

# A New Transcription and Assessment of 4Q9 (4QGenesis<sup>J</sup>): Manuscript, Scribe, and Text

## Abstract

This article presents a new transcription of 4Q9 on the basis of the new photographs and the identification of four more fragments. The irregular hand and the scribal errors indicate that the scribe was not very skilled. Orthographically and morphologically the text is very close to the Samaritan Pentateuch.

## Keywords

Qumran – Genesis – 4Q9 – scribe – errors – copying

4Q9 is one of those Qumran manuscripts that needs to be reedited.<sup>1</sup> The surface of the manuscript is severely damaged, with frequent loss of the layer on which the text was written. Moreover, where the surface layer remains, it has often darkened. In some of the fragments in this manuscript, the ink has occasionally faded, while discolorations create the illusion of being remnants of letters. The editor had to work primarily with prints of the 1950s infrared PAM photographs since consultation of the original materials in the Museum would not have helped much. At present, however, we have online access through the IAA's Leon Levy Dead Sea Scrolls Digital Library to both the old PAM and the new IAA photographs which one can blow up considerably and compare to one another. This is especially helpful in the case of those damaged sections. A fresh examination of those photographs by experienced scholars therefore often results in improved readings. It should also be remembered that none of the DJD editors of the 1990s had knowledge of or access to all the materials and the photographs, let alone to up-to-date search tools. Nowadays, the Accordance modules, the printed catalogues, and the many available photographs on the Leon Levy Library, are indispensable tools which help one to identify the text of those fragments which the editors labelled as unidentified, and to identify more fragments that were originally placed with other manuscripts and hence not accessible or known to the editors.

In the appendix to this article I present a new transcription of the text of 4Q9. This transcription includes the textual identification of the hitherto unidentified fragments 4Q9 frags. 11 and 13 (frag. 12 cannot be identified with certainty), and two other fragments which are on Museum Plate 114 together with 4Q230 fragments.<sup>2</sup> The new transcription offered here varies in many

---

<sup>1</sup>Original edition: Davila, "9. 4QGen<sup>J</sup>."

<sup>2</sup>Perhaps PAM 43.664 frag. 42 should also be assigned to 4Q9. It seems to have loss of the surface and an *ʾaleph* very similar to that of 4Q9.

small details from the DJD one. Often these differences are inconsequential. Specks of ink or small traces which appear where one expects a specific letter on the basis of the shared evidence of the Masoretic Text (MT) and the Samaritan Pentateuch (SP) are generally transcribed.<sup>3</sup> Sometimes I could not determine whether semblances of traces on the photographs are faded ink or discolorations of the leather (for example, possible traces of *yod* and final *mem* in frags. 2 ii 1; similarly a trace after לָ in 2 ii 8). Yet, occasionally these new transcriptions present new readings which correct the older ones, and which invite us to revisit the assessment of the text of the manuscript. For example, in frags. 3-4+11 line 9 the reading is certainly וִיקַבְצוֹ and not וִיקַבְצוֹ, one of several overlooked cases where the manuscript agrees with the SP against the MT. The new transcription offered in the appendix also includes reconstructions of the missing parts of lines. Given the frequent copying errors in this manuscript, these reconstructions can only be approximate. However, they also provide a somewhat firmer basis for assessments as to whether the manuscript might have had a shorter or longer text than that of the other Hebrew witnesses. In this article I do not attempt to materially reconstruct the original manuscript on the basis of real or perceived damage patterns, but will only deal with the manuscript as an ensemble of the preserved fragments.

It is not only time to reedit manuscripts like 4Q9. Now that we have access to all Judaeen Desert manuscripts, we are able to compare them and assess their writing style, quality, and scribal skills. On that basis we may consider such questions as who copied a manuscript for whom, or how a scribe copied a text. Such questions are important for assessing individual manuscripts, but even more for understanding the cultural phenomenon of the production of biblical and other manuscripts.<sup>4</sup> Earlier scholarly interest for 4Q9 has been very limited and exclusively concerned with its textual variants and textual character. The manuscript has some orthographic variants, several errors, and a few content variants. The editor simply recorded the variants. Armin Lange counted them and on that basis listed the manuscript among those that are equally close to the MT and SP.<sup>5</sup> However, a more comprehensive analysis of the manuscript is called for. I will draw together various aspects of the manuscript, and tentatively answer some of the above mentioned questions in this paper.

