Pieter B. Hartog, "The Qumran Pesharim and Alexandrian Scholarship: 4Q163/Pesher Isaiah C and Hypomnemata on the *Iliad*," *Journal of Ancient Judaism* 8 (2018): 344–64.

The Qumran Pesharim and Alexandrian Scholarship: 4Q163/Pesher Isaiah C and Hypomnemata on the *Iliad*[*]

Pieter B. Hartog (Protestant Theological University)

P.B.Hartog@pthu.nl

Abstract

This article compares 4Q163/Pesher Isaiah C and Greek papyrus commentaries on the *Iliad* (hypomnemata). These Greek commentaries reflect the methods and assumptions of Alexandrian literary-critical scholarship. This comparison will demonstrate that the scribe or exegete responsible for 4Q163/*Pesher Isaiah C* was acquainted with Alexandrian textual scholarship. It is further argued that the familiarity of the Pesher commentator with Alexandrian scholarship is the result of ongoing exchanges of knowledge between Jewish intellectuals in Hellenistic-Roman Egypt and Palestine. Thus, this contribution proposes that Alexandrian commentary writing is one of the roots of the Pesher genre.

The socio-historical backgrounds of the pesharim have been a central interest in the study of the Qumran scrolls since the discovery of Pesher Habakkuk in 1947, and remain so until today.[1] Traditionally, scholars have sought parallels to the pesharim in ancient Near Eastern interpretative traditions like dream and omen exegesis or commentary writing.[2] Jewish writings that shed light on the position of the Qumran commentaries in the ancient world, such as the book of Daniel and

[*] This article originates in a paper that I delivered at the Universities of Durham, Manchester and Sheffield Biblical Studies Postgraduate Training Day (1 May, 2014). I thank George Brooke for his invitation to this training day and for his comments on my paper and article. I am also grateful to Eibert Tigchelaar and the anonymous reviewer of the *Journal of Ancient Judaism* for their stimulating comments on earlier versions of this paper. Its final writing was carried out during my stay as Dirk Smilde Scholar at the Qumran Institute in Groningen. I thank Mladen Popović for hosting me, and the Smilde family for supporting my research.

References to and quotations from the pesharim follow Maurya Horgan's edition in PTSDSSP 6B, unless otherwise indicated. References to and quotations from the hypomnemata follow the standard critical editions, unless otherwise indicated. Translations of both the pesharim and the hypomnemata are mine.

[1] As the thematic issue of *Dead Sea Discoveries* on commentaries demonstrates (*DSD* 19:3 [2012]).

[2] Literature on this issue is vast. Useful overviews can be found in Daniel A. Machiela, "The Qumran Pesharim as Biblical Commentaries: Historical Context and Lines of Development," *DSD* 19 (2012): 313–62; Alex P. Jassen, "The Pesharim and the Rise of Commentary in Early Jewish Scriptural Interpretation," *DSD* 19 (2012): 363–98.

On Mesopotamian commentary writing and the pesharim see Uri Gabbay, "Akkadian Commentaries from Ancient Mesopotamia and Their Relation to Early Hebrew Exegesis," *DSD* 19 (2012): 267–312; Bronson Brown-deVost, "Commentary and Authority in Mesopotamia and at Qumran" (PhD diss., Brandeis University, 2014). I thank Dr Brown-deVost for sending me a copy of his dissertation.

the Aramaic tradition of which it is a part, depend in their turn on such Near Eastern traditions.[3]

Against this tendency to look East several more recent studies emphasise the importance of Graeco-Roman exegesis and commentary writing as parallels to the Qumran commentaries.[4] How these parallels must be assessed is still a matter of debate. Armin Lange and Zlatko Pleše point to broad hermeneutical similarities between the pesharim, the *Derveni Papyrus*, and Aristobulus, without arguing for (or denying) a historical connection between these writings.[5] Markus Bockmuehl, in contrast, suggests tentatively that Alexandrian Jews may have "exported ideas about biblical interpretation to the Dead Sea,"[6] and Reinhard Kratz raises the possibility that the Pesher commentators may have learnt about Alexandrian

[3] Machiela, "The Qumran Pesharim as Biblical Commentaries."

[4] Serious interest in Graeco-Roman commentary writing and its potential to shed light on the pesharim started only with Markus Bockmuehl's 2009 article (n. 6 below). Before that, the secondary literature offered only some isolated remarks or general suggestions on the possible connection between the Qumran commentaries and Graeco-Roman commentary writing. Isolated remarks: André Dupont-Sommer, "Le «Commentaire d'Habacuc» découvert près de la Mer Morte: Traduction et notes," *RHR* 137 (1950): 129–71 (151); Johannes P.M. van der Ploeg, *Bijbelverklaring te Qumrân* (MKNAWL 23/8; Amsterdam: Noord-Hollandsche Uitgevers Maatschappij, 1960), 4). General suggestions: Henning Graf Reventlow, *History of Biblical Interpretation: Volume 1: From the Old Testament to Origen* (trans. Leo G. Perdue; SBLRBS 50; Atlanta, Ga.: Society of Biblical Literature, 2009), 29; Shaye J.D. Cohen, *From the Maccabees to the Mishnah* (2d ed.; Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox, 2006), 35, 203.

In a rather idiosyncratic 1961 article, Carl Schneider argued that "[d]ie Kommentare von Qumrān … im alexandrinischen Sinn vorwiegend Scholien-Kommentare [sind]" ("Zur Problematik des Hellenistischen in den Qumrāntexten," in *Qumran-Probleme: Vorträge des Leipziger Symposions über Qumran-Probleme vom 9. bis 14. Oktober 1961* (ed. Hans Bardtke; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1963), 299–314 [302]). Schneider's views have not been accepted and probably reflect his inclinations to philhellenism and antisemitism; on which see Annette Merz, "Philhellenism and Antisemitism: Two Sides of One Coin in the Academic Writings of Carl Schneider," *KZG/CCH* 17 (2004): 314–30.

[5] "The Qumran Pesharim and the Derveni Papyrus: Transpositional Hermeneutics in Ancient Jewish and Ancient Greek Commentaries," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Context: Integrating the Dead Sea Scrolls in the Study of Ancient Texts, Languages, and Cultures* (ed. Armin Lange et al.; VTSup 140; Leiden: Brill, 2011), 895–922; eidem, "Transpositional Hermeneutics: A Hermeneutical Comparison of the Derveni Papyrus, Aristobulus of Alexandria, and the Qumran Pesharim," *JAJ* 3 (2012): 15–67; eidem, "Derveni – Alexandria – Qumran: Transpositional Hermeneutics in Jewish and Greek Culture," in *On the Fringe of Commentary: Metatextuality in Ancient Near Eastern and Ancient Mediterranean Cultures* (ed. Sidney H. Aufrère, Philip S. Alexander, and Zlatko Pleše; OLA 232; Leuven: Peeters, 2014), 89–162.

[6] "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of Biblical Commentary," in *Text, Thought, and Practice in Qumran and Early Christianity: Proceedings of the Ninth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, Jointly Sponsored by the Hebrew University Center for the Study of Christianity, 11–13 January, 2004* (ed. Ruth A. Clements and Daniel R. Schwartz; STDJ 84; Leiden: Brill, 2009), 3–29 (25). See also idem, "The Making of Gospel Commentaries," in *The Written Gospel* (ed. idem and Donald A. Hagner; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 274–95.

literary-philological scholarship in "the scribal schools and other educational institutions in Hellenized Judah."[7]

This article provides a detailed comparison between 4Q163/Pesher Isaiah C and Greek papyrus commentaries on the *Iliad* (hypomnemata), which reflect Alexandrian literary-critical scholarship.[8] This comparison will demonstrate that the scribe or exegete responsible for 4Q163/Pesher Isaiah C was acquainted with Alexandrian textual scholarship. As 4Q163/Pesher Isaiah C is often considered the earliest Pesher recovered from the Qumran caves, this finding suggests that the Alexandrian tradition of literary-philological exegesis is one of the roots of the Pesher genre.[9]

---

[7] "Text und Kommentar: Die Pescharim von Qumran im Kontext der hellenistischen Bildungstradition," in *Von Rom nach Bagdad: Bildung und Religion in der späteren Antike und im klassischen Islam* (ed. Peter Gemeinhardt and Sebastian Günther; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), 51–80; repr. as "Text and Commentary: The *Pesharim* of Qumran in the Context of Hellenistic Scholarship," in *The Bible and Hellenism: Greek Influence on Jewish and Early Christian Literature* (ed. Thomas L. Thompson and Philippe Wajdenbaum; CISem; London: Routledge, 2014), 212–29 (228). See also idem, "Die Pescharim von Qumran im Rahmen der Schriftauslegung des antiken Judentums," in *Heilige Texte: Religion und Rationalität: 1. Geisteswissenschaftliches Colloquium 10.–13. Dezember 2009 auf Schloss Genshagen* (ed. Andreas Kablitz and Christoph Markschies; Berlin: De Gruyter, 2013).

