

Copyright © 2018 Anthony Michael Ferguson

All rights reserved. The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary has permission to reproduce and disseminate this document in any form by any means for purposes chosen by the Seminary, including, without limitation, preservation or instruction.

A COMPARISON OF THE NON-ALIGNED TEXTS OF
QUMRAN TO THE MASORETIC TEXT

A Dissertation
Presented to
the Faculty of
The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Philosophy

by
Anthony Michael Ferguson

December 2018

APPROVAL SHEET

A COMPARISON OF THE NON-ALIGNED TEXTS OF
QUMRAN TO THE MASORETIC TEXT

Anthony Michael Ferguson

Read and Approved by:

Russell T. Fuller (Chair)

Peter J. Gentry

Terry J. Betts

Date _____

To my wife, my best friend, and my co-heir of the grace of life, Kristen

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	viii
LIST OF SYMBOLS	xv
PREFACE	xiv
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
Thesis	3
Methodology	3
History of Research	20
2. THE NON-ALIGNED TEXTS OF THE PENTATEUCH	41
4Q10	41
2Q2	45
2Q3	48
4Q15	54
4Q16	56
11Q1	60
11Q2	70
4Q29	74
4Q30	78
4Q35	91
4Q37	101
4Q38	110
4Q38a	114

Chapter	Page
4Q40	116
4Q41	119
5Q1	131
3. THE PROPHETIC NON-ALIGNED TEXTS	135
4Q47	135
4Q49	157
6Q4	167
1QIsa ^a	173
4Q57	215
4Q64	223
2Q13	229
4Q73	236
4Q76	239
4Q78	249
4Q79	259
4Q80	262
4Q82	266
4. THE NON-ALIGNED TEXTS OF THE WRITINGS	278
4Q83	278
4Q84	297
4Q86	302
4Q87	308
4Q88	316
4Q92	326
4Q93	330
4Q95	332

Chapter	Page
4Q98	337
4Q98a	343
4Q98g	345
11Q5	354
11Q6	395
11Q7	400
11Q8	404
4Q106	407
4Q107	413
6Q6	418
4Q109	421
4Q111	425
4Q112	436
4Q113	443
4Q114	446
4Q115	449
6Q7	451
4Q118	454
5. CONCLUSION	458
Implications	460
Future Research	462
Conclusion	464
 Appendix	
1. TABLES OF THE PENTATEUCH TEXTS	465
2. TABLES OF THE PROPHETIC TEXTS	488

Appendix	Page
3. TABLES OF THE TEXTS OF THE WRITINGS	535
4. SUMMARY OF THE NON-ALIGNED TEXTS' STATISTICAL RELATIONSHIP TO THE MT	588
BIBLIOGRAPHY	594

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. The statistical relationship between 4Q10 and the MT	44
2. The statistical relationship between 2Q2 and the MT	48
3. The statistical relationship between 2Q3 and the MT	54
4. The statistical relationship between 4Q15 and the MT	56
5. The statistical relationship between 4Q16 and the MT	59
6. The statistical relationship between 11Q1 and the MT	70
7. The statistical relationship between 11Q2 and the MT	74
8. The statistical relationship between 4Q29 and the MT	78
9. The statistical relationship between 4Q30 and the MT	91
10. The statistical relationship between 4Q35 and the MT	100
11. The statistical relationship between 4Q37 and the MT	110
12. The statistical relationship between 4Q38 and the MT	114
13. The statistical relationship between 4Q38a and the MT	116
14. The statistical relationship between 4Q40 and the MT	119
15. The statistical relationship between 4Q41 and the MT	131
16. The statistical relationship between 5Q1 and the MT	134
17. The statistical relationship between 4Q47 and the MT	157
18. The statistical relationship between 4Q49 and the MT	167
19. The statistical relationship between 6Q4 and the MT	173
20. The statistical relationship between 1QIsa ^a and the MT	215

Table	Page
21. The statistical relationship between 4Q57 and the MT	223
22. The statistical relationship between 4Q64 and the MT	229
23. The statistical relationship between 2Q13 and the MT	236
24. The statistical relationship between 4Q73 and the MT	239
25. The statistical relationship between 4Q76 and the MT	249
26. The statistical relationship between 4Q78 and the MT	259
27. The statistical relationship between 4Q79 and the MT	262
28. The statistical relationship between 4Q80 and the MT	265
29. The statistical relationship between 4Q82 and the MT	276
30. Graphically similar variants	296
31. The statistical relationship between 4Q83 and the MT	297
32. The statistical relationship between 4Q84 and the MT	302
33. The statistical relationship between 4Q86 and the MT	308
34. The statistical relationship between 4Q87 and the MT	316
35. The statistical relationship between 4Q88 and the MT	326
36. The statistical relationship between 4Q92 and the MT	330
37. The statistical relationship between 4Q93 and the MT	332
38. The statistical relationship between 4Q95 and the MT if fragments 2-3 preserve portions of Psalm 136:20-24	336
39. The statistical relationship between 4Q95 and the MT if fragments 2-3 preserve portions of a Psalm 135:11-12 and 136:23-24 (i.e., a New Psalm)	336
40. The statistical relationship between 4Q98 and the MT	343
41. The statistical relationship between 4Q98a and the MT	345
42. The statistical relationship between 4Q98g and the MT if one does not account for the sequence of verses	353

Table	Page
43. The statistical relationship between 11Q5 and the MT	395
44. The statistical relationship between 11Q6 and the MT	399
45. The statistical relationship between 11Q7 and the MT	404
46. The statistical relationship between 11Q8 and the MT	406
47. The statistical relationship between 4Q106 and the MT	413
48. The statistical relationship between 4Q107 and the MT	418
49. The statistical relationship between 6Q6 and the MT	421
50. The statistical relationship between 4Q109 and the MT	425
51. The statistical relationship between 4Q111 and the MT	435
52. The statistical relationship between 4Q112 and the MT	442
53. The statistical relationship between 4Q118 and the MT	445
54. The statistical relationship between 4Q114 and the MT	449
55. The statistical relationship between 4Q115 and the MT	452
56. The statistical relationship between 6Q7 and the MT	454
57. The statistical relationship between 4Q118 and the MT	456
A1. 4Q10: Description of variants	466
A2. 2Q2: Description of variants	466
A3. 2Q3: Description of variants	467
A4. 4Q15: Description of variants	467
A5. 4Q16: Description of variants	468
A6. 11Q1: Description of variants, category 1	469
A7. 11Q1: Description of variants, category 2	470
A8. 11Q1: Description of variants, category 3	470
A9. 11Q1: Description of variants, not counted in statistics	471
A10. 11Q2: Description of variants	472

Table	Page
A11. 4Q29: Description of variants	473
A12. 4Q30: Description of Variants, category 1	474
A13. 4Q30: Description of variants, category 2	475
A14. 4Q30: Description of variants, category 3	476
A15. 4Q30: Description of variants, not counted in statistics	476
A16. 4Q35: Description of variants	477
A17. 4Q37: Description of variants	479
A18. 4Q38: Description of variants	481
A19. 4Q38a: Description of variants	482
A20. 4Q40: Description of variants	483
A21. 4Q41: Description of variants, category 1	484
A22. 4Q41: Description of variants, category 2	485
A23. 4Q41: Description of variants, category 3	485
A24. 4Q41: Description of variants, not counted in statistics	486
A25. 5Q1: Description of variants	487
A26. 4Q47: Description of variants	488
A27. 4Q49: Description of variants	490
A28. 6Q4: Description of variants	491
A29. 1QIsa ^a : Description of variants (category 2, addition variants)	492
A30. 1QIsa ^a : Description of variants (category 2, omission variants)	496
A31. 1QIsa ^a : Description of variants (category 2, substitution variants)	500
A32. 1QIsa ^a : Description of variants, variants likely deriving from a damaged exemplar (category 2)	512
A33. 1QIsa ^a : Category 3 variants	514
A34. 1QIsa ^a : Did no count in the statistics	515

Table	Page
A35. 4Q57: Description of variant (categories 1, 2, 3)	515
A36. 4Q57: Description of variant, not counted in statistics	519
A37. 4Q64: Description of variants	521
A38. 2Q13: Description of variants	522
A39. 4Q73: Description of variants	525
A40. 4Q76: Description of variants	526
A41. 4Q78: Description of variants	528
A42. 4Q79: Description of variants	531
A43. 4Q80: Description of variants	531
A44. 4Q82: Description of variants	532
A45. 4Q83: Description of variants (category 1)	535
A46. 4Q83: Description of variants (category 2)	537
A47. 4Q83: Description of variants (category 3)	538
A48. 4Q83: Description of variants, not counted in statistics	539
A49. 4Q84: Description of variants	540
A50. 4Q86: Description of variants	542
A51. 4Q87: Description of variants	543
A52. 4Q88: Description of variants	545
A53. 4Q92: Description of variants	547
A54. 4Q93: Description of variants	547
A55. 4Q95: Description of variants if fragments 2-3 preserve portions of Psalm 136:19-24	548
A56. 4Q95: Description of variants if fragments 2-3 preserve Psalm 135:11-12 + Psalm 136:23-24	548
A57. 4Q98: Description of variants	549
A58. 4Q98a: Description of variants	549

Table	Page
A59. 4Q98g: Description of variants	550
A60. 11Q5: Description of variants, category 1	551
A61. 11Q5: Description of variants, category 2	557
A62. 11Q5: Description of variants, category 3	561
A63. 11Q5: Description of variants, not counted in statistics	561
A64. 11Q5: Differences likely caused by excerpted nature, compositions not in Masoretic Psalter	563
A65. 11Q5: Differences likely caused by excerpted nature, catena of Ps 118 at Col 16	563
A66. 11Q5: Differences likely caused by excerpted nature, reworked Psalm 145	564
A67. Order of Psalms (11Q5) and Spacing between Psalms	565
A68. 11Q6: Description of variants	568
A69. 11Q7: Description of variants	569
A70. 11Q8: Description of variants	570
A71. 4Q106: Description of variants	571
A72. 4Q107: Description of variants	572
A73. 6Q6: Description of variants	574
A74. 4Q109: Description of variants	575
A75. 4Q111: Description of variants	576
A76. 4Q112: Description of variants	579
A77. 4Q113: Description of variants	583
A78. 4Q114: Description of variants	585
A79. 4Q115: Description of variants	586
A80. 6Q7: Description of variants	586

Table	Page
A81. 4Q118: Description of variants	587
A82. A summary of the non-aligned texts statistical relationship to the MT ...	589

LIST OF SYMBOLS

Transcriptions

Ⓢ	Probable letter
Ⓢ̇	Possible letter
◦	Uncertain Hebrew letter
[Ⓢ]	Reconstructed letters
^Ⓢ^	Superscripted letters
{{Ⓢ}}	Erased letters

Translations

?	Uncertain translation ¹
option 1/option 2	Multiple possible translations
(word)	Implied by context

¹ One question mark is assigned uncertain Hebrew letter in the English translation.

PREFACE

I would like to thank Dr. Russell Fuller for his guidance in this project. His constant care and desire for excellence made this project a reality. I was grateful to learn under him as his student and to serve and grow under him as his Garrett Fellow and Online Teaching Assistant. I owe my understanding of the Hebrew language to his kind service. I am very thankful.

Several other individuals had a significant role in this project. Dr. Peter Gentry introduced me to the study of the Old Testament text. His passion for the Bible and his tenacity to set forth its trustworthiness have been inspiring. His feedback raised the quality of this dissertation. Dr. Terry Betts example is one of academic excellence and humility to all Ph.D. students at SBTS. His never-assuming attitude but profound understanding of the text exemplifies a pastor/scholar worthy of the highest honor. Dr. Paul Wegner was kind to give helpful feedback at the early stages of this project. Special thanks to Dr. Brian Vickers, who cared for me on an academic and a spiritual level. I am grateful for his investment in my life. I will not forget his service of love to me while at SBTS. Betsy Fredrick too deserves credit for laboring over this dissertation with care and precision.

The library staff at SBTS has been a great resource for me throughout this project. I am especially grateful to Emilee Smith for work in Interlibrary Loan. She retrieved countless books for me quickly. I am thankful for her willingness to search for obscure books and scan pages to this now distant student.

I am also indebted to the library staff at Gateway Seminary, in particular, Alex Yepiz. I wrote the bulk of my dissertation in Southern California and was thankful to have an excellent library full of germane resources and to be assisted by a friendly and professional staff.

A Ph.D. student is shaped not only by his faculty and library, but also by classmates and friends. I have greatly benefited from the feedback of fellow Ph.D. students throughout this process. I would like to thank Micah Wu, Ryan Hanley, Andrew King, and Jonny Atkinson. In particular, I would like to thank Brian Davidson. His extensive knowledge of Second Temple Literature and proficiency in countless library resources—especially Accordance Bible Software—were much appreciated. Moreover, we enjoyed several conversations where he pushed me to think more clearly about this topic. Matt Thomas and Jeff Horner provided invaluable feedback for me throughout this process. It was a privilege to study with Michael Graham throughout the Ph.D. program. His constant encouragement and assistance both while I was living in Louisville and while I have been in Southern California have been very appreciated.

I owe much to my family. My bampaw gave financial gifts at graduation and sporadically throughout this project that allowed me to build my Accordance library and allowed me to research more exhaustively and more quickly. My mom, Susan Ferguson; mother-in-Law, Kim Harris; dad, David Ferguson; grandma, Darlene Sabol; and my aunt, Deborah Christenson, have put hours into this project by caring, loving, and watching our son, Asher Ferguson—a most excellent gift from our heavenly Father. Their sacrifice for my family and this project is immense, and their love for our son will never be forgotten. I am very grateful. Thank you.

Last, my wife is due substantial credit for the completion of this project. Her helpful feedback, patience, profound love, and most of all, her godliness, have been an encouragement to this weary Ph.D.'s heart. She pointed me to our Lord both in the highs and lows of this project and reminded me of my place in his kingdom. Indeed, I have found a good thing and obtained favor from God in finding her (Prov 18:22). You are my best friend and my love.

Anthony Ferguson

Ontario, California

December 2018

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls (DSS) has provided the world with Hebrew texts that date from 275 BC to AD 135.¹ Fifty-five texts have been identified by Emanuel Tov as exhibiting the greatest amount of diversity because they are inconsistent in their agreement with the MT, LXX, and Samaritan Pentateuch while preserving unique readings.² Emanuel Tov labels these fifty-five texts as “non-aligned.”³

Many scholars refer to the diversity preserved in the non-aligned texts as the basis for asserting that the OT text existed in multiple forms during the Second Temple period. For example, Shemaryahu Talmon comments, “It appears that the extant text-

¹ Russell Fuller, “Some Thoughts on How the Dead Sea Scrolls Have Changed Our Understanding of the Text of the Hebrew Bible and Its History and the Practice of Textual Criticism,” in *The Hebrew Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. Nóra Dávid et al., *Forschungen Zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments* 239 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2012), 23.

² Emanuel Tov, “Groups of Biblical Texts Found at Qumran,” in *Time to Prepare the Way in the Wilderness: Papers on the Qumran Scrolls*, ed. Devorah Dimant and Lawrence H Schiffman, *Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah* 16 (Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 1995), 98.

³ This dissertation discusses only those texts exclusively identified by Tov as non-aligned. See n10 for a list of the texts covered in this dissertation. Moreover, Tov’s opinion about which texts belong in the non-aligned category and the proto-MT category has changed over time. For a table about how his opinion has changed, see Armin Lange, “The Textual Plurality of the Jewish Scriptures in the Second Temple Period in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *Qumran and the Bible: Studying the Jewish and Christian Scriptures in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. Nóra Dávid and Armin Lange, *Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology* 57 (Leuven, Belgium: Peeters, 2010), 49. On the one hand, whereas only 10 percent of the biblical-DSS were categorized as non-aligned in 1992, Tov classified 35 percent of the texts as non-aligned in 2001. *Ibid.* Tov categorizes fifty-seven texts (38.77 percent of the biblical-DSS) as non-aligned (texts not exclusively identified as non-aligned are not discussed in this dissertation). Emanuel Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert*, ed. Florentino García Martínez, Peter W. Flint, and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, *Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah* 54 (Boston: Brill, 2004), 332-35. Whereas the non-aligned category has increased over time, the proto-MT category has decreased from 60 percent of the overall texts in 1992 to 35 percent of the texts in 2001. Lange, “Textual Plurality,” 49.

types must be viewed as the remains of a yet more variegated transmission of the Bible text in the preceding centuries, rather than witnesses to solely three archetypes.”⁴

Similarly, Eugene Ulrich argues, “The Scriptures were pluriform (as was Judaism and Christianity) at least until 70 CE, probably until 100, and quite possibly as late as 135 or beyond.”⁵ Armin Lange alludes to a similar perception when stating, “The non-aligned texts were not the exception but the rule of the Second Temple textual reality and that proto-MT [texts] might not have been the dominant text of that time.”⁶ Thus, these scholars postulate that the OT text was fluid during the Second Temple period because of the diversity of readings found among the non-aligned texts.

Other scholars oppose the assertions of Talmon, Ulrich, and Lange. For example, Bruno Chiesa writes, “The tradition of the biblical text appears not to be substantially different from that of any other ancient text . . . a *recension* can be outlined, in order to arrive at *one* Text, despite any plurality of texts.”⁷ Peter Gentry likewise says, “Let me be absolutely clear: the consensus view that the text was standardized in the first century AD is wrong.”⁸ Arie van der Kooij expresses the same opinion: “It seems to me

⁴ Shemaryahu Talmon, “The Textual Study of the Bible—A New Outlook,” in *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text*, ed. Frank Moore Cross and Shemaryahu Talmon (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1975), 325. Although the term *non-aligned* did not exist in 1975, when Talmon wrote this article, he is referring to the type of diversity found in the non-aligned texts. Sidnie Crawford states that Talmon would understand most of the biblical manuscripts as “non-aligned.” Sidnie Crawford, “Understanding the Textual History of the Hebrew Bible: A New Proposal,” in Dávid et al., *The Hebrew Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 62.

⁵ Eugene Ulrich, “The Bible in the Making: The Scriptures Found at Qumran,” in *The Bible at Qumran: Text, Shape, and Interpretation*, ed. Peter W Flint and T’ae-hun Kim, *Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001), 65.

⁶ Lange, “Textual Plurality,” 57.

