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Abstract

The present thesis addresses the problem of how New Testament scholarship may best discern and eventually reconstruct the Aramaic backgrounds to the New Testament on linguistic grounds. The major works of the twentieth and twenty-first centuries are critiqued. The problems found with previous approaches highlight the need for future studies to be validated against the conclusions of a multitude of corollary disciplines. These include the morphology and syntax of the three major languages used in Judaea during the first-century CE and the translation techniques used to convey sources from one language in one of the other two. The most critical need demonstrated is that of a systematically developed awareness of first-century Judaean literary Aramaic.

The best representative corpus of this dialect is that from Qumran. Therefore, the second part of the present thesis contains a systematically developed and paleographically verified grammar of Qumran Aramaic. This treatment summarizes the heterogeneity of Qumran Aramaic orthography, phonology, morphology, and syntax. A complementary chrestomathy and a collection of thirty-five plates of previously unpublished photographs of the Genesis Apocryphon are included in appendices.
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### Symbols and Abbreviations

Table 1: Symbols and Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>A lacuna in the text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( )</td>
<td>A word inserted into the English translation for the sake of clarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>A reconstruction in the text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; &gt;</td>
<td>A word normally required but omitted in the Aramaic text and inserted into the English translation for the sake of clarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→</td>
<td>becomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>←</td>
<td>is derived from</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>abs.</td>
<td>absolute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>Biblical Aramaic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCE</td>
<td>Before the Common Era</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE</td>
<td>The Common Era</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cs.</td>
<td>construct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DJD</td>
<td><em>Discoveries in the Judaeanean Desert</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>du.</td>
<td>dual form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emph.</td>
<td>emphatic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1: Symbols and Abbreviations (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>feminine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JBA</td>
<td>Jewish Babylonian Aramaic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JPA</td>
<td>Jewish Palestinian Aramaic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l.</td>
<td>line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBH</td>
<td>Late Biblical Hebrew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LXX</td>
<td>Septuagint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m.</td>
<td>masculine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MH</td>
<td>Mishnaic Hebrew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>Masoretic Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>not extant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. rectum</td>
<td><em>nomen rectum</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. regens</td>
<td><em>nomen regens</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OfA</td>
<td>Official Aramaic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pl.</td>
<td>plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTA</td>
<td>Aramaic of the Palestinian Targums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QA</td>
<td>Qumran Aramaic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QH</td>
<td>Qumran Hebrew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sing.</td>
<td>singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TgA</td>
<td>The Aramaic of the later Targums</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Qumran Texts Used in The Preparation of This Document

The texts listed below informed the development of the grammar included in Part II.\(^1\) As all texts are in Aramaic, the customary suffix “ar” has not been included in the sigla we have used.

The critical editions consulted in the preparation of the database are listed in Column 3 and may also be found in Emanuel Tov, “List of the Texts from the Judaean Desert” in *The Texts from the Judaean Desert* ed. Emanuel Tov, DJD 39, 27–114. Where the work is cited more than once, the first citation contains the fuller, bibliographic listing. In addition to these printed editions, substantial use was also made of *The Dead Sea Scrolls on Microfiche: A Comprehensive Facsimile Edition of the Texts from the Judean Desert*, [E. Tov, ed. (Leiden: Netherlands, 1993)] and *The Dead Sea Scrolls Electronic Reference Library*, 2 [N. Reynolds, et al., eds. (Leiden: Netherlands, 1999)].

\(^1\)We regret that, due to complications in acquisition and a significant cataloguing backlog in the University Library, we were not able to make full use of DJD 36 [Stephen J. Pfann et al., *Qumran Cave 4: XXVI: Cryptic Texts and Miscellanea, Part 1* (Oxford: Clarendon, 2000), DJD 36] at the time that the Enochic literature from Qumran was processed. We have, however, endeavored to address the work of Stuckenbruck (4Q201, 4Q203, and 4Q206) and that of Tigchelaar and García Martínez (4Q208–209) where the differences of reading, translation, or interpretation are of substantial significance for understanding the grammar of QA.
It is worth noting that literally hundreds of fragments have been discovered at Qumran. While most of these have been in Hebrew, a substantial number of Aramaic texts were found. The language of many fragments are still uncertain, and the respective documents necessarily bear a question mark in their sigla. We have avoided most of these and have restricted ourselves to the fifty-nine longest and best preserved texts, with the least emphasis on those most recently published (4Q529-549). In some instances, we have not used a full text (e.g., 6Q8) because either (1) the reading of the parts could not be done with a similar amount of confidence to the readings of the other texts or (2) the available photographs were of insufficient quality to afford a preliminary reading.

\[^2\text{For the reasons concerning our de-emphasizing of DJD 31, please see our review of the same in RBL. Albert L. Lukaszewski, "Review of É. Puech Qumrân Grotte 4: XXII. Textes Araméens, Première Partie" RBL (2002).}\]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEXT NO.</th>
<th>SIGLA</th>
<th>PUBLICATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1Q21</td>
<td>1QTLevi</td>
<td>Barthélemy and Milik, DJD 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1Q23</td>
<td>1QEnGiants(^a)</td>
<td>Barthélemy and Milik, DJD 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1Q24</td>
<td>1QEnGiants(^b)</td>
<td>Barthélemy and Milik, DJD 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1Q32</td>
<td>1QNJ?</td>
<td>Barthélemy and Milik, DJD 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Q26</td>
<td>2QEnGiant(^c)</td>
<td>Baillet et al., DJD 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Q157</td>
<td>4QTgJob</td>
<td>de Vaux and Milik, DJD 6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Q197</td>
<td>4QTob(^b)</td>
<td>Broshi et al., DJD 19; Fitzmyer, <em>Christian Origins</em>, 159–236.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Q198</td>
<td>4QTob(^c)</td>
<td>Broshi et al., DJD 19; Fitzmyer, <em>Christian Origins</em>, 159–236.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Q199</td>
<td>4QTob(^d)</td>
<td>Broshi et al., DJD 19; Fitzmyer, <em>Christian Origins</em>, 159–236.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEXT NO.</td>
<td>SIGLA</td>
<td>PUBLICATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Q204</td>
<td>4QEnf</td>
<td>Milik, <em>Books of Enoch.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Q205</td>
<td>4QEnfd</td>
<td>Milik, <em>Books of Enoch.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Q206</td>
<td>4QEne</td>
<td>Milik, <em>Books of Enoch.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Q207</td>
<td>4QEnf</td>
<td>Milik, <em>Books of Enoch.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Q208</td>
<td>4QEnastra</td>
<td>Milik, <em>Books of Enoch.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Q211</td>
<td>4QEnastrd</td>
<td>Milik, <em>Books of Enoch.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Q212</td>
<td>4QEneg</td>
<td>Milik, <em>Books of Enoch.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Q213a</td>
<td>4QLevinb</td>
<td>Brooke and others, DJD 22.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Q213b</td>
<td>4QLevinc</td>
<td>Brooke and others, DJD 22.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Q214</td>
<td>4QLevinr</td>
<td>Brooke and others, DJD 22.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Q214a</td>
<td>4QLevinr</td>
<td>Brooke and others, DJD 22.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Q214b</td>
<td>4QLevifi</td>
<td>Brooke and others, DJD 22.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Q214c</td>
<td>4QLevifi</td>
<td>Brooke and others, DJD 22.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Q214d</td>
<td>4QPrNab</td>
<td>Brooke and others, DJD 22.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Q215</td>
<td>4QpsDans</td>
<td>Brooke and others, DJD 22.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Q216</td>
<td>4QpsDans</td>
<td>Brooke and others, DJD 22.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Q217</td>
<td>4QapocrDan</td>
<td>Brooke and others, DJD 22.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEXT NO.</td>
<td>SIGLA</td>
<td>PUBLICATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Q530</td>
<td>4QEnGiants</td>
<td>Puech, DJD 31.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Q531</td>
<td>4QEnGiants</td>
<td>Puech, DJD 31.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Q532</td>
<td>4QEnGiants</td>
<td>Puech, DJD 31.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Q533</td>
<td>4QEnGiants</td>
<td>Puech, DJD 31.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Q534</td>
<td>4QBirth of Noah</td>
<td>Puech, DJD 31.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Q535</td>
<td>4QBirth of Noah</td>
<td>Puech, DJD 31.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Q536</td>
<td>4QBirth of Noah</td>
<td>Puech, DJD 31.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Q537</td>
<td>4QTJacob?</td>
<td>Puech, DJD 31.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Q538</td>
<td>4QTJud</td>
<td>Puech, DJD 31.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Q539</td>
<td>4QTJoseph</td>
<td>Puech, DJD 31.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Q541</td>
<td>4QapocrLevi</td>
<td>Puech, DJD 31.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Q542</td>
<td>4QTQahat</td>
<td>Puech, DJD 31.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Q543</td>
<td>4QVisions of Amram</td>
<td>Puech, DJD 31.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Q544</td>
<td>4QVisions of Amram</td>
<td>Puech, DJD 31.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Q545</td>
<td>4QVisions of Amram</td>
<td>Puech, DJD 31.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Q546</td>
<td>4QVisions of Amram</td>
<td>Puech, DJD 31.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Q547</td>
<td>4QVisions of Amram</td>
<td>Puech, DJD 31.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Q548</td>
<td>4QVisions of Amram</td>
<td>Puech, DJD 31.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Q549</td>
<td>4QVisions of Amram</td>
<td>Puech, DJD 31.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6Q8</td>
<td>6Q8papGiants</td>
<td>Baillet et al., DJD 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11Q18</td>
<td>11QNJ</td>
<td>García Martínez, Tigchelaar and van der Woude, <em>Qumran Cave 11: II.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part I

Toward a Viable Method
Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1 The Problem

The Semitic origins of and influences on the early Christian writings have been noted since early church tradition. The authors or redactors of several Gospel pericopae offer a phrase in the original language, usually Aramaic, and follow it with a Greek translation.¹ In Eusebius’ *Demonstratio evangelica*, the apostles are portrayed as speaking Aramaic alone.² They appear to have spoken Hebrew in his quotation of Papias contained in *Historia ecclesiastica*.³ Hence, while there is consent among the church fathers that not all of the earliest Christian traditions were in Greek,⁴ there is some dispute over whether they were in Aramaic or

¹Cf. the use of μισθοτητος in Matt 1.23, Mk 5.41, 15.22, 15.34, Jn 1.38, and 1.41. In Acts, translation is also employed in 4.36.
²*Dem. Ev.* III.4.44; 7.10. In both instances, Eusebius emphasizes the inability of the apostles to communicate to the Romans. The veracity of this perception is, of course, debatable.
³*Hist. eccl.* III.39.16.
⁴Cf. Stanley Porter, “Did Jesus Ever Teach In Greek?” *TynBul* 44/2 (1993), 199-235. Given the present textual sources and methods, the question of when Christian tradition was first preserved in Greek may never be answered without a considerable amount of historical speculation.
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Hebrew or both.\(^5\)

This confusion has been resolved only marginally in the intervening centuries. The early Christian authors were not ignorant of the many languages used in first-century Judaea.\(^6\) However, while Greek and Latin are distinguished in the writings, Hebrew and Aramaic are not.\(^7\)

This lack of distinction compounds the difficulty of evaluating the sources used by the Gospel authors or redactors. In arguing for a non-Greek source of a New Testament passage, one can no longer proceed on the assumption that simplicity of style or Semitic “flavor” denotes an Aramaic substratum of tradition.\(^8\)

As a consequence of the newly rediscovered awareness of the various languages used in first-century Judaea, the New Testament Aramaic problem of how best to discern an Aramaic source from its Greek trappings is of continuing importance for the linguistic study of Christian Origins.

Any approach to the problem must take account of the linguistic environs in which the earliest Christian communities existed. By definition, this concerns the

---

\(^5\)This aspect of first-century Judaean language dynamics is obfuscated further by the seemingly confused usage of \textit{'Epho\'\textordmasculine}. In his revision of Bauer’s lexicon, Frederick Danker renders this word to mean ‘in Hebrew/Aramaic.” Walter Bauer et al., \textit{A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature} 3rd ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000), 270 ‘Epho\'\textordmasculine, Epho\'\textordmasculine.

\(^6\)In the course of this discussion, the term ‘Judaea’ will be used to refer to the area of Coele Syria encompassing Alexandria and Jericho in the northeast, Joppa in the northwest, and extending to the mountain ridge south of Bethlehem.

\(^7\)For the purpose of this discussion, we reject the use of the term “Palestine” for the land “from Dan to Beersheba” during the time preceding the Bar Kokhba Revolt as anachronistic and overly general. Where it is necessary to refer to this land during Graeco-Roman times, we shall employ the term “Eretz Israel.” Otherwise, the general region will be called Coele Syria, following the custom of Josephus and other first-century authors. When referring to texts and locations after the Bar Kokhba Revolt (c. 132) CE, we will then use the term “Palestine.” Cf. Benjamin Mazar, “The Aramaean Empire and its Relations with Israel” \textit{Biblical Archaeologist} 25 (1962), 98-120, and Robert H. Smith, “Arabia” in \textit{The Anchor Bible Dictionary on CD-ROM} (Logos Library System Version 2.0c, 1995, 1996).

\(^8\)Cf. Jn 19.20: ‘Epho\'\textordmasculine, Pw\'\textit{alh-lo\'\textordmasculine, E\'\textordmasculine-tolh}.
polyglot landscape of first-century Judaea. Early allusions to the languages of the early Christians only touched upon Latin, Greek, Hebrew and Aramaic. In more modern times, however, scholarship has detailed the use of five major linguistic forces in first-century Judaea: Latin, Greek, Hebrew, the pre-Arabic dialects, and Aramaic. The use of these is summarized below.

1.2 Language Usage and Attestation

1.2.1 Latin

The Latin textual data from first-century Judaea is relatively sparse. The language came to Judaea with the Roman conquest (c. 63 BCE). Fitzmyer has suggested that the scarcity of Latin texts at this time in Judaean history is due to Roman officials communicating with the local populus in Greek, not Latin. Price surveys the situation as follows:

---


During the period of the Roman Empire, the bulk of the Jews in the world lived in the eastern half of the empire or beyond, in Babylonia, and spoke a Semitic language and/or Greek. In this, they were no different from most of the other inhabitants of the East. Those who lived within the administrative confines of the Roman Empire had few regular or sustained contacts with the Latin language.

Within Judaea, only two sites near the Dead Sea have held Latin texts: Masada and Murabba'at. There is also inscriptive evidence of Latin in the form of milestones. However, in the greater region of Coele Syria, the evidence for Latin as an official language is buttressed by an inscription on the Tiberium in Caesarea Maritima. In the orchestra of the theatre, a dedicatory inscription was found in the name of Pontius Pilate, Prefect of Judaea. In sum, Latin, where it was used, served primarily for official purposes but not for the economic or cultural concerns of the indigenous population.

12Cf. Hannah Cotton, "Latin" in The Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls ed. Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 474-475. The Masada texts include inscriptions on jars (Mas793-852), papyri (Mas721a-7245, 749b), and various ostraca. Cotton has noted that only two Latin texts from Masada are likely to be of Jewish origin: Mas936 (a bread stamp bearing the name "Josep") and Mas748 (a bilingual papyrus bearing Jewish names). The texts from Murabba'at are Mur158-163. These are largely unclassified fragments. Mur159 is classified as a cursive text. However, little is known about these texts save an estimated date of the first and second century CE (Cotton, "Latin", 475). As the Murabba'at site attests to the Bar Kokhba Revolt of 132 CE, the value of these texts for our discussion is minimal.


15Cf. Greenfeld, "Languages of Palestine", 152-153. Greenfeld notes: "Of the many Greek and Latin loanwords in Mishnaic Hebrew and Aramaic, less than five percent are Latin and many of these are Greek in form. The Latin words are primarily from the military and administrative spheres" (153).
1.2.2 Greek

Greek came to be used extensively in post-exilic Judaea with the conquest of Alexander the Great (c. 332 BCE). Prior to that time, there is no reason to doubt that Greek culture did have significant influence on Eretz Israel and Coele Syria as a whole. With the Greek Empire, the Koine came into use from Greece to the Indus Mountains to the environs of Alexandria. With this conquest, Koine Greek became the administrative language throughout the region.

Millard has noted that Latin was known more widely among the Judaean population [Alan Millard, “Latin in First-Century Palestine” in Solving Riddles and Untying Knots: Biblical, Epigraphic, and Semitic Studies in Honor of Jonas C. Greenfield ed. Z. Zevit, S. Gitin and Michael Sokoloff (Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 1995)]. The evidence for this is primarily potsherds from Masada, labels for wine. From the inscriptions he reasons: “The wine merchants or shippers in Italy naturally wrote in their own language. When the wine reached King Herod’s cellars, his butler, at least, would need to know enough Latin to select the vintage his master demanded or liked” (Millard, “Latin”, 453).

In contrast to this assertion, Price offers a more nuanced perspective (Price, “Jews and the Latin Language”, 166):

The Roman colonies in the Near East — e.g., Jerusalem, Caesarea, Berytus and its sister-colony Heliopolis — were islands of Roman culture which, like the Latin authors of Eretz-Israel, had little lasting cultural or linguistic influence in the areas just outside their borders. The spread of Latin from these centers was wide but superficial: mostly individual words, especially military terms, city names and personal names.

Hence, while the butler may have known enough Latin to select a vintage, such a knowledge of Latin is not sufficient to warrant significant weight in the equation of the language dynamics of first-century Judaea.


On the existence of Koine Greek prior to the Alexandrian conquest, see Mussies, “Languages”, esp. part C “Koine Greek.”

Fitzmyer suggests that Greek became “the” lingua franca throughout the Near East (Fitzmyer, Wandering Aramean, 32). It would seem that this designation could use some nuancing as it suggests that Greek had supplanted Aramaic, a view that is not consonant with Fitzmyer’s other works. This is also not supported by the significant amount of Aramaic composition that occurred at this time. Further, if Greek had fully supplanted Aramaic in the Near East, it is doubtful that the Targumic literature and the Talmudic corpora would have developed as they did, in Aramaic. The influence of Greek was clearly felt; this is evident in the loanwords found in Aramaic as early as Daniel 3.5-6. (cf. also Greenfield, “Languages of Palestine”, 153).

However, Fitzmyer notes later that, while Greek influence was extensive, the Greek language never took a hold on the entirety of the population of Judaea or Eretz Israel. With regard to the
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This being said, however, Greek literary documents from Judaea during the first century CE are scarce.\textsuperscript{19} Inscriptions from the environs of Jerusalem attest to non-official uses of Greek. Fitzmyer has summed up this evidence as follows:

There is the Greek inscription forbidding non-Jews to enter the inner courts of the Jerusalem temple, the Jerusalem synagogue inscription which commemorates its building by Theodotos Vettenos, a priest and leader of the synagogue, the hymn inscribed in the necropolis of Marisa, the edict of Augustus... found at Nazareth concerning the violation of tombs, the Capernaum dedicatory inscription, and the numberless ossuary inscriptions from the vicinity of Jerusalem.\textsuperscript{20}

It is unlikely that these instances of Greek were written for the indigenous population alone, but rather for foreigners as well (if not primarily). Instances of Jewish texts being written in or translated into Greek were for the benefit of non-Judaeans.\textsuperscript{21} Jerusalemites seem therefore to have had a comparatively high knowledge of Greek, even if they did not employ it amongst themselves.\textsuperscript{22}

\textsuperscript{19}We here omit the several Greek texts found at Murabba'at as they are from the Bar Kokhba Revolt and are not necessarily reflective of Greek usage in the first century.

\textsuperscript{20}Fitzmyer, Wandering Aramean, 35. In the light of the other Greek evidence and the nature of the Aramaic and Hebrew texts from this period, the role of Greek language ossuaries in the environs of Jerusalem suggests a large Hellenistic population and not necessarily a widespread affinity for the use of Greek.

\textsuperscript{21}Cf. Mussies, “Languages”. Mussies observes several elements which seem to indicate a high degree of Greek learning in Jerusalem: the Greek names for the musical instruments in Daniel 3, the postscript at the end of LXX Esther which describes the conditions under which the translation occurred, and the sending of the Second Book of the Maccabees to the “Jewish brethren in Egypt.”

\textsuperscript{22}Cf. Jan N. Sevenster, Do You Know Greek? How Much Greek Could the First Jewish Chris-
field has summarized this mixed usage of Greek as follows: "[T]here were surely those, even in the rural areas, who could speak Greek freely, just as there were many natives who lived in urban areas who could speak only Aramaic or Hebrew, or perhaps, in the South, an Arabic dialect." 23

1.2.3 Hebrew

Hebrew is indisputably the oldest language used in the region of Judaea. 24 While the use of Hebrew receded as a result of the Assyrian exile/dispersion of 722 BCE and the Babylonian exiles of 598 and 587 BCE, the language remained in colloquial use throughout the Second Temple Period and eventually developed into Mishnaic Hebrew. 25 The extent of this use in conjunction with the usage of Greek and of Aramaic, however, has been debated.

23 Greenfield, "Languages of Palestine", 145. Greenfield later states: "There can be no doubt that there were Greek-speaking Jews in Jerusalem during the Second Temple period, but... these were Jews who had returned from the Diaspora and settled there" (150).

24 Of the languages used in first century Judaea, Aramaic is the oldest but is not attested in Judaea earlier than Hebrew.


See also Klaus Beyer, *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984), 55-58. Beyer finds the evidence for Greek and Aramaic usage in Judaea to suggest a lapse in spoken Hebrew. This overstates the evidence. As cited above, the textual evidence argues for an uninterrupted development of Hebrew from Late Biblical Hebrew to Mishnaic Hebrew. The fact that Babatha's archive does not have Hebrew texts does not lead logically to the conclusion that Hebrew ceased to be spoken. Rather, the fact that several kinds of Aramaic have been found there suggests a highly complex linguistic situation containing, among other languages, several types of Aramaic.

On the role of Hebrew during the Second Temple Period, see also Rabin, "Hebrew and Aramaic". 
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As a literary language, Hebrew is thought to be the original language for several canonical texts composed during the Second Temple Period. Among the texts in the Hebrew Bible proper, Qohelet and Song of Songs are seen to have been written in Hebrew against a Hellenistic backdrop. Esther and Daniel, both narratives set during the Babylonian exile, are generally held to have been written during the Hellenistic Period. Also, among the Qumran scrolls, a Hebrew version of Ben Sira has been found and dated to the first half of the second century before the common era (c. 195-180 BCE).

While the vast majority of the Qumran scrolls were written in Hebrew, any generalization of this tendency is counterbalanced by the sectarian, solitary conditions under which the community seems to have lived. Further, it is worth noting that the epigraphic evidence from this time excludes Hebrew almost completely. This aspect of the situation argues for a restricted use of the language.

\footnote{For further discussion on the precise dating of these canonical works, see Philip C. Schmitz, “Hebrew” in The Anchor Bible Dictionary on CD-ROM (Logos Library System Version 2.0c, 1995, 1996).}


\footnote{While none of the scrolls found at Qumran can be proven definitively to have been written in the area in which they were found, the script and language of the texts suggest a place of composition or copying not far removed from Judaea.}

\footnote{The reasons for this are speculative at best. The absence of Hebrew inscriptions does not necessarily indicate a lack of Hebrew usage but may indicate the destruction of the evidence at a later time. It is worth noting that Hebrew was once thought restricted to literary usage, before the discovery of the Qumran scrolls. Cf. Beyer, ATTM, 55-58.}
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To be sure, Hebrew never ceased to be used as שפה-high, "the holy tongue," and as a colloquial language among certain communities; however, these communities seemed to be comparatively few and were mostly in the area of Roman Judaea.  

1.2.4 Pre-Arabic Dialects

It is worth noting that other languages were used in Coele Syria besides the "standard" four, the aforementioned Latin, Greek, Hebrew and Aramaic. Throughout ancient times, Judaea and its surrounding regions were the crossroads of trade from Egypt and Arabia to Mesopotamia and beyond. The necessity of this trade route was largely determined by the Arabian desert. As a consequence, the populations of those areas influenced and infiltrated the language environment of the region. Egypt at this time had a similar linguistic history to that of Coele Syria, being conquered by the Greeks and later administered by the Romans. While the Nabataeans came under Greek, and later Roman, rule, this was only a part of the Arabian region. Arabia, however, did not become a province of Greek or Roman rule, opting rather to pay tribute. The Arabian regions consequently preserved their languages and were in a position to influence the language dynamics of Judaea as members of their community migrated there. Rabin has noted three major concentrations of Arab speakers in the region during the first century CE:

31 Nehemiah 4.7 records the use of three regional languages that seem to be distinct from Hebrew and Aramaic: Arabic, Ammonite, and Ashdodite. It is highly unlikely that local languages or dialects would have died out completely. More likely is a blending of the local language with the tongue of the conqueror. Cf. also Nehemiah 13.24 and Rabin, "Hebrew and Aramaic", 1010-1011.
32 With regard to the Middle Aramaic dialects in the first century, these trade routes involved Judaean, Nabataean and Palmyrene areas. See §1.2.5.1 on page 14.
33 For a more detailed discussion of the four Arabian geographical names and their history, see Smith, "Arabia".
34 Josephus, B.J. 1.159. On the defeat of Herodian troops at Ormiza see B.J. 1.368.
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In the northern mountain areas (Ituraea) and in southern Transjordan and in the Negev, there were populations of Arab stock, shown to be so by historians' statements and by their personal names. The Nabataeans, in the South, put up numerous inscriptions in Aramaic, in a special Nabataean ductus and with certain grammatical peculiarities, containing also a small number of Arabic words. Inscriptions in Thamudic, a language belonging to the so-called proto-Arabian subgroup and written in a script originating in the Arabian Peninsula, have been found in Transjordan, and while most of these are probably later, some may go back to our period. The same applies to the numerous Arabic names found in Greek and Latin inscriptions in south-east Syria and Transjordan. 35

Among the earliest Christian authors, there are three references to Arabians and Arabia. 36 In Acts 2:11, Arabians are among the foreigners who partake in the outpouring of the Holy Spirit. 37 Shortly after Paul's conversion, the apostle departed into Arabia for fourteen years (Gal 1:17). 38 Further Paul's escape from King Aretas occurred when the city was under the control of King Aretas IV, king of the Nabataeans from 9 BCE to 40 CE. 39 Hence, the influence of early Arabic

35 Rabin, "Hebrew and Aramaic", 1009-1010.
36 We here omit the Aramaic documents from Babatha's archive due to the fact that the relationship of the Nabataeans to the Arabic culture does not justify calling them "Arabs" in the modern sense of the term. Arabic loanwords do not suggest Nabataean as more than an Aramaic speaking group on the border of Arabia.
37 While there are several language groups represented in Jerusalem at this time, one can be reasonably certain of a significant minority who were Arab-speaking due to the Arabic loanwords in Nabataean texts and the proximity of the Arab communities in Trans-Jordan.
38 Contra Hengel and Schwemer, Paul's use of "Arabia" is geographic and not linguistic. See n.36 (page 11). See also Martin Hengel and Anna Maria Schwemer, Paul Between Damascus and Antioch (London: SCM Press, Ltd., 1997), 110 n.571 and 116 n.607.
dialects in the environs of Judaea must not be overlooked.\textsuperscript{40}

\subsection*{1.2.5 Aramaic}

The Aramaic language is known for approximately 3,000 years and includes writings whose dates of composition range from the tenth century BCE to the present. Fitzmyer has divided the course of its development into five phases: Old Aramaic, Official Aramaic, Middle Aramaic, Late Aramaic, and Neo-Aramaic.\textsuperscript{41} In addition:

\textsuperscript{40} Rabin concludes: "[E]arly Arabic dialects, probably rather different from the later classical Arabic, were spoken in marginal areas of Palestine, and probably known to some Jews" (Rabin, "Hebrew and Aramaic", 1010).

\textsuperscript{41} Fitzmyer, \textit{Wandering Aramean}, 57–84. The following discussion on the phases of Aramaic follows Professor Fitzmyer’s description over that of Klaus Beyer. Beyer, \textit{ATTM}, 23–71. While Beyer’s scheme is simpler on one level — using the main categories of Old Aramaic, Middle Aramaic, and Modern Aramaic, it tends toward atomism. Given the obvious tendency toward over-specialization illustrated below, we find Beyer’s map too unwieldy for the purpose of the present work.

Within Old Aramaic, Beyer maintains four subcategories: Ancient Aramaic, Imperial Aramaic, Old Eastern Aramaic, and Old Western Aramaic. For Beyer, Ancient Aramaic is all Aramaic prior to Imperial Aramaic (i.e., prior to 700 BCE) (Beyer, \textit{ATTM}, 25). Imperial Aramaic is all Aramaic from the Achaemenid period and the Aramaic of the following dialects (per Beyer’s division): Biblical Aramaic, Hasmonean, Babylonian Targumic, Galilean Targumic, Babylonian Documentary Aramaic, Nabataean, Palmyrene, and “Arsakidische” (the official language of the Parthians). Examples of Old Eastern Aramaic which Beyer cites are the Uruk text (an Aramaic cuneiform incantation text which is dated to Hellenistic times but whose style may betray an earlier dating. See Stephen A. Kaufman, “Aramaic” in \textit{The Anchor Bible Dictionary on CD-ROM} (Logos Library System Version 2.0c, 1995, 1996), Vol.4, 174), certain Palmyrene texts, Old Syriac, west Mesopotamian, and the Old Babylonian Aramaic used among the Jews. Old Western Aramaic contains the form of Old Palestinian Aramaic spoken amongst the Jews (a form characterized by the oldest manuscripts of Enoch), Old Heathen Palestinian Aramaic (“Das Heidnisch-altpalästinsiche”), Christian Palestinian Aramaic, and the several dialects spoken at the time of Jesus. In regard to this last item, Beyer further clarifies the language into seven subdialects: Jewish, Southwest Jewish, Samaritan, Galilean, West Jordanian, Damascant, and Orontic – a dialect presumably named after the Orontes river (near present day al-Mina).

Within his understanding of Middle Aramaic, Beyer draws a major distinction between Middle Eastern and Middle Western Aramaic. The former is seen to include Middle Syriac, Jewish Middle Babylonian, and Mandaic. The latter includes Jewish Middle Palestinian (itself comprised of Galilean, Middle Jewish, and Middle East Jordanian texts), Samaritan, Christian Palestinian, and the Aramaic of the synagogue at Dura-Europos.

Beyer’s Modern Aramaic category is similarly compartmentalized. His first division of this stage, Modern Eastern Aramaic, contains New West Syriac, New East Syriac, and New Mandaic. The second division is Modern Western Aramaic, the provenance for which dialect he describes
tion to addressing Aramaic usage during New Testament times, this brief introduction discusses the chronological setting of Qumran Aramaic amidst the major stages of the language and its synchronic relationship to the other dialects of Middle Aramaic (c. 200 BCE to 200 CE). We begin with a sketch of the various divisions and conclude with an assessment of the role Aramaic played in first-century Judaea.

1.2.5.1 A General Overview of Aramaic Usage

Old Aramaic (OA): 1000-700 BCE The palaeographic data for this period ranges from 925 BCE to 700 BCE. The texts included in this range come from Northern Syria, Upper Mesopotamia, Northern Israel, and Iran. Some of the better known texts from this period are the Tell Dan inscription, the Zakir inscription, and the Sefire treaty.

Official Aramaic (OfA): 700-200 BCE This period is alternatively named Standard Aramaic, Imperial Aramaic, or Reichsaramäisch. During this time, the language became more standardized and widely used. Included in this

---
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... phase are the Aramaic texts found on papyri, skins and ostraca from Elephantine, Aswan, and other sites from Upper Egypt to the Indus Valley. The best known literary examples from this period are the Aramaic portions of Ezra and Daniel and the proverbs of Ahiqar.

Around the turn of the fifth century BCE, it was made the official language of the western half of the Persian Empire by Darius I.44 On the duration of this period, Fitzmyer notes that the epigraphic evidence for OfA extends to the eighth century BCE.45

Middle Aramaic (MA): 200 BCE-200 CE Fitzmyer has noted that it is in this phase that local dialects take on greater significance. Whereas Official Aramaic saw minor variations from area to area, Middle Aramaic sees the stronger of these regional differences become dialects. The five major dialects of this period fall into categories of East and West. In the land of Israel and Arabia, Nabatean and Judaean Aramaic were used. The latter is best attested in Judaean Literary Aramaic.46 In the East, the lands of Syria and Mesopotamia, the major dialects were based in Palmyra, Edessa and Hatra.47


46On Nabatean, the standard grammatical treatment remains that of Jean Cantineau; Jean Cantineau, Le Nabataen. 1. Notions générales — Écriture, grammaire (Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1930). No systematic treatment of either the Bar Kochba texts has been discovered by our research. While grammars of Qumran Aramaic are rumored to be in process, none are currently published. The grammar of Part II represents a systematic treatment of this corpus.

47No systematic treatment of Hatran exists. For Palmyrene grammar, see Jean Cantineau, Grammaire du Palmyrénien Épigraphique (Le Caire: Imprimerie de l’Institut Francais d’Archéologie Orientale, 1935). Edessene is often considered to be early Syriac and is so described in Theodore Nöldeke, Compendious Syriac Grammar trans. by James A. Crichton 2nd ed. (London: Williams...
Within Judaean Aramaic, two general divisions may be made: (1) the Qumran scrolls and (2) the Aramaic of the Bar Kochba letters (Murabba'at, Seiyal, etc.) and the epigraphic materials (ossuaries, etc.).

There is a further division in this dialect that should be made for our purposes, as the latter two are significantly more similar to each other than they are to the first in terms of literary qualities. Several factors suggest that they are not to be treated as identical:

1. The *terminus* for communal use of Khirbet Qumran is 68 CE, over 60 years earlier than the Bar Kochba material. This necessarily increases the likelihood of dialectal change.

2. The Aramaic preserved in the Qumran scrolls is of a literary, non-epistolary quality and, therefore, may not naturally represent the speech patterns of the community. Indeed, there is virtually no indication that any of the Aramaic texts discovered at Qumran was written by the community who used that site. Rather, they preserved earlier works.

In contrast, the Bar Kochba material was written out of necessity and in moments of crisis. This further suggests possible disparity between the linguistic development of the two sites.

---


49 These corpora (i.e., the Bar Kochba letters and the epigraphic materials) are similar enough to be treated lexically together in Michael Sokoloff, *A Dictionary of Judean Aramaic* (Bar-Ilan, Israel: Bar-Ilan University Press, 2003). While their vocabulary may be similar, the grammar reflected in each corpus should be treated distinctly, with regard for their disparity of genre and dating.

3. The ossuaries are obviously not literary in nature and are closer to the Bar Kokhba letters than to QA.\textsuperscript{51}

As a consequence of these differences, it becomes problematic to apply the grammar or lexical register of the Bar Kokhba letters in the same manner and with the same weight as one applies the data from Qumran. While they are both in Aramaic, they differ in terms of chronological, geographical, and literary character.

**Late Aramaic (LA): 200-700 CE** The Western dialects of this period are represented by Jewish Palestinian Aramaic,\textsuperscript{52} Samaritan Aramaic,\textsuperscript{53} and Christian Palestinian Aramaic.\textsuperscript{54} The Eastern dialects are Syriac,\textsuperscript{55} Jewish Babylonian Aramaic,\textsuperscript{56} and Mandaic.\textsuperscript{57}


\textsuperscript{52}The most comprehensive grammar of JPA remains that of Dalman. See Gustaf Dalman, *Grammatik des jüdisch-palästinischen Aramäisch* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1905). However, various parts of the corpus have been reconsidered in more recent years: Steven Fassberg, “The Compound Preposition in Qumran Aramaic” *RQ* 16 (1995), and Hugo Odeberg, *The Aramaic Portions of Bereshit Rabba with a Grammar of Galilean Aramaic* (Lund: C.W.K. Gleerup, 1939).

\textsuperscript{53}For a grammatical treatment of Samaritan Aramaic, see Rudolf Macuch, *Grammatik des samaritanischen Aramäisch* (Berlin: New York: W. de Gruyter, 1982).


\textsuperscript{55}The standard reference work on this dialect remains that of Nöldeke: Nöldeke, *Compendious Syriac Grammar*.


\textsuperscript{57}The major reference grammar of Mandaic remains Theodore Nöldeke, *Mandäische Grammatik*. However, one may also consult Macuch, *Grammatik des samaritanischen Aramäisch*. 
Neo-Aramaic (NA): 700 CE-Present  These forms of Aramaic are still spoken among the peoples of northern Syria, Iran, and Iraq. They are heavily influenced by Arabic, Kurdish, and Turkish. 58

1.2.5.2 Usage in First-Century Judaea

The corpus of Qumran Aramaic ranges in dating from c. 200 BCE (4QEn[a]) to the demise of the group during the Great Revolt, c. 68 CE. 59 Despite this broad range of dates, it is likely that the community of Qumran could read all of the texts attested in this corpus. No reason is readily apparent to argue for their keeping texts which they could not read and, therefore, could not use. They are likely, therefore, to have read and used texts from the later centuries of Official Aramaic. However, as VanderKam has demonstrated, they are not likely to have written the more apocalyptic works. 60

In the centuries preceding the exile, Aramaic was undoubtedly introduced to Judaea by traders and others who passed through the land. However, during the Babylonian and Medo-Persian administration of the region, Aramaic developed lasting roots in Judaea. These roots are evident in the inscriptional evidence of ossuaries in Aramaic which date to the Roman period, the Aramaic letters of Murabba‘at and related sites, and the Aramaic texts of the Qumran corpus. 61

58The most recent grammatical treatment of this newly developed form of Aramaic is Geoffrey Khan, A Grammar of Neo-Aramaic (Leiden: Brill, 1999); however, a plethora of other, non-systematic discussions of the Aramaic forms spoken in Syria, Turkey, Iraq, and Azerbaijan have also been published by Harassowitz of Wiesbaden as part of the serial Semitica viva.
59VanderKam, “Apocalyptic Tradition”, 120. It must be noted, however, that these dates pertain to the time frame in which the extant copies were made. One cannot be certain how far the extant copies are removed from the original and the accompanying original linguistic environment. However, this distance does not appear to have mitigated against their being used by the community reflected in the scrolls.
60VanderKam, “Apocalyptic Tradition”, 113-134.
61For comprehensive surveys of ossuaries in Eretz Israel during the Second Temple period,
It is noteworthy that each of these preserved corpora reflect the practice of the *hoi polloi*. When contrasted with the extant Greek and Latin texts, this tendency reveals a pattern of usage that is fundamental to understanding the linguistic environment of first-century Judaea. While Greek was employed for administrative affairs and civil transactions that involved the secular rulers (e.g., deeds of sale), it was seldom used for intra-Judaean communication. For this purpose, Aramaic was largely, though not exclusively, employed.

1.2.5.3 The Aramaic at Qumran as Representing One Dialect

Ever since the Qumran documents were discovered in 1948, the question of where on the landscape of Aramaic dialectology to place the Aramaic texts has loomed in the background of Qumranological efforts. For the first decade after discovery, the Zeitgeist held that Qumran Aramaic was merely an extension of Official Aramaic. In his 1958 treatment of the Genesis Apocryphon, E.Y. Kutscher asserted that the stage of Aramaic reflected in that text represents a transitional stage between Imperial and Late Aramaic. This view has formed the basis of all subsequent discussion.

see Fitzmyer and Harrington, *MPAT* and L. Y. Rahmani, *A Catalogue of Jewish Ossuaries in the Collections of the State of Israel* (Jerusalem: The Israel Antiquities Authority; The Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1994). As noted above (note 25), Greenfield sees the Hebrew letters of Murabba'at as suggesting the colloquial use of Hebrew in the second century CE. Similarly, one may derive the same conclusions from the Aramaic letters.

62 In discussing the Babatha archive, Katzoff states the following: "Most of the documents were written in Greek, even when the principals were illiterate in that language but literate in Hebrew or Aramaic. Clearly these documents were intended for presentation, if need be, to Roman rather than to rabbinic courts..." Ranon Katzoff, "Babatha" in *The Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls* ed. Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 74. Cf. also Kutscher, *Isaiah Scroll*, 29–30.

63 One exception to this is the NT Epistle of James, if one accepts an early dating for it. See our paper "On the Nature of δ νύμος τέλειος τόν τῆς ἐλευθερίας in James 1.25", presented at the SBL Pacific Regional Meeting in April of 1998.
Using Fitzmyer's model of Aramaic language development, modern scholarship has come to place Qumran Aramaic among the Middle Aramaic dialects, more specifically among the Judaean forms of the language. Beyond this point, however, there is not a major consensus regarding whether this corpus reflects one dialect or multiple dialects.

1.2.5.3.1 What is a dialect? In considering the dialectal category of Qumran Aramaic, certain preliminary issues must be considered and kept in mind. Some of these concern the semantics of definitions while others involve delineating the linguistic landscape of the time.

In modern usage, the term "dialect" is commonly used to refer to any form of provincial language. In the United States, the form of English varies widely from Alabama to Boston to Seattle to Los Angeles. In the United Kingdom, the English of Edinburgh varies markedly from that of Aberdeen, Yorkshire, Manchester, or Devon. With these variations comes different understandings of what is meant by the term "the English language". Within this common language, one finds a breakdown by larger region or country (the United States, United Kingdom, and Australia) and subsequently by smaller region (southeast, northeast, northwest, southwest) and so on. Whilst we can recognise these distinctions in our own language, the question still remains as to what should be considered a dialect. Is a language simply "a dialect with an army?"

For the purpose of this discussion, we will rely on the following definition: A dialect is the largest subset of a language which is geographically defined and is grammatically distinct from other forms of the language to such a degree that one can discern between it and the communication of other regions with consistency
1.2.5.3.2 **Major text-critical questions which must be addressed**  When discussing the linguistic identity of Qumran Aramaic, there are at least three major text-critical questions which must be addressed for each text. These involve first the area and second the dating of the text's composition. By determining or, in the least, hypothesising about these two issues, one finds a basis for an historical placement of the text.

The third question is that of readership or provenance. After forming an historical setting for the text, corpus or corpora, one should form an opinion on how widely the text was read and where. This is certainly the most difficult of the three to answer with respect to the Qumran Aramaic texts. However, where a text is non-sectarian, one may posit a wider audience than that of a sectarian writing. Given their non-sectarian content, the readership of most of the Qumran Aramaic material is likely to have been wider than the sectarian, Hebrew manuscripts.

As VanderKam has demonstrated with respect to the apocalyptic literature from Qumran, none of it may be said to have been written there. If the text was written at another site, a copy was necessarily brought to Qumran. We can hypothesise with confidence that the copy we now have is not the only one to ever exist but is one of many. Given sufficient placement outside of Qumran, one can begin to generalise from linguistic trends toward dialectal nomenclature.

1.2.5.3.3 **What are the commonly recognized dialects at the time of QA?**

While there appears to be interplay between the five major Aramaic dialects of the Middle periods — particularly between the Aramaic of Judaea and both Nabataean
and Palmyrene — there does not appear to be any reason for significant confusion among them.\footnote{One will note that, for example, the documents from Murabba‘at, bear witness to distinctions between Judaean Aramaic and Nabataean Aramaic even though the two were used in close proximity to one another.} In this way they are regionally defined language standards.

Ed Cook has argued that these five dialects held the greatest influence in their respective centers of learning but lost influence as they approached other dialects.\footnote{Edward M. Cook, “Qumran Aramaic and Aramaic Dialectology” in Abr Nahrain Suppl. ed. T. Muraoka. Vol. 3 (Louvain: Peeters Press, 1992), 1–21.} While his evidence may be seen to suggest his conclusions, one must be careful not to see it as more comprehensive than it is.

While Cook observes eleven differences between the morphology of the five dialects, the exact number of differences between QA and the others varies. In total, one is left with a handful of differences between Qumran Aramaic and any of the other dialects.\footnote{The relative pronoun in QA (י/–) has the same morphology as that of Palmyrene and Hatran; but Edessene uses only -י, and Nabataean reflects only the use of י (Unfortunately, Cook does not enumerate the proportion by which י and -י occur, where appropriate. Further, not all of the relevant texts are published or sufficiently accessible to allow one to evaluate Cook’s study properly. In order to ease the comparison of the dialects, we here use the script of the western Aramaic dialects for all examples.) While QA resembles Hatran, Edessene, and Palmyrene in its use of י for the masculine plural suffixial pronoun, this is in marked distinction from Nabataean’s use of י. The Aramaic used at Qumran is to be further distinguished from Nabataean by the form of the plural demonstrative pronoun (יונ vs. יה), masculine plural independent pronoun (יהון/יו or יון vs. יה), the form of the derived infinitive (see Section 8.1 on page 118), and its exhibition of the infinitive.

With respect to Hatran, Qumran Aramaic is distinct in its use of יון for the plural demonstrative pronoun instead of the Hatran יון. Further, Hatran uses יון for the masculine singular demonstrative pronoun; QA uses י as the base of its inflected forms. Where QA would use יון or יון for the masculine plural independent pronoun, Hatran uses יון. Hatran, like Nabataean, does not appear to have morphological inflection for the infinitive of the derived stems. Whereas QA uses a יד followed by a long a to denote the masculine plural emphatic state, Cook finds that Hatran uses a long e. Whereas Hatran uses י for the prefix of the imperfect forms, Qumran reserves that usage for the imperfect of י (For example, see יון in 4QapocrDan i.7. Cook notes only the regular use of י to denote the imperfect). Finally, where QA uses יון to reflect the masculine singular suffixial pronoun attached to masculine plural nouns, Hatran morphology differs and employs יון.

Aside from the aforementioned difference between Edessene and Qumran Aramaic with regard to the relative pronoun, QA may be distinguished from the other dialect by its use of יון for the...}
Given these morphological distinctions, an argument against Qumran Aramaic as being distinguishable from Hatran, Edessene, Palmyrene, and Nabataean seems tenuous at best. The data briefly outlined here serves to illustrate that the dialect of the texts can be determined even if in the same script. This is not to say that the five dialects are not distinct, but rather the data presented does not necessitate Cook's conclusions.

In considering whether Qumran is one dialect or multiple, one must wrestle with the issue of when substandard variety becomes a dialect or subdialect. To classify the Aramaic of Qumran, it seems one must consider to what extent it is internally consistent with itself, that is its homogeneity, and compare it to how the different texts differ amongst themselves, QA's heterogeneity.

1.2.5.3.4 QA Homogeneity and Heterogeneity As may be expected, the Aramaic of Qumran is commonly considered to be a part of Judaean Literary Aramaic, a subdialect or subset of Judaean Aramaic. In this regard, it is very similar grammatically to Biblical Aramaic and the apparent consonantal text of Targum Onqelos demonstrative plural pronoun where Edessene uses יי'. Where the QA demonstrative pronoun is יי, Edessene uses וֵא. Edessene also differs from QA in its use of וֵא for the masculine plural independent pronoun (QA: וֵא/וֵא/וֵא). Where QA prefixes -ו and suffixes -ו to the infinitive of the derived stems, Edessene prefixes -ו and suffixes -ו. Also, Edessene uses the same suffix for the masculine plural emphatic as Hatran, which is distinct from QA. Finally, while Edessene uses -ו to denote the imperfect, similarly to QA, it also adds the use of -ו (We here must assume that Cook finds the prefix -ו in the third person imperfect. Naturally, QA, like BA, uses -ו as the prefix for the first common plural imperfect). Palmyrene is also to be distinguished from the Aramaic found at Qumran. The Palmyrene masculine singular demonstrative pronoun (וֵא) is distinctly different from that of Qumran Aramaic (וֵא). Further, Palmyrene uses the same forms as Edessene for (1) the masculine plural independent pronoun and (2) the infinitive of the derived stems, both of which differ from those of QA. Where QA uses -וֵא for the masculine plural emphatic state and Edessene uses -ו, Palmyrene uses both.

Two final distinctions may be made between Qumran Aramaic and the other major dialects of the Middle Aramaic period: the use of י and the attestation of the jussive. To demonstrate direct objects, Nabataean often uses י and the attestation of the jussive. To demonstrate direct objects, Nabataean often uses י and the attestation of the jussive. To demonstrate direct objects, Nabataean often uses י and the attestation of the jussive. To demonstrate direct objects, Nabataean often uses י and the attestation of the jussive. Finally, Judaean Aramaic is the only dialect of the five which manifests a distinct jussive.
to the Torah and Targum Jonathan to the Prophets, per Kaufman.

While there is significant heterogeneity within the Aramaic reflected in the Qumran texts, this is largely outweighed by the consistency one finds among the various documents.

Of the seventeen times where one finds deviations with regard to the Aph'el, Ithpe'el, and Ithpa'al, all occur in the Targum to Job from Cave 11. In that text, the aforementioned stems are often written with a he (נ) instead of an aleph (א).

However, the Aramaic at Qumran, like the Aramaic from Daniel, maintains the same basic morphemes for the Pe'al and Pa'el. Further, mem (מ) is routinely used in the participle forms of the derived stems.

With even greater uniformity, the construct and absolute forms of both the noun and adjectives of Qumran Aramaic match that of Biblical Aramaic. Further, the independent personal pronouns follow the same pattern as BA. While QA attests to more demonstrative pronoun forms, it remains consistent to the BA paradigms.

1.2.5.3.4.1 Homogeneity Within Qumran Aramaic, there is considerable homogeneity. In the following part of this discussion, we highlight some of the areas in which the Aramaic of Qumran could be expected to be quite disparate if it were multiple dialects but is, instead, highly consistent.

Some examples of this consistency may be found in the verbal system, the noun declensions, and several elements of syntax. One notes that, overall, there is virtually no major variation in the verbal morphology of QA.

---

See Table 8.1 "An Overview of Verbal Morphology (by stem)" on page 118 and Table 8.2 "The Afformatives of the Finite Regular Verb" on page 118.

See Table 8.11 "Sufformatives of the Tripartite or Regular Noun" on page 144.
There are only slight variations in the feminine singular absolute and in the feminine plural emphatic. Given the fact that these forms are used with comparatively less frequency in the language, one would not expect them to have set forms as readily as their masculine counterparts.

In terms of syntax, some examples we have culled are the syntax of the infinitive,\(^6\) of the adjective,\(^7\) and of the infinitive object.\(^7\)

Within QA, the infinitive regularly takes on five roles: gerundive, verbal complement, purpose, result, and objective. The adjective and those pronouns which function similar to adjectives (such as לַכְּנַה and לַל) tend to occur after their antecedent as closely as possible.

Finally, Jean Carmignac once observed that the Genesis Apocryphon was special in that it exhibited infinitival objects.\(^7\) However, upon further study, one finds that much of the Aramaic texts from Qumran exhibit the same phenomenon. These, however, do not occur with rhyme or reason but may appear either before or after the infinitive by which they are governed.

From these few items, one can begin to see that there is a significant amount of consistency in Qumran Aramaic. If the texts were in different dialects, as we earlier defined dialect, it is highly unlikely that such consistency would be found.

\(1.2.5.3.4.2\) \textbf{Heterogeneity} \hspace{1em} Despite this significant amount of homogeneity, Qumran Aramaic is not without its internal inconsistency. This is exemplified largely in terms of morphology.

\(^6\)See §9.1.2.2 “The Infinitive” (page 194) for a detailed discussion of the syntax of the infinitive with examples.
\(^7\)See §9.1.2.3 “The Construct” (page 201).
\(^7\)See §9.1.5.4 “Infinitival Objects” (page 201).
\(^7\)Jean Carmignac, “Un aramaïsme biblique et qumranien: l’infinitif placé après son complément d’objet” \textit{RQ} 5 (1966), 510.
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The "verbs exhibit considerable variety in their forms. These are largely the same sorts of variations which one finds elsewhere. However, to have such variety within one verb type is significant. The other kinds of weak verbs do not exhibit this disparity.

Of the thirty-one texts collated here, the 11QTgJob is the only one that exhibits at the head of haph′els, hithpe′als, and hithpa"als instead of N. Of the 204 finite forms which would have either an N or a il preformative, 19 occur with a il and not an N. Of the forty-nine possible non-finite forms, only two exhibit a il.

The QA infinitive also exhibits considerable variation. Whilst the change in the preformative is predominant in 11QTgJob, the change of the sufformative is not. Of the forty-three times the sufformative il is used with an infinitive in QA, only seven occur in TgJob.

In QA noun forms, il and N are interchangeable with regard to sufformatives. This orthographical phenomenon includes both the pronominal suffix and the emphatic form.

Further, the fem.pl.emph. sometimes has a medial il. For example, the paradigm form נָתַנְתָּךְ may sometimes appear as נָתַנְתִּךְ. Examples of this are found in 1QapGen ii.1 and xvii.13.

The 3d person plural masculine personal pronoun is typically נָתַנְתָּךְ. This form occurs 18 times in the corpus. However, one also finds the form נָתַנְתָּךַּל twice — once in 4QPrNab 4 1 and 11QTgJob xxv.2. Due to the lack of pointing in the text, it is unclear whether this is morphological or merely orthographical.

73 For a paradigm and examples, see Table 8.1.2.3 on "The Derived Stems of the "Verb" page 131.
74 See Table 8.10 "Paradigm of the Infinitive (by stem)" on page 142.
1.2.5.3.5 Variations on a Theme  Consequently, the texts do not support Qumran as being multiple dialects in the way ‘dialect’ was defined earlier. However, they are also not wholly consistent in their presentation of the language employed by the scribes.

At Qumran, there was apparently a community of users and readers whose language was influenced by the texts. We cannot tell how many people comprised the community of Qumran. We cannot tell whence they came, when they came to the community attested by the scrolls. But, the texts bear out that there was a substantial amount of common grammatical ground in their understandings of Aramaic.

In several ways, the older manuscripts differ from the later in terms of morphology and word order. VanderKam demonstrated that the apocalyptic texts did not originate at Qumran. This includes the Genesis Apocryphon, the Enochic literature, Aramaic Levi, the pseudo-Daniel literature, and the Testament of Amram. It is likely that 11QTgJob did not originate in Qumran. Judging from the heterogeneity among the texts, one may suggest that they represent dialects of different locations. But nothing suggests a provenance for these copies that is outside of Judaea during the late Second Temple Period.

The heterogeneity in QA does not establish a dialect but merely a collection of anomalies. The composition of the texts being separate from Qumran does not necessitate a different dialect but rather variety within Judaean Literary Aramaic. Therefore, QA is properly neither a single homogenous dialect nor a multitude of dialects. Rather, QA represents “variations on a theme” of Judaean Literary Aramaic as manifest in Judaea and its environs.
1.3 Which Aramaic Dialect is Most Relevant?

In light of the foregoing discussion, a general schematic of the languages of first-century Judaea with their relative influence and apparent interrelation is illustrated in Figure 1.1. One can speak of three languages with sufficient popularity and textual witnesses to render them relevant and able to be studied with regard to first-century Judaean language dynamics: Greek, Hebrew, and Aramaic. Of these three, Greek was used predominantly for Roman civil matters or for matters in which the Romans might be involved. Hebrew was used by a significant number of communities but was not necessarily understood or used throughout the region. Rather, Aramaic was the most commonly used language in Judaea at this time.\(^76\)

\(^{75}\)While there was undoubtedly a degree of interrelation between all five languages, the overlap of the central three occurs with the largest qualitative and quantitative attestations.

\(^{76}\)Cf. Fitzmyer, *Wandering Aramean*, 38.
being employed for not only intra-Judaean legal matters but also for ossuaries and similar texts.