[8] The best available introduction to the hypomnemata is Francesca Schironi, "Greek Commentaries," *DSD* 19 (2012): 399–441. I restrict my analysis to hypomnemata on the *Iliad*. On Homeric hypomnemata in particular see John Lundon, "Homeric Commentaries on Papyrus: A Survey," in *Ancient Scholarship and Grammar: Archetypes, Concepts and Contexts* (ed. Stephanos Matthaios, Franco Montanari, and Antonios Rengakos; TiCSup 8; Berlin: De Gruyter, 2011), 159–79.

The methods and assumptions on hypomnemata on other works of Greek literature do not differ substantially from those on the *Iliad*. For hypomnemata on ancient comedy see Silke Trojahn, *Die auf Papyri erhaltenen Kommentare zur Alten Komödie: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der antiken Philologie* (BzA 175; Munich: Saur, 2002).

[9] One of the roots, but not the only one. Many studies on the pesharim reflect a quest for the one most suitable parallel to these commentaries. In my view, such a perspective is not particularly helpful. It would be more fruitful to acknowledge the complex character of the pesharim and to allow different interpretative traditions to play a role in how we assess the position of the Qumran commentaries in the ancient world. For an exception to the general tendency see Machiela, "The Qumran Pesharim as Biblical Commentaries." Thus, the point of this article is not to promote Alexandrian textual scholarship as an *alternative* to Jewish or Near Eastern parallels to the pesharim. Rather, this contribution must be taken as an attempt to balance the scale of previous scholarship, which has for the most part looked East rather than West to account for the socio-historical setting(s) in which the pesharim developed.

I have elsewhere adopted glocalisation terminology to account for the development of the pesharim and their parallels with other cultures and traditions; see Pieter B. Hartog, *Pesher and Hypomnema: A Comparison of Two Commentary Traditions from the Hellenistic and Roman Periods* (STDJ 121; Leiden: Brill, 2017), 16–28. On globalisation and glocalisation see now Martin Pitts and Miguel John Versluys, ed., *Globalisation and the Roman World: World History, Connectivity and Material Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), who offer an excellent introduction to the concept and its potential for students of Hellenistic and Roman history.

1. 4Q163/Pesher Isaiah C and the "Continuous" Pesharim

Many studies on the so-called "continuous" pesharim acknowledge the peculiar structure of Pesher Isaiah C. Maurya Horgan argues that Pesher Isaiah C, unlike the other "continuous" pesharim, does not quote its base text continuously, but omits Isa 9:12; 10:1–11; and 14:9–25.[10] In addition, this Qumran commentary provides explicit quotations of parts of Scripture other than its base text.[11] Lastly, Moshe Bernstein has observed that Pesher Isaiah C employs the phrases ואשר אמר and כאשר כתוב to introduce initial base text quotations,[12] while other "continuous" pesharim do not introduce any of their initial base text quotations. These features distinguish Pesher Isaiah C from the other "continuous" pesharim and align it more closely with the "thematic" commentaries from Qumran.[13]

In addition to these structural peculiarities of Pesher Isaiah C, 4Q163—the manuscript in which this Pesher has been preserved—exhibits some striking physical characteristics. This manuscript is the only Pesher manuscript on papyrus.[14] In addition, 4Q163 6 ii exhibits a range of variously shaped marginal signs in its right margin. Surprisingly little attention has been devoted to these signs after John Allegro noticed their existence in this *editio princeps*;[15] most modern editions of 4Q163 ignore them or reprint them without comment.[16]

---

[10] Maurya P. Horgan, *Pesharim: Qumran Interpretations of Biblical Books* (CBQMS 8; Washington, DC: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1979), 95, 237–38. Horgan's estimations are not certain; see below.

[11] Horgan, *Pesharim*, 95, 237–38.

[12] The latter phrase is used in this capacity only in 6–7 ii 19. Elsewhere in Pesher Isaiah C כאשר כתוב introduces quotations from other scriptural sources. See Moshe J. Bernstein, "Introductory Formulas for Citation and Re-Citation of Biblical Verses in the Qumran Pesharim: Observations on a Pesher Technique," in *Reading and Re-Reading Scripture at Qumran* (STDJ 107; Leiden: Brill, 2013), 635–73 (643–47).

[13] Each of these structural features of Pesher Isaiah C finds some parallels in the thematic pesharim. For an omission of part of the base text see the omission of 2 Sam 7:12aα in 4Q174 1–2 + 21 i 10–12. Explicit quotations of parts of Scripture other than the base text are also attested in 4Q174; see the analysis of the structure of this commentary in George J. Brooke, *Exegesis at Qumran: 4QFlorilegium in Its Jewish Context* (JSOTSup 29; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985; repr. Atlanta, Ga.: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006). Explicit introductions of initial quotations occur in the thematic pesharim; quotation formulae are also amply attested in other writings such as the Damascus Document. For an overview see Casey D. Elledge, "Exegetical Styles at Qumran: A Cumulative Index and Commentary," *RevQ* 21/2 (2003): 165–208.

[14] Cf. Emanuel Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert* (STDJ 54; Leiden: Brill, 2004; repr., Atlanta, Ga.: Society of Biblical Literature, 2009), 48 (table 5).

[15] John M. Allegro, DJD 5:18–19.

[16] This may be due to the fact that most of Allegro's signs "cannot be identified on the plates" (so Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 187–88). Horgan, *Pesharim*, 239 mentions the signs, but remarks that she

However, the most recent PAM photos of 4Q163 leave no doubt that these signs exist and demand our attention.[17]

To summarise, the most noteworthy characteristics of 4Q163/Pesher Isaiah C are:

1. Pesher Isaiah C is not strictly continuous, but skips over parts of its Isaianic base text.
2. Pesher Isaiah C explicitly refers to parts of Scripture other than those quoted in its lemmata.
3. Pesher Isaiah C uses the phrases ואשר אמר and כאשר כתוב to introduce initial quotations from its base text.
4. Pesher Isaiah C is the only Pesher preserved on papyrus.
5. The right margin of 4Q163 6 ii exhibits a range of unexpected marginal signs.

Scholars account for these differences between 4Q163/Pesher Isaiah C and the other "continuous" pesharim in various ways. Bernstein has made a convincing case that the traditional nominator "continuous pesharim" should not be taken as the name for a unified group of writings. In his words: "[T]here is either one sort of pesher or many, but not exactly two."[18] From this perspective, a strict division between "continuous" and "thematic" pesharim is untenable, and the fact that Pesher Isaiah C shares structural features with some of the "thematic" pesharim merely demonstrates the formal variety of Qumran exegetical writings.[19] Thus, for Bernstein, 4Q163/Pesher Isaiah C is not a deviation from an fixed standard, but one possible type of Pesher alongside others.

---

has been unable "to discern any structural significance" for them. She prints them without comment in PTSDSSP 6B:54, 56. The signs are ignored in *DSSSE*; Christian Metzenthin, *Jesaja-Auslegung in Qumran* (AThANT 98; Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 2010); Elisha Qimron, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: The Hebrew Writings* (vol. 2; Jerusalem: Yad ben Zvi, 2013).

[17] See most clearly photo B-498126 (available at http://www.deadseascrolls.org.il/explore-the-archive/image/B-498126 [last accessed 16 August, 2018]).

[18] Bernstein, "Introductory Formulas," 638.

[19] See also George J. Brooke, "Thematic Commentaries on Prophetic Scriptures," in *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran* (ed. Matthias Henze; SDSSRL; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2005), 134–57.

Annette Steudel develops a different approach. If Bernstein emphasises the synchronic plurality of exegetical works in the scrolls, Steudel stresses the early palaeographical date of 4Q163 and adds a diachronic perspective to the equation. In Steudel's view, the Qumran scrolls reflect a development from freer to more systematic forms of scriptural exegesis, whereby the "thematic" commentaries precede the "continuous" ones.[20] The structural peculiarities of Pesher Isaiah C can be explained from its position as a turning point between these two types of exegetical writings:

> The pesharim turn out to be the latest stage of a development of interpreting texts at Qumran, while the genre "thematical midrashim" seems to be slightly earlier in sense of its form. The earliest pesher manuscript, 4QIsa^{c} [*sic*], is still very close in its form to the thematical midrashim.[21]

Bernstein's and Steudel's explanations of the surprising structure of Pesher Isaiah C are not mutually exclusive; they may even reinforce one another. At the same time, neither Bernstein nor Steudel includes the material features of 4Q163 in the analysis. As a result, both scholars overlook the broader socio-historical background of 4Q163/Pesher Isaiah C in the Hellenistic-Roman world. As we shall see, it is with regard to the physical aspects of 4Q163 that we find the most striking parallels with Alexandrian textual scholarship as it is exemplified in the *Iliad* hypomnemata. In addition to these physical resemblances Pesher Isaiah C and the hypomnemata exhibit structural similarities.