⁷ Bruno Chiesa, “The Textual History and Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Old Testament,” in *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid, 18-21 March, 1991*, ed. Julio C. Treballe Barrera and Luis Vegas Montaner, vol. 1, *Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 11* (Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 1992), 272.

⁸ Peter John Gentry, “The Text of the Old Testament,” *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 52, no. 1 (March 2009): 45.

that this second theory [a stable text existing alongside a multiform one] does more justice to the data than the first one [textual fluidity theory] because it sheds light on the assumption of a conservative line of copying.”⁹

The comments of Talmon, Ulrich, and Lange rest upon a basic premise: the diversity of readings found in the non-aligned texts necessitates textual fluidity rather than a standard text. Before this premise can be entertained, a careful comparison must be made to determine the significance of the disagreements and the overarching statistical relationship between each non-aligned text and the MT.

Thesis

Contrary to Emanuel Tov’s analysis that fifty-five texts from Qumran are exclusively identified as textually non-aligned, a more cautious analysis of each text demonstrates that once the few ambiguous texts are excluded from the category, the remaining texts can reasonably be explained as belonging to the Masoretic tradition.

Methodology

The purpose of this dissertation was to demonstrate that the non-aligned texts can be reasonably understood as belonging to the Masoretic tradition.¹⁰ This dissertation

⁹ Arie van der Kooij, “Preservation and Promulgation: The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Textual History of the Hebrew Bible,” in Dávid et al., *The Hebrew Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 30.

¹⁰ Tov has published at least two lists where he identifies which texts belong to the non-aligned category. The first list can be found in appendix 8 of Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 331-35. The second list is found in Emanuel Tov, “The Biblical Texts from the Judaean Desert—An Overview and Analysis of the Published Texts,” in *The Bible as Book: The Hebrew Bible and the Judaean Desert Discoveries*, ed. Edward D Herbert and Emanuel Tov (New Castle, DE: Oak Knoll, 2002), 156. A close examination of these two lists reveals that they are not identical. On the one hand, 2Q2 (2QExod^a) is omitted from the list found in *Scribal Practices and Approaches* published in 2004. On the other hand, 2Q3 (2QExod^b), 4Q98a (4QPs^r), and 11Q2 (11QLev^b) are omitted from the list found in “The Biblical Texts from the Judaean Desert” published in 2002. Lange alludes to this list in his 2010 work “Textual Plurality.” Moreover, in the list found in *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, Tov lists five texts as not exclusively non-aligned: 4Q13 (4Q[Gen]-Exod^b), 4Q17 (4QExod-Lev^f), 4Q41 (4QDeutⁿ), 4Q51 (4QSam^a), and 4Q53 (4QSam^c). These texts are not discussed in this dissertation because they are not exclusively categorized by Tov as non-aligned. However, since Tov no longer categorizes 4Q41 as pre-Samaritan, 4Q41 is included in this discussion. See Emanuel Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 3rd ed. (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2012), 91, especially 91n147. Last, although not listed in either of the two lists published by Tov, more

shows that each non-aligned text shares most readings with the MT while most disagreements concern minor details. The following outline provides an overview of how each non-aligned text is compared to the MT.

Introduction of Each Respective Non-Aligned Text

First, the non-aligned text is introduced. In this section, basic details about the text are discussed. These details include the biblical text preserved in the non-aligned text, the number of fragments preserved, the nature of the paleography, the date of the text, and the nature of the orthography. Furthermore, the scholarship of those who have commented on the textual tradition of each non-aligned text is surveyed.

Categorization and Description of Variants

Second, the variants are described and categorized. Several types of differences proposed by DJD are not included in the categories or statistics. First, readings based on reconstructions are not mentioned in the discussions, included in the statistics, or listed in

recent literature indicates that Tov now views 4QRworked Pentateuch as a biblical manuscript. See Emanuel Tov, "From 4QRworked Pentateuch to 4QPentateuch (?)," in *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible, Qumran, Septuagint: Collected Essays*, ed. Christl M. Maier, Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 167 (Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 2015), 3:45-59. Moreover, he specifically lists 4Q365-367 (4QRP^{c-e}) as non-aligned in Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 109. Nonetheless, these texts are not included in this discussion since his identification of these texts as non-aligned appear more suggestive than definitive. See Tov, "From 4QRworked Pentateuch to 4QPentateuch (?)," 45-59. Therefore, this dissertation accepts texts identified exclusively as non-aligned in appendix 8 of *Scribal Practices and Approaches* plus 2Q2 (a text included in a prior list, but omitted in this appendix). The full list of texts covered in this dissertation are as follows: 4Q10 (4QGen^k), 2Q2 (2QExod^a), 2Q3 (2QExod^b), 4Q15 (4QExod^d), 4Q16 (4QExod^e), 11Q1 (11QpaleoLev^a), 11Q2 (11QLev^b), 4Q29 (4QDeut^b), 4Q30 (4QDeut^c), 4Q35 (4QDeut^h), 4Q37 (4QDeutⁱ), 4Q38 (4QDeut^{k1}), 4Q38a (4QDeut^{k2}), 4Q40 (4QDeut^m), 4Q41 (4QDeutⁿ), 5Q1 (5QDeut), 4Q47 (4QJosh^a), 4Q49 (4QJud^a), 6Q4 (6QpapKgs), 1QIsa^a, 4Q57 (4QIsa^c), 4Q64 (4QIsa^k), 2Q13 (2QJer), 4Q73 (4QEzek^a), 4Q76 (4QXII^a), 4Q78 (4QXII^c), 4Q79 (4QXII^d), 4Q80 (4QXII^e), 4Q82 (4QXII^g), 4Q83 (4QPs^a), 4Q84 (4QPs^b), 4Q86 (4QPs^d), 4Q87 (4QPs^e), 4Q88 (4QPs^f), 4Q92 (4QPs^k), 4Q93 (4QPs^l), 4Q95 (4QPsⁿ), 4Q98 (4QPs^q), 4Q98a (4QPs^r), 4Q98g (4QPs^x), 11Q5 (11QPs^a), 11Q6 (11QPs^b), 11Q7 (11QPs^c), 11Q8 (11QPs^d), 4Q106 (4QCant^a), 4Q107 (4QCant^b), 6Q6 (6QCant^a), 4Q109 (4QQoh^a), 4Q111 (4QLam), 4Q112 (4QDan^a), 4Q113 (4QDan^b), 4Q114 (4QDan^c), 4Q115 (4QDan^d), 6Q7 (6QpapDan), 4Q118 (4QChron).

the tables in the appendices.¹¹ Second, some variants proposed by DJD are partially preserved in the text, but for a variant reading to be accepted in this dissertation, the reading must be fully or sufficiently present. Readings must be based on manuscript evidence. These differences are not included in the statistics but are mentioned briefly and included in the tables found in the appendices.¹² Third, some differences grouped as variants in DJD only differ regarding spelling. Examples of these differences include defective spellings, substitution of homorganic or homogeneous letters,¹³ omission of weak letters, and substitution of synonymous personal pronouns such as אָנִי for אֲנִי. Like those variants that depend on some but insufficient manuscript evidence, these variants are discussed briefly and included in the tables in the appendices, but not included in the statistics.¹⁴ Fourth, variants that concern a *kethiv qere* are also listed in the initial discussion of variants and included in the tables found in the appendices, but these too are not included in the statistics.

After eliminating these differences, each remaining variant was assigned to one of three categories: categories 1, 2, or 3. Variants in category 1 are variants that do not

¹¹ Emanuel Tov, "The Sciences and the Analysis of the Ancient Scrolls: Possibilities and Impossibilities," in Maier, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible, Qumran, Septuagint: Collected Essays*, 3:267-88. Tov argues that content is the main guide to reconstructions. He further states, "In other cases, with fragmentary contents and the fertile minds of scholars, there are many possibilities [to situate fragments] and therefore it would be good to be aided by additional methods. Such aid may come from an exact or almost exact physical join, but such joins are rare. Some fragments of similar shape reflect subsequent layers or revolutions of a scroll (see n. 71), but such cases are also rare." Ibid., 285. He goes on to argue that scholars would like help from the sciences to help determine where to place fragments in the reconstruction process, but the help of c-14, ink analysis, DNA analysis, follicle research will likely have their limitation. Ibid., 285-88. For example, DNA analysis could indicate if two fragments were written on the same skin, but this fact would not help determine which fragments were joined together. It would only prove that two fragments could not have been joined if they came from different animals. Ibid., 288. Therefore, reconstructions are not included in the discussions and statistics.

¹² The most unclear variants that belong to this category are discussed briefly in this initial section.

¹³ See Wilhelm Gesenius, E. Kautzsch, and A. E. Cowley, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1910), §6q.

¹⁴ Again, some of the less clear orthographic differences are discussed in more depth in this initial section.

necessitate any change in meaning. These include synonymous lexemes and synonymous syntactical constructions. If a construction in the Qumran text can reasonably be explained as synonymous to the form or construction found in the MT, the constructions are assumed to be synonymous and grouped as category 1 variants. Variants in category 2 are variants that can be reasonably explained as deriving from the MT although the readings are not synonymous with it. These variants typically involve a slight change in meaning or perspective. They usually elaborate or simplify the meaning of the MT so that the text is more explicit or less explicit. Moreover, these differences can usually be explained as cases of harmonization to the surrounding context or to parallel passages.

Variants in category 3 are variants that imply a meaning irreconcilable to the MT. These variants cannot be reasonably explained as deriving from the MT.

The categorization of variants into these three categories illustrates that most of the differences between the non-aligned texts and the MT are insignificant variants that can reasonably be attributed to the scribal process (category 1 and 2 variants). Only a few differences belong to category 3: the most reliable category for identifying separate textual traditions. Thus, the high percentage of variants from category 1 and 2 and the low percentage of variants from category 3 prove that these texts can be reasonably ascribed to the Masoretic tradition.

In addition to grouping each variant into categories, each variant is further described as either an addition, omission, substitution, or unclear variant. The MT was used as the basis for these descriptions. Thus, if the non-aligned text has a reading that the MT does not have, the variant is described as an addition. If the non-aligned text is missing a reading present in the MT, the variant is described as an omission. If the non-aligned text has replaced a reading of the MT, then the variant is described as a substitution. Furthermore, in some cases a variant exists, but the nature of the variant is uncertain. For example, it can be unclear if a Qumran text preserves an omission or

transposition when the text exists in a highly fragmentary state. In situations like this, the readings are categorized as unclear.¹⁵

Space prohibits the description of all the variants in detail. All the variants in category 1 are discussed generally and briefly. The variants from category 2 and 3 are discussed in more depth since these variants are more significant than those from category 1.¹⁶ Because of space limitations, the discussion of two larger texts are abbreviated further: 1QIsa^a which preserves approximately 22,696 words and 11Q5 (11QPs^a) which preserves approximately 3,299 words.¹⁷ The tables of 1QIsa^a and 11Q5 are abbreviated.

Statistics

Third, three sets of statistics are provided to depict the relationship between each non-aligned text and the MT. The purpose of these statistics is to show that the large majority of variants listed by DJD are insignificant (those from category 1 and 2). Furthermore, the statistics demonstrate that only a small percentage of texts include variants from category 3.

The first set of statistics is a purely statistical approach to grouping the biblical-DSS that simply counts all the variants within a text. This set of statistics reflects Tov's and largely Lange's approach to grouping the biblical-DSS.¹⁸ All the variant readings from categories 1, 2, and 3 between the MT and the non-aligned text are included in the

¹⁵ Not only is the categorization unclear for these variants, but the statistical value of these variants is also unclear. In these situations, the statistical value of the variant is assumed to be transposition as opposed to omission since transposition provides the more conservative approach in the statistics.

¹⁶ A table is included for each text in the appendices. These tables list the variants from category 1, 2, 3 and those that were not counted by this dissertation. Variants that depend entirely on reconstruction are not included in the tables.

¹⁷ The total number of words for each non-aligned text is based on the counts in the Dead Sea Scroll package of Accordance version 11.2.5.

¹⁸ Armin Lange, "Ancient and Late Ancient Hebrew and Aramaic Jewish Texts," in *Textual History of the Bible: The Hebrew Bible*, ed. Armin Lange and Emanuel Tov (Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 2016), 1a:127. See also Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 158-60.

statistics.¹⁹ Variants are not weighed in this set of statistics but counted. Thus, variants that could have arisen from transmission technique, or what Lange calls variant analysis or scribal error, are all included in this category with equal weight in the statistics.²⁰

The second set of statistics eliminates those variants from category 1 and depicts the overarching relationship between the MT and the non-aligned texts if only the variants that represent a change in meaning are included. This set of statistics does not represent a purely statistical approach but weighs the variants since it does not account for the category 1 variants.

The third set of statistics only includes variants from category 3. This set of statistics represents the most conservative approach to analyzing the textual tradition of the non-aligned texts since it only accounts for those variants less likely to have arisen from the scribal process.

The following rules govern how the statistics were calculated. The denominator for the statistics was the number of words present in each biblical-DSS. The number of preserved words for each non-aligned text was provided by the Dead Sea Scroll Package in Accordance 11.2.5.²¹ The numerator was determined by subtracting the number of variants from the denominator. Thus, if there are 100 words preserved in a Qumran text, and that text differs from the MT in 10 words, then the texts agree 90 percent. Each word (from the Hebrew perspective) receives one numerical point in the statistics. Thus, if the

¹⁹ See prior about the categorization and description of the variants for a discussion of those differences proposed by DJD that are not included in this set of statistics.

²⁰ For a discussion of variant analysis, see Lange, "Ancient and Late Ancient Hebrew and Aramaic Jewish Texts," 127-30.

²¹ The following guidelines determine the total word count per each biblical-DSS. The word count of each non-aligned text does not include reconstructed words. Moreover, some suffixes are excluded from the total word count such as indicative *nuns* since this difference largely concerns orthography only. In addition, the total word count does not include words that depend on insufficient manuscript evidence. However, a few texts (e.g., 11Q1, 1QIsa^a) are too large to count in this manner. The total word count for these texts will only exclude reconstructed readings and variants that depend on insufficient manuscript evidence. I am thankful to Brian Davidson for showing me how to determine word counts in Accordance.

words מלכי “my king” (the noun being one word and the pronominal suffix being another) appeared in the Qumran text, the denominator for these words would be two. Every time a word differs from the MT, one point was subtracted from the denominator.

Every additional word added to the Qumran text received one point in the statistics. For example, if a Qumran text has הדבר “the word” while the MT has דבר “word,” then the article and the noun both received one point value in the denominator. Furthermore, since the MT does not have the article, one point was subtracted from the denominator to determine the numerator. Thus, the Qumran text agrees with the MT 1/2 or 50 percent.

Likewise, every word omitted from the MT received one point in the statistics. For example, if a Qumran text does not represent a word such as a personal pronoun while the MT does, the texts have a 0 percent agreement.

Substitutions can be more complicated. An example of a straightforward substitution is the following: if the Qumran text has מלכו “his king” while the MT has מלכי “my king,” the statistical agreement is given as 50 percent since the forms disagree regarding the pronominal suffix. The variant would be worth one statistical point. However, some substitutions are more difficult. For example, if the Qumran text has דוד “David” while the MT has המלך “the king,” the numerical value of this substitution was 0 percent aligned and the statistical value for the variant was one point, not two or three points. The article was not counted as an addition since דוד is definite. This difference is merely a substitution, not a substitution plus an omission. Likewise, if a Qumran text has a proper name such as אלישע “Elisha” while the MT has איש־האלהים “the man of God” the texts agreed 0 percent and the statistical value for the variant was again be one point. Again, although the Qumran text technically has three words and the MT only has one, the Qumran text’s construction is merely a substitution, not a substitution plus an addition. Thus, the substitution only received one point in the statistics.

Conclusion of the Textual Tradition of Each Respective Non-Aligned Text

Finally, the textual tradition of each non-aligned text is discussed. Again, the grouping of the biblical-DSS depends on each text's overarching agreement with the MT and the fact that most disagreements only concern minor details. The conclusion is that, although a few non-aligned texts remain ambiguous, most belong to the Masoretic tradition.²²

The conclusion that most of the non-aligned texts belong to the Masoretic tradition does not imply that these texts are proto-MT texts. The methodology of Tov, which classifies the texts from Qumran as texts, not text-types/traditions, is not followed here; rather, the goal is to determine textual traditions.²³ When describing Tov's approach, it is appropriate to say that Tov's goal emphasizes the diversity among the biblical-DSS, not their unity, and his task is rightly seen as the task of sorting based on the most minutiae of differences. This very narrow categorization is evident in his classification of 1QIsa^a since he understands this text to be non-aligned even though it differs from the MT in the least "meaningful type of deviations, namely in orthography."²⁴ Tov's approach is also evident when he analyzes the liturgical non-aligned texts since he comments that these texts "probably branched off from MT."²⁵ Ulrich argues that Tov's approach is a

²² The ambiguous texts include (1) 4Q47, which appears to be a reworked text, but exists in a fragmentary state; (2) 4Q49, which may be a non-biblical text, perhaps an abbreviated text or reworked composition, but is very fragmentary; (3) 4Q95, which is likely a liturgical text that may rework a biblical passage, but likewise is very fragmentary (possible Pss 135 and 136); and (4) 4Q98g, which is possibly a liturgical text that might rework a biblical passage, but again, exists in a poor state of preservation (Ps 89).

²³ For a discussion of Tov's methodology to categorizing the biblical-DSS and his categorization grid, see "History of Research" section.

²⁴ Emanuel Tov, "A Didactic and Gradual Approach towards the Biblical DSS," in Maier, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible, Qumran, Septuagint*, 3:303. See Tov's graphic representation of 1QIsa^a at Emanuel Tov, "Samples," accessed April 24, 2017, <https://www.sbl-site.org/assets/pdfs/pubs/DSS/Tov.pdf>.

²⁵ Emanuel Tov, "The Textual Development of the Torah," in Maier, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible, Qumran, Septuagint*, 3:248-49.

minimalistic, reductionistic view of text-types, and that it is unhelpful,²⁶ while Chiesa identifies Tov's approach as tautological.²⁷ The approach to classifying the biblical-DSS here is not like Tov's. It is broader. Note the thesis:

Contrary to Emanuel Tov's analysis that fifty-five texts from Qumran are exclusively identified as textually non-aligned, a more cautious analysis of each text demonstrates that once the few ambiguous texts are excluded from the category, the remaining texts can reasonably be explained as belonging to the Masoretic *tradition*.