## 1 Manuscript

Most of the fragments of this manuscript have patches where the surface layer is lost. It is unknown to me what might have caused this specific damage in this manuscript.

The editor calculated correctly that the manuscript would have had some 24 lines per column.<sup>6</sup> The width of the lines varies in the preserved columns, but if a scroll with a height of 24 lines would have contained all of the text of Genesis, it would have required somewhere between

---

<sup>3</sup>I have used the new editions of Tal, "Genesis," and Schorch, "Genesis."

<sup>4</sup>See Popović, "Book Production."

<sup>5</sup>Lange, *Handbuch*, 50; Lange, "Ancient, Late Ancient," 31.

<sup>6</sup>Davila, "9. 4QGen<sup>1</sup>," 65.

80 to 100 columns. Among the Judean Desert materials, however, we do not have evidence for such long scrolls with only a limited height. It is therefore likely that the manuscript contained only a part of Genesis. However, we do not have evidence for ancient customs of writing the book of Genesis in two or more separate scrolls. The preservation of text from Gen 41–45 suggests that the scroll contained part of the last section of the book of Genesis, but one can only guess how much of its text was included in this manuscript.

## 2 Scribal Hand and Execution

Like so many manuscripts, 4Q9 is written in a hand which can be described, according to Cross' typology,<sup>7</sup> as late Hasmonaean. It is difficult to assess the scribe's writing skills from the remaining text on the severely damaged surface of the fragments. The hand has formal characteristics, and the scribe had no difficulties with most forms of the individual letters which appear to have been written fairly confidently (the letter *'aleph* is written in various ways, though, often with the diagonal stroke drawn vertically). Remarkable, in contrast, is the scribe's overall inconsistency. This holds for the letter size and height on some fragments. For example, in frag. 2 ii line 3 the height of the letters is 3 mm, but in the next line the letters are considerably smaller, and in the word אגדל no more than 2.2 mm. Also, while the tops of the letters are written more or less regularly on a line, this does not hold for the horizontal bar of *lamed*, or for the bottom of the letters: the vertical strokes of *he* and *het* often extend more downwards than those of other letters. The distance between the lines is uneven (for example ranging from 0.6 to 0.8 cm in frag. 9). The spacing in between letters of one and the same word is variable. Occasionally the strokes of different letters touch, or even intersect (see the intersection of *'aleph* and *reš* in frag. 9 i 2 צוארי), while sometimes spaces within a word, especially those preceding *'aleph* and *lamed*, are quite large.

Extraordinary is the scribe's peculiar representation of *waw* and *yod*. The scribe uses two different forms, overall easily distinguishable: a straight downstroke with a small head, and a generally straight but occasionally slanting downstroke with a large triangular pointed head. Normally, the scribe uses the first form for *waw*, and the second form for *yod*, as many scribes do. However, in word-final position *waw* is often written with the large triangular head,<sup>8</sup> and in word-final position the graphical sequence י is written with first the *waw*-like letter and then the *yod*-like one. The consistency of this graphical feature suggests a scribal idiosyncrasy, not an occasional confusion. Yet, this feature, alongside others to be discussed below, makes one wonder to what extent the scribe fully understood the text he was copying.

## 3 Scribal Errors, Corrections, and Oddities

---

<sup>7</sup>Cross, "Development."

<sup>8</sup>See, most clearly, in frags. 5+5a: עשו (l. 4), and frag. 9 i דברו (l. 5), טענו (l. 7), ולכ[ו] (l. 7), and אכלו (l. 9).