2. 4Q163/Pesher Isaiah C and Hypomnemata on the *Iliad*: A Comparison

This section compares the outstanding characteristics of 4Q163/Pesher Isaiah C as they have been listed above with hypomnemata on the *Iliad*. The purpose of this comparison is to lend support for my argument that the scribe or exegete responsible for 4Q163/Pesher Isaiah C was familiar with Alexandrian textual

[20] Annette Steudel, "Dating Exegetical Texts from Qumran," in *The Dynamics of Language and Exegesis at Qumran* (ed. Devorah Dimant and Reinhard G. Kratz; FAT 35; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009), 39–53; also eadem, "Die Rezeption autoritativer Texte in Qumran," in *Qumran und die biblische Kanon* (ed. Michael Becker and Jörg Frey; BTS 92; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 2009), 89–100.
[21] "Dating Exegetical Texts," 50.

scholarship. At the same time, this comparison contradicts the supposition that this Qumran exegete had received a thorough Greek education.

2.1. Processes of Selection

Both the hypomnemata on the *Iliad* and Pesher Isaiah C skip over parts of their base texts. The import of this observation is unclear, though: such omissions may be characteristic of all "continuous" commentaries, seeing that even commentaries usually referred to as "continuous" reflect principles of selection as to which parts of their base texts to include and how to present them. At the same time, the type of omissions one encounters in Pesher Isaiah C is absent from other "continuous" pesharim (Pesher Nahum, but also 4QPesher Psalms A and Pesher Habakkuk[22]). In this light the parallels between Pesher Isaiah C and the hypomnemata on the *Iliad* do seem illustrative.

The physical evidence of hypomnemata on the *Iliad* does not allow us to determine how many commentaries dealt with the entire epic. Seeing that a roll could contain a commentary on only one book of the *Iliad*, a hypomnema on the whole *Iliad* would have spanned at least 24 rolls.[23] Such extensive commentaries may well have existed, but there is no material evidence for them in the pre-codex era.[24] Presumably, some or most hypomnemata were restricted to several chapters from the *Iliad* which were particularly popular in educational contexts.[25] So, they

[22] As far as we can tell, *Pesher Nahum* offers a strictly continuous interpretation of its base text. *4QPesher Psalms A* and *Pesher Habakkuk* do reflect processes of selection, as they each omit parts of their base text (e.g., Pss 38–44 and Hab 3). However, the parts that are quoted in these pesharim, are interpreted in a strictly continuous manner.

[23] The division of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* into twenty-four books is a Hellenistic invention, either by Aristarchus or by one of his predecessors. See Guy Darshan, "The Twenty-Four Books of the Hebrew Bible and Alexandrian Scribal Methods," in *Homer and the Bible in the Eyes of Ancient Interpreters* (ed. Maren R. Niehoff; JSRC 16; Leiden: Brill, 2012), 221–44 (223–26, with references).

[24] The editor of P.Oxy. 65.4451 has suggested that the fragment stems from the same commentary as P.Oxy. 8.1086: "So 4451 and 1086 … may perhaps be said to be the same commentary. Whether they occupied the same roll is another matter;… I would guess the commentary on each book was given a roll to itself" (Michael W. Haslam, *P.Oxy*. 65:28). The fragmentary nature of P.Oxy. 65.4451 makes this suggestion problematic, but not impossible.

The only commentary from the Oxyrhynchus batch that stands a good chance of engaging the entire *Iliad* is P.Oxy. 76.5095. Unsurprisingly, this is a codex, not a roll.

[25] This included *Il*. 1–6 and, at a later educational stage, *Il.* 7–12. See Teresa Morgan, *Literate Education in the Hellenistic and Roman Worlds* (CCS; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998; repr. 2000), 111–12; Raffaella Cribiore, "A Homeric Writing Exercise and Reading Homer in School," *Tyche* 9 (1994): 1–8; eadem, *Gymnastics of the Mind: Greek Education in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2001), 194–97. The popularity of

reflect the aims of their composers and their selections of material to be included in the commentary. These processes of selection are at play also on a lower level: hypomnemata on a specific chapter of the *Iliad* may omit as many as twelve,[26] fourteen,[27] or seventeen lines[28] from their Homeric base texts. Some omissions may result from the commentator's unfamiliarity with a line,[29] but in most cases these omissions reflect a process of selection on the part of the commentator. The absence of some of the omitted lines from one or more of the medieval scholia collections strengthens this suggestion.[30] Even then, however, the exact reasons for omitting these lines usually remains unknown.

A similar situation pertains to Pesher Isaiah C. This Pesher probably did not cover the entire book of Isaiah. If it did, the size of 1QIsa[a] suggests that the Pesher would have occupied more than a single scroll. The selection of material to include in the commentary might reflect the bi-section of Isaiah at Qumran.[31] As we have seen, Horgan argued that Pesher Isaiah C omits Isa 9:12; 10:1–11; and Isa 14:9–25.[32] The case is not clear-cut, however, and George Brooke writes that "in the various fragments of 4QPesher Isaiah[c] the text of Isaiah seems to be cited

Il. 1–6 is also echoed in the literary and school papyri of the *Iliad*; see Morgan, *Literate Education*, 308 (table 11), 313 (table 15), 320 (table 21).

[26] P.Mich. inv. 1206 (TM 60948) omits *Il*. 14.325–336.

[27] BKT 10.16897 omits *Il*. 5.163–176.

[28] P.Giss.Lit. 2.8 omits *Il*. 11.713–729.

[29] Cf. *ap*. P.Oxy. 53.3710 3:39–40 Michael W. Haslam, *P.Oxy*. 53:111: "Though very dangerously *ex silentio*, the possibility must be entertained that vv. 177–84, left wholly without comment, were unknown to the commentator." Haslam's suggestion may be supported by the fluid state of the text of the *Iliad* in the Hellenistic period; on which see Stephanie West, *The Ptolemaic Papyri of Homer* (PC 3; Köln: Westdeutscher, 1967); Michael Haslam, "Homeric Papyri and Transmission of the Text," in *A New Companion to Homer* (ed. Ian Morris and Barry Powell; MnS 163; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 55–100.

[30] To give just two examples: *Il*. 5.179–180 and *Il*. 21.328–330 are absent from BKT 10.16897 (*Il*. 5.179–180) and P.Oxy. 2.221 (*Il*. 21.328–330) as well as all scholia collections. For a general introduction to the scholia to Homer see Eleanor Dickey, *Ancient Greek Scholarship: A Guide to Finding, Reading, and Understanding Scholia, Commentaries, Lexica and Grammatical Treatises, from Their Beginnings to the Byzantine Period* (APACRS; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 18–23. The editions of the scholia I have consulted are Hartmut Erbse, *Scholia graeca in Homeri Iliadem (scholia vetera)* (7 vols.; Berlin: De Gruyter, 1969–1988) for *Schol. A* and *Schol. bT*; Helmut van Thiel, *Scholia D in Iliadem* (2000; see http://kups.ub.uni-koeln.de/1810/ [last accessed 3 June 2016]) for *Schol. D*; Jules Nicole, *Les scolies genevoises de l'Iliade* (2 vols.; Paris: Hachette, 1891) for *Schol. Ge*.

[31] On which see George J. Brooke, "The Bisection of Isaiah in the Scrolls from Qumran," in *Studia Semitica: The Journal of Semitic Studies Jubilee Volume* (ed. Philip S. Alexander et al.; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 73–94.

[32] Horgan, *Pesharim*, 95.

continuously."[33] In my view, it is likely that Pesher Isaiah C either skipped over Isa 9:12 or abbreviated Isa 9:11–12 in 4Q163 4 + 6–7 i.[34] The Pesher may well have omitted parts of Isa 10[35] and Isa 14:9–25 too.[36] As in the case of the hypomnemata, the reasons for these omissions are not entirely clear. They do not seem to be accidental, though, but reflect the interests of the Pesher exegete.[37] Hence, both the hypomnemata and 4Q163/Pesher Isaiah C exhibit the workings of selection processes on the part of the individuals who produced them. These processes involved both the parts of the base text included in the commentary and the way in which these parts were dealt with and presented.

