. In the afternoon, after digging, she would take us to clean pottery with all of the volunteers. She would explain to us, one by one, how to identify each piece (“See that it’s round? That means it’s a handle,” or “If there’s a raised edge on the pottery it means that it’s likely the lip of a vessel”). While none of us became archaeologists, and many of her lessons might have been lost on us at the time, mom was a consistent role model of a strong, trailblazing woman—not only for women in the field of archaeology as she helped set a standard in the 1980s for digging while pregnant and bringing kids along, but also for us.²

The stuff of our nightly dinner discussions was just your average conversational topics of two scholars of the ancient Near East. We considered pressing issues of the Dead Sea Squirrels (Where did they live exactly? Who was feeding them?) and employment opportunities in the book of Job. One of our school teachers was a bit surprised when a first-grade homework assignment to bring in foreign words yielded Ugaritic, or when dad taught an entire second-grade class the word *boustrophedon* during career week. As we got older, mom and dad made

1. For our earlier work, see Smith, Smith, and Smith, “*Tohu Va’vo-Who Let the Dogs Out?* An Exploration of Childhood in the Post-late Late Late Modern Iron Age,” *Journal of Really Cool Archaeology* 21.5 (2022): 48–49.

2. Kristine Henriksen Garroway, “Digging Up the Past: The History of Women Archaeologists in the Society of Biblical Literature,” *lectio difficilior* 7, <https://www.lectio.unibe.ch/en/archive/kristine-henriksen-garroway-digging-up-the-past-the-history-of-women-archaeologists-in-the-society-of-biblical-literature.html>.

a point of instilling in us valuable skills that would prepare us for the workforce. We gained experience teaching in the Hebrew School and as research assistants, cataloging the home library, proofreading manuscripts, or creating indexes. They taught us other highly useful skills as well. We learned to wield a BDB and to trace etymologies, whether through Latin or Aramaic. We picked up conversational skills in foreign languages.³ We came to appreciate the significance and joy of a *shabbes shluf*. And potentially most importantly of all for our future careers, we learned how to identify *terra sigillata*.

The Bronze Age of our lives unfolded at New York University. While Rachel and Ben enjoyed weekly lunches at Grey Dog or Mamoun’s, Shula had the extra added benefit of actually enrolling in the course *Ancient Israel* with Professor Smith.⁴ After Shula pranked dad by calling him repeatedly during class because he could not figure out how to silence his phone, dad proclaimed a full out prank war, complete with displaying embarrassing photographs of Shula in some of his powerpoints. The pranks culminated in Shula sneaking into another one of Dad’s large lecture classes and singing him happy birthday with all of the students. Somehow, the other students still did not understand that she was his daughter, until she correctly divined the final exam questions. It was during the Bronze Age period that we also embarked on our own first attempts at knowledge production. Having created a Wikipedia page for Dr. Smith, adding new biographical information, such as his undying love of Lucky Charms, the Wikipedia censors immediately called for verification of sources, demonstrating the contested politics of knowledge production. As we came of age intellectually during these undergraduate years, we came to see how our own intellectual curiosity and critical engagement had grown out of their own engagement with the world and with others.

The Iron Age yielded a new set of historiographic insights. We have had the pleasure of seeing all the ways we end up becoming like our parents. Shula has developed the ability, taking after her father, to eat an entire pint of Ben and Jerry’s in one sitting. Dr. Rachel Smith has joined the ranks of academia and while this comes as no surprise to anyone, both she and Drs. Smith and Bloch-Smith maintain that her research in modern Jewish history is in a completely different field given that, as Dr. Mark Smith claims, “Everything after Jesus is modern.” Ben, for his part, has elected to no longer take pictures standing immediately next to his dad, as every person then inevitably makes the same joke that they “see the resemblance.” It also does not help that Dr. Smith fervently maintains his childhood tradition of taking all pictures on his “tippy toes” to try to make up the one inch height difference.

