Identification and Reidentification of Some Fragments of 4Q70 (4QJer^a)

A study of the new photographs of 4Q70 accessible on the Leon Levy Dead Sea Scrolls Digital Library of the Israel Antiquities Authority (www.deadseascrolls.org.il) facilitates the identification of some of the hitherto unidentified fragments and improved identifications of some fragments that were identified in the official DJD edition.¹ In the case of frag. 2 one may reconstruct the lines differently from the edition to make the text of MT fit easier. The new identifications of fragments also provides additional information on the extant columns and the original sheets.

1. Identifications of Fragments

1.1. *Frag. 1 Col. XII lines 6-7 / Jer 18:19-20 (formerly Col. I / Jer 7:1)*

In the DJD edition, frag. 1 was transcribed as follows:²

]○○○[	1
לאמ[ר עמד] בשער	2

The edition identifies its text as corresponding with Jer 7:1. In the edition's numeration of columns of the scroll, this fragment constitutes the sole textual remains of col. I, which would have covered

¹References are to Emanuel Tov's edition of 4Q70 in *Qumran Cave 4 X The Prophets*, Discoveries in the Judaean Desert 15 (Oxford: Clarendon, 1997), 145-70, pls. XXIV-XXIX (henceforth abbreviated as DJD 15 and referred to as "the edition"). See also Tov, "The Jeremiah Scrolls from Cave 4," *RevQ* 14/54 (1989): 189-206; Tov, "4QJer^a—A Preliminary Edition," *Textus* 17 (1994): 1-41 which differs from the final edition in minor respects, including a different numbering of the unidentified fragments.

²DJD 15, 154.

Jer 6-7,³ and would have been preceded by six missing columns.⁴ Due to the scant textual remains the edition has no further comments on this fragment. The IAA photograph (B-368256) facilitates the reading of line 1 and helps identify the fragment as belonging to col. XII.⁵ Both its textual remains and the shapes of its right and left side fit exactly in the first gap in frag. 29 lines 6-7. The remains of the fragment may now be read as follows:

א[לִי וְשָׁמַע 1

זְכֹר עֲמָדִי] 2

The ink remains of *lamed* in line 1, and *kaf* and *yod* in line 2 are minimal, but fit perfectly with the other traces of those letters in frag. 29. Col. XII lines 6-7 should therefore now be transcribed as follows:⁶

אֵלִי וְשָׁמַע לְקוֹלִי {דְּבָרִי} יְרִיבֵי הַיְשָׁלָם תַּחַת טוֹבָה רָעָה כִּי כָרוּ שׁוֹחָה לְנַפְשִׁי 6

זְכֹר עֲמָדִי לִפְנֵי [יָד] לְדַבֵּר עַל־יָהּ ט] וְבָהּ לְהַשִּׁיב [אֶת חֲמַתְךָ מֵהֶם לְכֵן תֵּן אֶת בְּנֵיהֶם לְרַעַב 7

1.2. Frag. 23 Col. XIV¹⁶⁻¹⁷ / Jer 22:3-4

The edition mentions the possibility that the fragment preserves the remnants of Jer 22:3-4 in which case it should be placed in col. XIV,⁷ but transcribes the fragment with col. VIII, part 2, lines 1-2 as corresponding to Jer 13:22. However, the *taw* in line 2 fits much better in a reconstruction of the lines of Col. XIV, than in Col. VIII, since the words with a *taw* in Jer 13:23, אַתֶּם תֹּכֵלִי, should not, according to the average length of the lines in col. VIII, part 1, come one line below חֲמַס of line 1, whereas in col. XIV חֲמַס] תַּחַת הַבַּיִת could fit nicely beneath חֲמַס of line 1.

³DJD 15, 145.

⁴DJD 15, 147.

⁵See in particular image B-368256 in the Leon Levy Digital Library.

⁶Compare the transcription without frag. 1 in DJD 15, 165.