2.2. Other Sources than the Base Text

Explicit references to sources other than the base text are another shared practice between Pesher Isaiah C and the hypomnemata on the *Iliad*. The hypomnemata contain many references to Homeric passages different from the one quoted in a lemma. In most cases, these quotations serve to illustrate principles of the style, choice of words, or other preferences of the poet—in short, to "explain Homer from Homer."[38] Furthermore, the hypomnemata refer to other authors and scholars than Homer. Consider, for instance, this reference to Alcaeus:

> P.Oxy. 8.1086 3:26–27, 29–33 (106–107, 109–113)[39]
> [>Τρω]σὶ μὲν ἡγεμόνευε μέγας κορυθαίολος Ἕκτωρ· κορυθαίολος δέ ἐστιν ἤτοι ὁ ποικίλη[ν ἔχων τὴν περικεφαλαίαν· αἰό]λον γὰρ τὸ ποικίλον· ἢ καὶ ὁ ἐν τῇ περικεφαλαίᾳ ὀξέω[ς καὶ εὐστραφῶς μαχόμενος· εὐ]θετεῖ γὰρ καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ ὀξέος καὶ εὐστραφοῦς τὸ αἰόλον, οἷον ὅταν λέγῃ ἔ[νθα ἴδον πλείσ]τους Φρύγας ἀνέρας

[33] "Thematic Commentaries on Prophetic Scriptures," 143.
[34] This assessment depends on Allegro's reconstruction of ישראל בכול in 4Q163 4, 6–7 i 7 (Allegro's line 3), which would be part of Isa 9:11. However, Allegro's reconstruction is not wholly certain.
[35] If we accept the arrangement of 4Q163 4–7 in Allegro, DJD 5 and Horgan, PTSDSSP 6B.
[36] If we accept the identification of a quotation from Isa 14:8 in 4Q163 8–10 1–3.
[37] Cf. Brooke, "Thematic Commentaries on Prophetic Scriptures," 141: "Once the continuous sequence of scripture is broken, it is possible to surmise that scripture is no longer the dominant control in the commentary. Rather, scripture has given way to some other thematic control, such as a particular theological concern of the author."
[38] On this adage see Christoph Schäublin, "Homerum ex Homero," *MH* 34 (1977): 221–27; Nigel G. Wilson, "Scholiasts and Commentators," *GRBS* 47 (2007): 39–70 (62–63).
[39] Text from John Lundon, *Un commentario aristarcheo al secondo libro dell'*Iliade*: POxy VIII 1086 (Proecdosis)* (Florence: s.n., 2002).

> αἰολοπώλους. Ὅθεν Ἀλκαῖος ἀμφο[τέρως ἔλαβε τὸ ὄνομα,] λέγων οὕτως· καὶ χρυσοπάσταν τὰν κυνίαν ἔχων ἔλαφρα π[....]
>
> [>]"Great Hector with glancing/moving helmet commanded ["the Tro]jans" (*Il*. 2.816). Κορυθαίολος is either "the man who [has] a decorate[d helmet"]—for [αἰό]λος is "decorated"—or also "the man who, wearing a helmet, is fighting keen[ly and with agility."] For αἰόλος [is sui]tably (used) also with regard to keenness and agility, as when he says: "T[here I saw ma]ny Phrygian men with keen horses" (*Il*. 3.185). Whence Alcaeus [takes the word] in both wa[ys,] as he says the following: "And having a helmet shot with gold, with agility [...."]

References to Homer and other scholars or authors in the hypomnemata tend to be introduced explicitly, just like the Alcaeus quotation above. But the introductions used exhibit much formal variety and cannot be understood as quotation formulae proper.[40]

Pesher Isaiah C offers no parallels to the principle of "explaining Homer from Homer." The commentary does, however, contain several quotations from sources other than its base text. A quote from Zech 11:11 occurs in 4Q163 21 7–8, and 4Q163 23 ii 14 has an interlinear and secondary quotation from Hos 6:9.[41] In both cases the context of the quotation is very fragmentary and in neither case do we find an explicit quotation formula. We do find such a formula in 4Q163 8–10 8, where the phrase "as it is written in the book of Zechariah" introduces a quote which unfortunately has not been preserved.[42] Many scholars opt to reconstruct the formula "as is written concerning him in Jeremiah" (כאשר כתוב עליו בירמיה) in

[40] Most introductions use either λέγω or φῆμι (to a lesser extent also γράφω), but we also encounter more idiosyncratic formulations like: "Apollo also [testifies] convincingly to Hector's strength and clearly points out his superiority, even over him" (P.Oxy. 8.1087 I 12).

[41] On the Hosea quotation in 4Q163 23 ii 14 see Pieter B. Hartog, "Interlinear Additions and Literary Development in 4Q163/*Pesher Isaiah C*, 4Q169/*Pesher Nahum*, and 4Q171/*Pesher Psalms A*," *RevQ* 28/108 (2016): 267–77.

[42] The quotation formula is followed by either]מפ (so Allegro, DJD 5:20; Horgan, *Pesharim*, 113; *DSSSE* 1:322) or]מפי (so Horgan, PTSDSSP 6B:58). Horgan reads these letters as "from the m[outh of God]," basing herself on 1QpHab 2:2–3. Florentino García Martínez and Eibert Tigchelaar, in contrast, read the letters as being part of a quotation of Zech 3:9 ("[See, I will] en[grave its inscription, oracle of YHWH of Hosts]"; see *DSSSE* 1:323). The fact that we nowhere find the phrase "from the mouth of God" in a quotation formula speaks in favour of García Martínez and Tigchelaar's suggestion, but certainty remains beyond reach.

4Q163 1 4, but this suggestion is problematic on material and content-related grounds.[43]

To sum up: both the hypomnemata and Pesher Isaiah C contain explicit quotations of sources other than the base text in their interpretations. The practices in both commentaries are not entirely the same, however. To begin with, the *Iliad* hypomnemata quote Homeric passages as well as passages from other authors. In contrast, Pesher Isaiah C refers to other (prophetic) passages from the Jewish Scriptures, not to Isaiah (which is only quoted in lemmata). Secondly, quotations from sources other than the base text are introduced differently in Pesher Isaiah C and the hypomnemata: the Pesher employs standardised quotation formulae, the hypomnemata do not. Finally, the frequency with which alternative sources were quoted may have differed, but 4Q163's state of preservation precludes certainty on that point.

2.3. Explicit Introduction of Initial Quotations

Pesher Isaiah C occasionally introduces intial quotation by means of a quotation formula. This practice finds parallels in the thematic pesharim and other Qumran writings that quote Scripture.[44] In the hypomnemata on the *Iliad* no parallels exist. Yet, the procedure was not entirely absent from Greek commentaries: the *Derveni Papyrus* (P.Derveni), whose second part constitutes a commentary on an Orphic theogony,[45] explicitly introduces initial quotations of its base text.[46] Nonetheless, the absence of this procedure from the hypomnemata is an important difference with Pesher Isaiah C.

---

[43] The traces on the photos may not allow for this reconstruction, as it is equally possible to read a *mem* for the *bet* in בירמיה. What is more, the use of its author/protagonist as a reference to a book is unattested elsewhere in the scrolls (cf. 4Q163 8–10 8: we do find "it is written in *the book of* Zechariah," but not "it is written in Zechariah"). Finally, even if we accept the reconstruction of this formula, fragment 1 may not belong to 4Q163 (see Qimron, *Dead Sea Scrolls*, 2:267).

[44] Cf. n. 13 above.

[45] On the *Derveni Papyrus* see Gábor Betegh, *The Derveni Papyrus: Cosmology, Theology and Interpretation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004); more specifically on the *Derveni Papyrus* as commentary see idem, "Exegesis in the Derveni Papyrus," in *Philosophy, Science and Exegesis in Greek, Arabic and Latin Commentaries* (ed. Peter Adamson, Han Baltussen, and Martin W.F Stone; 2 vols.; BICSSup 83; London: Institute of Classical Studies, School of Advanced Study, University of London, 2004), 1:37–50.

[46] P.Derveni 11:9 and 14:2–6.

2.4. Papyrus as a Writing Material

From the structural features of Pesher Isaiah C we turn to the material aspects of 4Q163. As I have hinted at, it is here that we encounter the most striking parallels between the Pesher and the hypomnemata on the *Iliad*. The first parallel is the use of papyrus as a writing material. In Egypt, papyrus had been the dominant writing material throughout antiquity.[47] The plant was indigenous to the area, and sheets produced from its fibres had been used for literary and documentary writing from an early period onwards. Hence, it should not surprise us that the hypomnemata are all written on papyrus.