In the Late Iron Age, and with the introduction of two granddaughters to the family, the Drs. Bloch-Smith and Smith expanded their pursuits even further beyond the academic realm. Mom found a second calling as an architect. Whether designing Mardi Gras ladders draped in purple, green, and gold, or constructing elaborate forts for both children and stuffed animal friends alike, she honed her skills to produce works rivaling the Ishtar Gate in its majesty. Dad, for his part, became an ardent student of the state of Texas, donning a cowboy hat as he roamed the Houston rodeo while also practicing day and night to become a champion taco vs. burrito competitor. Together, they have also both explored more artistic interests, each making their debuts as fashion show runway models, ghost charades performers, and Disney-

3. Examples include the common and important Ugaritic phrase, “*Miya kalbatu bi merkabtiyah?*,” roughly translating to “Who’s the bitch in my chariot?”

4. Let the record show that the class fulfilled a college requirement and Professor Smith was not responsible for grading Shula’s wonderful assignments. She is still peeved that she got an A-.

song karaoke crooners, though in the words of even their most ardent supporters “That’s okay, watch me, I’ll show you how to do it.”

This historiographical survey from early roots in the Stone Age to the apex of the Iron Age brings to the fore the many contributions of Drs. Bloch-Smith and Smith. Over the decades, they have persevered through obstacles great and small in the pursuit of knowledge, expanding ever wider the scholarship of the ancient Near East. Their monumental Judges commentary alone, which they have decided to work on for the rest of their lives, challenges only the authors of the Bible for the title of “longest book taken to write.” Their commentary, as much of their other work, pales in comparison to the greatest accomplishment of our parents: us. But we want to officially acknowledge in the publication of this *Festschrift* that they are an immense gift to the academic world, and even more so, to us.

Mom and dad, we love you and we are so proud of you.

עֲטֶרֶת זִקְנִים, בְּנֵי בָנִים; וְתַפְאֶרֶת בָּנִים אֲבוֹתָם
Proverbs 17:6

PART I
DIMENSIONS OF TEXTUALITY

THE SINGLE-COPY LITERARY MANUSCRIPTS FOUND IN THE QUMRAN CAVES

SIDNIE WHITE CRAWFORD
UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA-LINCOLN (EMERITA)

Abstract: This article explores one subset of the Qumran manuscript collection: those manuscripts that contain literary compositions preserved in only a single copy. These compositions are written in either Hebrew or Aramaic and were found across the manuscript caves. They exhibit a wide variety of literary genres or types of literature, including liturgical works, sapiential/didactic texts, “parabiblical” texts, legal texts, and magical/esoteric texts. The manuscripts range in date from the second half of the first century BCE through the second half of the first century CE. Their existence in the Qumran scroll collection gives insight into the identity of that collection as a sectarian scribal library.

This article grew out of two brief sections in my recent book, *Scribes and Scrolls at Qumran*, titled “Single-Copy Works,” and “Working Texts.”¹ In that short treatment I noted that Cave 4Q had a large number of single-copy literary works and that many of these manuscripts had a “draft-like quality.”² I concluded:

The presence of all these single-copy works points to the Cave 4Q collection as retaining a large portion of the scrolls that were kept in the buildings of Qumran, which were brought to Cave 4Q in anticipation of the Roman attack in 68 CE. The number of single-copy works in Cave 4Q also implies an interest in collecting as much Jewish literature as possible, perhaps simply for its own sake to preserve it, or perhaps for completeness in a “research” library. This points to the scholarly-scribal character of the Cave 4Q collection, and may indicate that at least some of the manuscripts from Cave 4Q were in regular use at some time during the life of the Qumran settlement before being stored in the nearby caves.³

For this paper honoring my dear friends and colleagues Elizabeth Bloch-Smith and Mark S. Smith I decided to take a deeper dive into the number of single-copy works in the Qumran caves to see if anything further can be concluded from their presence in the Qumran library. In honor of Liz, an archaeologist, I present an archaeological excavation into the single-copy literary manuscripts of the Qumran caves. In addition, two manuscripts that Mark, a text specialist, edited for the DJD series, 4Q462 and 4Q463, appear here as single-copy manuscripts.⁴

1. Sidnie White Crawford, *Scribes and Scrolls at Qumran* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2019), 142–46.