Again, the conclusion here is not that the non-aligned texts are proto-MT texts, that is, the argument is not that they are close to Leningrad to the same degree that some other biblical-DSS are (e.g., 1QIsa^b), to the degree that the other Judean Desert texts are (e.g., MasLev^b), or to the degree that the Medieval Manuscripts are. Rather, the conclusion is that these texts belong to the Masoretic tradition. In using the term *tradition*, rather than *text*, the texts are being categorized more broadly than Tov's categorization permits. Thus, dividing texts based on the most minutiae of differences, as Tov does, is not adopted here.²⁸ Meaningful differences are the standard for categorizing texts (category 3 variants). These differences appear least likely to derive from the scribal process; rather, the differences appear to indicate that the writer saw himself more as an author, not merely a scribe.

Presuppositions Guiding the Analysis of the Variants

There is no objective, standard method in the field of textual criticism of the DSS for analyzing texts and comparing them to potential traditions. Scholars, as discussed in the history of research section, operate according to their own presuppositions about

²⁶ Eugene Ulrich, "Pluriformity in the Biblical Text, Text Groups, and Questions of Canon," in Trebelle Barrera and Montaner, *The Madrid Qumran Congress*, 29. However, Ulrich appears more convinced in Ulrich, "Textual History of the Hebrew Bible," 11.

²⁷ Chiesa, "The Textual History and Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Old Testament," 266.

²⁸ One should note that Tov's approach is why he previously categorized some texts as QSP as opposed to proto-LXX, proto-SP, or proto-MT.

the textual relationship between texts. The following presuppositions guided the analysis conducted in this dissertation.

First, when dividing the variants into the three categories, this dissertation follows the presupposition of John Wevers, who states, “It seems only fair to begin with the consonantal text of the MT, and to accept change only after all other avenues of understanding have been explored.”²⁹ This presupposition is foundational to this dissertation. Only when a reading of a non-aligned text cannot be reconciled to the MT can the non-aligned text’s reading be considered a genuine variant. This presupposition is woven throughout the three categories previously described. Thus, if a form in a non-aligned text can be read as a synonymous construction to the MT, then the variant is grouped into category 1. If a form represents a change of meaning, but that meaning can reasonably be understood as deriving from the MT, the variant is categorized into category 2. Last, if a variant in a non-aligned text represents a meaning antithetical to the MT and there is insufficient evidence to explain the difference as deriving from it, then it is grouped into category 3. All approaches are explored for categorizing a variant into category 1 before category 2 and category 2 before categorizing the variant as a category 3 variant.³⁰

Second, when a non-aligned text appears to agree with the LXX against the MT, one must prove that the LXX reading could not have derived from the MT. Peter Gentry argues that most of the differences between the LXX and the MT arise from “differences between the source and target languages as codes of communication, corruption within the textual transmission of the Greek version, and variants, which are due to the translator and not genuinely textual.”³¹ Therefore, if the LXX readings could

²⁹ John William Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Exodus* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990), xv.

³⁰ Likewise, all avenues for identifying a difference as orthographic are also explored before grouping a proposed variant into one of the three categories.

³¹ Gentry, “The Text of the Old Testament,” 38-39.

have derived from the MT, then any apparent agreement between the non-aligned text and the LXX against the MT is insignificant and does not provide a basis for grouping a non-aligned text with the LXX against the MT.³²

In fact, for many books, the Septuagint aligns quite closely with the MT so that it is inappropriate to distinguish the tradition of the Septuagint as alluding to a tradition besides that found in the Masoretic text.³³ This dissertation does not assume that the Septuagint necessarily reflects a tradition besides that found in the MT as Frank Cross does. Cross's extreme comment that the Septuagint necessarily reflects a *Vorlage* "strongly divergent from our received Hebrew text (the Masoretic Bible)" is rejected by this dissertation.³⁴ Thus, simply because a non-aligned text agrees with the LXX against the MT in minor details, does not necessitate grouping its textual tradition as Septuagintal, and not Masoretic.

Third, since the Samaritan Pentateuch is an updated form of the MT, the chief text critical value of the Samaritan Pentateuch is its indirect witness to the MT as a superb text.³⁵ These comments are confirmed by Peter Gentry who identifies the Samaritan Pentateuch as a popular form of the Masoretic tradition characterized by modernizing grammar and spelling. Furthermore, he succinctly states, "The Samaritan Pentateuch is thus a strong witness to the antiquity and purity of the tradition in the MT, since the proto-MT had to be modernized and popularized in the second century BC so

³² These comments depend on Gentry, who states, "The claim that 5% of texts among the Qumran Scrolls are close to the parent text of the LXX can only refer to cases where the LXX differs textually from the MT." Gentry, "The Text of the Old Testament," 34.

³³ *Ibid.*, 38-39.

³⁴ Frank Cross, "Problems of Method in the Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible," in *The Critical Study of Sacred Texts*, ed. Wendy Doniger, Berkeley Religious Studies Series 2 (Berkeley, CA: Graduate Theological Union, 1979), 32.

³⁵ Bruce K. Waltke, "Samaritan Pentateuch," in *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, ed. David Noel Freedman et al. (New York: Doubleday, 1992), 938.

that it could be understood.”³⁶ James Davila, likewise, argues that the pre-Samaritan biblical-DSS represent the same text type as the MT in Genesis and Exodus.³⁷ He suggests that the MT and the Samaritan Pentateuch be grouped into one recension since the pre-Samaritan texts and the proto-MT texts are very close except for the secondary additions of the pre-Samaritan biblical-DSS.³⁸ Thus, agreements between a non-aligned text and the Samaritan Pentateuch are most often insignificant for grouping a non-aligned text with the Samaritan Pentateuch against the MT. In fact, more often, agreement between the Samaritan Pentateuch and a non-aligned text is positive evidence for grouping the non-aligned text as belonging to the Masoretic tradition.

Fourth, excerpted, abbreviated, and biblical texts are analyzed according to the same methodology, but the division of the variants into categories was even more conservative for excerpted and abbreviated texts. For example, different readings that derive from the nature of the excerpted and abbreviated text cannot be evidence for a different textual tradition.³⁹ Thus, the rearrangement or omission of text within excerpted or abbreviated texts were not considered genuine variants or indicative of a unique textual tradition.

Furthermore, small changes in meaning (variants from category 2) were less influential when identifying if an excerpted text deviates from the Masoretic tradition. Small changes in meaning do not necessarily reflect genuine textual variants despite

³⁶ Gentry, “The Text of the Old Testament,” 24. Bruce Waltke too points out that the Samaritan Pentateuch depicts the relative purity of the MT. Bruce K Waltke, “The Samaritan Pentateuch and the Text of the Old Testament,” in *New Perspectives on the Old Testament*, ed. J. Barton Payne, Symposium Series, Evangelical Theological Society 3 (Waco, TX: Word, 1970), 212.

³⁷ James R. Davila, “Text-Type and Terminology: Genesis and Exodus as Test Cases,” *Revue de Qumran* 16, no. 1 (1993): 36.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, 36-37.

³⁹ See Emanuel Tov, “Excerpted and Abbreviated Biblical Texts from Qumran,” *Revue de Qumran* 16, no. 4 (December 1995): 599.

Tov's claim that "the excerpted or abbreviated texts provide the same type of evidence as running biblical texts, with the exception that the lack of pericopes should be ascribed to excerpting or shortening, and not to the special textual character of the scroll."⁴⁰ Julia Duncan reasons that differences within excerpted texts may not always be indicative of a textual tradition, but may be the result of a scribe copying from memory.⁴¹ This theory is bolstered by the fact b. Megilla 18b permits *mezuzot* and *phylacteries* to be written by heart, not from a written text.⁴² It is possible that the excerpted texts from Qumran were permitted to be transmitted from memory since *mezuzot* and *phylacteries*, types of excerpted texts, were permitted to be copied from memory. Thus, conclusions concerning the textual tradition of excerpted texts were made very conservatively.

Fifth, the biblical-DSS were not grouped according to indicative errors (*Leitfehler*) in this dissertation, contrary to Ronald Hendel, because of the inherent difficulty in identifying this type of error. Three things must be established for a reading to be identified as an indicative error.⁴³ A reading must be a genuine variant and not the result of translation technique or scribal error. However, scholars have different opinions about which readings are true variants. A scholar who prefers the MT so that all avenues must be exhausted before a reading can be considered a genuine variant will argue for less variants than those who do not prefer the MT.⁴⁴ Furthermore, some scholars generally understand grammatical differences to be the result of translation technique while other

⁴⁰ Tov, "Excerpted and Abbreviated Biblical Texts," 599.

⁴¹ Julie A Duncan, "Excerpted Texts of Deuteronomy at Qumran," *Revue de Qumran* 18, no. 1 (April 1997): 60.

⁴² See especially *ibid.*, 61n68.

⁴³ Ronald S. Hendel, *Steps to a New Edition of the Hebrew Bible*, Text-Critical Studies 10 (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2016), 134.

⁴⁴ See Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Exodus*, xv. For an example of a scholar who does not prefer the MT, see Emanuel Tov, "Introduction," in *Textual History of the Bible*, 1a:33.

scholars are more open to understanding grammatical differences as genuine variants.⁴⁵ Thus, scholars differ concerning which readings are true variants. Next, the reading must be secondary. Although the traditional principles of textual criticism are helpful guides to determining the original text, judgments about which reading is original depend in part on the scholar's presuppositions and subjective reasoning.⁴⁶ Last, indicative errors must be monogenetic (readings that derived from a common text), not polygenetic (a shared reading arising independent of one another). Again, deciphering a secondary reading as monogenetic, not polygenetic, often depends on a scholar's methodology and presuppositions. Overall, an indicative error must be a secondary reading shared amongst manuscripts because of a shared textual tradition. Due to the difficulty in clearly identifying this type of error, it was not used as the basis for grouping the biblical-DSS.

Emanuel Tov's and Armin Lange's rejection of indicative errors should be considered. Armin Lange states,

Most biblical Dead Sea Scrolls are so badly damaged that the occurrence of a limited number of key readings does not allow for a reliable genealogical grouping. To base genealogical groupings on the occurrence of individual readings that are declared as indicative errors—as suggested, for example, by Hendel—ignores individual textual alterations inserted into ancient biblical manuscripts by copyists because of their own scribal idiosyncrasies. With only few overlaps between the biblical manuscripts from Qumran and the other sites in the Judean Desert, a comparative study that could identify manuscript families based on indicative errors is impossible because such indicative errors cannot be established without more textual overlaps.⁴⁷

Tov further argues that judgments concerning the nature of a variant are inherently subjective.⁴⁸ Tov concludes, "These judgments should not be used, in my view, when the

⁴⁵ See Davila, who is more liberal than Tov in accepting grammatical differences as genuine variants because of the literal translation philosophy of the scribe. Davila, "Text-Type and Terminology," 7.

⁴⁶ See Barthélemy for a summary of the principles of OT textual criticism in Dominique Barthélemy, United Bible Societies, and Committee of the Hebrew Old Testament Text Project, *Studies in the Text of the Old Testament: An Introduction to the Hebrew Old Testament Text Project* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2012), 598-603.

⁴⁷ Lange, "Ancient and Late Ancient Hebrew and Aramaic Jewish Texts," 127.

⁴⁸ Tov, "Groups of Biblical Texts Found at Qumran," 98.

overall relation between texts is determined.”⁴⁹ Therefore, due to the subjectivity and difficulty of identifying indicative errors, indicative errors were not the basis for grouping the biblical-DSS.

Sixth, this dissertation did not prioritize unique readings contrary to Emanuel Tov.⁵⁰ Whereas some scholars group the biblical-DSS into text-types based on qualitative differences shared amongst texts (i.e., indicative errors), Tov groups the biblical-DSS as texts based on quantitative differences.⁵¹ Tov’s emphasis on the quantitative difference between texts is motivated by the opinion that all aspects of a scroll must be considered when grouping the biblical-DSS, especially unique readings.⁵² Tov’s focus on unique readings coincided with a shift away from analyzing the biblical-DSS according to text-types to organizing them as simply texts or sources. This approach leads to the inevitable conclusion that the OT of the Second Temple period is characterized by “textual multiplicity displaying an unlimited number of texts.”⁵³ However, as Chiesa points out, “It is only obvious, nay, tautological to say that any textual source represents – from the point of view of the content—a given text.”⁵⁴ Thus, Tov’s reductionist approach to grouping the biblical-DSS into texts and his insistence on unique readings as a key factor in grouping the biblical-DSS does not address the central question: can the non-aligned

⁴⁹ Tov, “Groups of Biblical Texts Found at Qumran,” 98.

⁵⁰See Emanuel Tov, “A Modern Textual Outlook Based on the Qumran Scrolls,” *Hebrew Union College Annual* 53 (1982): 20. Contrary to Emanuel Tov, many others do not understand unique readings as indicative of a text’s textual tradition. See Hendel, *Steps to a New Edition of the Hebrew Bible*, 134-35; and Chiesa, “Textual History and Textual Criticism,” 267.

⁵¹ Tov, “A Modern Textual Outlook,” 20.

⁵² Ibid.

⁵³ Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 159.

⁵⁴ Chiesa, “Textual History and Textual Criticism,” 266.

texts have derived from scribal transmission?⁵⁵

Furthermore, although a unique reading may theoretically depict a text's independent status (Tov), it is more likely that unique readings derive from the process of scribal transmission. The tedious nature of copying manuscripts, especially in a pre-modern era, makes scribal errors a real phenomenon. Furthermore, any translator of the OT must accomplish two things if they are to represent faithfully the text before them. First, they must accurately determine the meaning of the ancient document. Second, they must appropriately communicate the OT in the target language. Balancing between these two principles leads to a spectrum of translation (and transmission) philosophies.⁵⁶ Since scribal errors and a scribe's translation/transmission philosophy are more likely reasons for the presence of unique readings, unique readings do not provide a reliable criterion for dividing the biblical-DSS into textual groups.⁵⁷ Thus, Tov's insistence that scholars have an open mind about classifying a text as non-aligned is not adopted in this dissertation.⁵⁸ Rather the presupposition maintained throughout this dissertation is that of John Wevers: "One must begin with a prejudice towards the text which we actually have."⁵⁹ In other words, "It only seems right to begin with the consonantal text of MT, and to accept change only

⁵⁵ Chiesa, "Textual History and Textual Criticism," 265-66.

⁵⁶ In Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Exodus*, vii, the first principle Wevers discusses is translation technique.

⁵⁷ See Gentry's comments about unique readings in Gentry, "The Text of the Old Testament," 36. His discussion relies on the observations of Chiesa, "Textual History and Textual Criticism," 272. See also Hendel's comments about unique readings in Hendel, *Steps to a New Edition of the Hebrew Bible*, 134-35. Yeshayahu Maori discusses significant variants that are also unique, in Yeshayahu Maori, "The Text of the Hebrew Bible in Rabbinic Writings in the Light of the Qumran Evidence," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research*, ed. Devorah Dimant and Uriel Rappaport, Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 10 (New York: Brill, 1992), 286. He argues here that these variants likely derive from "free play of the *derashah* or inaccurate citation by the copyist."

⁵⁸ Tov, "A Modern Textual Outlook," 22.

⁵⁹ John William Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Genesis* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993), xiii.

after all other avenues of understanding have been explored.”⁶⁰ Within this framework, unique readings are most often attributed to the scribal process. If the unique reading represents a synonymous form, then the form was categorized as a category 1 variant. If it represents a slight change in meaning, it was categorized as a category 2 variant. If it represents a drastic change in meaning and cannot be reasonably derived from the MT, it was classified as a category 3 variant. However, since unique variants are more likely the result of the scribal process, and not indicative of the manuscript’s textual tradition, category 3 variants that are also unique will be less persuasive in grouping the textual tradition of a manuscript.

Seventh, contrary to Armin Lange, the presence of category 2 variants does not indicate that a text reflects a tradition besides the Masoretic tradition. Lange argues that the harmonizations of 4Q41 (4QDeutⁿ) (namely, the inclusion of the reason for the Sabbath command given in Exodus in a Deuteronomy document) “demonstrate how a new text branched off of a textual tradition that was close to the medieval Masoretic text, i.e., how a new text developed and added to the textual plurality of the Second Temple period.”⁶¹ Lange further argues, “Whether liturgically motivated or not, in the end, the harmonizations of 4QDeutⁿ created yet another text of the book of Deuteronomy or – to be more precise – of parts of it.”⁶² Lange’s insistence in grouping the biblical-DSS into texts, not text-types, leads him to identify 4Q41 as non-aligned: as a text branched off of the Masoretic tradition. However, this goal is tautological and does not address the real question when grouping texts.⁶³ Differences like harmonizations derive from the scribal

⁶⁰ Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Genesis*, xiii..

⁶¹ Lange, “Ancient and Late Ancient Hebrew and Aramaic Jewish Texts,” 131. See further comments in Lange, “Textual Plurality,” 84-88.

⁶² Lange, “Textual Plurality,” 88.

⁶³ Chiesa, “Textual History and Textual Criticism,” 266.

process and thus do not reflect divergent textual traditions.⁶⁴

Emanuel Tov draws similar conclusions concerning 1QIsa^a.⁶⁵ Tov compares sections of 1QIsa^a to the MT and graphically groups the variants into three groups: orthographic variants are denoted in green, variants concerning linguistic details are denoted mainly in blue, and other differences are denoted in red.⁶⁶ Based on his three categories, Tov argues that 1QIsa^a was probably copied from a text close to MT,⁶⁷ but identifies 1QIsa^a as textually non-aligned.⁶⁸ Unlike Tov and Lange, if a text can reasonably be described as deriving from the MT, then it will be grouped within the Masoretic tradition.

History of Research

This brief history of research traces how scholars have categorized the biblical texts from Qumran. This overview considers the concept of vulgar texts, the local text theory, and Talmon's framework of textual diversity and group-texts. Following this summary, the work of Emanuel Tov is surveyed. Last, alternate proposals to Tov's are described.

Initial Frameworks Concerning the Categorization of the Biblical-DSS

The first generation of Qumran scholars developed three frameworks to account

⁶⁴ Davila, "Text-Type and Terminology," 37, argues that the pre-redactional state of the Samaritan Pentateuch should be compared to the MT to determine the relationship between these two texts.

⁶⁵ Tov, "A Didactic and Gradual Approach," 3:303-5. The samples discussed in this chapter can be found at Emanuel Tov, "Samples," accessed April 24, 2017, <https://www.sbl-site.org/assets/pdfs/pubs/DSS/Tov.pdf>.