The situation in Hellenistic-Roman Palestine is more complex. Outside Qumran, papyrus is rarely used for literary writing, and the vast majority of non-Qumranic papyri are documentary writings.[48] As a result, manuscript collections that have a larger percentage of documents (like the Murabbaʿat or Naḥal Ḥever collections) have a larger percentage of papyri too.[49] Only at Qumran do papyri constitute a minority of the collection as a whole,[50] and only at Qumran does the majority of papyri contain literary writing. This suggests that the use of papyrus for literary writing as it is reflected in the Qumran scrolls collection is deliberate. The exact reasons for this use of papyrus are not easy to pinpoint, however: the Qumran papyri testify to the complexity of Jewish scribal culture in Hellenistic-Roman Palestine.[51]

---

[47] On papyrus see Naphtali Lewis, *Papyrus in Classical Antiquity* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1974); Adam Bülow-Jacobsen, "Writing Materials in the Ancient World," in *The Oxford Handbook of Papyrology* (ed. Roger S. Bagnall; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 3–29 (4–10); Lucio Del Corso, "Mechanics and Means of Production in Antiquity," in *A Companion to Greek Literature* (ed. Martin Hose and David Schenker; Chicester: Wiley Blackwell, 2015), 9–26 (11–14).

[48] See Emanuel Tov, "The Corpus of the Qumran Papyri," in *Semitic Papyrology in Context: A Climate of Creativity: Papers from a New York University Conference Marking the Retirement of Baruch A. Levine* (ed. Lawrence H. Schiffman; CHANE 14; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 85–103; idem, *Scribal Practices*, 44–53.

[49] See Table 1 at Tov, "The Corpus of the Qumran Papyri," 86; idem, *Scribal Practices*, 44.

[50] Papyrus is the minority writing material at Sdeir and Ṣeʾelim as well. The statistics for these sites are skewed, however, by the small amount of fragments that were found there (four at Sdeir, of which one is on papyrus; three at Ṣeʾelim, with none on papyrus). See Tov's table referred to in the previous note.

[51] This point and the discussion that follows is inspired by George Brooke's paper "Choosing Between Papyrus and Skin: Cultural Complexity and Multiple Identities in the Qumran Library" (presented at the Qumran Institute Symposium Jewish Cultural Encounters in the Ancient Mediterranean and Near Eastern World, Groningen, 9 December 2013), now published in *Jewish Cultural Encounters in the Ancient Mediterranean and Near Eastern World* (ed. Mladen Popović,

Menahem Haran has argued for a diachronic development from papyrus to leather.[52] His arguments do not work for the Qumran scrolls collection as a whole, however, even if the papyrus fragments of some writings (e.g., 4Q255/*Serekh ha-Yachad*[a] and 4Q163/Pesher Isaiah C) seem to belong to the earliest stages in the development of these works and the movement in which they originated.[53] Other scholars provide synchronic reasons for the use of papyrus as a writing material. Assuming that papyrus was cheaper and less esteemed than leather in Hellenistic-Roman times, Michael Wise concludes that papyrus was often used for personal copies.[54] However, Wise's assumption is problematic,[55] and the probability that some papyrus manuscripts (including 4Q163) are personal copies[56] does not imply a general correlation between personal copies and writing on papyrus. Moreover, there may be some correlation between the use of papyrus as a writing material and the establishment of scroll collections or archives. Perhaps papyrus fragments like 4Q255 had a certain archival appeal or served as a point of reference for later manuscripts. Similarly, it is noteworthy that Qumran caves 6 and 7 contained only papyrus fragments (which in cave 7 are all in Greek). If these represent individual scrolls collections,[57] the use of papyrus as a writing material may have facilitated the establishment of these collections.

Myles Schoonover, and Marijn Vandenberghe; JSJSup178; Leiden: Brill, 2017), 119–35. I thank Professor Brooke for sharing the written version of his paper with me.

[52] "Book-Scrolls in Israel in Pre-Exilic Times," *JJS* 33 (1982): 161–73; idem, "Bible Scrolls in the Early Second Temple Period – The Transition from Papyrus to Skins," *Eretz-Israel* 16 (1982): 86–92 (Heb.).

[53] On 4Q255 see Philip S. Alexander, "Literacy among Jews in Second Temple Palestine: Reflections on the Evidence from Qumran," in *Hamlet on a Hill: Semitic and Greek Studies Presented to Professor T. Muraoka on the Occasion of his Sixty-Fifth Birthday* (ed. Martin F.J. Baasten and Wido Th. van Peursen; OLA 118; Leuven: Peeters, 2003), 3–24 (7): "It may be no accident that the two earliest copies of the *Serekh* (4QS[a] and 4QS[c]) are on papyrus and date from around 100 BCE."

[54] "Accidents and Accidence: A Scribal View of Linguistic Dating of the Aramaic Scrolls from Qumran," in *Thunder in Gemini: And Other Essays on the History, Language and Literature of Second Temple Palestine* (JSPSup 15; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994), 103–51 (127–28).

[55] Catherine Hezser, *Jewish Literacy in Roman Palestine* (TSAJ 81; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001), 132–33; Alexander, "Literacy," 7.

[56] See the discussion of the physical features of 4Q163 in Hartog, *Pesher and Hypomnema*, 82–100.

[57] As was argued, e.g., by Stephen Pfann, "Reassessing the Judean Desert Caves: Libraries, Archives, *Genizas* and Hiding Places," *BAIAS* 25 (2007): 147–70 (esp. 156–57, 166). Mladen Popović remains doubtful: "[T]he presence of only Greek texts in this cave should not be overinterpreted without other evidence of writing from this cave also being taken into account" ("Qumran as Scroll Storehouse in Times of Crisis? A Comparative Perspective on Judaean Desert Manuscript Collections," *JSJ* 43 [2012]: 551–94 [570]).

These different explanations for the use of papyrus as a writing material must be evaluated within their wider socio-historical context. Emanuel Tov has pointed out that many Qumran papyri contain so-called "sectarian" writings or writings that were of interest to the Qumran movement (he includes manuscripts in the Cryptic A script, which is often associated with the Qumran movement and its leadership). Thus, for Tov, the use of papyrus as a writing material is closely connected with the movement that collected the Qumran scrolls. He describes the Qumran papyri as "mainly sectarian and liturgical, and usually nonbiblical. Most papyri may reflect personal copies owned by members of the Qumran community, while some may have been imported from other sources."[58]

True as Tov's characterization of the Qumran papyri may be, it is probably not the whole story. Papyrus did not grow naturally in Palestine,[59] and for most of the Hellenistic and Roman periods the manufacture and trade of papyrus was a royal monopoly. This means that papyrus had to be imported from Egypt before it could be used for writing in Palestine.[60] The presence of papyrus fragments among the Qumran scrolls thus points to direct or indirect trade connections between the communities in which these scrolls were produced and Egypt.[61] Perhaps we must not make too much of this: papyrus may have been a commodity available to the scribes producing these manuscripts, which they may have turned to for special purposes. Yet, the overwhelming dominance of papyrus as a writing material in Egypt and the existence of a royal monopoly on its trade and production suggest that papyrus (especially its better qualities[62]) was perceived as a cultural marker, embodying Egyptian notions of textuality, scribalism, and

[58] "The Corpus of the Qumran Papyri," 96; cf. idem, *Scribal Practices*, 51.
[59] But cf. Lewis, *Papyrus*, 6–9, who gives some evidence for papyrus growing close to Lake Tiberias. Nonetheless, Lewis argues, "there is no reason to doubt that Egypt continued to be the source of supply as the use of papyrus spread through the Fertile Crescent" (9).
[60] Alexander, "Literacy," 7: "Papyrus originated in Egypt, from which it was exported in rolls of varying size and quality. The small community at the Dead Sea could only have acquired such rolls through the outlay of precious cash or goods."
[61] Such trade connections are also implied in the use of red ink in some Qumran fragments. Popović points out that the source for this type of ink had to be imported from either Spain or China. Thus, the use of red ink in some manuscripts indicates that the scribes of these manuscripts participated in international trade networks. See Mladen Popović, "The Ancient 'Library' of Qumran between Urban and Rural Culture," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls at Qumran and the Concept of a Library* (ed. Sidnie White Crawford and Cecilia Wassen; STDJ 116; Leiden: Brill, 2016), 155–67 (160).
[62] On the different qualities of papyrus see Pliny, *Nat. hist.* 13.74–82 and Lewis, *Papyrus*, 34–69.

textual scholarship. In this light, the use of papyrus at Qumran may be indicative of the appeal of these notions not merely for scribes and scholars in Egypt, but also for (some of) their peers in Palestine. The use of papyrus, which carried connotations of Egyptian scholarship, for the manuscript that contained Pesher Isaiah C may be taken as an attempt to accrue the authority of the Alexandrian tradition of scholarship—whose authority as a scholarly tradition was recognised throughout the Hellenistic and Roman worlds[63]—for this Qumran commentary.