### 3.1 *Errors and Corrections*

An analysis of scribal errors in a manuscript may provide evidence for the skills and the copying process of the scribe. The following errors can be found in the manuscript.<sup>9</sup>

Frag. 3–4 + 11 line 4 (Gen 41:31). After בארץ the scribe initially wrote another short word including a *lamed*, which was subsequently erased except for the mast of *lamed*. Given the width of the erased word, the word may have been ולא. The scribe would have halted after having written the words בארץ השבע ולא, looked at the Vorlage, saw the sequence הארץ ולא which had appeared a few words earlier, wrote ולא, then realized the mistake, and continued with the correct word מפני.

Frag. 2 i line 3 (Gen 41:24) must have had a longer text than any of the versions, perhaps due to a scribal error such as dittography.

Frag. 2 ii line 3 (Gen 41:39) ממיד (not the edition's ממוך!) in stead of either כמוך (as in MT and SP) or ממך (which could have been the Vorlage of the LXX). The unique spelling ממיד for *mimmèkkā*, may be the result of the scribe's expecting *mimmèkkā*, and hence misreading כמוך as ממיד.

Frag. 5+5a line 1 (Gen 42:15–16) witnesses the omission, through *saut du même au même* of הקטן הנה שלחו מכם אחד ויקח את אחיכם. This omission may have been corrected supralinearly or in the margin, but that section of the manuscript is not preserved.

Frag. 5+5a line 4 (Gen 42:18). Though one might label the spelling האלהים, in stead of האלהים, an orthographic variant, it is probably simply an erroneous omission of the *yod*.

Frag. 7–8 line 3 (Gen 43:7). The editor transcribes ולמולד'תנו, the reading of MT and SP. However, the fourth letter is the large *yod*-like form, which elsewhere in the manuscript is used for either *yod*, or for word-final *waw*. Indeed a larger than usual space follows this letter, but there are other cases where the scribe has a space in the middle of a word, especially before *lamed* or *'aleph* (most clearly so in frag. 5 line 7 וי אמרו 7). This could indicate that the scribe initially read ולמו or ולמי, and only after a space completed the remainder of the word.

Frag. 9 i line 7 (Gen 45:17) עשר in stead of עשו. This error is perhaps due to a misreading of a Vorlage with a narrow *reš*, which in older hands is often very similar to *waw*.

Frag. 9 i line 7 (Gen 45:17) בחו' where the MT has באו (SP has ובאו). The editor discusses the reading at length, and also discusses a different reading of the last trace with the variant בחט'ים.<sup>10</sup> However, *tet* is palaeographically unlikely, and in the Joseph narrative the words בר and שבר are used for “grain,” and never חטים. Rather, בחו' may be a strange spelling for באו, the result of either an auditory or a visual error, even though *'aleph* and *het* are usually only confused graphically in such semi-cursive hands where the crossbar of *het* descends diagonally towards the right.

For unknown reasons, the scribe left the rest of the line blank after וואחרי כן (frag. 9 i 4; Gen

---

<sup>9</sup>Davila, “9. 4QGen<sup>i</sup>,” 66 reported on two interlinear corrections and two copyists's errors.

<sup>10</sup>Davila, “9. 4QGen<sup>i</sup>,” 72.

45:15).<sup>11</sup> Though the fragment is now in a bad shape, there seem to be no material reasons (such as a damaged surface of the leather) for this decision, and this strange paragraphing may be yet one more of the scribe's errors.

### 3.2. *Additions in the Manuscript*

Frag. 1 line 2 (Gen 41:16) has supralinear א[ל, corresponding to SP and LXX. The vertical stance of the left leg of 'aleph is unique in the manuscript and may indicate it was written by a different scribe. Either the scribe overlooked the word in the *Vorlage*, or the word has been added later on the basis of another manuscript or tradition.

Frag. 2 i line 2 (Gen 41:24) has supralinear ע]ש, as in the LXX, possibly, given the diagonal stance of the left stroke of šin, written by a different hand. The word might have been added on the basis of another manuscript, or both the LXX and this manuscript may have added the word on the basis of the context. Note, however, that also in the following line the manuscript would have had a text different from MT and SP, and that we cannot assess either the wording of the original text, or the extent of the correction.