⁷DJD 15, 168

1.3. *Frag. 36 Col. VI 14-15 / Jer 11:10 (formerly Col. XV / Jer 26:10?)*

The edition hesitantly identified the words יהודה את with Jer 26:10, but noted that the “identification is problematic because there may be ink strokes before יהודה.” The new IAA photograph (B-368322) confirms these strokes, compatible with top of the left leg, and the left end of the foot of *taw*. It therefore makes more sense to identify the fragment with Jer 11:10 and to situate the fragment in Col. VI in between part 1 (Jer 11:3-6) and part 2 (Jer 11:19-20).⁸ Reconstruction of the lines according to MT suggests that the fragment should be placed in lines 14-15. In the MT a *setuma* is found after Jer 11:20, which would explain the unwritten part of the second line of the fragment. If one places the fragment in VI 14-15 one may transcribe these lines for example as follows:

אחרים לעבדם הפרו בית ישראל ובי[ת יהודה את] בריתי אשר	14
] vacat [vacat כרתי את אבותם	15

1.4. *Frag. 37 Col. XI bottom three lines / Jer 18:14-15*

⁸See also Kipp Davis, “The Social Milieu of 4QJer^a (4Q70) in a Second Temple Jewish Manuscript Culture: Fragments, Manuscripts, Variance, and Meaning,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Study of the Humanities*, ed. Pieter B. Hartog, Alison Schofield, and Samuel. I. Thomas (Leiden: Brill, 2018), 53-76, at 70 n. 58, who adds that a placement of the fragment in col. VI “would both accord with the vertical and horizontal arrangement of frgs. 14 ... and frgs. 17-20.” Indeed, a vertical arrangement of frag. 36 below (the left part of) frag. 14 is plausible, but reconstruction of the columns, however difficult, suggests that frag. 36 (to be placed in VI lines 14-15) should be placed horizontally corresponding to the bottom part of frag. 16 (to be placed in VII lines 9-15) and not to frgs. 17-20.

This hitherto unidentified fragment⁹ can be placed at the bottom of col. XI (lines 29-31 or 30-32) providing a running text with the preserved beginning of col. XII. One should transcribe as follows:

vacat []

[¹³לכן כה אמר יהוה שאלו נא בגוים מי שמע כאלה שעררת עשתה מאד בתולת ישראל¹⁴הי] עֹזְבִי מִצֹּר
[שדי שלג לבנון אם ינתשו מים זרים קרים נוזלים¹⁵ כי שכחני עמי לשוא יקטרו ויכשלוס בד] רִי כִי] הם

Palaeographically, the body of final *mem* at the end of the sheet is more oval or rounded than the other final *mems* in the extant fragments, which generally have a clear headstroke connecting the two downstrokes and a more rectangular body (whether narrow or wide). The *šade* (of which only the top is preserved) and *dalet* are typical of 4Q70. The width of the lines corresponds with those of the same column.¹⁰ The *vacat* at the end of the first line of the fragment would correspond to the *setuma* found in the MT after Jer 18:12. The fragment also contains remnants of sewing at its bottom left, which establishes that col. XI was the end of a sheet. The statement in the edition¹¹ that 1-2 columns were missing in between cols. XI and XII is incorrect.

1.5. *Frag. 43 Col. XIII lines 25-26 / Jer 20:18*

The fragment, with traces of the ruling of the left margin, can most easily be placed in between frags. 30 and 32, but does not have a physical join with either fragment.

[מותתני מרחם ותהי לי אמי קברי ורחמה הרת עולם] ¹² מה זה מרחם יצ] אתי	25
[לראות עמל ויגון ויכלו בבשת ימי	26

vacat []

⁹Independently, Kipp Davis made the same identification (personal communication).

¹⁰For a count of letter-spaces, one should compare to lines 9-16, since the earlier lines of the column have several unwritten patches.

¹¹DJD 15, 147.

1.6. Notes on other unidentified 4Q70 fragments

The transcription of frag. 38 should be slightly modified. Read

]ואג[1

]קק[2

MT Jeremiah has no words ending on קק, and the edition plausibly suggests this fragment reflects a variant. However, none of the LXX variants in Jeremiah can easily be connected to a word ending in קק.

Frag. 39 is badly legible, apart from the certain letters ים in line 1. The preceding letter is *taw* or perhaps *nun*. None of the other letters in this line, nor in the second and third line, is legible with any probability. Note that the second line is not a *vacat* but has remains of multiple letters.

Frag. 40 is not necessarily from the top right of a column. The two traces in line 2 could be from *alef* or the head of *kaf*.

Frag. 44 seems to have a deletion stroke through בל, before a word which begins with *za-*
yin, not *he*.

The traces in frag. 45 line 2 might be two correction dots.