2.5. Marginal Signs

The suggestion that the scribe or exegete behind 4Q163/Pesher Isaiah C sought to emulate practices of Alexandrian scholarship finds further confirmation in the use of marginal signs in 4Q163 6 ii. These signs have parallels in Alexandrian textual scholarship. In this latter tradition, two types of signs can be distinguished: critical signs indicate opinions on the textual history of the work in question; non-critical signs mark points of interest or serve as reference marks between an edition and a commentary.

The development of both critical and non-critical signs is closely bound up with the development of "commentary" as a genre of textual scholarship. A key player in this development in Aristarchus of Samothrace (*c.* 220–143 BCE), head of the Alexandrian librarian between 153–145 BCE. Zenodotus and Aristophanes of Byzantium, two of Aristarchus' predecessors, had adopted a system of signs to indicate their textual judgements in the margins of their editions.[64] *Obelos* (—), for instance, marked a line in the *Iliad* that they considered spurious (i.e., not to have been part of the original *Iliad* as Homer had written it).[65] And *antisigma* (ↄ),

[63] On the appeal of the Alexandrian library see Roger S. Bagnall, "Alexandria: Library of Dreams," *PAPS* 146 (2002): 348–62. On the legacy and influence of Alexandrian textual scholarship see, e.g., Schironi, "Greek Commentaries," 433–37; eadem, "The Ambiguity of Signs: Critical σημεια from Zenodotus to Origen," in *Homer and the Bible in the Eyes of Ancient Interpreters*, 87–112; Maren R. Niehoff, *Jewish Exegesis and Homeric Scholarship in Alexandria* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011); Filippomaria Pontani, "'Only God Knows the Correct Reading!' The Role of Homer, the Quran and the Bible in the Rise of Philology and Grammar," in *Homer and the Bible in the Eyes of Ancient Interpreters*, 43–83; Yonatan Moss, "Noblest Obelus: Rabbinic Appropriations of Late Ancient Literary Criticism," in *Homer and the Bible in the Eyes of Ancient Interpreters*, 245–67.
[64] On the Alexandrian system of critical *sigla* see Schironi, "The Ambiguity of Signs" (esp. 88–100).
[65] See the example from P.Oxy. 8.1086 quoted below. On Zenodotus' use of the *obelos* see Pfeiffer, *History*, 115.

one of Aristophanes' additions to the system, marked "two consecutive lines having the same contents and being therefore interchangeable."[66] Aristarchus inherited Aristophanes' system of *sigla* and expanded it.[67] His most notable invention was the *diple* (>), which marked matters he considered of special interest. Aristarchus' promotion of "commentary" as a genre of scholarly literature is tied up with his adoption of the *diple* sign: *diple* having a broader meaning than earlier signs, it no longer sufficed to comment on the text of the *Iliad* in the margins of its editions. Separate works (hypomnemata) were needed, in which the meaning of marginal signs in editions could be elaborated.

In its turn, this development of "commentary" triggered the use of other multi-purpose signs such as the *chi* sign or dotted *obelos*.[68] Just as *diple*, these signs often served no other purpose than to mark interesting passages in the base text of the commentary. The exact meaning of these signs would be explained in an accompanying commentary. In practice, therefore, many of these signs serve as reference marks between a commentary and its base text.[69] Other non-critical signs, such as the *chi-rho* sign (an abbreviation of χρηστόν, "useful"), feature not in base texts, but in commentaries and mark matters of particular importance to the exegete.[70] Finally, *diple* can be employed as a non-critical sign, for instance when it features as a sense divider between lines[71] or is attached to the lines of a base text quotation.[72]

---

[66] Pfeiffer, *History*, 178. See, e.g., *Schol. A ap. Il.* 2.188: "Because of its placement next to these [i.e., *Il.* 2.203–205], the *antisigma* [is placed]."
[67] On Aristarchus' system of signs see Graeme D. Bird, "Critical Signs – Drawing Attention to 'Special' Lines of Homer's *Iliad* in the Manuscript Venetus A," in *Recapturing a Homeric Legacy: Images and Insights From the Venetus A Manuscript of the* Iliad (ed. Casey Dué; HS 35; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2009), 89–115.
[68] Kathleen McNamee, *Sigla and Select Marginalia in Greek Literary Papyri* (PB 26; Brussels: Fondation Égyptologique Reine Élisabeth, 1992) offers a survey of these and other signs.
[69] This was first pointed out by Eric G. Turner, *Greek Papyri: An Introduction* (2d ed.; Oxford: Clarendon, 1980; repr. 2006), 117. Turner's views have been widely accepted, but some critical voices were also raised. McNamee provided textual and literary evidence, unavailable to Turner, that confirms his theory; see *Sigla and Select Marginalia*, 17 (n. 42), 18 (n. 51), 19–21. McNamee is more cautious than Turner in that she allows for only some signs to play the role of reference marks (*Sigla and Select Marginalia*, 15–16).
[70] McNamee, *Sigla and Select Marginalia*, 20–21.
[71] See P. Berol. inv. 9780 (= BKT 1 = Didymus's commentary on Demosthenes) and P. Oxy. 35.2737 (a commentary on Aristophanes).
[72] See n. 80 below.

The functional divergence of critical and non-critical signs is mirrored in how these signs are presented in commentary manuscripts. Critical signs are copied together with the lemma to which they belong and immediately precede this base text quotation—even when it starts mid-line. Non-critical signs occur in the left margin of the column of writing and are not tied to a specific base text quotation. Compare these two examples from P.Oxy. 8.1086 (a hypomnema on *Il.* 2 that exhibits both critical and non-critical *sigla*):

> P.Oxy. 8.1086 2:21–33 (61–73)
> [—]Εἴ[σ]ατο δὲ φθογγὴν ὑεῖ Πριάμοιο Πολίτῃ —ὃς Τρώων σκοπὸς ἵζε ποδωκείῃσι πεποιθώς —τύμβῳ ἐπ᾽ ἀκροτάτῳ Αἰσυιήταο γέροντος· —τῷ σφιν ἐεισαμένη μετέφη πόδας ὠκέα Ἶρις· ἀθετεῖ τούτους Ἀρίσταρχος, ὅτι πρῶτον μὲν οὐδέποτε ὑπὸ Διὸς πεμπομένη ἡ Ἶρις ὁμοιοῦταί τινι, ἀλλ᾽ αἰεὶ αὐτοπρόσωπος παραγίνεται.
>
> "—And she likened her voice to Polites, Priam's son, —who was seated as the watchpost of the Trojans, trusting in swiftness of foot, —on the highest tomb of the old man Aesyetes. —Likening herself to him, swift-footed Iris spoke" (*Il.* 2.791–793, 795). Aristarchus athetizes these (lines), because, first, Iris never likens herself to anyone when she is sent by Zeus, but always appears as herself.

> P.Oxy. 8.1086 2:1–4 (41–44)[73]
> 1 Οἱ δ᾽ ἄρ᾽ ἴσαν ὡς ε[ἴ] τε πυρὶ χθὼν πᾶ[σ]α νέμοιτο· …
> 2 … Τοῦ[τ]ο δὲ δεῖ λα-
> 3 ⳨ βεῖν πρὸς τὸ ἄνω τὸ ἵπποι θ᾽ οἳ φορ[έε]σκον ἀμύμονα. Οἱ δ᾽ ἄρ᾽ ἴσαν ὡς εἴ τε πυρὶ χθών· τὰ δὲ λοιπὰ πα-
> 4 ραναπεφώνηται.
>
> 1 "So they went, like wh[en] an ent[ir]e land is consumed by fire" (*Il.* 2.780) …
> 2 … It is necessary to under-
> 3 ⳨ stand th[i]s with regard to the above: "And the horses ca[rr]ied the blameless. So they went, like when land by fire" (*Il.* 2.770, 780). The rest is pa-
> 4 renthetical.