⁶⁶ Tov, "A Didactic and Gradual Approach," 3:304.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, 3:305.

⁶⁸ See Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 333. Interestingly, Tov does not group this text as non-aligned in Tov, "A Didactic and Gradual Approach." Rather, he places it under a heading title "Texts Differing from MT Mainly in Orthography and Morphology." *Ibid.*, 303.

for the diversity of texts found during the Second Temple period: vulgar text, the Local Text Theory, and Textual Diversity Theory.

Vulgar text. Although Lieberman did not comment on the biblical-DSS directly, he did divide the types of OT texts into three categories. These categories were (1) the school copies used for children—the φαυλότερα; (2) the κοινά, *vulgata*, or popular texts identified as the common texts; and finally, (3) the temple scrolls identified by Lieberman as the ήκριβωμένα.⁶⁹ Lieberman cites Rabbi ‘Akiba’s plea to his student, Rabbi Simeon, as proof of the φαυλότερα type (b. Peshaim 112a).⁷⁰ An example of a *vulgata* text is the Severus Scroll since it used medial and final *mem* interchangeably, was written in a different script, and its number of verses did not correspond to the number given the *baraita* of b. Kiddushin 30a.⁷¹ Lieberman identifies the standard text as the text deposited in the archives of the temple (m. Kelim 15:6).⁷²

Like Lieberman, Edward Kutscher differentiated popular texts from a standard text, but unlike Lieberman, he worked directly with the biblical-DSS. Whereas popular texts were used for study, the home, and probably even the Synagogue, the standard text was carefully preserved in the Temple and in the Synagogues.⁷³ Kutscher identified the MT as the standard text and 1QIsa^a as a popular text.⁷⁴ Kutscher reasoned that popular

⁶⁹ Saul Lieberman, *Hellenism in Jewish Palestine; Studies in the Literary Transmission, Beliefs and Manners of Palestine in the I Century B.C.E.-IV Century C.E.* (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1950), 22-26.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, 26. Here Rabbi ‘Akiba implores Rabbi Simeon that he should teach his son from a revised copy.

⁷¹ Lieberman, *Hellenism in Jewish Palestine*, 23-24.

⁷² *Ibid.*, 22.

⁷³ Edward Yechezkel Kutscher, *The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll (I Q Isa^a)* (Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 1974), 78.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, 79.

texts derive from the MT and became corrupt because of neglecting to correct them with the standard text.⁷⁵

The local text theory. William Albright categorized the DSS into three separate recensions: one from Babylon, Palestine, and Egypt. According to Albright, the most surprising feature of Qumran is that most of the scrolls preserve a consonantal text virtually indistinguishable from the MT (Babylonian Recension).⁷⁶ Less surprising is the discovery of texts that more closely align with the LXX (Egyptian Recension).⁷⁷ Variant readings and inferior texts are explained by geographical distance according to Albright.⁷⁸ Thus, Albright divided the texts from Qumran into three textual families that developed in isolation from one another.

Cross, likewise, described the Second Temple period as an era when local texts prevailed.⁷⁹ Cross summarized the evidence from Qumran with three observations: “The plurality of text-types, the limited number of distinct textual families, and the homogeneity of each of these textual families over several centuries of time.”⁸⁰ In the Pentateuch and the Former Prophets, texts from only three families existed at Qumran while only two families existed for the Latter Prophets.⁸¹ The textual families prevalent at Qumran include a Palestinian text represented by an early form which stood close to the *Vorlage* of the

⁷⁵ Kutscher, *The Language and Linguistic Background*, 79.

⁷⁶ William Albright, “New Light on Early Recensions of the Hebrew Bible,” *Bulletin of The American Schools of Oriental Research* 140, no. 4 (1955): 28.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, 29.

⁷⁸ See his discussion of 1QIsa^a and 1QIsa^b in *ibid.*, 29-30.

⁷⁹ Frank Moore Cross, “The History of the Biblical Text in the Light of Discoveries in the Judaean Desert,” in Cross and Talmon, *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text*, 182.

⁸⁰ Frank Cross, “The Contribution of the Qumrân Discoveries to the Study of the Biblical Text,” in Cross and Talmon, *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text*, 282.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, 281.

Septuagint and the proto-Samaritan form,⁸² an Egyptian text that corresponded to the LXX,⁸³ and a Babylonian text that corresponded to the Pentateuch and former prophets of the MT.⁸⁴ Like Albright, Cross argued that the texts from Qumran belonged to three textual families, no more. Unlike Albright, Cross specifies that these three textual families are not recensions but are the product of natural growth or development in scribal transmission.⁸⁵

David Gooding reasons that Cross's categorization is too imprecise.⁸⁶ Specifically, Gooding asserts that Cross at times distinguishes a text-type from a text-family, but at other times, he uses these terms interchangeably.⁸⁷ Ulrich agrees with Gooding that the terminology used by Cross could be more precise, but he defends Cross by arguing that the imprecise nature of data forbids the level of precision Gooding desired.⁸⁸ Cross revised his categorization of the biblical-DSS in *From Epic to Canon*, possibly per Gooding's critique. On the one hand, Cross said in 1975, that the biblical-DSS alluded to "the plurality of text-types, the limited number of distinct textual families, and the homogeneity of each of these textual families over several centuries of time."⁸⁹ On the other hand, in 1998, he argues that the DSS alluded to "the plurality of text-types or families, the limited number of distinct textual families, and the relative homogeneity

⁸² Cross, "The Contribution of the Qumrân Discoveries," 285.

⁸³ *Ibid.*, 284.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, 286-87, 291.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, 282n21.

⁸⁶ D. W. Gooding, "Appeal for a Stricter Terminology in the Textual Criticism of the Old Testament," *Journal of Semitic Studies* 21, nos. 1-2 (1976): 15-25.

⁸⁷ Gooding, "Appeal for a Stricter Terminology," 16-17.

⁸⁸ Eugene Ulrich, "Horizons of Old Testament Textual Research at the Thirtieth Anniversary of Qumran Cave 4," *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 46, no. 4 (October 1984): 622-23.

⁸⁹ Cross, "The Contribution of the Qumrân Discoveries," 282.

of each of these textual families over several centuries of time.”⁹⁰ Thus, Cross understood the biblical-DSS to be grouped into three recensions.

Textual diversity theory. Talmon expressed two reservations concerning Cross’s theory. First, Cross argued that each text-type derived from a fifth century BC proto-Hebrew text which is nearly five hundred years earlier than Lagarde’s *Urtext* or Rosenmüller’s *Ur-rezension*.⁹¹ Second, the three-local text theory does not explain why a plurality of text forms existed in a restricted area and time during the pre-Christian era.⁹² Talmon summarizes his understanding of the nature of the texts at Qumran:

It appears that the extant text-types must be viewed as the remains of a yet more variegated transmission of the Bible text in the preceding centuries, rather than as witnesses to solely three archetypes. The more ancient manuscripts are being discovered and published, the more textual divergences appear.

Thus, contrary to Cross, Talmon understood the biblical-DSS as alluding to more diversity than the three-local text theory.

Despite Talmon’s hesitation about the local text theory, his theory of the OT text in the Second Temple period can be characterized as group specific. Before the pre-Christian era, Talmon asserted that sociologically definable groups adopted texts as their standard text form.⁹³ The synagogue, the Samaritan community, and the church all adopted *Gruppentext* (text groups). In short, Talmon’s view is characterized by textual chaos while being group specific.⁹⁴ Group specific texts emerged after a period of textual chaos.⁹⁵ Here he echoes Kahle’s sentiment that a standard text is never found at the

⁹⁰ Frank Cross, *From Epic to Canon: History and Literature in Ancient Israel* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998), 211.

⁹¹ Talmon, “The Textual Study of the Bible,” 325.

⁹² *Ibid.*

⁹³ *Ibid.*

⁹⁴ Lange, “Textual Plurality,” 45.

⁹⁵ Talmon also asserts that other deviant Jewish communities may have also selected a

beginning of the process of transmission, but at the end.⁹⁶

The Categorization of the Biblical-DSS by Emanuel Tov

Although many principles articulated by Lieberman, Kutscher, Albright, Cross, and Talmon are still relevant today, their theories have largely been replaced by the framework proposed by Tov.⁹⁷ In many ways, Tov's model for grouping the biblical-DSS is a modern approach to textual criticism as indicated by the title of his 1982 article, "A Modern Textual Outlook Based on the Qumran Scrolls."⁹⁸ First, Tov categorized the DSS, not according to geographical origins, but based on the text's textual character.⁹⁹ This starting point led Tov to describe each biblical-DSS according to that text's agreement with the MT, LXX, and the Samaritan Pentateuch. However, Tov discovered that many of the texts did not align with MT, LXX, and the Samaritan Pentateuch. Thus, he developed a fourth category: the non-aligned texts.¹⁰⁰

Second, Tov's non-aligned category represents a further division between him and Cross since Cross asserted that all the biblical-DSS belong to three text-types at most

Gruppentext that is now no longer available because their heritage may have simply disappeared or have been suppressed. Talmon, "The Textual Study of the Bible," 326.

⁹⁶ Paul Kahle and Mahmoud Saba, "The Cairo Geniza" (Schweich Lectures, Oxford, 1947), 175.

⁹⁷ For a discussion of how modern theories have incorporated the thoughts of Cross, Albright, and Talmon, see Ulrich, "Pluriformity in the Biblical Text, Text Groups, and Questions of Canon," 25-29.

⁹⁸ Tov, "A Modern Textual Outlook."

⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, 19-20. See also Tov's discussion of the biblical DSS in Tov, "The Biblical Texts from the Judaean Desert," 152-57.

¹⁰⁰ For a text to be classified as non-aligned, it must be inconsistent in its agreement with the MT, LXX, and Samaritan Pentateuch, and it must possess unique readings. See Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 159.

and none of these text-types were previously unknown.¹⁰¹ Tov's non-aligned category represents a significant break from Cross's stance.

Third, Tov's insistence on categorizing a text according to its textual character led him to disagree with Cross concerning his terminology. On the one hand, Cross understood the biblical-DSS as divided into three text-types. On the other hand, Tov argued that the biblical-DSS are better described in terms of texts or sources, not text-types.¹⁰² Thus, not only did Emanuel Tov largely reject Cross's term *text-type* in favor of the term *text*, he also counters Cross's claim that Qumran confirms the existence of three text-types. Tov states, "The textual reality of the Qumran texts does not attest to three groups of textual witnesses, but rather to a textual multiplicity displaying an unlimited number of texts."¹⁰³

Fourth, Tov's methodology is further distinguished on methodological grounds from many OT text critics such as Chiesa,¹⁰⁴ Gentry,¹⁰⁵ and Hendel¹⁰⁶ since he does not group the biblical-DSS based on indicative errors. Tov recognizes this and rightly labels his approach as a new approach.¹⁰⁷ Tov argued that if two texts share indicative errors, then a close relationship is possible, but the fragmentary nature of the biblical-DSS and the subjective nature of identifying an error as an indicative error prohibits these types of

¹⁰¹ See Cross, "The Contribution of the Qumrân Discoveries," 281.

¹⁰² Although Tov believes that the term *text* better represents many of the biblical-DSS, he maintained the term *text-type* when describing those texts that he labels proto-MT, LXX *Vorlage*, and pre-Samaritan. See Eugene Ulrich, "Textual History of the Hebrew Bible: Post Qumran Theories," in Lange and Tov, *Textual History of the Bible*, 1a:11. See also Tov's comments that one can recognize among the biblical-DSS two or more clusters in Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 158.

¹⁰³ Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 159.

¹⁰⁴ Chiesa, "Textual History and Textual Criticism," 266-67.

¹⁰⁵ Gentry, "The Text of the Old Testament," 35.

¹⁰⁶ Hendel, *Steps to a New Edition of the Hebrew Bible*, 134.

¹⁰⁷ Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 158-60.

errors from being the criterion for dividing the biblical-DSS.¹⁰⁸ Tov explains, “These judgments [indicative errors] should not be used, in my view, when the overall relation between texts is determined.”¹⁰⁹ Thus, Tov’s new approach to grouping the biblical-DSS breaks from the traditional approach in terms of terminology (he favors the term *text* as opposed to *text-type*) and methodology (he rejects indicative errors as the basis for grouping the biblical-DSS in favor of analyzing the biblical-DSS in light of all aspects of a text, especially unique readings).¹¹⁰

Tov’s new approach to classifying the biblical-DSS originally depended on five principles. He argues,

[1] Questionable attributions to textual groups are counted as regular ones. . . .
[2] In accord with statistical probability, texts which are equally close to MT and SP in the Torah and to MT and the LXX in other books are counted as MT. . . . [3] Texts written in Qumran practice are not included separately in the statistic, since these texts are already counted in other groups in accord with their textual affiliation. . . . Texts which are characterized as both ‘independent’ and close to the LXX or the SP are counted as “independent.” . . . [5] Since the texts like the SP are not evidenced for books other than the Torah, statistics for the Torah are separated from those of the other books, but they are rather similar.¹¹¹

Tov’s categories and principles have not been monolithic, but have undergone at least four developments since 1992. First, the current division of the DSS into four categories is a revision of his original categorization. Originally, Tov divided texts written in a scribal practice that exhibited unique peculiarities in orthography, morphology, and scribal features into a fifth category labeled Qumran Scribal Practice (QSP).¹¹² He no longer sub-categorizes these texts into a separate textual group.

¹⁰⁸ Tov, “Groups of Biblical Texts Found at Qumran,” 89.

¹⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, 98.

¹¹⁰ Tov, “A Modern Textual Outlook,” 20.

¹¹¹ Tov, “The Biblical Texts from the Judaean Desert,” 153.

¹¹² Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 261. The fact that Tov no longer classifies those texts written in QSP as a separate group is evident in his third principle listed in Tov, “The Biblical Texts from the Judaean Desert,” 153.

Second, Tov's opinion about which texts belong in the non-aligned category and the proto-MT category has changed over time.¹¹³ On the one hand, whereas only 10 percent of the biblical-DSS were categorized as non-aligned in 1992, now Tov classifies 35 percent of the texts as non-aligned.¹¹⁴ On the other hand, the MT texts have decreased from 60 percent of the overall texts in 1992, to 35 percent of the texts.¹¹⁵

Third, Tov has subdivided the proto-MT category into two sub-categories: an inner circle and outer circle of texts.¹¹⁶ The inner-circle of rabbinic texts exist at other Judean Desert sites besides Qumran, especially Murabba'at. These texts align precisely with Leningrad (L) while the proto-MT texts from Qumran align with L less precisely.¹¹⁷

Fourth, Tov now uses the terms *proto-MT* and *proto-Rabbinic* interchangeably to describe the category of texts from Qumran that align with the MT. Lange argued that Tov now prefers the term *proto-Rabbinic* instead of the term *proto-MT*.¹¹⁸ Nonetheless, in work dating back to 2002, Tov uses these words interchangeably to describe the texts from Qumran that align with the MT.¹¹⁹

¹¹³ Lange depicts this change well in Lange, "Textual Plurality," 49.

¹¹⁴ See also Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 332-35, where he categorizes 57 texts (38.77 percent of the biblical-DSS) as non-aligned.

¹¹⁵ Lange, "Textual Plurality," 49.

¹¹⁶ Emanuel Tov, "The Text of the Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek Bible Used in the Ancient Synagogues," in *Hebrew Bible, Greek Bible and Qumran: Collected Essays*, Texte und Studien Zum Antiken Judentum 121 (Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 176.

¹¹⁷ Ibid.

¹¹⁸ Lange, "Textual Plurality," 50. However, he still uses the term *proto-MT* to describe this category of texts from Qumran.

¹¹⁹ Tov used these words interchangeably in 2002, in Tov, "The Biblical Texts from the Judaean Desert," 154. He, likewise, refers to the category as proto-MT in 2012, in Emanuel Tov, "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Textual History of the Masoretic Bible," in Dávid et al., *The Hebrew Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 45.

Thus, Tov's approach represents a shift on both terminological and methodological grounds. Concerning terminology, Tov's divides the biblical-DSS into texts, not text-types. Any disagreement from a specific text, whether the text is the MT, Samaritan Pentateuch, or LXX, is important for grouping the biblical-DSS because the goal is not to group them into three separate text-types, but to group them into texts. Unique readings, unimportant for grouping texts in the traditional approach because their goal is to group texts into text-types (unique readings are not shared so they are not valuable for dividing texts into groups), are vital for Tov's approach. This trajectory led to the formulation of the non-aligned category and the statement that "the textual reality of the Qumran texts does not attest to three groups of textual witnesses, but rather to a textual multiplicity displaying an unlimited number of texts."¹²⁰ Concerning methodology, Tov's approach represents another break. His framework does not weight one type of variant as more significant for textual grouping, but understands them all as significant for grouping the biblical-DSS into groups. This approach again is shaped by his desire to group the biblical-DSS, not into text-types, but into texts.

Alternate Proposals to Tov

The impact of the proposal of Emanuel Tov cannot be underestimated in the field of OT textual criticism. Despite this influence, many have critiqued various aspects of Tov's theory or proposed entirely different frameworks for grouping the biblical-DSS.

Armin Lange. Armin Lange adopts the model proposed by Tov for classifying the biblical-DSS with slight modification.¹²¹ First, he establishes a statistical threshold for categorizing a text as either proto-MT (Tov's inner Rabbinic circle) or semi-MT

¹²⁰ Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 159.

¹²¹ Armin Lange, *Handbuch der Textfunde vom Toten Meer Bd. 1. Bd. 1. Die Handschriften biblischer Bücher von Qumran und den anderen Fundorten* (Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 2009), 15.

(Tov's outer Rabbinic circle). If a text differs from the MT more than 2 percent, the text is labeled semi-MT, not proto-MT.¹²² Second, like Ulrich, Lange also critiques Tov's second principle for grouping the biblical-DSS. Tov's principles is that "in accord with statistical probability, texts which are equally close to MT and SP in the Torah and to MT and the LXX in other books are counted as MT."¹²³ Considering this principle, Lange adds a fifth category to Tov's grid: those texts that equally agree with the Samaritan Pentateuch and the MT.¹²⁴ Third, he understands texts with less than 100 words as problematic to categorize because of their deteriorated status.¹²⁵ The nature of these texts is enigmatic. They might represent a quotation in a para-biblical source rather than a biblical text.¹²⁶ Thus, Lange's model for analyzing the biblical-DSS derived from Tov with slight modifications.