Frag. 3–4 + 11 line 2 (Gen 41:30) ויקמו. If the first trace is indeed the remnant of *waw*, then the letter was apparently inserted inbetween מצרים and the first hand's יקמו.

Frag. 3–4 + 11 line 8 (Gen 41:34). The text read ופקד, and *yod* was added supralinearly after the *waw*, resulting in ופקד'ו.

Frag. 9 ii line 5. The letters ירא (Gen 45:27?) are written interlinearly, possibly in a different hand, perhaps because the scribe originally omitted one or more words.

### 3.3 *Copying the Manuscript*

Not all errors and other unexpected scribal features can be explained. Yet, several can best be explained by the scribe closely following a written *Vorlage*. This holds for the omission of words in frags. 5+5a line 1 (Gen 42:15–16) through *saut du même au même*, and the erroneous but corrected writing of לוֹא in frags. 3–4 + 11 line 4 (Gen 41:31). The first case is instructive as it indicates that here the scribe did not memorize short sense units, like אחיכם הקטן, but apparently copied word by word. Such word-by-word copying could also explain the misreading עשו as עשר and of באו as בחו in frag. 9 i line 7 (Gen 45:17), where the scribe simply copied the letter and the word which he thought to have read, without realizing that these words did not make sense in the context. The case of ממיך in frag. 2 ii line 3 (Gen 41:39) is more complex. Perhaps the scribe did pay attention to meaning and expected ממך, but mixed this form with the written כמוך of the *Vorlage*. Most of these errors suggest a scribe who was not fully attentive to the meaning of the text and, at least in the mentioned examples, mechanically copied, word by word, what he read in a *Vorlage*.

Perhaps the empty line after אחריו בן in the middle of a clause is based on an imitation of a *Vorlage* which had these words at the end of a column, but of course this is only a guess.

---

<sup>11</sup>See also Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 146.

#### 4 Textual Variants

The DJD edition records extensively variants vis-à-vis a broad range of witnesses, including the Targumic, Syriac, and Latin ones, and even textual witnesses depending on the LXX. It is, however, clear that the preserved text of 4Q9, apart from its errors, generally aligns with either the MT or the SP. There is only one case where it corresponds to the LXX against MT and SP, namely in the supralinear addition, probably in a second hand, of שב]ע in Gen 41:24. However, this concerns an assimilation to the context, which could have occurred independently in different manuscripts.

Based on the new transcription, I present a list of variants between MT, SP, and 4Q9.<sup>12</sup>

|           | MT                    | 4Q9  | S   |                           |
|-----------|-----------------------|--|---|---------------------------|
| 41:16     | -                     | sup add ל]א  | לא  | content; cf. also LXX     |
| 41:24     | -                     | sup add שבע  | -   | assimil. context; cf. LXX |
| 41:24     | ותבלען                | ותבלענה  | ותבלענה   | orthography               |
| 41:24     | הדקת                  | הדקות  | הדקות   | orthography               |
| 41:24     | הטבות                 | הטבות  | הטבות   | orthography               |
| 41:30     | וקמו                  | ויקמו  | וקמו  | syntax                    |
| 41:32     | ועל השנות             | ועל השנות  | ועלה שנית   | different word division   |
| 41:34     | יעשה                  | וי]עש  | ויעש  | syntax; morphology        |
| 41:34     | ויפקד                 | sup add ו]פקד  | ויפקד   | syntax; corrected         |
| 41:35     | ויקבצו ( <i>qal</i> ) | ויק]בץ ( <i>piel?</i> )                                | ויקבץ ( <i>piel</i> )                                     | number                    |
| 41:35     | הבאת                  | ה]באות   | הבאות   | orthography               |
| 41:39     | כמוך                  | ממיך   | כמוך  | error                     |
| 41:42     | רבד                   | ר]ביד  | רביד  | orthography               |
| 41:42     | הזהב                  | ז]הב or הז]הב  | זהב   | ± article                 |
| 42:15     | בבוא                  | ב]בוא  | בבוא  | orthography               |
| 42:15–16  |                       | omission of<br>הקטן הגנה שלחו מכם<br>אחד ויקח את אחיכם |   | omission by copying error |
| 42:16 end | -                     | -  | + ויאמרו לא יוכל<br>הנער לעזב את אביו<br>ועזב את אביו ומת | ± addition from Gen 44:22 |
| 42:18     | אלהם                  | אל]ם   | אליהם   | orthography               |
| 42:18     | האלהים                | הא]להים  | האלהים  | error                     |
| 42:19     | אחד                   | ה]אחד  | האחד  | ± article                 |
| 42:20     | תביאו                 | ת]ביאו [ו]?  | תביאון  | morphology                |