Frag. 50 has the large *yod* which generally is used as the form of the letter in word-final position. Within the range of cols. II-XIV the only possible placement would be in col. XIV 20 as the last three letters of וקדשתי (Jer 22:7) but the fragment might also come from a later column, e.g., from ונטשתי of Jer 23:33 or 39.

2. Different Reconstruction

2.1. Frag. 2 Col. II Jer 7:15-20 (formerly Jer 7:15-19)

The difficulty in this fragment is the reading of the traces in lines 3, which are found in two pieces separated by a horizontal tear, and the vague traces in line 5. The edition sees the traces in line 3 as belonging to two letters in ובחצות, but this reading necessitates the edition to assume “that part of v 18 was lacking in the text.”¹² Neither the atypical *šade* (with a clear base-stroke unlike any other *šade* of the main hand of the scroll) nor the incomplete *waw* are by any means certain, but if one would read the traces as עצים, then one could reconstruct the lines more naturally with the text of MT, without the need to assume something lacking. See the following tentative reading and reconstruction:

1	[והשלכתי אתכם מעל פני כאשר השלכתי את כל אחיכם את כל זרע א] פִּרִים <i>vacat</i>]
2	[¹⁶ וְאֵתָה אֵל תִּתְפַּלֵּל בְּעַד הָעָם הַזֶּה וְאֵל תִּשָּׂא בְעֵדָם רְנָה וְתִפְּלָה וְאֵל תִּפְּגַ] עֵ בִי כִי אֵינִי [נִי שִׁמְעַ]
3	[אֵתְךָ ¹⁷ הָאֵינֶךָ רֹאֵה מָה הֵמָּה עֹשִׂים בְּעֵרֵי יְהוּדָה וּבְחִצּוֹת יְרוּשָׁלַם ¹⁸ הַבְּנִים מִלְּקִטִּים [עֲצִי]ם וְהָאֲבוֹת]
4	[מִבְּעָרִים אֶת הָאִשׁ וְהַנָּשִׁים לְשׁוֹת בְּצֶק לְעֹשׂוֹת כּוֹנִים לְמַלְכַּת הַשָּׁמַיִם וְהַסֵּד נ] סִכֹּם לֹא [לֵהִים]
5	[אַחֲרֵים לְמַעַן הַכְּעִסְנִי ¹⁹ הָאֵתִי הֵם מִכְּעִסִּים נֹאם יְהוָה הֲלוֹא אַתֶּם לְמַעַן בִּשְׁתַּ פְּנִיָהֶם] ²⁰ לֵךְ [כ] [ז] כֹּה]

2.2. Other

It is not the purpose of this note to survey the reading and reconstruction of the lines of all 4Q70 fragments.¹³ In certain cases, however, the new photographs facilitate improvements. For example, in Col. IV 15 the first letter is certainly not *he*, but probably *mem*, which also necessitates a different reconstruction of the lines:¹⁴

¹²DJD 15, 154.

¹³For a partial reconstruction of col. III, cf. Kipp Davis, “Margins as Media: The Long Insertion in 4QJer^a (4Q70),” in *Bible as Notepad: Tracing Annotations and Annotation Practices in Late Antique and Medieval Biblical Manuscripts*, ed. Liv Ingeborg Lied and Marilena Maniaci (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2018), 39-53.

¹⁴Cf. also Davis, “Social Milieu,” who, however, reconstructs the grammatically implausible הַנִּי מֵאֲכָלָם אֵתָם לְעֵנָה, because of purported reasons of space and the absence of “this nation” in the LXX.

לכן כה אמר [י] ה' [וה צבאות אלהי ישראל] ל הנני מאכלם א[ת העם הזה לענה והשקותים]	14
מִי רֹאֵ [ש והפצותים בגוים אשר לא ידע] וְ[המה] וְא[בותם ושלחתי אחריהם את]	15
החר[ב עד כלותי אותם]	16

3. Columns and Sheets

With the reidentification of frags. 1 and 36 and the identification of frag. 37, the edition's overview of columns and sheets¹⁵ should be slightly reviewed. All hitherto identified fragments stem from the columns which are numbered II-XIV in the edition. However, these thirteen cols. II-XIV are not continuous, since the edition's cols. X and XI are not adjacent.¹⁶ In fact, the traces of a few letters remaining in frag. 26 i belong to the column in between X and XI, which I will call Xa.