Lange's methodology is evident in his chapter "The Severus Scroll Variant List in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls."¹²⁷ Lange argues in this chapter that the Severus Scroll is "an average proto-Masoretic Torah scroll from the Second Temple period, and not a vulgar text."¹²⁸ His methodology is twofold. First, he divides the variants into two

¹²² Lange, "Textual Plurality," 53-54.

¹²³ Tov, "The Biblical Texts from the Judaean Desert," 153.

¹²⁴ Lange, "Textual Plurality," 54.

¹²⁵ Ibid.

¹²⁶ Ibid.

¹²⁷ I am thankful to Ruth Clements for informing me about this resource. Armin Lange, "The Severus Scroll Variant List in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Tradition, Transmission, and Transformation from Second Temple Literature through Judaism and Christianity in Late Antiquity: Proceedings of the Thirteenth 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, 22-24 February, 2011*, ed. Menahem Kister et al., Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 113 (Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 2015), 178-207.

¹²⁸ Ibid., 201. Among those who argue that the Severus Scroll was a vulgar text, see Lieberman, *Hellenism in Jewish Palestine*, 23-24. For others see Lange, "The Severus Scroll Variant List," 183.

groups: group 1 consists of orthographic, phonetic, and paleographic variants¹²⁹ and group 2 consists of textual variants divided into scribal errors, textual harmonizations, and original readings.¹³⁰ After dividing the variants, he makes conclusions about the textual nature of the Severus Scroll. He argues that the Severus Scroll is more properly identified as a proto-MT text, not a vulgar text because of its high statistical agreement with the MT in both orthographic and textual variants.¹³¹

Bruno Chiesa. Unlike Lange, Bruno Chiesa severely critiques Tov's terminology and methodology.¹³² First, Chiesa critiques Tov's historical reconstruction that the OT text existed in an unlimited amount of forms prior to and during Qumran.¹³³ Chiesa argues that the discovery of more texts will inevitably lead to the discovery of more textual variants.¹³⁴ This fact does not mean that the text at Qumran existed in a state of unlimited plurality.¹³⁵ Rather, the job of the textual critic is to determine the connections between the texts and choose between the readings the most original form.¹³⁶ Chiesa argues that Tov has not done this; Tov has only described the texts, and as a result, obscures the evidence.¹³⁷ Thus, Chiesa is not persuaded that the discovery of the biblical-DSS necessitates new definitions of the principal terms (Tov's replacement of text-type

¹²⁹ Lange, "The Severus Scroll Variant List," 186-94.

¹³⁰ *Ibid.*, 195-98.

¹³¹ *Ibid.*, 202.

¹³² Chiesa, "Textual History and Textual Criticism."

¹³³ *Ibid.*, 258.

¹³⁴ Chiesa, "Textual History and Textual Criticism," 264.

¹³⁵ *Ibid.*, 265.

¹³⁶ *Ibid.*, 264.

¹³⁷ *Ibid.*, 264-65.

with texts) and criteria adopted in textual criticism (Tov's insistence on unique readings as a criterion of grouping texts and his rejection of indicative errors as essential for grouping texts).¹³⁸

Second, Chiesa critiques Tov's new methodology. Chiesa argues that Tov's insistence on replacing the term *text-type* with *text* is tautological.¹³⁹ Furthermore, relationships between manuscripts depend on shared corrupted readings, not on unique readings, unintentional errors, and common errors.¹⁴⁰ Chiesa upholds the traditional view and argues that by means of textual criticism, scholars can "arrive at *one* Text, despite any plurality of texts."¹⁴¹

Eugene Ulrich. Ulrich argues that Tov's minimalist, reductionist view of text-types is unhelpful.¹⁴² Rather than employing the term *text* to describe the biblical-DSS, Ulrich proposes a more complex system of categorization that divides texts into text families, text types, text tradition, and text groups.¹⁴³ A text family is the narrowest classification of texts in Ulrich's classification. He argues that a text family is "a relatively small set of MSS that display close agreement in idiosyncratic or unique readings which are secondary (e.g., errors, distinctive additions, etc.)."¹⁴⁴ The criterion for this category is that the texts somewhat agree on minor variants.¹⁴⁵ Texts are divided into different text-

¹³⁸ Chiesa, "Textual History and Textual Criticism," 265.

¹³⁹ *Ibid.*, 266.

¹⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 266-69.

¹⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 272.

¹⁴² Ulrich, "Pluriformity in the Biblical Text, Text Groups, and Questions of Canon," 29. However, Ulrich appears more convinced in Ulrich, "Textual History of the Hebrew Bible," 11.

¹⁴³ Ulrich, "Pluriformity in the Biblical Text, Text Groups, and Questions of Canon," 38.

¹⁴⁴ *Ibid.*

¹⁴⁵ Eugene Ulrich, "Two Perspectives on Two Pentateuchal Manuscripts from Masada," in *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov*, ed.

families when they display more disagreements.¹⁴⁶ The text type category is broader than the text family category. He defines a text type as “a relatively large set of MSS which display general agreement despite differences in detail, but where the emphasis is affiliation.”¹⁴⁷ The text type category is a synchronic label, per Ulrich, while the label text tradition is the analogous diachronic label.¹⁴⁸ Various literary editions would represent distinct text types or text traditions per Ulrich.¹⁴⁹ Like the text type category, the text tradition category is also broader than the text family category. A text tradition is “a relatively large set of MSS that displays general agreement despite differences in details, but where the emphasis is on the development or history of a text.”¹⁵⁰ Last, the text group category is the broadest category. He defines *text group* as “a general term that covers any or all the above when speaking generally or when the evidence is insufficient to use the other terms.”¹⁵¹ A text should be classified as an independent text if the text shares a large amount of disagreements with texts from the same passage.¹⁵² Thus, Ulrich, contrary to Tov who proposes that the biblical-DSS be described simply as texts, proposes alternate terms.

Ulrich further critiques Tov’s methodology. He argues that Tov’s categorization of the biblical-DSS imprecisely represents the MSS from the Second Temple since it relies

Shalom M. Paul et al., *Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 94* (Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 2003), 461.

¹⁴⁶ Ulrich, “Two Perspectives on Two Pentateuchal Manuscripts,” 461.

¹⁴⁷ Ulrich, “Pluriformity in the Biblical Text, Text Groups, and Questions of Canon,” 38.

¹⁴⁸ Ulrich, “Two Perspectives on Two Pentateuchal Manuscripts,” 461.

¹⁴⁹ *Ibid.*

¹⁵⁰ Ulrich, “Pluriformity in the Biblical Text, Text Groups, and Questions of Canon,” 38.

¹⁵¹ *Ibid.*

¹⁵² *Ibid.*, 39.

too heavily on the MT.¹⁵³ Ulrich proposes that the situation as it existed in the Second Temple period ought to be the basis for categorizing the biblical-DSS: “How would the people who were producing or hearing or reading the texts have described them? What were the operative categories, classifications, and worldview with which they were working?”¹⁵⁴ The categories operative in Second Temple Judaism would have been the biblical-DSS, Samaritan-Pentateuch, LXX, the text of Josephus, and the text of the NT.¹⁵⁵ Ulrich sees this perspective as a more accurate description from the standpoint of the Second Temple period.¹⁵⁶

Ulrich further questions Tov’s methodology by critiquing one of Tov’s basic underlying principles for grouping the biblical-DSS. Whereas Tov argues that “in accord with statistical probability, texts which are equally close to MT and SP in the Torah and to MT and the LXX in other books are counted as MT,”¹⁵⁷ Ulrich argues that it would be equally acceptable to label these texts proto-Samaritan Pentateuch or *LXX-Vorlage*.¹⁵⁸ Thus, like Chiesa, Ulrich has critiqued Tov’s terminology and methodology.

Sidnie Crawford. Sidnie Crawford proposes a methodology very different from that of Tov. Instead of grouping the biblical-DSS according to its agreement with the MT, Samaritan Pentateuch, and LXX, Crawford proposes that the biblical-DSS be grouped according to the scribal approach represented in each text. These approaches are a

¹⁵³ See Ulrich, “Two Perspectives on Two Pentateuchal Manuscripts.” The MSS discussed here are not the biblical DSS, but MSS from Masada.

¹⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 456.

¹⁵⁵ Eugene Ulrich, “Qumran Biblical Scrolls—The Scriptures of Late Second Temple Judaism,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Their Historical Context*, ed. Timothy H. Lim et al. (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2000), 87.

¹⁵⁶ Ulrich, “Two Perspectives on Two Pentateuchal Manuscripts,” 457.

¹⁵⁷ Tov, “The Biblical Texts from the Judaean Desert,” 153.

¹⁵⁸ Ulrich, “Two Perspectives on Two Pentateuchal Manuscripts,” 457.

conservative and a revisionist approach.¹⁵⁹ Crawford is not the first scholar to recognize that scribes of the Second Temple approached their text in one of two ways. Patrick Skehan,¹⁶⁰ James Sanders,¹⁶¹ Eugene Ulrich,¹⁶² Emanuel Tov,¹⁶³ Arie van der Kooij,¹⁶⁴ and Peter Gentry¹⁶⁵ are a sampling of scholars who have recognized the phenomenon that some scribes approached the text with a free approach while others approached with a more conservative approach. However, she is the first to propose that categorization of texts be based on these two approaches. According to Crawford, the benefit of this approach is that it focuses on the beginning of the transmission process, not the end.¹⁶⁶ She emphatically concludes that this shift will release scholarship from the tyranny of the MT, LXX, and Samaritan Pentateuch.¹⁶⁷

Crawford's focus on the beginning of the transmission process leads to disagreement concerning Tov's terminology. She critiques Tov for grouping texts as proto-MT because the MT does not even constitute a textual family; namely, the entire

¹⁵⁹ Crawford, "Understanding the Textual History," 67. See also Sidnie White Crawford, "Interpreting the Pentateuch through Scribal Processes: The Evidence from the Qumran Manuscripts," in *Insights into Editing in the Hebrew Bible and the Ancient Near East: What Does Documented Evidence Tell Us about the Transmission of Authoritative Texts?*, ed. Reinhard Müller and Juha, Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology 84 (Leuven, Belgium: Peeters, 2017), 59-80.

¹⁶⁰ See Patrick Skehan, who alludes to this tendency in Patrick W. Skehan, "The Biblical Scrolls from Qumran and the Text of the Old Testament," *The Biblical Archaeologist* 28, no. 3 (1965): 99.

¹⁶¹ See James A. Sanders, *Canon and Community: A Guide to Canonical Criticism* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984), 22.

¹⁶² Eugene Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans; Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 1999), 11.

¹⁶³ See Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 184-85.

¹⁶⁴ Kooij, "Preservation and Promulgation," 29.

¹⁶⁵ Peter J. Gentry, "The Septuagint and the Text of the Old Testament," *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 16, no. 2 (2006): 215-16. See also Gentry, "The Text of the Old Testament," 33.

¹⁶⁶ Crawford, "Understanding the Textual History," 69.

¹⁶⁷ *Ibid.*

corpus does not share textual characteristics.¹⁶⁸ On the one hand, the Torah reflects the conservative approach to transmission. On the other hand, Jeremiah and Ezekiel reflect the free approach to copying.¹⁶⁹ She asserts that the MT did not exist at the beginning of the process of textual transmission, but only toward the end.¹⁷⁰ Thus, she dismisses the term *proto-MT* as an appropriate label for the biblical-DSS in favor of the labels *conservative scribal approach* and *revisionist scribal tradition*.¹⁷¹

Crawford is likewise unsatisfied with Tov's term *pre-Samaritan*. She reasons that the term *pre-Samaritan* "implies that the Samaritan Pentateuch is the model or chief exemplar of this group, when in reality it is simply one exemplar among many." Rather than labeling these texts as pre-Samaritan, she proposes that the texts be labeled "harmonistic/expansive."¹⁷² Thus, Crawford's proposal for grouping the texts from Qumran depends on the scribal approach of the scribe, not the text's general agreement with the MT, LXX, or Samaritan Pentateuch.

James Davila. James Davila differs from Tov regarding terminology and method. With regard to methodology, he maintains that the biblical-DSS from Genesis

¹⁶⁸ Crawford, "Understanding the Textual History," 67. See also similar comments of Barthélemy about the MT in Barthélemy, United Bible Societies, and Committee of the Hebrew Old Testament Text Project, *Studies in the Text of the Old Testament*, 140.

¹⁶⁹ Crawford, "Understanding the Textual History," 67. Her underlying assumption in categorizing the biblical-DSS is that the shorter text reflects the conservative approach while the longer text reflects the free approach.

¹⁷⁰ Ibid. This opinion is shared by Ulrich, "The Bible in the Making," 66.

¹⁷¹ Crawford, "Understanding the Textual History," 68.

¹⁷² Sidnie Crawford, "The Pentateuch as Found in the Pre-Samaritan Texts and 4QReworked Pentateuch," in *Changes in Scripture: Rewriting and Interpreting Authoritative Traditions in the Second Temple Period*, ed. Hanne von Weissenberg, Juha Pakkala, and Marko Marttila, Beihefte Zur Zeitschrift Für Die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 419 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2011), 125. Crawford states that this expansive tradition was probably handed down by the priests in Jerusalem—possibly even the temple—since they had the job of handing down the writing tradition. Ibid., 129-30.

and Exodus can be divided into only two text-types.¹⁷³ His methodology is influenced by Gooding's paper "An Appeal for Stricter Terminology in the Textual Criticism of the Old Testament," and is further influenced by the terminology outlined by Colwell in *Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament*.¹⁷⁴ However, Colwell's criteria for grouping NT texts cannot be applied directly to OT textual criticism in Davila's mind because the NT texts preserves an abundance of textual variants whereas the OT textual witnesses point to massive deforestation of once convoluted textual groupings.¹⁷⁵ Thus, Davila modifies Colwell's criteria and develops the following methodology: First, only retroverted variants of reasonable certainty were considered for the LXX. Second, agreement in unique secondary readings were given most weight. Third, agreement in secondary readings shared with other witnesses was the next weightiest criterion. Fourth, the overall pattern of agreement over a broad range of secondary, original, and uncertain readings were considered. Fifth, both agreements and disagreements were considered. All non-orthographic variants and all the variants in the LXX that represent a different Hebrew *Vorlage* were considered.¹⁷⁶ Furthermore, Davila's study is not exhaustive, but covers a representative and randomly chosen statistically significant sample.¹⁷⁷ Davila's insistence on distinguishing secondary from original readings represents a break from Tov.

¹⁷³ Davila, "Text-Type and Terminology," 5.

¹⁷⁴ See Gooding, "Appeal for a Stricter Terminology." See also Ernest Cadman Colwell, *Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament*, New Testament Tools and Studies 9 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1969), 9-11. Colwell states that there are two criteria for establishing a text type: First, texts must share some readings that do not appear outside of the group. *Ibid.*, 10. Second, texts in the same text-type must share a large majority of total readings when the evidence is divided. *Ibid.*, 11.

¹⁷⁵ Davila, "Text-Type and Terminology," 7.

¹⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, 7-8.

¹⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, 5.

Arie van der Kooij. Arie van der Kooij's comments concerning the biblical-DSS differ radically from Tov and the consensus view. He states, "Finally, at the panel discussion in Rome (2009) I state that the biblical texts from the Dead Sea region are very interesting indeed, but not that important."¹⁷⁸ Van der Kooij believes that scribes copied the text according to one of two approaches: a conservative approach and a revisionist scribal approach.¹⁷⁹ However, unlike Crawford, van der Kooij identifies the MT as the conservative approach kept in the Temple according to the testimony of rabbinic literature, Josephus, 2 Macc 2:13-14, the Letter of Aristeas, Qumran, and the OT,¹⁸⁰ and kept by the proper authorities.¹⁸¹ In short, he states, "All in all, it is my thesis that the MT goes back to an official text kept in the temple and preserved with great care by the appropriate temple officials, the chief priests. It implies that the temple text represented a stable textual tradition."¹⁸² This approach largely resembles that of Lieberman.¹⁸³

Conclusion of Research

The history of research demonstrates that there is no standard methodology or terminology when discussing the groups of the biblical-DSS. Whereas the traditional approach to grouping texts depends on the identification of indicative errors and dismisses unique readings as irrelevant for textual criticism,¹⁸⁴ the modern approach of Tov depends on a quantitative analysis of a text considering all aspects of a scroll, especially the

¹⁷⁸ Kooij, "Preservation and Promulgation," 40.

¹⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, 29.

¹⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, 31-32.

¹⁸¹ *Ibid.*, 32-35.

¹⁸² *Ibid.*, 37.

¹⁸³ Lieberman, *Hellenism in Jewish Palestine*.

¹⁸⁴ Chiesa, "Textual History and Textual Criticism," 272.

scroll's unique readings. In addition to the traditional approach articulated by Chiesa and the modern approach articulated by Tov, other proposals have been made by Ulrich, Crawford, and Davila. Despite this lack of consensus concerning terminology and methodology, most Qumran scholars agree that the text of the OT was fluid during the Second Temple period because of the diversity of texts found at Qumran (e.g., the non-aligned texts). This consensus concerning the state of the OT text during the Second Temple period is surprising since scholars disagree about how to group the biblical-DSS on both methodological and terminological grounds.

The present lack of consensus should lead scholars to approach the biblical-DSS with great caution. However, this is not always the case. For example, Michael Law confidently asserts,

We have seen repeatedly that the Septuagint and especially the Dead Sea Scrolls offer proof that the Hebrew Bible was not fixed before the second century CE and, perhaps more surprisingly, that many readers and users of scriptural texts before then were not bothered about it.¹⁸⁵

The diversity of opinions about how to group the biblical-DSS calls both of Law's statements into question. First, do the biblical-DSS *prove* that the Hebrew Bible was not fixed before the second century CE? Second, do the biblical-DSS *prove* that Second Temple Jews possessed an attitude toward the OT identical to post-modernity—that ancient Jews are not bothered by fluidity? Law simply advocates the consensus view without first understanding that the consensus view depends on an inconsistent methodology and terminology. Furthermore, Law assumes that a diversity of reading means a standard/authoritative text could not have existed before the second century AD. However, the field has not proven this assumption. The field has only established that a diversity of readings exists in the biblical-DSS, not that this diversity entails no unity (standard/authoritative text).

¹⁸⁵ T. M. Law, *When God Spoke Greek: The Septuagint and the Making of the Christian Bible* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013), 79.