2. The phrase is Charlotte Hempel’s. See Hempel, *The Qumran Rule Texts in Context*, TSAJ 154 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), 332–34. She particularly cites 4Q174, 4Q175, 4Q176, 4Q177, 4Q252, and 4Q265, all manuscripts on our single-copy list.

3. Crawford, *Scribes and Scrolls*, 143.

4. Mark S. Smith, “462. 4QNarrative C,” in *Qumran Cave 4 XIV: Parabiblical Texts, Part 2*, ed. Magen Broshi et al., DJD 19 (Oxford: Clarendon, 1995), 195–210; and Smith, “463. 4QNarrative D,” in Broshi et al., *Qumran Cave 4 XIV*, 211–14.

Before commencing an analysis of the available data, two caveats are in order. First, it must always be remembered that we do not, and never will, have the complete collection of scrolls from the Qumran library as it existed in antiquity. We also do not know what percentage of the ancient collection we do have. This means that, second, works that are identified here as single-copy works may not have been such in antiquity; that is, the Qumran community may have possessed more than one copy of, say, the pesher to Nahum (4Q169), during its lifetime. This caveat holds especially true for those fragmentary manuscripts that cannot be identified with any certainty, about 32 percent of those works identified as single-copy.

The process of determining which manuscripts should be included on the list of single-copy manuscripts was not straightforward. First, I had to decide what categories of manuscripts to include and which to exclude. First and most broadly, I decided to consider only the Hebrew and Aramaic manuscripts found at Qumran. Therefore, no Greek manuscripts are included in the list. The small number of Greek texts recovered from caves 4Q and 7Q form a special subset within the collection, and, as I have suggested elsewhere, may have come from a separate section of the library.⁵ Many of these manuscripts remain unidentified; those that are identified are translations of Pentateuchal books (Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy) and therefore, as I explain below, are not part of this study.

Next, I decided to exclude manuscripts of the classical literature of ancient Israel (usually referred to as the biblical books), since those texts were wide-spread in ancient Judaism and not peculiar to the Qumran library, even though some texts (i.e., Psalms, Deuteronomy, and Isaiah) were better represented at Qumran than others, and two, Ezra-Nehemiah and Chronicles, were only found in one copy each.⁶ That datum may simply be an accident of preservation or an indication of preference, but it does not necessarily suggest anything unique about the library. The exceptions to this exclusion of classical texts are those “biblical” manuscripts that have been recognized as excerpted texts, which were created for specific purposes of worship and/or study, and were never complete biblical books.⁷ They are included in the count of single-copy manuscripts.⁸

Another category of texts excluded from the count are the calendar and *mishmarot* texts. These texts, calculating the sacred calendar and the priestly courses, form a common group. Although there are clear differences among the manuscripts, I chose to treat them as different iterations of the same subject matter.⁹ The same remark holds true for the tefillin and mezuzot, created for personal use, which are likewise not included in the count of single-copy manuscripts.¹⁰ They are also not “literary” texts in the usual sense of that word.

5. For further discussion, see Crawford, *Scribes and Scrolls*, 147.

6. For discussion of this terminology, see Crawford, *Scribes and Scrolls*, 11.

7. Sidnie White Crawford, “The Excerpted Manuscripts from Qumran, with Special Attention to 4QRe-worked Pentateuch D and 4QRe-worked Pentateuch E,” in *The Text of the Pentateuch: Textual Criticism and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, BZAW 493 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2022), 261–78, <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110467420-023>; and Crawford, “A Postscript on the Excerpted Texts,” in *Text of the Pentateuch*, 279–84, <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110467420-024>.

8. Also included is 4Q156 (4QTargum Leviticus), the earliest Aramaic translation of Leviticus. This second century BCE manuscript was brought into the settlement and stored in Cave 4Q.

9. See recently Helen Jacobus, “Calendars,” in *T&T Clark Companion to the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. George J. Brooke and Charlotte Hempel (London: T&T Clark, 2019), 435–48.

10. For discussion, see Ariel Feldman, *Tefillin and Mezuzot from Qumran: New Readings and Interpretations*, BZAW 538 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2022).