The two remaining languages existed largely on the margins. Latin was reserved for official, administrative purposes. The pre-Arabic dialects, on the other hand, were used by those on the fringe of Judaean society. The preserved texts of the latter do not afford much information for the language dynamics of Judaea at this time. Unfortunately, the documents representing the former are not of sufficient provenance to mitigate doubts about their relevance. While Latin certainly had an influence on later Jewish literature, first-century Judaean literature does not appear to manifest similar, influential qualities.

However, as we illustrated with regard to Aramaic, the question must be answered: Which form of Aramaic holds the greatest relevance for discerning an Aramaic textual ancestor of a New Testament document? It was at this stage of development that significant disparity existed within general Aramaic both diachronically, between the preceding and ensuing stages of the language, and synchronically, between the various dialects of Judaea, Edessa, Nabataea, Hatra, and Palmyra as well as the appearance of Syriac in the latter half of the first century.

---

77 We find it necessary to set Latin and the pre-Arabic dialects away from the three major languages as their exact influence is either not attested or seems to be negligible.


79 For examples of this see Daniel Sperber, A Dictionary of Greek and Latin Legal Terms in Rabbinic Literature (Ramat-Gan, Israel: Bar-Ilan University Press, 1984).

80 As far as our study has concluded, a treatment of Latin influence on Jewish literature before and after the First Jewish Revolt and the Bar Kokhba Revolt is wanting. The recent work by Jonathan Price details the Jewish use of Latin but does not attempt to include the influence Latin may have had on Jewish authors writing in other languages. However, we eagerly anticipate the general availability of another study which may address this issue: Werner Eck, "The Language of Power: Latin in the Inscriptions of Judaea/Syria Palaestina" in Semitic Papyrology in Context ed. Lawrence H. Schiffman (Leiden: Brill, 2003), Culture and History of the Ancient Near East 14, 123–144.
Further, as we noted with particular regard to the textual attestations of the Judaean dialects, there are substantial reasons for holding the literary Aramaic from Qumran separate from the colloquial Aramaic of the Bar Kokhba literature and the other epigraphic texts.

While the New Testament Gospels may contain traces of oral tradition, they are widely recognized as also having written sources. They are biographical narratives whose penultimate sources are commonly conceded to have been largely written, as opposed to oral, tradition. As none of the Gospels in their present forms has a provenance in Eretz Israel, nevermind Judaea, one may conclude that the tradition was born to the locus of writing or redaction mostly, if not completely, in the form of a text.


For a general schematic of how the Gospels developed from Jesus to the final forms found in the New Testament, see Raymond E. Brown, An Introduction to the New Testament (New York: Doubleday, 1997), ABRL, 107–111, esp. p.109. Given the material shared verbatim between (a) Mark and the other two synoptic Gospels and (b) Matthew and Luke, one is hard-pressed to discount even most of it as purely oral tradition. While the Fourth Gospel rarely offers verbatim parallels to the synoptics, its being dated later than the first three Gospels by upward of twenty years renders unlikely the use of oral tradition that has not been augmented by time.

We do not here suggest that the Johannine tradition is necessarily early or late because of its apparent level of Semiticization. As both E.P. Sanders and R. Buth have observed, Semitic “flavor” does not necessitate an early dating. The textual evidence suggests that Aramaic and Hebrew continued to be used throughout antiquity. However, the existence of Aramaic or Hebrew inflection in an otherwise Hellenistic document does suggest a peculiar strand of tradition being conveyed but not necessarily created. See Edward P. Sanders, The Tendencies of the Synoptic Tradition (Cambridge: CUP, 1969), SNTSMS 9, 190–256, Randall Buth, “EDAYIN/TOTE — Anatomy of a Semitism in Jewish Greek” MAARAV 5-6 (1990), 33–48, and Morton Smith, “The Jewish Elements in the Gospels” Journal of Bible and Religion 24 (1956), 95.


For the difference between “Eretz Israel” and “Judaea”, see note 6 on page 3.
By restricting our discussion largely to the written material, we do not uninten­tionally exclude the role of the oral stratum as irrelevant. Rather, it is exceedingly
difficult to determine oral tradition through a written text on grammatical grounds.
Given the present means available for researching the New Testament Aramaic
problem, an oral stratum cannot be ascertained with confidence, reliability, and
consistency.

Despite the myriad of postulations concerning parts of the New Testament as
reflecting either the *ipsissimum verbum* or the *ipsissima vox* of Jesus or the earliest
disciples, no systematic approach for the recovery of this layer has been asserted.
This is not to say that scholarship cannot knowingly touch upon early tradition.
Rather, the methods of modern scholarship are unable to regularly and reliably
traverse the bridge between the language of the written text and the language of
the oral tradition.

It is an indisputable fact that the only means by which scholarship can study
the languages of first-century Judaea is through written texts. Modern scholarship
is yet to uncover reliably the oral language which immediately preceded the written
text, the ancestor of our extant texts. Consequently, it remains to be demon­
strated how one should proceed to the lips of Jesus or the Twelve from the hand
of the scribe.

As is demonstrated in this first part, modern scholarship cannot ascertain reli­
ably and consistently in which languages the source texts used in the compilation
of the early Christian writings occurred (See §3.3.4 on page 76). It is even less
likely that the current scholarly tools can be used to discern the speech patterns of
the earliest Christians or of Jesus himself. It would be such a text or the textual
ancestor of such a writing that was used in the production of the earliest Gospels.
The provenance of such a text would necessarily be closer to the local language of Judaea. The sources of the Gospels are likely to be literary and are, at least partly, from Judaea prior to the Great Revolt. Consequently, it naturally follows that when one seeks to unearth the first-century Judaean literary sources of a Greek text, one should turn to a literary – not colloquial – body of texts.\textsuperscript{85}

The Aramaic dialect most relevant for the New Testament Aramaic problem is thus shown to be Qumran Aramaic, a part of Judaean Literary Aramaic. In the subsequent chapters of Part I, we offer a survey of the major trends in New Testament Aramaic studies from Dalman's work at the close of the nineteenth century to Casey's treatments at the beginning of the twenty-first. As illustrated in the following chapters, New Testament Aramaic studies shifted considerably with the discoveries at Qumran. Whereas Dalman, Kahle and their adherents drew from the later Targums, Fitzmyer and those agreeable to his view would later insist on the use of Qumran Aramaic alone. The later studies of Wilcox and Casey have sought, at least in method, to cut a middle ground.

In the critical review which follows, it will be demonstrated that the work of each of these scholars is weakened by insufficient data and insufficient attention to method. Our critique will illustrate various prerequisites for addressing the New Testament Aramaic problem; perhaps the two most significant among these are the need for systematic, complementary, modern grammars of the three major Judaean languages and enhanced studies on the translation techniques used in antiquity. Certainly the most obvious need is that of a systematically developed grammar of Qumran Aramaic. It is to this end that we offer Part II of this work,

\textsuperscript{85}By literary we here mean those texts which manifest a humane learning and which are expressed in a formal manner. Colloquial, on the other hand, refers to conversation or otherwise informal forms of communication.
“A Grammar of Qumran Aramaic.”
Chapter 2

Targumic Approaches

Prior to the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls, critical attempts to address the question of an Aramaic substratum were required to reconstruct an hypothetical dialect, using texts dating to immediately prior to the first century CE, Biblical Aramaic and Official Aramaic, and those which appeared earliest after it, the Aramaic of the pre-rabbinic Megillat Ta'ani with the Targums and Talmuds. The Targums were dated as being composed in the second century CE,\(^1\) even though the actual documents were medieval in origin. However, the two major schools which dominated New Testament Aramaic studies through the first six decades of the twentieth century differed on which Targum to use.

The school of thought founded by Dalman held that Targum Onqelos best represented the Aramaic of first-century Judaea. This argument was asserted despite the Babylonian influences on the document and its apparent dependence on a Hebrew Vorlage. For Dalman, the language of Targum Onqelos was the same dialect

\(^{1}\)The obvious exception to this trend is manifest in the works of those who follow Díez Macho’s dating of Targum Neophyti. See §2.2.3.
as that of the Jerusalem Christians, the conveyors of the words of Jesus.\(^2\)

Attempting to discern which Targum deserved priority, scholars of the Kahle school turned to the Hebrew Bible as an early witness of tradition, assumably prior to the common era, and to the Mishnaic interpretive tradition as a later witness, occurring after the revolts of the first and second centuries of the common era. A principle of dissonance was then applied to the texts: tradition that was contrary to the standard must have preceded the standard. Two variations of this overriding principle were repeatedly used to determine which Targum was earlier and/or more closely related to the Aramaic of first-century Judaea. Where the Targums disagreed with the Mishnaic interpretation, they were seen to be earlier than 200 CE. Where they disagreed with the Masoretic text, they were dated even earlier.\(^3\)

A second principle was then applied: early hermeneutical positions necessitated early language forms. That is, if one were to ascertain what may be an early or earlier interpretive line of thought, one may posit that the relevant phrases contain early language forms. To do this, one would need to establish dissent, reasoning that antithetical perspectives would need to be marginalized, at the very least, in order to allow for the stabilization of the textual tradition. Hence, any contrary views that were found were of necessity earlier in date and, therefore, closer to the targeted time frame. Once contrary opinions were determined about


\(^3\) The understanding that dissonance does not necessitate an early dating has since been discussed. Cf. P. Wernberg-Müller, “An Inquiry into the Validity of the Text-Critical Argument for an Early Dating of the Recently Discovered Palestinian Targum” *VT* 12 (1962), 312–330.

a narrative or an interpretation, the language of those pericopae were held to re-
tain the patterns of earlier Aramaic dialects, possibly the Aramaic of first-century
Judaea. This process of hypothetical reconstructionism prevailed until the years
following the discovery of the Qumran scrolls.

2.1 Schools of Thought

2.1.1 Gustaf Dalman and Targum Onqelos

At the end of the nineteenth century, Gustaf Dalman wrote Die Worte Jesu, an
effort to begin to ascertain how the Jewish people of first-century Judaea heard
the message of Jesus.4 This was the first work specifically dedicated to the task
of uncovering the Aramaic behind the sayings of Jesus using a relatively critical
methodology.5 In his introductory material, Dalman notes the scarcity of precu-
sors to his work: “Es ist zu beklagen, dass so wenig Vorarbeiten vorhanden sind,
welchen unmittelbar nützliches Material für unsere Arbeit entnommen werden
könnte.”6

In reconstructing the dialect of first-century Judaea, Dalman openly voices

5While Meyer offers reconstructions as early as 1896, his work uncritically draws from sources
that are either too late in date to be considered credible for the task or that are otherwise outside the
pale of what might have been available to the Galilean Rabbi. Arnold Meyer, Jesu Muttersprache
(Freiburg: J.C.B. Mohr, 1896). For a critique of Meyer’s work a century after its publication,
see Maurice Casey, Aramaic sources of Mark’s Gospel (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press,
1998), SNTSMS 102, 1-16.
While Fitzmyer views Black’s work as the first major work on the problem, it should be noted
that Dalman does offer some attempt at a critical approach. Cf. Joseph A. Fitzmyer, A Wandering
Aramean: Collected Aramaic Essays (Grand Rapids, MI/Livonia, MI: Eerdmans/Dove, 1997), 4.
See also page 36 n. 8 of the present work.
6Dalman, Die Worte Jesu, 60. Dalman follows this statement with a brief discussion of the
principal works of his day which pertained to Jewish theology (60), rabbinc literature (61) –
particularly rabbinic parallels to the New Testament (61-62). He curiously seems unaware of
Meyer’s work.
awareness and regret that the only corpora large enough and early enough for the endeavor are the Targums.\textsuperscript{7} With that constraint, Dalman outlines his reasoning for giving priority to \textit{Targum Onqelos}. He takes issue with the allegation that \textit{Onqelos} was disfigured during its usage in the East.\textsuperscript{8} For Dalman, there is only one point at which the Babylonian dialect may be seen to affect the language of \textit{Onqelos}.\textsuperscript{9}

Contrary to the nineteenth century \textit{Zeitgeist},\textsuperscript{10} Dalman sets the "\textit{Jerusalem Targums}" aside, stating that the early aspects of their grammar are derived from \textit{Onqelos}.\textsuperscript{11} He also sets aside the Christian Palestinian lectionaries of the Gospels, documents that appear to be translated from Greek originals or otherwise influenced by Syriac. Ultimately, Dalman finds value for the task in only two corpora: \textit{Targum Onqelos} and the Palestinian rabbinic literature. Pride of place, however,

\textsuperscript{7}Dalman, \textit{Die Worte Jesu}, 66.
\textsuperscript{8}Dalman, \textit{Die Worte Jesu}, 67. For the argument that the Palestinian Aramaic of \textit{Onqelos} was corrupted by Babylonian Aramaic, the analysis to which Dalman responds, see Theodore Nöldeke, \textit{Die semitischen Sprachen} (Leipzig: T. O. Weigel, 1887), 32.
\textsuperscript{10}For a discussion of the use of the Targumim with regard to the New Testament in the nineteenth century, see Meyer, \textit{Jesu Muttersprache}.
\textsuperscript{11}Dalman, \textit{Die Worte Jesu}, 68–70.
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is clearly given to the former.12

2.1.2 The Kahle School and the Palestinian Targums

In 1941, Paul Kahle presented the British Academy Schweich Lectures on the texts from the Cairo Geniza. Discussing the relationship of Targum Onqelos to Biblical Aramaic, Kahle takes issue with Dalman’s view that “we may take it to be in the main an exact rendering in the language spoken at that time in Judaea.” Kahle argued that Onqelos, while originating in the area of Palestine, was not favored by the rabbis. On the contrary, he argues, it was disparaged.15

Kahle asserts that Targum Onqelos matured among Babylonian Jews and came

12 In order to use Targum Onqelos to reconstruct a dialect of first-century Judaea, Dalman had to clarify what should not be seen as representative of that dialect. To this end he lists eight “Hebraisms” which are common in Onqelos:

1. The use of the construct state without a construct complement.
2. The use of וד for the Hebrew הנ. Dalman states that Aramaic does not use this form.
3. The use of י. Dalman sees this as stemming from the Mishanic use of י.ר
4. The use of an infinitive to emphasize the main verb.
5. The use of Aramaic והז, which is foreign to Aramaic, according to Dalman.
6. The use of י for ד and י for י in the Targumic translation technique.
7. The use of the perfect for a historic narrative tense. Dalman says that Aramaic would normally use a participle.
8. The use of infinitive complements.

(Dalman, Die Worte Jesu, 66–67). These are stylistic devices used in the Targum that do not commonly appear in Dalman’s understanding of Aramaic, an understanding which he does not delineate.

The limitations of Dalman’s retroversion have recently been intimated by Philip Alexander, “Jesus and the Golden Rule” in Hillel and Jesus: Comparisons of Two Major Religious Leaders ed. James H. Charlesworth and L. L. Johns (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1997), 370 n.5.


15 Cf. Kahle, Geniza, 194, esp. note 1. See also note 8 on page 36 of the present work.
back to Palestine later, along with the Babylonian Talmud and the yearly Parasha divisions of the Torah. However, until that time, Palestinian Judaism used the Palestinian Talmud and the Palestinian Targum, the latter of which Kahle argued is earlier than *Targum Onqelos.*

In support of this argument, he offers the Targumic paraphrase of Exodus 22:4–5. Kahle suggests that whereas *Baba Qamma* 6:4 presupposes that the four types of damage discussed will come from either a man or a fire, the Targum does not. Kahle’s conclusion is as follows: “Since in the second century B.C. an addition to the Targum was made which cannot have been made later than the second century B.C., the Targum must have existed at that time.” From this conclusion, Kahle suggests that, due to its inconsistency against the Mishnah and the Masoretic Torah, the Palestinian Targum from the Cairo Geniza “can be regarded as being nearly in the same form as when it was in circulation at the time of the beginning of Christianity.”

**2.2 Major Adherents**

As indicated above, the Dalman and Kahle schools dominated study on the New Testament Aramaic substratum for the first half of the twentieth century. Al-

---


17Kahle, *Geniza,* 207.

18Kahle, *Geniza,* 207. Interestingly, Kahle does not clarify precisely whether he intends the language of Jesus or the earliest Christians. For problems in Dalman’s linguistic approach, see n. 14, above.

19Mention should be made of Paul Joïon’s *L’Évangile de Notre Seigneur Jésus-Christ* in which he considered the New Testament Aramaic problem. Unfortunately, having been written prior to the discoveries at Qumran, this work suffers from similar problems to those of Dalman and Kahle. As it did not receive a particularly significant following, we do not consider it further here. See Paul Joïon, *L’Évangile de Notre Seigneur Jésus-Christ* (Paris: G. Beauchesne, 1930), Verbum Salutis 5.
though many were persuaded by their views,²⁰ a notable few published seminal works on the subject to present a more nuanced perspective. While those who subscribed to Kahle’s view were sufficiently significant in number to be called the “Kahle school,”²¹ these adherents nuance Kahle’s perspective and are notably influenced — to a lesser extent — by Dalman’s work, as well.²²

2.2.1 Matthew Black

Matthew Black’s *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts* is held by many as the quintessential, twentieth-century exemplar of the Targumic approach and as contributing to a renewed interest in the New Testament Aramaic problem among English-speaking scholars.²³ Black was not as adamantly critical of Dalman’s use of *Targum Onqelos* as Kahle, but he continued to maintain that the Palestinian Targums were to be preferred.²⁴ He agreed with Kahle that the Palestinian Targums

---

²⁰ Two scholars are particularly noteworthy in this respect. Bruce Chilton uses the Targums in traditio-historical criticism. He does not attempt reverse translation or otherwise to attain the precise words of Jesus but seeks, rather, to clarify what Jesus said with little concern for how he said it. For the role of the Targums in New Testament Studies see especially Bruce D. Chilton, *Targumic Approaches to the Gospels* (Lanham, Maryland: University Press of America, 1986), Studies in Judaism, and Bruce D. Chilton, “Four Types of Comparison between the Targumim and the New Testament” *Journal for the Aramaic Bible* 2 (December 2000).


In the introduction to *Targumic Approaches to the Gospels*, Chilton acknowledges his indebtedness to Black’s work and credits him with the revitalization of the field (p. 1). Evans calls Black’s *Approach* “the highwater mark in the older dictional and philological analysis and comparison of Aramaic sources with the New Testament Gospels and Acts” [Craig A. Evans, “Introduction” in *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), v].

²⁴ Black concludes:
from the Cairo Geniza dated to pre-Mishnaic times.

Black saw QA as complementing the extant BA and OfA corpora, precursors to the Aramaic of the early Christians. However, the Palestinian Targums he held to preserve Aramaic from the first century, Targum Onqelos coming later and being polluted by Babylonian forms.

With this linguistic perspective, Black details his textual approach: the exclusive use of Codex Bezae (D) for the New Testament text. Citing Wilcox, Black sees Codex Bezae as resembling the “Aramaic background of the Gospel tradition” as found in Luke with greater fidelity than the non-Western manuscripts.

“We need not... be so sceptical about the value of Dalman’s Aramaic Grammar as Kahle was: at the same time, it must be admitted with Kahle that the more idiomatic and freer Aramaic of the pre-Onkelos Palestinian Targum tradition, uninfluenced by the Babylonian dialect or the need to translate the Hebrew word by word, is a much better source of knowledge for the Aramaic of the New Testament period” (Black, Aramaic Approach, 42).

Unlike Kahle, Black used his reconstructed dialect to offer reverse translation for parts of the New Testament into Aramaic. This is, however, a trait of Dalman and, later, of Casey. The last reconstructs perhaps more than the earlier two added together. Cf. Dalman, Die Worte Jesu, 75–77; Black, Aramaic Approach, 165; Casey, Aramaic Sources of Mark’s Gospel, 138.

At the time of the first two editions, first-century Aramaic was not seen as a transitional stage unto itself but largely as a period of transition between OfA and LA. This understanding was not invalidated until Kutscher’s description of the language of the Genesis Apocryphon as “a language in transition” from OfA to the contemporary conception of Middle Aramaic (Aramaic after 200 BCE). Cf. Eduard Y. Kutscher, “The Language of the ‘Genesis Apocryphon’: A Preliminary Study” in Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls ed. C. Rabin and Y. Yadin (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1958), Scripta Hierosolymitana 4, 6; Fitzmyer, Wandering Aramean, 60–63.

To be sure, Black recognized that the Qumran corpus was not to be neglected. However, at the time of his writing, relatively few texts had come to light (Black mentions only 1 Enoch, the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs, and the Genesis Apocryphon). QA was not considered a dialectal denomination but was seen by Black as merely an extension of Official Aramaic:

“There are the new Qumran Aramaic texts to study, for the most part exhibiting a language closer to the old Reichsaramäisch, but also in their literary form and character, no less than in language, exhibiting a literature which serves as a much closer prototype of the Aramaic portions and especially the original Aramaic poetry of the Gospels” (Black, Aramaic Approach, 42).

These texts were naturally seen as secondary to Targum Neofiti among the “New Discoveries” (Black, Aramaic Approach, 35).


Cf. Black, Aramaic Approach, 31. It is noteworthy that here, again, earlier theological narra-
Hence, he steers the quest away from the language of Jesus, per Dalman, to the substrata of the New Testament texts and, thereby, the language of the early church. Black views the alleged Syrian influence on D as potential Aramaisms, derived from the sources for the Gospels — an argument from silence. 29

2.2.2 Martin McNamara

In his 1972 work *Targum and Testament*, Martin McNamara presents a detailed study on the value of the Targums for New Testament study. 30 While this work is now dated, it was a trend-setting study of similar scope to Black’s *Aramaic Approach* and Dalman’s *Die Worte Jesu*.

In discussing Aramaic as the language of Jesus, he takes account of Qumran Aramaic and its value against the Palestinian Targum. McNamara discounts the former as a literary dialect which is less likely to preserve spoken language patterns. 31 This perspective foreshadows the rest of McNamara’s work in which he champions the role of the Palestinian Targums for New Testament study. 32 As

---

29 Black, *Aramaic Approach*, 33. As the alleged sources for these Aramaisms are as yet not found nor discerned reliably from the known Gospel traditions, Black’s argument is not as strong as it first appears.


31 Martin McNamara, *Targum and Testament: Aramaic Paraphrases of the Hebrew Bible: A Light on the New Testament* (Shannon, Ireland: Irish University Press, 1972), 59: “[W]e must observe that the Aramaic of Qumrân is a *literary* form of the language. Of itself it fails to let us know what the *spoken* form of Aramaic was. It by no means rules out the possibility that the spoken language in Palestine, or in part of it, was the Aramaic found in the Palestinian Targum to the Pentateuch, i.e., Palestinian Aramaic. The Aramaic of Qumrân is itself a more developed form of Aramaic than that found in the Bible.” McNamara is here responding to the idea of reconstructing an *oral Vorlage*, something which we argue is not attainable from Aramaic and Christian Greek literary texts.

with others who adopted the Targumic approach, McNamara does not attend to a 
linguistic approach involving a comparison between the grammars of TgA and an 
alleged Aramaic ancestry to parts of the New Testament, but uses the Targums for 
a traditio-historical criticism of early Christian theology and practice.33

2.2.3 Alejandro Díez Macho

In a 1959 work, Alejandro Díez Macho disclosed to the scholarly world that he 
had “discovered” a new Targum named Neofiti I, a Targum of the Pentateuch.34 
He has since argued that Neofiti portrays a pre-Christian form of Aramaic, despite 
the manuscript’s sixteenth century dating. As no other copy of the text is known 
to exist, all of Díez Macho’s assertions are text-critically based on a single copy of 
Neofiti I and rely heavily upon comparison to cognate literature such as Philo, the 
Mishnah, and the Talmud, as well as the languages of Hebrew, Greek and Latin. 
Table 2.1 “A Summary of Díez Macho’s Reasons for an Early Dating of Targum 
Neofiti” below presents a summary of Díez Macho’s ten points in favor of an early 
dating of Targum Neofiti.35

33Examples of this approach may be seen in the work of Chilton and Evans (see page 39 n.20.) 
The later rabbinic sources are used in a similar fashion in Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus (Joachim 
approach as not effectively bridging the gap between correlation and causation. Cf. Edward P. 

34Alejandro Díez Macho, “The Recently Discovered Palestinian Targum: its Antiquity and Rela-
tionship with the Other Targums” in Congress Volume Oxford 1959, 222-245.

35Page numbers which follow each item in Table 2.1 refer to the page on which the item is 
discussed in Díez Macho’s general introduction to the first volume of the editio princeps. See Ale-
jandro Díez Macho, Neophyti 1, Targum Palestinense ms. de la Biblioteca Vaticana. Vol. 1, 
(Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1968). They were first published in Díez Macho, 
“Recently Discovered”, 222–245.
2.2.3.1 Criticisms of Díez Macho’s Position

While the discovery of the text was met with understandable excitement by many scholars, Díez Macho’s assertion of an early dating came under scrutiny. Of particular note is the 1962 work by P. Wernberg-Müller. In “An Inquiry into the Validity of the Text-Critical Argument for an Early Dating of the Recently Discovered Palestinian Targum”, he undermines the text-critical basis of Díez Macho’s argument severely by a thirty-seven point, line-by-line analysis of the same. In general, Wernberg-Müller finds Díez Macho’s evidence inconclusive; demonstrating diachrony from a single manuscript is seen to be virtually impossible. His conclusion: “the text-critical material presented by Macho is incapable of proving a pre-Massoretic, pre-Christian date of the Palestinian Targum.”

Wernberg-Müller’s conclusion was reiterated and expanded by Anthony York in 1974. York debunked Díez Macho’s 1959 criteria point-by-point as being largely superficial.

39 A précis of York’s summary of Díez Macho is contained below.

1. Tradition that differs with the Mishnah predates the Mishnah
2. The lack of a reference to Johanan in Deuteronomy 33:11
3. The messianic interpretation of Numbers 24:17
4. Tradition that is in common with the New Testament (i.e., correlation necessitates causation)
5. Geographic names in Neofiti suggest a pre-Mishnaic date
6. Neofiti does not parallel Targum pseudo-Jonathan in several ways
7. Greek and Latin vocabulary
8. Relationship to New Testament, building on the third and fourth elements mentioned above
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Using his own summary, York notes that Díez Macho’s second criterion – the absence of Johanan in Deuteronomy 33:11 – is merely a textual variant and does not necessitate an earlier dating. It should be noted that this is true for any correlation with the Hebrew against other forms of the Aramaic traditions.

Any relationship between the tradition of Neofiti and the early Christian traditions is tenuous and difficult to trace. Alleged “early” geographical names are invalid as one cannot rule out their use by later writers. York notes that the lack of parallels to pseudo-Jonathan, the sixth criterion, is an argument from silence. With regard to the Greek and Latin words found in Neofiti and used by Díez Macho to argue for an early dating, York notes that the Talmud, Midrash, and later Targumim also exhibit Greek and Latin words. Finally, with reference to Díez Macho’s text-critical method and his reconstruction of an alleged Hebrew Vorlage, York defaults to the thirty-seven problems demonstrated by Wernberg-Müller in 1962.

Díez Macho’s first criterion – tradition contrary to the Mishnah must predate the Mishnah – largely echoes Kahle’s work on the Palestinian Targum. The problems inherent in this perspective is discussed in Section §2.3, “Problems in the Targumic Approach”.

2.2.3.2 Targum Neofiti and Qumran Aramaic

Díez Macho’s sixth criterion, a reference to Qumran Aramaic, is problematic in that the similarity is largely based on anomalous data and does not represent the QA corpus as a whole. While several allusions are made to similarities between

---

40 York notes that A. Berliner used a similar criterion to prove the antiquity of Onqelos. York, “Dating”, 56.
the *Genesis Apocryphon*, the Bar Kochba letters, and Targum Neofiti, the more substantial evidence consists of four items: the use of יָד as a complement of the construct relationship, the use of פּ ו and -ל to mark direct objects, the form לַעֲבֵר וּרְדָּב, and quiescent *aleph*. From this evidence, he concludes that Neofiti is of the same evolutionary line as the Targum Onqelos, *Genesis Apocryphon*, and the other documents from Qumran.\(^{41}\)

This evidence falters on several counts. As discussed in Section 9.1.2.2 “The Construct Phrase” (page 199), the use of the relative particle as a construct complement is exceptionally rare in QA and may not be seen as a defining characteristic of the corpus. The direct object markers cited by Díez Macho are common to more than one form of Aramaic from the fifth century BCE.\(^{42}\) Hence, the use of such a criterion in dating is questionable. The form לַעֲבֵר וּרְדָּב to which Díez Macho refers is not attested in our corpus. Finally, quiescent *aleph* is not a defining characteristic of the QA idiom and should be seen more as circumstantial evidence needing correlation.\(^{43}\)

\(^{41}\)Díez Macho's original treatment reads [Díez Macho, *Neophyti 1, Targum Palestinense ms. de la Biblioteca Vaticana.*, 77.]:

Unicamente despues de caracterizar con seguridad el arameo de Onqelos y el del *Apócrifo del Génesis* y el del resto de los documentos aramaicos de Qumrán, y sólo después de haber fijado la mutua relación de estas diversas clases de arameo, se podrá pasar a compararlo con el arameo de Neofiti 1 para ver si es un arameo posterior dentro de la misma línea evolutiva, o si son tipos distintos de arameo: arameo literario uno, arameo hablado otro, o arameo hablado en el sur de Palestina uno, arameo galilaico otro.


\(^{43}\)For more on quiescent *aleph* in QA, see §7.1.1 “Aleph” on page 108.
2.2.4 Geza Vermes

In a 1982 essay entitled “Jewish Literature and New Testament Exegesis”, Geza Vermes reflected on the interrelationship between the study of the New Testament and Jewish literature from the Second Temple Period to the Talmudim. In laying out the question he considers, Vermes describes the landscape as follows:

To start with, two commonplaces have to be taken into account. Firstly, it is accepted that the New Testament is in some way connected, not only with the Hebrew Scriptures (which it often cites), but also with post-biblical Judaism. It is consequently assumed that the literary relics of ancient Israel may from the viewpoint of language and content prove useful to New Testament exegesis. Secondly, the earliest surviving form of the New Testament is Greek. Yet although a good deal of it was actually composed in that language, neither Jesus himself nor his original milieu belonged in any real sense (pace Hengel) to Hellenistic Judaism, so any valid approximation of his genuine message must entail a linguistic and religious-cultural “re-translation” from the Greek into Aramaic/Hebrew concepts and thought-forms.

Is such a reconversion possible, and if so by what means?

To this end, he takes issue with Fitzmyer’s linguistic approach. While he agrees that Fitzmyer’s assertion of the primacy and exclusivity of the first-century Judaean documents is legitimate on methodological grounds, he also considers

---

46See §3.1 on page 57 for a summary of Fitzmyer’s approach.
it impracticable in terms of conclusivity.\textsuperscript{47} This is largely due to a lack of comparative Aramaic evidence as highlighted by Fitzmyer and Harrington’s \textit{Manual of Palestinian Aramaic Texts}.\textsuperscript{48} With this reasoning in mind, Vermes effectively gives up on the linguistic question as unresolvable at the present time.\textsuperscript{49}

He then devotes the balance of his essay to the “religious-cultural” question. Easily making the case for the early Christian writings to have developed within a Jewish milieu and with a significant amount of Jewish tradition as their basis, Vermes sets the study of the New Testament within the larger framework of Jewish studies from the post-biblical period to the Talmudic period of the sixth Christian century. His point is not that the New Testament is dependant on rabbinic tradition or vice versa. Rather, he stresses that both are dependant upon “Jewish traditional

\textsuperscript{49}The religious-cultural and linguistic questions are naturally complementary. However, while we would concede that the linguistic question is unresolvable without considerably more work being done in the field, we would highlight the more systematic method needed for the linguistic question in contrast to the religio-cultural approach espoused by Vermes. If Vermes would neglect the former for the latter, we would argue the need for a significantly more stringent account of method than has heretofore been seen in print.
teaching". 

Vermes' conclusion, therefore, is that both fields would benefit from a comprehensive and unifying study of Jewish religious ideas "from Apocrypha to Talmud". Such a work would serve as a guide for the religious and cultural reconstruction of the earliest Christian times.

2.3 Problems in the Targumic Approach

Early attempts at the Targumic Approach were necessarily naïve in comparison with later works. We, therefore, do not judge them by the same standard as we do later works. Rather, we endeavor to critique them based on the awareness they show about the problem. The early Targumic studies of Dalman and Kahle had three fundamental flaws that are either ignored by their later adherents or are not

Divested, however, of its denominational garb, the matter takes on another colour. The New Testament then ceases to be insignificant for Jews or autonomous and in every sense primary for Christians. Jesus and the movement that arose in his wake are recognized as belonging to first century Jewish history. Furthermore, a good deal of the New Testament appears as reflecting a brief moment in the age-long religious development of Israel that starts with the Bible and continues via the Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran, Philo, the New Testament, Josephus, Pseudo-Philo, the Mishnah, Tosefta, Targum, Midrash, Talmud - and so on and so forth. For Jews, the study of rabbinic literature benefits greatly inasmuch as the New Testament is able to fulfill the exceedingly important function of providing a chronologically well-defined segment of tradition applicable as a yardstick in dealing with undated material.

In our judgment, to judge these earlier works by the same rule as Fitzmyer, Wilcox, et al. is inequitable. The earlier works necessarily paved the way for later studies. While the information against which we compare the findings of these earlier scholars is necessarily more current than theirs, we shall endeavor to keep this fact in mind in our discussion. Simple examples of the value QA holds for a critique of Dalman's paradigm may be had by comparing the eight "Hebraisms" of Onqelos (see note 12 on page 37) to their respective sections in Part II.
addressed adequately. A certain, benign ignorance allowed:\(^{53}\)

- the overlooking of the various fates that could befall a text,
- linguistic ambivalence about how the various languages were employed in first-century Judaea and in later works,
- the overlooking of the genre of the texts used and the genre of the target (New Testament) texts, and
- the assertion that one tradition that is contrary to another must predate it.

### 2.3.1 The Fates of a Text

Regardless of the intent of the author, the fate of a work was seldom in a controlled environment after the author had released it. Michael Wise has detailed three ways that texts were disseminated in antiquity. First, an author could deposit his writing in the temple at Jerusalem, allowing for public reading and discussion of it.\(^ {54}\) Second, he could deposit a copy with a group or influential friend. Third and finally, he could provide the work to a bookseller for copying and selling.\(^ {55}\)

From the time that the work left the hands of the author, it was released, literally given over, to the public. Any member of the public could copy it and amend

\(^{53}\)We do not consider the lateness of the dating of the Targums to be a flaw in the Targumic approach as it was initially developed by Dalman and Kahle. As these scholars worked prior to the discovery of the Qumran scrolls, they could not do more than work with the texts at hand. Cf. Dalman, *Die Worte Jesu*, 66, and Stephen A. Kaufman, “Aramaic” in *The Anchor Bible Dictionary on CD-ROM* (Logos Library System Version 2.0c, 1995, 1996).


\(^{55}\)Wise, “Accidents and accidence”, 155-156.
or otherwise “improve” upon it. Wise characterizes the consequent situation as follows:

“Once a work was published, the author had no control over its circulation. Common trade copies were notoriously prone to error and distortion, a fact which led to the prestige of so-called ‘autograph copies’... An author’s work might appear in truncated or extended form, combined with extracts from other authors, while ironically no one read his original book.

After being released to the public, the work was then copied privately. In this process, either the scribe would copy it by himself alone or, with dictation, in a group.

With this paradigm in mind, one can see that the Targums were not likely to be immune to these fates, even though they were produced within a religious atmosphere. Indeed, Nöldeke recognized and Dalman disputed a level of linguistic corruption in Targum Onqelos. However, neither Dalman nor Kahle nor their adherents have taken account of the corruption incorporated into the text over the centuries from its source(s) to the making of the copies extant today. But, to rely on the Targums as if they preserved the first-century verbage is to ignore the many

58Wise, “Accidents and accidence”, 157. Wise further observes that the booksellers typically employed copyists. While these were usually Greco-Roman slaves, the Jerusalem temple employed lower-class freemen for the task. Cf. Anthony J. Saldarini, Pharisees, Scribes and Sadducees in Palestinian Society (Grand Rapids, MI/Livonia, MI: Eerdmans/Dove, 2001), The Biblical Resource Series, 266–268.

Of greater significance for our purposes is Wise’s observation that “there is no convincing evidence that scriptoria as such existed prior to the Middle Ages” (Wise, “Accidents and accidence”, 157). On the lack of evidence for institutional memorization, see Jacob Neusner, Rabbinic Literature and the New Testament (Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International, 1994), 8.

59See §2.1.1 (page 35).
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2.3.2 The Use of the Languages

The Targumic approach does not represent a clearly developed conception of first-century, Judaean language dynamics. Unsurprisingly, the use of Greek has never been in dispute; however, the perceived role of Greek was significantly greater than the aforementioned textual data allow. This is reflected in how Black summarizes the use of the languages in first-century Judaea:

Greek was the speech of the educated ‘hellenized’ classes and the medium of cultural and commercial intercourse between Jew and foreigner; Latin was the language of the army of occupation and, to judge from Latin borrowings in Aramaic, appears also to some extent to have served the purposes of commerce, as it no doubt also did of Roman law; Hebrew, the sacred tongue of the Jewish Scriptures, continued to provide the lettered Jew with an important means of literary expression and was cultivated as a spoken tongue in the learned coteries of the Rabbis; Aramaic was the language of the people of the land...  

60 For an example of how a single convention changed over two centuries, consider the use of נ in Classical Hebrew, post-Classical Hebrew, and Qumran Hebrew. The last of these is decidedly in favor of נ over ס. However, by the time the Mishnah was compiled, ס had almost completely displaced the other form. Cf. Elisha Qimron, The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls (Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press, 1986), §400.16.

While Kutscher suggests several similarities between the language of the Genesis Apocryphon and Targum Onqelos, this does not legitimize the use of Onqelos for the resolution of our question, as if Onqelos reflected a natural extension of QA. Rather, in our judgment, it highlights the import of the Qumran corpus. Kutscher, “Language of Gen. Ap.”, 1–35.

61 Black, Aramaic Approach, 15.
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Hence, from Dalman to Black, a quasi-diglossic relationship was thought to exist between Aramaic and Hebrew.62

Diglossia may be defined as a situation in which “two varieties of a language exist side by side throughout [a] community, with each having a definite role to play”.63 The quasi-diglossic relationship mentioned here describes Aramaic as the “low” language and Hebrew as the “high” language. Hebrew was thought to be the language of the academic élite. Aramaic was the language of the hoi polloi.64

As we discussed in Section 1.2, Hebrew was still in use in first-century Judaism and not merely among academics. Greek was used by more than just the intelligentsia.65 Further, other languages were employed for trade and commerce. Finally, the pre-1948 perspective did not account for the pre-Arabic speech communities characterized by the use of Nabatean.66

2.3.3 The Overlooking of Genre

By relying on rabbinic paraphrases of the Hebrew Bible and their accompanying hermeneutical notes, the Targumic approach does not give sufficient attention to

---

62 Cf. Black, *Aramaic Approach*, 48–49: “[T]here is... a case, certainly for a wider literary use of Hebrew in New Testament times. This much is certain from the Qumran discoveries. It is also possible, however... that Hebrew did continue as a spoken tongue: it seems unlikely, however, that this was outside the circles of the learned or the educated, i.e., in learned Pharisaic, priestly, or Essene circles. We must nevertheless allow possibly for more than has been done before for the use of Hebrew in addition to (or instead of) Aramaic by Jesus Himself, especially on solemn festive occasions; there is a high degree of probability that Jesus began his career as a Galilæan rabbi who would be well versed in the Scriptures, and able to compose (or converse) as freely in Hebrew as in Aramaic.” See also Black, *Aramaic Approach*, 16.

63 Ferguson, “‘Diglossia’” *Word* 15/2 (1959), 325.

64 As Black noted, this view did have its dissenters. However, Black insisted that: “This extreme position has found little if any support among competent authorities...” (Black, *Aramaic Approach*, 47–48.)

65 Cf. note 23 on page 8 of the present volume.

the problem of genre. Elements of syntax and style are employed differently in
literary narrative than in poetry, records of commerce, and epistolary literature.
One would then expect the syntax and style of an hermeneutical text to vary con­
siderably from that of a catechetical biography, especially when the two texts are
separated by more than 200 years!67 This consideration is missing from the Tar­
gumic approaches established by Dalman and Kahle but, as discussed above, is
touched upon by those who adhered to their views.68

2.3.4 Contrary is not Early
Critical to the perspectives of both Kahle and Díez Macho is the understanding
that traditions which contradict the Mishnah must predate the Mishnah. This sug­
gests an alignment between posture and chronology that does not follow naturally.
At its root, it is an argument from silence on two accounts and, on a third account,
requires two unsupported assumptions.

It first assumes a ubiquitous influence on the part of the Mishnah virtually
from the time of its compilation in the late second to early third centuries. This
is an assertion for which the extant texts offer no evidence. Second, it assumes
exceptional stability on the part of the Hebrew text, stability against which textual
variants among the Qumran biblical texts and Targumic variants would argue.

Further, it assumes uniformity on the part of the traditions which occurred
after the Mishnah and comprehensiveness on the part of the Mishnah itself. While

67 The Gospel of Mark, widely held to be the earliest of the canonical Gospels, is commonly
thought to have been written in the late sixties or early seventies of the common era. However, the
western Targums are generally dated to after 250 CE. For a summary of the dating of Mark accord­
ing to church tradition and according to modern scholarship, see R. T. France, The Gospel of Mark
(Grand Rapids, MI and Cambridge, UK/Carlisle: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company/The

68 See McNamara, Targum and Testament, 59.
the majority of any group forms the rule, this criterion of Kahle and Díez Macho interprets the group preserved in the texts as the whole of the society to which they attest. Neither approach convincingly discounts the role of the minority and why the texts, of medieval dating or later in both instances, can not represent a dissenting view of a later period.\(^69\)

Contrary traditions are not necessarily earlier traditions. Rather, dissenting views may be contemporary or later than those previously thought to be the absolute majority.

\(^69\)Inherent in this discussion is the assumption that the texts – whether Mishnaic or Targumic – which survived were those of the majority. They are obviously sectarian in that, generally, they do not entertain alternative perspectives outside of their own camp. Further, while they clearly held considerable influence, they were not necessarily the only or even the majority perspective at the time of their composition/compilation.
Table 2.1: A Summary of Díez Macho's Reasons for an Early Dating of Targum Neofiti

- Anti-Mishnaic tradition predates the Mishnah [57]
- Neofiti firstly observes the rubrics of the Mishnah, which follows the Hebrew and seems not to know the Aramaic or Targumic traditions, and secondly follows some post-Mishnaic norms (i.e., practices known from the Talmudic era) [60]
- The absence in Neofiti of later additions which are later accentuated in Pseudo-Jonathan [70]
- Historical and geographical allusions in Neofiti suggest a pre-Mishnaic date [71]
- Large number of Greek and Latin loanwords in Neofiti [73]
- Neofiti and Qumran Aramaic are similar [75]
- Neofiti is similar to the Peshitta and may therefore be a Palestinian Targum [78]
- The Hebrew text behind Neofiti suggests an early dating [82]
- Comparisons between Neofiti and documents from early Christianity or Second Temple Judaism suggest resonation and a similar dating [88]
- Comparison of Neofiti with writings of hellenistic Jewish authors (esp. Philo, 1 Enoch, and the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs from Qumran) suggests an early dating [93]
Chapter 3

Fitzmyer, Maloney and Their Use of Qumran Aramaic

In light of the discovery of the Qumran scrolls in 1947, three major approaches have been advanced for the resolution of the Aramaic problem. These approaches include the works of (1) Fitzmyer and Maloney, (2) Max Wilcox, and (3) Maurice Casey. The first, discussed in this chapter, argues that the Aramaic from Qumran should be the latest Aramaic corpus consulted to address the New Testament Aramaic question. This suggests that the surviving manuscripts of the rabbinic material are too far removed from first-century Judaea to contribute substantially to our understanding of first-century Judaean language dynamics.

The latter two approaches are considered in Chapter 4, “Hybrid Approaches.”

---


2As will be seen below, however, Fitzmyer breaks with this same principle by referring to the Bar Kokhba materials in his restoration of the kyrios hymn.

As we have alluded previously, modern textual method does not allow one to comment on the issue of oral tradition with confidence. Therefore, our address of the problem and the method of its resolution pivot on the question of a written source.
Max Wilcox argues for the use of both QA and TgA to address the problem. Maurice Casey seeks to extend the corpus to "any Aramaic dialect."³

### 3.1 Joseph Fitzmyer

Perhaps no one has advocated the priority of Qumran Aramaic for the study of the New Testament Aramaic problem more than Joseph Fitzmyer.⁴ While Fitzmyer has published widely in the field of New Testament Aramaic studies, his approach is summarized best in a lecture delivered at the 1973 *Journées bibliques* held in Louvain.⁵

Introducing his method, Fitzmyer first dismisses the studies prior to Dalman as having been done in a piece-meal fashion.⁶ He points out the need to account for the diversity of material within the New Testament corpus. Each book has problems of its own which must be considered whenever evaluating a possible Aramaic substratum behind it. In this regard Fitzmyer follows the nuancing of Black as he moves away from the language of Jesus to the language of the early

---


⁵This work was revised and published first as “Methodology in the Study of the Aramaic Substratum of Jesus’ Sayings in the New Testament” and was later re-published as “The Study of the Aramaic Background of the New Testament” in *A Wandering Aramean* (Fitzmyer, *Wandering Aramean*, 1–27). While this work may appear dated, having been published originally thirty years before the present work, its recent re-publication suggests that Fitzmyer feels no need to clarify his approach further. We here use the most recently published version for our review.

⁶“This is not meant as a criticism of the scholars who wrestled with one or other aspect of the problem... Their piece-meal work was determined by what little was known about Aramaic and its various phases at that time” (Fitzmyer, *Wandering Aramean*, 3).
Christian communities.

Second, Fitzmyer observes that one of the critical problems for any such study is that of provenance. If, for example, a work such as Philippians is written from a city in Asia Minor (he suggests Ephesus) to Christians of a city in Asia Minor (Philippi), an alleged Aramaic substratum is difficult to justify. Such an ancestor behind part of the text must be established against the linguistic milieu of the larger document.⁷

With this understanding, New Testament Aramaic scholarship has contented itself largely to work on the Gospels and Acts.⁸ Given that two of the Gospels have been described as having been written near Eretz Israel and that one of these is Mark,⁹ a Judaean provenance for the earliest Gospel traditions seems highly probable.¹⁰ Such rationale is lacking for most of the epistolary writings of the New Testament. Without establishing the provenance of Aramaic writing as having included the alleged locale of composition, postulation about an Aramaic textual


⁸The most notable exception to this trend is the work of R.A. Martin on the Catholic Epistles. Cf. Raymond A. Martin, Syntax Criticism of Johannine Literature, the Catholic Epistles, and the Gospel Passion (Lewiston, NY: Mellen, 1989). However, even this work was preceded by his work on the Synoptic Gospels, itself being based on his study on the syntax of translated documents. See Raymond A. Martin, Syntax Criticism of the Synoptic Gospels (Lewiston, NY: Mellen, 1987), and Raymond A. Martin, Syntactical Evidence of Semitic sources in Greek Documents (Lewiston, NY: Mellen, 1974).

However, while Martin’s work is innovative and important, it is as cracks in the soil of the largely forsaken field of New Testament Greek grammatology. Much of his evidence is circumstantial. His conclusions about which texts are likely to have been translated from an earlier (Semitic) source require integration with the conclusions of other disciplines.


¹⁰Fitzmyer, Wandering Aramean, 4–5.
ancestor falters.

Third, Fitzmyer objects to the loose labeling of any spurious Greek construction as a “Semitism.” Something that is merely “Semitic” in tone is not a Semitism. Rather, Fitzmyer argues that the use of the term should be supported by the Aramaic and Hebrew corpora that are contemporary with the text under consideration. For the study of the New Testament, this logic inevitably points to the Qumran writings.

Fitzmyer divides the Aramaic problem into eight elements. We have listed these in Table 3.1 (“Eight Aspects of the Aramaic Problem According to Fitzmyer” on page 60) with brief summaries of each. Fitzmyer’s view of the early Christian linguistic environment is very close to our own, the most significant difference being his exclusion of the pre-Arabic dialects. In his perspective, as in our own, Greek and Aramaic were widely used; Hebrew also was spoken, but not as widely.

The modern understanding of the NT Aramaic problem has been advanced significantly through Fitzmyer’s work. Of particular import are the refinement of the problem to the language of the early church and the consideration he gives to method. Unfortunately, many of the aspects he delineates have not been developed further by other scholars. However, a significant exception to this trend is an early work by Elliott Maloney.

---

11 See §1.2 (page 4).
Table 3.1: Eight Aspects of the Aramaic Problem According to Fitzmyer

1. Aramaic as a Language of Jesus
   Aramaic was one of three languages spoken in first-century Judaea, along with Greek and Hebrew.

   Words which are obviously transliterated from another language may be attributed to that language, but vocabulary common to Hebrew and Aramaic (e.g., יִשְׂרָאֵל) must be recognized as indeterminable.

3. Aramaisms in New Testament Greek
   To determine where constructions in New Testament Greek reflect first-century Aramaic, one must compare it with genuine, first-century Aramaic texts.

4. Mistranslations
   Allegations that myriad pericopae are simply mistranslations of Aramaic originals must be tempered by comparison to contemporary evidence.

5. Aramaic Literary Forms in Prose and Poetry
   The characteristics of Aramaic (vs. Hebrew) poetry need to be defined. Not all poetry in Aramaic is Aramaic poetry.

6. Aramaic and Variant Readings in the New Testament Text-Tradition
   Because Codex Bezae may preserve an early or even original Aramaism does not necessarily denote an early date for the document as a whole. Further, independence of later (Syriac) corruption needs to be established.

7. Jewish Literary Traditions Found in the New Testament and in Known Aramaic Literature
   Correspondence does not necessitate dependence. Simply because a similar textual tradition occurs in the New Testament as is found in the non-Qumran Targums does not mean that the author used that Targum as a source.

8. Aramaic Epistolography
   Our current understanding of Aramaic epistolography is too incomplete to offer any sound conclusions. While such study is unlikely to have a direct bearing on the New Testament epistles, it is a desideratum for purposes of comparison.
3.2 Elliott Maloney

Elliott Maloney wrote *Semitic Interference in Marcan Syntax* as his doctoral dissertation under Joseph Fitzmyer. In this work, Maloney restricted himself to the third of Fitzmyer's elements, multi-lingual interference.\(^{14}\) Whereas Black used Codex Bezae, Maloney relies upon the text-critical conclusions of the Nestle-Aland committee as "the" Greek text of Mark.\(^{15}\)

Within the realm of multi-lingual interference, Maloney purposely does not assert Semitic interference which he discovered. Rather, he discusses the validity of the syntactic elements asserted by others.\(^{16}\) He compares the alleged Semitisms against the non-Atticist, Hellenistic littérateurs and the Greek of the Egyptian, non-literary papyri.\(^{17}\) Then, Maloney's method is to compare the syntagneme to its equivalent in the following dialects of Hebrew: classical, late-biblical, Qumran.


\(^{15}\)Maloney relies on the Nestle-Aland *Novum Testamentum Graece*, revised twenty-sixth edition (Maloney, *Semitic Interference*, 35). In doing so, however, he notes the work of Kilpatrick who suggested that the more Semitic New Testament texts may be more original. Cf. George D. Kilpatrick, "Atticism and the Text of the Greek New Testament" in *Neutestamentliche Aufsätze* ed. J. Blinzler et al. (Regensburg: Pustet, 1963), 126–127. Maloney underscores three possible ways Christian scribes of the second century may have sought to "cleanse" the New Testament texts after the "parting of the ways" in the late first century:

1. Elimination of Semitisms
2. Revising non-literary Koine to a more sophisticated, literary style
3. Atticizing the mottled style of first-century Judaean Greek

The evidence for these, however, is rather slight when one considers the number of Semitisms that allegedly "survived" and the relatively rough syntax of many New Testament authors.

\(^{16}\)Maloney relies especially on Howard's "Semitisms of the New Testament," a part of Howard's 1929 volume *Accidence and Word-Formation*, the second volume in J.H. Moulton's *A Grammar of New Testament Greek* (Maloney, *Semitic Interference*, 45 and 268). While such a work was certainly desirous, his review serves only to clarify what is still valid without substantially adding to the number of Semitisms known to us.

\(^{17}\)One should note that Maloney does not explicitly clarify the contents of these corpora anywhere save the volume index.
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(QH), and "proto-Mishnaic Hebrew materials." Third, the syntagmeme is held against the contemporaneous Aramaic evidence from Qumran and the earlier, biblical writings in Daniel and Ezra. Finally, the Old Greek version of the Hebrew Bible is used for comparison.

While Maloney's approach is, by far, the most rigorous approach seen yet for a single volume on the Aramaic problem, it has several innate problems. These are addressed in Section 3.3.2, "On Bilingual Interference" (page 63).

3.3 Problems in These Approaches

With the discovery of a significant number of Aramaic texts at Qumran, New Testament Aramaic scholarship finally had a dialect of Aramaic that was of the same general time frame and location as that of the early church. Further, with the discovery of the Qumran scrolls and the Bar Kokhba letters, modern scholarship has a more informed view of the relevant linguistic milieu, as detailed in Section 1.2 (page 4). As Fitzmyer observed about the works written on the New Testament Aramaic problem prior to the discovery and assessment of Qumran Aramaic:

The recovery of earlier Aramaic from extrabiblical sources has been largely an achievement of this century; and when it comes to Palestinian Aramaic of the first century it is almost a matter of discoveries of the last two decades (i.e., since 1959/1960). As a result, the older material that has been written on the problem of Aramaic and the NT

---

18 Maloney, Semitic Interference, 40.
19 Fitzmyer has written a myriad of articles on the subject but has not yet presented a comprehensive treatment.
can only be used today *with great caution*.\textsuperscript{20}

While the adherents of the Targumic approach observed many difficult areas, their conclusions must be re-evaluated against a more relevant, first-century, literary Judaean dialect: Qumran Aramaic.

### 3.3.1 Some Corrective Qualities

As detailed in Table 3.1 (page 60), Fitzmyer has identified eight aspects of the NT Aramaic problem.\textsuperscript{21} In those aspects, Fitzmyer has rightly addressed, albeit in principle alone, many of the problems of language dynamics and literary genre which eluded those who advanced the Targumic approach. However, just as Dalman and Kahle were the first to address the New Testament Aramaic problem critically and were not able to consider the issues modern scholarship takes for granted, Fitzmyer and Maloney have advanced the quest significantly in some areas but have not developed the inquiry beyond a preliminary level in others.\textsuperscript{22} This is due in large part to the non-systematic fashion with which the problem has been addressed.

### 3.3.2 On Bilingual Interference

While Maloney's study on Semitic interference in the text of Mark is invaluable for the New Testament Aramaic problem, it covers only half the ground necessary

\textsuperscript{20}Fitzmyer, *Wandering Aramean*, 3. Material in parentheses inserted by the present author.