In the first passage, *obelos* is a critical sign, which indicates that Aristarchus viewed these lines as spurious (he "athetised" them). The sign is copied with the quotations

[73] Quoted with line numbers to indicate the position of the *chi-rho* sign in the manuscript.

from the base text. In the second passage, the marginal *chi-rho* sign marks the appeal this passage had for either the scribe or a later reader of P.Oxy. 8.1086.[74]

The situation in the pesharim differs from that in the hypomnemata in two regards. First, the pesharim are more reticent in their use of marginal signs; only 1QpHab and 4Q163 exhibit signs in their margins.[75] Second, the pesharim—or in fact the entire Qumran scrolls collection—do not exhibit *critical* signs. The absence of these signs is due to the different views on textuality, textual transmission, and authorship reflected in the scrolls and the hypomnemata.[76] At the same time, the pesharim do use *non-critical* signs, which mark passages deemed of special interest by either the scribes or later readers of the pesharim. The horizontal strokes in the margins of 1QpHab (4:12 and 6:4) must probably be understood along these lines. Seeing that the interpretation sections in 1QpHab 4:9–13 (Hab 1:11) and 6:2–5 (Hab 1:16a) describe the advance of the Kittim in particularly vivid terms, the signs in 1QpHab 4:12 and 6:4 seem to express the appeal these passages had for the scribe or a reader of Pesher Habakkuk.[77] Thus, the purpose of the marginal signs in 1QpHab is similar to that of the *chi-rho* sign in P.Oxy. 8.1086 and other non-critical signs in works of Alexandrian scholarship.

The marginal signs in 4Q163 6 ii are more elusive. To begin with, they exhibit much formal variety: some signs may resemble paleo-Hebrew letters or

---

[74] This passage is part of an elaborate explanation of the complicated structure of *Il*. 2.760–779. Presumably, the extensive literary argument developed in these lines attracted the attention of whoever placed the sign.

[75] Some thematic pesharim have signs in their margins too. See George J. Brooke, "Some Scribal Features of the Thematic Commentaries from Qumran," in *Writing the Bible: Scribes, Scribalism and Script* (ed. Philip R. Davies and Thomas Römer; Durham: Acumen, 2013), 124–43.

I exclude the X-shaped signs in 1QpHab and 4Q252 from the discussion, as these are no marginal signs proper (they occur within the column of writing).

[76] A description of these differences (and an appraisal of the similarities) would move beyond the topic of this paper. For some comments on the topic see Philip S. Alexander, "Why No Textual Criticism in Rabbinic Midrash? Reflections on the Textual Culture of the Rabbis," in *Jewish Ways of Reading the Bible* (ed. George J. Brooke; JSSSup 11; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 175–90; Maren R. Niehoff, "Commentary Culture in the Land of Israel from an Alexandrian Perspective," *DSD* 19 (2012): 442–63.

[77] It may be noteworthy that modern secondary literature on the scrolls often takes these passages in particular as the most concrete clues for the equation of the Kittim in *Pesher Habakkuk* with the Romans. See, e.g., Dupont-Sommer, "Le «Commentaire d'Habacuc»," 157, 159; Michael A. Knibb, *The Qumran Community* (CCWJCW 2; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987; repr. 1994), 226–27, 230–31; James H. Charlesworth, *The Pesharim and Qumran History: Chaos or Consensus?* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2002), 109–12; Gregory L. Doudna, *4Q Pesher Nahum: A Critical Edition* (JSPSup 35; CIS 8; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), 608–9; Hanan Eshel, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Hasmonean State* (SDSSRL; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2008), 174.

letters of the Cryptic A script;[78] others are horizontal strokes similar to the signs in 1QpHab and the Alexandrian *obelos*; and still others are of a more idiosyncratic shape. The function of these signs is likewise unclear. Tov and Brooke plausibly suggest that some of them are sense dividers.[79] Horizontal strokes mark lines that belong to an interpretation section (4Q163 6 ii 5–8; 15–16; 18).[80] The signs next to 4Q163 6 ii 11 (after a blank line), 17 (a secondary base text quotation), and 19 (an initial base text quotation) might also indicate sense divisions. However, this does not explain all signs in 4Q163 6 ii: at least those appended to lines 9, 12, and 21 remain difficult to account for.[81] The assumption that these signs mark matters of special interest to the scribe or a later reader of 4Q163 is unlikely in view of the uneven distribution of these signs in 4Q163 as a whole.[82]

A solution to this problem is to see these signs as being related not just to the contents of 4Q163. Even if some signs in 4Q163 6 ii serve as sense dividers, the range of signs in the margin of this column also collectively embodies the aesthetic preferences of the scribe or a later reader of 4Q163. The large formal variety of these signs and their uneven distribution across 4Q163 reveal that they constitute no *systematic* attempt to indicate sense divisions. As it appears, the goal of the person(s) who placed these signs was to evoke the image of an exegetical tradition where marginal signs play a significant role. In light of what was said above, the Alexandrian tradition is a particularly likely candidate. What mattered for the individual(s) who placed the signs in 4Q163 6 ii was not *the function and form* of Alexandrian signs, but *their central appeal in scholarship and exegesis*.

---

[78] See Emanuel Tov, "Letters of the Cryptic A Script and Paleo-Hebrew Letters Used as Scribal Marks in Some Qumran Scrolls," *DSD* 2 (1995): 330–39 (337); idem, *Scribal Practices*, 203–8.
[79] Tov, "Letters of the Cryptic A Script and Paleo-Hebrew Letters," 337; idem, *Scribal Practices*, 207–8; George J. Brooke, "Aspects of the Physical and Scribal Features of some Cave 4 'Continuous' Pesharim," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Transmission of Traditions and Production of Texts* (ed. Sarianna Metso, Hindy Najman, and Eileen Schuller; STDJ 92; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 133–50 (144–45).
[80] The use of these signs can be compared to the use of *diple* in P.Berol. inv. 9782 (= BKT 2 = *Anon. Theaet*.). In this commentary, *diple* occurs with every line of a lemma. See Guido Bastianini and David N. Sedley, "*Commentarium in Platonis Theaetetum (P.Berol. inv. 9782)*," in *CPF* 3:227–562 (241). Cf. also the plates on https://berlpap.smb.museum/02729/ (last accessed 16 August, 2018).
[81] Cf. Brown-deVost, "Commentary and Authority in Mesopotamia and Qumran," who writes that, even if some signs in 4Q163 6 ii serve as sense dividers, "a number of other marginal scribal marks in this fragment may point to some other, as yet unknown, significance" (50).
[82] Signs are absent from the margins preserved in fragments 11 and 23 of 4Q163.

Thus, the inclusion of the signs in 4Q163 6 ii, like the use of papyrus, was intended to emulate practices of Greek-Egyptian textual scholarship and scribal culture and to appropriate the appeal of the Alexandrian scholarly tradition for 4Q163/Pesher Isaiah C.

3. A Historical Perspective

The preceding comparison of 4Q163/Pesher Isaiah C and the hypomnemata on the *Iliad* has yielded a diverse picture. On the one hand, the use of papyrus and marginal signs in 4Q163 seem to reflect a familiarity with Alexandrian textual scholarship and an attempt at its emulation on the part of the Pesher exegete. The structural parallels between Pesher Isaiah C and the *Iliad* hypomnemata, like the omission of parts of the base text or the use of other sources than the base text, support this view. On the other hand, there are differences between both types of commentary. These differences demonstrate that 4Q163/Pesher Isaiah C is not just an imitation of Greek commentaries on the *Iliad*, but combines elements from the hypomnemata with features aligning the Pesher more closely with other exegetical traditions, such as the "thematic" pesharim.

In view of this complex picture I consider the suggestion that the Pesher commentators had received a thorough Greek education[83] and the proposal that "the sect at Qumran lived an intellectually more isolated life than the rabbis, who engaged in a lively discussion with their cultural environment and appropriated exegetical strategies in a highly creative manner"[84] equally problematic. Had the Qumran exegetes received a proper Greek training, their commentaries would, in all likelihood, have resembled the hypomnemata more closely than they do. Or at least the Pesher commentators would be more explicit about where they deviated from the Alexandrian commentary tradition. At the same time, studies on the community organisation or war tactics reflected in some of the scrolls demonstrate that alien wisdom permeates even the so-called "sectarian"

[83] This possibility was raised by Reinhard Kratz. See his works cited in n. 7 above.
[84] Niehoff, "Commentary Culture in the Land of Israel from an Alexandrian Perspective," 463.

writings.[85] The individuals who composed and collected the Qumran writings[86] did not live an "isolated life," but they were part of and in conversation with their Hellenistic-Roman *Umwelt*, even if these conversations did not, in the case of the Pesher exegetes, assume the shape of Greek educational curricula.