The documentary texts recovered from the Qumran caves were also excluded; while those documents are single-copy by their nature, since they are not literary texts they do not give us any particular information about the Qumran library qua library. Finally, I did not include the Copper Scroll (3Q15), since, as I have argued elsewhere, I believe that it is a separate deposit in Cave 3Q, unrelated to the Qumran library.¹¹

With those caveats and explanations, I now turn to the single-copy literary manuscripts from the Qumran caves.

Single-Copy Literary Manuscripts: General Analysis

The total number of single-copy manuscripts is 225. To arrive at that number, I examined the lists provided by Emanuel Tov for the DJD series.¹² After making a preliminary list of probable single copies, I consulted the convenient handbook *The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader*, to note whether or not any manuscripts on my preliminary list had indicative textual overlaps with any other manuscript.¹³ If so, I eliminated them from my list. I also consulted the text editions found in the DJD series, to determine the editor's opinion of whether or not a seemingly unique work could be related to any other. In this way I arrived at my list of 225 single-copy manuscripts.¹⁴ The complete list may be found in the appendix.

An analysis of the complete list produces the following information.

1. The vast majority of the single-copy manuscripts come from Cave 4Q. This is not surprising, given that Cave 4Q contained the bulk of the manuscripts recovered from the Qumran caves. The counts from each cave that yielded a single-copy manuscript are:

1Q: 12
 2Q: 5
 3Q: 5
 4Q: 182
 5Q: 6
 6Q: 10
 8Q: 1
 11Q: 4

Every manuscript cave contains at least one single-copy manuscript, with the exceptions of 9Q and 10Q, which, as Mladen Popovic notes, really cannot be counted as scroll caves.¹⁵ All of the caves with larger collections of manuscripts, 4Q (along with 5Q, which was part of the marl terrace cave complex across the ravine from the settlement), and 1Q, 2Q, 3Q, 6Q, and 11Q (limestone cliff caves) are represented.¹⁶ Many of these manuscripts are extremely fragmentary and cannot be confidently identified as

11. Crawford, *Scribes and Scrolls*, 126.

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

13. Donald W. Parry and Emanuel Tov, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader*, 2nd ed., 2 vols. (Leiden: Brill, 2014).

14. Other scholars may differ with my list, wishing to include certain manuscripts or to eliminate others. I view my own attempt as just that, an attempt, given the incomplete nature of the data.

15. Cave 9Q yielded only tiny fragments, and 10Q contained only an inscribed potsherd. Popovic, "The Manuscripts: An Overview," in Brooke and Hempel, *T&T Clark Companion*, 39.

16. Although Cave 6Q is a limestone cliff cave, it is also in the near vicinity of Qumran, situated at the top of

to their contents, as, for example, 6Q19, “Text Related to Genesis.” As I explain below, 68 manuscripts are too fragmentary for further analysis; 51 of these come from 4Q (see the appendix). Even after eliminating those extremely fragmentary manuscripts, however, 4Q still preserved the vast majority (131) of the single-copy manuscripts.

In previous publications I have argued that 4Q served as the “remote storage” for the library that existed in the buildings of the settlement as well as the main emergency repository for manuscripts in anticipation of the Roman attack in 68.¹⁷ Thus, it makes sense that the most single-copy works would be found in this cave, since manuscripts that may have been in “circulation” in the buildings before the Roman attack would have been quickly deposited in 4Q before the Qumran residents fled. This scenario includes manuscripts that could have been created for the use of community residents, such as the excerpted texts or individual hymns and prayers, or for ephemera such as the scribal exercises. Cave 4Q also includes the kind of learned texts (in single copies) one might expect to find in a scribal library, such as the esoteric texts Zodiocal Physiognomy (4Q186), Zodiology and Brontology (4Q318), and Magical Booklet (4Q560). Thus, cave 4Q has both the greatest number of single-copy manuscripts and the greatest variety of types of texts.