\textsuperscript{22}One example of this is in the determination of whether constructions in New Testament Greek reflect first-century Aramaic. While Fitzmyer is right to point to first-century Aramaic texts as the Aramaic corpus of choice, he does not develop the necessary controls of the Greek and Hebrew corpora. This, however, was developed in part by Maloney, presumably with Fitzmyer's counsel. Cf. Maloney, *Semitic Interference*, 35–45. Our observations on the value of Maloney's study may be found in §3.3.2.
to address the problem in a critical manner. Chapter III of his study presents a detailed analysis of several Semitisms that had been alleged in Marcan syntax. In that the method is to consider the evidence for these Semitisms in the extant literature, Maloney’s study provides a great service to the scholarly community. However, as a comprehensive treatment of Semitic interference in the second Gospel, the method falters on two accounts.

First, it does not stem from a systematic knowledge of the three relevant languages. Rather, the databank of Semitisms whence Maloney draws is the various Semitisms previously alleged by Howard and others. Consequently, Maloney’s work is more a critical review of alleged Semitisms than an advancement of new ones.

Second, the work does not offer conclusive criteria for discerning between Hebrew and Aramaic but, because of the constraints of Maloney’s method, is restricted to commenting on Semitic and non-Semitic interference — and that without the comprehensiveness that comes from a systematic approach.

As a result of these two shortcomings, the value of Maloney’s work is in laying some of the groundwork for future studies. However, as noted here, a more comprehensive study is needed and will require a systematic knowledge of the three relevant languages as used in first-century Judaea.

---

23 Maloney, *Semitic Interference*. For a summary of Maloney’s method see §3.2.
3.3.3 Some Things Are Lost in Translation

Outside of Black’s *Approach* and various attempts born of pre-Qumran Targumic studies, little was offered in the way of retroversion after the discovery of the Qumran Scrolls. Fitzmyer, Maloney, and those who agreed with the former’s approach to the question simply did not take up the issue. However, in a 1988 article, Fitzmyer endeavored to reverse translate Philippians 2:6-11 into an alleged Aramaic *Vorlage*. This is a milestone in that it illustrates succinctly some of what Qumran Aramaic can contribute to New Testament Aramaic studies. However, as demonstrated in our extensive critique below, it also highlights problems which any attempt at reverse translation needs to address. Fitzmyer’s translation is shown against the Nestle-Aland Greek text in Table 3.2.26

3.3.3.1 The Need to Assume an Aramaic Original

Fitzmyer begins with the assumption that the passage had a textual ancestor in Aramaic.27 While this assumption is in-line with the tradition of Lohmeyer,28

---


26The translation is taken from Fitzmyer, “Aramaic Background of Philippians”, 482; verse numbers were added from Fitzmyer’s transliteration. Also, the original translation contained typographical errors (e.g., אָל in v.6) and has been corrected here according to Fitzmyer’s transliteration. Verse 3d (ἐγκεκριμένος δὲ στάσις) is placed in brackets as it is widely considered to be a Pauline addition. Cf. Fitzmyer, “Aramaic Background of Philippians”, 473.

The Greek text is that of the Nestle-Aland *Novum Testamentum Graece* (27th ed).


Table 3.2: The Greek text of Philippians 2:6-11 and Fitzmyer’s translation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nestle-Aland text</th>
<th>Fitzmyer’s translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 ὡς ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων</td>
<td>ὡς ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 σὺν ἄρπαγμον ἠγίστατο</td>
<td>σὺν ἄρπαγμον ἠγίστατο</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 ἀλλὰ ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν</td>
<td>ἀλλὰ ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 ἵνα καὶ ὁ θεὸς αὐτὸν ὑπεράψωσεν</td>
<td>ἵνα καὶ ὁ θεὸς αὐτὸν ὑπεράψωσεν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 τὸ ὄνομα τὸ ὑπὲρ πᾶν ὄνομα,</td>
<td>τὸ ὄνομα τὸ ὑπὲρ πᾶν ὄνομα,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 ἵνα ἐν τῷ ὄνοματι Ἰησοῦ</td>
<td>ἵνα ἐν τῷ ὄνοματι Ἰησοῦ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 πᾶν γὰρ κάμψη</td>
<td>πᾶν γὰρ κάμψη</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 ἐπομακρύνοντας καὶ ἑπηγεῖον καὶ καταθηκὴν</td>
<td>ἐπομακρύνοντας καὶ ἑπηγεῖον καὶ καταθηκὴν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 καὶ πάσα γλώσσα ἐξουσιοδοτήσει ὅτι</td>
<td>καὶ πάσα γλώσσα ἐξουσιοδοτήσει ὅτι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός</td>
<td>κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 εἰς δόξαν θεοῦ πατρὸς.</td>
<td>εἰς δόξαν θεοῦ πατρὸς.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fitzmyer’s translation:

6 ὡς ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων
7 σὺν ἄρπαγμον ἠγίστατο
8 ἀλλὰ ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν
9 ἵνα καὶ ὁ θεὸς αὐτὸν ὑπεράψωσεν
10 τὸ ὄνομα τὸ ὑπὲρ πᾶν ὄνομα,
11 ἵνα ἐν τῷ ὄνοματι Ἰησοῦ
12 πᾶν γὰρ κάμψη
13 ἐπομακρύνοντας καὶ ἑπηγείον καὶ καταθηκὴν
14 καὶ πάσα γλώσσα ἐξουσιοδοτήσει ὅτι
15 κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός
16 εἰς δόξαν θεοῦ πατρὸς.
Levertoff,29 and Grelot,30 the question must still be answered as to why the text is not likely to have been in Greek or Hebrew originally. Obviously, the fact that one can render a text into a particular language does not necessitate its existence in that language in antiquity.

The only apparent way of discerning an Aramaic original from a Greek text is through negative proofs developed from the grammar of the Greek and Hebrew corpora most relevant to the earliest Christian textual traditions. Only after a text has been demonstrated not to reflect the known grammar of the other two main languages used in first-century Judaea can one justifiably address its possible Aramaic origins. Save for certain obvious morphemic or phonemic echoes in Greek transliteration of an Aramaic word or phrase (e.g., ταλιακοιομελομενοι), modern scholarship cannot readily establish Aramaic phrasing from Hebrew or Greek as echoed in a Greek text.

The consequent requirement to assume an Aramaic original highlights the need for complementary grammars of the Hebrew and Greek of first-century Judaea.31 Among English language resources, the grammatical standard reference work for Greek among New Testament scholars, A Greek Grammar of the New Testament,32 is over forty years out of date, being translated from the ninth-tenth edition of the original. There are two major problems with using this work to approach the problem of Aramaic sources behind the NT. First, it is focused almost exclusively on the Greek of the NT, not having been developed from the

31On the need for the grammatical study of first-century QH texts, see our discussion below.
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larger Hellenistic corpus.\[^{33}\] Second, while the original work has been updated to an eighteenth edition,\[^{34}\] the English-speaking world does not include this in its standard repertory. Instead, continued use is made of the 1961 translation by Robert Funk.\[^{35}\] Another standard work, the four-part grammar by Moulton, Howard, and Turner, was completed over seventy years (1906–1976) and, again, treats the Greek of the New Testament as a dialect unto itself and with secondary consideration being given to its linguistic and literary environment.\[^{36}\]

In terms of Hebrew, no grammar of exclusively first-century Hebrew exists. The only English-language grammar of Qumran Hebrew is that of Qimron.\[^{37}\] Obviously, this slender volume is not as comprehensive as would be necessary for determining the standard characteristics of QH.\[^{38}\] Qimron’s corpus is relatively small and excludes texts from the common era.\[^{39}\] However, while the corpus predates the common era, it is still relevant for New Testament studies as it illustrates the tendencies leading up to the first century CE and may be used as a control

\[^{33}\]The model of Blass and Debrunner follows the traditional view of separating the Greek of the New Testament from the rest of Koine Greek. This division is artificial and should be discarded. Rather, the Greek of the New Testament must be considered against other documents from the time. The only grammar of Koine texts known to address the phonology and morphology of the Greek papyri is Francis T. Gignac, *A Grammar of the Greek Papyri of the Roman and Byzantine Periods* (Milano: Istituto Editoriale Cisalpino-La Goliardica, 1976), Testi e documenti per lo studio dell’antichità 55.

\[^{34}\]The most recent publication is in 2001, but this is merely a reprint of the 1976 edition, revised by Friedrich Rehkopf. Cf. Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch, Cited 2 July 2003. Online: http://newfirstsearch.uk.oclc.org.

\[^{35}\]Blass, DeBrunner, and Funk, *Greek Grammar of the NT*.


\[^{37}\]Elisha Qimron, *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press, 1986). This is an abridged, English translation of Qimron’s Hebrew grammar of the same corpus. Unfortunately, while we have been told of this earlier Hebrew work, we have not been able to find bibliographic information for it.

\[^{38}\]If one omits §§500 and 600 and the indices of Qimron’s grammar, one is left with a seventy-two page treatise (pp. 14–86).

\[^{39}\]Cf. Qimron, *Hebrew of the DSS*, §0.12.
for general stylistic tendencies of the time. Naturally, a grammar based on first-century QH texts is to be desired. Until such time as either Qimron's fuller work is rendered in a more commonly understood language or a more comprehensive work becomes available in English (or another modern language), the field of New Testament Aramaic study will proceed awkwardly, where it can, and without a necessary control mechanism. This lack consequently necessitates, but does not justify, the common assumption of an Aramaic original on the part of Fitzmyer and others who work this field.

3.3.3.2 A Problem of Aramaic Grammar

Further compounding the problem of an assumed Aramaic source, Fitzmyer justifies his vocabulary and morphological choices based largely on QA. However, as demonstrated in Part II of the present work, QA is not completely standardized in its morphology.\(^{40}\) Hence, any translation should be accompanied by an apology for the forms chosen.

With respect to Fitzmyer's justification of his translation, the issue of syntax is virtually omitted. This problem is compounded by the fact that there is so little Aramaic poetry available for comparison and study. Because of this scarcity, the unfortunate state of affairs is that one cannot be sure what makes Aramaic poetry different from Hebrew poetry. Indeed, we cannot be sure if there even are any significant differences.\(^{41}\)

---

\(^{40}\)See Chapter 8, "Morphology".

The fact that Philippians 2:5–11 is commonly held to be a "hymn of Christ" and to be poetry, therefore, suggests the need for the syntax of Aramaic poetry to be brought as a comparison. Elsewhere, Fitzmyer counts seven sources for Aramaic poetry (Fitzmyer, Wandering Aramean, 16–17):

1. the Carpentras stele (c. 4th c. BCE). Obviously, the relevance of this text is compromised
Chapter 3: Fitzmyer, Maloney and Their Use of Qumran Aramaic

As a consequence of these limitations, Fitzmyer must build on the earlier works of Levertoff, who used the later Galilean Aramaic, and Grelot, who used an amalgam of the Palestinian Targums and a selection of QA texts as representative of first-century Judaean Aramaic. The result is a translation that may be correct in that the forms included are attested in QA or BA. The syntax of the poetry is questionable, however, being determined by word-for-word rendering from the Greek text.

An example of this problem is with regard to the use of נָמָר for εἰναι in his translation of verse 6 (τὸ εἰσιν οὐ θεῖν). While this is literally accurate, the use of נָמָר as an epexegetical infinitive is not found in the Aramaic from Qumran, somewhat by its early dating.

3. Tobit 8:5–6, 15–17; 13:1–8. Of these, only three verses are extant in Aramaic (13:6-8 in 4QpapTob 17 ii.1–6).
4. 11QTgJob. However, as Fitzmyer asks, while this is poetry in Aramaic, is it necessarily Aramaic poetry?
5. some of the proverbs of Ahikar.
7. a rhythmic meter in the paratactic clauses of 4QApocalypse (i.e., 4Q246).

Cf. also Fitzmyer, Wandering Aramean, 17.

Fitzmyer’s study on the Kyrios-hymn is exploratory and conjectural, to be sure. Lest we be accused of being as the fox and the grapes, our criticism here is intended to take inventory of what steps would be needed to validate Fitzmyer’s work.


As Fitzmyer notes, the classifying of the Palestinian Targums as being of the same era as Qumran Aramaic is questionable and, in our judgment, wrong. Cf. Fitzmyer, “Aramaic Background of Philippians”, 474.

Fitzmyer does vary slightly for reasons of syntax. However, this is the exception and not the rule. The reasons for variation are deduced from his own experience with the texts and are not systematically developed anywhere. See the justification for נָמָר in Fitzmyer, “Aramaic Background of Philippians”, 477.
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despite Fitzmyer’s attempt at justification. The form in question occurs twice in QA: 11QTgJob xv.5 and 4QLevib 1 i.18. The first reflects an objective infinitive. The second is an infinitive of purpose.47

Similar issues might be raised about other parts of the translation, as well. The use of -ו as an object complement in verse 9 requires clarification. While not without precedent at Qumran, it is not necessary for the meaning of the sentence. Fitzmyer does not state why he chooses to use it.

Also in verse 9, the use of את implant for “that is above” is disputable. את implant occurs once in 1QapGen xx.7; however, there it requires the complement of a -ו. The only place where את implant occurs in conjunction with את but without the -ו in our period is in non-literary Aramaic from Murabba’at and Nahal Şe’elim.48 And there the phrase is את implant not implant את.

Another problem may be seen in the use of נחרת in verse 10. As Qumran Aramaic leaves off the prefixed -ו in 4Q213a 1 ii.17 and 11QTgJob xx.1, one is left to wonder why the -ו is included here.

Simply because a form occurs in a dialect within close proximity to the early Christian writings either geographically or chronologically does not mean one

47The first of these infinitives occurs in conjunction with את for a partitive effect. The second may be considered to express result. The context of the two lines are as follows:

11QTgJob xv.5: נחרת ממלאתו מכביד עני... ] their [father] is from being the dogs of [my] sheep.

4QLevib 1 i.18: ...עלוּ מְלַכְוֹ הַמַּעֲרָבָּה לָכָּה... ] upon me, Lord, and draw me near to be for you...


may use it as a one-to-one correspondence to the Greek text. The syntax of the forms must be considered in a more systematic fashion than they have been in this rendering of Philippians 2.

3.3.3.3 On Literal Translation Technique

Given our lack of grammatic knowledge and the want of further translation studies related to ancient Greek texts, scholarship currently endures an inability to distinguish clearly between Aramaic and Hebrew sources behind Greek documents. Consequently, Fitzmyer must assume that any Greek translation that occurred was a literal rendering of the alleged Aramaic source of the hymn. This overlooks a few problems which must be addressed. Although we here critique Fitzmyer’s translation, the critique is equally applicable to any work of reverse translation.

While literal translation technique is known in the ancient world, it does not seem to have been employed as much among first-century texts as in earlier documents. The premier example of literal translation in antiquity is the LXX Pentateuch. Concerning the use of literal translation techniques, Olofsson has noted:

The main factor behind the adoption of a literal translation technique in the LXX Pentateuch was presumably the convenience of this approach since the translators had no instruments that could facilitate the, in many respects, more complicated free translation process; no grammars, lexica, concordances or commentaries, and probably not even any earlier translation that they could use as their model. At the most they or at least the later translators may have employed some sort of a primitive glossary that would make the consistent rendering
of words, which is one of the most prominent aspects of the literal approach, easier. But there are no concrete evidences that the trans­lators used either dictionaries or word lists. They did not employ any system with notes on alternative translations or interpretations. All these circumstances paved the way for their choice of translation technique, because with a literal approach they could preserve some of the (sometimes alleged) ambiguity of the original.49

While the majority of the LXX exhibits literal translation technique,50 this is not due to an ignorance on the part of the translators but is due to their respect for the


50Throughout the present work, we use the term LXX to mean the standard Greek translations of the contents of the Hebrew Bible. We refer to works not included in the Hebrew Bible but that were later translated into Greek as part of the Apocrypha (a.k.a., the Deuterocanonical works), Pseudepigrapha (e.g., 1 Enoch), or otherwise non-biblical, historical works (e.g., the works of Josephus), as relevant. Further, any additions to the works represented in the Hebrew Bible are recognized as additions and the Hebrew Bible material is assumed to be reflective of the original form and length of the work in question. For more on the various meanings of the term “LXX” see Melvin K.H. Peters, “Septuagint” in The Anchor Bible Dictionary on CD-ROM (Logos Library System Version 2.0c, 1995, 1996).

Any description of Septuagintal translation technique is by necessity general in its scope. Translation technique varies widely throughout the Septuagint. The Pentateuch tends to exhibit a very literal style of translation. As one proceeds from the Pentateuch to the Prophets, however, the style tends to become progressively more liberal. The Writings tend to reflect even freer techniques of translation. Olofsson goes on to state (Olofsson, The LXX Version, 33-34):

The Septuagint displays a great variety in the style of the language and in the translation technique adopted. It is actually a collection of translations together with original Greek compositions that belong to different periods of times and are translated according to different principles. This must be kept in mind when the more general characteristics of Septuagint Greek are discussed. By the designation “Septuagint Greek” I refer to the typical traits of the overwhelming majority of books that are translations, leaving out of account the original Greek works. I especially have those books in mind which are translated in a literal way. There are also great differences in the translation technique in general as well as in the choice of equivalents between different books of the LXX... Every translation unit has to be dealt with separately.
object of translation. Conversely, when one surveys the non-canonical Jewish works that were translated into Greek, one finds more fluid translation techniques used consistently.

The use of less-literal translation techniques in non-canonical literature calls into question the uncritical use of literal translation techniques in retroverting any

---


Some studies have discounted an Aramaic Vorlage to B.J. citing as evidence:

- the verb μεταφάτω which Josephus uses in B.J. 1.3 properly means to recast and not to translate.
- Josephus never again mentions an Aramaic original or his translation of it.
- the Atticized Greek prevalent in B.J. is not likely to have been derived from an Aramaic original.


In response to these criticisms, Nodet has suggested that Josephus drafted the first, Greek translation of his work himself, without assistants. This version would have many of the Semitisms which Nodet finds in Slavonic Josephus. However, Josephus’ Greek-speaking assistants cleansed this version when they rendered the later Greek version. Cf. Étienne Nodet, “Jewish Features in the ‘Slavonic’ War of Josephus” Cited 8 July 2003. Online: http://www.josephus.yorku.ca/pdf/nodet2000.pdf (presented at the annual meeting of the SBL, Nashville, Tenn., 21 November 2000), 26.
New Testament pericope. Therefore, it is incumbent on anyone who asserts a reverse translation to justify the technique they employ.

### 3.3.3.4 Misappropriation of Sources

A final concern must be voiced about Fitzmyer’s sources. While Fitzmyer is not as boundless as Casey, his unquantified references to the LXX and the Bar Kokhba literature are questionable. The LXX was by no means favored throughout the Empire but seems to have been discounted, though not wholly disparaged, in first-century Judaea. The Bar Kokhba letters and related texts, by contrast, are comparatively less important than QA because of their genre and dating. While they may give marginal support for the probability of a morpheme having existed

---

53In order to assert that an ancient translator would have used a literal translation technique, presumably from a perspective of respect (per Olofsson, *The LXX Version*, 7-8), one must demonstrate a similar status of authority within the community or communities involved.

An illustration of less-literal translation of the Decalogue may be found in James 2:11. See §3.3.3.4, n.56.

54See §4.3.2.

55For a list of the Greek manuscripts from Qumran, see Emanuel Tov, “Lists of Specific Groups of Texts from the Judaean Desert” in *The Texts from the Judaean Desert* ed. Emanuel Tov, DJD 39, 215-216. It is worth noting that these thirty-seven texts comprise a very small fraction of the Qumran corpus. Further, their role for the community of the Qumran scrolls is not clear.

56This may be reflected in the clear use of LXX only once by the author of James, the only NT manuscript to claim Judaean origin. The other six quotations from the Hebrew Bible are either overtly translated from the Hebrew (e.g., James 2:11) or are of an unclear origin.

We here follow Judaean authorship of James for reasons outlined in a paper we presented to the SBL Pacific Region meeting held March 17, 1998, entitled “On the Nature of δόμημα τῆς ἔλευθερίας in James 1.25.” The summary of these reasons are as follows: there is no mention of Paul or the Gentile question, Jewish tradition is not argued but assumed, the unfriendly diaspora to which James is directed thus becomes persecuted Jews, and the amalgamation of the various known Jesus traditions in the one letter argues for either very early or very late dating. Given the (contested) references to Jesus, these may be Christian Jews. As Hengel and Sevenster have shown, superior Greek is not an obstacle to the possibility of Judaean authorship. Martin Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974); Jan N. Sevenster, *Do You Know Greek? How Much Greek Could the First Jewish Christians Have Known?* Vol. 19, (Leiden: Brill, 1968), 3–21. For a more recent treatment of the Judaean hypothesis, see Todd C. Penner, *The Epistle of James and Eschatology* (Sheffield: SAP, 1996), JSOT Supplement 121, 37.
in first-century Judaea, they should be used in a qualified manner simply because they postdate the text in question.57

3.3.4 Conclusion: The Need for Comprehensive Grammars

Therefore, while Fitzmyer has touched upon many of the salient issues for the New Testament Aramaic problem, we must conclude that these issues will only be resolved in the light of a grammar of Qumran Aramaic. The closest Fitzmyer comes to addressing the characteristics of this dialect is in his "Sketch of Qumran Aramaic."58 Unfortunately, this treatment was restricted to the grammar of the Genesis Apocryphon. While this text is certainly among the most relevant for New Testament Aramaic studies, the rest of the QA corpus should also be processed in order to give the fullest field of view.

Furthermore, for reverse translation studies to be more scientific and less conjectural, up-to-date grammatical touchstones are needed for Hellenistic Greek and Late Second Temple Hebrew. The present grammars are simply insufficient for the task, having been written for different purposes. Put simply, we cannot currently distinguish with confidence and regularity the differences (1) between “good” Greek used by a native Greek speaker and “good” Greek used by a non-native Greek speaker and (2) between “bad” Greek used by a native speaker and “bad” Greek used by a non-native speaker.

57Cf. Fitzmyer, “Aramaic Background of Philippians”, 477. While legal texts may be argued to preserve earlier forms, the matter of how conservative any given legal text is in its preservation of forms is debatable. No evidence for an institutional or otherwise systematic adjustment of the legal idiom of antiquity exists. therefore, we suggest that changes in legal idiom occurred with relative randomness. The amount of conservation in the texts would be uneven, therefore. This unevenness renders their value for our purposes to be questionable.

Greek used by a non-native speaker. Consequently, the consideration of a pericope as having a non-Greek or even an Aramaic substratum because of its grammar is not tenable given the present state of academic inquiry.

Where we are able to speak with any degree of confidence about a Semitic ancestor of a Greek text, we are not able to discern readily and regularly whether a Hebrew or an Aramaic source is involved. As described in Section 1.2, Hebrew and Aramaic were used side-by-side, with the latter seeming to have been used more often. Hence, in order to justify the assertion of an Aramaic textual ancestor adequately, one must first rule out the possibility of either a Greek or a Hebrew source. At present, modern scholarship cannot do this with confidence.

These significant breaks in our understanding will only be resolved with a greater awareness of the intralinguistic differences and the interlinguistic relationships present in first-century Judaea. The only apparent way of attaining these is through a more developed knowledge of the grammar and styles employed by writers of each of the three major languages used at this time and place. Finally, as much as grammars of the relevant Greek and Hebrew are desiderata, the aforementioned problems illustrate that any inquiry into the New Testament Aramaic problem has the obvious and critical need for a grammar of Qumran Aramaic, the literary dialect closest to the literary works of the earliest Christians.

59 For this reason, Maloney's treatise on Mark is restricted to Semitic interference. Cf. Maloney, Semitic Interference.
60 Cf. §4.1, especially page 84.
Chapter 4

Hybrid Approaches

Before entering into a discussion of the grammar of QA, it is desirable to review the works of two other scholars. The approaches of Wilcox and Casey endeavor to blend the use of QA with other dialects of Aramaic. Such arguments for a *via media* seek to forge an Aramaic approach which combines the aural aspect of the Targums and/or other dialects of Aramaic with the early dating of the Qumran literary texts. Wilcox grants a significant degree of continued relevance to the Targumic literature. Casey uses an amalgam of corpora to retrovert the Greek to an Aramaic *Vorlage* which he then proceeds to exegete.

4.1 The Approach of Max Wilcox

Wilcox, a student of Matthew Black, not surprisingly favors the Targumic approach in the published version of his doctoral thesis, *The Semitisms of Acts*.\(^1\)

\(^1\)Max Wilcox, *The Semitisms of Acts* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965), 21–30. A revised and expanded version of his doctoral thesis, this work was originally drafted for a Ph.D. in 1955, eight years after the discovery of the Qumran scrolls. The value of the scrolls for Wilcox’s study are naturally underestimated because all of the Aramaic scrolls had not yet been discovered, never-
While he makes use of some of the Dead Sea Scrolls, this is largely peripheral to the core of his evidence, drawn from the Targums and the Septuagint. However, in later essays — “Semitisms in the New Testament,” “The Aramaic Background of the New Testament,” and “Semiticisms in the NT” — Wilcox nuances his approach to include more of the Qumran scrolls. For the purpose of this review, we shall constrain our study to these later treatments.

Among the commendations for addressing this later perspective instead of the earlier one is the increased number of Qumran scrolls which have been released. Wilcox’s approach naturally has become more nuanced and more comprehensive, considering the larger QA corpus as well as the whole of the New Testament instead of a single book.

In “Semitisms in the New Testament,” Wilcox presents a comprehensive approach to the problem, a treatment on par with Fitzmyer. The latter two works ("The Aramaic Background of the New Testament" and "The Semiticisms of the New Testament") are not as extensive and will, therefore, be used here to augment the first.

It should be noted that, as with all of the scholarly approaches reviewed in mind released (Cave 11 was not discovered until 1956). Later works show Wilcox’s view refined to include the Qumran texts.

2The Damascus Document (CD), the Community Rule, the Hodayot, 4QFlorilegium, 4QTestimonia, and the Genesis Apocryphon are referenced by Wilcox. He also uses Murabba‘at 42 for confirmation of conclusions taken from other works. Wilcox, *Semitisms of Acts*, 91.


the present work, this first section (§4.1) offers an uncritical summary which is followed by a critique of Wilcox’s approach (§4.2).

Wilcox delineates three stages of the problem: interpreting the textual evidence from the period in question, determining which dialects of Hebrew and Aramaic are appropriate for comparison, and distinguishing Aramaic from Hebrew.\(^7\) Interpreting the textual evidence, Wilcox’s overriding question is "How does one distinguish a Semitism from other grammatical phenomena?" To this end, he highlights a series of textual elements which are likely to occur in the New Testament and allied literature but which are not properly Semitisms.\(^8\) These are detailed in Table 4.1, “Textual Elements not to be Considered as Semitisms, per Wilcox”.\(^9\)

After determining that a linguistic construction is (1) not likely to have been commonly used among native Greek speakers and (2) unlikely to have come from

---

\(^7\) Wilcox, “Semitisms in NT”, 986–992.

\(^8\) These elements have been addressed singularly by a myriad of scholars. Wilcox, however, pulls the threads of discussion together to illustrate the greater tapestry.

\(^9\) As Wilcox notes, the first item in this table was originally put forth in James H. Moulton, *Prolegomena Vol. 1, A Grammar of New Testament Greek* (Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1908), 981.


Wilcox also provides a summary of his view, but he skips some issues which are particularly relevant for our discussion. The four points he highlights are as follows:

1. Possible septuagintalisms should be excluded from consideration in the first instance; they may need to be reviewed later, in the light of other data.

2. We need to determine dialect(s) of Aramaic, Hebrew and even Syriac which may be used as proper models for assessing NT Semitisms.

3. The several Semitic languages must be kept distinct.

4. We should see how far such Semitisms may point to written or oral sources, or bilingualism, and what light they may throw on inter-Synoptic deviations.

[Each item is taken verbatim from Wilcox, “Semitisms in NT”, 986].
Table 4.1: Textual Elements not to be Considered as Semitisms, per Wilcox

1. Locutions which were rare in ancient Greek but which came into prominence among Semites due to their Semitic parallel.

2. Semitisms may exist in the “touch-stone” documents, thus corrupting the standard. (981)

3. Given the Hebrew and Aramaic Vorlagen to the Septuagint, Semitisms are of little surprise despite it having been translated in a predominantly Greek-speaking atmosphere. In the compositional environment of the early Christian traditions, Greek competed with Aramaic and Hebrew. The possibility of New Testament Semitisms is even greater, and such evidence should be considered in its complete context where it is found. (981)

4. Given the multi-lingual environment of first-century Judaea, one must not discount the possibility that, in addition to Aramaic, Jesus spoke Greek also. (981)

5. Greek and Aramaic interpenetrated each other’s vocabulary. (981-982)

6. The sources whence the Gospel narratives were drawn are not necessarily singular documents as popular, source-critical theories would suppose. There may, in fact, be “isolated units of primitive tradition.” Also, these units may not have been received in the same language. (983)

7. “Septuagintalism” is too broad a term. Users of this term should clarify which of three meanings are intended: (1) those constructions used widely in LXX, (2) constructions occurring in both LXX and NT but rarely in the former, and (3) constructions which appear to be formed after the pattern of LXX. Only the first of these should be considered a ‘true’ Septuagintalism for purposes of New Testament study. (984-985)
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Septuagintal influence, Wilcox states that one must determine whether the construction is of Semitic origin. Wilcox maintains five criteria for the Aramaic and Hebrew corpora most desirable for such a study (see Table 4.2, “Wilcox’s Characteristics of Desirable Corpora”).

Table 4.2: Wilcox’s Characteristics of Desirable Corpora

1. Close in date and geographical distribution to the persons and events mentioned in the NT,
2. Akin to the spoken forms of the languages in idiom, grammar, syntax and literary form,
3. Not itself under suspicion of being a translation, but as far as possible a free composition,
4. Preserved in texts containing at least some of the teaching-forms represented in the Jesus-material (e.g., sayings, parables, ‘cases’, and debates),
5. Available in samples large enough to permit the drawing of reasonably credible conclusions about its proper grammar, syntax and idiom.

Surveying the Qumran scrolls and the Bar Kokhba correspondence, Wilcox affirms Segal’s earlier assertion that Hebrew was a living language in first-century Judaea. It was not, as was maintained prior to the Qumran discoveries, an artificial language of the elite. He argues that, since pre-Mishnaic Hebrew is closer to first-century Aramaic than is (post-)classical Hebrew, the Tannaitic literature should be given greater value in assessing the language spoken in the first-century.

century.\textsuperscript{13}

Next, with regard to Aramaic, Wilcox weighs the value of both Qumran Aramaic and Targumic Aramaic against the aforementioned criteria. He argues that, while Qumran Aramaic has a claim to greater contemporaneity, Targumic Aramaic has at least equal claim in every other criterion. “[I]f the texts from Qumran meet the criteria for date, independent composition and sample-size, the Rabbinical material fits all criteria except that of date.”\textsuperscript{14}

However, Wilcox is quick to point out that similarities between the transliteration of $\text{אָרְמָי} (\text{אָרְמָי})$ in the New Testament\textsuperscript{15} and the vocalization of the Palestinian Targumic tradition\textsuperscript{16} do not argue for the first-century dating of the Targum. Rather, such similarities merely suggest the Palestinian Targum tradition is closer to the first-century Judaean traditions than is \textit{Targum Onqelos}.\textsuperscript{17}

Wilcox duly gives Qumran Aramaic pride of place for the study of the New Testament Aramaic problem. However, he would complement the data offered by QA with the Aramaic from the Bar Kokhba letters and the Palestinian Targums.\textsuperscript{18}

While an exact dating of the Palestinian Targumic tradition is out of the reach of


\textsuperscript{14}Wilcox, “Semitisms in NT”, 989.

\textsuperscript{15}Mk 10:51 and Jn 20:16.

\textsuperscript{16}Gen. 44:18.

\textsuperscript{17}Wilcox, “Semitisms in NT”, 989–990.

\textsuperscript{18}In a 1984 essay, Wilcox also cites as witnesses Samaritan Aramaic and the Christian Palestinian Aramaic texts. However, he backs away from this assertion in his Anchor Bible Dictionary article on Semitisms and his 1994 essay on Aramaisms in the New Testament. See Wilcox, “Semiticisms” and Wilcox, “The Aramaic Background of the New Testament”, 377.
present scholarship, Wilcox, with the Kahle school,\textsuperscript{19} maintains that it should play a critical role in discerning the dialectal characteristics of first-century Judaean Aramaic.\textsuperscript{20}

Finally, Wilcox offers several criteria for distinguishing Aramaic from Hebrew.\textsuperscript{21} In addition to seven elements of syntax distilled from the works of other scholars,\textsuperscript{22} he offers three additional criteria. These are shown in Table 4.3.

Further, with respect to the words of Jesus in particular, Wilcox sets forth three important parameters in which any critical approach to the New Testament problem should work:\textsuperscript{23}

\begin{itemize}
\item[1.] The absence of the Perfect and Imperfect Consecutive forms and their replacement by Imperfect and Perfect respectively.
\item[2.] The use of the Participle as a Present, found in Biblical Hebrew, but very common in Mishnaic Hebrew and Aramaic.
\item[3.] The Periphrastic tenses: the use of the Participle with the Perfect or Imperfect of the verb 'to be' to form frequentative and iterative meanings; a similar use with the Imperative and the Infinitive of the verb 'to be'.
\item[4.] The use of the 3rd. pers. plural of a finite verb, or the plural of a participle, to indicate an indefinite subject.
\item[5.] The use of the relative particle to introduce circumstantial and causal clauses, and with conjunctions or prepositions, to introduce temporal clauses also.
\item[6.] The Ethic Dative with -\textit{7}.
\item[7.] The 'proleptic pronoun': the use of a personal pronoun either in the nominative or in the oblique cases to anticipate a following noun.
\end{itemize}

These elements are still maintained by Wilcox for discerning Aramaic from Hebrew influences on Greek texts. Cf. Wilcox, “Semiticisms”.

\textsuperscript{20}Wilcox, “Semitisms in NT”, 992. This point is developed further in “Aramaic Background” (Wilcox, “The Aramaic Background of the New Testament”, 377).
\textsuperscript{21}It is worth noting that Wilcox considers there to have been two different types of Hebrew in use during the first century: Mishnaic Hebrew and classical Hebrew (Wilcox, “Semitisms in NT”, 993). As noted above, this paradigm has significant flaws which have been demonstrated to be untenable. Cf. Muraoka, “Hebrew”.
\textsuperscript{22}The seven elements which distinguish Aramaic from Hebrew are as follows (The text of this note is drawn verbatim from Wilcox’s essay [993]. Some minor parts have been omitted for the sake of space.):

\begin{itemize}
\item[1.] The absence of the Perfect and Imperfect Consecutive forms and their replacement by Imperfect and Perfect respectively.
\item[2.] The use of the Participle as a Present, found in Biblical Hebrew, but very common in Mishnaic Hebrew and Aramaic.
\item[3.] The Periphrastic tenses: the use of the Participle with the Perfect or Imperfect of the verb 'to be' to form frequentative and iterative meanings; a similar use with the Imperative and the Infinitive of the verb 'to be'.
\item[4.] The use of the 3rd. pers. plural of a finite verb, or the plural of a participle, to indicate an indefinite subject.
\item[5.] The use of the relative particle to introduce circumstantial and causal clauses, and with conjunctions or prepositions, to introduce temporal clauses also.
\item[6.] The Ethic Dative with -\textit{7}.
\item[7.] The ‘proleptic pronoun’: the use of a personal pronoun either in the nominative or in the oblique cases to anticipate a following noun.
\end{itemize}

1. The fact that a saying attributed to Jesus is not in Aramaic or traceable to Aramaic does not render it inauthentic. Jesus may have spoken Hebrew and/or Greek in addition to his home-language of Aramaic.

2. Jesus should be seen as part of his society and not innately at odds with it. Hence, where a Jesus-saying fits into first-century Jewish culture, it is more likely to be genuine.

3. Understanding Jesus and his followers as having lived and moved within first-century Jewish culture in Judaea, one must respect the complexity of that culture and the implications of that complexity for studying the New Testament Aramaic problem.

### 4.2 Problems in Wilcox’s Approach

Among the more modern studies, perhaps no one has thought through the deeper problems of method better than Max Wilcox. For example, none of the other approaches we have surveyed have considered the problems in labeling Septuagint-like words as “Septuagintalisms,” the deeper intricacies of discerning Hebrew

| Table 4.3: Wilcox’s Criteria for Distinguishing Between Hebrew and Aramaic |
| 1. Aramaic or Hebrew words that were transliterated into Greek. |
| 2. Elements of vocabulary, idiom, or syntax which suggest Aramaic or Hebrew influence or that are capable of being interpreted in more than one way. |
| 3. Evidence of a knowledge of Jewish tradition such as is preserved in the Targums and the texts from Qumran. |
from Aramaic, and the possible polyglot nature of both the writers/redactors of source documents and the source documents themselves. There are, however, several issues that are not addressed by his paradigm.

Unlike Fitzmyer and Casey, Wilcox does not offer a reverse translation from Greek into Aramaic. However, although he thereby avoids the issue of translation technique, he overlooks the issue of literary genre and style. Further, while he touches upon the problem of bilingual interference, he apparently overlooks our present need for grammars of first-century Greek, Hebrew, and Aramaic.24

In addition, although the critical points Wilcox makes are legitimate, we find his use of the later Targums to be problematic.25 As Wilcox does not specify the circumstances under which one should turn to the Targums, we assume that he would use the Targums with the QA corpus as a single corpus of comparison. If this is the case, we find this part of his approach to be significantly flawed. For the same reasons that one must treat circumspectly the conclusions of the Targumic approach, one must also cautiously use Targumic grammar and vocabulary when considering the language of first-century Judaea.26

Languages do not develop in straight lines but are organic and, in many instances, can appear random in their development. It is, therefore, questionable to comment on the language of a given time by using a corpus from centuries later. For example, to use a third-century text alone to comment on the grammar of a

---

24 See §3.3.4 “The Need for Comprehensive Grammars.”
25 Our review of Wilcox’s characteristics to be desired in the corpora of comparison may be found in Section 4.1 (page 78). Particular attention should be given to Table 4.2, “Wilcox’s Characteristics of Desirable Corpora.”
language from 200 or more years earlier is dangerous.27 The route which requires the least amount of conjecture excludes the Targumic grammar except to comment on areas not readily found in Qumran Aramaic. As Stuckenbruck has reasoned:

When a word, form, or phrase fails to appear in Middle Aramaic of Palestine, but is found in Official and in a western dialect of Late Aramaic (e.g. Christian Palestinian, Samaritan, Galilean), it is not rash to suppose that it belonged to the language of Jesus and the earliest Christian communities in Palestine.28

The criterion of contemporaneity thus requires one to start with Qumran Aramaic as the foundation of one’s understanding of first-century Judaean literary Aramaic. One may justifiably branch out from there to the Bar Kokhba letters and then to the various corpora both later and earlier by centuries. But one must always give account of the differences in genre, purpose, and circumstances of composition between the corpora.

27We here set aside the problem of whether and to what degree the Targums reflect the religious practice and views of first-century Judaea. This is an issue beyond the scope of the present work.

28Stuckenbruck, “Approach”, 28–29. Italics for “fails” added. Casey may be seen to use a similar argument with respect to the vocabulary used in first-century Judaea. However, such an argument is still flawed in that Casey employs not the Targums but the later Talmuds. The relevance of this dialect for the linguistic study of the New Testament Aramaic problem is questionable for the reasons we have stated in §1.2.5.
4.3 Maurice Casey

4.3.1 His Approach

In 1998, Maurice Casey set forth to reconstruct and exegete the Aramaic sources behind the Gospel of Mark.29 The year 2002 saw him apply this same methodology to the hypothetical source Q.30 In both instances, Casey argues that such a reconstructed Aramaic source would be as close to the original as we can come and that scholarship can reconstruct it now because sufficient vocabulary exists among the textual evidence. As will become obvious, Casey’s perspective differs substantially from our own; our critique of his position appears below in Section 4.3.2 “Problems in Casey’s Approach.”

With regard to the linguistic milieu in which Jesus lived, Casey maintains that there were four languages in first-century Eretz Israel: Aramaic, Latin, Hebrew, and Greek.31 Jesus spoke Aramaic almost exclusively.32 He did not know Latin except for “the occasional Latin loanword.”33 Hebrew was a literary language and therefore not spoken by Jesus.34 However, he might have known some Greek.35 Consequently, Casey concludes: “It follows...that Jesus spoke Aramaic,

29 Maurice Casey, Aramaic sources of Mark’s Gospel (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), SNTSMS 102, 73.
30 Maurice Casey, An Aramaic Approach to Q (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), SNTSMS 122, 51. Because Casey uses the same methodology in the second volume as the first, much of our discussion will be drawn from this earlier work.
31 For Casey’s later (2002) perspective on language dynamics, see Casey, Aramaic Approach to Q, 51–60. Casey’s approach has not changed apparently since his 1998 volume.
32 Casey, Aramaic Sources of Mark’s Gospel, 79.
33 Casey, Aramaic Sources of Mark’s Gospel, 83.
34 Casey, Aramaic Sources of Mark’s Gospel, 79. On this aspect of Casey’s argument, see also Klaus Beyer, Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984), 55–58.
35 “We must conclude that Jesus probably knew more than one word of Greek. He did not, however, generally teach in Greek, so to understand his words we shall need to reconstruct them in their original Aramaic” (Casey, Aramaic Sources of Mark’s Gospel, 83).
that he taught in Aramaic, that accounts of his life and teaching were transmitted in Aramaic, and that Mark’s Gospel contains some literal translation of Aramaic source material."36

Given this extraordinary linguistic environment, Casey clarifies his corpora for comparison in order of priority: the Aramaic of the Dead Sea Scrolls,37 the Palestinian Talmud,38 Christian Palestinian Aramaic,39 and “Aramaic of any period and dialect.”40 The last corpus he includes for finding Aramaic equivalents of rare words.

Having delineated his texts for comparison, Casey discusses the matter of translation technique and the effects of bilingual interference on the New Testament text.41 To this end, he calls upon works in modern Translation Studies and concludes that translators suffer from higher levels of interference than non-translators. The reason for this is that the texts they translate reinforce the in-

36Casey, Aramaic Sources of Mark’s Gospel, 86. While Casey’s conclusion reflected here is, in our judgment, a non sequitur, we present it here with neither justification nor overt criticism but in order to illustrate the logic of Casey’s argumentation.
37Casey, Aramaic Sources of Mark’s Gospel, 91. Casey strangely does not clarify whether he intends the Aramaic from the Qumran scrolls or the later Bar Kokhba correspondence.
39Casey, Aramaic Sources of Mark’s Gospel, 92–93.
40Casey, Aramaic Sources of Mark’s Gospel, 93.
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Consequently, Casey argues, the translators of the New Testament suffered from slavish literalism and occasionally altered the texts according to their cultural biases.

Finally, Casey combines these conceptions of Judaean language dynamics and translation technique into a seven-step "standard procedure for reconstructing Aramaic sources from the witness of our Greek Gospels." This is summarized in Table 4.4.

Table 4.4: Casey's Procedure for Reverse Translation of the Greek Gospels

1. Select passages which show some signs of having been translated literally.
2. Draft a possible Aramaic substratum using the Aramaic of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Where words are not found, the lexica of the aforementioned corpora should be consulted.
3. Verify that the draft reconstruction is appropriately idiomatic.
4. Interpret the resulting reconstruction from a first-century Jewish perspective.
5. Endeavor to read the reconstruction through the eyes of a first-century translator.
6. Infer any deliberate editing by the Gospel writers themselves.
7. Assess the probability of the suggested reconstruction.

---

42 Casey, Aramaic Sources of Mark's Gospel, 95.
43 Casey, Aramaic Sources of Mark's Gospel, 93–107.
44 Casey, Aramaic Sources of Mark's Gospel, 107–110. || Casey, Aramaic Approach to Q, 60–63. In the latter volume, Casey adds one more step: the results should be written in a reader-friendly manner (63).
4.3.2 Problems in Casey’s Approach

Among the approaches discussed in this and the previous chapters, the approach of Maurice Casey is perhaps the most aggressive and the least tenable. In the methodology detailed above, Casey proceeds along several lines which, while relevant to the New Testament Aramaic problem, are either not able to be supported by the present state of research or are simply not justified by himself.

4.3.2.1 Step One: Natural Selection?

In Section 3.3.3.1, “The Need to Assume an Aramaic Original” (page 65), we noted the need for comprehensive grammars of Hellenistic Greek and Qumran Hebrew to clarify (1) which passages in Greek may not have originally been cast in Greek and (2) which of those might have been in Aramaic and which in Hebrew. This discussion also applies to Casey’s first step: selecting passages which might have been translated from non-Greek sources. Casey states that the passages he chose have been noted by others as possibly having an Aramaic source that was “somewhat misread and misunderstood,” This criterion follows a similar vein to that of Maloney’s attempt to ascertain Semitic interference in Mark.

Without a complementary knowledge of Greek, Hebrew, and Aramaic to better clarify the nature of the text, the process of selection is left to a semi-educated kind of intuition. With this comes the inability to judge whether an anomaly in one language that happens to be common in another is the result of a source in

---

45For a discussion of Casey’s approach see §4.3 on page 88. A summary of his eight-part process follows is contained her for ease of reference. All items are quoted verbatim from Casey, Aramaic Approach to Q, 60–63. Items in brackets are inserted for readability or clarity.
46Casey, Aramaic Approach to Q, 60.
the second language or a native speaker of the first using his mother tongue in an irregular way.\textsuperscript{48}

\textbf{4.3.2.2 \ Step Two: A Problem of Dialectal Sources}

In developing a proposed Aramaic substratum, Casey’s process relies on a database of Aramaic phonemes, morphemes, and syntagmeme\textsuperscript{s} which either are yet to be documented in a systematic fashion or are virtually irrelevant to the question. As discussed in Section 1.2, “Language Usage and Attestation” (page 4), the Aramaic of the Qumran scrolls is the most relevant Aramaic dialect for resolving the New Testament Aramaic problem.\textsuperscript{49} Casey, however, does not distinguish between Qumran Aramaic and the Aramaic of the Bar Kokhba letters. Instead, among his sparse references to QA texts, he indiscriminately refers to a letter from Naḥal Ḥever.\textsuperscript{50} This is an artificial amalgamation of a literary dialect and an epistolary dialect from different times, before versus after the First Jewish Revolt.

\textsuperscript{48}See “bad” Greek versus “good” Greek in §3.3.4.

\textsuperscript{49}While ossuaries and other sundry inscriptions exist from Eretz Israel in the period from 200 BCE to 200 CE, one is hard-pressed to consider these as representative of their own dialect. The value of the Qumran scrolls is that, while many (if not all) of the Aramaic scrolls were originally drafted elsewhere, one may proceed with confidence that a single, sizable linguistic community was able to read these texts.

Use of the inscriptions of the other Middle Aramaic dialects is problematic in that one cannot address their correlation to QA without caveats concerning the disparity between the two in terms of genre, geography, or chronology. Further, even if some members of the Qumran community had been familiar with the other corpora, the degree to which this impacted the texts of the community as a whole is doubtful.

\textsuperscript{50}Casey makes reference to 5/6ḤevA nab I.10 (Casey, \textit{Aramaic Sources of Mark’s Gospel}, 211). He dates this to the first century CE. While some of the texts may be dated to 95 CE, it is preferable to refer to the texts from the Babatha archive as from the second century CE. For the date of XḤev/Se 7-50, see Hannah Cotton, “Ḥever, Naḥal: Written Material” in \textit{The Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls} ed. Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 360, and Hannah M. Cotton and Ada Yardeni, \textit{Aramaic, Hebrew and Greek Documentary Texts from Naḥal Hever and Other Sites} (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997), DJD 27, 10-11.

This is the only reference to the Bar Kokhba material we have found in Casey’s two volumes. Curiously, Casey’s index omits this reference.
Next, Casey inexplicably skips the Targums and instead draws from the Palestinian Talmud. This may be due to the aforementioned corruption of Onqelos and Jonathan. It may be that, in a self-appointed effort to find the words Jesus said, Casey decided to omit the later Targums for an unstated reason. We speculate here because Casey offers no justification for his omission of these two major texts. Since Jesus was a first-century Galilean, the better method would be a negative one, first establishing what influence Judaean language patterns may have had on the tradition. What is left could then be compared against what can be known about the later Aramaic of Galilee.  

However, the time-frame of the Talmud Yerushalmi is problematic for Casey’s goal as it represents Aramaic from the beginning of the fifth century and he does not allow for dialectal changes in the preceding 370 years. Some of the dialectal changes between Middle Aramaic and Late Aramaic have been summarized by Kaufman as follows:  

---

51 This is not to say that one can rule out those parts of the tradition that echo Judaean Aramaic, keep the part that echoes the later Galilean Aramaic, and declare the result the words of Jesus. As no writing of Jesus of Nazareth is extant, one’s working hypothesis must be that his words are primarily preserved through the textual tradition of the early church. Given that one must work from a later textual tradition to uncover an earlier one, and then never have the hope of knowingly and reliably touching upon an element of oral tradition, any connection between the textual tradition and an alleged oral one is tenuous at best.

52 It should be noted that the distinction between literary and oral forms is here moot because both corpora are literary in their extant form. While Yerushalmi, like the New Testament, clearly preserves some oral tradition, the extent to which the extant material reflects modifications of the original is a matter of ongoing study.

As an illustration of changes in orthography alone, compare נשים as a construct/suffixed form in Michael Sokoloff, *A Dictionary of Judean Aramaic* (Bar-Ilan, Israel: Bar-Ilan University Press, 2003), 64a, to נשים and related forms in Michael Sokoloff, *A Dictionary of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic* 2nd ed. (Bar-Ilan, Israel/Baltimore, Maryland: Bar-Ilan University Press/The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2002), 329b–331a. This difference is also seen in QA. Cf. נשים as the emphatic in 4QEnh iii.14 and 4QWords of Michael lines 6, 7, 11, and 12. The form נשים occurs in QA (1QapGen xx.13 and 15) as the absolute form. While the form נשים does occur in QA, it consistently serves as the construct form: 1QapGen xxi.2, xxii.16, and 21. This is the same force as נשים just mentioned in Judaean Aramaic.
Short vowels in unstressed syllables are reduced and, in some cases, totally elided. The vocalization traditions indicate that in the period after the loss of final case vowels, stress was generally on the final syllable of the word, although the modern dialects (and some reading traditions) show a strong tendency toward penultimate stress (the phonological situation that had obtained prior to the loss of those vowels). Weakening of the laryngeal/pharyngeal consonants is characteristic both of Palestinian dialects (Samaritan and some Galilean) and of Babylonian. In Syriac and Babylonian, final unstressed long vowels are elided, as are final liquids, nasals, and interdentals in Babylonian.53

Thus, at the very least, any application of JPA grammatical or lexical data to our problem must account for inevitable changes in accidence, morphology, and syntax; differences in style should also be addressed where possible.

In order to proceed along these lines, drawing from significantly later Aramaic corpora, Casey must insist that Aramaic is a stable, standardized language in the Middle period. Unfortunately for his approach, however, it was not a standardized language, “as the Dead Sea Scrolls have helped us to understand.”54 Characteristic of Middle Aramaic is the breakdown of the standardization prevalent in OfA.55 “Here one notes... the emergence of ‘real local dialects.’”56 For Aramaic to be stable and standardized at this time would mean that the significant differences

55See §1.2.5.
Chapter 4: Hybrid Approaches

between Judaean Aramaic, Nabataean, Palmyrene, Hatran, and Edessene did not exist whereas the various corpora demonstrate otherwise. Further, as is demonstrated in Part II, QA is characterized by diversity in its orthography, morphology, and syntax. Hence, a wealth of textual data and study weighs against Casey's allegation of stability in the Aramaic of the first-century.

Casey's third resource is Christian Palestinian Aramaic. These texts reflect a dialect, as Casey states, "in the right place, of a slightly different culture, and somewhat later date." However, he does not give sufficient weight to the fact that these texts are from at least the sixth century CE and, thus, date to over 400 years later than the latest dating for the writing of Mark. Consequently, the inclusion of this corpora is erroneous in not taking account of the variations in language and culture that arose from the First Jewish Revolt (c. 66-70 CE), the expulsion of Christians from the synagogues (a.k.a., the "parting of the ways"), the Second Jewish Revolt (c. 132-135 CE), and the rise of Christianity as a cultural force in what was then named "Palestine."

Finally, Casey's eclectic use of any Aramaic dialect from any period and location is simply untenable. Hurvitz has noted:

"[F]rom a linguistic point of view there is no such thing as 'Aramaic'
of which one can speak generally and without further specification.

---

Footnotes:
57Cook has observed several significant differences between these dialects. While we disagree with Cook on his proposed dialect continuum, the differences he notes are nonetheless significant. Cf. Edward M. Cook, "Qumran Aramaic and Aramaic Dialectology" in Abr Nahrain Suppl. ed. T. Muraoka. Vol. 3 (Louvain: Peeters Press, 1992), 8.
Fitzmyer has preferred the term "Old Syriac" for the languages of Edessa, Serrin, Dura, and other Syrian towns. For the sake of clarity, to avoid confusion with Casey's references to Syriac, we here use the traditional Edessene. Cf. Joseph A. Fitzmyer, "Aramaic" in The Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls ed. Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 49b.
58On "Palestinian Syriac" as a misnomer, see note 39 on page 89.
39Casey, Aramaic Sources of Mark's Gospel, 92.
There are various Aramaic dialects, differing from one another both in time and place.⁶⁰

Endeavoring to work from later sources in order to reconstruct a text is tenous at best. In Casey’s studies, where his allusions to the rabbinic literature account for approximately half of the allusions to his literary databank. It is highly circumspect to draw from such corpora without addressing the chronological and geographical differences between the two. Casey’s use of the rabbinic literature calls into question how much more he has offered than Black.⁶¹


⁶¹ Even a cursory survey of Casey’s An Aramaic Approach to Q and Aramaic sources of Mark’s Gospel will show that the representation of the Qumran material is decidedly in the minority, being surpassed significantly by his use of the Babylonian and Palestinian Talmuds. In the indices of passages discussed for both volumes, Casey’s functional corpus of Qumran Aramaic is comprised of 1QapGen xxi.13, 4QTgLev. and 11QTgJob in Aramaic Sources of Mark’s Gospel and 1QapGen xxi.13 and 4QapocrDan in An Aramaic Approach to Q.

A similar problem is to be found with Schwarz’s 1985 work, “Und Jesu sprach”, in which he considers the form of the Aramaic substratum to the words of Jesus. Schwarz gives greater weight to the rabbinic and Targumic material than to the Qumran Aramaic texts, but he does not explain why. In this preference, he follows the lead of several nineteenth-century scholars (Meyer, Nestle, Wellhausen, Dalman) and some twentieth-century academics (Burney, Joüon, Torrey, Black, and Jeremias) who either did not know of the Qumran material or discounted its importance. He further refers to Beyer’s Semitisiche Syntax im Neuen Testament, a treatment which amalgamates the various Semitic languages from Old Babylonian to (Babylonian) Talmudic Aramaic to North and South Arabic. While Schwarz gives some credit to Fitzmyer’s work, he does not exhibit allegiance to Fitzmyer’s methods. Cf. Günther Schwarz, “Und Jesu sprach”: Untersuchungen zur aramäischen ursprache der Worte Jesu (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1985), BWANT 118, 1–3, 334–337, 352–362, and Klaus Beyer, Semitisiche Syntax im Neuen Testament (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1962), 19–27. Cf. also Arnold Meyer, Jesu Muttersprache (Freiburg: J.C.B. Mohr, 1896); Gustaf Dalman, Die Worte Jesu 1st ed. (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1898); C.F. Burney, The Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel (Oxford: Clarendon, 1922); Paul Joüon, L’ Évangile de Notre Seigneur Jésus-Christ (Paris: G. Beauchesne, 1930), Verbum Salutis 5; C.C. Torrey, Our Translated Gospels: Some of the Evidence (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1937); Black, Aramaic Approach; and Joachim Jeremias, The Parables of Jesus 2nd ed. (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1972).
4.3.2.3 Step Three: A Matter of Idiom

Casey’s third step is to ensure that a proposed draft reconstruction is idiomatically consonant with the Aramaic of first-century Judaea. As we have just noted, Casey’s proposal of which dialects should be used to estimate first-century Judaean Aramaic is severely flawed. Further complicating this matter, Casey does not offer any basis for his understanding of what first-century Judaean idiom was. If his understanding is from his own study, he does not offer any explanation of it. Currently, no standard work exists for the study of first-century Judaean Aramaic idiom — either literary or colloquial. Without this work or a line-by-line justification similar to Fitzmyer’s study on Philippians,” one finds it difficult to accept without strong reservations the idiom of Casey’s reverse translations.