<sup>12</sup>For the Samaritan Pentateuch I compared only to the critical text in Schorch, *Genesis*.

|       |           |               |           |                          |
|-------|-----------|---------------|-----------|--------------------------|
| 42:20 | תמותו     | תמת[ו]י       | תמותון    | orthography & morphology |
| 42:21 | באה אלינו | בֵּאָה אלינו  | באה עלינו | אל/על                    |
| 42:21 | הצרה      | הצרה          | כל הצרה   | כל ±                     |
| 42:22 | ראובן אתם | אֲתֶם רא[ובן] | ראובן אתם | transposition            |
| 42:38 | שאולה     | שאלה          | שאלה      | orthography              |
| 43:8  | שלחה      | ש[ל]ח         | שלח       | morphology               |
| 45:14 | צוארי     | צוארי         | צואר      | number                   |
| 45:14 | בנימן     | בן ימין       | בנימים    | orthography              |
| 45:16 | והקל      | [והקל]        | והקול     | orthography              |
| 45:17 | עשו       | עשר           | עשו       | error                    |
| 45:17 | באו       | בח[ו]         | ובאו      | error                    |

With respect to orthography, 4Q9 has some forms spelled defectively which do not match either MT or SP. Yet, when its spelling aligns with either of those it is virtually always with SP and not with MT. The one exception is ]והקל[ in 45:16. Also in the few morphological variants, 4Q9 is closer to SP. However, there are some cases where the SP has content variants which are not found in 4Q9, including the different word division of ועלה שנית in 41:32 and the addition at the end of 42:16. Lange's assessment should be nuanced, namely that with regard to orthographic and morphological variants 4Q9 is much closer to SP than to MT, and with regard to the few content variants it is more or less equally close to both.

## 5 Assessment of the Manuscript

Ideally, an assessment of manuscripts should take multiple aspects into account. The scribal hand, the execution of the writing, and the scribal copying, all lack the skill which one expects from a professional scribe. The scribe knows to form the letters, but fails to write regularly or consistently. Moreover, the evidence for word-by-word copying and the various errors suggest that the scribe was not fully trained. One can only speculate as to whether the manuscript was a personal copy made by an unprofessional writer who wished to have their own copy of part of the text of Genesis, or whether this copy was a product of one of the stages in the training of a scribe.

It is difficult to assess the origin of the two supralinear corrections in frag. 1 line 2 (Gen 41:16) and frag. 2 i line 2 (Gen 41:24). Given the different forms of *'aleph* and *šin*, these may have been written by another hand, perhaps on the basis of the text of another manuscript. This could imply that even a substandard manuscript was considered important worthy of correction. That second scribe did not correct some obvious errors as עשר for עשו, though.

Recent studies have argued for more non-professional, substandard copies found at Qumran, both of biblical and of non-biblical manuscripts.<sup>13</sup> The presence of 4Q9 and other substandard manuscripts among the collection should be accounted for in hypotheses about the origin and function of the manuscripts found in the caves.