2. The paleographic dates of the single-copy manuscripts fall mostly in the first century BCE and the first century CE, which coincide broadly with the period of the life of the settlement, from its founding ca. 100–50 BCE to its destruction by the Romans in 68 CE.¹⁸ Not all the manuscripts were dated paleographically by their editors, but of the 212 that were dated, their dates fall as follows (see the appendix for the raw data):¹⁹
 - 42.38 percent fall in the second half of the first century BCE;
 - 22.38 percent fall in the first half of the first century BCE;
 - 11.90 percent fall in the first half of the first century CE;
 - 8.10 percent fall in the mid-first century BCE;
 - 5.71 percent in the mid-first century CE;
 - 5.24 percent more generally in the first century CE;
 - 3.81 percent in the second century BCE;²⁰
 - 0.48 percent in the second half of the second century CE.

the Wadi Qumran, directly below the aqueduct (although its exact identification is uncertain). See Marcello Fidanzio, “Searching for Cave 6Q,” *RevQ* 43 (2018): 267–77, <https://doi.org/10.2143/RQ.34.2.3291416>.

17. Sidnie White Crawford, “Qumran Cave 4: Its Archaeology and Its Manuscript Collection,” 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 Cioata, and Charlotte Hempel, STDJ 119 (Leiden: Brill, 2017), 111, https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004344532_007; Crawford, *Scribes and Scrolls*, 137–46, 319–20.

18. Jodi Magness, *The Archaeology of Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2021), 67–72.

19. To arrive at the aggregate list of paleographic dates, I used first the tables provided by Webster in DJD 39. Brian Webster, “Chronological Index of the Texts from the Judaean Desert,” in *The Texts from the Judaean Desert: Indices and an Introduction to the Discoveries in the Judaean Desert Series*, ed. Emanuel Tov, DJD 39 (Oxford: Clarendon, 2002), 351–446. I also checked the individual editions of the manuscripts in the DJD volumes. Sixteen of the manuscripts were not dated by their editors. I decided to use spans of fifty years to group the paleographic dates together; some editors used dates in twenty-five-year spans, while others used broader ranges.

20. A total of eight manuscripts. These manuscripts had to have been imported into the settlement at some point after its founding.

It is immediately evident that 54.28 percent of the manuscripts (114; over half) fall between the years 50 BCE–50 CE, the *floruit* of the settlement. If we add in those manuscripts dating to the first half of the first century BCE and the mid-first century BCE (when the settlement was founded), a total of 84.76 percent (178) were penned during the life of the settlement.²¹ Although this is speculative, I would suggest that some of these manuscripts (e.g., the excerpted texts, the scribal exercises, and the lists) were produced at Qumran itself for the use of its residents.

3. By far the majority of the single-copy manuscripts are written in the Hebrew language (201) and the square script (224). Twenty-four of the manuscripts are written in Aramaic, and only 1 (4Q298) was copied in a cryptic script.²² Since Hebrew appears to have been the literary and liturgical language of the Jewish community that resided at Qumran, this also supports the suggestion that some of these manuscripts were copied at Qumran for the use of the residents.²³

Material Observations

Although most of the manuscripts were copied on skin, twenty (about 9 percent) are papyrus.²⁴ These papyrus manuscripts come from caves 4Q and 6Q, which contained the largest number of papyrus manuscripts overall. It is not surprising that there are fewer single-copy papyrus manuscripts, and that they are more fragmentary than the parchment manuscripts (fourteen papyrus manuscripts are too fragmentary for further analysis), since papyrus is a more friable medium than parchment.

Two manuscripts are opisthographs: 4Q338, *Genealogical List?*, is written on the verso of 4Q201, cols. I–III. J. T. Milik suggests “This might have been a school-exercise, as the surface of the verso is badly blotted with ink,” although Tov does not support this suggestion.²⁵ 4Q503, *Daily Prayers*, is on the recto of 4Q512.

Tov, in *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, his overview of the material characteristics of the Dead Sea Scrolls, divides the scrolls into general sizes according to the dimensions of their writing blocks, that is, their column height (calculated by number of lines per column).