4.3.2.4 Step Five: Translation Technique

In the fifth step of his method, Casey does not give due attention to the other translation techniques employed in antiquity. While he discusses modern translation techniques at length in Aramaic sources of Mark’s Gospel and, presumably, relies on the same in his volume on Q, he does not justify his own use of literal translation technique. Critical to this step in reverse translation is the study of Koine Greek translations of known Semitic documents. To apply the conclusions developed from the study of modern translations is anachronistic and otherwise too

63 Examples of these may be found in Benjamin G. Wright, No Small Difference: Sirach’s Relationship to Its Hebrew Parent Text (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989), Septuagint and Cognate Studies 26, Erik W. Larson, The Translation of Enoch: From Aramaic into Greek Ph.D thesis, (New York University, 1995), and, to a lesser degree, Vincent T.M. Skemp, The Vulgate of Tobit Compared with Other Ancient Witnesses (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 2000), SBLDS.
far removed from the historic setting of the ancient texts. For more on the need to justify one’s choice of translation technique, see Section 3.3.3.3 “On Literal Translation Technique.”

4.3.2.5 Step Six: Which Level of Redaction?

Casey’s sixth step is to “isolate as far as possible deliberate editing by the Gospel writers themselves.”64 In support of this, he notes that several passages betray some form of editing.65 However, Casey does not delineate the characteristics of the Gospel writers’ editing and how it is distinct from that of other redactors. The results of this omission in method is that all redaction is implied to have happened at a single stage of the written tradition, the first stage. This is simply not supported by the known tradition history of any pericope.66 Given that the known tradition history shows marked diversity by several hands at the earliest recoverable stages, it is likely that the earlier stages of the tradition were similarly fraught with emendations by various sources. For more on the precarious life of a first-century text, see Section 2.3.1, “The Fates of a Text.”

4.3.3 Concluding Comments on Casey’s Approach

In light of the foregoing analysis of Casey’s resources and method, much of his reconstructions simply fails to persuade. Casey’s method highlights some of the

64Casey, Aramaic Approach to Q, 62.


66In this regard, one may take the critical apparatus of any critical edition as reflective of the known, albeit later, textual history of a passage. For an example, see the critical apparatus of Eberhard Nestle et al., eds., Novum Testamentum Graece 27th ed. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1995).
key processes required for a reverse translation. Unfortunately, however, due to the lack of the necessary studies in several areas, his effort does not yield substantial results. Rather, his reverse translations and the conclusions he draws from them are not supported by relevant data and are therefore largely conjectural. This is due in part to our general lack of knowledge and in part to a seeming misappropriation of the extant resources. In the best of cases, the data has not yet been distilled from the various corpora or, in the worst, the conclusions are simply not justified adequately by the author.
Chapter 5

Summary of Part I

The time since Meyer's *Jesu Muttersprache* has seen several significant studies devoted to the New Testament Aramaic problem. Aside from the study of the New Testament writings, corollary fields of study in the Targums, the Qumran scrolls, the Semitic languages, ancient translation technique, and Hellenistic Greek grammatical might be included in a comprehensive review of the problem. To include such a comprehensive work here is precluded by the exigencies of space.¹ In this part we have restricted the scope of our survey to those works which substantially shaped the agenda of New Testament Aramaic studies by addressing the issue of method.²

Prior to the beginning of the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls in Novem-


²In 1962, Beyer published his *Semitische Syntax im Neuen Testament* which, while being very comprehensive in its inclusion of studies on the diverse Semitic and Greek languages, omits the Qumran literature and thereby is forced into a reconstructive approach similar to the approaches of Dalman and Black. Further, Beyer's work does not endeavor to discern between Hebrew and Aramaic. Cf. Klaus Beyer, *Semitische Syntax im Neuen Testament* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1962), 19–28.
ber 1947, any approach to the New Testament Aramaic problem was severely restricted to using TgA and the later rabbinic literature in conjunction with BA and OfA. Any argument about Aramaic in first-century Judaea was necessarily speculative and reliant upon texts separated by several hundred years. The discussion of this period was dominated by Dalman, Kahle, and, to a lesser extent, Black. As seen in Chapter 2, any efforts to reverse translate the Greek of the New Testament were severely hampered by technical difficulties.

Further, due to the narrow scope through which scholars could peer into the language dynamics of first-century Judaea, the influence of Hebrew was severely underplayed. The appearance of Latin was skewed, and the existence of the pre-Arabic dialects did not even enter into the discussion of scholars at this time.

The uncovering of the Qumran texts in 1948 began a paradigmatic earthquake that permanently changed the landscape of New Testament studies. Scholarship could not base arguments on preconceptions such as an alleged diglossic tension between Aramaic and Hebrew. The language dynamics of first-century Judaea came to rest upon the use of Greek, Hebrew and Aramaic. The place of Latin was significantly undermined, and the pre-Arabic dialects came to have a more pronounced place on the horizon.

In light of these changes, scholars began to espouse the use of QA in the reconstruction of Aramaic Vorlagen. Notably, Fitzmyer has advocated the use of Qumran Aramaic as the most relevant Aramaic corpus for the study of the problem. Our review of the linguistic landscape of first-century Judaea and of the dialect and stages of Aramaic (see Chapter 1) vindicates this perspective.

---

3 The use of BA also conflated the issues as Daniel is widely seen as having been written in the second-century BCE but in a style reminiscent or imitative of the sixth-century BCE.

4 See n. 63 on page 52.
However, as noted in Chapter 3, there are several issues which neither Fitzmyer
nor Maloney take into account. These issues are nuanced further in the first of the
hybrid approaches we consider. Wilcox’s view lays out several issues which must
be addressed before one can adequately study the question of an Aramaic source
behind Greek texts. Our discussion of the problems in Wilcox’s approach (see
§4.2) illustrates our resonance with several aspects of his work.

Finally, Maurice Casey used an unusual amalgam of dialects to reconstruct
the Aramaic Vorlage to the Greek of Mark and Q. He then proceeded to exegate
those texts as well. Unfortunately, Casey appears to do this without the necessary
textual support; as a result, his work retains several major problems of method.

In our discussion of the major figures who addressed the problem in the twen­
tieth and early twenty-first centuries, it becomes evident that their studies have met
with only partial success due in part to the inadequacy of the datasets they used.
While an Aramaic form or phrase was employed as justification by each scholar
who offered a reconstruction or commented on an explicit passage of Greek, such
application is unsystematic and borders on proof-texting as it does not appeal to
the tri-lingual corpora in comprehensive, systematic terms.

The elevated status of Hebrew in the first-century Judaean linguistic landscape
now requires the use of negative proofs to justify an alleged Aramaism, as Wilcox
stated. If one seeks to argue for an Aramaic background, one must first delin­
eate why the background could not be irregular Greek usage or Hebrew in origin.
Such negative proofs require systematic, complementary grammars of the three
major languages used in first-century Judaea. Toward this end, we undertake in
Part II to offer a grammar of the literary Aramaic dialect most pertinent to the
Part II

A Grammar of Qumran Aramaic
Chapter 6

The Limitations of This Grammar

The following discussion of Qumran Aramaic grammar does not seek to probe every linguistic development but seeks to describe the state of Aramaic as it is reflected in the texts themselves.\(^1\) Where a grammatical convention common among other Aramaic dialects which precede or follow QA is not found in our corpus, we do not discuss it. Some illustrative reference will naturally be made to texts from other sites and corpora. As will be demonstrated, however, the Aramaic of this period and region demonstrates a significant number of grammatical elements which are peculiar to the QA corpus.

The quantity of reconstructed material has been minimized.\(^2\) Due to the number of homographs and the variety of ways different forms are employed, the corpus typically excludes those fragments which do not exhibit sufficient syntax to judge clearly the nature of the form.\(^3\)

---

\(^1\) Those texts from Cave 4 which are numbered above 550 have not been verified since the author did not receive permission to study the actual text, pending publication of the *editio princeps*.\(^4\)

\(^2\) Reconstructed material is indicated in the text by square brackets (e.g., [Nאול]). Further symbols are noted in Table 1, "Table of Symbols and Abbreviations".

\(^3\) For example, see פ in 4QEnGiants' 35. One cannot determine whether it functions here as a preposition or as a subordinate conjunction.
In the interest of academic integrity, we have restricted our analysis to those texts for which photos have been published or for which copyright permission has been granted to reproduce them in this volume.\(^4\) In several places, the traditional line numbering is based on the combining of two fragments. While this numbering is occasionally followed here, the numbering used in the grammar is largely that of the fragments themselves with minimal reconstruction.

As certain sources became available to us later in the research process than others, the corpus used for the statistics cited in this grammar and the corpus of texts cited differ. Not all texts cited are included in the statistical analysis. Those texts excluded are the medial columns of the *Genesis Apocryphon* and those texts numbered 4Q529-549. Where these texts have been cited, the readings have been verified against the common or standard readings published on each text.

The photographs of the *Genesis Apocryphon* included in Appendix B were taken in 1994 by Gregory Bearman (Jet Propulsion Laboratory and the Ancient Biblical Manuscript Center) and Bruce and Ken Zuckerman (West Semitic Research) and formed the basis of the work by Matthew Morgenstern, Elisha Qimron, and Daniel Sivan "The Hitherto Unpublished Columns of the Genesis Apocryphon" (*Abr-Nahrain* 33, 30-54). As the authors of that article stressed, theirs was a preliminary edition which did not include photographs. Since high resolution or computerized photographs of the other texts are available, these images are included to offer the reader the ability to verify the readings cited.\(^5\)

With regard to those texts numbered 4Q529-549, we have noted elsewhere that most of the photographs which accompany them in DJD31 are simply too

---

\(^4\)Hence the exclusion of those Cave 4 texts numbered 550 and higher.

\(^5\)The reproduction of these photographs as part of this work was made possible through the gracious permission of the Israel Antiquities Authority.
small to allow for proper validation of the *editio princeps*.\(^6\) We have been restricted to correcting only what can be clearly seen from the plates. Hence, we have removed most of Puech's reconstructions, leaving those we judged most probable.

Finally, not all cited words will be translated in this work. We have used our discretion and translated those words and phrases which may be misunderstood for homographic or context-based reasons or which are sufficiently rare as to not readily come to mind.

---

\(^6\)Émile Puech, *Qumrán Grotte 4: XXII. Textes Araméens, Première Partie* (Oxford: Clarendon, 2001), DJD 31. See our pending review in *Review of Biblical Literature* (http://www.bookreviews.org). While this work is copyright 2001, we did not receive a copy of the work until shortly before we validated some questionable readings in a research trip to Jerusalem in the summer of 2002.
Chapter 7

Accidence

7.1 Orthography: Vowel Indicators

The reading of an unpointed text is inevitably determined by one’s interpretation of the scribe’s orthographic conventions and the representation of his phonology. The writers of QA texts utilized *matres lectionis* abundantly.¹ As in BA, the *m. lectionis* denote quality and not quantity.²

As J. Fitzmyer has noted in particular with regard to α and η in QA, it is


It is to be noted that in each of Beyer’s volumes, his understanding of the Aramaic of the Dead Sea Scrolls includes texts which date as early as the fifth century BCE (e.g., the Hermopolis Letter) and which reflect the Aramaic of their time in a questionable, possibly stylistic manner (e.g., Daniel). Examples of this unjustified combining of corpora may be found on page 411 of the former volume or page 280 of the latter. Consequently, Beyer’s treatments must be used with caution.

sometimes difficult to tell whether one should regard these as consonants or *matres lectionis*. In the orthographic analysis below we endeavor to clarify this issue to some extent; however, cases not covered in the examples should be judged separately.

There is no reason to assume that short vowels in pretonic syllables have not been reduced in QA. Kaufman has argued for the beginning of the reduction process in the Achaemenid period. This reduction is evident in both pretonic (מָדרִיתוֹן *their province* 1QapGen xxii.4) and pro-pretonic syllables (כְּמֶמְפֶּלֶתוֹן *in his downfall* 11QTgJob v.1) shortening of the first *a* is evident in both LBH and BA. analysis proceeds under this assumption accordingly.

### 7.1.1 Aleph

As a vowel letter, *aleph* occurs in both medial and final positions. Final *aleph* typically designates *a* or *e*; in this capacity it indicates original vowels which occurred in both morpho-syntactical changes and regularly occurring forms (long *a*: יָקָפָן xxii.19, יִלְעָם 11QTgJob iii.5, long *e*: יִלְעָם 11QTgJob xiv.6, אֵל בָּן...)

---


5Not all cited words will be translated in this work. We have used our discretion and translated those words and phrases which may be misunderstood for homographic or context-based reasons or which are sufficiently rare as to not readily come to mind.


Chapter 7: Accidence

While this is common among the other phases of Aramaic, in QA נ also tends to replace ו and is the primary indicator of both the determined state and of feminine singular absolute forms. It is used in the infinitive of the derived stems ( שתן to relate, tell a story 1QapGen xix.18, נאמה to be grieved 1QapGen xx.12, נאמה to defile, make unclean 1QapGen xx.15, נזרה to destroy, lay waste 4QpsDan 12.3). The final aleph is also used for certain suffixes and adverbs which will be discussed below.

Medial aleph often follows ו and י and represents א (1QapGen xxii.1). In this use נ probably represents a long vowel. As E. Cook has noted, the use of נ for א generally serves to distinguish between homographs.

ני is also evident in נרה (1QapGen xxi.5, xxii.27; 11QTgJob xxiii.7; with י in 1QapGen xix.23). Also, נ in 4QpsDan 12.2 may demonstrate a quiescent נ when compared to נ in 14.3 or נ may be seen to represent א.

---

8 On the passive rendering of נַנְשָׁע, see Fitzmyer, Genesis Apocryphon, 73. Given the lack of vowel pointing, one could also read this form as a Pe'el perfect form, נרַה.

While QA vowel indicators do not signify length, the use of a vowel letter for the final syllable of a word necessitates a long vowel. The only exception to this pattern is the representation of diphthongs. Cf. §7.1.4 (page 112).

9 Fitzmyer, Genesis Apocryphon, 196.

10 In accordance with this former usage, one finds that ני and יי verbs tend to retain their final aleph (e.g., כָּנָה, קְנֵה, etc.). Cf. Table 8.4 (page 131). Cf. also Harold H. Rowley, “Notes on the Aramaic of the Genesis Apocryphon” in Hebrew and Semitic Studies Presented to Godfrey Rolles Driver ed. David W. Thomas and William D. McHardy (Oxford: Clarendon, 1963), 119.

11 The use of נַרְכָּה in 1QapGen xxi.31 and xxii.13 has seemingly lost its infinitival ending due to the force of the pronominal suffixes involved (ןְלָא and יְלָא, respectively).

12 D.N. Freedman and A. Rittersprach noted this with particular regard to the Genesis Apocryphon (David Noel Freedman and A. Rittersprach, “The Use of Aleph as a Vowel Letter in the Genesis Apocryphon” RQ 6 (1967), 299–300. Some of the quiescence cited is dubious, however, particularly with reference to the נ suffective to indicate the emphatic state.


14 For נַרְכָּה cf. BA רכָּכ. The latter, however, may be shortened due to a possible construct relationship with נַנְשָׁע.

A similar quiescence is demonstrated in נַנְשָׁע (1QapGen xxii.10, 12). For a defense of the proposal that נַנְשָׁע is a mistaken metathesis for נַנְשָׁע, see...
7.1.2 He

י occurs in final position serving one of two functions:

1. to designate the final, original long a: יא玛גנ 1QapGen xx.27, 34, יאlama to acknowledge יפטבפ 4QpapTob הינול to cause precipitation יפוסי 11QTgJob xxxi.3, ישליט to be changed יפעספ 4QpsDan ימעתי to offer יפגנ 1QapGen xxii.2, ימנוח you have done יפגנ xx.26, xxii.28, יפגנ you have done יפוסי iv.1, יפוסי the abandoned [vine] יפוסי 11QTgJob xxxi.2.

2. to represent long e: (יהי מרה יפגנ ii.4, xx.13, יפגנ ימעתי to go before יפגנ xix.22, ימעתי drink יפגנ xxii.15, ימעתי you will hide יפוסי 11QTgJob xxxiv.9, ימעתי did you set...? יפוסי 11QTgJob xxxi.7).

Occasionally, י is used instead of נ to indicate the emphatic form of masculine nouns. Singular: יאמש יאمش יאמש יאמש יאמש יאמש יאמש יאמש יאמש יאמש יאמש יאמש יאמש יאמש יאמש יאמש יאמש יאמש יאמש יאמש יאמש יאמש יאמש יאמש יאמש יאمش Y

7.1.3 Waw

י is used in final position to represent both original long u or long o. Examples of י as indicative of י are found largely in verbal forms: יאמש יאמש יאמש יאמש יאמש יאמש יאמש יאמש יאמש יאמש יאמש יאמש יאמש יאמש יאמש יאמש יאמש יאמש יאמש יאמש יאמש יאמש יאמש יאמש יאמש יאמש יאמש יאמש יאמש יאמש יאמש יאמש יאמש יאמש יאמש יאמש יאמש יאמש יאמש יאמש יאמש Y

Fitzmyer, Genesis Apocryphon, 197.

Kutscher has demonstrated a tendency among the Qumran scribes to “Hebraize” the orthography of the dominant Aramaic. This is found, among other places, in the use of נ for ה. Hence the use of נ in יאמש may be to suggest or stress the pronunciation of יאמש as ending in o. Cf. Eduard Y. Kutscher, The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll (I Q Isaa) (Leiden: Brill, 1974), Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 6, 20-21, esp. references to י and נ.


Beyer finds י several times in his assembled corpus of Dead Sea Scrolls Aramaic. See Beyer, ATTM, 415, and Beyer, Ergänzungsband, 415. Of the forms he cites, only one is attested in our
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partnered [with] 4QEn b iv.9,\textsuperscript{17} 

they went away 11QTgJob ii.3,\textsuperscript{18} 

they ate 1QapGen xxi.21, xxii.23, 7 

they took 1QapGen xxii.4, 

they fled 4QpapTob\textsuperscript{a} ii.4, 

may you cut down 1QapGen xix.16, 

Examples of \( \delta \) indicating \( \delta \) are the following: 

\begin{itemize}
\item 11QTgJob xxvi.2, 
\item Pharaoh 
\item 1QapGen xix.22, xx.14. 
\end{itemize}

It also represents medial long and short \( u: \) 

\begin{itemize}
\item 1QapGen ii.13, 17, 11QTgJob ii.6, xiii.6, etc., 
\item 1QapGen xix.8, xxi.7, 16, 
\item 4QpapTob\textsuperscript{b} ii.4. 
\end{itemize} 

and medial long and short \( o: \) 

\begin{itemize}
\item 1QapGen xix.15, xx.32, xxi.13, 
\item 4QEn\textsuperscript{c} 10, 
\item Enoch 4QEnGiants\textsuperscript{d} 84, 
\item its light 4QEnastr\textsuperscript{b} 66, 
\item before 4QWords of Michael i.10, 
\item strength 1QapGen xx.14. 
\end{itemize}

The "aw diphthong is represented by \( \mathbf{a}. \)\textsuperscript{20} \quad \text{It is evident in both medial and final positions:} 

\begin{itemize}
\item \( \text{he continued} \) 4QTob\textsuperscript{f} ii.1, 
\item \( \text{his} \) 11QTgJob v.5, 
\item \( \text{his raiders} \) 11QTgJob ii.2, 
\item \( \text{day} \) 1QapGen xxii.21, 
\item \( \text{his bones} \) 11QTgJob v.5, 
\item \( \text{his raiders} \) 11QTgJob ii.2, 
\item \( \text{his raiders} \) 11QTgJob ii.6, 
\item \( \text{his raiders} \) 11QTgJob ii.25, 
\item \( \text{his raiders} \) 4QEn\textsuperscript{c} 11 ii.17, 25, 
\item \( \text{his raiders} \) 4QpapTob\textsuperscript{b} ii.15, 
\item \( \text{his raiders} \) 4QpapTob\textsuperscript{b} ii.18, 
\item \( \text{his raiders} \) 4QEn\textsuperscript{c} 11 ii.17, 
\end{itemize}

Other examples of "aw may be found in 4QpapTob\textsuperscript{b} ii.8 and 4QEn\textsuperscript{a} iii.17, 

(4QEn\textsuperscript{c} ii.18), and \( \text{in 4QEn\textsuperscript{c}} \), 5 i.22 and 4QLevi\textsuperscript{a} iv.8.


\textsuperscript{18} Cf. Sokoloff, Targum to Job, 108. 

\textsuperscript{19} Fitzmyer here includes a reconstructed form \( \text{in 4QpsDan} \) from 1QapGen xx.26 (Fitzmyer, Genesis Apocryphon, 64). The photographic evidence does not make this peculiar form certain enough to be included in our analysis. Further, 11QTgJob ii.3 may include the form \( \text{in 4QpsDan} \) and they have pressed him (?), but the final letters of the morpheme are too corrupt to warrant this reading as significant for our purposes. 

\textsuperscript{20} A statement concerning the contraction of the "aw diphthong cannot be made with confidence due to the non-vocalized nature of the texts. 

\textsuperscript{21} Puech here numbers this occurrence of \( \text{in 4QpsDan} \) ii.2 i + 3 5. Obviously, this is based on a proposed reconstruction of the text. Our numbering is derived from the fragment alone. 

\textsuperscript{22} There may be some doubt about whether \( \text{in 4QpsDan} \) is representative of the "aw diphthong. Cf. Sokoloff, Targum to Job, 108.
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7.1.4 Yod

is found in QA both in final and medial positions. In final position,  is used in the following ways:23

1. the long vowel -e: his father 1QapGen ii.20, 22, 24, my mother 4Q Tob 4 ii.10, יד 1QapGen ii.1, 12, etc., 11QTgJob ii.8, iii.5, vii.1, etc., [Then] give me [an answer!] 11QTgJob xxx.1, ובחרה his friends 1QapGen xx.8, מפרשים his raiders 11QTgJob ii.2, [in] my making [of the earth] 11QTgJob xxx.2, my family 4QpapTobא 2 9, Naphetai 4Q Tob 4 iii.6, עש 1QapGen ii.11, xix.27, xx.8, 31, xxi.6, xxii.32, a second time, again 1QapGen xxi.1.24

2. the diphthong -ay:25

The diphthong -ay is found:/light 1QapGen xxii.19, 22, 29, 11QTgJob vi.4, xxi.3, xxxiv.5, יא 1QapGen ii.12, 4QpapTobא 6 8, 4QEnGiantsא i.3, ג 1QapGen xx.29, 4QpapTobא 18 14, 11QTgJob x.8, על 1QapGen ii.2, 11, 12, xix.20, xx.21, 28, xxi.7, 4QLeviא 4 4, and ועיט עיט nuded 1QapGen xxii.33.

In medial position,  represents:

1. long -e: 1QapGen xx.2, 4.26

Beyer finds  in his composite of Aramaic Levi and in several texts outside of the Qumran scrolls. See Beyer, ATTM, 417 and 188-209. In our corpus, however, we do not find Beyer’s reading of רבעי rather, we find  attested in the following places and forms: 1Q20 י.1 (נודניק), 4QpapTobא 2 13 (ראות), 4QpapTobא 6 5 (חום), 27 1 (תל), 4QTobא 1 6 (עזר始め), 4QEnא 1 26 (אלה), 4QEnא 4 (שער), 11QTgJob xxxiv.10 (איה).

Fitzmyer notes this as the nisbe ending, denoting an adjectival suffix which indicates membership in a class. See Fitzmyer, Genesis Apocryphon, 200, Muraoka and Porten, GEA, 2nd rev. ed., 378.

The degree to which diphthongs demonstrated by final  in QA have contracted is not clear.

Consequently, 1QapGen xx.3 is defectively written. Fitzmyer notes -e is also written defectively in literature 1QapGen xxii.13 (Fitzmyer, Genesis Apocryphon, 202). This is not nec-
2. long 𐤙: אֶתָרְיָה the Watchers 4QEn b iv.6, 11, 1QapGen ii.1, 16, 19, judgement, justice 1QapGen xx.13, 14, 1QapGen xxii.19, 22, 29, 11QTgJob vi.4, xxi.3, xxxiv.5.

7.2 Phonology

7.2.1 Interdentals

The phonology of the Aramaic consonants of this period is, by all indications, equivalent to that of BA. The relationship between interdentals in Qumran Aramaic (QA) and Proto-Semitic (PS) is illustrated by Table 7.1.

Table 7.1: Consonantal correspondence to Proto-Semitic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PS</th>
<th>QA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>d, ɗ</td>
<td>כ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t, ʈ</td>
<td>ת</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʈ, ʈ (ValueType, ʒ)</td>
<td>ט</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ɖ, ɡ</td>
<td>װ, װ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.2.2 Assimilation

The most common form of assimilation in QA is that of ʿ to a following consonant. However, יִסָו verbs are also present and exhibit the assimilation of ʿ to the


28 The information presented here is derived from Rosenthal, Grammar, §17.
following consonant, like 2.

Where one would expect to find doubling in QA, one frequently finds a resolution of the doubled consonant by means of a liquid consonant. 32

In forms of נ, dissimilation occurs frequently, resulting in a ל closing the first syllable (1QapGen xvi.2, 11QTgJob xxii.4, 1QapGen xxii.4, 11QTgJob xvi.2.

verbs

7.2.3 Dissimilation

Where one would expect to find doubling in QA, one frequently finds a resolution of the doubled consonant by means of a liquid consonant. 32
7.2.4 Partial Dissimilation

A partial dissimilation is suggested by פַּלֶת in 1QapGen xxii.5, 10.\(^{34}\)

7.2.5 Non-dissimilation of Two Laryngeals in the Same Root

In many later Aramaic dialects, when two laryngeals occur within the same root, one of them tends to be dissimilated (e.g., עִנ wood). However, with few exceptions,\(^{36}\) QA does not exhibit this tendency.\(^{37}\) Rather, neither laryngeal is dissimilated. For examples, see עִנ wood in 4QpapTob\(^{a}\) xviii.8, 4QLevi\(^{b}\) 2-3 2, 5-6 i.5,\(^{38}\) כָּנַה to smile in 4QVisions of Amram\(^{a}\) 5 5 and 4QVisions of Amram\(^{b}\) 1 14,\(^{39}\) כָּנַה to embrace in 1QapGen xvi.11, כָּנַה to hasten in 1QapGen xx.9.

\(^{34}\) Cf. Kutscher, Isaiah Scroll, 3-4. Kutscher dates the form פַּלֶת to "the last centuries BCE" by comparing the occurrences of "Damascus" from the Tel el-Amarna tablets through Stephanus of Byzantium. He notes the parallel occurrences of פַּלֶת in both OfA and BH. The occurrence here in 1QapGen points to similar parallelism between QH and QA.

As in OfA, the correlation of QA to Hebrew does not necessitate dependence on the sister language. This may be a Hebraism, but the relationship is far from certain.

\(^{35}\) פַּלֶת ← פָּלֶת to beg persistently; here the Pa'el participle seems to suggest the meaning of the Pa'el stem to crush. Cf. Michael Sokoloff, A Dictionary of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic 2nd ed. (Bar-Ilan, Israel/Baltimore, Maryland: Bar-Ilan University Press/The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2002), 273a-b; Marcus Jastrow, A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli, and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature (New York: The Judaica Press, 1996), 683a; also Fitzmyer, Genesis Apocryphon, 131.

\(^{36}\) 4QPrNab 1-3 8, 11QTgJob xv.1, xxxii.6, xxiii.3, and xxxv.7.


\(^{38}\) Puech also cites 4Q554 3 ii.15, but we have not been permitted to confirm this reading.

\(^{39}\) NB: The line numbering for 4QVisions of Amram\(^{a}\) is here different from that contained in the editio princeps (DJD 31) due to the latter’s reliance on a proposed reconstruction, combining fragments five through nine. Cf. Émile Puech, Qumrân Grotte 4: XXII. Textes Araméens, Première
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4QVisions of Amram 1a ii.17, 11QTwJob iii.7, רוחה to wash, and עין to meet in 1QapGen xxii.13.

7.2.6 Metathesis

The metathesis of the sibilant ש and the stop נ is exhibited throughout QA: שחשפנ נ changed 1QapGen ii.11, 12, נחשפנ נ was changed 1QapGen ii.2, נחשפנ נ tell me 1QapGen xix.18, נחשפנ נ recompensed 11QTwJob xxiii.6, and נחשפנ נ strive 11QTwJob xxxiii.6.40

Partie (Oxford: Clarendon, 2001), DJD 31, 298

While it is a noun and is likely to be less subject to diachronic change, we here include נחשפנ נ. It does demonstrate the continuance of a metathetical pattern in word formation and, consequently, underscores the continued metathesis of ש and נ.

It is worthy of noting that the metathesis evident here in נחשפנ נ does not occur in Judaean Aramaic. Cf. אַּחַ 53:3 and Mur 49:3, as cited in Michael Sokoloff, A Dictionary of Judean Aramaic (Bar-Ilan, Israel: Bar-Ilan University Press, 2003), 82a.
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Morphology

While the morphology of QA is very similar to that of BA, the following paradigms serve to illustrate those forms which do exist in the text and can be said thereby to have been known as part of this sub-dialect of Judaean Literary Aramaic.

8.1 Verbs

8.1.1 Morphological Overview.

Table 8.1 illustrates the stems attested in QA. Unsurprisingly, the verbal system is similar to earlier dialects of Aramaic, especially BA.

---

For the purpose of the following discussion, we use the term "regular verb" to refer to a verb that is not of the ֶיֶהוֹנָה conjugation. Given the constraints of this thesis, we have opted to omit discussion of the other weak verb forms; these are largely the same as BA. Hence, for the conjugation of these forms, we refer the reader to Franz Rosenthal, *A Grammar of Biblical Aramaic* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1995), 51–54, and 56.

The Haph’el form is seldom attested in QA. When it does occur, the form is similar to the Aph’el, with the only exception being the obvious change from an initial aleph to he. Hence, only the predominant Aph’el is represented here.
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Table 8.1: An Overview of Verbal Morphology (by stem)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Stem</th>
<th>Perfect Form</th>
<th>Imperfect Form</th>
<th>Participle</th>
<th>Infinitive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pe‘al</td>
<td>יָכַל</td>
<td>יָכָל</td>
<td>יָכִל</td>
<td>יָכִל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pa‘el</td>
<td>יָכַל</td>
<td>יָכָל</td>
<td>יָכִל</td>
<td>יָכִל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aph‘el</td>
<td>יָכָל</td>
<td>יָכָל</td>
<td>יָכִל</td>
<td>יָכִל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ithpe‘el</td>
<td>יָכָל</td>
<td>יָכָל</td>
<td>יָכִל</td>
<td>יָכִל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ithpa‘el</td>
<td>יָכָל</td>
<td>יָכָל</td>
<td>יָכִל</td>
<td>יָכִל</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.1.2 Finite: the Perfect, Imperfect, Imperative, and Jussive

8.1.2.1 The Regular Verb

Table 8.2: The Afformatives of the Finite Regular Verb

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perfect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>יָכַל</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>יָכִל</td>
<td>n/e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>פֹּטְלָת</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>פֹּטְלָת</td>
<td>n/e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third</td>
<td>יָכָל</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>יָכִל</td>
<td>n/e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperfect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>יָכָל</td>
<td>כָּכֶל</td>
<td>כָּכֶל</td>
<td>כָּכֶל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>יָכָל</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>יָכִל</td>
<td>n/e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third</td>
<td>יָכָל</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>יָכִל</td>
<td>n/e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>יָכָל</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>יָכִל</td>
<td>n/e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third</td>
<td>יָכָל</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>יָכִל</td>
<td>n/e</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.1.2.2 Finite: the Perfect, Imperfect, Imperative, and Jussive

The extant verbal afformatives are reflected in Table 8.2. While most of the forms are resonant of OfA and may be derived from forms in BA, the jussive tends to be marked by greater variety or deviation than the

---

2Beyer reads נָכַל in 1QapGen xxii.28 as a third person feminine plural perfect form. However, we read the same form as a Pe‘al participle with a feminine singular absolute sufformative. Klaus Beyer, *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984), 470.

Beyer also projects the second feminine plural of the Hermopolis letter into Judaean Literary Aramaic. However, this is not substantiated by our corpus. Beyer, *ATIM*, 471.

In his discussion on the imperative, Beyer also asserts a preformative for the feminine singular. This, however, is not substantiated by our reading. See Beyer, *ATIM*, 473–474.

In considering the jussive forms, Beyer overlooks the second masculine singular jussive in 1QapGen ii.25 (ָהֲנַשְׁתָל), xxii.30 (lxdt), 4QTo`b 4 ii.17 and 5 8 (lxdt
Chapter 8: Morphology

Other forms. Cook has stated that the jussive and the imperfect follow virtually the same pattern. This is not completely accurate. While the masculine singular forms are the same, the other extant forms are not.

Beyer, however, finds a number of precative forms in the Qumran texts and in those texts he holds to be related to them. Unfortunately, the majority of these forms are cited from Official Aramaic texts, outside of the Qumran corpus: the

3 Grelot observed the imperfects (נִקְטַב to cut) in 1QapGen xix.16 and (כָּבָד to be able) as imperfect forms in his review of Fitzmyer’s The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave 1: “[L]es deux imparfaits נִקְטַב et יְקִבְּלוֹן ne sont pas davantage des formes étranges; la mater lectionis -v- montre simplement que l’accent n’était pas encore descendu sur la désinence -w(n), mais demeurait sur la voyelle précédente: נִקְבָּשַׁה (de qṣ), et יְקִבְּלוֹן (de ykl). Il y a là un archaïsme que la vocalisation masoretique de Daniel n’a pas conservé” Cf. Pierre Grelot, “Review of J. A. Fitzmyer The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran” RB 74 (1967), 103. Cook arrives at the same conclusions about the forms, but does not seem to be aware of Grelot’s review. Cf. Edward M. Cook, “The Aramaic of the Dead Sea Scrolls” in The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment ed. P. Flint and James C. VanderKam. Vol. I (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1998), 371. The first of these readings, however, is dubious, breaking off in the middle of the word. The second deserves further study.

Cf. Joseph A. Fitzmyer, The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave 1: A Commentary (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute Press, 1972), 210. Fitzmyer finds the form to be normative, referring to 1QapGen xi.17 (וַעֲקֵלָן). This is confirmed by other forms from 11 QTgJob xxi.2 and 4. For photographic confirmation of Fitzmyer’s readings, see Appendix B.

4 “The paradigm [of the jussive in QA] is the same as the imperfect except that the jussive is indicated by final y in the masculine plural forms...1QapGen 19:16...’Cook, “Aramaic of DSS”, 371.

5 Cook overlooks two jussives:

- the second feminine singular jussive in 4QTob i:3, Do not fear and do not worry about him, my sister.

- the third masculine plural in 11QTgJob xxi.2: And he says: Let them listen to him!

In 4QTob ii, the second feminine has a y suffixed to it. In 11QTgJob, the jussive clearly matches the form of the imperfect. On the former, see Joseph A. Fitzmyer, The Dead Sea Scrolls and Christian Origins (Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2000), 200–203. On the latter, see Michael Sokoloff, The Targum to Job from Qumran Cave XI (Ramat-Gan/Jerusalem, Israel: Bar-Ilan University at Alva Press, 1974), 84–85, 143, and Florentino Garcia Martinez, Eilbert J.C. Tigchelaar and Adam S. van der Woude, Qumran Cave 11: II. 11Q2-18, 11Q20-31 (Oxford: Clarendon, 1998), DJD 23, 147. In the present volume, see also “The Aффormatives of the Finite Verb” (Table 8.2) for the form of the jussive versus the imperfect and “Examples of the Jussive” (page 124) for in-context examples. For the jussive indicated by syntax and not by form alone, see §9.1.1.1 (page 190).

6 Beyer, ATTM, 472–474.
letters of Elephantine, sources from Hermopolis, and Ahiqar. The relevance of these texts for synchronically detailing the grammatical forms of Jewish Literary Aramaic is questionable.

In comparing our findings to those of Beyer, we find that the forms which he includes and which we include is typically found outside the corpus of Qumran Aramaic texts. In the ensuing discussion, we have endeavored to denote those areas where we disagree substantially with Beyer. On several points, our assessment concurs with Beyer’s; however, where the matter of disagreement concerns his versus our reading of the texts, we have erred on the side of omission. 7

Examples of the Perfect

Singular

First Common (nuṭalat) 8

אֵלֶּחֶם אֲתָא לָמֵךְ וַיְהִי עַל בָּטָנוֹשׁ Then I,

Lamech, was afraid and went to Batenosh.

דָּדוֹת 4QpapTob 2: ... I was frightened and fled...

Second Masculine (nuṭalat)

7It should be noted that Beyer’s first volume, and the volume most germane for the present work, was published in 1984 — several years prior to the release of all of the photographs of the Qumran scrolls. Consequently, Beyer had to work with substantially poorer material than is currently available. A comparison between palaeography of twenty years ago and the present day is not reasonable.

8While the first person feminine form of the verb is not extant for every stem in QA, we employ the traditional label of “first common” throughout the grammar based on analogy with other Aramaic dialects.

Beyer asserts an ending of נ' for the first common singular. However, the yod is a mater lectionis, not part of a suffix. Beyer, ATTM, 469–470.
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1QapGen xxii.29: "Lo, ten years have passed... one from when you returned from Egypt."

1QapGen xx.26: "What have you done to me on account of [Sar]ai?"

4QapocrDan ii.2: "Like the sparks which you saw, thus will their kingdom be."

Third Masculine (קֵטֶן)

1QapGen xi.13: "And I turned and [again] blessed that he had mercy upon the earth..."

4QapocrDan i.1: "...settled [up]on him and he fell before the throne."

Third Feminine (קֵטֶל)

1QapGen ii.8: "Then Batenosh, my wife, spoke to me with force and strength."

4QTobb 4 iii.5: "Then Edna inquired of them and said to them, “Whence have you come, my brothers?”"

Plural

First Common (קּטֶל)

Beyer’s observation of a second feminine singular suffix -מל- is not supported for the time of Qumran Aramaic. Beyer, ATTM, 469-470.

In §8.1.2.3 (page 133) we discuss the use of מָלַלֶה. Clearly, the roots מָלַל and מָלַל were used at different times and by different groups to mean exactly the same thing.
Now, we passed through our land and entered the land of the sons of Ham, the land of Egypt.

Second Masculine (כַּפֵּל־חַמֶּל)

... the corruption with which you have corrupted it.

Third Masculine (כַּפֵּל־חַמֶּל)

And all of the healers and wizards and wisemen were not able to stand to heal him.

Examples of the Imperfect

Singular

First Common (אָכַלט)

And to your offspring after you I will give it [the land] forever...
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Second Masculine (גָּדֶל)

4Q Tob b 4 ii.3: בֵּלֵילָה דָּא תַּכְּפִּמָּה יָתְבַּנְּתוּ בְּאָנָתָהוּ... In this night you will engage her and take her to yourself for [a] wife.

Second Feminine (גָּדֶל)

1QapGen ii.7: חמך כל עטמת אג בקשת עמו תأملך לא בכרים... ... by the King of Eternity that you will speak with me in truth and not with lies.

Third Masculine (כַּל)

1QapGen ii.20: ידועו... And he will know all things with certainty because he is favored...  

Third Feminine (כַּל)

4QL evi 2 15: ... It will [not] pass from you unto every...

1QapGen xix.20: אַתִּי בִּטָּלָהּ וּפִטָּלָהּ בִּדְרֵי... And I will live by your protection, and my soul will be spared on account of you.

Plural

First Common (כֵּן)

4Q Tob b 4 ii.6-7: כֵּן נָשְׁקֶּמָּה דָּא לִיָּלָהוּ זַכְּפִּמָּה... And now, we will speak with that girl this night and we will present her her.

12 See note 10 (page 121).
We will [not] turn back, any of us, from this affair.

**Second Masculine**

And you will not be able to find [a way for walking on the du[s]t] [and on the stones]...

You will forsake the [ways of truth and all the paths of...]

**Third Masculine**

...They will [not] be able to conquer its ramparts.

...and all the provinces will pay him homage.

**Third Feminine**

And all those who enter the bridal chamber are not more beautiful than she.

They will cleave together and the wind [will] not enter between them.

---

**Examples of the Jussive**

Note also the use of ממלך in line 6 of this fragment.
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Singular

Second Masculine (ḵêṯēl)

אמור לך זכרון על דידי לך ידך עד ה買いו אתיה ו... And [I] say to you: “Do not be angry with me because I came here to [you…”

נואש סלע יכ אל סלע ו... 4QLevi^1 1 i.17: And may no adversary rule over [lit.: in] me…

Second Feminine (ḵêtēl)

אל תדחהו את זכימת של אחותי Do not fear and do not worry about him, my sister.

Third Masculine (ḵêṯēl)

ואל ישלך בלילה ובלבמים אתיהי מני And may he not have power in this night to defile my wife from me.

אל יבק נבكتابة ברי May my son not cling to silver!

Plural

Second Masculine (ḵêṯēl)

ואל נ JsonConvertה ליטא... May they not renounce wisdom for the teaching…

Third Masculine (ḵêṯēl)

Examples of the Imperative

Singular

Second Masculine (קָוָה)

And now, go, speak to the king, and may he send his wife from himself to her husband.

Plural

Second Masculine (קָוָה)

Place your hands upon...
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Table 8.3: The Afformatives of the יָלַים Verb in the Pe'āl

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perfect</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>נָתַת/מַעַת</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>נָתַת/מַעַת</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Second</td>
<td>נָתַת-מַעַת</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>נָתַת-מַעַת</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Third</td>
<td>נָתַת/מַעַת</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>נָתַת/מַעַת</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperfect</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>אַתְמָן/אָתֶם</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>אַתְמָן/אָתֶם</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Second</td>
<td>תַּבָּנִית/תַּבָּנִית</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>תַּבָּנִית/תַּבָּנִית</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Third</td>
<td>תַּבָּנִית/תַּבָּנִית</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>תַּבָּנִית/תַּבָּנִית</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperative</td>
<td>Second</td>
<td>בַּא/בָא</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>בַּא/בָא</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Second</td>
<td>תַּבָּנִית</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>תַּבָּנִית</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples of the Perfect

**Singular**

**First Masculine** (נָתַת/מַעַת)

And [I] say to you, 'Do not be angry with me because I came here...

**Second Masculine** (נָתַת-מַעַת)

...that you saw thus will their kingdom be.

**Third Masculine** (ה-מַעַת)

How this young man is like Tobit, the son of my uncle.\(^{17}\)

\(^{17}\)One may read a degree of ambiguity in the use of ה-מַעַת here. It may be read as a participle or as a finite, perfect form. We prefer the latter.
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... [he] sought wisdom...

Third Feminine (בֵּנָה)

... he sought wisdom...

And when Batenosh, my wife, saw that my face upon me was changed...

... rested [up]on him, he fell before the throne.

Plural

First Plural (בָּנָיִם)

... cattle we resembled...

Second Masculine (בָּנָי)

... cattle we resembled...

And the sons of man came and desired to cut down and uproot the cedar...

They were born upon the earth...

Examples of the Imperfect
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Singular

First Masculine (אֲבַנָּה אֲבָנָה)

אֲבַּה 1QEnGiants 29:1: ... I will be...

Second Masculine (תְּפַתֵּר)

תְּפַתֵּר 4QTob 10:5 ... And you will go to the house of Gabe[el] and give him a document...

Third Masculine (רָמֹז/רָמַז)

וְיִרְשָׁו 4QEn 1:2 ... and violence disappears from the earth...

Blessed be the true judg[ment.]

Third Feminine (רָמֹז/רָמַז)

וְיִרְשָׁו 4QLevi 1:4 ... and he will not depart from its flow...

While the noun here is normally masculine, the morphology of the verb would appear to argue for a feminine gender in this instance.
Plural

Second Masculine (דַבָּנוֹן)

athan חֶזְוֹק: ...yo/you will be...

QEn א: 5.127: ...now [two] times will be for the falling...

Third Masculine (דַבָּנוֹן)

athan חֶזְוֹק: ...they will [not] see the treasure...

QpSdan 12.2: ...And they will depart from the midst...

Examples of the Imperative

Singular

Second Masculine (בָּנָנוֹן)

athan חֶזְוֹק: ...According to what is in your hand, my son, give alms.

QpapTob א: 10.1: ...rejoice and exult among the sons...

Plural

Second Masculine (בָּנָנוֹן)

8.1.2.3 The Derived Stems of the בּ Verb

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perfect</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>n/e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>n/e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>n/e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Imperfect</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>n/e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>n/e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>n/e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jussive</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>n/e</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.4: The Afformatives of the בּ Verb in the Derived Stems

The patterns of the derived stems are illustrated in Table 8.4. The patterns included do not represent the affixes of the derived stems (e.g., the prefixed -N of the Aph’el) but are meant to illustrate the conjugative changes undergone by the basic verb stem. Only attested forms are represented by the appropriate form of 부.

Examples of the Perfect

Singular

First Common (ברוח/ברוח)

Aph. 4QEn Civ2 i.20: רוח/ברוח נ_own מ었던ת מעדפתים I was shown mountains to the northeast of them.

Aph. 4QLevi b i.15: רוח/ברוח אני אוותי Then I saw visions.20

20If one reads this verb as an Aph’al, the sentence should be rendered I was shown visions. However we prefer to read it as an Aph’el. So, also, García Martínez and Tigchelaar. Florentino García
Third Masculine (תתי)

Ithpe. 1QapGen ii.11: Then my heart within me changed greatly.

Aph. 4QpapTob 2 1: ... one of the sons of Niniveh. And he told the king...

Pa. 4QPrNab 1-3 3: ... I was banished seven years. And after God made...

Examples of the Imperfect

Singular

First Common (אחת)

And I, in truth, will make known to you everything.

Second Feminine ( Behin)

You will tell me – and not with lies – [whether] that...

Third Masculine (גית)

[G]reat will he be called and by his name he will name him.
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Third Feminine

Ithpe. 4QpsDan 25: 3: ...and you will speak the [and...]

Plural

Third Masculine

Pe. 4Q Tob 4 ii.18: ... that they will be to you... [and] they [will be...]

They will see his insignia.

Third Feminine

Ithpe. 4QpapTob 18,8: ... [And the gates of Jerusalem?] will be built of [beryl and] sapphire... 22

Examples of the Jussive

Singular

Third Masculine

Ithpe. 4Q Levi 2 4: ... and may [it] not be visible...
8.1.2.4 Thematic Vowels

The theme vowel that is most obvious is \(u\) in the active imperfect (דְּנַחְתָּנ הָעָשַׁר \(1Q\)apGen xx.22, מִסְרָה \(1Q\)apGen xx.19).

8.1.3 Non-finite: Participles and Infinitives

All forms of the active participle and infinitive are attested in QA. The paradigm for these forms is reflected in Table 8.5. All forms listed below are distilled from active participles. The only passive participle attested in QA is \(בַּרְכֵּי נַפְרוֹת\) in 4QpsDan 24 2. However, because the text breaks before the end of the word, one cannot be certain about the state of the participle. We, therefore, exclude this from our analysis below.

As with other Aramaic dialects, the sufformatives used for the participles follow the same paradigm as nouns. Similarly, the feminine adjective is formed like the feminine noun (e.g., suffixing of \(י\)). As Cook has pointed out, there is no

23The Pe’îl participle may also be classified as the Pe’al passive. Cf. Fitzmyer, Genesis Apocryphon, 211. The participle functions both as a modifier and as a substantive and, as such, takes the appropriate suffixes for each.

We hold the reading of דְּנַחְתָּנ (← לצות לשון to leave behind) in 1QapGen xix.15 to be of doubt and, therefore, do not include it here. The reading is simply not supported by the photographic evidence. What Fitzmyer seems to read as פ is actually a medial י rotated slightly counterclockwise. Reconstruction from the photograph argues for a Hebraic form, possibly Аפ ’ел, of הָעָשַׁר (← חותה). The expected Aramaic form would be מֵעָשַׁר (← חותה). This root is unattested in Aramaic according to Jacob Hoftijzer and K. Jongeling, Dictionary of the North-west Semitic Inscriptions (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1995), Handbuch der Orientalistik 21 2 vols., 465. Cf. also §7.1 (page 113). Jastrow finds a verbal form מִיעַפ in later Aramaic to mean to burst forth and a nominal form meaning scraper; Sokoloff only finds the latter meaning in JPA, and then in the form מִיע. Marcus Jastrow, A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli, and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature (New York: The Judaica Press, 1996), 583b; Michael Sokoloff, A Dictionary of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic of the Byzantine Period (Ramat-Gan: Bar-Ilan University Press, 1992), 243a.

The seeming usage of מִישְׁצֵה (← יָשָׁם to heal) in 1QapGen xx.19 and xx.20 is, in our judgment, evidence of an infinitive with a suffixal pronoun.

24See §§8.2 and 8.3.1 (pages 144 and 147, respectively)
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evidence for the vocalization of the infinitive. The preformatives, however, are shown below. The complement marker for the infinitive is typically -ד but -ד also occurs several times.

Table 8.5: Non-finite Verb Patterns in QA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern</th>
<th>Infinitive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pe‘al</td>
<td>מַכְלָא</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pa‘el</td>
<td>מַכְלָא</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aph‘el</td>
<td>מַכְלָא</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ithpe‘el</td>
<td>מַכְלָא</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ithpa‘al</td>
<td>מַכְלָא</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.1.3.1 The Participle of the Regular Verb

Paradigm of the Singular

Table 8.6: Participle Forms of the Regular Verb (singular, by stem)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stem</th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Absolute</th>
<th>Emphatic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pe‘al</td>
<td>Masculine</td>
<td>קְבָלָא/קֵבָל</td>
<td>n/e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feminine</td>
<td>קְבָלָא/קֵבָל</td>
<td>n/e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pa‘el</td>
<td>Masculine</td>
<td>מַכָּלָא</td>
<td>n/e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feminine</td>
<td>מַכָּלָא</td>
<td>n/e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aph‘el</td>
<td>Masculine</td>
<td>מַכָּלָא</td>
<td>n/e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feminine</td>
<td>מַכָּלָא</td>
<td>n/e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ithpe‘el</td>
<td>Masculine</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>n/e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feminine</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>n/e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ithpa‘al</td>
<td>Masculine</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>n/e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feminine</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>n/e</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples of the Singular

PE‘AL

Masculine Absolute (קָטֵל)

וַיִּשְׁפַּר בָּרָא אָבִירה דִּי אָבְרָהָם דִּי הוֹא יוֹב בֵּיתוֹ: 1QapGen xxi.34-xxii.1: And they captured Lot, the son of Abraham’s brother, who was living in Sodom together with them and all his flocks.

Feminine Absolute (קָטֶל)

וַחֲרָאת מַחֲשָׁה לְהוֹלֵךְ אָן חַיִיתָה: 1QapGen xx.16-17: And it was crushing to him and to every member of his house.

PA‘EL

Masculine Absolute (מֹכֵל)

וְמַחְשֵׁרָה מִדְבַּר שׁומַע: 4QEnastrª 26:3: And it wants for the leading of the sun...

Feminine Absolute (מֹכֵל)

בִּכְרֵשֵׁת מַחְכָּלָה עָמְךָ... 1QapGen ii.18: ...speaking with you truthfully.
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APH‘EL

Masculine Absolute (מַפֶּסֶת)

1QapGen xxii.20: ... עד שאמר أברא ממלך סדום פירם הגוה Then I

Abram said to the King of Sodom, "I lift up..." 26

ITHPE‘EL

Masculine Singular (מַפֶּסֶת)

וַיֹּאמֶר שֵׁם מִלְקָה דָּוִיד לְאָבִיו וַיִּרְבֶּה 1QapGen xx.9-10: And Sarai said to the king. "He is my brother" so that I was profiting on account of her.

Paradigm of the Plural Participle

Table 8.7: Participle Forms of the Regular Verb (plural, by stem)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stem</th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Absolute</th>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Emphatic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pe‘al</td>
<td>Masculine</td>
<td>כִּיסִי</td>
<td>כִּיסִי</td>
<td>n/e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feminine</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>n/e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pa‘el</td>
<td>Masculine</td>
<td>מַכְסִי</td>
<td>מַכְסִי</td>
<td>n/e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feminine</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>n/e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aph‘el</td>
<td>Masculine</td>
<td>מַכְסִי</td>
<td>מַכְסִי</td>
<td>n/e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feminine</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>n/e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ithpe‘el</td>
<td>Masculine</td>
<td>מַכְסִי</td>
<td>מַכְסִי</td>
<td>n/e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feminine</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>n/e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ithpa‘al</td>
<td>Masculine</td>
<td>מַכְסִי</td>
<td>מַכְסִי</td>
<td>n/e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feminine</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>n/e</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples of the Plural

PE'AL

Masculine Absolute (כֹּסֶל)

1QapGen xix.24-25: ... And they gave [to me...

4QTob\(^b\) 4 i.11: The two of [th]em [to]gether went [until they drew] ne[ar] to Media.

Masculine with Possessive Pronoun (כֹּסֶל)

11QTgJob ii.2: ... his snatchers [have come and they have pressed... \(^{27}\)

APH'EL

Masculine Absolute (מְכֶלכֶל)

4QEnastr\(^d\) 1 i.2: ... and] rain caused to fall [up]on the earth... 

ITHPE'EL

Masculine Absolute (מְרַכֶלכֶל)

4QEnastr\(^b\) 23 6: ... ] because in it all of the stars of the sky assemble and gather togeth-er and return... 

\(^{27}\)On this translation and the use of סָפֶל in QA, QH and related dialects, see Sokoloff, Targum to Job, 31 and 108.
ITHPA'AL

Masculine Absolute (מְרֻקְשֵׁלִים)

4QEn⁴ ii.4: ...זַהֲזַ אֱלֹהֵינוֹת נִלְחֲזְוּ מִכָּבֵיתִן See how all the trees – all of them – are withering ...