Since several fragments preserve the top or bottom margin of the columns and frags. 4 and 22 have sufficient text of two adjacent columns, one can, with the edition, roughly reconstruct the height of the columns as 30-32 lines. Exact reconstructions of lines and columns are impossible, due to the different sizes of the open sections and the many corrections in the text. The tool of calculating letters per line is not very reliable in this manuscript, given the large variation in the width of letters. Nonetheless, on the basis of those fragments which allow for reconstructions of multiple lines, one can construct the columns in an approximate matter.

columns	reconstructed	fragments	extant
6/7 cols. missing	1:1 -	-	-
II	?-7:15	2	7:15-20

¹⁵DJD 15, 145-48.

¹⁶As also reported in DJD 15, 146 (note †) and 147

III	7:15–9:3	3, 4 i, 5, 6, 7	7:28–9:2
IV	9:3–ca. 10:1	4 ii, 8, 9, 10	9:7-15
V	ca. 10:1–11:3	11, 12, 13	10:9-14 / 10:23
VI	11:3-20	14, 15, 36	11:3-6 / 11:10 / 11:19-20
VII	11:20–12:17	16, 17, 18, 19, 20	12:3-7 / 12:13-16
VIII	12:17–13:27	21, 22 i	12:17–13:7
IX	13:27–15:1	22 ii, 24	13:27 / 14:4-7
X	15:1–ca. 16:5	25	15:1-2
Xa	ca. 16:5–17:8	26 i	traces of letters
XI	17:8–18:15	26 ii, 27, 28, 37	17:8-26 / 18:14-15
XII	18:15–ca. 19:13	29, 1	18:15–19:1
XIII	ca. 19:14–ca. 21:2	30, 31, 32 i, 43	20:14–21:1
XIV	ca. 21:3–22:16	32 ii, 33, 23, 34, 35	22:3-16

The edition observed that col. IV preserves the end of a sheet (on the basis of the holes for stitching in frag. 9) and that col. VIII preserves the beginning of a sheet (stitching holes or thread are not clearly visible on the photographs, so that the observation seems to be based on the right margin with a straight right edge). We may now add that col. XI was the end of a sheet (in view of frag. 37 with stitching to be placed in the bottom left of a sheet). If indeed col. VIII preserves the beginning of a sheet, then cols. V-VII formed a separate sheet, while cols. VIII-XI either formed a large sheet of five columns, or consisted of two smaller sheets.

In the edition, Tov calculated that if the original scroll contained all the text of MT, it would have encompassed 54-58 columns,¹⁷ and measured between 7.9 and 8.5 meters. Davis raises

¹⁷I double-checked and calculated the twelve columns (including Xa), from col. IV (Jer 9:3) through col. XIV (Jer 22:16) to have had 4,516 words (according to the MT), an average of 376 words per

the possibility that 4Q70 might have “contained only the first half of ‘scriptural Jeremiah,’ perhaps ending at some point after ch. 24.”¹⁸ Material bisection of works in two scrolls has been suggested for Isaiah (chs. 1-33 and 34-66) and Jubilees (chs. 1-23 and 24-50).¹⁹ In the case of Jeremiah, literary and material considerations could have led to a bisection into two separate scrolls, containing chs. 1-25 and chs. 26-52. A 4Q70 scroll with only chs. 1-25 would have counted 25 to 26 average columns. Sometimes, the study of damage patterns enables one to measure or to calculate the distance between corresponding damage points, which would give an indication of the place of the fragment in the scroll, since the outer revolutions of a large scroll would be considerably larger than those of a smaller scroll. However, I am not able to discern any clear damage patterns or other indications of the length of a revolution in the larger fragments, not even in frags. 21-22, so that the possibility of a bisection remains unresolved.

column. Taking the amount of words of MT Jeremiah to be 21,819 (THAT 2:540), the entire book would have required 58 average columns.

¹⁸Davis, “Social Milieu,” 70. The mention of “some point after ch. 24” is strange.

¹⁹George J. Brooke, “The Bisection of Isaiah in the Scrolls from Qumran,” in *Studia Semitica: The Journal of Semitic Studies Jubilee Volume*, ed. Philip Alexander et al., JSSSup 16 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 73-94, taking up an idea of William Brownlee; Eibert Tigchelaar, “The Qumran Jubilees Manuscripts as Evidence for the Literary Growth of the Book,” *RevQ* 26/104 (2014), 579-94, esp. 593, expanding on an idea of J. T. Milik. Cf., however, Emanuel Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judaean Desert*, STDJ 54 (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 79.