To understand how the Pesher exegetes became familiar with Alexandrian textual scholarship a network perspective can be helpful. Jewish intellectuals were part of scholarly networks that spanned the entire Hellenistic and Roman worlds.[87] Most important for the purposes of this article are networks comprising Jews in Egypt and in Palestine. Jewish literature from the Hellenistic and Roman periods offer ample indications of what such networks could look like.[88] The Letter of Aristeas, the prologue to Greek Sirach, and the colophon to Greek Esther all attest to intellectuals travelling from Jerusalem to Egypt.[89] The best example of a scholar travelling in the opposite direction is Philo, who writes that he went on a pilgrimage to Jerusalem.[90] In addition to these references to travelling scholars, other passages indicate that Egypt and Palestine in the Hellenistic and Roman periods were not sealed off from one another, but closely connected.[91] Even if the historical reliability of some of these sources is doubtful, the picture they paint reflects a socio-historical reality in which Jewish intellectuals travelled freely between Palestine and Egypt. In the Hellenistic and Roman periods, Jewish

[85] See Moshe Weinfeld, *The Organizational Pattern and the Penal Code of the Qumran Sect: A Comparison with Guilds and Religious Associations of the Hellenistic-Roman Period* (NTOA 2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986); Jean Duhaime, "The *War Scroll* from Qumran and the Greco-Roman Tactical Treatises," *RevQ* 13/49–52 (1988):133–51; Yonder M. Gillihan, *Civic Ideology, Organization, and Law in the Rule Scrolls: A Comparative Study of the Covenanters' Sect and Contemporary Voluntary Associations in Political Context* (STDJ 97; Leiden: Brill, 2012).

[86] These need not have been the same persons.

[87] On the transmission of scientific knowledge via such networks see Mladen Popović, "Networks of Scholars: The Transmission of Astronomical and Astrological Learning between Babylonians, Greeks and Jews," in *Ancient Jewish Sciences and the History of Knowledge* (ed. Jonathan Ben-Dov and Seth Sanders; New York: New York University Press, 2013), 151–91.

[88] See also John M.G. Barclay, *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora: From Alexander to Trajan (323 BCE – 117 CE)* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996), 418–23; John J. Collins, *Between Athens and Jerusalem: Jewish Identity in the Hellenistic Diaspora* (2d ed.; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2000), 16–18.

[89] *Let. Aris.* 46, 301–11, and *passim*; Esther (LXX) F 11; Prologue to Ben Sira (LXX).

[90] *Prov*. 2.64.

[91] Consider, e.g., the two letters sent from Jerusalem to Egypt in 2 Macc 1:1–2:18; the depiction of Egypt as a place of refuge for Jews fleeing from Palestine in Matt 2; and the references to Jews from Egypt in Jerusalem in Acts 2:5; 6:9. Contacts between Jews and non-Jews in Egypt and Palestine are harder to come by, but not absent; they are implied, e.g., in the story of the Tobiads (Jos., *Ant*. 12.154–234).

scholars and intellectuals in Egypt and Palestine were closely connected and interdependent.

In her *Jewish Exegesis and Homeric Scholarship in Alexandria*, Maren Niehoff argues that Jews in Alexandria were well acquainted with the methods of Alexandrian scholarship of the Greek classics. As she writes,

> Jewish intellectuals came into contact with the work of Aristarchus and his numerous students at the Museum. They seem to have been part of Aristarchus's original audience as well as subsequent admirers of his work.[92]

This does not mean that Jewish writers uncritically adopted the approaches and assumptions of non-Jewish Alexandrian intellectuals. As they appropriated the procedures and terminology of Alexandrian textual scholarship, Jewish writers adapted them to their own needs and interests. But these appropriations and adaptations only stress the close familiarity of Jews in Egypt with Alexandrian scholarship. Considering the constant "to and fro" between Egypt and Palestine,[93] Egyptian Jews or Palestinian Jews travelling to Egypt probably constituted an important chain in the transmission of knowledge of Alexandrian scholarship to the Pesher exegetes.

The question remains *where* the Pesher commentators learnt about Alexandrian scholarship. On the one hand, the presence of fragments of Greek Scripture in the Qumran caves suggests that at least some individuals who lived at the site knew and consulted Scripture in Greek.[94] The recensional activity in the

---

[92] *Jewish Exegesis and Homeric Scholarship in Alexandria*, 14.

[93] To borrow Turner's phrase, which he used to describe the relationship between Alexandria and Oxyrhynchus. See his "Roman Oxyrhynchus," *JEA* 38 (1952): 78–93; repr. in *Oxyrhynchus: A City and Its Texts* (ed. Alan K. Bowman et al.; GRM 93; London: Egypt Exploration Society, 2007), 141–54 (148).

[94] This issue is debated. Tov writes that "the evidence does not suggest that the Greek texts from cave 4 were read or consulted at Qumran or that they were written there" ("The Greek Biblical Texts from the Judean Desert," in *The Bible as Book: The Transmission of the Greek Text* [ed. Scot McKendrick and Orlaith A. O'Sullivan; London: The British Library, 2003], 97–122 [100]). Whereas he is probably right on the writing part, I am less convinced by his comments on reading and consulting. Instead, I tend to agree with scholars who argue that Greek was known and used at Qumran. See David Hamidović, "Do Qumran Inscriptions Show Hellenization of Qumran Residents?" in *Names in Multi-Lingual, Multi-Cultural and Multi-Ethnic Contact: Proceedings of the 23rd International Congress of Onomastic Sciences: August 17–22, 2008, York University, Toronto, Canada* (ed. Wolfgang Ahrens et al.; Toronto: York University, 2009), 465–72; Matthew

Naḥal Ḥever Twelve Prophets scroll (8ḤevXII gr) also shows that the Greek Scriptures were critically studied in Hellenistic-Roman Palestine.[95] On the other hand, these activities need not have taken place at Qumran itself. Recent studies on the Qumran movement stress, in the words of John Collins, that the movement "was not an isolated monastic community, as has sometimes been imagined, but was part of a religious association spread widely throughout the land."[96] Thus, members of the Qumran movement may have lived in Jerusalem or elsewhere, or they may have travelled across Palestine and perhaps Egypt, and they may have obtained their knowledge of Alexandrian scholarship from there. Whatever the case may be (and the scenarios are not mutually exclusive), the Pesher exegetes were evidently in contact with other intellectual communities in the Hellenistic and Roman world, and the commentaries they produced reflect the exchange of knowledge between these communities.

4. Conclusion

In the preceding pages I have argued that the exegete or scribe responsible for 4Q163/Pesher Isaiah C was familiar with Alexandrian textual scholarship. His familiarity with this scholarly tradition was not the result of a Greek training he had received, but of contacts with Jews in Egypt, who had had such an education and were closely acquainted with the procedures and assumptions of Alexandrian textual scholarship.

Considering the still common classification of the pesharim as belonging to the "core sectarian writings" from Qumran, these findings confirm the results of previous studies, which argue that at least some members of the Qumran movement had an open view to other cultures across the Hellenistic and Roman worlds and participated in networks of intellectual exchange. The socio-historical

Richey, "The Use of Greek at Qumran: Manuscript and Epigraphic Evidence for a Marginalized Language," *DSD* 19 (2012): 177–97.

[95] On this scroll and the recensional activity reflected in it see Dominique Barthélemy, *Les devanciers d'Aquila: Première publication intégrale du texte des fragments du Dodécaprophéton trouvés dans le désert de Juda, précédée d'une étude sur les traductions et recensions grecques de la Bible réalisées au premier siècle de notre ère sous l'influence du rabbinat Palestinien* (VTSup 10; Leiden: Brill, 1963); Natalio Fernández Marcos, *The Septuagint in Context: Introduction to the Greek Versions of the Bible* (trans. Wilfred G.E. Watson; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 109–73.

[96] *Beyond the Qumran Community: The Sectarian Movement of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2010), 208.

context of the pesharim in the Hellenistic and Roman worlds and the development of Jewish commentary writing must be understood against this broad background.

As we have seen, 4Q163 is the palaeographically oldest Pesher manuscript. Thus, Steudel may be right that a gradual development took place from freer to more systematic pesharim. However, the argument put forward in this article adds an important dimension to Steudel’s picture. If 4Q163/Pesher Isaiah C stands at the beginning of a gradual movement towards more systematic commentary writing, the earliest stages of this development apparently came about in dialogue with Alexandrian textual scholarship. From that perspective, the diachronic development Steudel describes is not just a development from liberal to more fixed forms of scriptural interpretation. It is at the same time an emancipation of the Pesher genre, which over time moved away from its Alexandrian pedigree and acquired an increasingly idiosyncratic character.