8.1.3.2 The Participle of the הָנִּיח Verb

Paradigm of the Singular

Table 8.8: Participle Forms of the הָנִּיח Verb (singular, by stem)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stem</th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Absolute</th>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Emphatic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pe‘al</td>
<td>Masculine</td>
<td>הנָחֵלִים</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>n/e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feminine</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>בָּנוֹאָה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pa‘el</td>
<td>Masculine</td>
<td>מִנְמַחְמִים</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>n/e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feminine</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>בָּנוֹאָה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aph‘el</td>
<td>Masculine</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>n/e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feminine</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>n/e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ithpe‘el</td>
<td>Masculine</td>
<td>מְמַבְּנֵי</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>n/e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feminine</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>n/e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ithpa‘al</td>
<td>Masculine</td>
<td>מְמַבְּנֵי</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>n/e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feminine</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>n/e</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples of the Singular

28This is the only place in QA where the root הָנִּיח occurs verbally as a participle. As a passive form of wither is required by context, one must assume either that the כ has assimilated or that there is lexical confusion on some level and that the participle is another form (e.g., Pa‘el). We side with the former here. Jastrow notes an alternative spelling of הָנִּיח in the later Targumic literature. Sokoloff, however, does not find an Ithpa‘al form of this verb in JPA. See Jastrow, Dictionary, 562b; Sokoloff, Dict. of JPA, 234b.
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PEʾAL

Masculine Absolute

(בָּאָה/בָּאָה)

4QEn² 4 9: ... and to trouble whoever swore concerning... 

4QLevi a 2 4: ... all who seek...²⁹

Feminine Absolute

(בָּאָה)

1QapGen ii.14: ... I swear to you by the Great Holy One, by the King of heaven...

PAʾEL

Masculine Absolute

(מֶבֶנָה/מֶבֶנָה)

4QPrNab 1-3 7: Seven years [I] prayed [before] gods of silver and gold.

4QEnastrb 7 iii.2: ... then it begins to turn, to come and to arise through its parts.

ITHPEʾEL

Masculine Absolute

(מְדָהָה)

4QEn a ii.2: ... and everything is apparent to you...


³⁰We here read this form as a Peʾal feminine singular absolute; however, it could also be read as a Paʾal feminine singular emphatic.
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ITHPA‘AL

Masculine Absolute (המ戾)

1QapGen ii.2: And my heart within me was changed about this boy.

Paradigm of the Plural

Table 8.9: Participle Forms of the נינ Verb (plural, by stem)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stem</th>
<th>Plural</th>
<th>Absolute</th>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Emphatic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pe‘al</td>
<td>Masculine</td>
<td>נינ</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>n/e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feminine</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>n/e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pa‘el</td>
<td>Masculine</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>n/e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feminine</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>n/e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aph‘el</td>
<td>Masculine</td>
<td>ממען</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>n/e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feminine</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>n/e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ithpe‘el</td>
<td>Masculine</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>n/e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feminine</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>n/e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ithpa‘al</td>
<td>Masculine</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>n/e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feminine</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>n/e</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples of the Plural

PE‘AL

Masculine Absolute (נינ)

4QEn i.7: ...And you desire [shade and relief] from it.

4QLevi 1 i.17: ...giving to him with it honor because everything [they] desire...
APH‘EL

Masculine Absolute (מ פת

וַיִּתֵּן לְהוֹ הר קה ט מַהְיוּ מִלְאָה 1QapGen ii.21: And to him [they] make known everything.

8.1.3.3 The Infinitive

The forms of the infinitive are reflected in Table 8.10. As the infinitive forms of the לַּי verb do not differ substantially from the regular forms, the following table reflects both types.

Paradigm of the Infinitive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stem</th>
<th>Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pe‘al</td>
<td>מַקְטָב</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pa‘el</td>
<td>הַמַּקְטָב</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aph‘el</td>
<td>הַמַּקְטָב</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ithpe‘el</td>
<td>הַמַּקְטָב</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ithpa‘el</td>
<td>הַמַּקְטָב</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples

Pe‘al (מַקְטָב)

וַיִּתֵּן לְהוֹ הר קה ט מַהְיוּ מִלְאָה 1QapGen xx.17: And he was able to approach her.
And I know that Raguel will not be able to keep her from you...

The giants arranged to kill the man and...

winds depart which are] to them for the healing of the earth and for its revitalization.

...because from there the moons rise in [their] completing of their cycles...

I prayed and asked and begged <God> and said in sorrow, even <as>

---

31 Note also the use of 'tn in this line.
32 We here read the supralinear ב as an alternative reading. The aleph under it may be read in its stead. Milik understands the he as the intended reading. See Jozef T. Milik, The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumrān Cave 4. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976), 288.
my tears fell... 

8.2 Nouns

Paradigm of Noun Forms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Absolute</th>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Emphatic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Masculine</td>
<td>קטל</td>
<td>קטל</td>
<td>קטל נ</td>
<td>קטל נ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminine</td>
<td>נ - נ</td>
<td>קטל נ</td>
<td>קטל נ</td>
<td>קטל נ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Plural</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Masculine</td>
<td>קטל</td>
<td>קטל</td>
<td>קטל נ</td>
<td>קטל נ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminine</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>קטל</td>
<td>קטל נ</td>
<td>קטל נ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples

Singular

Masculine Absolute (קטל)

1QapGen xix.14: And I Abraham dreamed a dream in the night of <our> entering the land of Egypt.

4QLevi¹ 1 i.9: And now, reading and instruction and wisdom...

4QTob² ar 5 10: [And] you will go to the house <of> Gaba[e]l and give him a document and [receive...
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Feminine Absolute (קֵּסֶלַד)

1QapGen xx.34: ... And [Lot] had taken for himself a wife from the daughters of...

4Q Tob $ar 4 i.17: ... and he has a beautiful daughter...

Masculine Construct (קְסֶל)

4Q Enastr $b ar 7 ii.5: ... And it is covered the rest of this day...

4QapocrDan ar i.6: ... the king of Assyria and of Egypt...

Feminine Construct (קָסֶלַד)

1QapGen xxi.5-6: ... And he went and dwelt in the Valley of the Jordan, and all his possessions were with him.

4QpapTob $ ii.10: ... and Anna my wife had been returned to me.

Masculine Emphatic (קָסֶל)

1QapGen xxi.16: ... And I walked along the shore of the Great Salt Sea...

4Q En $ b ar iii.14: ... Our Great Lord is he, the Lord of the Ages...
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[And every]one was gazing upon it...

Feminine Emphatic (ןְִנְִלְִתָּה)

... do not renounce wisdom.

Plural

Masculine Absolute (קִנְִלְִתָּה)

And he chose from his servants three hundred choice men <ready> for war.

He will give a nation into his hand.

And have they increased <their> possessions?

Masculine Construct (קִנְִלְִתָּה)

And I read before them the [writing] of the words of Enoch. 33

And they fled to the mountains of Ararat.

33Beyer reads את here instead of תֹּנֵי [Beyer, ATTM, 173]. Palaeographically, this is unlikely. While the word is broken horizontally by a tear, one can still read the word with some degree of confidence. the initial letter exhibits two vertical lines hanging from the ceiling of the line. This could be read as an aleph if the lines were further apart. As it is, they represent the two vertical strokes of a het. The final letter has a broader head than a final nun and should thus be read as a final kaph.
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Feminine Construct

And how long and thin are all the fingers of her hands!

Masculine Emphatic

And he sent calling all the wise men of Egypt and all the healers...

Feminine Emphatic

And I gave thanks there before God concerning all the flocks and the good things which we had given to me...

8.3 Modifiers

8.3.1 Adjectives

The formation of adjectives in QA, as in BA, is analogous to nouns in gender, number, and state. Similarly, they use the same sufformatives as nouns (See §8.2).

Table 8.12 reflects the basic forms of the adjective in QA.
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Paradigm

Table 8.12: Sufformatives of the Adjective

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Absolute</th>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Emphatic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Masculine</td>
<td>גַּלַּי</td>
<td>גַּלַּי</td>
<td>גַּלַּי</td>
<td>גַּלַּי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminine</td>
<td>נַלְטָל</td>
<td>נַלְטָל</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>נַלְטָל</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Masculine</td>
<td>נַלְטָל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminine</td>
<td>n/e</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples

Singular

Masculine Absolute (גַּלַּי)

1QapGen xii.13: And I planted a great vineyard on Mount Lubar.

4Q242 i.2: ... you are angry... 34

Masculine Emphatic (גַּלַּי)

1QapGen xix.8: Up to this point I had not reached the holy mountain.

Feminine Absolute (נַלְטָל)

4Q196 2 11: On the day of Shavuot [they made] for [me...] a good meal.

34 While הֶרֶם may be seen to be a participle here, we find an adjectival function to be simpler. Based on our research, QA does not elsewhere use a participle form without a main verb to express attribution. Therefore, a predicate adjectival form is to be preferred.
8.3.2 Adverbials

8.3.2.1 Adverbials of time

then 1QapGen ii.1 Then I thought in my heart..., 1QapGen ii.8, xx.21, xxii.20, 4QLeviª a 1 ii.13, 4QLeviª b 2, 4QTJud 1 4, 4QapocrLevi² 9 i.4, 11QTgJob xx.6
Until now I had not reached the holy mountain, 4QLevi\textsuperscript{a} \textsection{1} i.9 until now I had not.

And now, reading and instruction and wisdom... 1QapGen \textsection{xix.12, xx.13, 23, xxii.29, 4QEnGiants\textsuperscript{a} \textsection{8} 14, 4QEnGiants\textsuperscript{c} \textsection{24} 4, 4QEnGiants\textsuperscript{d} \textsection{2} 13, 4QTQahat \textsection{1} i.4, 4QVisions of Amram\textsuperscript{d} \textsection{14} 1, 11QTgJob xxiv.4, 6, xxxvii.7.

And the next day, I thus went up to Ramat-Hazor.\textsuperscript{35}

8.3.2.2 Demonstrative adverbials

And [I] say to you, “Do not be angry with me because I came here to...”.

There they will shout... 4QWords of Michael \textsection{1} i.2, 4; 3 there will shout... And there he found him... 1QapGen \textsection{xix.7, xxi.1, 20, 4QpapTob\textsuperscript{d} \textsection{17} i.13, 4QEn\textsuperscript{c} \textsection{3} 18.

\textsuperscript{35}This is the only occurrence of the word in QA. The morpheme is anomalous. The lexical form from later sources is here. Cf. Sokoloff, Dict. of JPA, 301a; Jastrow, Dictionary, 764a.

Fitzmyer offers as a single, compound preposition meaning on the morrow. Cf. Fitzmyer, Genesis Apocryphon, 215. We, however, have judged the former adverb to suffice to express the temporal aspect of the verb. The latter we judge to express a modal sense, thus. Cf. Rosenthal, Grammar, §92.

\textsuperscript{36}Cf. Florentino García Martínez and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition Vol. 2, (Leiden/Grand Rapids, MI: Brill/Eerdmans, 1998), 30. The reading of here is very uncertain. If reading is read as a finite verb with a masculine singular suffix, a reading which matches the context better than an infinitive, then the next word is not likely to be a proper name with an object complement. Beyer reads . Cf. Beyer, ATTM, 169. This reading fits the context better, not requiring a direct connection with the preceding suffix, but the photographic evidence argues against it. Avigad and Yadin and Fitzmyer, as well, do not attempt reconstruction of this partially extant form. Cf. Nahman Avigad and Yigael Yadin, A Genesis Apocryphon: A Scroll from the Wilderness of Judaea: Description and Contents of the Scroll, Facsimiles, Transcription and Translation of Columns II, XIX-XXII (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1956), Plate for Column II; Fitzmyer, Genesis Apocryphon, 52.
8.3.2.3 Modal adverbials

how 11QTgJob vii.6 ... How [did?] not...; 5Q537 11 2, 12 1; 11QTgJob xxxi.2  And where will he make [the wind] go forth?

where 11QTgJob xxxi.2  And where will he make [the wind] go forth?

All of these joined together for war, 1QapGen xxi.25, 11QTgJob xxx.5.

how much 4QTob 4 iii.4 And he said to Edna, his wife, “How much this young man is like Tobit!”

And how he does not answer him... 1QapGen xx.2-4; 4QpapTob a 14 ii.8, 4QPrNab 4 4; 1QapGen xxi.14 And how he does not answer him...

and see how (great) is its (lit.: her) length... xxii.29, 11QTgJob xxi.6.

thus, so 1QapGen xxi.10 And so I went up to Ramat-Hazor the next day, 11QTgJob xxxvii.8... Therefore, I was poured out...

much, exceedingly 1QapGen xiii.15 And I was marvelling at this olive tree and its leaves exceedingly much, xx.33

Your wealth and your flocks will increase much.

why 1QapGen xxi.32-33 And why are all these things to me?
8.3.2.4 Modal assertive adverbials

... and also the Levant because they rise from there, 1QTG Jb xxi.1. ... my words, even mine
1QapGen xx.17, 32, 33, 34, xxi.6, 13, xxii.11, 4QpapTob a xiii.1, 4QTob b iv.10, 4QLevi b 3, 4QBirth of Noah c i.10, 11QTG Jb xxi.9, xxvii.2, xxix.1.

8.3.2.5 Expressions of Negation

For a discussion of the expressions of negation, see Section 9.5.1 on page 231.

37 11QTG Jb x.5 may be translated in two ways: What a wondrous matter we are hear[ing]! and How wondrous is the matter we are hear[ing]. In both instances, נְמָמָני functions to modify the verb. However, the context of 1QapGen xx compels the rendering how, which is not without precedent. Cf. נְמָמָני in Beyer, ATIM, 620–621; Sokoloff, Dict. of JPA, 293; Jastrow, Dictionary, 721a. Cf. also נְמָמָני in 4QTob b i.12.

38 נְמָמָני is usually rendered what (cf. BH מַה). However, the context of 1QapGen xx compels the rendering how, which is not without precedent. Cf. מַה in Beyer, ATIM, 620–621; Sokoloff, Dict. of JPA, 293; Jastrow, Dictionary, 721a. Cf. also מַה in 4QTob b i.12.

39 We here render fully after the MT מַה.
8.4 Pronouns

8.4.1 Personal

Table 8.13: Personal Pronouns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>First</th>
<th>Second</th>
<th>Third</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Masculine</td>
<td>מִי</td>
<td>אָהֵנִי</td>
<td>אָה</td>
<td>אָה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminine</td>
<td>מִי</td>
<td>אָה</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>אָה</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Plural</th>
<th>First</th>
<th>Second</th>
<th>Third</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Masculine</td>
<td>אָהֵנַם</td>
<td>אָהֵנַם</td>
<td>אָה</td>
<td>אָה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminine</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>אָה</td>
<td>אָה</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples

Singular

First Common (انا

1QapGen ii.3: ... וְמַעֲרִי אָהִי לֹא אָהֵנַם אֵלֶּה אָה | Then I, Lamech, was frightened and entered upon Batenosh... |

1QTgJob xiv.6: ... אוּר אָהִי שֵיָנְבֶּית לוֹמָמֵך | Behold, I saved a poor person from... |

Second Masculine (אתַּה/אתַּה)

1QapGen xx.15-16: ... וְיָדַעְךְּ מִרְי בַּאֲתַהְךְּ מִרְי הָלָכְּ מִלְּכֵי אָתָּה | And they will know you, my Lord, that you are the Lord to all the kings of the earth. |

4QapocrDan i.2: ... אוּר אָתָּה שֵיָנְבֶּית | You are angry and [...] have changed you. |
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Third Masculine (א vowels)

1QapGen xix.20: "In every place [we go, you are to say] about me, ‘He is my brother.’"

4QTobb⁴ iii.7: And they said to her, “We know him.” “Is he well?”

Third Feminine (א vowels)

1QapGen xx.27: ... “‘She is my sister,’ and she is your wife! And I took her to myself for a wife!”

4QEn c 2: 4 QTobb iv i.17: And fear not... [for?] she has been set apart for you.

Plural

First Common (א vowels)

1QapGen xix.12: ... We... our land [and] I trav[ersed] the seven branches of this river...

4QEn c 2: ... We are [not] able to stand before...

Second Masculine (א vowels)

4QTobb⁴ iii.5: And she said to them, “Whence have you come, brothers?”

4QEn c 1 6.18: ... You are desiring and entr[eating]...

Third Masculine (א vowels/ה vowels)
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11QTgJob xxv.2: ...and in the place of... he will throw them.\(^{40}\)

1QapGen xxii.24: ...they are rulers over their portion to give [it] to you.

Third Feminine (אֵנֹּט)

4QEn\(^{a}\) iii.15: ...וַאֲנָהּ אֵנֹּט הֵרַשָּׁה... ...and to teach sorcery (to) them...

8.4.2 Pronominal Suffixes

8.4.2.1 Preceded By A Consonant

Table 8.14: Affixed to noun forms that end With a consonant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>First</th>
<th>Second</th>
<th>Third</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Masculine</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>י-</td>
<td>י-</td>
<td>י-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminine</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>n/e</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Plural

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>First</th>
<th>Second</th>
<th>Third</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Masculine</td>
<td>ע-</td>
<td>מ-מ-</td>
<td>ע-מ-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminine</td>
<td>ע-</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>n/e</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples

Singular

First Common (ך-)

\(^{40}\)Cf. MT: סֵפֶךְ he strikes them; cf. also Sokoloff, Targum to Job, 77. Sokoloff renders this passage: “he will throw them.” Obviously, the broken context of this passage does not allow for certainty about whether the objective pronoun was intended in Aramaic to perform a similar function as in Hebrew. Cf. also García Martínez, Tigchelaar and van der Woude, Qumran Cave 11: II, 136.
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also in my heart, and
[...] not to anyone.

I called to my servant, but he
did not answer.

Second Masculine (ך)

אמסת לי Ashton עיל תלמי ונגדו: And she said to me,
"Tell me your dream and I will know (it)."

for the [everlasting] years...

Third Masculine (ך)

In that night, God Most High sent a crushing spirit to
him to crush him and all the members of his household...

Third Feminine (ך/חק-)

And you will profane his name
and the name of his father.

It should be noted that all instances of the second masculine pronominal suffix, save for two,
are to be found in 4QEnGiants a (7 i.3, ix.4, ix 5, ix 6, and xiii 3.). The two exceptions are
in IQapGen xx.26 and הול in 4QLevi b 1 18.
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And how smooth is the hair of her head!

And her beauty is above all of them.

Plural

First Common (ן-)

After this day, Lot parted from my camp because of the behavior of our shepherds.42

... our Lord, great is he, the Lord of Eternity...

Second Masculine (מ-)

And the years of your destruction will increase...

And now, unfasten your chains binding...

Third Masculine (נ-)

For twelve years they paid their tribute to the king of Elam.

42 Note that לָכִי may be read also as an object complement with a first person singular suffix. We here render the form as my camp from the לָכִי to join (by implication to camp).

43 Curiously, Beyer does not include the third person plural pronominal suffix in his paradigm of the object suffix. See Beyer, ATTM, 474.
8.4.2.2 Preceded By A Vowel

Table 8.15: Affixed to nouns that end with a vowel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>First</th>
<th>Second</th>
<th>Third</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Masculine</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>י-</td>
<td>ḫ-</td>
<td>ק-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminine</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>י-</td>
<td>ק-</td>
<td>ק-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plural</td>
<td>נ-</td>
<td>א-</td>
<td>ת-</td>
<td>י-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masculine</td>
<td>נ-</td>
<td>א-</td>
<td>ת-</td>
<td>י-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminine</td>
<td>נ-</td>
<td>נ/e</td>
<td>י-</td>
<td>ק- (?)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.15 reflects the pronominal suffix as it is attached to a base form which ends in a vowel. One will note that where the ultimate consonant of the base form is the same as that of the prefix, a coalescence takes place (e.g., the first common singular).44

Examples

Singular

First Common (י-)

44Beyer finds the suffix י in the Egyptian Papyri. However, due to the unusual way in which he refers to the text, we are unable to trace this form. Further, he does not clearly delineate why this Egyptian papyrus should be associated with the Aramaic of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Klaus Beyer, Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer: Ergänzungsband (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1994), 288.

Throughout his discussion of the pronominal suffixes in his 1994 volume, Beyer prepends the yod of the base form to the suffix. This is a curious departure from the manner in which he details them in his 1984 volume. This later presentation is also erroneous in that it confuses a part of noun morphology with the morphology of the pronoun. Beyer, ATTM, 424, and Beyer, Ergänzungsband, 287–288.
And I sent (and) I called to Mamre, Arnem, and Eshkol, the three Amorite brothers, my friends.

Second Masculine (ך-)

א песך

And raise your eyes and look to the east and to the west...

Second Feminine (ך-ך-ך)\(^{45}\)

אמרין עליי יד אחתי וזו אחתי בטליכי: "...say about me, 'He is my brother', and I will live under your protection."

Third Masculine (ך-ך-ך)

והיה המלך עליים...מלך סודס לכלל תורהיה: And the king of Elam...proved stronger than the king of Sodom and all his allies.

Third Feminine (ך-ך-ך)

\(^{45}\)Steven Fassberg, "The Pronominal Suffix of the Second Feminine Singular in the Aramaic Texts from the Judaean Desert" DSD 3 (1996), 10-19. Fassberg discusses four different spellings of the second feminine singular in texts from the Judaean Desert: כ, כך, כ-ך, וך, and כ. The first (ך-ך) is used in QA in conjunction with the infinitive and with prepositions. In 1QapGen xix.21, one finds the infinitival form [They will desire] to separate you from me and to kill me. The suffix adjoined to prepositions is discussed in §8.4.2.6; later dialects of Middle Aramaic demonstrate its usage with nouns, as well.

The latter two suffixial forms are attested in documents from Murabba'at and Nahal Ḥever, respectively, and thus fall outside the scope of this work.
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...and beautiful is the image of her face.

They will not be able to conquer its walls...

Plural

First Common (ך-)

...and he is a [m]an from our father's house...

Second Masculine (省公安厅-)

...place your hands upon...

Third Masculine (ן-)

Their sons will be destroyed and they will see...

Third Feminine (ן-ן)(?)

...their father. Then...

8.4.2.3 Used With Perfect Verb Forms

Examples

46The feminine character of the third person suffix in אבות is questionable. If it is read as masculine, then the suffixן should be read as an option for the third masculine suffix, obviously. We here read it as feminine and include it under that heading.
### Table 8.16: Suffixes of Perfect Verb Forms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>First</th>
<th>Second</th>
<th>Third</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Masculine</td>
<td>-ני</td>
<td>-ז</td>
<td>-ה</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminine</td>
<td>-ני</td>
<td>-כ</td>
<td>-ה</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plural</td>
<td>Masculine</td>
<td>נ-</td>
<td>נ/ע</td>
<td>נ/ש</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminine</td>
<td>נ-</td>
<td>נ/ע</td>
<td>נ/ש</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Singular**

**First Common (ן-)**

ואדודי התם קודם אלהא על כל...визי海滨...וזיר אטיןש

And I gave thanks there before God concerning all the things...which he had given to me...and because he had returned me to this land in peace.

**Second Masculine (ד-)**

ד...ן פקדך

4Q Tobb 4 ii.12: "...who commanded you?"

**Third Masculine (ך-)**

ך...ך קשיטא לביית רוגאל אוחנה דרבך א抑え..."Take me straight to the house of Raguel our brother." And he took him and [they] went...

**Third Feminine (ך-ךך-)**
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1QapGen xx.27: And I took her to myself for a wife!

4QTob⁴ iii.1: He loved her greatly and his heart within him...

Plural

First Common (ָּ/ן-)

4QLevi³-⁴ 2: He beswore us rest...men.

4QEnastr⁶ 7 i.7: He has imprisoned us and has captured you.

8.4.2.4 Used With Imperfect Verb Forms

Table 8.17: Suffixes Used With Imperfect Verb Forms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>First</th>
<th>Second</th>
<th>Third</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Masculine</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>ח-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminine</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>ח/ן-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Plural</th>
<th>First</th>
<th>Second</th>
<th>Third</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Masculine</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminine</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.17 reflects the object suffixes as they are affixed to the imperfect forms of Qumran Aramaic. It should be noted that the examples cited below occur with paragogic nun. Our research has not revealed an exception to this trend.⁴⁷

Examples

Singular

First Common (ו-)

אליעזר בר זר... ונתנין: \( \) יir\( \)
1QapGen xxii.34: \( \) Eliezer, son of... [w]ill inherit me.

וחגיגי לא יברך תדנ... \( \)
1QapGen ii.6: \( \) You will make known to me – and not with lies – [whether] that...

Second Masculine (ד-)

אמר לה לא יתרנך זר נון די וטן ... \( \)
1QapGen xxii.34: ... And he said to him, “This one will not inherit you, but one will come forth...”

Third Masculine (ה-)

וידתנה וקדשתה... \( \) ...and he will cleanse it and will sanctify it...
4QTgLev 2:3: ...

��א תדענה \( \)
4QLevi\( ^{a} \) 4:4: Lo, know it (?)

Third Feminine (נ-)

אלה כי ודתרען אינתן... \( \) Behold, to you and to your descendants I will give it...
1QapGen xxi.14: ...

יד חזא תדע נון ותנתנה כנכר... \( \) ...because h[e] kno[ws] that if he gives her to [another] man...
4QTob\( ^{b} \) 4 ii.5: ...

ת realtà דעגנוה דא בוליא וא תקימנה... \( \) Tonight you will speak with this wo[m]an. You will engage her...
Table 8.18: Suffixes Used With Infinitives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suffixes Used With Infinitives</th>
<th>First</th>
<th>Second</th>
<th>Third</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Singular</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masculine</td>
<td>-ר</td>
<td>ח-</td>
<td>ח-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminine</td>
<td>-ל</td>
<td>-ל</td>
<td>-ל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plural</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masculine</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>n/e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminine</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>n/e</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.4.2.5 Used With Infinitive Verb Forms

Examples

**Singular**

**First Common** (ל-)

1QapGen xx.9: ... 1 רבשקתי לאמורה שרי ... 1QapGen xx.9: And he wanted to kill me, but Sarai said...

4QapTob vi.8: ... 1overe לאמורה ... 1overe ... and speak for my freeing from upon...

**Second Feminine** (ל-)

1QapGen xix.21: ... 1综合整治 מילקסי ... 1综合整治 ... they will try] to separate you from me and to kill me.

**Third Masculine** (ר-)

1QapGen xx.20: ... 1综合整治 לאסייתו ... 1综合整治 ... But all the healers and the magicians and all the wisemen were not able to stand to heal him.

48Cf. note 45 (page 159).
Third Feminine (תָּנָה-)

1QapGen xx.9: שָׁנָא רַחַם תֹּלֵעַ דָּבָרָה...

...he desired her greatly and sent for her to be brought with haste.⁴⁹

8.4.2.6 Used With Prepositions

Prepositions Functioning As Singular Nouns - Examples

Singular

First Common (ך•)

⁴⁹In his commentary on the *Genesis Apocryphon*, Fitzmyer reads this as an asyndetic use of דָּבָר. In support of this he cites the use of שָׁלֵל in 1QapGen xx.18–19, xxi.21, the use of נֶמֶד in xx.29, xxi.13, and the use of לִי in xx.23 and 24. See Fitzmyer, *Genesis Apocryphon*, 127. However, when one considers these forms, one realizes that the use of דָּבָר in 1QapGen xx.9 is open to more than one interpretation. The lines in question are listed below in order of their citation here and by Fitzmyer.

The use of נֶמֶד

1QapGen xx.18–19: ...עַל שָׁלֵל נֶמֶד הַכָּפָר

1QapGen xxi.21: ...וְשָׁלֵל נֶמֶד

Of these two instances, the latter is the only inflected form. Therefore, the use of נֶמֶד in xx.18–19 could be an epexegetical participle.

The use of נֶמֶד

1QapGen xx.29: ...וֹי נֶמֶד וָנָה

1QapGen xxi.13: ...נֶמֶד וָאָל

Obviously, there is no asyndeten in the first use of נֶמֶד listed here; this example should therefore be discarded for the present argument. With regard to the second instance, the quality of the parallel is significantly reduced by the use of imperatives in a series. Fitzmyer’s argument, in our judgment, needs a negative proof as to why the first imperative could not be in a sentence of its own: *Stand up! Walk and go…*

The use of נֶמֶד

1QapGen xx.23: ...וָנָה נֶמֶד אָמַר לְמַלְאָךְ

1QapGen xx.24: ...וָנָה נֶמֶד אָמַר לְמַלְאָךְ ...

While both of these lines may exhibit an asyndetic use of אָמַר, neither manifests a suffixial pronoun nor an adverbial phrase, nevermind an adverbial phrase which begins with the infinitive complement. We submit that 1QapGen xx.9 may exhibit an infinitive that is anomalously separated by its complement by an adverb and that has a third feminine pronominal suffix. There is obvious ambiguity about how to understand the forms of the sentence. Therefore, we include the form נֶמֶד here with due caution.
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Table 8.19: Suffixes Applied to Prepositions

*Prepositions functioning as singular nouns*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>First</th>
<th>Second</th>
<th>Third</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Masculine</td>
<td>-ו/י</td>
<td>-ו/י</td>
<td>-ו/י</td>
<td>-ו/י</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminine</td>
<td>-ו</td>
<td>-ו/י</td>
<td>-ו/י</td>
<td>-ו/י</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>First</th>
<th>Second</th>
<th>Third</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Masculine</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>-ו/י</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminine</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>n/e</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Prepositions functioning as plural nouns*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>First</th>
<th>Second</th>
<th>Third</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Masculine</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>-ו/י</td>
<td>-ו/י</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminine</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>n/e</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>First</th>
<th>Second</th>
<th>Third</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Masculine</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>n/e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminine</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>n/e</td>
<td>n/e</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Except for that which the young men who went with me ate...

And she said, “Lo, my brother, and lo, my lord, remember (to yourself) my pleasure!”

...and bring me near to be with you...

---

50 Cf. Fitzmyer, *Genesis Apocryphon*, 86.  דרדר is a composite form of -דדר + -ל + -מ meaning, literally, “remember to yourself.”
Second Feminine (ו-ו-ו\(^5\))

1QapGen xix.19: ...that they desire to kill me and to leave you alone.

1QapGen xix.21: ...to separate you from me and to kill me.

Third Masculine (ו-

11QTgJob v.2: they [p]ray to God in his house...

4QWords of Michael i.12: ...to the Eternal Lord, to him mercies, and to him...

Third Feminine (ו-ו-ו\(^-\)ו\(^-\))

1QapGen xx.17: And he was not able to approach her, let alone know her, even though he was with her.

4QEnastr\(^c\) 1 ii.2: [that is,] the earth) and for its revitalization.

Plural

First Common (ו-ו-ו)

Fassberg has stated that the second feminine singular suffix is found in 4QpapTob\(^4\) 3 9 (ו-ו-ו) and 13 13 (ו-ו-ו). However, neither one is extant according to our reading. Fassberg relies on Beyer’s paleography. However, Beyer’s readings do not always adequately account for the textual evidence. For more on Fassberg’s study on the second feminine singular pronominal suffix, see note 45 in §8.4.2.2.
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Then he tormented, but not us...

Go[de] to us...

Second Masculine (כ-מ/כ, פ-מ)

There will be no peace for you.

hard-hearted ones, there will not be any peace for you...

Third Masculine (ן-מ)

And also among them, I saw trees that issued...

...and he forgave them their sins because of him.

Third Feminine (ו-מ/ו, מ)

How radiant are her eyes!

With regard to the third feminine plural, Fitzmyer and Kutscher argue for לרות to them in 1QapGen xx.3 where Avigad and Yadin and García Martínez and Tischler have read לרות. We find both readings to be doubtful. The graphemic identity between ו and וי in QA complicates the matter. While the form ו- is plausible by analogy with the masculine form and possibly with Aramaic outside of QA, we prefer the more conservative reading ו- because it is clearly attested in 1QapGen xx.6 and because the photographic evidence does not necessarily suggest a letter between ו and וי.

By way of illustration, with them is found in 4QEnGiants 16.4 by E. Cook’s reading. Milik’s transcription reads לכรอ. However, the photographic evidence vindicates neither reading, but the line should be readכי יד. Cf. Cook, “Aramaic of DSS”, 367; Milik, Books of Enoch, 307; Émile Puech, Qumrân Grotte 4: XXII. Textes Araméens, Première Partie (Oxford: Clarendon, 2001), DJD 31, 52 and Plate III.
Chapter 8: Morphology

4QEnastr 1 ii.2: ...which are] for them, for its healing [(that is,) the earth) and for its revitalization.

Prepositions Functioning As Plural Nouns - Examples

Singular

Second Masculine (ךכ/ךכ-)

4QTob 4 ii.2: And concerning yourself, a rightful judgment has decreed (for you) to take her.

הכנסה למותא העינא ת"א הלשוננה 4QEnGiants 9 5: ... before you [blank]

And now...

Second Feminine (ךכ-)

1QapGen xix.20: ...and I will live by your protection.

4QpapTob 18 ii.11: [Blessed be he unto the end of] everlasting, because in you they will bless his name... 53

Third Masculine (ךכ-ךכ)

1QapGen xx.18: ...the punishment and affliction grew stronger and more intense upon him and upon those of his house.

53 Fitzmyer suggests that the form דוכל is a case of scribal metathesis. By his rendering, the form should read דוכל. While this certainly is possible, modern students of the text are left with little recourse but to assume that the form as we have it was intelligible to the early reader and, judging from context, contained a feminine suffix דוכל.
Chapter 8: Morphology

And you desire shade and relief from it.

Praise and consider all of these works.

And he will cast all of them before him.

Third Feminine (וַיִּהְזֹא -)

...and they died just as they were entering her.

And the king gave to her... [and gold in abundance... before her and also Hagar.

Plural

Second Masculine (וְזָרָה -)

...upon you for evil.

Is it not upon me and upon you, my sons?

Third Masculine (וְזָרָה -)

And he came upon them in the night from their four sides.
8.4.3 Demonstrative

Table 8.20: Demonstrative Pronouns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Near</th>
<th>Far</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Masc Sing</td>
<td>ידוי</td>
<td>ידוי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fem Sing</td>
<td>נ</td>
<td>נ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Plur</td>
<td>אלוי</td>
<td>אלוי</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.20 highlights the demonstrative pronouns attested in QA. With reservation Fitzmyer suggests יד (1QapGen xx.9) as the masculine far demonstrative pronoun that. However, he gives no reasoning for such an assertion. The graphemic identity shared by יד and יד and by נ and נ in the scroll, combined with the obscure context, makes this reading dubious. For comparison, one should also

---

54 On the employment of "Zodiacal" in relation to מֶׁצַּר, see Milik, Books of Enoch, 295. García Martínez and Tigchelaar render this word as "constellations" or, in DJD 26, "periods." See García Martínez and Tigchelaar, DSSSE/I, 439 and Florentino García Martínez and Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar, "4Q Astronomical Enoch" ar" in Qumran Cave 4: XXVI: Cryptic Texts and Miscellanea, Part I ed. Stephen J. Pfann et al. (Oxford: Clarendon, 2000), DJD 36, 166.

55 Fitzmyer, Genesis Apocryphon, 205.

Beyer includes several forms of the demonstrative pronoun which are not included in Table 8.20. Our research has uncovered none of these, however. Cf. Beyer, ATTM, 425, and Beyer, Ergänzungsband, 281–282.

consider the end of the same line, which Fitzmyer renders as עזרו.\footnote{Fitzmyer, Genesis Apocryphon, 66.}

The difficulty in discerning how to read these two letters is further compounded by the fact that this may be a 	extit{hapax legomenon} for QA. It occurs in non-biblical QA again only in 1QNJ? 13, where it seems to begin a word and does not stand independently.

**Examples**

**Near Masculine Singular (דָּנָה/זָד)**

1QapGen ii.2: הָלַבְּנָי עַל מַשְׁתַּכְּנִי עַל עַלְיָמוֹת דָּנָה And my heart within me was changed concerning this boy.

4QTob\textsuperscript{b} 4 ii.3: ... והלך דָּנָה והקימוּתָה והשבנה נַלַחָתוֹת... “In this night, you will engage her and take her to yourself for a wife.”\footnote{We here render אָסָף, the Aph’el of אָסָף, as “engage.” The use of it here is idiomatic, being derived from the Aph’el to appoint. Cf. Sokoloff, Dict. of JPA, 481. קָמָה, Af., 4.}

**Near Feminine Singular (נָדָה/נַדָּה)**

4QTob\textsuperscript{b} 4 ii.3: ... והלך נַלַחָתוֹת נַדָּה... [My brother,] you will speak with this wo[man]...\footnote{Puech, Qumran Cave 4.XII: Part 1, 25. This reading is slightly different from Puech’s and does not follow his line numbering. Puech combines this fragment with fragment 2 column i, thus rendering this line 2\textsuperscript{i}+3 5.}

**Near Common Plural (אֲלֵךְ/אֲלֵיכָנָן)**

1QapGen xxi.25: כָּל אֶזְכָּר הַדָּתָה לִכְרָב לַעֲמַקָה דָּר סְדָיו All of these had made an alliance together to make war in the Valley of Siddim.

4QEnGiants\textsuperscript{b} 3 ii.\footnote{58} ...וַיֶּמֶּה אֶזְכָּר בֵּיתוֹ... ...these days in the[ir] rain...
4QEn ii.11: He is for[ever... he has made] all of these works.

Far Masculine Singular (יהו)

1QapGen ii.6: ... You will tell me, and not with lies, [whether] that...

8.4.4 Interrogative

what 1QapGen xx.26: And he said to me, “What have you done to me because of [Sar]lai?”; 11QTgJob x.5: “And what small things do we he[ar]!”; 4QLevi a 6 1, 4QVisions of Amram b 2 13.

who, whom 4QLevi a 4 3: And upon whom will the blame fall?

For other interrogatives see §8.3.2.

8.4.5 The Forms of מָה

Table 8.21 illustrates the conjugation of מָה מָה in QA. While we use the spelling מָה for illustrative purposes, the spelling מָה is equally common.

Functioning as a substantive, מָה מָה is conjugated as a masculine singular noun.

59 A paleographic note is due with regard to the second column of the Genesis Apocryphon. Until recently, all transcriptions have read מָה this in 1QapGen ii.6, following Avigad and Yadin. However, evidence for this reading is not found in the photographs published in 1956. The correct reading of 1QapGen ii.6 is מָה that; Cf. Albert L. Lukaszewski, “‘This’ or ‘That’: The Far Demonstrative Pronoun in 1QapGen II, 6’ RQ 20 (2002), 589–592. This form is extant in both OA and JPA; therefore, it may be expected to appear in QA. Cf. Hoftijzer and Jongeling, Dictionary of NWSI, 319-320, מָה. Cf. also Sokoloff, Dict. of JPA, 159b, מָה.

60 Cf. §9.1.3.5.
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It occurs in all three states. While it is pronominal in that it takes the place of other nouns, also functions as a true substantive, able to receive a pronominal suffix itself.

Table 8.21: Forms of כֵל
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Absolute</th>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Emphatic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Masculine</td>
<td>כֵל כֵל כֵל</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Absolute

1QapGen xxii.29: Now count up everything which is yours.

4QEn° iii.14: ...women from all whom they chose.

Construct

1QapGen ii.7: ...by the king of all eternity that you are speaking to me truthfully and not with lies.

4QEn° iii.18: ...the labor of all of the sons of humankind.

Emphatic

4QTob° 1.5: Everything will happen in its time.

4QapocrDan ii.6: And all will work peace.

With a Pronominal Suffix

4QEn° iii.1: ...And all of them said to him...
8QEnastr\textsuperscript{b} 23 \ldots whence they (the stars of heaven) set and whence they rise, all of the stars.\textsuperscript{61}

8.5 Prepositions

The prepositions of QA function similarly to those in BA and are placed after the verb. As in BA, prepositions can be combined with nominal forms to create a unified idea. By way of example, \textit{ל ה}, \textit{to} in 1QapGen xxii.15 and other places unites the preposition -\textit{ל}, for with the common noun \textit{ יָד}, hand in order to express, in this context, movement toward the edge of the water, or the shoreline.\textsuperscript{62} The various prepositions employed in QA are detailed below.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textit{ל ת}, after 1QapGen xxii.14 \ldots Behold, to you and to your offspring after you I will give\ldots, 4QEnGiants\textsuperscript{c} 2 7.
\item \textit{ל ה}, Lo, then I thought in my heart\ldots, xix.10-11, 1QEnGiants\textsuperscript{a} 21 2, 4QTgJob ii.3-4, 4QpapTob\textsuperscript{a} 2 1, 4QEn\textsuperscript{a} ii.9,\textsuperscript{63} 4QEnGiants\textsuperscript{a} 8 11, 4QEnastr\textsuperscript{d} 1 ii.5-6, 4QPrNab 1 2, 4QpsDan\textsuperscript{c} 2 3, 4QapocrDan ii.5, 6, 7, 8, 4QEnGiants\textsuperscript{b} 7 ii.3, 4, 11 3,\textsuperscript{64} 11QTgJob v.1-
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{61}Curiously, this instance of מָחַר demonstrates the use of the proleptic suffix \textit{without} the use of יָד as a construct complement.

\textsuperscript{62}Cf. Rosenthal, \textit{Grammar}, §84. Rosenthal here renders \textit{ יָד} hand as a preposition, after its syntactical function. However, morphologically it remains a noun which takes on prepositional force only when a preposition is affixed to it.

For -\textit{ל} and \textit{ יָד} as separate words combined for effect, consider Fitzmyer, \textit{Genesis Apocryphon}, 233a, yd, and 234a-234b, l-.

\textsuperscript{63}Cf. George E. Nickelsburg, \textit{1 Enoch 1: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch, Chapters 1-36; 81-108}. (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001), 150. Presumably to follow English idiom, Nickelsburg renders this use of -\textit{ל} with "on" and not "in." This does not match the consistent locative sense one finds in the other uses of -\textit{ל}.

\textsuperscript{64}Note that this line number differs from the numbering given in the \textit{editio princeps}, DJD 31, because the latter relies on a reconstruction. The numbering given here is that of the fragment.
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2, viii.4, 8, x.3, etc.

I, Abram, was spared on account of her, and I was not killed, 11QTgJob xxxviii.3
And he forgave them their sins because of him, 1QapGen xi.14, xix.20, xx.10, 25, 26, 4QEnastrb xxiii.3, 4QEnastrb 23 3, 11QTgJob xxxviii.3.

And I will live with your protection.

And Shem divided his portion between his sons... 11QTgJob xxxvi.3-4
His sneezing kindles the fire between his eyes like the glow of the dawn, 1QapGen xxi.24, 1QEnGiantsa 27 3.

After that day, Lot departed... 4QEnastrc 1 ii.9... And] after it, a wind departs... 1QapGen xxii.27, 4QpapTobd vi.1, 4QpsDana 14 1, 4QpsDanb 8 2, 4QVisions of Amramc 9 7; with -כ 1QapGen xix.23.

Like the sparks which you saw, thus his kingdom will be, 1QapGen ii.21, xxi.13, etc., xx.1, 23, 4QEnf 3 17, 11QTgJob v.6, ix.1.

And I said to Sarai, my wife... 1QapGen ii.1, xix.21–22, xx.6-7, 10, 1QEnGiantsb vi.1, 4QpapTobs 17 ii.2,
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3, 14, 4QEn\textsuperscript{a} iii.6-12, 19,\textsuperscript{65} 4QWords of Michael i.4, 5, 7, 4QEnGiants\textsuperscript{b} 7 ii.6, 11QTgJob i.5, ii.5, x.9, etc.

And then came to Job all of his friends and all of his brothers...\textsuperscript{66} 4QEn\textsuperscript{c} 5 ii.17.

toward 1QapGen xvii.17: \ldots and after him, to Javan, all the islands toward Lydia.

... and after each wing... 4QTJacob? 9 2.\textsuperscript{67}

... before each wing..., 4QTJacob? 9 2.\textsuperscript{67}

... and not from any foreigner and not from any of the Watchers...\ldots , 4QVisions of Amram\textsuperscript{a} 9 8

And I was roused from the sleep of my eyes, 1QapGen xix.16-17, 24, xx.7, 19, 27, xxix.5, etc., 1QEnGiants\textsuperscript{a} 22 2, 4QpapTob\textsuperscript{a} 6 8, 4QEn\textsuperscript{a} ii.8, iv.5, 4QapocrDan ii.6, 4QWords of Michael i.8, 4QTJacob? 12 2, 3, 11QTgJob i.8, iii.5(2x), viia.2, xiv.6, xxiii.1, 2, xxiv.1, 4, xxvi.3, etc; 1QapGen xxii.23, 31, 1QEnGiants\textsuperscript{a} 1 3;\textsuperscript{68} 4QLevi\textsuperscript{a} 2 15 ... כנפ

\textsuperscript{65}As is typical of Nickelsburgs's translation of 1Enoch, the text is rendered after English idiom. While a good translation, in our opinion, this does not convey the aspect of the Semitic prepositions very well. As Nickelsburg points out, it is not wholly intended to do so. See Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch, 3.

\textsuperscript{66}This is an anomalous occurrence of לְדָע as an independent preposition. For a comprehensive discussion of this occurrence, cf. Sokoloff, Targum to Job, 169.

\textsuperscript{67}On 1QapGen xxi.32, cf. BH: לְדָע.


\textsuperscript{68}Cf. García Martínez and Tigchelaar, DSSSE/1, 62. García Martínez et al. posit a line before the first line extant on the fragment. Consequently, this reference is found in line 4 of The Dead...
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What will you give to him or what will he receive from your hand?, 11QTgJob xx.3, xxxvi.6.

... and everything (that is) coming unto eternity, 1QapGen ii.5, xxii.21, 1QEnGiants a 27 4, 4QEn a v.4, 4QEnastr c 1 iii.4, 4QapocrDan ii.4, 11QTgJob xxviii.4, xxi.2, xxx.8.

And my heart upon me was changed concerning this child, 4QLevi a 4 3 4QapGen ii.9, 11, xxii.21, 24, xx.6, 9, 13-14, xxi.2-3, 6-8, xxii.2, 5, 8, 4QTgLev 2 6,4QEn a iii.17, 4QapocrDan i.4, 4QEnGiants b 1 i.4, 4QEnGiants c 5 4, 14 2,4QBirth of Noah a 1 i.3, 9,4QT Jacob? 14 2, 4QapocrLevi a ? 1 1, 4QapocrLevi b ? 2 i.7, 9 i.2, 11QTgJob ii.1, v.6, ix.6, xv.4, etc; hence 1QapGen ii.26, 4QapocrLevi b ? 3 4. 72 to 1QapGen ii.3, 19. 73

Sea Scrolls Study Edition.

While the reading of טוע here is not in question, this prepositional phrase has been rendered both as “for[ever]” and “for all the generations of eternity.” For the former, see García Martínez and Tigchelaar, DSSSE/1, 403. For the latter, Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch, 215.

Nickelsburg curiously does not render this prepositional phrase. Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch, 182.

While may be read as an infinitive construct with a second person plural suffix, we here follow the judgment of García Martínez-Tigchelaar in evaluating it as a preposition with a suffix. Cf. García Martínez and Tigchelaar, DSSSE/1, 30–31.

For a discussion of this compound preposition in 4QapocrLevi b ?, see Steven Fassberg, “The Compound Preposition in Qumran Aramaic” RQ 16 (1995). É. Puech has also read a compound preposition טוע in 4QapocrLevi b ? 2 i.8. However, the text is significantly damaged and the reading of some doubt. We therefore do not include it here. See Puech, Qumran Cave 4.XII:Part I, 231–233.

García Martínez and Tigchelaar find טוע to mean to in 4QEnGiants b ii.5.21, but we have not found this text in PAM 43.568. García Martínez and Tigchelaar, DSSSE/2, 1062–1063.
with 1QapGen xx.7  And with all this beauty, great wisdom is with her and the work of her hands, 4QTQahat 1 i.2, etc., xxii.1, etc., 4QEnastrb 6 6, 4QLeviα 5 i.2, 4QEnGiantsc 22 4, 11QTgJob ii.4, xv.5, xxvii.2.

before 4QTgLév 1 6  ... over the throne and before the throne to the East, 4QpapTobα 2 8, 4QapocrDan i.1, 4QBirth of Noahb 3 4, 5, 4QBirth of Noachc 11, 4QVisions of Amramb 26, 11QTgJob xxvii.3;

And I gave thanks there before God... , 4QEnGiantsα 9 2, 4QpsDanb 4 1, 4QapocrDan i.1, ii.9.

before 4QpapTobα 2 11  ... And they brought the table near, in front of me... , 4QEnastrc 2 7, 11QTgJob vii.9.

before 4QEnα ii.7...  ... and you look for shade and a hiding place from before it... , 74 4QEnα 9 2, 4QTJacob? 2 3, 75 11QTgJob xxvi.4.

before 1QapGen xxii.23  And before those days came Chedarlaomer, king of Elam, Amraphel, king of Babylonia, Arioch, king of Cappodocia, Tidal, king of Goiim, which is Mesopotamia... 76

74 Nickelsburg renders “from before it” as “from its presence”. For the limitations of Nickelsburg’s translation, see Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch, 3.

75 Puech’s line numbering relies on his postulation that fragments one, two, and three are to be read together. Hence, his line numbering for this form is 4QTJacob? 1+2+3 6. Cf. Puech, Qumran Cave 4.XII: Part 1, 175. The line numbering given here is based on fragment 2 alone.

76 See also §8.5 (page 179).
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The object marker, by definition, is non-translatable.

- ידוע אנתו כתובær א الفرص, "Do you know Tobit, [ou]r brother?", 4QpapTob א 14 i.5, 4QEn א iii.19, קסירך לכסלה לאנשה... ...they] arranged to kill the man, 4QEn א ii.1, 2, 4QEn ב iv.9, 4QEnGiants א 7 i.5, 6, 7, 4QLevi ב 5-6 i.2, 4QpsDan א 13 2, 1QEnGiants ב 8 2, 4QBirth of Noah ב 2 ii.9, 4QVisions of Amram ב 1a i.8, 11QTgJob iv.5, xiii.6, xiv.6-7, xxii.4, etc.

- ידוע אנתו כתובær א الفرص... ...and they will divide it in the land of... 78

77 We here follow Fitzmyer's numbering of this column (Fitzmyer, Christian Origins, 178). Due to the loss of at least two lines, it is not certain whether this column originally had thirteen or sixteen lines.

8.7 Numerals

8.7.1 Cardinal

And in my dream I saw, lo, a cedar and a palm tree, And he made a boat for himself, 1QapGen xix.11, xx.8, 4QEn\textsuperscript{c} 1 vi.1, 4QEn\textsuperscript{e} 5 i.13-14, 4QEn\textsuperscript{c} 5 i.19, 4QEnastr\textsuperscript{b} 7 ii.8, 10-11, 13, 4QEnastr\textsuperscript{d} ii.3-6, 4QLevi\textsuperscript{a} 1 ii.18.

The Hebrew word \textit{one} 1QapGen xix.14-15 translates as \textit{one} \textit{time} in English. And in my dream I saw, lo, a cedar and a palm tree, And he made a boat for himself, 1QapGen xix.11, xx.8, 4QEn\textsuperscript{c} 1 vi.1, 4QEn\textsuperscript{e} 5 i.13-14, 4QEn\textsuperscript{c} 5 i.19, 4QEnastr\textsuperscript{b} 7 ii.8, 10-11, 13, 4QEnastr\textsuperscript{d} ii.3-6, 4QLevi\textsuperscript{a} 1 ii.18.

\textit{One things I have spoken and I will not change, even two things, and to them I will not add...}, 4QBirth of Noah\textsuperscript{a} 1 i.1; 4QEn\textsuperscript{c} i.25

(construct form with a suffix) 4QVisions of Amram\textsuperscript{c} 3 3.

This occurrence is included because of the high probability that the word in question is a form of \textit{two}. However, it should be noted that the text breaks: ... \textit{two}.

This latter rendering is based on a possible reading of \textit{two} in 4QEn\textsuperscript{c} i.25 as \textit{two} \textit{time}.

Cf. Sokoloff, \textit{Targum to Job}, 133.

\textbf{81} The reason for the double entry of the feminine form is evident in the examples cited here. At first glance, the use of the feminine form might appear as being in construct, with the construct complement following. However, we submit that the בכון in 4QEnastr\textsuperscript{c} 1 ii.1 is the conjunction of a subordinate clause which modifies \textit{two}.

\textbf{82} Milik reads 4QEn\textsuperscript{e} ii.6 similarly as \textit{two} \textit{time}. See Milik, \textit{Books of Enoch}, 146. We read the line as \textit{two} \textit{time}. It must be said, however, that this passage from 4QEn\textsuperscript{c} i.25 offers some credence to Milik’s reading. The photograph offers no justification of it, however, and our own study of the fragment in the Summer of 2002 did not offer any reason to change our reading of the text.
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...three of the men among the princes of Egypt [came], 1QapGen xx.8...  
...that the three of them spoke (with) one mouth..., 1QapGen xxi.21, xxii.23, 4QBirth of Noah a 1 i.5

And he fell upon them at night from four of their sides, 4QEnastr b 1 4

And it waxes in this day four sevenths, 4QEnastr b 1 6, 7 ii.3, iii.5, 4QEnastr c ii.14

And it shines in night twenty-eight; it is covered six and a half sevenths. 4QEnastr b 6 4

And it shines in night seventy-two; it is covered eight and a half sevenths. 4QEnastr b 7 ii.6, 7, 9, iii.6, 7, 8.

And it shines in night seventy-five; it is covered nine and a half sevenths. 4QEnastr b 7 ii.14

And he said to him, “Lo, ten years have passed...”  
4QVisions of Amram g 2 8;  
1QapGen vi.10 5...  
...ten jubilees, then...  
eleven 4QEnastr\textsuperscript{b} 1 12 ... [And it shines in night]
eleven...

twelve 4QEnastr\textsuperscript{c} 1 ii.14.14
The twelve gates of the four winds of heaven are completed.

thirteen 1QapGen xxi.27
And in the thirteenth year, they revolted against him, 4QEn\textsuperscript{a} iii.10, 4QEn\textsuperscript{f} 1 ii.27.

fifteen 4QEnastr\textsuperscript{f} 1 iii.5
...fifteen.
And in it all of its light is completed, 4QEnastr\textsuperscript{d} 1 ii.5.

eighteen 1QapGen xxii.6
And he chose from his servants men ready for war, three hundred and eighteen (men).

nineteen 4QEn\textsuperscript{a} iii.12... Toriel... to him. Yomiel nineteen...

twenty 4QpsDan\textsuperscript{a} 20 2... twenty [year]s...

twenty-five 4QEnastr\textsuperscript{b} 7 ii.6
And in night fifteen, it is covered five sevenths.

twenty-six 4QEnastr\textsuperscript{b} 7 ii.9
... And in night twenty-six, it is covered five and a half sevenths...

twenty-eight 4QEnastr\textsuperscript{b} 6
And it shines in night twenty-eight; it is covered six and a half sevenths.
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thirty-six QVisions of Amram\textsuperscript{a} 1

... and thirty-six, the year of [his death.]

\textit{one} hundred 1QapGen xxii.6 (three hundred)

... and thirty-six, the year of [his death.]

\textit{three hundred} two hundred 1QEnGiants\textsuperscript{a} 1 2, 3.

8.7.2 Ordinal

\textit{first} 4QEnastr\textsuperscript{b} 7 iii.2  The sun finishes going through all its sections which are in the first gate, 4QEnastr\textsuperscript{c} 1 ii.4, 15, 4QEnastr\textsuperscript{d} 1 ii.5.