21. This is not to argue that all of them were penned *at* the settlement; it seems likely that many were imported into the settlement at various times. However, we do know, from ink tests, that at least one manuscript from the Qumran caves, 1QH, was copied in the Dead Sea region. Oliver Hahn et al., “On the Origin of the Ink of the Thanksgiving Scroll (1QHodayot),” *DSD* 16 (2009): 97–106, <https://doi.org/10.1163/156851709X395722>.

22. It is possible that other cryptic manuscripts, e.g., “Midrash [Sepher] Moshe” (4Q249) and 4Q250, “crypt A Text concerning Cultic Service” are also a single-copy works. However, the state of research on these very fragmentary papyrus texts does not allow for any certainty on the question. See Stephen J. Pfann, “Cryptic Texts,” in *Qumran Cave 4, XXVI: Cryptic Texts and Miscellanea, Part 1*, ed. Stephen J. Pfann et al., DJD 36 (Oxford: Clarendon, 2000), 515–696. Pfann’s initial work has been refined by Jonathan Ben-Dov and Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra, “4Q249 Midrash Moshe: A New Reading and Some Implications,” *DSD* 21 (2014): 131–49, <https://doi.org/10.1163/15685179-12341310>; and Jonathan Ben-Dov, “An Early Halakhic Midrash in the Fragments of 4Q249 Midrash Moshe,” *Meghillot* (2021): 3–20 [Heb.].

23. For the presence of scribes at the Qumran settlement, see Crawford, *Scribes and Scrolls*, 195–96.

24. By “skin” I am referring to texts copied onto treated animal skin, usually referred to in the literature as “parchment.” See recently Ingo Kottsieper, “Physicality of Manuscripts and Material Culture,” in Brooke and Hempel, *T&T Clark Companion*, 167–72.

25. Milik, *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4*, trans. Matthew Black (Oxford: Clarendon, 1976), 139. Emanuel Tov, “338. 4QGenealogical List?,” in Pfann et al., *Qumran Cave 4, XXVI*, 290.

He divides these writing blocks into four sizes: small (four to fourteen lines); medium-sized (fourteen to twenty-five lines); large (twenty-five to thirty-four); and very large (thirty-five to sixty lines).²⁶ Among the single-copy manuscripts, Tov lists the following as “small” (from smallest to largest):

- 4Q444 Incantation (3 cm in height)
- 5Q14 Curses
- 4Q550 Jews in the Persian Court
- 4Q16 Exod^e
- 4Q274 Tohorot A
- 4Q501 Apocryphal Lamentation B
- 4Q339 List of False Prophets
- 4Q246 Apocryphon of Daniel
- 4Q318 Zodiology and Brontology
- 4Q448 Apocryphal Psalm and Prayer
- 4Q298 Words of the Maskil
- 4Q162 Pesher Isaiah^b
- 4Q370 Admonition Based on the Flood
- 4Q44 Deut^q
- 4Q40 Deutⁿ
- 4Q169 Pesher Nahum
- 4Q542 Testament of Qahat
- 4Q179 Apocryphal Lamentation A
- 4Q37 Deut^j (12.2–12.5 cm in height)

Listed as “medium-sized” are:

- 5Q1 Deut (12.6 cm in height)
- 4Q185 Sapiential Work
- 4Q521 Messianic Apocalypse
- 4Q177 Catena A
- 4Q184 Wiles of the Wicked Woman
- 1QpHab Pesher Habakkuk
- 4Q166 Pesher Hosea^a
- 4Q174 Florilegium
- 4Q252 Commentary on Genesis A (13.0 cm)

Listed as “large” are:

- 11Q13 Melchizedek (14.9 cm)
- 4Q171 Pesher Psalms^a
- 4Q175 Testimonia
- 1Q20 Genesis Apocryphon (30.5–31 cm)

No single-copy manuscripts are listed as “very large.”

26. Emanuel Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert*, STDJ 54 (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 82–93. Tov admits that these divisions are “impressionistic” and made “mainly for the sake of convenience.” They do help to grasp the difference in sizes among scrolls. It should be emphasized that most manuscripts are too fragmentary to calculate the size of their writing blocks. This is especially the case with the single-copy manuscripts.