#### Appendix: A New Transcription of 4Q9 Fragments<sup>14</sup>

Frag. 13 Gen 41:12–14

|   |   |
|---|---|
| [כחל]מוֹן פתר <sup>13</sup> זיהי כאשר פתר לנו כן היה אתי השיב   | 1 |
| על כני ואתֹן תלה <sup>14</sup> וישלח פרעה ויקרא את יוסף ויריצהו | 2 |
| מִן הבור וְיגלח   | 3 |

The transcription is based on the photograph of the fragment in PAM 43.157, which was unknown to the editor.<sup>15</sup> He had the fragment transferred to an unnumbered plate for new photographing.<sup>16</sup>

Frag. 1 Gen 41:15–18

|   |   |
|---|---|
| [עליך לאמר תשמע חלוֹם] לִפְתֹּר [ר] אֲתוֹ ויען יוסף את פרעה           | 1 |
| [לאמר בלעדי אלהיִם] לִיעֲנָה את שלום פרעה <sup>17</sup> וידבר פרעה    | 2 |
| [אל יוסף בחלמי הנני עמ] דִּעַל שפת היאר <sup>18</sup> והנהֹ [מן היאר] | 3 |
| [עלות שבע פרות בריאות בש] רִוִּיפֹ [ות] תֵּאָר וְתֵרַעֲנָה באחון      | 4 |

The differences vis-à-vis the DJD edition are inconsequential. The transcription [בש] רִוִּיפֹ [ות] is very uncertain.

Frag. 2 i Gen 41:23–27

|  |   |
|--|---|
| [בקנה אחד מלאת וטבות והנה שבע שבליים צ] נמות דִּקֹּ [ות]       | 1 |
| [שדפות קדים צמחות אחריהם ותבלענ] ה שִׁבֵּעַ [הש] בְּלִים הדקות | 2 |
| [ותבלענה השבליים הדקות את שבע] הֵשְׁבִלִים הַטּוֹבוֹת          | 3 |
| [ואמר אל החרטמים ואין מגיד] לִי ויאמר יוסף א [ל]               | 4 |

<sup>13</sup>Popović. “Book Production” and the literature discussed there.

<sup>14</sup>The final PAM photograph of 4Q9 is PAM 43.007 with 4Q9 frags. 1–10. Cf. <https://www.deadseascrolls.org.il/explore-the-archive/image/B-284247>. At present 4Q9 frags. 1–12 are on Plate 1072. See the recent photograph on <https://www.deadseascrolls.org.il/explore-the-archive/image/B-371163>.

<sup>15</sup>Davila, “9. 4QGen<sup>1</sup>,” 72.

<sup>16</sup>See [anonymized reference to forthcoming publication].





|   |   |
|---|---|
| יד[ו] ויתן אתה על יד יוסף וילבש אתו בגדי שש וישם] | 6 |
| רביד זהב על צוארו ויירכב אתו במרכבת המשנה]        | 7 |
| אשר לו ויקראו לפניו אברך ונתון אתו על כל ארץ]     | 8 |
| [מ]צרים]  | 9 |

Given the scribe's use of the forms of *waw* and *yod*, the reading in line 3 is ממיד, and not ממוך. In line 7 רביד rather than רבד is certain, given the traces of the downstrokes. The following traces could be either זהב (see SP) or הזהב (see MT). There may be ink of a supralinear addition after לו in line 8.

Frag. 5 + 5a Gen 42:15–22

|  |    |
|--|----|
| [ כי אם בבא אחיכם אתם ]  | 1  |
| [ האסרו ויבחנו דבריכם האמת אתכם ואם לא חי פרע ה כי מר גלים ]       | 2  |
| [ אתם וי אסף אתם א ל מ שמר שלשת ימים ויאמר אלם יו סף ]             | 3  |
| [ ביוס ] ה ש ליש זא ת עשו ות יו את הא להם אני י רא אם כנים ]       | 4  |
| [ א תם אחיכם ] א חד יאסר ב בית משמרכם ואתם ל כו הביאו שבר ]        | 5  |
| [ רעב ] ון בתיכם ו א ת אחיכם הק טן תב י א ו אלי ויאמנו דבריכם ]    | 6  |
| [ ו לא תמת ו ] ו יעשו כן ויאמרו אי ש אל א חיו א ב ל אשמם ]         | 7  |
| [ אנחנו על אחינו אשר ראינו ב צרת נ פשו בהתחננו ] אלינו ולא שמענו ] | 8  |
| [ על כן באה אלינו הצרה הזאת ויען אתם ראובן ] ל אמר הלוא ]          | 9  |
| [ אמרתי אליכם לאמר אל תחטאו בילד ולא שמעתם וגם דמו הנה ]           | 10 |