\textit{second} 4QpapTob\textsuperscript{a} 2 8 And Esarhaddon appointed him to rule second to himself, 4QEn\textsuperscript{a} iii.6; 4QEnastr\textsuperscript{b} 7 ii.8

collected third 4QEnastr\textsuperscript{c} 1 i.25 ... And then it sets [and] enters the second gate, 4QEnastr\textsuperscript{c} 1 iii.7.

\textit{third} 4QEn\textsuperscript{c} 1 ii.25 Kokab’el, fourth to him.

\textit{fourth} 4QEn\textsuperscript{c} 1 ii.25 Kokab’el, fourth to him.

\textit{sevenths} 4QEnastr\textsuperscript{b} 1 3 And it shines in night seven three sevenths and a half, 4QEnastr\textsuperscript{b} 6 2 and 4.
8.8 Interjections

Because Aramaic interjections are onomatopoetic and more suggestive of emotion than reason, the translations offered here are for illustrative purposes only.

אַרְמָאָכֵי דָּוָאָכֵי קַשְׁתִּים 4QLevi 4 4-5 ... Behold, we know the right way... 11QTgJob iii.6 ... Behold, the rejoicing of the wicked... 4QLevi 3 1, 4QEnGiants 22 10, 4QapocrLevi 3 5, 4QVisions of Amram 2 15, viia.8, xviii.1, xxii.6-7, xxviii.1, 8; רַעְוּּרֶם 1QEnGiants 7 1.

לֹא! 1QapGen ii.1 Lo, then I thought in my heart that from the Watchers... 4QWords of Michael 1 7... 11QWords of Michael 1 7, xx.27, xxii.27, עֵלֶם. And, lo, the Great Ones of the Eternal Lord... 4QpapTob 17 i.3, 4QEnf 2 and 4, 4QWords of Michael 1 9, 14, 11QTgJob xxiii.7, xxxiv.5.

In comparison with other dialects of Aramaic, should be classified as a cardinal number. However, due to its ordinal force in the context of these verses, we include it here. Cf. also Beyer, ATTM, 701. For morphological confusion between cardinals and ordinals in JPA, see Sokoloff, Dict. of JPA, 583, רָאוֹעָּא and תְּנוֹדֵה. In JPA, an ordinal would appear as רֵעָּא. Cf. Sokoloff, Dict. of JPA, 535.

See note 84. An ordinal force is the only sense that logically fits the syntax of these lines. As observed in note 83, Beyer would also include רָאוֹעָּא as an ordinal. Cf. Beyer, ATTM, 728. In JPA, רָאוֹעָּא appear as the ordinal רָאוֹעָּא. Cf. Sokoloff, Dict. of JPA, 593.
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And to the sound of the trumpet he would say, “Aha!”

And she said, “Oh, my brother, and oh, my lord!”

8.9 Conjunctions

8.9.1 Coordinate

And she said, “Oh, my brother, and, oh, my lord!”

Anna, my wife, had been returned to me...

[You] smoke it before a man or a woman who is afflicted with a demon or a spirit...

8.9.2 Correlative

And the king gave to her... [and] great (amounts of) gold and great (amounts of) fine linen which were purple, 4QPrNab 1

The words of prayer which Nabonidus, the king of Babylon, prayed,
1QapGen xxii.14, 4QEna iii.14, 4QLevi a i.15, 4QWords of Michael 1 1.

8.9.3 Disjunctive

And he said to him, “This one will not inherit you, but one will come forth...”. 11QTgJob xxii.5.

Therefore, it is God whom we blamed and not... 11QTgJob iii.3.

Therefore, my heart...

8.9.4 Subordinate

If (see also היח) 1QapGen xxii.21... I raise my hand this day... if I should take anything that belongs to you... 1QapGen xxii.22.

And the great wind [they call] the wind of the west because there... 6-7, 4QLevi a 2 i.17; 4QLevi a 1 i.17, 4QpsDan a 1 1, 87 11QTgJob xxix.7, 88 because 4QTob b 4 ii.4. Raguel will not be able to withhold her from you because he knows [...]

Nickelsburg renders this use of יד (combined with כע) as “such as.” See Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch, 182. We prefer a more literal rendering of כע יד bàחר: “from all whom they chose.”

Note that the form is partly restored in context.

This reading is particularly tentative as the -ב is reconstructed on a fragment which is hypothesized to have been part of 11QTgJob xxix. We include it here as a separate morpheme based on the evidence of Sokoloff. See Sokoloff, Targum to Job, 145. Others reconstruct the same morpheme as Sokoloff but offer no justification for it. See García Martínez and Tigchelaar, DSSSE/2, 146-148.
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Ev'ry man who teaches wisdom... 4QTob 16, 4QPrNab 18.

I turn away from anything that is yours lest you should say... perhaps, lest 11QTgJob xxii.4...

leq ady rutmor... lest you should say...

[I] adjure [you by the Most High...] that you will make known to me everything truthfully whether... 4QpapTob 4 ii.5... 

...he know[s] that if he gives her to [another] man, 1QapGen xx.19, 4QTob 5 11, 4QEnGiants 7 ii.1, 11QTgJob viia.9, x.9, xi.4, xviii.5, 8, etc.

And when Methuselah heard Enoch his father... 1QapGen vi.9, xx.8, 24, xxii.33, 4QpapTob 2 1, 4QEnGiants 1 1, 4QEnastr 26 4, 4QWords of Michael 1 8, 11QTgJob xviii.7.

And they routed... the Horites of the mountains of Gebal until they came... 11QTgJob xxi.2

And when... tell me whether or not you searched... you finished, until you searched the end of... 1QapGen xxii.7, 9, 4QEn 5 ii.1, 3, 21, 4QLevi a 1 ii.15, 4QpsDan a 25 2.

And I went south until I reached Hebron, 1QapGen xix.26, xxi.1, 15, 17, 18.

And I went south until I reached Hebron, 1QapGen xix.26, xxi.1, 15, 17, 18.

so that (OfA) 11QTgJob xxxiv.4... And declare me guilty so that you might be innocent?
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Syntax

Syntax is a categorical means of expressing how the words of a sentence relate to one another to express meaning. No discussion of syntax is exhaustive;¹ therefore, we focus our discussion on the more important elements of Qumran Aramaic syntax, trying again to cover the breadth while also commenting on some of the finer points.

¹Cf. Elisha Qimron, The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls (Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press, 1986), 16. No reasonable study can hope to have the last word on a language’s syntax. Rather, it is hoped that this work may set forth enough material in a sufficiently definitive manner that others will not feel the need to cover the same ground again for some time to come.
9.1 Separate Parts of Speech

9.1.1 Verbs

9.1.1.1 Finite Verbs

As indicated in the discussion on verbal morphology, the syntax of the verb closely follows BA and TA.

9.1.1.1.1 Indicative Forms For indicative force, the perfect and imperfect forms are used. They tend to exhibit past- and future-orientation, respectively.

Examples of the Perfect

1QapGen xx.20: And all of the healers and wizards and wisemen were not able to stand to heal him.

Examples of the Imperfect

1QapGen xix.20: And I will live by your protection, and my soul will be spared on account of you.

4QEn² ii.8: And you will not find [a way for wallking on the du[s]t [and on the stones...
9.1.1.1.2 Precative Forms

**The Imperative**  
The imperative in QA is, unsurprisingly, one of command. As an order, examples of the imperative include:

1QapGen xx.23: *And now, go, speak to the king, and may he send his wife from himself to her husband.*

4QpapTob\* 2 12: *And I said [to Tobit], my son, “My son, go; fetch all [whom] you find among [our] broth[ers]*

11QTgJob iv.4: *Place your hands upon...*  

However, when used in conjunction with א, the imperative is seen to take on an exhortative force.\(^4\)

4QEn\* 5 ii.29: *And now, go t[o] Lamech your [son]...*  
11QTgJob xxxiv.3: *Gird up your loins like a man...*  
11QTgJob xxxvii.6: *Listen and I will speak.*

**The Jussive**  
The use of the jussive is strongly suggested by the use of א. Muraoka has argued for other occurrences in 1QapGen ii.5 (חרותינ) and xix.18 (אדריא).\(^5\) Further, 1QapGen xx.15 shows an imperfect form with a contextually-denoted jussive force: *And may he not have power tonight*

---

\(^4\)Given the imperatival context of the following examples, translation of א as *please* would make for an awkward rendering, in our judgment. This is particularly true for the commands of God in 11QTgJob.

\(^5\)These lines read as follows:
to defile. Hence, the jussive form does not appear always to be morphologically
distinct from the imperfect, contra E. Cook. Rather, at times, the jussive and the
imperfect are differentiated by context alone.

9.1.1.2 Non-Finite Verbs

9.1.1.2.1 The Participle  The participle is employed in four ways in QA:

1. as the main verb of the sentence (i.e., in sentences without an explicit finite verb) As in BA, when the participle functions as the main verb of a clause,

\[ \text{1QapGen ii.5: } \ldots \text{by the sons of heaven that you will tell me everything truthfully...} \]

\[ \text{1QapGen xix.18: } \text{And she said to me, "Tell me your dream that I may know it."} \]

The former example is, in our judgment, questionable. The participle may be read as a future-oriented indicative, “You will tell me...”, or as a jussive, “You should tell me...” While a precative force is certainly present, such a force does not necessitate a precative form in this instance. Furthermore, given the context of this passage as the midst of an oath whose subject is not preserved in the text, we cannot be certain of the force of this verb. In the latter example, an indicative force is unlikely. Such a force would be tautological and very awkward in the context of 1QapGen xix.18.


7One example of this is the aforementioned use of עשת in 1QapGen xix.18. On this, see also Joseph A. Fitzmyer, The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave 1: A Commentary (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute Press, 1972), 60. Fitzmyer labels this form as “a volitive use of the imperf. [imperfect]” but does not offer supportive argumentation. Cf. Fitzmyer, Genesis Apocryphon, 113.

Another example is in 11QTgJob xxix.2 (משמرون). The attribution of an indicative sense to this verb (i.e., They will hear [it]) does not seem to synchronize well with the historic present sense of the next verb (והםloyd). A precative sense seems to lay the premise for the subsequent appointment (i.e., Let them hear it...and he appoint[s] them...). Cf. Michael Sokoloff, The Targum to Job from Qumran Cave XI (Ramat-Gan/Jerusalem, Israel: Bar-Ilan University at Ahva Press, 1974), 84-85. This reading is affirmed by Florentino García Martínez and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition Vol. 2, (Leiden/Grand Rapids, MI: Brill/Eerdmans, 1998), 147. However, contrary to their translation, חילון is a participle functioning epexegetically to the pronoun suffixed to the subsequent finite verb (← עשת to appoint). Therefore, a better rendering of the phrase may be: and those who go to their work over all which he created he appoints over the surface of the earth.”
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it denotes the immediate present. This phenomenon, however, occurs with relative rarity: 1QapGen ii.2: And my heart within me was changing concerning this young boy, 1QapGen ii.14, 21, 25 xx.8, 12, xxi.18, xxii.4, 20, 4QTob \textsuperscript{b} 4 ii.17, 4QTob \textsuperscript{b} 4 iii.7, 4QEn \textsuperscript{c} 5 iii.14, 4QEnastr \textsuperscript{b} 23 5, 4QLevi \textsuperscript{a} 1 i.11, 17, 11QTJob vii.2, xxviii.2, 4, xxxvi.8.

2. with the verb \textit{לְהוֹדֵה} עד \textit{דָּבָק} חָפְבוּת}: 1QapGen xix.9: And I went to the South until I came to Hebron, 4QEn \textsuperscript{a} iii.17: והוֹדֵה מִתָּל נַע אַרְעָה They were being born upon the earth, 1QapGen xix.24, xx.10, 17, 19, 20, 34, \textsuperscript{9} xxi.7, 17, 26-27, 28, xxii.1, 2-3, 8, 9, xxii.22, 4QpapTob \textsuperscript{a} 10 1, 4QEn \textsuperscript{c} 5 i.18. When occurring with \textit{לְהוֹדֵה}, the active participle serves a past-oriented, durative function and occurs immediately after the verb it complements.\textsuperscript{10}

3. as a verbal modifier: 1QapGen xxii.7-8: וַחֲזֹן אֶתְנָמ שֵׁיָּר בֵּכְקַע וֹר And he found them camping in the valley of Dan, 1QapGen xxii.29: וַחֲזֹן כְּכַלָּן ... וֹר' And see how, doubling, they have increased... , 4QpapTob \textsuperscript{a} 14 ii.6: וַחֲזֹן וָעָמָלְּךָ לֶגֶמָּם הָדֵי דְּרֵיהָ And they found Raguel sitting in front of the courtyard.

4. in a nominative sense: \textsuperscript{11} 4QLevi \textsuperscript{a} 1 i.8: וַתָּטֵל הַעַלְּלוּת בְּרִיתָהּ דְּרוּי כִּי טָב מְרוּלְּךָ וְרָוִית I was camping with him) as probable in the given context.

\textsuperscript{9}Muraoka, “Notes”, §20.1.

\textsuperscript{9}Including this reference, we here agree with the restoration of \textit{לְהוֹדֵה} (in context: \textit{לְהוֹדֵה} עַמָּה} I was camping with him). We here include instances of \textit{לְהוֹדֵה}. While these may be instances of the copula, they are (a) indistinguishable from \textit{לְהוֹדֵה} because of the mixed usage of \textit{לְהוֹדֵה} and \textit{לְהוֹדֵה} in QA and (b) function in the same manner as a copula or a finite verb of being.

\textsuperscript{11}Cf. Fitzmyer, \textit{Genesis Apocryphon}, 223. The participle alleged by Fitzmyer to be in 1QapGen xx.7 is dubious because of the tear in the scroll. In our judgment, a case can be made for this to be a perfect passive of שָׁרָיו because the upward slope on the head of the last letter better resembles the head of \textit{לְהוֹדֵה} than the common downward diagonal of \textit{לְהוֹדֵה} (consider the palaeography of \textit{לְרָוִית} later in the same line, where both letters are clearly demonstrated in the hand of the same ...
You will bring in a blessed harvest because the one who sows goodness harvests goodness.

Muraoka has rightly challenged Fitzmyer’s suggestion that a complementary participle is suggested in 1QapGen xx.20; rather, the אֵלָה may indeed be the masculine pronoun. We submit that 1QapGen xxii.7 may be viewed similarly.

9.1.1.2.2 The Infinitive  The infinitive in QA plays five roles: nominal, complementary, purposive, resultative, and objective.

Gerundive: In nominal usage, the infinitive is introduced by בִּכְלָיָא. In that night I prayed and I sought and I entreated and I spoke with distress... In his making the wind...

In 1QapGen xix.14 and xxii.30, the infinitive is not introduced by a preposition but functions as the n. rectum of a construct phrase.
1QapGen xix.14: And I Abram dreamed a dream in the night of my entering the land of Egypt.

1QapGen xxii.30: And behold how, (by) doubling, they have increased from all that went out with you in the day of your departing from Haran.

In both of these latter instances, however, the infinitive is also in construct to a pronominal suffix which indicates its subject. 19

Verbal Complement: As a complement to the main verb and in showing purpose, the infinitive is marked by -ל. 20

1QapGen xxi.15: And I Abram went to traverse and to see the land.

4QEn a iii.15: And to teach them sorcery.

Purpose: In expressing purpose, the following lines contain exemplary infinitives: 21


20 For other exemplary infinitives see the infinitive forms of the following verbs in the given lines: איבר in 1QpsDan 1 1, ביע to plan in 1QapGen xix.15, xix.19, xx.9, כי to be able in 1QapGen xx.17, xix.19, 20, 22, and 11QTgJob xxxvii.4, רכש to continue in 4Q Tob 1 1, הכט to write in 4QPrNab 1 5, ילב to restrain in 4Q Tob 4 ii.4, לכל to press in 4QEn 5 ii.18, גס to take in 4Q Tob 4 ii.5, סנדל to rise in 1QapGen xxi.13, 4QpapTob 4 7 i.4, דרכ to bring near in 4QLev 1 1 i.18, אפשר to be able in 1QapGen xxi.13, and שלח to rule in 1QapGen xx.13, and הזיא to begin in 1QapGen xix.18.

On איבר in 1QapGen xxi.13, see Fitzmyer, Genesis Apocryphon, 150. While the tripartite root is clearly איבר. Fitzmyer includes the Aph’el preformative. However, because other forms of this verb do not evidence a quadri-partite root, we refrain from following suit. Other occurrences of the same root are found in 1QapGen ii.23, xxi.19, and xxii.7. In each of these instances, however, the verb denotes the traditional meaning to find. Cf. also Michael Sokoloff, A Dictionary of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic of the Byzantine Period (Ramat-Gan, Israel: Bar-Ilan University Press, 1992), 549b, and Marcus Jastrow, A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli, and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature (New York: The Judaica Press, 1996), 1572b

21 For other examples see the following: ביבא to examine 4QpsDan 10 3, לזר to walk 4QEn a...
1QapGen xx.20: And none of the healers, magicians, and wise men were able to stand to heal him.

Result: In the following examples, the infinitive is used to indicate the result of the main verb.

4QpapTob a 6 8: and I lift my eyes and speak for my liberation.

4QEn a iii.19: ... plotting to kill the man and...
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4QEnastr א 1 ii.18: ...ד ימעניא רוחני וראות וראותתות...ויתם לאתתיתא...

Whence the moons rise in [their] fullness day by day to appear...

Objective: The objective infinitive is manifest in the following parts of QA.22

4QLevi א 1 ii.6: ...מעטרה מן... ...hiding itself from it...

4QLevi א 1 ii.2: ...ишכית למרכבים שירה... ...they will be able to conquer its walls...

9.1.2 Nouns and Related Modifiers

9.1.2.1 The States of the Noun and the Adjective

As with other dialects of Aramaic, Qumran Aramaic nouns appear in one of three states: absolute, construct, and emphatic.23

9.1.2.1.1 The Absolute As with BA, the absolute state is used for unbound constructions (nominative and objective) as well as for the n. rectum of the construct phrase. Some examples of the absolute state are:

אנווי בליילא תמיתא הב שבעין: ...

And it shines in the eighth night one seventh...24

masו תמיתא לברי תמלכימ... ...instructfion of wisdom for honor and for greatness, and for kings.

22For other examples, see רוחני to practice witchcraft, לכת to practice sorcery in 4QEnb ii.19, and לער to do/work with in 4QEnh ii.26. Some of these unfortunately require partial reconstruction.

23For more examples of each state see §§8.2, 8.3.1, and 8.4.3 (pages 144, 147, and 171, respectively).

24On תמיי as a cardinal instead of an ordinal number, see the use of תמיי in Klaus Beyer, Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984), 725.
9.1.2.1.2 The Emphatic  Similarly, the emphatic state is also used for unbound constructions (nominative and objective) and for the \textit{n. rectum} of the construct phrase. In addition, the emphatic state is regularly used for the vocative.\textsuperscript{25}

The emphatic state is exemplified as follows:

\begin{quote}
N‘I\textdegree as a subject in 1QapGen ii.15: \\
\ldots from you is this seed, and from you is this pregnancy, and from you is the planting of [this] fruit.
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
Our great Lord [is the Lord of Eternity.
\end{quote}

9.1.2.1.3 The Construct  The construct case is used as the \textit{n. regens} before a dependent noun and in conjunction with possessive suffixes. While the emphatic may suggest a level of determination by its form, the construct receives its determination by its relation to the word that follows (hence, \textit{n. regens}). Where construct phrases occur in series, the construct state functions as the \textit{n. rectum} of the preceding phrase and the \textit{n. regens} of the following one.\textsuperscript{27}

\textsuperscript{25}We here omit 4QEn\textsuperscript{b} ii.14 (הלבר) as requiring too much reconstruction to be dependable.

\textsuperscript{26}On מלכת as a vocative here, see John Collins and Peter Flint, “Pseudo-Daniel” in \textit{Qumran Cave 4: XVII. Parabiblical Texts, Part 3} ed. James C. VanderKam et al. (Oxford: Clarendon, 1996), DJD 22, 100. For more on the syntax of the vocative, see §9.1.9.

We consider it unfortunate to have to cite a word that is so dependant on restoration as an example here. However, other examples of the emphatic being used as a vocative are either preserved as poorly as this example or have insufficient syntax to render the vocative sense of no doubt. See, for example, מלכת in 4QpsDan\textsuperscript{a} 4 1, 4QpsDan\textsuperscript{b} 1-3 4, and 4Q246 i.2; also, consider מלכת in 11QTglo\textsuperscript{b} viii.2.

\textsuperscript{27}A fuller discussion of the construct phrase is contained in Section 9.1.2.2.
As a *n.regens* in 4QpapTob\(^a\) 2:4: *And they fled to the mountains of Ararat.*

as a *n.regens* in 4QEnastr\(^c\) 1 ii.14: *...And the twelve gates of the four corners of heaven are completed.*\(^{28}\)

as a prepositional object with pronominal suffix in 4QpapTob\(^a\) 6:9: *...I am clean in my bones from any forbidden thing.*

9.1.2.2 **The Construct Phrase**

The construct phrase is very much in use in QA. The most common, almost exclusive, means of indicating the bound relationship is by a noun in the construct state followed by one in the emphatic. Curiously, the relative particle יד is typically not used.\(^{29}\) יד acts as a construct complement in a total of ten places in the corpus: 1QapGen xxi.16, xxii.21, 33, xxii.22-23, 4QpapTob\(^a\) 1, 17 ii.15, 4QTob\(^b\) 4 iii.11, 4QLevi\(^a\) a 2 7, 4QpsDan\(^a\) 35 2, 4QpsDan\(^b\) 1-3 1, 11QTgJob xxii.9, xxxv.10, and xxxviii.2.\(^{30}\) Some examples of two emphatic nouns mediated by יד are:

1QapGen xxi.16: יד רבג מלתאמ this Great Sea of Salt

\(^{28}\)It is worth noting here that the construct phrase in QA may be interrupted for modifiers such as numerals.

\(^{29}\)Kaddari has posited: “Chronologically, the later the document, the greater are the number of יד (dt)-phrases in it...” [M.Z. Kaddari, “Construct State and dt-Phrases in Imperial Aramaic” in *Proceedings of the International Conference on Semitic Studies* (Jerusalem: Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1969), 103]. However, we fail to find the twelve instances which Kaddari takes as data for his ratio between the construct state and dt-phrases in the Genesis Apocryphon. Hence, without the specific examples being listed, we must respectfully disagree with his assessment of the Aramaic attested in that text.

\(^{30}\)Sokoloff has also noted 11QTgJob xxvii.9, but this is problematic due to the preceding break in the text and the subsequent loss of the *n.regens*. Cf. Sokoloff, *Targum to Job*, 189.
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1QapGen xxii.21:  הרקָּה דֶמְסָאָן \textit{the strap of a sandal}

1QapGen xxii.22-23:  הכל עתרה ד זַבֵּרָם \textit{all the riches of Abram}

4QEn\textsuperscript{d} 2 iii.29:  הדָּרְ לֶא דֶ הַטָּמָא \textit{to/at this ram of the flock[k]}

The \textit{n. regens} with a proleptic suffix occurs in 1QapGen xxii.34-xxii.1: אַחֲרֵי דֵי אַבְרָם \textit{the brother of Abram}.\textsuperscript{31}

There appears to be some variation in the ways the construct phrase is formed in QA. In particular, 1QapGen xxii.21 and 11QTgJob xxxviii.8 reflect unusual ways of expressing the bound relationship.

In 1QapGen xxii.21, Abram is refusing any claim to the wealth of the King of Sodom when he says: מָרֵים אָנֹה דְי מִסָא דָּרָם עַל עַלָּמָא מֶהוּ דָּרְעָא אֵי מַה תְוַה דָּעָא \textit{I raise my hand this day to God Most High, Lord of Heaven and Earth, and I will not accept from a thread to the strap of a sandal...}  In the construction one finds a \textit{n. regens} in the absolute case; this is relatively rare in QA.\textsuperscript{32}

Also, as discussed in Section 9.1.2.1, the absolute state may be used in QA as a \textit{n. rectum}.\textsuperscript{33} Hence, QA exhibits unique rules about the expression of the bound relationship in that it allows a \textit{n. regens} which is in the absolute state to be bound by -ד to a noun in the absolute. While this may be analogously rooted in other forms of the construct phrase,\textsuperscript{34} the absolute \textit{n. rectum} runs contrary to the lin-

\textsuperscript{31}In our judgment, T. Muraoka here wrongly finds the construct structure in xx.31 and xxi.11-12. Cf. Muraoka, “Notes”, 15. Both cases exhibit the relative particle introducing a subordinate clause.

\textsuperscript{32}Only 3.5\% of the \textit{n. regens} in our corpus are in the absolute state. Nearly 96\% (95.8\%) are in the construct.

\textsuperscript{33}The use of an absolute \textit{n. rectum} followed by -ד is also attested in 11QTgJob xxxviii.8.

\textsuperscript{34}Cf. Franz Rosenthal, \textit{A Grammar of Biblical Aramaic} (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1995), §48. Rosenthal observes construct phrases in BA wherein both the \textit{n. regens} and the \textit{n. rectum} are in the emphatic state.
guistic trend reflected in BA.\textsuperscript{35}

Another infrequent means of forming the construct phrase is the use of a relative clause as the \textit{n. rectum}. In this capacity, the relative particle or construct complement typically takes on an adverbial force:

1QapGen xxii.9 \textit{Bethel, the place where you camped}

1QapGen xxii.28 \textit{from Haran}.

With reference to the former occurrence, Fitzmyer has argued that this should be read as an absolute in apposition with a proper name.\textsuperscript{36} However, we find persuasive the argument of E.Y. Kutscher who demonstrated that similar constructions exist in various stages of Aramaic.\textsuperscript{37}

9.1.2.3 The Placement of the Adjective

As already noted, the morphology of the adjective and similarly formed pronouns (e.g., \textit{ך,ך or דך}) follows the same pattern as that of nouns. Similarly, the usage of each is analagous to the usage of nouns. As in BA, the adjective and the aforementioned pronouns follow their antecedent as closely as possible.\textsuperscript{38} Some examples

\textsuperscript{35}Given the use of the absolute as the \textit{n. rectum} in BH and the elevated place of Hebrew in the linguistic environment of Qumran, a Hebraic influence cannot be ruled out. However, such a relationship is tenuous and hypothetical, at best.

\textsuperscript{36}Fitzmyer, \textit{Genesis Apocryphon}, 220.
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follow below.

Up to this point I had not reached the holy mountain.

The kings had set out by way of the Great Valley toward their province.

...and he has a beautiful daughter...

9.1.2.4 Numerals

As in BA, the numerals in QA occur both before and after the noun being modified. The object being counted occurs in the plural, naturally, when the count is greater than one.

Muraoka has stated with respect to the Aramaic of the Genesis Apocryphon: “The numerals from ‘three’ and upwards always precede the noun.” However, at least two instances in that text bear evidence to the contrary.

Arpachshad, Lud, and Aram, and five sons and daughters.  

And Put and Canaan, and seven sons and daughters.

This trend is also seen in 4QEnastr: And it wax/les in this day four sevenths.

40 Muraoka, “Notes”, §10.3.
The numbers three to nine occur in the opposite gender to the noun being counted. That is, masculine nouns receive feminine numeral forms and vice versa.

1QapGen vi.10 ... יבגלש שערת באמד ... \ldots ten jubilees, then ... 

1QapGen xix.24 ... שלוחת וברך מברך מastered ... \ldots three men from the princes of Egypt I came.

4QEnastr$^b$ 1 ... וזכחי בقضاءDROP ... \ldots And it was in this day four sevenths.

4QEnastr$^b$ 7 ii.6 ... ובכלמה חמישת וששיה ... \ldots And in night fifteen, in it, it is covered five sevenths.

9.1.3 The Pronoun

9.1.3.1 Possessive Pronouns

Possession in QA is indicated by the use of pronominal suffixes. While a suffix appended to a noun in the construct state regularly indicates possession, a more nuanced form of possession exists in the use of מישר $>n$ נ followed by -כ and the relevant suffix. Below are some examples of each.$^{41}$

Pronominal Suffix Appended to a Noun

1QapGen ii.19: בامية אנוה ולא נלע על מ ifndefים ... Then I Lamech ran to Methusealah, my father.

$^{41}$ Examples of nouns with pronominal suffixes may also be found in 1QapGen ii.22, xxi.6, 4QEn$^b$ iii.15, 4Q213b 3, 4QLevi$^d$ 2 10, 4QapocrDan ii.5, 11QTgJob iii.3.

Further examples of נ and מ may be found in 1QapGen xxii.22, 29, 4QTob$^b$ 4 i.18, 4QEnGiants$^a$ 13 3, 4QEn$^d$ 1 i.5, 11QTgJob xxxi.5, and xxxiv.5.
Possession Expressed with

1QapGen xxii.19: My Lord Abram, give me the men that are mine...

4Q Tob b 4 i.17: ...and he has a beautiful daughter.

9.1.3.2 Personal Pronouns

As in other dialects of Aramaic, the personal pronouns occur independently, not being affixed to any word, and manifest consonance with their antecedent and the active verb of the clause. Independent third person plural pronouns may occur as either subject or object. However, dependent pronouns occur consistently as objects of either a verb (indirect or direct) or a preposition. A few examples are found in 4Q197 4 iii.5, 4QEn a 3.15, and 11QTgJob xxv.2. 4Q Tob b 4 iii.5: And she said to them, “Whence have you come, brothers?”

4QEn a 3.15: ...and to teach sorcery (to) them... and

11QTgJob xxv.2: ...and in the place of... he will throw (to) them.\(^{42}\)

9.1.3.3 Demonstrative Pronouns

Demonstrative pronouns occur regularly as adjectives in QA. As such, they follow the noun being modified.\(^{43}\) One apparent exception to this may be זְדָּ֫ךְ in 1QapGen ii.6, where the context breaks before the antecedent of that would have

\(^{42}\)See note 40 (page 155).

\(^{43}\)Muraoka, “Notes”, §3.1.
been revealed: ... You will tell me, and not with lies, [whether] that... Some examples of the aforementioned norm are found in 4QTob\(^4\) ii.3:

“\[In this night, you will engage her and take her to yourself for [a] wife.\]”\(^{45}\) and 4QEn\(^a\) ii.11: He is for\[ever... he has made\] all of these works.\(^{46}\)

9.1.3.4 Relative Pronouns

For the use of \(\text{כָּל}\) as a relative pronoun, see Section 9.4.1, “The Use of the Relative Particle” (page 225).

9.1.3.5 The Use of \(\text{כָּל}\)

כָּל, or \(\text{כָּל}\), functions as a masculine singular substantive and is meant to suggest meanings of universality — all, every, or each. It typically precedes the noun from which it takes its semantic identity. As such, it occurs frequently in the construct,\(^{47}\) and it may occur with a pronominal suffix.

Occurring in the absolute and emphatic states, \(\text{כָּל}\) functions as an independent pronoun. It is not restricted in its antecedents to either humans, animals, or objects but may refer to any of them. Examples of \(\text{כָּל}\) follow below.

1QapGen xxii.29: ... Now count up everything which is yours.

4QEn\(^a\) iii.18: ... the labor of all of the sons of humankind.

\(^{44}\)See note 59 (page 173).

\(^{45}\)See note 57 (page 172).

\(^{46}\)As Muraoka has noted, the head of the demonstrative pronoun can be a construct phrase, as in 1QapGen xvii.10. Muraoka, “Notes”, §3.2.

\(^{47}\)For forms of \(\text{כָּל}\) in context, see §8.4.5.
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4QEnastr $\text{23}$ 5: ...whence they (the stars of heaven) set and whence they rise, all of the stars.

4QapcrDan ii.6: "And all will work peace."

9.1.4 Adverbial Expressions

Unlike the later Syriac, a noun of place like (בית) alone does not serve for an adverb of place. Rather, it requires a prepositional complement and is thus the object of that preposition.

1QapGen xxi.19: Then I returned and came to my house in peace.

4QEnastr $\text{2}$ ii.1: Lo, these are the pits (which serve) as a prison for them.

11QTgJob v.2: ...desire for God in his house.

The numeral אֶחָד one is also joined with the prepositions -ָךְ and -ַל to render a collective and a comparative adverbial expression, respectively. For more examples of adverbial expressions, see Section 8.3.2.3. The following are examples of אֶחָד as it occurs in adverbial phrases in QA.

11QTgJob xxx.5: ...with the morning stars shining together...

1QapGen xxii.32: Your wealth and your flocks will increase much.

---

49On the syntactical force of the prepositional phrases in QA, see §9.1.7.
50On this passage, see Sokoloff, *Targum to Job*, 112.
9.1.5 Objects

9.1.5.1 Direct Objects

The direct object appears in QA in any of the three aforementioned states. With regard to word order, it generally follows the verb of a sentence:51

4QTob\(^b\) 4 iii.4: And he made them enter his house.

4QEn\(^a\) ii.12: ... But you have changed your behavior...

An exception to this pattern is found in 4QEn\(^a\) ii.14: Then you will curse your days!52

When the object is pronominal in form, it often appears as a suffix on the main, transitive verb: 4QTgLev 2 3 וַיַּקְדֻשֶּׁהוּ and he will make it holy, 4QTob\(^b\) 4 iii.8 וַיַּקְשֶׁהוּ [Raguel] kissed him, and 4QEn\(^f\) 1 i.29 וַיִּשְׁחַטֶּהוּ You should praise him.

9.1.5.2 Indirect Objects

The indirect object in QA appears before and after the verb. Generally, the indirect object in QA occurs with a prepositional complement, -ל.

1QapGen ii.13: וַעֲמַתַּתְּ יִלָּהּ אֲשֶׁר אִימָר אֲשֶׁר אָמַר And with me she spoke and to me she said, “Oh, my lord, and, oh, my brother!”

4QLevi\(^a\) 1 i.17: וַיַּחְסְבֶּהוּ לְהַבְּכֶר ... ... will give him glory in it...

4QapocrDan ii.7: וַכְּלִמְכֶּהָ הַבְּכֶר And all of the provinces will pay homage to him.

51Muraoka observed that the pronominal object in the Genesis Apocryphon is suffixed to the verb. Cf. Muraoka, “Notes”, 31.

52We here follow the reconstruction of García Martínez and Tigchelaar, DSSSE/2, 400.
9.1.5.3 Objects of Prepositional Phrases

The prepositional phrase may appear either before or after the main verb, and the object may appear in any of the aforementioned states. The object is obviously the recipient of the governing preposition’s syntactical force, for which see Section 9.1.7. More examples than those listed immediately below may be found in that section.

4QpapTob\textsuperscript{a} 2 4: ...And they fled to the mountains of Ararat...

4QTobb\textsuperscript{b} 4 ii.2: ...And as for you, a true judgment is decided for [marrying her.

4QEn\textsuperscript{c} 5 ii.28: ...and violence will pass away from the earth

9.1.5.4 Infinitival Objects

With regard to the syntax of the infinitive, Carmignac once posited that the Genesis Apocryphon was unique in demonstrating infinitives with complements.\textsuperscript{53} Since Carmignac stated this, other QA texts have been published, and infinitives with complements may be found in 11QTgJob as well other texts.\textsuperscript{54}

The object of the infinitive may occur before or after the relevant infinitive or, if a pronoun, may be suffixed to it. However, preference is given to placing it as

\textsuperscript{53} As J. Carmignac has noted: “Le seul ouvrage araméen de Qumrán où l’on rencontre des infinitifs pourvus d’un complément d’objet est l’Apocryphe de la Genèse.” Cf. Jean Carmignac, “Un aramaisme biblique et qumrânien: l’infinitif placé après son complément d’objet” RQ 5 (1966), 510.

\textsuperscript{54} Carmignac reckons seven occurrences of an infinitive before its complement, including two cases in 1QapGen xix.15. However, we do not judge the reading of these infinitives to be certain enough to include here.
a separate form after the infinitive.55 As with the object of the preposition, the syntactical role of the infinitival object is governed primarily by the infinitive and secondarily by the main verb of the sentence. Examples of complements occurring before the infinitive:

1QapGen xix.19: ...דָּיָן לְמַכְסֶטִיִּיםִי לְכָלָי לַמָּשְׁבָּךְ ...who will seek to kill me and to spare you.

11QTgJob xxxvii.3-4: 56 יָדְעִי דָּיָן לְמָכְסֶטִיִּיםִי ...I knew that you are capable of doing everything.

Examples of complements occurring after the infinitive:

1QapGen ii.22: ...לְמַכְסֶטִיִּיםִי לְכָלָי בֵּכֶשֶׁטִי... ...to Enoch, his father, to know from him everything truthfully.

4QTob c 1: ...וַיֶּהָסָּח לֵאמֹר לָא לֶאֲנַחֲלָה ...And he continued to fear God...

11QTgJob xix.7: ...וַיַּחְדָּל לְמַכְסֶטִיִּיםִי אֶיתָּנָּה... ...my palate to ask...a mJan...

55Of the thirty-two infinitive objects we have identified, four occur before, sixteen occur after, and twelve are suffixed to the relevant infinitive.

Those occurring before their governing infinitive: 1QapGen xix.19, 4QEn c 1 vi.8, 4QLevi c 1 i.13, and 11QTgJob xxxvii.3-4.

The infinitive objects occurring after their governing infinitive are found in the following lines: 1QapGen ii.22, xix.18, xx.13, 15, xxi.15, 4QpapTob a 18 15, 4QTob b 4 ii.5, 4QLevi c 1 i.13, 4QEnastr a 1 ii.2, 4QLevi c 1 ii.2, 4QLevi c 1 i.15, 4QPrNab 1-3 5, 4QpsDan a 12 3, 4QpsDan b 12 3, 4QpsDan c 22, and 11QTgJob xix.7.

The object is suffixed to the infinitive in 1QapGen xix.19, 21, xx.9, 16, 19, 20, xxi.13, xxi.28, 4QpapTob b 4 ii.4, 4QLevi c 1 vi.15, and 4QLevi c 1 ii.6.

To Carmignac’s credit, it is noteworthy that more infinitival objects occur in the Genesis Apocryphon than in any other Qumran Aramaic text. It should further be noted that our count of infinitival objects does not allow for wholly restored forms.

9.1.6 Other Predicate Forms

9.1.6.1 Predicate Nominatives

The predicate nominative routinely occurs after the subject in QA. It does not always demonstrate concord of state with the subject and is not required to do so for the meaning of the sentence to be clear.

1QapGen ii.20: ... because he is beloved and a friend...

4QEn ii.14: He is our great Lord; [he] is the Eternal Lord.

4QapocrDan ii.9: His rule is an eternal rule.

As demonstrated above, the predicate nominative regularly follows the subject of the sentence. One exception to this pattern is found in 4QPrNab i 1: [I was thinking that they are gods. However, attribution of this anomalous word order to the influence of the subordinated conditions under which it occurs cannot be ruled out.

9.1.6.2 Predicate Adjectives

The word order employed when a predicate adjective is used is also a significant issue of style. In 1QapGen, 4QpapTob and 4QTobit, the word order tends to be predicate adjective-subject.

1QapGen xx.2: And beautiful is the image of her face.

1QapGen xxii.16: Blessed by Abram to God Most High, Lord of the Heavens.
However, in 4QTobit, 4QEnGiants, 4QEn, 4QLevi, and 11QTgJob, the word order tends to be reversed, the subject being given priority.

4QTob 1: 'תְּרוּעָה אֱלֹאִי' Israel is whithered.

4QLevi 1 i.18: 'םְתָלָל שְׂמֵהּ רֶבֶךְ' And those who bid him well are numerous.

Feminine adjective forms are employed in two places. 57

4QpapTob 6 9: 'דָּחוּ אֲנִי בֵּרֵי מְזֹן וְנָבָט רְפָאִים' ... I am clean in my bones from any forbidden thing.

4QTob 4 ii.1: 'אַהֲוָה וְתַכְקְפַּדָּה וְשֵׂפָרָה חֲבֵרָה' She is... and noble and very beautiful. 58

The only example of an explicit verb, subject and predicate adjective is in 4QEn 1 i.2, where an order of verb-predicate adjective-subject is manifest:

'בָּרָכָה בְּרִיךְ אַתָּה' Blessed be the judgment of truth. 59

9.1.7 Prepositions

The syntactical force of prepositions varies widely in QA. The following list details several of these:

57 We here do not include places where concord of masculine gender is manifest as the masculine emphatic adjective form appears to be the default for the predicate adjective in QA. Hence, in order to demonstrate discord with a masculine noun, the author/redactor would need to write contrary to the literary convention of using masculine forms by default.

58 This line is also the only place in 4QTobb where an overt word order is manifest. שִׁמְעָה is used as a predicate adjective in two sentences in 4QTobb 4 iii.7. In the first instance, the subject is masculine singular; the use of נְזָרָה is therefore ambiguous. In the other, a reconstructed form קָפֵשְׂתָה, both subject and verb are understood.

59 We here follow García Martínez et alia in the reconstruction of an emphatic form. García Martínez and Tigchelaar, DSSSE/2, 422.
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1. Accompaniment:

With 4QTob\textsuperscript{b} 4 i.5: And the angel went with him...

4QLevi\textsuperscript{d} 2 7: And after the thighs, the hind-legs are to be washed with the entrails,\textsuperscript{60} 4QpapTob\textsuperscript{a} 17 i.1,

4QTob\textsuperscript{b} 5 6, 9, 4Q213\textsuperscript{a} 5 i.2.\textsuperscript{61}

2. Advantage:

For 4QTob\textsuperscript{b} 4 ii.2: And as for you, a true judgment is decided for [your] marrying her. This is also represented in less certain contexts in 4QTgLev 2 4 and 7.\textsuperscript{62}

3. Comparison:

According to, like 4QLevi\textsuperscript{b} 2 16: And the vision... according to the appearance of the vision.\textsuperscript{63} 4QTob\textsuperscript{b} 1 10: And not like the first time...

And not like 4QEnastr\textsuperscript{b} 26 4 and 5, 4QapocrDan ii.1

(> > than 4QEn\textsuperscript{d} 1 ii.5: And as for you, a cavern... greater/less] than it and among them <I saw> a cavern...

4QLevi\textsuperscript{a} 5 3, 4QLevi\textsuperscript{d} 3 3

\textsuperscript{60} For this reconstruction, see García Martínez and Tigchelaar, DSSSE/I, 452.


\textsuperscript{62} For examples of this usage in BH, see Ronald J. Williams, Hebrew Syntax: An Outline 2nd ed. (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1996), §295.

\textsuperscript{63} Stone and Greenfield note with respect to this line that דע is equivalent to דע רד. Cf. 1QapGen ii.5; cf. also Stone and Greenfield, “Aramaic Levi Document”, 30.

Contrary to the editio princeps, we here render the first word of 4QLevi\textsuperscript{b} 2 16 as מנה and not בהי אתי. This is in accordance with PAM 43.242, wherein the beg consistently has a tittle where the horizontal stroke meets the baseline (Consider in 1.14, אתי in 1.13, and בהי אתי in 1.12). The first letter here has no such tittle but has a smooth stroke.
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between 1QEnGiants\(^a\) 27 3: ...ובין... ...and between..., 1QEnGiants\(^a\)

30 2: ...בין... ...between...

4. Exclusion:

and etc. except from 4QEn\(^a\) ii.8, 4QEn\(^c\) 5 ii.28: ...etc. except... and violence will pass away from the earth, 4QEn\(^c\) vi.19, 4QEn\(^a\) ii.7: [And you] seek [a hiding place from it.

except for 4QEn204 1 i.24: ...except for four...

apart from 4QPrNab 4 1: ...apart from them

alone, only 4QLevi\(^b\) 1 11: ...you alone know

5. Inclusive:

among 4QEn\(^c\) 5 i.21: ...among the sons of the earth]

6. Interest:

for 4QpapTob\(^d\) 6 12: ...my [soul] for a son to whom I will be a wife, 4QTob\(^b\) 4 i.19: ...כָּלָה... Take her]
to yourself for a [wife], 4QpapTob\(^d\) 17 ii.10, 4QTob\(^b\) 3 1

7. Locative:

in 1QEnGiants\(^a\) 17 2: ...בידיים... ...in their hands..., 4QEnGiants\(^a\)

8 13: ...and which are in the deserts and [which] are in the seas,\(^64\) 1QEnGiants\(^a\) 21 2, 4QpapTob\(^d\) 17 ii.14,

\(^64\)We here follow García Martínez and Tigchelaar in our use of “which,” but the relative particles may also be rendered as “who.” Cf. García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *DSSSE/I*, 410–411.
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4QEn\textsuperscript{c} iv.2, 4, v.8, vi.10, 4QEnastr\textsuperscript{b} 23 6 and 8, 4QEnastr\textsuperscript{b} 26 2 and 4, 4QLevi\textsuperscript{a} 1 i.16 and 17, 4QLevi\textsuperscript{c} 3.

And they fled to the mountains of Ararat.

4QLevi\textsuperscript{b} 1 8: I lifted [my eyes and my face] to heaven,\textsuperscript{65} 4QTobb\textsuperscript{b} 4 iii.4, 4QEn\textsuperscript{c} iv.3, 4QEn\textsuperscript{a} 3 21, 4QEnastr\textsuperscript{b} 23 9

And <I> speak for my liberation from up[on the earth], 4Q201 i.5: ...

The [G]reat Holy O[ne] will go out from [...], 4QEn\textsuperscript{a} iv.5, 4QEnGiants\textsuperscript{a} 13 1, 4QEn\textsuperscript{c} 2 ii.3, iii.20-21, 5 iii.20, 4QEnastr\textsuperscript{b} 7 ii.10, iii.8, 23 7 and 8, 4QpsDan\textsuperscript{b} 8 3.

Ahikar was... and] the administrator before Esarhaddon, the king of Assyria,\textsuperscript{66} 4QapocrDan i.1: ... he fell before the throne, 4QTobb\textsuperscript{b} 4 i.13, iii.3, 4QLevi\textsuperscript{b} 1 15 and 16, 4QapocrDan ii.9

... and they brought the table before me

unto 4QEn\textsuperscript{c} 5 ii.17: ... unto the wolves

Is it not upon me and upon you, my sons?, 4QpapTob\textsuperscript{a} 2 12, 4QTobb\textsuperscript{b} 4 ii.8, 4QEn\textsuperscript{c} iii.17, 4QEnGiants\textsuperscript{a} 4 4, 4QEn\textsuperscript{c} iv.5, 4QEnastr\textsuperscript{c} 1 i.1, 4QLevi\textsuperscript{b} 2 12.

\textsuperscript{65}On the posited reconstruction see García Martínez and Tigchelaar, \textit{DSSSE/I}, 448-449.

\textsuperscript{66}Cf. García Martínez and Tigchelaar, \textit{DSSSE/I}, 384-385.
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4QapocrDan i.4, ii.2

8. Modal:

- in 4QEna ii.1: Consider the earth and meditate in her works, 4QpapTobb 17 i.16, ii.2, 18 9, 12, and 14, 4QTobb 4 i.2, 3, and 18, iii.4, 4QTobb 1 11, 4QEna i.6, 4QEna ii.10, and 15, 4QEnastr 8 iiii.6, 4QLevii 2 10, 4QPrNab 1 iii.2 and 6 and 6.

9. Partitive:

- from, among 4QTobb 4 iii.6: ... And they said to her, “From the sons of Naphtali...”, 4QLevii 5: ... and to me, among his sons, he gave... 67 4QpsDan 27 1, 4QpsDanb 10 1

10. Possession:

- to 4QpapTobb 2 2: ... And nothing was left to me... 69 1QEnGiants b 1 4, 3 2, 5 3, 4QpapTobb 2 10, 4QpapTobb 6 11, 4QTobb 4 i.17 and 18, 4QTobb 4 ii.3, 4QEnb 1 v.5, 4QEnb 5 i.14, 4QEnastr 8 23 1, 4QapocrDan ii.7.

67 Cf. García Martínez and Tigchelaar, DSSSE/1, 452–453.
68 While יד is not attested in the photograph, the size of the lacuna in PAM 43.175 requires a reconstruction of more than the prefix to הָטְחָנוֹת. The space appears to be sufficient only for one additional word of two-letters; thus, the reconstruction seems very likely.
69 On this reconstruction we follow Fitzmyer. The שָׁבָךְ after יד is disregarded in the reading. For the reasoning behind this, see Joseph A. Fitzmyer, The Dead Sea Scrolls and Christian Origins (Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2000), 165.
11. Purpose:

for 4QEnastr\textsuperscript{b} 23

... for the deserts and for the seven...

4QTob\textsuperscript{b} 5 1, 4QTob\textsuperscript{c} 1 1, 4QEn\textsuperscript{a} iii.21, 4QEn\textsuperscript{b} ii.27, 4QEnGiants\textsuperscript{a} 8 14, 4QEn\textsuperscript{c} i.27, 4QEn\textsuperscript{c} 1 vi.11, 12, and 29, 4QEn\textsuperscript{c} 1 xiii.26, 4QEn\textsuperscript{c} ii.1, 4QEnastr\textsuperscript{a} ii.2 (2x), 4QLevi\textsuperscript{a} i.10, 12, 13, 19, 71 4QLevi\textsuperscript{b} 1 18, 4QLevi\textsuperscript{d} 1 6, 72 4QPrNab 1 5, 4QpsDan\textsuperscript{a} 8 3, 13 3, 4QpsDan\textsuperscript{b} 12 3

12. Relation:

4QTob\textsuperscript{b} 4 i.18: he does [not] have [anyone] except [pt] Sarah, 4QEnastr\textsuperscript{b} 28 2: and according to their [au/thority in relation to each of their stations]...

4QLevi\textsuperscript{d} 1 i.12, 4QLevi\textsuperscript{a} 1 i.16, 4QLevi\textsuperscript{b} 1 18, 4QLevi\textsuperscript{d} 3 2.

4QEnastr\textsuperscript{b} 6 6: And its wheel comes out, empty of all light...

4QPapTob\textsuperscript{a} 7 ii.6, 26 3.

4QEnGiants\textsuperscript{a} 8 10: and he lodges a complaint against you and against the work of your sons, 4Q244 12 2: And God became angry against them, 1QEnGiants\textsuperscript{a} 1 4, 4QEn\textsuperscript{c} 1 i.16, 4QVisions of Amram\textsuperscript{b} 2 16.

\textsuperscript{70} For the purposive understanding of -ל here, see García Martínez and Tigchelaar, DSSSE/I, 437.

\textsuperscript{71} While the use of -ל here is as an infinitive complement, the infinitive itself is one of purpose. Thus, we also categorize the preposition as one of purpose.

\textsuperscript{72} Curiously, Stone and Greenfield offer different readings in their transcription and their discussion on translation for this passage.

\textsuperscript{73} Garcia Martínez and Tigchelaar render [לע as disc. Beyer, however, renders it Rad or wheel. Sokoloff also interprets [לע in JPA as wheel. Cf. García Martínez and Tigchelaar, DSSSE/I, 434–435; Beyer, ATTM, 543; Michael Sokoloff, A Dictionary of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic 2nd ed. (Bar-Ilan, Israel/Baltimore, Maryland: Bar-Ilan University Press/The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2002), 129a.
13. Separative:

already seven men perished from me, Azarias, my brother, take with you from here for... 4QpapTob

17 ii.2, 18 6, 4QpsDan 12 2: And they will depart from inside...

14. Source:

this one from its measure..., 1QEnGiants 22 2, 26 1, 4Q196 2 9, 4QTob b 12, 4 i.6 and 17, 4QEn c iii.14, 4QEn b iii.15, 4Q211 1 ii.5, iii.5, 4QLevi b 1 ii.10 and 13, 4QLevi d 3 1, 4QpsDan a 24 3, 4QEnGiants c 19 4.

15. Specification:

...he appointed Ahikar, the son of Anael, my brother, over all of the accounts... 13 3

And Esarhaddon appointed him to rule second to himself, 4QEnGiants b 1 i.4

16. Temporal:

And in the days of Esarhaddon the king, when I returned... 4Q201 iii.4: And in the days of Jared upon... 4Q196 2 10, 6 5, 4QEn c 5 ii.17,
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4QEnastr\textsuperscript{b} 3 and 6, 6 5, 4QEnastr\textsuperscript{b} 7 ii.6, 7, 9, 12, 13, iii.1, 3, 4, 5, 7,
4QEnastr\textsuperscript{c} i.iii.7, 4QEnastr\textsuperscript{d} 1 ii.5

 Crimea... 4QpsDan\textsuperscript{b} 8 2: ...after the flood...

 ii.2: ...They are made like this until the day of...

1.7. Terminative:

4QpapTob\textsuperscript{a} 17 ii.2: [And give thanks] to him with your whole mouth, 4QVisions of Amram\textsuperscript{b} 2 12: And he said to me, “What is this called?”, 4QpapTob\textsuperscript{a} 14 i.9, 16 1, 17 14, 20 2, 4QTob\textsuperscript{b} 4 i.5, 11, 16, ii.3, 10, 17, 18, iii.1, iii.2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 5 6 and 10, 4QTob\textsuperscript{c} 11 11, 4Q213a 2 10, 18, 4QLevi\textsuperscript{c} 3 and 5, 4QpsDan\textsuperscript{a} 13 2, 4Q529 1 4

...from prayers to earthly things

9.1.8 Complements

9.1.8.1 The Object Complement

In the predicative use of nouns, -ו is often the object marker in QA. As Rosenthal has stated concerning BA, -ו is used to indicate both the direct and indirect objects, as well as the objects of infinitives.\textsuperscript{74} As in BA, the Aramaic from Qumran also

\textsuperscript{74}Rosenthal, Grammar, §182.
manifests the object complement י. See the section “Direct Object Marker” in the chapter on morphology (§8.6 on page 180).

9.1.8.2 The Infinitive Complement

The infinitive complements attested in QA are י and ב. The syntactical force of either of these is always within the pale of their prepositional usage. Examples of the former are לְמַעַשָׂה תַּעַשֶּׁה “to cut” in 1QapGen xix.15 and both לִפְיוֹל לָא לִפְיוֹל לָא for its healing and לַא הָבֵל לַא הָבֵל for its revitalization in 4QEnastr 1 ii.2. Two examples of י as a complement are יִפְנוּ הָבֵל יִפְנוּ in their completing in 4QEnastr 1 ii.18 and יִפְנוּ הָבֵל יִפְנוּ while being sad in 1QapGen xx.12.

9.1.9 The Vocative

The vocative in QA, naturally an element of speech and not of narrative, always refers to the subject of the sentence. It is found in both initial and medial positions. It is used sometimes to suggest either entreaty (1QapGen xxii.18: מְרוּ אֲבוֹ מֵר לֶוֶד אֲבוֹ my lord Abram, 4QpapTob a 14 i.9: אֲבֹ תֶרֶט אֲבֹ תֶרֶט my brother, 4QLevi a 1 i.11, 4QLevi b 1 i.18)75 or exclamation (1QapGen ii.9: מְרוּ אֲבֹ תֶרֶט אֲבֹ תֶרֶט my brother and מְרוּ אֲבֹ תֶרֶט אֲבֹ תֶרֶט my lord). But simple address is most common (4QpapTob a 2 12-13: בָּרָא לְךָ בָּרָא לְךָ my son, 4QTob b 4 i.12, 16, ii.7, iii.4, 5, 5 9).

75 In three other instances, the vocative may express entreaty, but the context renders a simple form of address also possible: 4QTob b 4 i.3, 5 8, and 4QLevi b 1 i.10.
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9.2 The Simple Sentence

The simple sentence is by far the most frequent construction in QA. In the following discussion we comment upon the more noteworthy syntactical elements of this construction.