This dissertation argues that the diversity of readings found among the biblical-DSS are largely insignificant variants and do not attest to a textual tradition besides the MT (category 1 and 2 variants). The few number of category 3 variants and the overwhelming agreeing in most details with the MT indicates that these texts belonged to the Masoretic tradition. Amongst the diversity of readings is a unity that dispels the assumptions of Law.¹⁸⁶ The unity can be reasonably explained as the MT.

¹⁸⁶ Chiesa, "Textual History and Textual Criticism," 272.

CHAPTER 2

THE NON-ALIGNED TEXTS OF THE PENTATEUCH

This chapter analyzes the Pentateuch manuscripts from Qumran that Emanuel Tov identifies exclusively as non-aligned. First, each respective manuscript is introduced. Then, the text's orthographic and paleographic character is surveyed. The history of how scholars have viewed the textual tradition of each text is also surveyed. Second, the variants are listed and discussed. Whereas category 1 variants are discussed briefly and in an abbreviated manner, the nature of categories 2 and 3 variants are discussed more thoroughly. Third, three sets of statistics provide the reader with the overarching relationship between each respective Pentateuch manuscript to the MT. The first set of statistics accounts for all categories 1, 2, and 3 variants. The second set accounts for only category 2 and 3 variants. The most conservative set of statistics is the third: it only accounts for category 3 variants. Fourth, conclusions are drawn based on the nature of the variants (section 2) and based on the overarching statistical relationship (section 3). This analysis demonstrates that those Pentateuch manuscripts identified by Emanuel Tov as exclusively non-aligned can be reasonably grouped as belonging to the Masoretic tradition.

4Q10

4Q10 (4QGen^k) consists of five fragments that preserve portions of Genesis 1, 2, and 3.¹ The scribe of 4Q10 wrote in a Herodian formal hand (c.1-30 AD).² The

¹ James R. Davila, ed., "4QGenk," in *Qumran Cave 4: Genesis to Numbers*, vol. 7, Discoveries in the Judaean Desert 12 (Oxford: Clarendon, 1994), 75.

² *Ibid.*, 76.

orthography represents some long vowels *plene* (e.g., î), while others are written *defective* (e.g., *aw* to *ô*).³

James Davila, Armin Lange, Emanuel Tov, and John Strugnell have all discussed the textual tradition of 4Q10. James Davila and Armin Lange both argue that textual damage prohibits conclusions concerning the textual tradition of 4Q10.⁴ Davila records that John Strugnell privately suggested that fragment 5, edited as a fragment of 4Q10, is really a fragment of 4QRP.⁵ Emanuel Tov echoes the argument of Strugnell⁶ and further labels 4Q10 as non-aligned.⁷ Although Tov classifies 4Q10 as non-aligned, he assesses 4Q10's textual tradition as deviating only slightly from the MT.⁸ The argument here is that 4Q10 belongs to the Masoretic tradition since it agrees with the MT in most readings while only diverging in small details.

³ Davila, "4QGenk," 76.

⁴ James R. Davila, "Text-Type and Terminology: Genesis and Exodus as Test Cases," *Revue de Qumran* 16, no. 1 (1993): 30. See also Armin Lange, "The Textual Plurality of the Jewish Scriptures in the second Temple Period in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Qumran and the Bible: Studying the Jewish and Christian Scriptures in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. Nóra Dávid and Armin Lange, Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology 57 (Leuven, Belgium: Peeters, 2010), 55.

⁵ Davila, "4QGenk," 75.

⁶ Emanuel Tov, "4QReworked Pentateuch: A Synopsis of Its Contents," in *Hebrew Bible, Greek Bible and Qumran: Collected Essays*, Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism 121 (Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 22-23. Tov now argues that 4QRP is a scriptural text in Emanuel Tov, "A Didactic and Gradual Approach towards the Biblical DSS," in *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible, Qumran, Septuagint: Collected Essays*, ed. Christl M. Maier, Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 167 (Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 2015), 3:309-10. See further how Tov admits that although he now views 4QRP as a scriptural text, this assumption cannot be proven in detail, in Emanuel Tov, "From 4QReworked Pentateuch to 4QPentateuch (?)," in Maier, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible, Qumran, Septuagint*, 3:59.

⁷ Emanuel Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert*, ed. Florentino García Martínez, Peter W Flint, and Eibert J. C Tigchelaar, Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 54 (Boston: Brill, 2004), 332.

⁸ Tov, "4QReworked Pentateuch," 23, esp 23n19.

Description and Categorization of Variants

Davila proposes that 4Q10 differs from the MT in three places.⁹ There is enough manuscript evidence to support each of these variants, although Davila's assumption concerning the variant at F1:L1 (Gen 1:9) is uncertain. This difference is preserved at F1:L1 (Gen 1:9). Here, the MT reads וַתֵּרָאֵה “and let it [the dry land] appear,” whereas 4Q10 reads ותרא “it appeared/and let is appear.” This difference can be explained in one of two ways. However, the form of 4Q10 prohibits certainty. Davila argues that ותרא is a *vav*-consecutive imperfect “it appeared,”¹⁰ which is possible, but the form could also be a jussive “and let it [dry land] appear.” If Davila is right, this variant would indicate that Genesis 1:9 of 4Q10, along with the LXX, preserved both God's declaration that the waters would be gathered (a jussive) and a statement that the waters were gathered (an indicative). This variant would be a noteworthy category 2 variant, but this reading is not certain. Again, the form could be a typical jussive form that has apocopated the final *he*.¹¹ Therefore, Davila's argument that 4Q10 followed the LXX against the MT because of the short form ותרא is inconclusive. 4Q10 may simply be preserving the more common jussive form (the form of the MT).

Category 1. 4Q10 preserves two category 1 additions. First, at F2:L3 (Gen 1:14), the scribe supplies a preposition omitted in the MT.¹² Second, at F5:L2 (Gen 3:1),

⁹ In addition to the differences discussed here, 4Q10 further differs from the MT five times concerning *plene*/defective spelling. See Davila, “4QGenk,” 76.

¹⁰ See James R. Davila, “New Qumran Readings for Genesis One,” in *Of Scribes and Scrolls: Studies on the Hebrew Bible, Intertestamental Judaism, and Christian Origins, Presented to John Strugnell on the Occasion of His Sixtieth Birthday*, ed. Harold W. Attridge, John J. Collins, and Thomas H. Tobin, Resources in Religion 5 (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1990), 9. Davila, “4QGenk,” 76.

¹¹ Davila, “4QGenk,” 76. For other examples of long form jussives, see Gesenius, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, §75t; Joüon Paul, and T Muraoka. *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*. §79m. See also Ps 90:16, which preserves a long form jussive of ראה “to see.”

¹² Wilhelm Gesenius, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, ed. E. Kautzsch and A. E. Cowley, 2nd English ed. (Oxford: Clarendon, 1910), §119hh. Here he says that the governing power of a preposition can extend to a corresponding substantive of the second member in poetic parallelism. Some examples he lists

4Q10 specifies the interrogative nature of the sentence with the addition of the interrogative *he*.¹³

Category 2. 4Q10 does not preserve a category 2 variant.

Category 3. 4Q10 does not preserve a category 3 variant.

Statistics and Conclusion of 4Q10's Textual Tradition

Based on the above analysis, 4Q10 can be shown to fit well within the Masoretic tradition.¹⁴ Regarding agreements, 4Q10 agrees with the MT in most details. Concerning disagreements, 4Q10 only preserves three differences. Two, possibly all three of these differences, simply make the text of the MT more explicit. Thus, reasonable evidence suggests that 4Q10 interprets an MT like exemplar.

Table 1. The statistical relationship between 4Q10 and the MT

Total # of Words in 4Q10	Categories 1, 2, and 3	Statistical Relationship	Categories 2 and 3	Statistical Relationship	Categories 3	Statistical Relationship
70	2	97.14%	0	100%	0	100%

include Isa 48:14; Gen 45:8, and Ezek 39:4. See also Isa 6:10 for an analogous construction. The non-repetition of a preposition is also discussed in Joüon Paul and T. Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*, rev. ed., Subsidia Biblica, (Roma: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2003), §132g. For a similar phenomenon concerning the marker of the accusative, see the discussion of which birds are unclean in Deut 14:13-18.

¹³ Russell Fuller and Kyoungwon Choi, *Invitation to Biblical Hebrew Syntax: An Intermediate Grammar* (Grand Rapids: Kregel, 2017.) §55a. See also Gesenius, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, §150a. Gesenius, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, §150a; Paul, and Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*, §161a. An interrogative particle is not necessary for interrogative statements in Hebrew nor in many other languages. Intonation alone can indicate a question.

¹⁴ Overall, 7 words transcribed by Davila will not be accepted in the final word count because of insufficient manuscript evidence: 4 words from fragment 2; 1 word from fragment 3; 1 word from fragment 4; and 1 word from fragment 5.

2Q2

2Q2 (2QExod^a) partially preserves content from Exodus 1, 7-9, 11-12, 21, 26, 30, and 32 in ten fragments.¹⁵ Baillet describes the script of 2Q2 as typical Herodian script, while the orthography is characterized as generally full.¹⁶

Few scholars have commented on the textual tradition of 2Q2. Even Baillet, the editor of the text in DJD, does not identify the textual tradition of 2Q2. He does, however, indicate that 2Q2 shares characteristics with the LXX.¹⁷ Moreover, Tov does not include 2Q2 in his list of biblical texts categorized in Appendix 8 of his book *Scribal Practices*,¹⁸ but he does identify 2Q2 as a non-aligned text in an earlier list.¹⁹ Lange too identifies 2Q2 as a non-aligned text.²⁰ Contrary to Tov and Lange, 2Q2 is identified here as belonging to the Masoretic tradition since it agrees with the MT in most readings while disagreeing in minor details.

Description and Categorization of Variants

Baillet proposes that 2Q2 differs from the MT in ten places. Two of these possible differences, however, are not included in the following discussion and statistics since they depend on insufficient manuscript evidence.²¹

¹⁵ Maurice Baillet, “Grottes 2: Exode (i),” in *Les “Petites Grottes” de Qumran: Exploration de la Falaise, les Grottes 2Q, 3Q, 5Q, 7Q à 10Q, le Rouleau de Cuivre*, vol. 3, Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan, pt. 1 (Oxford: Clarendon, 1962), 49-52. I am thankful to my friend Benjamin Tilson for translating Baillet’s discussion of 2Q2 for me from French into English.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 49.

¹⁷ Baillet, “Grottes 2: Exode (i),” 49, comments that 2Q2 does possess a number of variants of the LXX.

¹⁸ Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 332.

¹⁹ Emanuel Tov, “The Biblical Texts from the Judaean Desert—An Overview and Analysis of the Published Texts,” in *The Bible as Book: The Hebrew Bible and the Judaean Desert Discoveries*, ed. Edward D. Herbert and Emanuel Tov (New Castle, DE: Oak Knoll, 2002), 156.

²⁰ Lange, “Textual Plurality,” 54.

²¹ These variants are preserved at F6:L2 (Exod 6:20) and F3:L2 (Exod 9:28). Notice the variant

The third category 2 addition occurs at F9:L4 (Exod 30:25) and reads ל[דורות]יכם “throughout your] generations.”²³ This addition conforms Exodus 30:25 to Exodus 30:31. Both of these verses identify the oil as anointing oil שֶׁמֶן מִשְׁחַת־קֹדֶשׁ יִהְיֶה “it shall be a holy anointing oil,” but the MT only identifies this oil as a practice לְדֹרֹתֵיכֶם “throughout your generations” at Exodus 30:31, not 30:25. 2Q2, however, adds the statement ל[דורות]יכם “for your] generations,” to Exodus 30:25. This addition conforms 2Q2 to the immediate context.

Besides additions, one category 2 substitution is preserved in 2Q2. This substitution occurs at F5:L8 (Exod 12:39) and reads גרשום מצר[י]ם “the Egyptians drove them” while the MT reads גִּרְשׁוּ מִמִּצְרַיִם “they were driven from Egypt.”²⁴ The difference between these readings is slight. A difference in word division has led to two alternative readings. The differences concern voice (the MT is passive while 2Q2 is active) and the syntax of מצרים (the MT reads this word as Egypt, a place, and understands it as a genitive of a prepositional phrase, whereas 2Q2 likely read it as a plural gentilic, Egyptians, and understands it as the subject of the active verb גרשו). The active voice of 2Q2 also has precedent in the MT. In Exodus 6:1, God tells Moses that “he [Pharaoh] will drive them [Israel] from his land” וַיִּגְרֹשֶׁם מֵאֶרֶצוֹ. This variant belongs to category 2 since it represents a slight change in meaning while likely deriving from the scribal process (faulty word division).

Last, there remains one variant whose description is ambiguous because of the fragmentary nature of the evidence. This variant occurs at F3:L3 (Exod 9:29). Whereas 2Q2 reads ויאמר מושה] אליו “And Moses said to him/And Moses said,” the MT reads ויאמר אליו משה “And Moses said to him.” The scribe of 2Q2 has either transposed the

²³ Although supplied by Baillet, the ל depends on too little manuscript evidence.

²⁴ See Baillet’s notes about this variant in Baillet, “Grottes 2: Exode (i),” 51.

prepositional phrase with the subject or has omitted the prepositional phrase.²⁵ The fragmentary nature of this line prohibits a more precise description of this variant.

Category 3. 2Q2 does not preserve any category 3 variants.

Statistics and Conclusion of 2Q2's Textual Tradition

The above discussion indicates that the differences between 2Q2 and the MT can reasonably be attributed to the scribal process.²⁶ While three of these variants merely represent synonymous readings (category 1), five others represent slight changes (category 2). Moreover, each of these variants harmonize 2Q2 to parallel contexts. Therefore, the nature of the variants, as discussed, and the high level of agreement in most other details demonstrates that 2Q2 can reasonably be grouped as a text belonging to the Masoretic tradition.

Table 2. The statistical relationship between 2Q2 and the MT

Total # of Words in 2Q2	Categories 1, 2, and 3	Statistical Relationship	Categories 2 and 3	Statistical Relationship	Category 3	Statistical Relationship
148	15	89.86%	12	91.89%	0	100%

2Q3

2Q3 (2QExod^b) consists of eight identifiable fragments that preserve portions of Exodus 4, 12, 18, 21, 22, 27, 31, 19, and 34.²⁷ Tov hesitantly characterizes the

²⁵ Baillet further notes that 2Q2 could have originally read ויאמר משה אל פרעה "and Moses said to Pharaoh." Baillet, "Grottes 2: Exode (i)," 50.

²⁶ Overall, 51 words transcribed in Accordance are not accepted here. Two belong to fragment 1; 1 belongs to fragment 2; 4 belong to fragment 3; 4 belong to fragment 4; 14 belong to fragment 5; 5 belong to fragment 6; 3 belong to fragment 7; 3 belong to fragment 8; 4 belong to fragment 9; 2 belong to fragment 10; and 9 words belong to unidentifiable fragments.

²⁷ Maurice Baillet, "Grotte 2: Exode (ii)," in *Les "Petites Grottes" de Qumran*, 52-55.

orthography of 2Q3 as written in QSP,²⁸ while Maurice Baillet described the text as full (i.e., more *plene*) while departing from the MT in a few details of morphology.²⁹ For example, 2Q3 employs the following long forms: עמכה, כול, מושה, מאיות,³⁰ and אנוכי.³¹

2Q3 has been described by many scholars as a non-biblical text because of fragment 8, which appears to transition from Exodus 19:9 to Exodus 34:10 and because of the divine name written in paleo-Hebrew.³² Tov argues, more specifically, that 2Q3 may be an example of a rewritten Bible and questions Baillet's identification of the first line of fragment 8 as the remains of Exodus 19:9.³³ Tov argues, "It is more likely that this fragment represents a non-biblical addition before Exodus 34:10 similar to the additions in 4QRP."³⁴ According to Tov, the contents of a rewritten Bible text are often close to a biblical text, but the scribes of these texts did not intend to write a biblical text.³⁵ These

²⁸ Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 332.

²⁹ Baillet, "Grotte 2: Exode (ii)," 53.

³⁰ The form מאיות substitutes for מאות at least 9 times in the DSS. It also occurs as the *kethiv* in 2 Kgs 11:4, 9, and 10. For a discussion of this form, see *Ibid*.

³¹ This word is poorly preserved. However, if one were to accept this reading, the form אנוכי for MT's אני would be quite unusual since, according to Reymond, [Qumran] biblical manuscripts tend to follow the biblical text. In fact, Reymond comments that the usual form of the first personal pronoun in [Qumran] biblical manuscripts is אני, not אנוכי or אנוכי. Eric D Reymond, *Qumran Hebrew: An Overview of Orthography, Phonology, and Morphology* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2014), 155.

³² See Baillet's observations about the nature of 2Q3 in Baillet, "Grotte 2: Exode (ii)," 53. Tov makes similar comments in Tov, "4QReworked Pentateuch," 23, esp. 23n11. Brooke makes the same suggestion in George J. Brooke, "Torah in the Qumran Scrolls," in *Bibel in jüdischer und Christlicher Tradition: Festschrift für Johann Maier zum 60. Geburtstag*, ed. Johann Maier et al., Athenäums Monografien Theologie 88 (Frankfurt am Main: A. Hain, 1993), 102.

³³ See Emanuel Tov, "Excerpted and Abbreviated Biblical Texts from Qumran," *Revue de Qumran* 16, no. 4 (December 1995): 584.

³⁴ See Tov, "4QReworked Pentateuch," 23, esp. 23n11.

³⁵ Tov, "Excerpted and Abbreviated Biblical Texts," 583. Tov's view of the 4QRP has hence changed, and this view may have since changed. See Tov, "From 4QReworked Pentateuch to 4QPentateuch (?)."

texts are characterized by frequent exegetical omissions, additions, and transpositions.³⁶ Contrary to Tov, Hartmut Stegemann³⁷ and George Brooke³⁸ identify 2Q3 as an excerpted text, not a rewritten Bible. Moreover, Maurice Baillet identified 2Q3 as either a biblical manuscript or as an anthology.³⁹ A more precise identification of 2Q3 as either a rewritten Bible, excerpted text, or abbreviated text is likely impossible.⁴⁰ The text is too fragmentary.⁴¹

The textual tradition of 2Q3 has been further described by Tov and Lange. Tov hesitantly identifies 2Q3 as non-aligned,⁴² while Lange withholds judgment about the nature of 2Q3 since 2Q3 exists in a highly-damaged state.⁴³ Excluding what appears to be a different sequence of text in fragment 8 from the discussion,⁴⁴ it is argued here that 2Q3

³⁶ Tov, "Excerpted and Abbreviated Biblical Texts," 583.