Frag. 5a was formerly published as 4Q230 frag. 10.<sup>17</sup> The reading אתם in line 1 confirms the editor's assumption of *saut du même au même*,<sup>18</sup> the scribe skipping from אחיכם of Gen 42:15 to אחיכם in Gen 42:16, and as a result omitting the words שלחו מכם אחד ויקח את אחיכם from Gen 42:15–16. The decipherment of the traces between *lamed* and *mem* in line 3 אלם is difficult, and neither אליהם nor אלהם seem to fit the traces. The new IAA photograph shows that in line 6 a tiny fragment has been inserted with the letter 'aleph of תב י א ו. The end of that word (with or without final *nun*) is uncertain. Note the new reading ו תמת in line 7 instead of תמו. In line 8 both צרתינו (cf. MT) or צרתינו (see SP) would be possible.

Frag. 6 + 14 Gen 42:37–43:2

|   |   |
|---|---|
| [ עלי היו כלנה ויאמר ראובן אל אביו לאמר את שני בני ת מית ]          | 1 |
| [ אם לא אביאנו אליך תנה אתו על ידי ואני אשיבנו אליך ] ויאמר ]       | 2 |
| [ לא ירד בני ומכם כי אחיו מת והוא לבדו ] נשאר וקרא ] הו אסון בדרך ] | 3 |
| [ אשר תלכו בה והורדתם את שיבתי ביגון שאלה ] והרעב כבד בארץ ]        | 4 |

<sup>17</sup>Tigheelaar, "Catalogue of Spirits," 145–46.

<sup>18</sup>Davila, "9. 4QGen," 70, who labels the scribal error as haplography.

[זיהי כאשר כלו לאכל את השבר אשר הב]א<sup>19</sup> [ו ממצרים ויאמר] 5

The fragment which was found with the 4Q230 fragments was identified in 2004,<sup>19</sup> and later referred to as frag. 14.<sup>20</sup>

Frag. 7–8 Gen 43:5–8

[אינדך משלח לא נרד כי] האיש [אמ]ר<sup>1</sup> [אלינו לא תראו פני בלתי אחיכם] 1  
[אתכם] ויאמר [ישראל] למה הרעתם לי לה<sup>2</sup> [גיד לאיש העוד לכ]ם [א]ח<sup>3</sup>  
[ו]יאמרו שאל שאל האיש [לנו ולמו לד]תנו לאמר העוד אבי<sup>4</sup> [כ]ם חי היש  
[לכם אח ונגד לו על פי הדברי]ם ה<sup>5</sup> [אלה הידוע נדע] [כ]י יאמר  
[הורידו את אחיכם] ויאמר יהודה אל ישראל אביו ש<sup>6</sup> [ל]ח [הנער] 5

The scribe seems to have written ולמו לד<sup>7</sup>תנו as two words.

Frag. 9 i Gen 45:13–19

[ראית]ם [ומהר]ת<sup>2</sup> [ם] [וה] ורדתם את אבי הנה<sup>14</sup> [ויפל ע]ל צוארי בן ימין 2  
[אחיו] ויבד<sup>3</sup> [ובן] [י]מין [בכ]ה על צואריו<sup>15</sup> וינשק לכל אחיו [ויבד ע]ל<sup>4</sup> [ליה]ם  
ואחרי כן 4  
*vacat*  
דברו אחיו א<sup>5</sup> [תו] [והקל] נשמע ב<sup>6</sup> [ית] [פרעה] [לאמ]ר באו אחי [י]ו<sup>7</sup> [סף]  
[וי]טב בעיני פרעה וב<sup>8</sup> [עיני] עבדיו<sup>17</sup> [ויא]מר פ<sup>9</sup> [רעה] א<sup>10</sup> [ל יוסף אמר]  
[א]ל אחיך זאת עשר טענו<sup>11</sup> [את] [בע]י<sup>12</sup> [רכם] [ולכ]ו בחון [ארצה כנען]  
[ו]י<sup>18</sup> [ק]חו את א<sup>13</sup> [ב]יכם ואת בתיכם [ובאו א]ל<sup>14</sup> [י] ואתכם את טוב<sup>15</sup>  
[ארץ מצרי]ם ואכלו את [חל]ב<sup>16</sup> [ה] א<sup>17</sup> [רץ] ואת<sup>18</sup> [צויתה זאת עשו]  
[קחו לכם מארץ מצרי]ם עג<sup>19</sup> [לות לט] פכ<sup>20</sup> [ם ולנשיכם ונשאתם את] 10