9.2.1 The Simple Sentence in General

9.2.1.1 The Subject

As with other Semitic languages, QA demonstrates concord between the noun and its modifier(s) in gender, number, state, and the pronoun of which it is the antecedent (where applicable). Concord is also evident between the subject and the sentential verb(s) and predicate adjective(s) and nominative(s).

The scribes who wrote our texts frequently used simple subjects. Compound subjects are evident, however, and are always joined by a coordinating conjunction. In cases of compound elements, the elements are rendered phrase-by-phrase (e.g., compound subject: 1QapGen xxii.6:).

In the subsequent discussion, a simple sentence contains one subject unit and one predicate unit; however, each unit may be compounded by the use of a conjunction. A compound sentence consists of two independent clauses joined by a conjunction. A complex sentence contains a main clause, an independent clause, and at least one subordinate clause. These definitions (i.e., simple, compound, and complex sentences) are derived from Herbert W. Smyth, Greek Grammar (Cambridge, MA: HUP, 1984), 255. Nöldeke uses similar distinctions to these, categorizing his discussion into “The Simple Sentence” and “Combination of Several Sentences or Clauses.” Cf. Nöldeke, Compendious Syriac Grammar, pages 245 and 268, respectively.

In 1QapGen xix.14: And lfo, a cedar and a palm,…, 4QEn 5 ii.28: Then wickedness and corruption will cease. 1QapGen xx.3-4, etc., xxi.25-26, 31, xxii.6-7, 31-32, 11QTgJob ix.4, xvi.4, xxxiii.5, xxxvii.4, xxxviii.5, and 7.

In 11QTgJob xxxiii.5, the compounding occurs in the apposition to the subject. 11QTgJob xxxviii.8 interestingly compounds both the subjects and the objects with a single coordinating conjunction (and in i.8). Further, the operative verb for each phrase (and the indirect object) are placed at the beginning of the sentence.
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and Arnem and Eshkol and Mamre drew together with him; compound object:

1QapGen xx.17: And [the spirit] was crushing to him and to all the men of his palace).

9.2.1.2 The Use of the Copula

The copula appears in our QA corpus twelve times. As Nöldeke notes with regard to Syriac, the copula את always expresses tense and is, therefore, not a true copula. Unlike verbs, the copula does not always exhibit concord with the subject of the sentence:

1QapGen xix.7: את אתה ואל אלוף אתלמה You are to [me the G]od of [E]ter[nity].

11QTgJob xxviii.3: את אלהים ו הדת Lo, God is great...

9.2.1.3 The Verbless Clause

As in other dialects of Aramaic, the verbless or nominal clause is attested throughout the QA corpus. The word order of these clauses is variable.

4QTob⁶ 4 i.12: עראית את מה סמ כלב נא Azarias, my brother, what medicine is in the heart of the fish?

4QapocrDan ii.5: ממלכתו糜מה עלבים גם הראותה בקשת His kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and all his ways are in truth.

---

78 The vast majority are found in the Genesis Apocryphon.
79 Nöldeke, Compendious Syriac Grammar, §313. A true copula is simply an indicator of the predicate and does not show tense.
80 The latter half of this reading is substantially reconstructed. However, the three lamedhs can be clearly made out on the scroll. We therefore include them here. Cf. Fitzmyer, Genesis Apocryphon, 58.
4QEn\textsuperscript{d} i.i.5: ... And between them was a deep ravine.\textsuperscript{82}

\subsection*{9.2.1.4 Word Order}

In general, word order in Aramaic has been shown to be VSO (Verb-Subject-Object).\textsuperscript{83} As shown below, the word order in QA is very flexible but still demonstrates stylistic tendencies.\textsuperscript{84} Examples of each pattern are given after Table 9.1.\textsuperscript{85}

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline
Word Order & Total \\
\hline
SV & 32 \\
SVO & 60 \\
SCV & 20 \\
VSO & 59 \\
VS & 19 \\
VCS & 29 \\
VO & 204 \\
OVS & 21 \\
OV & 54 \\
OSV & 11 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{A Summary Count of Word Order in QA}
\end{table}

\begin{flushleft}
Examples
\end{flushleft}

\textsuperscript{82}For the reconstruction of ודייל, we have been impressed by the reading contained in García Martínez and Tigchelaar. \textit{DSSSE/I}, 422.


\textsuperscript{84}J. Cantonau’s statement concerning Palmyrene word order also applies to a more modest extent in QA: “Il n’est pas rare de voir des compléments placés en tête de phrase, avant le verbe, pour les mettre en relief.” Jean Cantonau, \textit{Grammaire du Palmyrénien Épigraphique} (Le Caire: Imprimerie de l’Institut Français d’Archéologie Orientale, 1935), 147.

\textsuperscript{85}It must be stressed that the data of Table 9.1 reflect only fully extant sentences; reconstructions of a single letter have been allowed where the context is paralleled in other texts. The texts used in the collation of the data are: lQapGen, 1QEnGiants\textsuperscript{c}, 1QEnGiants\textsuperscript{d}, 4QTgLev, 4QTgJob, 4QpapTob\textsuperscript{a}, 4QpapTob\textsuperscript{b}, 4QTob\textsuperscript{c}, 4QTob\textsuperscript{d}, 4QEn\textsuperscript{a}, 4QEn\textsuperscript{b}, 4QEnGiants\textsuperscript{a}, 4QEn\textsuperscript{c}, 4QEn\textsuperscript{d}, 4QEn\textsuperscript{f}, 4QEn\textsuperscript{f}, 4QEnastr\textsuperscript{b}, 4QEnastr\textsuperscript{c}, 4QEnastr\textsuperscript{d}, 4QLevi\textsuperscript{a}, 4QLevi\textsuperscript{b}, 4QLevi\textsuperscript{d}, 4QLevi\textsuperscript{d}, 4QLevi\textsuperscript{d}, 4QPrNab, 4QpsDan\textsuperscript{a}, 4QpsDan\textsuperscript{b}, 4QpsDan\textsuperscript{c}, 4QapocrDan, and 11QTgJob. The predicate objects counted include not only direct objects but also indirect objects and the objects of prepositional phrases.
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Subject-Verb

4QEn e 5 i.19: הַרְוָיָא שָכַעְתָּ וׇטְעָם The bulls were submerging and drowning.\(^{86}\)

4QapocrDan ii.2: הַרְוָיָא שָכַעְתָּ וׇטְעָם The bulls were submerging and drowning.

\(\ldots\) thus will their kingdom be.\(^{86}\)

Subject-Verb-Object

4QEn a ii.12: לְאוֹתֵהוּ שֶׁעִיטָה עַבְּדֶךָ And you changed your work.

4QLevi a 1 i.10: וְיִהְיֶה תַּכְּנָה יִקָּר Whoever learns wisdom he will honor.\(^{87}\)

Subject-Complement-Verb

4QapocrDan ii.6: וַהֲרָבָּה מִאֶרֶץ נָסִית The sword will cease from the earth.

Verb-Subject-Object

4QTobb 4 iv.9: וַיִּדְגֹּהֲלָה אֵאֵה עַמֵּי שִׂדָּא I am afraid of the demon...

4QTobb 4 iii.7: וְדִעְנָה אֵאֵה לְהָ עֲמָה We do know him.

Verb-Subject

4QTobb 4 i.6: וַגוֹתֵה עֵלוֹתָא And the youth went down.

4QEn b iv.10: בֵּנהֵי בָּנוּ תִּבְדֹּל Their sons will be destroyed.

Verb-Complement-Subject

4QpapTob a ii.10: וְאָבָּטַה עַל הָאָחָטָא And Anna my wife was restored to me.

---

\(^{86}\)While others add a reconstructed context following drowning (e.g., and perishing by that water), we see little need for this context. Cf. García Martínez and Tigchelaar, DSSSE/1, 427.

\(^{87}\)While the word order of the main clause is object-verb, we include this example based on the word order exhibited in the subordinate clause.
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4QpsDan\[b\] 12:2 And God grew angry with them.

Verb-Object

4QTob\[b\] 4 ii.3: You will speak with this woman in this night.

Object-Verb-Subject

4QEnastr\[b\] 23:7: ... because from there the bodies of the heavens shine.

4QEnastr\[c\] 1 ii.4: Through the east gate proceeds the east wind which...

Object-Verb

4QapocrDan ii.8: He will place nations into his hand.

Object-Subject-Verb

4QTob\[b\] 4 ii.17: ... because she has been set apart [for] you.\[88\]

9.3 The Compound Sentence

The compound sentences in QA exhibit both asyndeton and parataxis. The following are two examples of asyndeton in QA:

1QapGen xx.8-9: Then he sent for her to be fetched with haste.

\[88\]Given that the earlier part of the line included a causative clause is likely. Further, the attributive, almost possessive, force of the -ל is very likely given the sentence which begins at the end of this line: ...ךל.
Instances of parataxis, on the other hand, are more abundant. In addition to the following two illustrations, examples of parataxis may be found in 1QapGen xxii.5, 4QEna ii.1, 2, 3, 6-8, 4QLevi a 2, 5, 4QPrNab 1 4, 11QTgJob ii.2, 3, 5, and viia.3:

1QapGen xxi.2-3:  

And there I called on the name of the Lord of Eternity, and I praised the name of God, and I blessed God, and I gave thanks there before God concerning all of the flocks and good things which he gave me and because he worked good toward me...  

4QpapTob a 2 1:  

[One of] the Ninevites went and told [the] king...  

9.4 The Complex Sentence

9.4.1 The Use of the Relative Particle

Both Rosenthal and Dalman categorize יד (and its compounds) as both a relative pronoun and as a subordinating conjunction, not considering its role in the
construct phrase. In the former two functions, it typically introduces a relative clause. It thus serves to introduce a relative clause and, as such, may be appended to any substantival part of the sentence. Consider:

4QLesi a 1 i.14 ... Evbery man who learns wisdom...

4QPrNab 1 8 The words of prayer which Nabonidus, the king of [Babyl]on, prayed.

The relative pronoun is also used to introduce the object of the sentence and to introduce direct speech. This former use is, however, less common. The latter use is addressed in Section 9.5.5 (page 236).

4QTob b 4 ii.4 ... And I know that Raguel will not be able...

As mentioned under the construct phrase, is sometimes used to mediate between the n. regens and the n. rectum. However, the use of the relative particle most frequently attested in QA is that of introducing subordinate clauses. In this role, it is the most common expression, but not the only means employed by the scribes. The force of the relative particle used in this way is categorized in the following section on the subordinate clause in QA.

9.4.2 Types of Subordinate Clauses

The list below details the various types of subordinate clauses found in QA followed by a description of the type of clause, the subordinate conjunctions em-

---

92 Fitzmyer, Genesis Apocryphon, 218.
93 Cf. §9.1.2.2.
ployed to indicate the respective subordinate force, and a list of each occurrence by function.

1. Asseverative: These clauses are imprecatory by nature and demonstrate either the being by which the oath is validated or the object of the oath.

\[ that \] 1QapGen xx.30: ... And the king swore an oath to me that (he had) no[...]

\[ that \] 1QapGen ii.5: ... sons of heaven that you will tell me everything truthfully, whether... , 1QapGen ii.7

2. Causative: As the name implies, such clauses indicate the cause or reason behind the action of the main verb.

because 4QEnastr\(^b\) 23 4: ... And the great quarter [they call] the West quarter because there... ,\(^94\) 4QEnastr\(^b\) 23 6 and 7

because, for 4QEn\(^d\) iii.5: ... ... because they swore and declared... , 1QapGen ii.24, 25, xx.13, 14, 4QLevi\(^d\) 3 2, 11QTgJob xxiv.5\(^95\)

... and to lay waste their land from them from the time that... 


\(^95\) Note: The use of ב in 1QapGen xx.23 is ambiguous and may be read as either causal or temporal. Further, with regards to a restored מ in 11QTgJob xxiv.5, cf. Job xxxiv.11 (MT).
3. Circumstantial: These indicate the conditions under which the action of the main clause occurs.

which 1QapGen xix.20: בכל מקום יד ... עלי יד אחיו הוא In every place where [we go you are to say] about me, “He is my brother.”

11QTgJob xxxi.4: ... להנההו על ארץ מעמר יד לא אסף בה ... to bring them down onto a deserted land in which there is no one...

4. Conditional: The occurrences of this type of clause express the potential circumstance under which something might occur.

if 1QapGen xx.19: קרא למל חכמים מצרים ... ויסמך לאסופתה ... He called to all the wise men of Egypt... (to see) whether they were able to heal him...

4QThob 4 ii.5: ...הואא יהו יד וינחנה להוב ... h[ey know[s] that if he gives her to [another] man...

1QapGen ii.5, 4QThob 5 11, 11QTgJob viia.9, x.9, xi.4, xviii.5, 8, xxii.1, 4, xxvi.9, xxvii.4, 5, xxviii.3, 4, xxx.2, 3, xxxv.2.

5. Desiderative: As the name suggests, this type expresses desire or volition.

that 11QTgJob xxxv.2: ונתן לו יד יקפכמה ... ... he is confident that [...] will receive him, 11Q10 xxv.6: ... די אם ישיעו להתקמ ... ... that] they should ensnare the evil person...97

6. Epexegetical: These clauses function appositionally.

96This verse does not occur in the Masoretic Text. Cf. García Martínez, Tigchelaar and van der Woude, *Qumran Cave 11: II*, 164.

97The use of ד in 11QTgJob xxv.6 is restored. We include it here tentatively in light of the Hebrew Vorlage, Job xxxiv.30 (MT).
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7. Objective: This type of clause functions as the object of verbs which deal with direct and indirect discourse.

8. Purposive/Result: These clauses show the result of the main clause, as the name implies.

---

98 The use of ל in 11QTgJob xxxii.5 is possibly epeexegetical; however, it may be the pronominal subject of the main clause.

99 Contrary to Fitzmyer, we here include לא הלמה lest (Genesis Apocryphon, 179 and 226) as introducing a non-restrictive, result clause which, in the context of 1QapGen xxii.22, expresses an outcome that Abram does not desire.
9. Relative: This type of clause serves either to explain an antecedent or to otherwise modify a non-verbal part of the sentence.

who, that 1QapGen xx.6: And none of the virgins who enter the bridal chamber are more beautiful than she, 4QEna iii.14: [women from all whom they chose], 1QapGen xx.25, 32; xxi.1, 3 (3x), 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 17, 18, 19, 22, 23 (4x), 26, 28, 29 (2x), 30, 32; xxii.1, 2 (2x), 3(2x), 10, 11, 15, 17, 25, 4Q Tobc 1 3, 4QEnGiantsa 8 11, 4QLevitya 1 i.13 and 14, 4QPsDan a 20 3, 4QapocrDan ii.2

10. Restrictive/Exclusive: This type of clause serves to narrow the understanding of a previously mentioned element.

except 1QapGen xxii.23 (2x): ... barr ma d’el cub yelum yid emu berah ... [men who are with me have eaten and except for the portion of the three men...]

100 Cf. Sokoloff, Targum to Job, 69, and García Martínez, Tigchelaar and van der Woude, Qumran Cave 11: II, 128.

101 For the subjunctive force of מָצַל and the consequent subordinate conjunctive force of -ו here, cf. note 5 on page 192. This is, admittedly, an anomalous use of -ו, but the context offers no room to read it otherwise.

102 The construction רָדָה: מִעָלָיו occurs with regularity in OfA but not in the Middle Aramaic dialects. Cf. García Martínez, Tigchelaar and van der Woude, Qumran Cave 11: II, 161–162.
11. Temporal: These clauses express a time-based condition of the main verb.

when, just as 1QapGen xx.11: אַנָּה חֵלֶט בְּרָאָה עָמוּ בַּלּוּלָהוּ כַּדְּרַי
... I and Lot with me in the night when Sarai was taken from me, 11QTgJob xviii.7: ... just as [God] will arise...
4QVisions of Amram° 1a i.7

until 4QEn° 5 i.18: And I was watching until water covered the earth, 4QEn° ii.1, 3, 21, 5 ii.21, 4QLevi° 2 15: ... will [not] pass from you until all...
11QTgJob xxi.2

... the time when [God] will bring them back with [mercies], 4Q206 2 ii.2: ... like this they are made until the day when they are judged.

9.5 Special Kinds of Sentences

9.5.1 Negative Sentences

In every context that is clear, the negations, both לא and לא, are placed immediately before the clause which they modify.

לא This negation is used before precative and imperative forms. Context suggests that isn't rule, you should fear, you should worry,

103 For the insertion of not, cf. García Martínez and Tigchelaar, DSSSE/1, 449.
and may it be seen are jussive in force.\textsuperscript{104} Hence, by this precedent, Cook’s understanding of the precative force behind \textit{may you cut} in 1QapGen xix.16 is correct, even though the precise reading is debatable.\textsuperscript{105} 1QapGen xx.15 And may not rule... to defile... , 4QTob\textsuperscript{b} 4 i.3 Do not fear and do not worry... , 1QapGen xxii.30, 4QLevi\textsuperscript{d} 2 4.\textsuperscript{106}

\textit{ל} This is the typical means of negation throughout QA. Unlike \textit{לא}, it is used to negate statements, not precative expressions. 4QTgJob ii.6 \textit{לא...}

\textit{ותא שברך...} \textit{and not with wisdom...} , 4QpapTob\textsuperscript{a} ii.2 And none of my possessions were left to me., 11QTgJob iv.3 Behold, therefore, you do not... , 1QapGen xix.7, 4QTgJob ii.7, 4QpapTob\textsuperscript{a} ii.3, 4QEnastr\textsuperscript{d} i.5.

In 4QpapTob\textsuperscript{a} 6 1, there is an instance in which the negation \textit{לא} is used to suggest volition: \textit{And may we not see a son [or daughter] of yours [for ever...} \textsuperscript{107} A similar instance of \textit{לא} + the imperfect is found in Ezra 4:21: \textit{הכיתת דכו לא התבנה} let that city not be rebuilt.\textsuperscript{108} Rosenthal describes this phenomenon as a “possible but doubtful example” of the process by which \textit{לא} fell into disuse in later Aramaic and was replaced by \textit{ל} .\textsuperscript{109}

While Rosenthal’s conclusion is possible, we do not count it likely because

\textsuperscript{104} Cf. Rosenthal, Grammar, §87.
\textsuperscript{105} Cook, “Aramaic of DSS”, 371–373. See note 6 on page 192.
\textsuperscript{107} For the reconstruction here, see Fitzmyer, Christian Origins, 171-172. We refrain from the use of “never” here because the Septuagint has refrained from the use of \textit{μη τοστε}. However, this sense is obviously implied.
\textsuperscript{108} Translation from Rosenthal, Grammar, §87.
\textsuperscript{109} Rosenthal, Grammar, §87.
of the several places where א is used to negate precative forms (see א, above). This anomalous construction echoes an emphatic Hebrew construction. Given the proximity in which QA and QH were used in first-century Judaea, it is not wholly impossible that QH has influenced QA in this way. Examples of this phenomenon in QH include:

1QS v.5: אasher לא כל איש בחרות כלב: No one may go in the stubbornness of his heart.”

1QS viii.25: אasher לא נשפע איש ולא ישאכ: He may neither judge anyone nor be asked.

9.5.2 Sentences of Entreaty

In Qumran Aramaic, the particle of entreaty (א) is used infrequently and is essentially untranslatable. While it usually occurs to soften the force of an imperative, it is understandably used with a jussive in 1QapGen xx.25, when Hirqanos speaks to the king of Egypt (see the first example below). In total, the particle of entreaty occurs only seven times in our corpus:

1QapGen xx.25:=torch
t
May they return Sarai to Abram, her husband.

[111] While these readings and translations are our own, they were decidedly influenced by Qimron, Hebrew of the DSS, §400.11. Each line was checked against John Trever, Three Scrolls from Qumran Cave I: The Great Isaiah Scroll, The Order of the Community, The Pesher to Habakkuk (Jerusalem: The Albright Institute of Archaeological Research and The Shrine of the Book, 1972), pages 134–135 and 140–141, respectively.
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4QEn c 5 ii.29: And now, please, go to Lamech your son...

11QTgJob xxx.1 and xxxiv.3: Gird up your loins like a man...

11QTgJob xxxiv.6: Remove the proud and the proud of spirit...

11QTgJob xxxiv.7: Remove the burning of your anger...

11QTgJob xxxvii.6: Listen and I will speak.

9.5.3 Interrogative Sentences

9.5.3.1 Introduced by an Interrogative Pronoun

With an Interrogative Pronoun Alone As might be expected, the interrogative sentence is consistently introduced by an interrogative pronoun.

1QapGen xxii.32: My Lord God, my riches and flocks are great, but what is that to me?

4Q Tobb 4 iii.5: Whence are you <come>, my brothers?

With the Vocative While the interrogatives are restricted to places of dialogue, one does not find an interrogative used with a vocative form often. In fact, only two occurrences may be found of this construction:

This quote is from 11QTgJob xxxiv.2-3, the better preserved of the two examples.
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4Q Tobb 4 i.12 And he said to him, "Azaria, my brother, what medicine is in the heart of the fish? and

4Q Levi 4 3-4 And upon whom will the blame be? Is it not upon me and upon you, my sons?

9.5.3.2 Introduced by He Interrogative

QA also forms interrogative clauses by means of the he interrogative. In these cases, the he interrogative always heads the sentence.113

4Q Tobb 4 iii.7: Is he well?

4Q Levi 4:114 Is it not upon me and upon you, my sons?

11Q Tg Job i.2: Will [you...] with me to Sheol?115

9.5.4 Exclamatory Sentences

9.5.4.1 Introduced by an Interrogative Pronoun

The exclamatory sentence is often introduced by an interrogative pronoun.

1QapGen xx.3: And how soft is the hair of her head.116

4Q Tobb 4 iii.4-5: How much this young man is like Tobit, my nephew!

113 As this phenomenon does not occur in the later texts from Qumran (e.g., Genesis Apocryphon), a chronological element may exist in its attestation.

114 The traditional reference for this line is 4Q Levi a 3+4 8.

115 Cf. Sokoloff, Targum to Job, 28-29, 203.

116 On the reading of soft instead of tender see Kutscher, Isaiah Scroll, 31, and Fitzmyer, Genesis Apocryphon, 121. While Kutscher reads ṣafı, we see no reason for a restored resh when the beginning of the head and the full vertical tail is manifest in the text under computerized magnification. Fitzmyer does not offer confidence marks in his transcription.
9.5.4.2 Determined by Context

Context-determined exclamation is also attested, typically with the use of an imperative. However, our study of the corpus has found this in the Genesis Apocryphon exclusively.117

1QapGen ii.9: Oh, my brother, and, oh, my lord, remember my pleasure!

1QapGen xx.27: Lo, here is your wife! Take her! Go away!

9.5.5 Sentences with Direct Speech

Direct speech in QA is usually implied by the context of the sentence. In these instances, the direct quotative frame consistently precedes the speech event.118 In places where speech is not contextually determined, it is indicated by either the infinitival form or by the use of the relative particle יִדְרֹפֶה.

9.5.5.1 Indicated by Context

By far, the regular way of presenting direct speech in QA is simply an appropriate verb followed by the speech event.

1QapGen ii.13: And she said to me, “Oh, my lord, and, oh, my brother...”

117While imperatives are found in a myriad of texts, we do not find a place where one can say definitively that the imperative indicates the exclamation.

4Q Tob b 4 i.2: ... [And] he said to him, “Do not fear...”

4QL ev i.10: ... 

9.5.5.2 Indicated with an Infinitive

Only once in our corpus, however, do we find the use of an infinitive form (אמר ← מצר) with a clitic -ל. 4QpsDan a 1 reads: ... He asked Daniel, saying, “Because of [...” It is unclear whether this may result from an Hebraic influence.119

9.5.5.3 Indicated by the Relative Particle

The relative particle is used to indicate direct speech several times in our corpus. As such it follows the main part of the frame and effectively complements the speech event.

4Q Tob b 4 iii.7: אמרה נל ה דעינ אמצעה ילב ... And they said to her, “We know him.”

4Q Tob b 4 iii.8: אמרה נל ה דעינ אמצעה ... [And To]bias [said], “He is my father.”

4QL ev d 3 2: ... because you said to me, [“...”]

9.5.6 Performative Utterances

Performative utterances are defined as those parts of a text which are intended to be performed, rather than read, by the reader/oral performer. In Official

119 On the use of ל empir in Egyptian Aramaic, see Takamitsu Muraoka and Bezalel Porten, A Grammar Of Egyptian Aramaic (Leiden: Brill, 1998), Handbuch der Orientalistik 32, 328. On its use to introduce speech events in BH, see Miller, Representation of Speech, §4.3.

120 M. Jaffee, in commenting on the reciprocal relationship between aural composition and oral recitation, suggests: “Precisely because texts were composed under the assumption that they would
Aramaic, these phrases typically use the perfect form of the verb. However, in later, Classical Syriac, one finds the participle to be used for this purpose. In QA, both are attested, but the participle is favored.\textsuperscript{121}

Several instances of performative utterances are found in QA. While the semantics of many of these phrases are debatable due to necessary reconstructions, the force of each phrase appears clear from the extant text. Examples of these are:\textsuperscript{122}

\begin{itemize}
  \item 1QapGen ii.14
    \begin{quote}
      אֶזְמָעַ אֶתָהּ לַכְּבֵלֵדֶךְ רַבָּא בֶּן אֲשֶׁר שְׁמוֹעַת
    \end{quote}
    \textit{I swear to you by the Great Holy One, by the King of Heaven}
  \item 1QapGen xx.13-14
    \begin{quote}
      וֹכָנָ עָבְרָדִים מִרְיָ עָלֶא פְּרָעָה צָעֵי מֵאֵל מֵאֵוָרִי די...
    \end{quote}
    \textit{And now I cry out to you, my Lord, concerning Pharaoh Zoan, the king of Egypt, who . . .}
  \item 1QapGen xxii.20-21
    \begin{quote}
      מִרְכָּבָא בְּיִדְּךָ דָּרֶךְ עֶלְיוָה מֵאֵל מֵאֵוָרַה שְּפָמָא אֲשֶׁר אֶלְמָא אַנְא מֹתָא.
    \end{quote}
    \textit{I lift my hand this day to the Most High God, the Lord of heaven and earth, that not (even) a strap . . .}
\end{itemize}

be read in the setting of oral performance, their compositional styles drew deeply upon habits of speech and rhetorical traditions that had their living matrix in oral communication.” Cf. Martin Jaffee, \textit{Torah in the Mouth: Writing and Oral Tradition in Palestinian Judaism, 200 BCE - 400 CE} (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001), 18.

\textsuperscript{121}M. Rogland, “Performative Utterances in Qumran Aramaic” \textit{RQ} 74 (1999), 278.

\textsuperscript{122}This is a corrected list adapted from that of M. Rogland. Cf. Rogland, “Performative Utterances”, 279. Several examples which Rogland lists are not included here because the readings were either paleographically unsupportable or did not allow sufficient confidence to follow one reading over others.
4QEn8 v.24

And now I say to you, “My sons,[...”

4QTQahat ii.9-10

And now to you Amram, my son, I entrust ... and to your [children]...

and to their children I entrust ...
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Appendix A

Chrestomathy
A few words of description are in order as to how this chrestomathy was formed and on what basis the readings were done. The present chrestomathy was compiled from the author's grammatical database by a computer program written in Perl. Where possible, the base transcription was that contained in either García Martínez and Tigchelaar's *Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* or the relevant *DJD* volume as reflected in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Electronic Reference Library* Vol. 2, (Leiden: Brill, 1999).

The transcriptions were processed into a database format via a computer program written in Python and were then handchecked by the present author. The only exceptions to this process were those not included on the CD-ROM of the *Electronic Reference Library* (4Q490 and above). These were hand-entered and then handchecked.

The verification and emmendation of the readings were done against the photographs contained as part of the aforementioned compact disc and against the photographs contained in the *DJD* volumes. The photographs of the first five columns of the *Genesis Apocryphon* which were used were those published originally in Nahman Avigad and Yigael Yadin, *A Genesis Apocryphon: A Scroll from the Wilderness of Judaea: Description and Contents of the Scroll, Facsimiles, Transcription and Translation of Columns II, XIX-XXII* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1956). Verification, emendation, and reconstruction was done using the GNU Image Manipulation Program (GIMP), version 1.2. Where significant doubt existed about the reading of a text, this was verified against the relevant scroll in a research trip taken by the author during the summer of 2002.

There were, unfortunately, certain exceptions to this process of verification. In the case of the medial columns of the *Genesis Apocryphon*, we have relied on the
works of Greenfield, Qimron, Morgenstern, and Sivan. Where their readings were used in the grammar, they were verified against the high resolution photographs contained in Appendix B. Due to the text’s advanced state of corruption, questionable readings were *not* verified personally. Also, 4QEn$^a$ was not verified directly due to the costs involved.

Further, as mentioned earlier, the *editio princeps* of 4Q529–549 came too late to be verified in the research trip. As the photographs in the volume are generally too small for a thorough palaeographic analysis, the texts represented are largely echoes of Puech’s readings that are corrected where we found the plates (1) clearly did not record the text in question and (2) represented the abundant reconstructions which characterize Puech’s readings.

In our readings we often err on the side of caution. Throughout the chrestomathy, we have oft omitted lines which preserved less than a single, whole word. Further, we have endeavored to minimize the amount of reconstruction included in our work. We have, however, followed the reconstructions of others where they appeared probable.

While these readings are, in our judgment, to be preferred to the standard readings, this chrestomathy should not be seen as more than the documented readings on which this grammar was produced. In this regard, several parts of the texts that are not wholly represented do not appear in this chrestomathy, though the critical editions may present part of the word. A detailed portrayal of each text is not the intent of this appendix. It is not a substitute for the *editio princeps* of any of these texts, where such a volume exists. Rather, it is intended to show the paleographic understanding and relevant context of the readings reflected in the preceding Qumran Aramaic grammar. For a listing of the critical editions used in
studying these texts, please see “Qumran Texts Used in The Preparation of This Document” (page xxv).  

A.1 Cave One Texts

1QGenesis Apocryphon (1QapGen and 1QapGen)

1Q20, Fragment 1, Column 1

1-2

vacat 6

קודשת רבא ... 7

דרי מלח ... 8

... 9-10

1Q20, Fragment 1, Column 2

... 1-2

וסע 3

...1 מלח 4

---

1 A word about the formatting of the present work is in order. Given the unorthodox nature of this document and despite our best efforts, we have been unable to avoid various formatting pitfalls which a professional typesetter might have means of correcting. These include widows and orphans of both normal text and section headers.
Chapter A: Chrestomathy

... 1
... 5
... 6
... 7
... 8
... 9-10

1Q20, Fragment 2

... 1
... 2
... 3
... 4
... 5
... 6

1QapGen, Column 1

... 1
... 2
... 3
... 4
... 5-9
... 10
... 11-24
... 25
... 26
... 27
1QapGen, Column 7

עליהו ארעא מב ד"י עליהו במקרא
וא"ז מ"ל שומיש שומיש דרומא ומכביו י_kv

... 1
... 2
... 3-4
... 5
vacat ... 6
... 7
vacat ... 8-23

1QapGen, Column 10

ربعא נחדר ... מ"ל ד"י בר מ"ן ... vacat 1
1QapGen, Column 12

... 18-24

1QapGen, Column 13

... 1-7
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... 1-5

vacat ... 6
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254

... 6

Chapter A: Chrestomathy

254

... 9

Chapter A: Chrestomathy

254

... 12

Chapter A: Chrestomathy

254

... 15

Chapter A: Chrestomathy

254

... 18

Chapter A: Chrestomathy

254

... 19

IQapGen, Column 19

... 7

IQapGen, Column 19

... 8

IQapGen, Column 19

... 9

IQapGen, Column 19

... 10

IQapGen, Column 19

... 11

IQapGen, Column 19

... 12

IQapGen, Column 19

... 13

IQapGen, Column 19

... 14
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256

1. The child leaves home to seek a new life in the city, but upon arrival, he is met with discrimination and hardship. He must learn to adapt and survive in a world that does not always welcome him.

2. Despite the challenges, the child learns resilience and finds a community that offers support and guidance. He begins to thrive and contribute to society.

3. As he grows and gains experience, the child becomes a mentor to others, helping them navigate the same trials he faced. He finds fulfillment in giving back to the community.

4. Through his experiences, the child develops a deeper understanding of the complexities of life and the importance of empathy and compassion. He becomes a beacon of hope for others who face similar struggles.

5. In the end, the child realizes that his journey is not complete without giving back to those who helped him along the way. He continues to support and empower others, ensuring that the cycle of help and support continues.
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25
26

27
28

29

30

31
32
33

34

IQapGen, Column 21

1
2

3

4

5
6

7

8

9
10 ראהו על כל עוד צרכו להقيام מנומך ולהיות ישר צפחה, עד שписанו מהם רואים על צורה והם

11 כון שהמלכה

12 הם שונים צפחה לפני ראה על טעם כל יכשת על צורה יד והם להקים חוף לול

13 והם

14 הם כולם מלך מי להב את הSWG אחרון עד כי לכל אימוץ

15 הושחתה האב והמשתתע הלוחח ראשה משורות שלימשו והם מהן נראים ו뎃ית כי כל

16 דבקת סוס תורא וסותרת כל גם בתוכו ד echoes די ימי וישא האהלה לפי דיב

17 דיב לדיב긊 נורא וסותרת כל פורה דיב דיבית לילמה שומקיה הלוחח קות אתנה

18 ימי שומקיה דיב דיבית לכל שש שסוחרו שליב דיב דיבית לילמה שומקיה הלוחח קות אתנה

19 דיב значит

20 כלמותה אם חובה גביה כן מעשה הלוחח ובאצוליה לוחחי עד דיב

21 פנקה מצה

22 עם עדשתון עוד

23 דיבת ימי אצל האהלהDDR מדיל.Net מצה מרחבית ממיל הדימונים מותל אוארה להרי

24 ממיל מר
חל檔案, 열람 22

1. זה Бог בנה עבדו בור הוא בור מלך סחורה ובו נשוןежду סחורה ובה השואל מלך אדמן
2. בכע שמיאנבר מלך צבון עמו מלך בלא כל עלי באודמו חתונה בקרבי השלמה די טיף ותקח
3. עולה מלביהMIC והכר מלכ סחורה והיה שם עליوء מדו ותרתי מעשה ענייה משיא
4. יהב מדברון מלך עליות והנה נשונת מודיו והנה נسعادة ארבע מעשה דרכו עלים
5. לכן נספלה והريس DI*Mזרเมน ובאודמו יד ונשואת יד ונשואת

changes

1. אני אברך DI* הזה אברך הביאים חתונה מלאים עולם חמידים יאוחין ויהי
2. ענה DI* ישב אברך צבון די פטימ שאביה על אברות אברות ביאים الأهلي
3. מי תיבר והוים DI* שיבי טל בר אוחיו כל נספלה ולא יכול ויהי
4. גו זה מלכיך יותר חתונה רבת חמידים בשבי חמידים יבשלי יאוחין
5. למדתי דורשי זכאי אברות על טל בר אוחיו וההלות אברות עליות
6. זהי הנכון הנכון ביהר קבר בלוד מייתני נשואות ושעת עונס
7. אשר נמרות אשר עמי הזה DI* ההורים עד דבר קד אוחש אנון
8. שור בקבוע DI* ורוה עליונות בכלים די ארבע ויהיוו הזה קטל
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Fragment 1

1. תחתית מאתני עדין
2. עי מאתת מזvisión מחזון
3. ברן מ雜לח... 1
4. על שע... 1

Fragment 2

1. אמן... 1
2. אמן... 2

Fragment 3

1. מנה
2. רוחות... 2
3._VARIABLE_1... 3

Fragment 4

1. ... 1
2. תוקבד... 2
3. ... 3
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Fragment 7

... אַרְּחָה... 1

... 2

Fragment 9

... הַגִּב... 1

... 2

... גֵּבְרֵי... 3

... 4

Fragment 11

... כֶּס... 1

... גֶּוְרִית... 2

Fragment 13

... לְגַאֲפְּרִי... 1

... עוֹנְקָה נֹרָא... 2

... אֵלוּ... 3

Fragment 14

... 1

... רוּדָה... 2

... בָּאָה... 3

... יָסֵף נַ... 4

... 5
Fragment 15

... 1
... שבא... 2
... כל זה... 3

Fragment 16

... 1
... ואי... 2
... 3

Fragment 17

... של... 1
... בדוהן... 2
... במקום... 3

Fragment 18

... 1
... זאב... 2

Fragment 20

... אומץ grandi... 2
... עולם... 3
... כל זאת... 4
... 5
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Fragment 21

... 1
... 2
... 3

Fragment 22

... 1
... 2
... 3

Fragment 23

... 1
... 2

Fragment 26

... 1
... 2

Fragment 27

... 1
... 2
... 3
... 4
... 5
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Fragment 28

...ותר... 1

Fragment 29

...אלא... 1
...לא שפּ... 2

Fragment 30

...רש... 1
...ב... 2

IQEnGiantsb (1Q24)

Fragment 1

...끄ִּים... 1
...נַבּוֹת... 2
...נַקְלוֹ... 3
...מַחְלָיָה... 4
...לִקֵּל... 5
... 6
... 7
... 8
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Fragment 2

... 1
... 2
... 3

Fragment 3

... 1
... 2
... 3

Fragment 5

... 1
... 2
... 3
... 4
... 5

Fragment 6

... 1
... 2

Fragment 7

... 1
... 2
... 3
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Fragment 8

... 1

... 2
A.2 Cave Two Texts

2QNJ (2Q24)

Fragment 1

... 1
... בַּהֲמוּשִׁים זֶה... 2
רַבָּשֵׁךְ נְתַשֵּׁר סַחְוָר... 3
גַּלְגַּל יְאַתֹּניָּגַל פִּשְׁחוֹת... 4
אֲרַבַּיְא וְצֶרֶדְוָן... 5

Fragment 2

... 1
... כְּאָמָנוּ... 2

Fragment 3

... 1
... קָהַד... 2
... רַמְשֶׁת אֵצְרֵי סֶפֶרַא... 3
... פָּתְרָאִים וְיֶכְמוֹפָהּ לְמֵרָא... 4
... בָּאָמְלַח... 5

Fragment 4

... 1
... בְּשֵׁרֶךְ... 2
... לֶכְרוֹמְנָנָּמ רָעָה... 3
... גוֹעַלְוִלָנָּו לְיַמָּכל... 4
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Fragment 5
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Fragment 7

1

... יִשָּׁרֵא שְׁוָא אֲרֵבּוֹא... 2

cותילא אָגְנ הָור... 3

... זו אָחָרִין מַדְּבָּר שָׁעִירו... 4

... זְכָּרְוֵא... וֹלְחוֹת מְכֶרֶח בֶּהָלְנוֹי... 5

... זְכוֹרְוֵא... וֹלְחוֹת מְכֶרֶח בֶּהָלְנוֹי... 6

... מְדַבֶּר שָׁעִירו... 7

... מְדַבֶּר שָׁעִירו... 8

Fragment 8

... 1

... יִשָּׁרֵא שְׁוָא אֲרֵבּוֹא... 2

... מְדוּלָּא אָגְנ הָור... 3

... זו אָחָרִין מַדְּבָּר שָׁעִירו... 4

... זְכָּרְוֵא... ולְחוֹת מְכֶרֶח בֶּהָלְנוֹי... 5

... זְכוֹרְוֵא... ולְחוֹת מְכֶרֶח בֶּהָלְנוֹי... 6

... מְדַבֶּר שָׁעִירו... 7

... מְדַבֶּר שָׁעִירו... 8

Fragment 9

... יִשָּׁרֵא... 1

... יִשָּׁרֵא מַדְּבָּר... 2

... יִשָּׁרֵא מַדְּבָּר... 3
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Fragment 10

... 1

... 2

Fragment 11

... 1

2QEnGiants (2Q26)

Fragment 1

... 1

... 2

... 3

... 4
A.3 Cave Four Texts

4QTargum to Leviticus (4Q156)

Fragment 1

... נגזרו ... 1
... תcompanyId ... 2
... ופרדהנו וושק ... 3
... הבכש ענש ... 4
... והא ימותו ייִלָּךְו ... 5
... על טס יקדם כסיו קמדה ... 6
... מד נאם באפנזה ופיוש ... 7

Fragment 2

... ענשה ... 1
... כدركנו מדרבןיה ... 2
... שגנוהו ... וเครดנה יקדשה ... ו تماما ... 3
... עֹלוּ ... והיה קדרניא ... ... ומישר גנוז גazu ... 4
... יולא ... והשם חסמן ... והם הגנו ... ו ...) ... 5
... אנפיהו המ הנסך ... גזרך ... והם גוזו ... והם הגנו ... ... 6
... אנפיהו המ והיו תדע ...ו ... 7

4QTargum to Job (4Q157)

Fragment 1
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Fragment 2

1...
2...
3...
4...
5...
6...
7...
8...
9...
10...

4QpapTobita (4Q196)

Fragment 1

1...

Fragment 2

1... }מנת בנה נון וחברי קולנו...anza הקבר אחרון נאחזת רבד דעת (דִּי) ודע ב...
Fragment 3

Fragment 4

Fragment 5

Fragment 6
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... 2

... 3–4

... 5

... 6

... 7

... 8

... 9

... 10

... 11

... 12

... 13

Fragment 7

... 1

... 2

... 3

Fragment 8

... 1

... 2

Fragment 9

... 1

... 2

... 3
Fragment 10

...יחד בני ויהי עבד...

Fragment 11

...יאִילן... 1

...פְּקַדְּחַת לי עֲבֹדָה... 2

Fragment 12

...אָקֶר... 1

...מָתְתָּם... 2

Fragment 13

...אֶבֶכֶל אֶפֶק לֵאָחָרָה שֶה מַכֵּלַח שֵׁרָרָיְתֵיכֶם אֵאַתָּה... 1

...שְׁצֵּלָה עֱרֹנָה לְמַלְכֵּכֶם (עָצְרוּה) אָןָּה אֲמַרְו... 2

...בָּדָלַת נָטְנָה עֶפֶרְו... 1 ... 3

...רֹאֵשָׁה סְתַחְרָה... 4

...לבְּל... 5

Fragment 14, Column 1

...וְהָלַךְ מְנוּבָּה... 1

... 2–3

...זֶה הַתַּחְתָּה... 4

...שֶׁזֶּה כְּטֵל כִּֽתָּב... 5

...חַיָּה אֵבִי אָמְמ... 6
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Fragment 14, Column 2

_fragment... 4
ショップ... 5
והשונת יִתרא וְיִתְנָה... 6
לַרְבִּיהַ נַשְלֶה גְּחַיֶּם וּפְלִילָה בְּשָׁלוֹן)... 7
... כְּמָה צֹמְח... 8
שְׁאָלֵה... 9
אַמְלָה... 10
יִזּּוּ בְּשָׁדָה... 11
... אַבְּגִי לִגְּאָה וְשָׁוָה... 12–13

Fragment 16

... עַמְּנָק וְנַתְנָה לַאֲגָה... 1

Fragment 18

... שָׁוָה... 1
... הָדַּי רֵמוּה בְּכֶרֶנִי... 2
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Fragment 19

... 1
ארחון ג"ת... 2
... ארחיי ... 3

Fragment 20

... 1
לולחן ... 2
... לשבך ... 3
... לjabi ... 4
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...ז"ע.... 5

Fragment 25

...ןכומ.. 1

...נש.. 2

Fragment 26

...אראירוע.. 1

Fragment 27

...א מפייא.. 1

...את.. 2

Fragment 29

... 1

...ודידי פטל.. 2

Fragment 31

...זרבא לעון.. 1

Fragment 32

...עלמא.. 1
Chapter A: Chrestomathy

Fragment 33

... 1
... נא עד ז

Fragment 34

... י למר נ... 1
... יעל נ... 2

Fragment 39

...الة מעו... 1

Fragment 40

... שגנ נ... 1

Fragment 43

... בירק נ... 1

Fragment 44

... שבר נ... 1
Chapter A: Chrestomathy

4QTobit\(^b\) (4Q197)

**Fragment 1**

... 메뚜 디 놀래... 1
... 핏더 목 줄다... 2
... 나도시켜 경질... 3

**Fragment 2**

... חיה ממכה... 1
... תלמר... 2

**Fragment 3**

... אזדרך קל... 1
... למדוע... 2
...アナ가 우 Troll... 3
... אמר... 4
... למדוע בקושטא... 5

**Fragment 4, Column 1**

... אל ודנק (בסוף) ברי רכון... 1
...亚洲라 할 إلاandro 일이.RestController 웅 되... 2
... 비숍 알고 도착 할 도착 할... 3
... vacat 하 아르哈우 왕복시한 겨우 이 날 뱀... 4
...lemma 아르하우 왕복시한 임용 이 날 뱀 부분... 5
Fragment 4, Column 2

1 ... καὶ κακοὶ τῶν φιλοσοφῶν
2 ... γεγονός ἐστιν οὗτος ὁ δικαστήριος
3 ... καὶ γεγονός ἐστιν οὗτος ὁ δικαστήριος
4 ... ὁ δικαστήριος τοῦ τῶν φιλοσοφῶν
5 ... τῶν φιλοσοφῶν τοῦ τῶν φιλοσοφῶν
6 ... καὶ κακοὶ τῶν φιλοσοφῶν
7 ... καὶ κακοὶ τῶν φιλοσοφῶν
8 ... καὶ κακοὶ τῶν φιλοσοφῶν
9 ... καὶ κακοὶ τῶν φιλοσοφῶν
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Fragment 4, Column 3

... שָׁפָּ֖אָה תִּרְפֵּ֑הוּ הַדְּבָֽקָּ֣ךְ-ה בֵּֽהּ לְחָדָ֔וָ֖ו וְכִּדֶּ֖֔י עַל לְגָּנָֽא אָ֖֔חָמְּפַּֽתֵּ֔הוּ... 1

... הַ לְחָדָ֔וָ֖ו וְכִּדֶּ֖֔י עַל לְגָֽאָ֖֔נָא אָ֖֔חָמְּפַּּ֔תֵּהוּ... 2

... שָׁפָָ֖אָה תִּרְפֵּ֑הוּ דְּבָֽקָּ֗ךְ-ה בֵּֽהּ לְחָדָ֔וָ֖ו וְכִּדֶּ֖֔י עַל לְגָֽאָ֖֔נָא אָ֖֔חָמְּפַּּ֔תֵּהוּ... 3

... שָׁפָָ֖אָה תִּרְפֵּ֑הוּ דְּבָֽקָּ֗ךְ-ה בֵּֽהּ לְחָדָ֔וָ֖ו וְכִּדֶּ֖֔י עַל לְגָֽאָ֖֔נָא אָ֖֔חָמְּפַּּ֔תֵּהוּ... 4

... שָׁפָָ֖אָה תִּרְפֵּ֑הוּ דְּבָֽקָּ֗ךְ-ה בֵּֽהּ לְחָדָ֔וָ֖ו וְכִּדֶּ֖֔י עַל לְגָֽאָ֖֔נָא אָ֖֔חָמְּפַּּ֔תֵּהוּ... 5

... שָׁפָָ֖אָה תִּרְפֵּ֑הוּ דְּבָֽקָּ֗ךְ-ה בֵּֽהּ לְחָדָ֔וָ֖ו וְכִּדֶּ֖֔י עַל לְגָֽאָ֖֔נָא אָ֖֔חָמְּפַּּ֔תֵּהוּ... 6

... שָׁפָָ֖אָה תִּרְפֵּ֑הוּ דְּבָֽקָּ֗ךְ-ה בֵּֽהּ לְחָדָ֔וָ֖ו וְכִּדֶּ֖֔י עַל לְגָֽאָ֖֔נָא אָ֖֔חָמְּפַּּ֔תֵּהוּ... 7

... שָׁפָָ֖אָה תִּרְפֵּ֑הוּ דְּבָֽקָּ֗ךְ-ה בֵּֽהּ לְחָדָ֔וָ֖ו וְכִּדֶּ֖֔י עַל לְגָֽאָ֖֔נָא אָ֖֔חָמְּפַּּ֔תֵּהוּ... 8

... שָׁפָָ֖אָה תִּרְפֵּ֑הוּ דְּבָֽקָּ֗ךְ-ה בֵּֽהּ לְחָדָ֔וָ֖ו וְכִּדֶּ֖֔י עַל לְגָֽאָ֖֔נָא אָ֖֔חָמְּפַּּ֔תֵּהוּ... 9

... שָׁפָָ֖אָה תִּרְפֵּ֑הוּ דְּבָֽקָּ֗ךְ-ה בֵּֽהּ لְחָדָ֔וָ֖ו וְכִּדֶּ֖֔י עַל לְגָֽאָ֖֔נָא אָ֖֔חָמְּפַּּ֔תֵּהוּ... 10

... שָׁפָָ֖אָה תִּרְפֵּ֑הוּ דְּבָֽקָּ֗ךְ-ה בֵּֽהּ לְחָדָ֔וָ֖ו וְכִּדֶּ֖֔י עַל לְגָֽאָ֖֔נָא אָ֖֔חָמְּפַּּ֔תֵּהוּ... 11

... שָׁפָָ֖אָה תִּרְפֵּ֑הוּ דְּבָֽקָּ֗ךְ-ה בֵּֽהּ לְחָדָ֔וָ֖ו וְכִּדֶּ֖֔י עַל לְגָֽאָ֖֔נָא אָ֖֔חָמְּפַּּ֔תֵּהוּ... 12

... שָׁפָָ֖אָה תִּרְפֵּ֑הוּ דְּבָֽקָּ֗ךְ-ה בֵּֽהּ לְחָדָ֔וָ֖ו וְכִּדֶּ֖֔י עַל לְגָֽאָ֖֔נָא אָ֖֔חָמְּפַּּ֔תֵּהוּ... 13
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Fragment 5

... (4Q198) ... 1
... 2
... 3
... 4–5
... vacat ... 8
... 9
... 10
... 11
... 12

Fragment 6

... 1
... 2

Fragment 7

... 1

4Q Tobit (4Q198)

Fragment 1

... 1
Chapter A: Chrestomathy

Fragment 2

... לא 1
... אנFileSync 2
... הת 3
... כל לה 4
... 5

4Q Tobit\(^d\) (4Q Tobit\(^d\))

Fragment 1

... חכינו זה לא אכלי תנו لنا 1
Fragment 2

4QEnoch* (4Q201)

Column 1

... 2

... [hebrew text]

Column 2

... [hebrew text]
Chapter A: Chrestomathy

Column 3

... 1

... 2

... 3

... 4

... vacat 5

... 6

... 7

... 8

... 9

... 10

... 11

... 12

... 13

... 14

... 15

... 16

... 17

... 18-27
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Column 5

... 1–2

... קחשועה... 3

... vacat ...וֹמוֹמָה... 4

... והנתן... 5

... 6-27

Column 6

... יְשַׁעיהוּ... 3

... והנתן... 4

... והנתן... 5

... ובגדים... 6

... 7-27

4QEnoch$^b$ (4Q202)

Column 2

... יְשְׁמִי... 1

... והנתן... 2

... שִׁפֵּי... 3

... והנתן... 4

... 5

... והנתן... 6

... כִּמוֹ... 7

... ולָכוּ... 8
... 9-14

... ראבעע עטרא... קלח... ומקמח תועשר...

... 15

... ומקמח תועשר... לשבעה... זמאן...

... 16

... ומקמח תועשר... לחדליאצ' עטרא... עלין (1)

... 17

... וישיל... שליהו... (1)

... 18

... מחרשא... ואלשקות...

... 19

... 20

... וכיכרוהות... וחברה... עכל

... 21

... 22-23

... וחברה...

... 24

... 살ינא ד今回... ולא נלז מודיע...

... 25

... טשף: את'ך... לומערא הרב... ור'ל ור'ש'וינק(1)... ועט...

... 26

... וחזוק... והברא... במגזרה... ופלוגה עם הסיף...

... 27

... בכドイ...

... 28

... וברע... על קדודה...

... 29

Column 3

... וברע... על קדודה...

... 1

... וברע... על קדודה...

... 2

... וברע... על קדודה...

... 3

... וברע... על קדודה...

... 4

... וברע... על קדודה...

... 5

... וברע... על קדודה...

... 6

... וברע... על קדודה...