³⁷ Hartmut Stegemann, "Weitere Stücke von 4 Q P Psalm 37, von 4 Q Patriarchal Blessings Und Hinweis Auf Eine Unedierte Handschrift Aus Höhle 4 Q," *Revue de Qumran* 6, no. 2 (September 1967): 220. Tov mentions that the rewritten Bible category was well known when Stegemann wrote his article. Tov, "Excerpted and Abbreviated Biblical Texts," 584.

³⁸ Brooke, "Torah in the Qumran Scrolls," 102.

³⁹ Baillet, "Grotte 2: Exode (ii)," 53.

⁴⁰ See Tov, "Excerpted and Abbreviated Biblical Texts," 586. Some characteristics of an excerpted text listed by Tov include the juxtaposition of different biblical texts, either from different books or from the same book and smaller dimensions. Tov further argues that the main criterion to identifying an excerpted text is often the limited scope of content. Brent Strawn identifies five possible characteristics to help identify excerpted texts in Brent Strawn, "Excerpted Manuscripts at Qumran: Their Significance for the Textual History of the Hebrew Bible and the Socio-Religious History of the Qumran Community and Its Literature," in *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Second Princeton Symposium on Judaism and Christian Origins*, ed. James H Charlesworth, vol. 2 (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2006), 110-22. These characteristics are the juxtaposition of different biblical texts, smaller dimensions, correspondence in biblical passages among excerpted passages, shared textual characteristics, and typically written in QSP (Qumran Scribal Practice).

⁴¹ See Tov's cautions approach to identifying 2Q3 as a rewritten Bible text in Tov, "Excerpted and Abbreviated Biblical Texts," 584.

⁴² Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 332.

⁴³ Lange, "Textual Plurality," 55.

⁴⁴ Tov prescribes this rule in Tov, "Excerpted and Abbreviated Biblical Texts," 599.

agrees with the MT in most readings while disagreeing in only minor details. Thus, it can be reasonably grouped within the Masoretic tradition.

Description and Categorization of Variants

Baillet proposes that 2Q3 deviates from the MT on three occasions by means of additions. However, the first two proposed variants will not be included in the statistics because they depend on insufficient manuscript evidence. The third proposed variant of Baillet is partially accepted here and is included in the statistics.

The first addition proposed by Baillet occurs at F4:L5 (Exod 22:2). Baillet proposes that 2Q3 reads]אין לו לש[לם] שלם ישלם אם [“he shall surely repay. If there does not exist the ability for him to re]pay” whereas MT reads לו ישלם אם אין לו “he shall surely repay. If there does not exist to him.” The proposed addition would clarify what is omitted in the MT: namely, the concept of restitution. This would be a category 2 variant, but several factors make this reading uncertain. First, all that is preserved of line 5 is the very top upper stroke of a letter and two upward strokes of the following letter preceding at a forty-five-degree angle deriving from a horizontal stroke connecting them. The first letter could be the remnant of a *lamed* since this is the only letter to extend that far above the line.⁴⁵ However, see 2Q2 fragment 1, line 2. Here, a *vav* corrected above the line: א'ת is preserved. The superscripted *vav* extends above the line and complicates Baillet’s proposal. If all that was left of fragment 1 of 2Q2 was the upper portion of line 2, then a superscripted *vav* would give the appearance of a *lamed*. Thus, Baillet’s reconstruction is uncertain. The following letter is even more enigmatic since no preserved letter matches

⁴⁵ The fourth line from the bottom on fragment 8 preserves an indisputable ל. See The Leon Levy Dead Sea Scrolls Digital Library, “Plate 739 B-284856,” accessed November 23, 2016, <http://www.deadseascrolls.org.il/explore-the-archive/image/B-284856>.

this letter's remains.⁴⁶ Thus, based only on manuscript evidence, the *lamed* is possible, but the proposed final *mem* is uncertain.

Second, Baillet's proposed reading is further complicated by the fact that the root שלם occurs twice in the MT of Exodus 22:2 near where Baillet reconstructs the variant reading שלם so that the remnant of the לם might be the remnant of the reading of the MT. Baillet argues that this is unlikely because of the size of the lacuna,⁴⁷ but reconstructions based on spatial considerations are highly tentative, especially in a fragmentary text like 2Q3.⁴⁸ Therefore, this variant will not be counted in the following discussion and statistics.

⁴⁶ Baillet reads this letter as a final *mem* and cites the presumed final *mem* of fragment 8, line 1 as evidence. Baillet, "Grotte 2: Exode (ii)," 54. However, the upward strokes of this final *mem* are different than the one in fragment 4, line 5. See The Leon Levy Dead Sea Scrolls Digital Library, "Plate 739 B-284856." The fragment in question is the first fragment in the third row.

⁴⁷ Baillet, "Grotte 2: Exode (ii)," 54.

⁴⁸ Although Baillet's reasoning may appear plausible, several factors weaken his reasoning. First, 2Q3 is highly fragmentary. No line is fully preserved, and no line fully preserves letters from more than one spot of a line. The most fully preserved line consists of only eleven letter spaces (F8:L1), while one line only preserves one partially preserved letter (F6:L6). This fact makes reconstruction based on spatial considerations highly tentative especially since the number of letter spaces per line fluctuates within a given text. Second, several situations can cause a scribe to skip space on the leather and thus, less content will occur on a line than expected. A scribe may leave portions of a line blank to avoid writing over scar tissue. This is the case twice in 11Q1 (Col 3:6 [Lev 24:11a]). See David Noel Freedman and Kenneth A. Mathews, *The Paleo-Hebrew Leviticus Scroll (11QpaleoLev)* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1985), 4. See also 11Q5, which contains at least fourteen instances where the scribe avoided writing on the skin probably due to poor tanning procedures or scar tissue. See James A. Sanders, *The Psalms Scroll of Qumran Cave 11 (11QPsa)*, vol. 4, *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert 4* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1965), 14. Furthermore, erasures would cause a scribe to skip space. This happens at 11Q1 Col 3:3. Here, the scribe has written נא twice and then erases the second occurrence. See Freedman and Mathews, *The Paleo-Hebrew Leviticus Scroll*, 43. See also 11Q1 Col 6:9 (Lev 27:19a) for another example of the scribe of 11Q1 erasing text. Freedman and Mathews, *The Paleo-Hebrew Leviticus Scroll*, 49. In these situations, less content is written than would be expected. The opposite can be true too; namely, a large amount of text can be written in a small space. For example, scribes, at times, add text above the line, crowd texts into margins, or even vertically up the page. Moreover, not all lines of a column contain equal number of letter spaces. For example, Julia Duncan reasons that fragments 1-3 of 4Q40 (4QDeut^m) contained lines of 58 to 67 letter-spaces per line except line 7, which she reasons may have only contained 46-53 letter spaces. See Julie A. Duncan, "4QDeutb," in *Qumran Cave 4: Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Kings*, ed. Eugene Ulrich and Frank Moore Cross, vol. 9, *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert 14* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1995), 114-15. See also 4Q98g where several letters have been cramped together to fit the available space of the first line. See Patrick W. Skehan, Eugene Ulrich, and Peter W. Flint, "Psalms: 4QPsx," in *Qumran Cave 4. XI, Psalms to Chronicles*, vol. 11, *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert 16* (Oxford: Clarendon, 2000), 163.

The second proposed addition occurs at F7:L1 (Exod 31:16). Baillet proposes that 2Q3 reads וה]בְּת לִיה[[The sons of Israel shall keep the Sab]bath to the Lord” whereas the MT reads וְשָׁמְרוּ בְּנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל אֶת־הַשַּׁבָּת “The sons of Israel shall keep the Sabbath.” Baillet’s proposal is not certain for two reasons. First, what is left of the *lamed* is faint, but possible. Nonetheless, Baillet’s proposed variant is weakened since the next word of the MT begins with a *lamed* preposition: לְעֵשׂוֹת. Second, there is not enough of the paleo-Hebrew to substantiate the reading יְהוָה.⁴⁹ Therefore, both of these proposed variants depend on insufficient manuscript evidence.

Category 1. 2Q3 does not preserve category 1 variants.

Category 2. Only one variant is accepted here, and it is a category 2 variant. This addition is the third proposed addition by Baillet and occurs at F8:L3 (Exod 34:10). Baillet proposes the reading [וּיְאָמַר]ר י[הוה א]ל מושה “[and the Lo]rd said [to Moses]” whereas the MT reads וַיֹּאמֶר “and he said.” Baillet’s reading is possible but should be nuanced. Part of the paleo-Hebrew remains indicating that the subject was specified. However, Baillet’s desire to reconstruct a prepositional phrase is unwarranted. Baillet’s proposed *aleph* is impossible to make out with certainty; Baillet indicates this fact.⁵⁰ Thus, all that is certain is that 2Q3 makes the subject of the MT explicit. This variant belongs to category 2.

Category 3. 2Q3 does not preserve category 3 variants.

⁴⁹ See the middle fragment of the third line of fragments on The Leon Levy Dead Sea Scrolls Digital Library, “Plate 739 B-284856.”

⁵⁰ Baillet, “Grotte 2: Exode (ii),” 55.

Differences that may be caused by excerpted nature. The ambiguity of fragment 8 may be the result of the excerpting process since the text appears to transition from Exodus 19:9 to Exodus 34:10.

Statistics and Conclusion of 2Q3’s Textual Tradition

Based on this analysis, 2Q3 can be shown to fit well within the Masoretic tradition.⁵¹ Regarding agreements, 2Q3 agrees with the MT in most details. Concerning disagreements, 2Q3 preserves only one difference. This difference simply makes the MT explicit.

Table 3. The statistical relationship between 2Q3 and the MT

Total # of Words in 2Q3	Categories 1, 2, and 3	Statistical Relationship	Categories 2 and 3	Statistical Relationship	Category 3	Statistical Relationship
32	1	96.88%	1	96.88%	0	100%

4Q15

4Q15 (4QExod^d) exists as one fragment preserving text from Exodus 13 and 15.⁵² The scribe wrote in an elegant Hasmonaean hand that dates from the late second or early first century BC.⁵³ Out of the thirty-three full and partially preserved words, 4Q15 differs orthographically only twice—in the same word—from the MT.⁵⁴

⁵¹ 2Q3 is very damaged. Fifty-one of the words transcribed by Accordance will not be accepted here. Thirteen of these words derive from unidentifiable fragments. One derives from fragment 1; 5 from fragment 2; 4 from fragment 3; 5 from fragment 4; 7 from fragment 5; 1 from fragment 6i; 2 from fragment 6ii; 5 from fragment 7; and 8 from fragment 8.

⁵² Judith E. Sanderson, ed., “4QExodd,” in *Qumrân Cave 4: Genesis to Numbers*, 127.

⁵³ Ibid.

⁵⁴ Ibid.

The exact nature of this fragment is enigmatic since it is poorly preserved and because of the sequence of text. The text preserves Exodus 13:15-16 followed by Exodus 15:1. Judith Sanderson suggests that 4Q15 may be a liturgical scroll.⁵⁵ Tov more confidently identifies 4Q15 as an abbreviated text for liturgical purposes.⁵⁶ The fact that the fragment omits material between Masoretic paragraph markers (Exod 13:15-16 ends with a ם while Exod 15:1 begins with a ט) further indicates that the omission was likely intentional.

Only a few other scholars have commented on the textual nature of 4Q15 beyond stating that it may be an excerpted/abbreviated text. Emanuel Tov lists 4Q15 as a non-aligned text with an exclamation mark in appendix 8 of *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts from the Judean Desert*.⁵⁷ Lange classifies 4Q15 as unable to be classified because of textual damage.⁵⁸ It is demonstrated here that 4Q15 can reasonably be classified as belonging to the Masoretic tradition since it agrees with the MT in most readings.

Description and Categorization of Variants

Besides the different sequence of texts, which likely indicates the text's excerpted nature, the only difference is a difference in spelling. 4Q15 reads אַנְי[א] at L2 (Exod 13:16) while the MT 4Q15 אַנְי.⁵⁹

⁵⁵ Sanderson, "4QExodd," 127.

⁵⁶ See Tov, "Excerpted and Abbreviated Biblical Texts," 591, 597-98. Tov further states that 4Q15 was probably meant for personal use in Emanuel Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 3rd ed. (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2012), 321.

⁵⁷ Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 332.

⁵⁸ Lange, "Textual Plurality," 55.

⁵⁹ Reymond argues that the biblical manuscripts tend to follow the biblical text when representing personal pronouns. Reymond, *Qumran Hebrew*, 155. This form, therefore, might be evidence of the text's non-biblical status or evidence that it was copied from memory.

Statistics and Conclusion of 4Q15's Textual Tradition

Based on the analysis, 4Q15 can be shown to fit well within the Masoretic tradition.⁶⁰ Due to the limited size of 4Q15, one cannot be sure that it originally belonged to a biblical document. It may have been a quote from a non-biblical text. Despite this fact, the content of this fragment is identical to the MT besides one substitution of spelling. This substitution is insignificant; it does not even belong as a category 1 variant.

Table 4. The statistical relationship between 4Q15 and the MT

Total # of Words in 4Q15	Categories 1, 2, and 3	Statistical Relationship	Categories 2 and 3	Statistical Relationship	Category 3	Statistical Relationship
31	0	100%	0	100%	0	100%

4Q16

4Q16 (4QExod^e) exists in one fragment and partially preserves Exodus 13:3-5. The fragment is written in an early Hasmonaean semi-cursive script dating from the middle to the late second century BC.⁶¹ The orthography is fuller than MT, but does not exhibit features common to Tov's QSP.⁶² Sanderson and Tov argue that 4Q16's small column size most likely indicates that the scroll originally did not contain all of Exodus, but existed as an excerpted text.⁶³ Beyond labeling 4Q16 as an excerpted text, only a few other scholars have commented on the textual tradition preserved in the text. Tov labels

⁶⁰ What remains of 4Q15 is well preserved. Only four words transcribed by Accordance are not accepted here. All of these words derive from line 5 of the fragment: the last line.

⁶¹ Judith E. Sanderson, ed., "4QExode," in *Qumrân Cave 4: Genesis to Numbers*, 127.

⁶² For a list of the orthographic differences between 4Q16, see *ibid.*, 130.

⁶³ *Ibid.* See also Tov, "Excerpted and Abbreviated Biblical Texts," 596. He cites b. B. Bat 14a as evidence, which says, "The size of the columns should be commensurate with the size of the scroll."

4Q16 as non-aligned,⁶⁴ while Lange withholds judgment about the textual nature of 4Q16 because of textual damage.⁶⁵

Description and Categorization the Variants

4Q16 possess both category 1 and category 2 variants.

Category 1. Four variants belong to category 1. These variants include the omission of three conjunctive *vavs* at L6 (Exod 13:5) and the transposition of two nouns in a list at L6 (Exod 13:5).

Category 2. 4Q16 preserves four category 2 variants. Two of these variants are additions. The first addition is preserved at L2 (Exod 13:3). 4Q16 reads מארץ מצרים “from the land of Egypt,” while the MT reads ממצרים “from Egypt.” The addition of 4Q16 provides a more descriptive definition of the place of Israel’s slavery: the land of Egypt (4Q16) as opposed to Egypt (MT). 4Q16 is slightly different, but since the MT commonly refers to Egypt as the land of Egypt, the difference is slight (e.g., Gen 21:21; 41:19, 29, 33, 36, 41).

Second, at L5 (Exod 13:5), 4Q16 designates the Lord who brought Israel out of the Land of Egypt as יהוה אלוהיך [יהוה] “[the Lor]d your God” whereas the MT describes the Lord as יהוה “the Lord.”⁶⁶ The addition of “your God” is an adaption to a formulaic expression and represents only a slight change.⁶⁷

⁶⁴ Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 332.

⁶⁵ Lange, “Textual Plurality,” 55.

⁶⁶ The same variant is preserved at 4Q41 Col 2:10-11 (Deut 5:5).

⁶⁷ Emanuel Tov, “Textual Harmonizations in the Ancient Texts of Deuteronomy in Mishneh Today,” in *Mishneh Todah: Studies in Deuteronomy and Its Cultural Environment in Honor of Jeffrey H. Tigay*, ed. Nili Sacher Fox, David A. Glatt-Gilad, and Michael James Williams (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2009), 19.

4Q16 also preserves an omission with respect to the MT. At L2 (Exod 13:3), 4Q16 omits the fuller description of the MT. The MT describes Egypt beyond the description provided in 4Q16 to include the phrase מִבֵּית עֲבָדִים “from the house of slavery.” Describing God’s redemption from Egypt as redemption “from the house of slavery” is a very common designation in the MT (e.g., Exod 13:3, 14; 20:2; Deut 5:6; 6:12; 7:8; 8:14; 13:5, 10; Josh 24:17; Jdgs 6:8; Jer 34:13), but at times this designation is omitted as it is in 4Q16 (e.g., Ex 13:16; Deut 6:21). This omission could have derived from parablepsis due to homoioarcton (the scribe’s eyes skipping from the ending of מִצְרַיִם to the ending of עֲבָדִים). However, this explanation is not definitive. This omission could also have derived from the scribe writing the text from memory. Thus, this omission belongs to category 2 because it represents a slight change in perspective.

4Q16 preserves one substitution. At L6 (Exod 13:5), 4Q16 reads כְּאִשֶּׁר “just as” where the MT reads אֲשֶׁר “that.” Both constructions have precedent in the MT. The conjunction כְּאִשֶּׁר is used in Deuteronomy 13:18; 19:8; 26:15; and 29:12 whereas the relative אֲשֶׁר is used in Deuteronomy 6:10; 7:12; and 8:18. Furthermore, both constructions modify and clarify the prepositional phrase אֶל-יִרְאֵן, but in slightly different ways. The אֲשֶׁר introduces a demonstrative/relative clause,⁶⁸ whereas the כְּאִשֶּׁר introduces a comparative clause.⁶⁹ Thus, this variant belongs to category 2 because it represents a slight change in perspective.

Category 3. 4Q16 does not preserve a category 3 variant.

⁶⁸ Gesenius, *Gesenius’ Hebrew Grammar*, §138a-f.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, 104a-b. See also Francis Brown, S. R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs, eds., *The Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1996), 455.