Frag. 10 Gen 45:20–22

כל ארץ מצרים לכם הוא<sup>21</sup> ויעשו כן בני ישראל ויתן להם] 12  
[יוסף] עגלות על פי פרעה ויתן להם צדה לדרך<sup>22</sup> לכלם נתן] 13  
[ל]איש חלפות שמלת ולבנימן נתן שלש מאות כסף וחמש] 14

The identification is possible but not assured.

<sup>19</sup>Tigchelaar, "Minuscule," 646.

<sup>20</sup>For example in the Accordance software text module Dead Sea Scrolls Biblical Corpus.

Frag. 9 ii Gen 45:25–27 (?)

|           |    |
|-----------|----|
| ]°[       | 1  |
| אל]       | 2  |
| לא ה]אמין | 3  |
| ]ו[רא     | 3a |
| ]°[ ]ו    | 4  |

The textual remains do not fit well with Gen 45:25–27, and א[ו] is part of a inter- or superlinear addition. It is not clear whether the trace between lines 1 and 2 is also a superlinear trace, or rather part of the mast of *lamed* of line 2.

Frag. 12 Gen 41:16 (?)

|         |   |
|---------|---|
| ]מר בל] | 1 |
| ] [     | 2 |
| ]°[     | 3 |

## Bibliography

- Cross, Frank M. “The Development of the Jewish Scripts.” Pages 133–202 in *The Bible and the Ancient Near East: Essays in honor of William Foxwell Albright*. Edited by George E. Wright. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1961.
- Davila, James R. “9. 4QGen<sup>1</sup>.” Pages 65–73 in *Qumran Cave 4.VII Genesis to Numbers*. Edited by Eugene Ulrich et al. DJD 12. Oxford: Clarendon, 1994.
- Lange, Armin. *Handbuch der Textfunde vom Toten Meer. Band 1: Die Handschriften biblischer Bücher von Qumran und den anderen Fundorten*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009.
- Lange, Armin. “Ancient, Late Ancient, and Early Medieval Manuscript Evidence.” Pages 22–59 in *The Hebrew Bible. Volume 1B: Pentateuch, Former and Latter Prophets*. Edited by Armin Lange and Emanuel Tov. Leiden: Brill, 2017.
- Popović, Mladen. “Book Production and Circulation in Ancient Judaea as Evidenced by Writing Style, Quality and Skills in the Dead Sea Scrolls Isaiah and Serekh Manuscripts.” In *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Ancient Media Culture*. Edited by Chris Keith, Loren Stuckenbruck, and Travis B. Williams. Forthcoming.
- Schorch, Stefan. *Genesis. The Samaritan Pentateuch. A Critical Editio Maior 1*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2021.
- Tal, Abraham. *Genesis בראשית*. BHQ 1. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2015.
- Tigchelaar, Eibert. “Minuscule Qumranica I.” *RevQ* 21/84 (2004): 643–48.

- Tigchelaar, Eibert. "Catalogue of Spirits, Liturgical Manuscript with Angelological Content, Incantation? Reflections on the Character of a Fragment from Qumran (4Q230 1). With Appendix: Edition of the Fragments of IAA #114." Pages 133–46 in *A Kind of Magic: Understanding Magic in the New Testament and its Religious Environment*. Edited by Michael Labahn and Bert Jan Lietaert Peerbolte. LNTS (JSNTS) 306. London: T&T Clark, 2007.
- Tov, Emanuel. *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert*. STDJ 54. Leiden: Brill, 2004.