... 7
Chapter A: Chrestomathy

Column 4

... 1-4
... 5
... 6
... 7
... 8
... 9
... 10
... 11
... 12
... 13
... 14
... 15
... 16-28

Column 6

... 1-5
... 6
... 7
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Fragment 4

... 1

... 2

... 3

... 4

... 5

... 6

... 7

Fragment 5

... 1

... 2

... 3

Fragment 7

Column 1

... 1-2

... 3

... 4

... 5

... 6

... 7
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Column 2

... 1–4
... מִלְכֵּה רַם
... מֵהַדֶּר לְאָנָהוֹן
... וְתַנֵּנַּה כֶּנֶּה כַּלָּה
... וּמַעְבַּדְתָּן

Fragment 8

... סֵפֶר 1
... vacat 2
... כֹּלְכֵּל קָנָה בַּלָּוָל וּבֵיתָנָה...
... וּבִּנְשָׁנָה יִתְּנַשְּׁנָה פְּרָשָׂה 3
... וַעֲבַדֵּית ַּפְּרָשָׂה 4
... וְקָדָּשָׁה לְשֵׁמֹהוּ ַוְּלֹא חַכְּרוֹתוּ 5
... וּדְיָה לָא לִכְנָן 6
... וְגָבֹא וּלָן 7
... וְגָבְּנָה וְתְנָשָּׁא 9
... וְכְבַּדְתָּן לְהַקְּנֵנָה וּבֵיתָנָה 8
... וְכְבַּדְתָּן לְכַרָּנָה 9
... וְכְבַּדְתָּן לְמִלְקֵנָה 10
... vacat 11
... וְכְבַּדְתָּן לְמִלְקֵנָה 12
... וְכְבַּדְתָּן לְמִלְקֵנָה 13
... וְכְבַּדְתָּן לְמִלְקֵנָה 14
... vacat 15

Fragment 9
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... 1
... 2
... 3
... 4
... vacat... 5
... 말 тогда таков... 6
... 7
... 8

Fragment 10

... 1
... 2
... 3
... 4

Fragment 11

... 1
... 2

Fragment 13

... 1
... 2
... 3
... 4
Chapter A: Chrestomathy

4QEnoch (4Q204)

Fragment 1, Column 1

...ريبא ידישרה... 15
...עוגורי בושרה על... 16
...גרחין וקשקשים... 17
...עבות קומיא סעפב... 18
...מפעלים ו人格יה קולות.... 19
...מבשרות...人格יה קולות.... 20
...כמ חיות...人格יה קולות.... 21
...ולכש מתחתה.... 22
...די טעמן.... 23
... 24
...ำלה תהלך...י... 25
...גרחין ו人格יה קולות.... 26
...בחיה ג mj שלך 1...
...כספים מכלדר.... 27
...בכ nok עלינו ממלות 1...
...וה蚺ה (.... 28
...י... 29
...י... 30

Fragment 1, Column 2

...אוכלים...שמותה.... 24
...אוכלים...שמותה.... 25
...דיבריא בוסרי...הל ת الاحت... 26
...דיבריא בוסרי...הל ת الاحت...
...אוכלים...שמותה.... 27
Fragment 1, Column 5

1. כלכלת יד של תרניר
2. מקדש סדרות עלון
3. וברד subtotal ניכר
4. ובה켄יס חלון...
5. ומטבח...
6. ובחפשות ו والفילחת התניבב ברבח תכל עתון
7. בתתתתתתתתתת
8. שב...
9. ...
10-18
19. ...
20-30

Fragment 1, Column 6

1. יש... והנה חקוק על כל מ PostgreSQL כל שוד...
2. בעולם (יחד)...立て יהfindBy...
3. והנה חקוק...מעל דע עד...
4. חסן עלי מותר וחבר
5. וחטף חוטי רוחים ואתנש... והנה קי
6.עלים ומלוחות כמי חועד והתחתנו אתנש...
7. והמלבד קדימיהם של vacat 7
chapter A: chrestomathy

Fragment 1, Column 8

... 1-26
כרסט אוטיפ
27
המח经济社会
28
המ שומרי
29
ם וינקר
30
Fragment 1, Column 12

... 1-22

tnuw rhrkhk
23

hArhaxh tkh ... 24

knhlhlv nhxv skhp vacar nhxv skhp ... 25

khnhv nhxv nhxv nhxv nhxv ... 26

wvnhh nhxv tchvxh chvxh skhr ... 27

wrw nhxv vhxv chvxh skhr ... 28

hct vchvlh nhxv vhxv skhr ... 29

 jeśli vacar nhxv nhxv nhxv ... 30

cchaxh nhxv tchvxh nhxv nhxv

Fragment 1, Column 13

... 1-22

hcrkhv mchkhv ... 23

whnxwhc nwnwh ... 24

... nhxv nhxv nhxv nhxv ... 25

wvnhh nhxv nhxv nhxv nhxv ... 26

nhxv nhxv nhxv nhxv nhxv nhxv nhxv ... 27

... nhxv nhxv nhxv nhxv nhxv nhxv nhxv ... 28

... nhxv nhxv nhxv nhxv nhxv nhxv nhxv ... 29

... nhxv nhxv nhxv nhxv nhxv nhxv nhxv ... 30

Fragment 4

... 1
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... 19

... וֹרְחָגוּךָ... אָרָבָא 20

... וָכָּא 21

... וָכָּא... עָלְיוֹן (1)... וָכָא 22

... וָכָּא... וָכָא... בּוֹדָשְׁתָּה 23

... וָכָּא... וָכָא... וָכָא... וָכָא 24

... וָכָּא בָּלְמְפַה... וָכָּא 25

... וָכָּא בָּלְמְפַה... וָכָּא 26

... וָכָּא בָּלְמְפַה... וָכָּא 27

... וָכָּא בָּלְמְפַה... וָכָּא 28

... וָכָּא בָּלְמְפַה... וָכָּא 29

... וָכָּא בָּלְמְפַה... וָכָּא 30

4QEnoch\(d\) (4Q205)

Fragment 1, Column 1

... וָכָּא בָּלְמְפַה... וָכָּא 1

... וָכָּא בָּלְמְפַה... וָכָּא 2

... וָכָּא בָּלְמְפַה... וָכָּא 3

... וָכָּא בָּלְמְפַה... וָכָּא 4

... וָכָּא בָּלְמְפַה... וָכָּא 5

... וָכָּא בָּלְמְפַה... וָכָּא 6

... 7-30

Fragment 1, Column 2
Fragment 1, Column 1

... 1-23
... 24
... 25
... 26
... 27
... 28
... 29
... 30

Fragment 1, Column 2

... 27
...vacat... 28
Chapter A: Chrestomathy

Fragment 2, Column 3

... 1-26
... 27
... 28
... 29
... vacat... 30

4QEnoch' (4Q206)

Fragment 2, Column 2

... 1 ... כל ביני אנושה רעה נפש אנוש פרתמו בתים שלום...
... 2 ... לכלד מעודו של נפש די חודה שהיה עדمل ושם קאם
... 3 ... אם ואת נומו ו זקוק החוד vacat וemetery ו THEME ...
... 4 ... אם שהכלה וידא כי נודעו שמי ספרו ומקים ויקבלו ...
... 5 ... התאמה והקדישה עד ...
... 6 ... ושם ואת דק ...
... 7 ... כי אתיו ...
... 8-21

Fragment 3

... 1-2
... 3
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Fragment 4

... 4
... 5
... 6
... 7-13
... 14
... 15
... 16
... 17
... 18
... 19
... 20
... 21

... 1
... 2
... 3
... 4-9
... 10
... 11
... 12-18
... 19
... 20
... 21
Fragment 5, Column 1

... 1-10
מִי... 11
מַכְבַּלוֹתָה שְׁמוֹאֵל... 12
לְכָךְ דִּי הַנְּכִיָּן וְרָמָא... 13
איַרְבַּעַת אֶל עֲלֵי דָּוִד מֵהֵרֵיא... 14
עֹבֵדַה אֶל עֲרֶבֶדְוַה וּבֹמַג... 15
עָמֵה עֹרֶבֶדְוַה וּרְבֵּאָה הָפִיטָהּ וּכְסַיָּתָו... 16
תַּחְצָה וְהָאִירָבְנֵי שְׁבִיעַתָו... 17
זִיפָּהּ יִדְוָהֵפַת שְׁמוֹאֵל וּרְבֵּאָהּ וּשְׁרֵי... 18
זָנָאָה יִזְדָּהֵפְת הָוֵת דָּוִד אֱלֹאַהָּ הָפִיטָהּ וּמִן... 19
קָגִיםּ הֵלֵלָה וֹרְבֵּאָהּ שְׁכַעֲעַת וּטַעְעַעְת... 20
עָרֵבֵה הָשְׁהָדִית הָעֵלָה מֵהֵמָא וְכְכַּרְוְיָא...vacat (ַפְּלִילָיָא וּדָּרַף) 21

Fragment 5, Column 2

... 1
בֹּלַוְיָא דָּוִד וּוֹרְבְּנֵה... 2
... 3
דַּרְבּּוֹדָיָא שֶפֶרְךָ וּדָוִד... 4
... 5-10
... 11
... 12
... 13
... 14
... 15
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Fragment 5, Column 3

... 1-12

... 14

... 15

... 16

... 17

... 18

... 19

... 20

... 21

4QEnoch' (4Q207)

Fragment 3

... 1

... 2

... 3

... 4
4QEnastr\textsuperscript{a} (4Q208) 2

Fragment 15

... 1
... 2... 3... 4... 5... 6

4QEnastr\textsuperscript{b} (4Q209)

Fragments 1 and 2

... 1... 2... 3... 4... 5... 6... 7... 8

\textsuperscript{2}It should here be noted that only fragment 15 of 4QEnastr\textsuperscript{a} is included here because, when the Enochic literature was processed in 2000, we did not have access to the work of García Martínez and Tigchelaar in DJD36. The base transcription of this fragment was corrected against PAM 43.210.
Fragment 6

...*

 Fragment 7, Column 2

... 1

... 2

... 3

... 4

... 5

... 6

... 7

... 8

... 9

... 10

... 11

... 12
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Fragment 7, Column 3

... 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11-13

Fragment 23
Chapter A: Chrestomathy

Fragment 25

... ה...'...
... vacat ... 2
... ושֵׁנְבָּה יָאֹרֵי אֲשֶׁר אֶזְכָּרֵת לָהֶנָּה ... 3
...إلّا ... 4

Fragment 26

... 1
... נגזרה שֶׁהְיָה ... 2
... וְיֵשׁ בִּרְכָּת הַיָּמִים מִן דָּרֶךְ שַׁמָּעַת ... 3
...|--... ... 4
... כַּהֲפַת דָּרֶךְ חַי דָּמִי נָחָרָה הַחֲגוֹר ... 5
...|--... ... 6
...|--... ... 7

Fragment 28

... כִּלֶּפִיָּהוּ לַחֲדַשְׁשֵׁהָה לְדָלִיֵּהוּ ... 1
... וכִּשֵּׁלֵגָהוּ לְלַכְּכַלָּהוּ ... 2
...|--... ... 3
...|--... ... 4
...|--... ... 5

4QEnattr (4Q210)
Fragment 1, Column 2

vacat 1
vacat 2
vacat 3
vacat 4
vacat 5
vacat 6
vacat 7
vacat 8
vacat 9
vacat 10-13
vacat 14
vacat 15
vacat 16
vacat 17
vacat 18
vacat 19
vacat 20

Fragment 1, Column 3

... 1-2
... 3
... 4
... 5
... 6
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4QEnoch\(^{\dagger}\) (4Q211)

Fragment 1, Column 1

1. ... 7
   ... 8
   ... 9

Fragment 1, Column 2

1. ... 2
   ... 3
   ... 4
   ... 5
   ... 6

Fragment 1, Column 3

1. ... 2
   ... 3
   ... 4
   ... 5
   ... 6
   ... 7

... 1-3
4QEn\* (4Q212)

**Fragment 1, Column 1**

... 1

**Fragment 1, Column 2**

... 1

... 2

... 3

... 4

... 5

... 6

... 7

... 8

... 9

... 10

... 11

... 12

... 13

... 14
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Fragment 1, Column 3

... 1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

Fragment 1, Column 4

... 1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12
Fragment 1, Column 5

... 1
... 2
... 3
... 4
... 5
... 6
... 7
... 8
... 9
... 10
... 11
... 12
... 13

4QLevi* (4Q213)

Fragment 1, Column 1

vacat 1

כומת בו ... 2
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Fragment 2

... 1-3
... 4
... 5
... 6
... 7
... vacat 8
... 9
... 10
... 11
... 12
... 13
... 14
... 15
Chapter A: Chrestomathy

Fragment 3

_fragment_3

Fragment 4

_fragment_4

Fragment 5

_fragment_5

4QLevi (4Q213a)
Chapter A: Chrestomathy

Fragment 1, Column 1

... 1-4
... 5
... 6
... 7
... 8
... 9
... 10
... 11
... 12
... 13
... 14
... 15
... 16
... 17
... 18

Fragment 1, Column 2

... 5
... 6
... 7
... 8
... 9
... 10
... 11
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4QLevi (4Q213b)

... 1
... 2
... 3
... 4
... 5
... 6
... 7
... 8
... 9
... 10
... 11
... 12
... 13
... 14
... 15
... 16
... 17
... 18

Fragment 2

... 1
... 2
... 3
... 4
... 5
... 6
... 7
... 8
... 9
... 10
... 11
Chapter A: Chrestomathy

4QLevi\(d\) (4Q214)

Fragment 1

... 1–3
... יבגניא... 4
... וַזְּבָה... 5
... נַעֵס... 6
... 7–8

Fragment 2

... 1
... רְנֶּלֶקְּנַשׁ... 2
... יִכְאָשָׁה... 3
... וַאֲנָא תַּעְמָה... 4
... גֶּנֶּרֶתְוָה תִּשְׁא... 5
... בַּתָּנָה יְכָנֹא וָשָׂדָה... 6
... קַחְשָׁה עַמְּכָה לְלַלְּלָה... 7
... כָּמְסָחָה... 8
... וַהֲנָתָר כָּלָא חַמֶּר... 9
... וַתָּאָה גָּנָד בּוֹסֵד... 10

Fragment 3

... 1
... יָאָר... 1
... יָאָר... 2
... כְּפָרִים... 3
Chapter A: Chrestomathy

Fragment 4

... 1
... ווונר ו... 2
... וו ו... 3
... וו ו... 4

Fragment 5

... 1
... vacat ו... 2
... 3
... ו... 4
... 5-6
... ו... 7

4QLevi☆ (4Q214a)

Fragment 2-3, Column 1

... ו... 1
... vacat ו... 2
... 3

Fragments 2–3, Column 1
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Fragments 2-3, Column 2

... 1
... ... 2
... ... 3
... ... 4
... ... 5
... ... 6–7

4QLevi (4Q214b)

Fragment 1

... ... 1
... ... 2
... ... 3

Fragments 2-3

... 1
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Fragment 4

... 1

... 2

Fragment 5–6, Column 1

... 1

... 2

... 3

... 4

... 5

... 6

... 7

... 8

Fragment 7

... 1

... 2
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Fragment 8

... 1
... 2
... 3

4QPrayer of Nabonidus (4Q242)

Fragments 1–3

1... מְלֶל אֵלֶּלֶה יְהוָה וְאָז נֶדֶּנָּה מַכֵּלָה... 2
... בָּשָׁחֵת בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל אֲנָכֹהֶנָּה בִּימֵי י... 3
... כִּפְתָּשׁוֹת שֵׁנֶּנֶּכֶל וְזֶכַּה שְׁיֵי אֲנָכֹה... 4
... וָּתְפָּאָה שַׁבַּכְתָּ הַנַּר וְזָהָה זְרָהַ פָּרוּ... 5
... זָרָה זְרָה לְעֵדָן יִרְדִּי לֹשֶׁנ אָנָכֹה... 6
... כִּפְתָּשׁוֹת שֵׁנֶּכֶל וְאֶמְשָׁאָה בִּימֵי... 7
... שְׁנֶנֶּכֶל וְאֶמְשָׁאָה בִּימֵי יִרְדִּי לֹשֶׁנ אָנָכֹה... 8
... אֶמְשָׁאָה בִּימֵי יִרְדִּי לֹשֶׁנ אָנָכֹה... 9

Fragment 4

... לְכַלִּי קָרָא אֲנָכֹה... 1
... זָמֵהוּ אֲנָכֹהֶנָּה סְּלַמְּנָה... 2
... יְרוֹמֵהוּ לְכַלִּי... 3
... יְרוֹמֵהוּ לְכַלִּי... 4
... לְכַלִּי קָרָא אֲנָכֹה... 5
4Q Pseudo-Daniel (4Q243)

Fragment 1

... ישיאל ורגיא קמער בדנין 1
... א랙חה קמע 2
... סכש 3
... 4

Fragment 2

... ויניא קדום 1
... ברוך 2

Fragment 3

... ונותי 1
... מלקא 2

Fragment 4

... ומילא חזרה 1

Fragment 5

... ויניא 1
... 2
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Fragment 6

... 1
... וגה טריב 2
... דגאלא ד 3
... אהנהות חתני 4

Fragment 7

... 1
... יקריה נ 2
... נהוא חנקטו 3

Fragment 8

... החרס ... 1
... והבראא נברמ ... 2
... וי אפ שמע ... 3
... י ... 4

Fragment 9

... תורת ... 1
... 2

Fragment 10

... פך ... 1
... על מדא אע 2
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Fragment 12

... לְבַּקְרֵיה בֵּנוֹנִי... 3
... כָּכֶס... 4

Fragment 13

... אֶרֶבָּנֵעַ מְתָאָטֶף... 1
... סָחוּ חֵיתּתַּמְלֵה מַמְּמַמְּמָא... 2
... מְעַרְבִּהְרַנְרַנְוַני דִּינְדַּנְנַמְמַנְוַני... 3
... בִּנְיָנְהַו... 4
... 5

Fragment 14

... הֹנָרַנְרַתַּנְרַנְוַני בַּנְיָנְהַו... 1
... דְּבָּעַּנְרַנְרַנְוַני כְּבָּנְיָנְהַו... 2
... לְמַעְנַתַּנְעַתַּנְנַתַּנְתַּנְתַּוַּנְנְנַנְנְוַני... 3
... אַרְעַדְלַון מַכְּעַתַּנְתַּנְנַנְנְנַנְנַנְנַנְוַו... 4

Fragment 15

... בַּשָּׁלַר... 1
Fragment 16

... ישן... 1
... ב_inventory ומשי עלון... 2
... תשבים מלקחה עגפה... 3
... אלו מלכותה קדישתא... 4

Fragment 19

... שבא... 1
... 2
... ישן רוחני... 3
... יפתח... 4

Fragment 20

... נבס פלוגה... 1
... ושנין עשר... 2
... זרי... 3
... פתק שין... 1

Fragment 21

... 1
... אלכתח... 2
... 3

Fragment 22
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Fragment 23

... 1
... 2
... 3

Fragment 24

... 1
... 2
... 3
... 4
... 5

Fragment 25

... 1
... 2
... 3
... 4
... 5
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Fragment 26

... ותם... 1
... ותא... 2
... שאר... 3

Fragment 27

... ותא... 1
... יתב... 2
... 3

Fragment 28

... ולא... 1
... הפחת... 2
... 3

Fragment 32

... ותא... 1
... 2

Fragment 33

... שבכ... 1
... 2–3
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Fragment 34

Fragment 40

4QPseudo-Daniel⁵ (4Q244)

Fragment 4

Fragment 6

Fragment 7

Fragment 8
Chapter A: Chrestomathy

Fragment 9

... 1
... 2
... 3
... 4

Fragment 10

... 1
... 2
... vacat... 3

Fragment 12

... 1
... 2
... 3
... 4

Fragment 13

... 1

4QPseudo-Daniel\(^{\dagger}\) (4Q245)
Fragment 1, Column 1

... 1
... 2
... 3
... 4
... 5
... 6
... 7
... 8
... 9
... 10
... 11
... 12
... 13

Fragment 1, Column 2

... ו... 9
... 10

Fragment 2

... 1
... 2
... 3
... 4
ארבעת הפריטיםEnding בדאות רות... 3

4QApocryphal Daniel (4Q246)

Column 1

... 1

... 2

... 2

... 2

... 2

... 2

... 2

... 2

... 2
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Column 2

1. ברה די של תפשיל ורב עליון יחזק בן יוחנן
2. די חלהן כסף מלומדיה תqueda שchina: ממולך על
3. אריה לבן יזד לשב צדיע ומירו למדיאגו
4. vacat
5. מחנהו מחנה עלם וכל ארחותו בחקה ביו
6. אריה בקשה לכל עבד שלבר וארבעה שק
7. וכל מחנהו הל שמים ואל רבעbé הל
8. ויה נערל הל כ.confirm עמות נחמ בידד רכש
9. ויהו קדושה שלטתת שלט עלם וכל תוריה

4QWords of Michael (4Q529)

Fragment 1

1. מלכו חנה די אפרים מיכאל למלכות
2. אמר די מדרד חוה נתמ השכיכות נתמה
3. (חוחייתו שתחמינ תור הירק המחנה)
4. כדרכא וסמתה חוה תמת יד מ
5. ... כ hammah החופית חוה תמת יד מ...
6. בספר די רבי מרא עלהם כותב חוה
7. בין מ tys ליבי ומשד דרב מרא עלהמ
8. ... כי כשבים דמעא יימ אדריא...
9. ויהו מתבגית קרש למשה די רבי פארא
10. ... עדנא דל ייבוש חוסר רבי פארא...
11. ויהו רבי מרא עלהמ לבריהה
Fragment 2

... לך לך שמעי... 1
... אמר על... 2

4QEnGiants\* (4Q530)

Fragment 1, Column 1

... 1
ולוכט ו턴ער אתך יד יד... 2
...tol פלטנ דן ואדם לול... 3
כִּכְּסִיִּים עלי וכִּכְּסִיִּים ותְרוֹעֲשָׁנָה... 4
כִּכְּסִיִּים עלי וכִּכְּסִיִּים ותְרוֹעֲשָׁנָה... 5
כַּרְפּוֹר זוואנו צדקה ודניק לול... 6
אַחַד חַסָּנָה חַסָּנָה ודניק... 7
אַלָּלַכְּשֵׁנָה גֶּרֶנִי... 8

Fragment 2, Column 1

... ישאר... 1
... ישאר... 2
Fragment 3

... תותשרב בשנפ שינת... 1
... שבאותו יום אני במרור... 2
... זא קול חתודות ואל חתוד... 3

Fragment 2 (Column 2) and Fragments 6, 7 (Column 1), 8–12

1 עד מות נשאו ועלו של חברותיה אשתי ואשת أخي מת אמר להם
2 ונכנם וחורבנו אתמה דינו עלério חיתא טל תורהינו
3 ודעתו עשתנו נברת עשתו התוקן עלייה ביאדיה הכנסה והתירום הלפם
4 רותה ששתת איניורסו_marker מקומ ששת איניורסו_marker ממקושームות התוקן הצלחון
5 התנה עליה... החריתות והנחתות ככשה החריתות
6 נמיין אלי... גש מיהם ולהם בךילニュース (אה)
7 התנה באה ג cgi והאם מתקיק
8 ושרשיה רברבנ ג פייס מעייך חומר
9 זא לה על ידי שמשנ די זי מי
10 עופר... באל אם נטוור דלק ב
11 באם ראתו כו וית איה
12 ממקמה על אס בחכמה (יא)
13 אלה חזקתיו בגדה чחיריו leaked
14 חילותיו... שולמו עד הותר את הכיר פרשיא ופילור לא
15 ת럼_mut... בדיאלקט עתא והוה אשתיו אמר קדום caravan
16 נאמנ חית בחכמה בך ימי וברחנה עליה ששלח שמיי כאריאי וית
Fragment 13

...خلاً هذهُ مَلْصِقَتَ مِنْ أَذِنَاءِ... 1

...نقلْتُ هُدَىٰ أَهْلِكَ أَنْ يُرِيدُ لِمَنِي مَا مَّلَّهُ... 2

...فَلَمَّا أَنَّهُ كَانَ عَلَىٰ مَيْلٍ مُّطْرِقٍ شَامِلٍ... 3

...لَفَلَحِ الْيَدُ الْأَفْقِيَ مَرَّةً ثُمَّ حَبَّتْ... 4

...مَنْ يُسْقِي بِقُمَّةِ مَرْهَبَتِهِ يَتَوَسُّدُ عَنْهَا... 5

...قَدْ أَتَى مَنْ يُسْقِي مَرْهَبَتِهِ يَتَوَسُّدُ عَنْهَا... 6

...فَنَقَّدَ مَنْ يُسْقِي مَرْهَبَتِهِ يَتَوَسُّدُ عَنْهَا... 7

...فَنَقَّدَ مَنْ يُسْقِي مَرْهَبَتِهِ يَتَوَسُّدُ عَنْهَا... 8

Fragment 14

...فِي... 1

...فِي... 2

...فِي... 3

Fragment 15

...فِي... 1

...فِي... 2

...فِي... 3

Fragment 16

...فِي... 1

...فِي... 2
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Fragment 17

Fragment 18

Fragment 20

4QBook of the Giants (4Q531)

Fragment 1
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Fragments 2 and 3

Fragment 4

Fragment 5
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Fragment 6

...ןיא... 1
...ברה... 2
... הננה הל ד"לדה דע נאו... 3
... האותות עליזנה גומאה רב א נאו... 4

Fragment 7

...ולאנו... 1
... וה ענוא הלזראקון הלפין... 2
... לא שמיאהール הלזרסק העריאלי... 3
... וכלל אלה גרובי מיחויה לכל די קכשה... 4
... ונלא כל א.minute בהרה כות... 5
...angan ררבד על אואר... 6
... עליסה גשא... 7

Fragment 8

...לא ונלאינברוק... 1
... תשלו... 2

Fragment 9

...מרוע... 1
...לא... 2
... כל... 3
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Fragment 10

... 1
... קסם... 2

Fragment 11

... 1
... חיות ורגלים... 2
... יהושע קדום... 3

Fragment 12

... 1
... אבשלום לובש... 2
... נתן ומשכינך... 3

Fragment 13

... 1
...ึת תפתה ומשי... 2
... א קדום וUAGE... 3
... יושב... 4
... גם... 5
... ו... 6

Fragment 14

... 1
... ואת אלפיםandal...
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Fragment 15

Fragment 16

Fragment 17
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Fragment 18

...ז"כדיש רימ מקומ... 1
...ןגשגר חרב אבוד... 2
...א נפשא ידי חסנה... 3
...לו החבה וניה... 4
...א נפשא... 5

Fragment 19

...ץ"ע... 1
...זיר החמסournée בapistה... 2
...זרфесс תרמי אנתנה ולא ישר... 3
...בריך תמחיו מתרדנים... 4
...והוק ידישיכ ליאה... 5
... 6

Fragment 20

...בז"א קפ קפ... 1
... 2
...ז"ומ וני... 3
... 4

Fragment 21

...אנותר... 1
...ז"ומ וני... 2
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Fragment 22

...א לך ימיות... כו בראת... חזרות אל... 1
...رافך... 2
מתأخر והתקף ח流れ.presenterגורתיני... 3
cיול זכר וوضوع עמה נברר כה... 4
נשענה אתה עמי לאשתיהandra... 5
א硬化根据自己قط peninsulaו... 6
...ך לקפיבシー מ... 7
...יהו דה גחיה אניה הגור... 8
...זוכ נאר לה... [blank]... 9
...שנת עני כמותה... נראה עד אנה די עלו... 10
...אפור והג אכ עלות... 11
...גלימה אחר החולמות... 12

Fragment 23

...מלחה כותם ימיות... 1
...כל רשעיא מע... 2
...אתחקט האEmitter... 3
...שלחי השפיגא... 4
... 5

Fragment 24

...א... 1
...אש פריטק... 2
...יד רכנא ישאם... 3
Chapter A: Chrestomathy

Fragment 25

... ו... 1
... דַּיְּעֵבָדָוּ 2
... יִזַּעְרֵיהֶלְמָן 3
... אוּם יִשְׂכֹהֵם 4
... לֵאמֶנָּנָה מַעַדְתֵּן 5
... 6

Fragment 26

... יִלָּכֵל עֵינוֹ מֵסֵךְ 1
... מְסַמְּכֵתָנָה וְחָזֵנָה 2
... 3

Fragment 28

... 1
... גָּבֹהָמָו 2
... וַחַד 3
... דַּקְשֵׁנָן 4
... אֶמֶרָה 5
... לַמָּשָׁה 6

Fragment 30

... 1
... וַחָא וַח... 2
Fragment 31

... 1
... רַבִּים וְכָלֶכֶם... 2
... יה שָׁנָא גַנ... 3

Fragment 32

... 1
... אשר בָּדַמְא... 2
... 3

Fragment 33

... 1
... נְגַוֵּא... 2
... בַּכֵּן... 2

Fragment 42

... 1
... אֱלַמָּה... 2
... אָמָן... 2

Fragment 44

... 1
Chapter A: Chrestomathy

Fragment 45

...אנא... 1
... 2
... ננך מופלא... 3
... אנ דת סמיה... 4
...ויב... 5

Fragment 46

...אנא אנוהיה... 1
... ססכן ועעד שופים... 2

Fragment 47

...אַנֵה בָּמַמְתָּה... 1
...אנ דקדייש... 2
... 3

4QBook of the Giants (4Q532)

Fragment 1, Column 1

...سام... 5
... אַרְע... 6
_fragment 2

...30 ... 1
... למחר ... 2
... נפוג ונו ... 3
... והם卡车 וקרובים ... 4
... בלע ... 5
... ועדי ... 6
... שלימית … 7
... השם ערפי עליו ... 8
... שלו וใด מהותו ... 9
... חסוד בר הסל באז ... 10
... שקרות וליומן ... 11
... דין ואתה עד ... 12
... באצי_fragment 2

... לבר يقول אל שים ... 13
... בاسر תפוקה ... 14
Chapter A: Chrestomathy

4QBook of the Giants° (4Q533)

Fragment 3

... 1
... 2
... 3

Fragment 4

... 1
... 2
... 3

4QBirth of Noah° (4Q534)

Fragment 1, Column 1
Fragment 1, Column 2, and Fragment 2

... 1

תָּמִיתָהּ דִּי טִּלֶּהֶנֶּה מַחְּבָּֽדָהּ וְגַם כְּתֵּבִים גֵּפֶּם בָּֽעָרָהּ... 2

... 3

... 4

... 5

... 6

רוחָּהָ שְׁמוּנָה יָרִידֵהוּּ 7

... 8

... 9

... 10

... 11

מָז נִיהָ מִתְּנַקְּנוּ אַמָּֽה יָסִּיסָּרֵם וּמַשְׁרַבְּבֵּן דַּי לָא 12

חָקִּיטָהּ יָסִּים מַמְלַעַרְבָּֽהּ קֵלָה אֶדְמַיָּהוּ 13

... 14

... 15

... 16
Chapter A: Chrestomathy

Fragment 7

17 חלף כללו... כה קדיש עדיכן... כמאמר
18... כי תשודר אנוש אפרע... וגו... 19,... ולה... מתיישמר כי פס
20... וה... 21

Fragment 2

2 דק לכהה... 1
3 והנה בן... 2
4... והנ... 3
5... 6

Fragment 3

1 והננה נצחיים ומ לודאר... 1
2,... ומאריך ביטו... 2
3,... לעמארה פמליה... 3
4,... אдетיה... 4

4QBook of Noah* (4Q535)
Chapter A: Chrestomathy

4QBook of Noah $^c$ (4Q536)

Fragment 1

... 4
... [4... 5
... [... 6

Fragment 2, Column 1, and Fragment 3

... [1... 2
... [3... 4
... [3... 5
... [6... 6
... [7... 7
... [8... 8
... [9... 9
... [10... 10
... [11... 11
... [12... 12
Chapter A: Chrestomathy

Fragment 2, Column 2

... ומזה... 7
... עוד... 8
... כי אתה İn פא של כל א {[... 9
cסלה באספארק אצטף ... שובחו ל כל אנוש... 10
וכא יד בהרי ישות ... ובל כל סכלא יד filmpjes באבאה... 11
웃נה להפנ את מיכול ממ אנהacket יד לא עם אל האמארי דק... 12
tשודא אריה עדיה יתיש עד לעלם גבר יד לעבידכ יכון...

4QTJacob? (4Q537)

Fragment 1

... לכל... 4
... ו... 5
... מִצְפָּה מִמָּוָּס (... 6
... 7

Fragment 2

... או... 1
... והיו את ביכ הח' 2
... והיו קדשים... 3
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Fragment 3

...זלהא מידי... 1

Fragment 4

... 1
...א 2
...בח... 3

Fragment 5

...בארעו והכינים פרהי וכל טביהה והתוכן)... 1
...למס צא הלמס על ממק באנрат טע יי... 2
...אראשתיים עד...זההו קדמינו ל... 3
... 4

Fragment 6

...עעותים כל חוכמן ככלה... 1

Fragment 7

...אנו... 1
...המעוגן בד פשהוכן... 2

Fragment 8

...זא המעוגן... 1
Fragment 9

זוהי דע... 1

ואנсход חורום ממריח ממקשי דברים ו... 2

שלו... 3

Fragment 10

כןpected Eagמג... 1

ונכון לרוחםعلמי ו... 2

Fragment 12

ואורח להראג בנו... 1

ומסקוק דורח פמדבתה ו... 2

ב方式进行...

וזז החומ נפקק מקריות ומדות שורים והא חום נש... 3

... 4

קדימה ראשית ויתכן ואוור... 5

Fragment 14

ומכסיים ממקשים... 1

וביתוא ל... 2

ומני קורט לאחיה נפגק למון... 3

... 4

Fragment 15

כל עמה עלה... 1
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Fragment 16

...

Fragment 24

... 1

לעומק רוח הראל... 2

כל אתה ואהיהدين יד... 3

וע מתהו שלחת... 4

... 5

4QJTJud (4Q538)

Fragments 1 and 2

ואדום חתל על...אתיותיו ושז... 1

עדיל או אתיות בלבבותנו עליים...בידי אתנולות האלה... 2

ינכ חציאעל طويلתוםן ובארAnthווק擴ם טיסק... 3

ולה עודד את כי דיכ אתיות...רהח באתה הול вся עד... 4

וה בהוד דיל לא לא...ישר רוח אתה על אתנוה... 5

או...על וואן והקנ בכות שני klub יד Raleigh... 6

... 7

ועד חסף ומקל א...לאת... 8

Fragment 3

... 1

... 1
Chapter A: Chrestomathy

Fragment 4

... 1
... 2
... 3
... 4

4Q739

Fragments 2 and 3

... 1
... 2
... 3
... 4
... 5
... 6
... 7

4QapocrLevi (4Q539)

Fragment 1

... 1
... 2
... 3
Chapter A: Chrestomathy

4QapocrLeviᵇ (4Q541)

Fragment 1, Column 2

... 4
... 5
... 6

Fragment 2, Column 1

... 3-4
... 5
... 6
... 7
... 8
... 9

Fragment 2, Column 2

... 1
... 2
... 3

4QapocrLeviᵇ (4Q541)
Chapter A: Chrestomathy

Fragment 3

... לְתֹוֹד לְכָּה לְכָה ... 1

... נַתִּיב אֵנֶה לְכָה לְכָה ... 2

... וְאֵלֶָו בְּתוֹמֶָָָָוָתֶּּ נִּלְכָּה ... 3

... תִּכְפַּה שַׁאֲתָה קָלֵּלָה דִּי נַסְיָבַת ... 4

... זוֹ לְמַכְּלָל אָרֶּר שִׁיִּהוֹדָה ... 5

Fragment 4, Column 1

... 2

... 3

... 4

... 5

... 6

Fragment 4, Column 2

... 1

... 2

... 3

... 4
Fragment 6

... ומכבים על מתי... 1
הזכרה ולך תזו הוב... 2
גדי מתחבים ודיו... 3
לא עmozilla? והל... 4
זהות לכל מ кто... 5

Fragment 7

...weets ומשהו עמיוקה... 1
די לא מת=sum וזו... 2
ишאמת למא רב המה... 3
אדי ימסורハード ספיד ומכות... 4
מאמר ומשתפה ומגי... 5
אליפתא... 6

Fragment 8

... колב... 1
ום כל כדל... 2
בימה זומ... 3
ז'... 4
...Bah... 5
Chapter A: Chronology
Chapter A: Chrestomathy

4QVisions of Amram\(^a\) (4Q543)

Fragment 1a

... פרשנ כותב מלי חותם לע מרט ב... 1
... אחוי לבלניה וד יפק ד אמט בים... 2
... התחים ומע את שנות אדי... 3
... קחשמ וHotéisין ליג... ינותראלית פוריאק... 4
... עלוה תשלחת... 5
... היא מרום... 6
... 7

Fragments 2a and 2b

... ממרד נתונים... 1
... ודחי עלמוס נתונים... 2
... ואותו אל... 3
... ואל תchner הלפאוא הל척ה... 4
... וنعגר באראע או שלח השן... 5
... וארת תנך מכל פול... 6
... יכל רבי עולומ... 7
... נה תנג... 8
... קלחש... 9
Chapter A: Chrestomathy

Fragment 3

... 1
... אמ"ה אע... 2
... ולאמע"ג ר"ג... 3

Fragments 5

... 3
... וטסקט עני החותה והדח מ... 4
... שלג החשק החודש... 5
... וחברה חות ית אח"א... 6
... ואר מחיח חוכן ומכסה ג... 7
... הת"ה וצל ע"ת... 8
... וא... 9

Fragment 10

... זאמה שילט... 1
... זאמה שילט... 2

Fragment 15

... ח"בב ע"ת... 1
... הלכלוחות והרחואנים... 2
... זבב שטמאין או ד"ג... 3
... וי... 4
Chapter A: Chrestomathy

Fragment 16

Fragment 17

Fragment 18

Fragment 20

4QVisions of Amram$^b$ (4Q544)
Chapter A: Chrestomathy

Fragment 3

4QVisions of Amram\(^c\) (4Q545)

Fragment 1a, Column 1
Chapter A: Chrestomathy

Fragment 1a, Column 2, and Fragment 1b

... 1-9
... 10
... 11
... 12
... 13
... 14
... 15
... 16
... 17
... 18
... 19

Fragment 4

... 13
... 14
... 15
... 16
... 17
... 18
... 19
Fragment 6

1. תופע חל אחור
2. הקדמאת תדה
3. על הנשה תנכומ לבוק
4. ...  

Fragment 7

1. האמרת בד אנה רבה...
2. נמרוג על ודחהוונינ

Fragment 8

1. אויסר...
2. תחתונה במלים קורר...
3. ...

4QVisions of Amram (4Q546)

Fragment 1

1. ינשנה מחזרה...
2. מאה צד משני ותדהונינ
3. עזר עלייה והעולה...
4. לאותה מקרא ותדהונינ

Fragment 2

... 1

מד資料 שלקת למך בחר

... 2

אנו בחילה ובין כינוי קוהט...

... 3

ולמסת להן כל זריכות מנואר...

... 4

Fragment 3

... 1

... 2

... 3

... 4

... 5

Fragment 4

... 1

ויצא הürn

... 2

ויצא השיט לין

... 3

... 4

Fragment 5

... 1

שלטונה לא

... 2

אלא קושטיאן

... 3
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Fragment 6

...lecce
... 1
... כיכרות
... 2
... שותפ
... 3

Fragment 7

...יומ
... 1
...משגיח
... 2
... ז"ע
... 3
...משהו
... 4
..._social
... 5
...مالק
... 6

Fragment 8

...تصرف
... 1
...זמנה
... 2
...aviest
... 3
...وحد
... 4
...אמרת
... 5

Fragment 9

...זאת
... 1
...방송
... 2
...טקט
... 3
Chapter A: Chrestomathy

Fragment 12

... בֶּן עד עֵינָם לָהוּ... 1
... עִלְמוֹת... בֵּיןָוֹבָּדַר וַאֲנָא עַכּ... 2
... אָנוּ אָנוּ וּכְעִבּוּר וְאַהְּרֹן וְקַוִּים... 3
... בָּהּ וּרְצוּ מֵרִים עַבּד לָהוּ... 4
... יַכָּה... 5

Fragment 13

... 1
... אָנוּ וּכְעִבּוּר וְאַהְּרֹן וְקַוִּים... 2
... בָּהּ וּרְצוּ מֵרִים עַבּד לָהוּ... 3
... בָּהּ וּרְצוּ מֵרִים עַבּד לָהוּ... 4
... יַכָּה... 5

Fragment 14

... כְּעִבּוּר וְקַוִּים... 1
... כְּעִבּוּר וְקַוִּים... 2
... בָּהּ וּרְצוּ מֵרִים עַבּד לָהוּ... 3
... בָּהּ וּרְצוּ מֵרִים עַבּד לָהוּ... 4
... יַכָּה... 5
4Qvisions of Amramő (4Q547)

Fragment 1 and Fragment 2, Column 3

... 6

Fragment 3

... 6
Fragment 5

קָרַבְבָּה ... 1
❦ָרֶבֶךְ ... 2
ניָצְרָה ... 3
וְיָרָה ... 4

Fragment 8

לָא דוֹ קָרַבְבָּה יִרְיָב עַל ... 1
אָלָיְא דְיֵ קָרַבְבָּה יִרְיָב עַל ... 2
ויָמְרַת לֶחְבוֹת מְלָדְתָּם ... 3
ויָמְרַת לֶחְבוֹת מְלָדְתָּם ... 4
ויָמְרַת לֶחְבוֹת מְלָדְתָּם ... 5

Fragment 9

וְיָמְרַת לֶחְבוֹת מְלָדְתָּם ... 1
וְיָמְרַת לֶחְבוֹת מְלָדְתָּם ... 2
וְיָמְרַת לֶחְבוֹת מְלָדְתָּם ... 3
וְיָמְרַת לֶחְבוֹת מְלָדְתָּם ... 4
וְיָמְרַת לֶחְבוֹת מְלָדְתָּם ... 5
וְיָמְרַת לֶחְבוֹת מְלָדְתָּם ... 6
וְיָמְרַת לֶחְבוֹת מְלָדְתָּם ... 7
וְיָמְרַת לֶחְבוֹת מְלָדְתָּם ... 8
וְיָמְרַת לֶחְבוֹת מְלָדְתָּם ... 9
Fragment 1, Column 2, and Fragment 2

4xisons of ARMAM (40548)

12
11
10

Chapter A: Christmas
Chapter A: Chrestomathy

4Qvisions of Amram$^5$ (4Q549)

Fragment 2

1... נִמְדַּי

2... קִיםוּ בֵּיתָם

3... אָסְרוּ נָאָו

4... וַה...

5... מקט מען

6... פִּנְרָל בְּלֵית עָלְמָה...וְשַׁלְמָהוּ

vacat... 7

vacat וַסְתַּר

8... עָשָּׁר אָאָדְלָא מְחַרְמָא עָפָר

9... וּסְתַּר וְאַבּוּ חֵר

10... וְאַאֲדָל מְחַר לְאָאָדְלָא

11... מָה אֶרְבְּשׁ בְּנָקָה...
A.4 Cave Six Texts

6QpapGiants (6Q8)

Fragment 1

...א... 1
...זאיה אמר לה告诉他... 2
...ראא מר בשמע את אמרו... 3
...wacat ברקאל אברע מעוה... 4
...ולאהושפייו מערת... לאשיטעמה מד יד... 5
...לעו אראה חשפתיו וו ידת שריק... 6

A.5 Cave Eleven Texts

11QTargum to Job (11Q10)

Column 1

...ותיכהו מע אפר... 1
...הנה מעлибоון... 2
wacat גשך... 3
...ענה בכדר ושהתה... 4
...תרשץ סחף ליפא... 5
...לכבודו דמגא... 6
...Јאלו ודנרד... 7
...ים אלחר... 8
### Column 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Column 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Column 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column 5</td>
<td>Column 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>עניינים בְּמַפְקֻלָּהּ הַמַּחֲכֶרֶת</td>
<td>אֲנָפוֹת...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>אָרַח...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Column 7

1.  דָיָמֶת
2.  אָמַרְתָּם
3.  לֶאַךְ עַלָּנָּהוּ
4.  הַגַּת רְשִׁיעִי
5.  הֲחַזְקֵן
6.  הִכָּה אָלוֹן
7.  הָסְדְּלֵךְ
8.  כָּכֵל אָלוֹן
9.  ...  

Column 7a

1.  וּכְאֵר וְאָמַר... vacat
2.  מִמְּשֶׁל שֶׁטָּהְרוּ דָי
3.  זְנוּנָהָה מֶלֶךְ אָנֵדָו אַשׁוֹלְחוּ
4.  אֵת הַדַּרְרָה אֲמָלָּלְךָּוֶּה
5.  וְפַמְלָה אֲמָלָה חַכְּמָתָה אַנָּדוּ
6.  נָאֵשְׁלָלֶךְ מַאָּמָרֶךְ וְלֹא
7.  יִנְצַלֵךְ עַמְּיְמָךְ עַד
8.  גַּרְּנָךְ קָשָׁת דֹּדֵךְ
9.  ... וּחַ בְּכֵלֻּם
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Column 8

... 10

Column 9

... 10

vacat... 1
עג בבלד... 2
וש lưng ובו עליה עון... 3
ונמרמה האינתי חנית לשת... 4
וא שע מלא תקפים... 5
ואלאו אם כי... 6
והי טכיאי לא (1)... 7
vacat גבר אינא מבטate... 8
ואנמו תזדא... 9
vacat... 10
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Column 10

1. null
2. null
3. null
4. null
5. null
6. null
7. null
8. null
9. null
10. null

Column 11

1. null
2. null
3. null
4. null
5. null
6. null
7. null
8. null
9. null
10. null
11. null
### Column 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>건 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>תחניה אצתרי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>سفرת...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>לא...ודאכרה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>תונן...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>טיפות...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>כותר...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>... 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>אצを使った</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Column 13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>מחיר ושימן אצתרי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>בاداتני שמסגה...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>בבל ארז הוא...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>לקפיי בראיה...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>במעבדה לזרה...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>בأمراض במעבדה...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>קלחן באתפלן...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>אמרremium...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>ומספגים...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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_Column 15_

1. לא בא חזרה עלホール להתרומן.
2. באחרת אחור חזרת.
3. זריאש וחלש חзамен.
4. החפץ עלי אברוןIOD יריבים.
5. באזרות פנימיות הｴ ﻣﻊ כל מים.
6. לא זוא חצר כים בצבאות אדום.
7. כפתי רוע חז איצק אתרט.
8. ביאש יותר זא אכל.
9. רטרון חתולות.

_Column 16_

סזארו, יומון ופאלא לא
Column 17

 barring... 1
 før... 2
 הרש... 3
 ההכלת... 4
 الأهקר... 5
_Off... 6
 מ... 7
 אברכים... 8
 נָה... 9

Column 18

 나오ֹע... 1
 בַּלַּּוּן... א"ל... 2
 תְּרוֹם... 3
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גווא הותוא... למה העד

אבותיו罙יכל... וה אתקרט

בריתعودة... מא שני

כדי לקיים... עור

عونディי זה וו

אמרנו... סהיפ

Column 19

זה הלגוףאר

ושקת יידי... בודת

לאלהמעלואוולת

... על ביאש xv

ليس והשגרה... זריגה

אותרדו... תליאת

והיכלתעלא אוש

בכרי פזך...

... לא ג

Column 20

תחות חטוק... 1

ちなみに סוף...

אילן נחלובב...

חק ואיבagan...

... vacat 5

... אדנ רג... 6
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Column 21

1... ملي اف انا اور سبان
2... صيفم دد ثكتر سكش
3... نار لم اتيف مكن شافو
4... كلمح دد عما التمر
5... الله أنشه تجننا لانا
6... ملي ونما اا تجونا
7... وخشون تورت مون
8... نكموا بنا مكنو شود
9... نأحزه ملي اف

Column 22

1... ذوي هرخو لنا نفسون
2... يكور ذا امشر بادن شوك
3... جفلي انا دنا عهنا الا نكون
4... نكم الشرح نصوح جهدا
5... ينوا بسمه رار تسر كل
6... أري رالهما ما انطل
7... ربون ثملا انا بكل
8... ناوي بحدنا مكلا انا
9... بعالم بوادي مكلا
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Column 27

1. נמלני תבש"ע...ראחמניךeatureי ורומן
2. לאף עב אסריים ג'...אנחתיך הבכלי מסכןא
3. ויתוא לוחין עבדיהם...זווא ארוצר החなのに ויגלה
4. אדיגתך הלסרנא ואמר...וז צונאומן סנ ביאשייתרמן
5. לך ישמעון יונדזון...בכט ימשרין טנייתון
6. יניקו עדינה...ישמעון התבראר פוטן
7. ואבדם מופגיגנא לברכה להרג
8. עלוהו נוק...מדינתך נמעדית נמדית
9. ופקדך מולי...יז אייגיתן
10. ...

Column 28

...וֹבָדָה...זֶּכֶר אָוֶר רָבְרֹכֶם עֶבֶדֹה יִזַּן...
1. החosc החוטים מכל אוטהו חוכי בינן יאושא
2. והחותי בחיק את אילו ריב ואילו וימינו
3. סטיא...ונגיד ומך שווה די לא טפי אורי
4. עֶגֶל...וֹיָכֵל מֶטֶר יוכי צעיגה ונאותך
5. סטוּפָי...וגוֹנָא וּרְאַף מַס פּרַס וָכָּאֵר
6. והשתָאָה...מַשְּלָהּ מְלָל וְפֶרֶס נַפְלוּהו...
7. ...כנסי אורי סבויי נַדַּי עֲמִמָּה
8. ...אָלֵךְ מַמָּרָה מְאוֹ.
9. ...גיטאֶה עַלֹוהי...
Column 33

110000
1000000
6000000
8000000
7000000
6000000
5000000
4000000
3000000
2000000
1000000
0
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Column 34

... 3

... 4

... 5

... 6

... 7

... 8

... 9

... 10

... vacat איזול... 1

... 2

... 3

... 4

... 5

... 6

... 7

... 8

... vacat איזול... 9

... 10

Column 35

... 1

... 2

... 3
Column 37

1

Column 36

01
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וכזל למשבר ולא תבצר מוכז תוקע והכמה

וזה מביך לה אצניך ותרתך_Utilות לא

אותך שמיע לא זוהי אמלה אשתנך

ורתניכי למשמו אזור שמעעך ועט עני

ותך על כאן אתחנן ואתמה אאתיאה genomes

vacat קטעי 9

...сталו ... vacat קטעי 10

Column 38

...сталו...

אתלה השמע אתולה בכול די יאכט שבק

לחך התאווה בצהל תור אצלה ולכואנא ברחמון

יוחבله דה טור נבל די הוה הל אאתיםerot

יאוגכ לד יהוהי וכל אוחייה וכל דיתויהם וסמל

ועכן תם ביבשת והטוריו על כל באישתה די

ותה אתלה לכליה ויהוה הל גזר אמירה דודה

vacat נגור קסח הוא דו דחא

אתלה ב็ก דל א xbox 복ואר ג

11QNJ (11Q18)

Fragment 6

...מאתיים התוכנים אתון...

...אוכף פוריא לד שוהא...

...דרורא זפלן...
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Fragment 7

... 1
... 2
... 3
... 4
... 5

Fragment 8

... 1
... 2
... 3
... 4
... 5

Fragment 9

... 1
... 2
... 3
... 4
... 5
... 6
Fragment 10, Column 1

1. א Mali חית
2. ראר טד הב טב
3. ... י מי מן
4. ...
5. נפ מוכ אביה
6. ... א הפג דהב
7. ... אשה העשר...
8. ...

Fragment 11

1. תוחי ארבעה רמי אממ אומם אומנט...
2. ינא פי מתאלא די סחר...
3. ... פותדה אם אממ תדנ י וחמה אם והיה...
4. ... סאהמה ושלה דהב טב די...
5. ...
6. ... דוי עמדים סחר מ חור חייר...
7. ... מ חור לחרשק בשרטות...
8. ... ילך בכסף...

Fragment 12, Column 1

1. ... מ נפל פעבליא די
2. ... איא פירשה דידי מתפושיא
3. ... ווה פירשה וסכתבא
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Fragment 12, Column 2

... 1–2
... 3
... 4
... 5
... 6
... 7
... 8
... 9

Fragment 13

... 1
... 2
... 3
... 4
... 5
... 6
... 7
... 8
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Fragment 14, Column 2

Fragment 15

Fragment 16, Column 1
Fragment 16, Column 2 and Fragment 17, Column 1

ברכה (הנינט ומקבילות

מסתתרות)... модели מסכרים...

מי תדחו דפוס... לא תלויא...

על כל כה אנוש...

זה靜...

Fragment 17, Column 2

שכינה שביעת נין...

كيف תłę תושך והשעון...

ככל זה עשר הערוך...

והתרחמים וה젰 נמשך...

כדמהו וקבן פстал...

ול...

Fragment 18

כסי שביעת דספלים לבהר שותה...

... עליسا שביעת דריך תפיס על אבניא...

... וכשלוחות ותדריך אתה אלפים ויתשת מפחיא...

... ואמר כי היא אנשה ניו...

... לכלוח זהות...

... עלבריה והורא...

...
Fragment 19

... 1
... 2
... 3
... 4
... 5
... 6
... 7

Fragment 20

... 1
... 2
... 3
... 4
... 5
... 6
... 7
... 8

Fragment 21

... 1
... 2
... 3
Fragment 22

על ארבע קרנס מדברוא...

minster מותרת...

נישפף פיל...

מודותא לוהינ...

אלוקדימ...

... 7

... 8

Fragment 23, Column 1

... 1

... 2

Fragment 23, Column 2

... 1

... 2

... 3

... 4

... 5

... 6

... 7

... 8
Fragment 24

...ול שמשה אחר... 1
...זה דמ' חל ש... 2
...זא דיב ארבג'... 3
...על כל צור... 4
... componentWillMount... 5
...בה עלי... 6
...Fil... 7

Fragment 25

...أم קדיש ישראל... 1
...זא בלילה זו... 2
...זא ערב וקריאה... 3
...בר' בטשה זוס... 4
...זא עמה ומע... 5
...זא ויכם יישו... 6
...000... 7

Fragment 26

...אול אנשה ד' ח... 1
...יומ TAXATION... 2
... WINAPI מ... 3
...Ivacat ח... 4
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Fragment 27

... vacat ... 5
... הלוחה שעב ... 6
... הלוחה ... 7

Fragment 28

... בכל יושב זוחה ... 1
...درك ומשל ... 2
... בכל פסחא限时 ... 3
... על חנוכה שמעת ומד ... 4
... ישר עתימו ... 5
... כאן לוחית ... 6

Fragment 29

... קדום מכרות ... 1
... וכמו משכ ... 2
... רבם ה ... 3
... חמא ותומ ... 4
Fragment 30

... 5
... 6

Fragment 31, Column 1

... 1
... 2
... 3
... 4
... 5
... 6

Fragment 31, Column 2

... 1
... 2
... 3
... 4
... 5
... 6
... 7
Fragment 32

... מרסיא 1
... וכותב וושאר 2
... ולא היכלה מב דמע 3
... שבظاهرة ק jedis 4
...زيارة ארצה 5
... כמ היכלה 6
... יהודי בדמע 7
... וכתיבת לארבע 8
....neg ויסד 9

Fragment 33

... גרה בניות 1
... ואת الاتفاق הנ 2
... ופרישת עלי 3
...Neg 4

Fragment 34

...观音 1
...וורט 2
... 3

Fragment 35
Chapter A: Chrestomathy

Fragment 36

... 1

Fragment 37

... 1

... 2

... 3

... 4
Appendix B

Photographs of the Genesis Apocryphon

The following photographs of the *Genesis Apocryphon* are included in the interest of intellectual integrity. Photographs of all of the other scrolls used in the preparation of this work are commonly available in the *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert* series or in separately published volumes, as we have cited earlier in this volume. These photographs formed the basis against which the medial columns (columns 3–18) of the *Genesis Apocryphon* were published. However, the photographs have never been released to the public and the readings of these columns have never been able to be verified independently. Therefore, in order to enable the reader to verify every reading included in this work, we included the following images.

These photographs were taken in 1994 by Bruce and Ken Zuckerman of the West Semitic Research Project. They are included here by the kind permission of the Israel Antiquities Authority who retains copyright ownership of them.
Figure B.1: 1QapGen cols. 3 and 4 (top).
Figure B.2: 1QapGen col. 3 and 4 (middle).
Figure B.3: 1QapGen col. 3 and 4 (bottom).
Figure B.4: 1QapGen col. 5 (fragment #1).

Figure B.5: 1QapGen col. 5 (fragment #2).
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Figure B.6: 1QapGen col. 6 (top).
Figure B.7: 1QapGen col. 6 (bottom).
Figure B.8: 1QapGen cols. 8 and 9.
Figure B.9: 1QapGen col. 11 (top).
Figure B.10: 1QapGen col. 11 (top-middle).
Figure B.11: 1QapGen col. 11 (bottom-middle).
Figure B.12: 1QapGen col. 11 (bottom-middle).
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Figure B.13: 1QapGen col. 12 (top).
Figure B.14: 1QapGen col. 12 (middle).
Figure B.15: 1QapGen col. 12 (bottom).
Figure B.16: 1QapGen col. 12 (fragment).
Figure B.17: 1QapGen col. 13 (top).
Figure B.18: 1QapGen col. 13 (top-middle).
Figure B.19: 1QapGen col. 13 (bottom–middle).
Figure B.20: 1QapGen col. 13 (bottom).
Figure B.21: 1QapGen col. 14 (top).
Figure B.22: 1QapGen col. 14 (middle).
Figure B.23: 1QapGen col. 14 (bottom).
Figure B.24: 1QapGen col. 15 (top).
Figure B.25: 1QapGen col. 15 (middle).
Figure B.26: 1QapGen col. 15 (bottom).
Figure B.27: 1QapGen col. 16 (top).
Figure B.28: 1QapGen col. 16 (middle).
Figure B.29: 1QapGen col. 16 (bottom).
Figure B.30: 1QapGen col. 17 (top).
Figure B.31: 1QapGen col. 17 (middle).
Figure B.32: 1QapGen col. 17 (bottom).
Figure B.33: 1QapGen col. 18 (top).
Figure B.34: 1QapGen col. 18 (middle).
Figure B.35: 1QapGen col. 18 (bottom).
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