Statistics and Conclusion of 4Q16's Textual Tradition

Based on the analysis, 4Q16 fits within the Masoretic tradition.⁷⁰ However, due to the small column size, it is highly likely that 4Q16 was an excerpted text. Textual analysis of excerpted texts must be done with great caution since variants of an excerpted text may not always be evidence of the text's textual tradition, but may be the result of a scribe copying the text from memory.⁷¹ Rabbinic tradition permitted *mezuzot* and *phylacteries* to be written by heart, not from a written text (b. Megilla 18b).⁷² Thus, small deviations such as those found in 4Q16 do not necessarily indicate that the textual tradition behind 4Q16 was not the MT. Regarding agreements, 4Q16 agrees with the MT in most details while preserving only minor difference from the MT. Moreover, these minor differences can all be explained as examples of harmonization. Thus, 4Q16 can reasonably be classified as belonging to the Masoretic tradition.

Table 5. The statistical relationship between 4Q16 and the MT

Total # of Words in 4Q16	Categories 1, 2, and 3	Statistical Relationship	Categories 2 and 3	Statistical Relationship	Category 3	Statistical Relationship
61	11	81.97 %	7	88.52%	0	100%

⁷⁰ The one fragment from 4Q16 is well preserved, but seven words transcribed by Accordance are not accepted here.

⁷¹ Julie A Duncan, "Excerpted Texts of Deuteronomy at Qumran," *Revue de Qumran* 18, no. 1 (April 1997): 60.

⁷² Duncan, "Excerpted Texts of Deuteronomy at Qumran," 61n68. See also Brooke's comments about the nature of the *tefillin* and *mezuzot* from Qumran, in George J. Brooke, "The Textual Tradition of the Temple Scroll and Recently Published manuscripts of the Pentateuch," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research*, ed. Devorah Dimant and Uriel Rappaport, Series on The Texts of the Desert of Judah 10 (Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 1992), 279-80. He says that the types of differences between these texts and biblical texts may not simply be the result of scribal memory, but they might be the result of a desire to make the Pentateuch more internally consistent through assimilation.

11Q1

11Q1 (11QPaleoLev) is preserved in an excellent state. 11Q1 consists of “useless bits; fifteen fragments; and one scroll of seven columns.”⁷³ Only a few darkened areas prohibit certain readings unlike many other biblical-DSS.⁷⁴ According to Freedman and Mathews, “The scroll’s height was roughly four times greater than the extant lower portion.”⁷⁵ Portions of Leviticus 4, 10, 11, 13-27 are preserved.⁷⁶

11Q1 was carefully designed. Vertical lines provide side margins and columns while horizontal lines provide a consistent guide to suspend letters.⁷⁷ Spacing between lines prohibit letters from crowding other lines while enabling adequate space for correction above the word.⁷⁸ Scribal dots evenly space words along the line and function as word dividers.⁷⁹

11Q1 consists of several unique features. First, the scribe left words unfinished at the end of the line and finished them on the subsequent line (e.g., Col 3:6-7).⁸⁰ Second, 11Q1 preserves two types of paragraphing. One type is characterized as a “*vav*-method” where one line is left incomplete, the next line is skipped, and the *vav* of the first word of the next line is enlarged and occupies the middle of the remaining incomplete space.⁸¹ The second type, “the non-*vav* method,” consists of a closed incomplete line, but the next

⁷³ Freedman and Mathews, *The Paleo-Hebrew Leviticus Scroll*, 3.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, 4.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, 5.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, 8.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, 9.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, 10.

line begins without an enlarged *vav*.⁸² The breaks employed mostly agree with the paragraph breaks of the MT.⁸³ Third, the scribe made a few mistakes: some of which he erases, others he leaves uncorrected, and one he brackets. Concerning the bracketed text, Freedman and Mathews argue, “Rather than erasing the lengthy insertion—almost one line of text—the scribe ‘bracketed’ the interpolation to draw attention to its misplacement.”⁸⁴

The script of 11Q1 is inconsistent so that Richard Hanson first postulated if 11Q1 was written by more than one scribe, but he still characterized the script of the scroll as handsome and economical.⁸⁵ On paleographical grounds, he dates the scroll to ca. 100 BC.⁸⁶

Freedman and Mathews argue that the orthography of 11Q1 reflects the MT prototype as opposed to the orthography of proto-Samaritan texts.⁸⁷ In fact, they state that the spelling of 11Q1 is remarkably close to the MT with only a few insignificant differences.⁸⁸ This fact is unusual since most Qumran texts written in paleo-Hebrew follow the proto-Samaritan orthography.⁸⁹

Several scholars have commented concerning the textual character of 11Q1.⁹⁰ The history of labeling 11Q1 as a mixed text began with Freedman. Freedman’s suggestion

⁸² Freedman and Mathews, *The Paleo-Hebrew Leviticus Scroll*, 10.

⁸³ *Ibid.*, 12.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.* See also Brooke, “The Textual Tradition,” 275-76. He argues that the change bracketed was a deliberate change since the scroll does not deviate much from known texts.

⁸⁵ Freedman and Mathews, *The Paleo-Hebrew Leviticus Scroll*, 18.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, 20-23.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, 82.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, 78.

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, 82.

⁹⁰ Interestingly, *The Paleo-Hebrew Leviticus Scroll* does not contain a discussion of the textual

is based on agreements and disagreements with the MT, the Samaritan Pentateuch, and the LXX and the nature of the script. Despite Freedman labeling 11Q1 as a mixed text, he asserts that 11Q1 is related predominantly with the MT, but slightly more with the Samaritan Pentateuch.⁹¹ Freedman states, “In view of the textual characteristics and the script of the present manuscript, it is reasonable to conclude that it belongs to the Palestinian, or proto-Samaritan, text-type.”⁹² Freedman attributes the influence of the MT upon 11Q1 as the result of the early date of 11Q1: “11Q Lev [11Q1] thus reflects an older stage in the history of the Palestinian text, itself a descendant of the Babylonian text [the MT] presumably brought to Jerusalem by Ezra the Scribe in the 5th century B.C.”⁹³ Thus, Freedman suggests that 11Q1 can be described as a mixed text because it represents an early stage of the Palestinian family. It is a text that derives from the Masoretic text but has gleaned features in common with the Samaritan Pentateuch.

Kenneth Mathews argues that 11Q1 can be described as a mixed text but questions the accurateness of this classification. His conclusions are based on both a qualitative and a quantitative analysis of the text. On the one hand, he states that 11Q1 does not mirror one tradition, but contains a mixture of readings while possessing unique readings (Tov’s non-aligned category).⁹⁴ Thus, Mathews states that Tov is correct to argue that 11Q1 has no clear textual affiliation.⁹⁵ Nonetheless, Mathews points out that

character of 11Q1. This fact is pointed out in Florentino García Martínez, “Review of the Paleo-Hebrew Leviticus Scroll (11QpaleoLev),” *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic and Roman Period* 17, no. 2 (December 1986): 250.

⁹¹ David Noel Freedman, “Variant Readings in the Leviticus Scroll from Qumran Cave 11,” *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 36, no. 4 (October 1974): 533.

⁹² *Ibid.*

⁹³ *Ibid.*, 534.

⁹⁴ K. A. Mathews, “The Paleo-Hebrew Leviticus Scroll from Qumran,” *The Biblical Archaeologist* 50, no. 1 (March 1987): 51.

⁹⁵ K. A. Mathews, “The Leviticus Scroll (11QpaleoLev) and the Text of the Hebrew Bible,”

the differences between the textual witnesses of Leviticus are largely insignificant errors that result from the mechanics of the transmission process.⁹⁶ Furthermore, Leviticus can be described as existing in a textually uniform state.⁹⁷ Therefore, Mathews acknowledges that 11Q1 fits Tov's criteria, but casts doubt on the appropriateness of labeling 11Q1 as non-aligned because of the nature of 11Q1's inconsistent agreement and unique readings; namely, they are insignificant. Mathews further identifies 11Q1 as an inferior text. It is "the kind of text one would expect of a sectarian manuscript antedating the stabilization of the Hebrew Bible."⁹⁸ Furthermore, contrary to Freedman, Mathews states that 11Q1 does not distinctively resemble the reading of the Samaritan Pentateuch neither does its orthography reflect that found in the Samaritan Pentateuch; rather, the orthography reflects the orthography found in the MT.⁹⁹

Emanuel Tov argues that 11Q1 ought to be classified as non-aligned because of its inconsistent agreement with the MT, Samaritan Pentateuch, and the LXX.¹⁰⁰ In fact, Tov argues that 11Q1 was the text that opened his eyes to the non-aligned category since it could not adequately be described as a type of the MT or the Samaritan Pentateuch.¹⁰¹ Lange, who bases his analysis of the biblical-DSS on Tov's classification grid, also lists 11Q1 as non-aligned.¹⁰²

The Catholic Biblical Quarterly 48, no. 2 (April 1986): 198.

⁹⁶ Mathews, "The Leviticus Scroll (11QpaleoLev)," 198.

⁹⁷ Ibid.

⁹⁸ Mathews, "The Paleo-Hebrew Leviticus Scroll," 51.

⁹⁹ Mathews, "The Leviticus Scroll (11QpaleoLev)," 199.

¹⁰⁰ Emanuel Tov, "A Modern Textual Outlook Based on the Qumran Scrolls," *Hebrew Union College Annual* 53 (1982): 19. Tov's assessment of 11Q1 first appeared in Hebrew in Emanuel Tov, "Textual Character of the Leviticus Scroll from Qumran Cave 11," *Shanton*, 238-44.

¹⁰¹ Tov, "A Modern Textual Outlook," 19.

¹⁰² Lange, "Textual Plurality," 54.

Like Mathews, the conclusions here are based on a mixed method. First, the variants are categorized based on their quality. Second, three sets of statistics are provided to depict the quantitative relationship between 11Q1 and the MT. Based on this analysis, 11Q1 can reasonably be claimed to belong to the Masoretic tradition.

Description and Categorization of Variants

Freedman and Mathews discuss forty-eight differences between the MT and 11Q1.¹⁰³ Out of the forty-eight differences, nineteen differences are dismissed here from the following discussion and statistics. Four of these differences depend on insufficient manuscript evidence; one is a correction likely from the first hand; eleven represent synonymous spellings of the same word; two concern a *kethiv/qere*; in one instance, Freedman and Mathews appear to mistakenly represent the form of the MT.¹⁰⁴

Category 1. Several differences belong to category 1. These variants account for eighteen points in the statistics. However, one substitution can either be grouped as a category 1 or 2 variant. This variant is found at FK_i:L5 (Lev 21:8b). Whereas 11Q1 reads מקדשם “who sanctifies them,” the MT reads מקדשך “who sanctifies you.” Leviticus 21:1-9 describes the cleanness laws for a priest. Leviticus 21:8a of 11Q1 and the MT both state that the priest is to be sanctified by the people. The reason for sanctifying the priest, however, is slightly different. In 21:8b, 11Q1 gives the reason that “the Lord is the one who sanctifies them” while the MT reads, “The Lord is the one who sanctifies you.” This difference can be explained in two ways. First, one can argue that this is a material difference. The referent for each version is different: 11Q1 refers to the priests while the MT refers to the people. The second explanation is that 11Q1 and the MT refer to the

¹⁰³ In addition to these differences, they also list 34 words that differ from the MT regarding *plene*/defective spelling.

¹⁰⁴ See appendix 1 for details.

same referent in a slightly different manner. Mathews argues for the former explanation but asserts that both readings have contextual support.¹⁰⁵ In the latter explanation, the referent is best explained as the people. Ezekiel 20:12 provides some precedent for this explanation since it alludes to Exodus 31:13. Both verses explain that the Sabbath was given to Israel as a sign that Israel might know “that I am the Lord who sanctifies them” (Ezek 20:12) or “sanctifies you” (Exod 31:13). These texts use different pronominal suffixes to refer to Israel. Thus, it is possible that both 11Q1 and the MT refer to the same referent by means of different pronominal suffixes.

Category 2. Three additions preserved in 11Q1 belong to category 2. First, 11Q1 adds the phrase בּוֹ כָּל יְמֵי זָבַח “because of it all the days of [his discharge]” at FG:L7 (Lev 15:3b). This phrase is surrounded by lacunae. However, the phrase most likely followed the last phrase of the verse of the MT: “his uncleanness, it is” וְטִמְאָתוֹ הָיָא. This addition occurs in the LXX and the Samaritan Pentateuch although the readings of the LXX and the Samaritan Pentateuch are not identical.¹⁰⁶ Leviticus 15:13-14 clarifies how long the person with the discharge will be unclean: seven days after his cleansing. The Samaritan Pentateuch and the LXX agree with the MT that the man will be clean seven days after his cleansing. The addition, then, simply specifies a fact assumed by the MT: he is unclean all the days of his discharge.¹⁰⁷

The second addition is preserved at FL:L5 (Lev 22:24a) and concerns the identification of the direct object. The verse in the MT begins with four direct objects, follows with the verb, and then specifies to whom the offering is presented. 11Q1 appears to follow the same pattern but inserts the demonstrative pronoun אֵלֶּה “these” after the

¹⁰⁵ Mathews, “The Leviticus Scroll (11QpaleoLev),” 182.

¹⁰⁶ Freedman and Mathews, *The Paleo-Hebrew Leviticus Scroll*, 32.

¹⁰⁷ For a discussion of possible explanations for this variant see Freedman, “Variant Readings,” 528-29. Cf. the explanations offered in Mathews, “The Leviticus Scroll (11QpaleoLev),” 177-78.

verb. Thus, 11Q1 identifies the objects twice in this verse. The clause in question of the MT reads *תִּקְרִיבוּ לַיהוָה* “they will offer to the Lord” whereas 11Q1 reads *תִּקְרִיבוּ אֵלֶּה לַיהוָה* “they will offer these to the Lord.” The addition of the demonstrative pronoun again makes the text of the MT explicit.

The third addition is preserved at Col 5:7 (Lev 26:24a). The MT describes how God will walk with Israel if Israel does not turn to God after he disciplines them. If they do not turn to God, God will walk with them “in hostility” *בְּקָרָי* according to the MT. 11Q1 states that he will walk “in the anger of his hostility” *בְּהַמַּת קָרָי*. In Leviticus 26, God describes how he will walk with Israel if they do not accept his discipline (Lev 26:24, 28, 41). On the one hand, at Leviticus 26:28, Moses describes God as 11Q1 does: as one who will walk in the anger of his hostility (Lev 26:28). On the other hand, at Leviticus 26:24 and 41, Moses simply describes God as walking in hostility. Thus, 11Q1 has precedent within the MT.¹⁰⁸

11Q1 preserves three omissions that belong to category 2. The first is preserved at FF:L2 (Lev 14:16b). 11Q1 omits *בְּאֶצְבְּעוֹ* “with his finger.” The MT reads that “he will sprinkle some of the fat with his finger seven times before the Lord while 11Q1 reads that “he will sprinkle some of the fat seven tim[es] befor[e the Lord].” In Leviticus, the concept of a priest sprinkling something with his finger does not always specify that the sprinkling is done with his finger. Moses omits this point eight times in Leviticus (Lev 4:6, 17; 5:9; 6:20; 8:11, 30; 14:7, 51), but specifies this point five times (Lev 14:16, 27; 16:14^{twice}, 19). Thus, the omission is not alarming, but fits with the style of the MT.

The second omission is preserved at FH:L2 (Lev 17:2a) and concerns the words *וְאֶל בְּנָיו וְאֶל* “his sons and to”. The MT lists those whom Moses should speak as Aaron and to his sons and to all the sons of Israel while 11Q1 states that Moses is to speak with Aaron and to all the sons of Israel. The omission is almost positively the result of

¹⁰⁸ Mathews, “The Leviticus Scroll (11QpaleoLev),” 186.

parablepsis due to homoioarcton.¹⁰⁹ The scribe's eyes most likely skipped from ואל to ואל omitting בניו ואל. Nonetheless, the omission does not significantly change the meaning of the text since Aaron's sons would be included among the sons of Israel. No person included by the MT is excluded by 11Q1.

The third omission occurs at Col 5:7 (Lev 26:24a). 11Q1 omits the phrase אֲנִי אֲנִי “even I.” This verse supplies the apodosis of the general condition if Israel disobeys. The omission is small since the MT at times omits this phrase in a similar construction. It is omitted at Leviticus 26:27 but is included at Leviticus 26:24 and 26:40. Thus, the omission of this phrase fits within the general tradition preserved in the MT.

Besides additions and omissions, 11Q1 also preserves two category 2 substitutions. The first substitution is found at FC:L1 (Lev 11:27a). Here, 11Q1 reads גחון[ני] “[its] bellie[s]” against the MT, which reads כפיו “its hands.” 11Q1 has harmonized Leviticus 11:27 with 11:42.¹¹⁰ Leviticus 11:42 identifies על-גחון וכל הולך על-ארבע “all that walk on the belly and all that walk on four.” Leviticus 11:27 reads וכל הולך על- “and all that walk on its hands, among all the animals that walk on fours.” Thus, the proximity of these verses and the similarity of content provided fertile ground for substituting the MT's כפיו “its hands” with either גחוני “its bellies” or simply גחון “belly.”¹¹¹

The two substitution is preserved at Col 1:7 (Lev 22:25b). Here, 11Q1 reads משחתימ הם “they are corrupted” while the MT reads מִשְׁחָתָם בָּהֶם “it's corruption is in them.” The reading of the MT is difficult.¹¹² The clause gives the reason why Israel

¹⁰⁹ Freedman and Mathews, *The Paleo-Hebrew Leviticus Scroll*, 34.

¹¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 28.

¹¹¹ Brooke, “The Textual Tradition,” 278, argues that this is deliberate because of evidence found in 11QT.

¹¹² Mathews, “The Leviticus Scroll (11QpaleoLev),” 183.

cannot offer animals to the Lord from the hand of a foreigner. The MT gives the reason that “its corruption is in them” (*them* refers to the potential sacrifices prohibited by the Lord). 11Q1 communicates the same meaning, but differently. 11Q1 reads that these should not be offered because “they are corrupted.”¹¹³ In Mathews’ judgment, 11Q1 along with the versions attempt to improve the MT.¹¹⁴

Last, two variants’ descriptions are uncertain for several reasons. The first variant may either be an omission or transposition, and it occurs at FA:L3 (Lev 4:25). Certainty about this variant is complicated by the fact that the identification of this fragment is not completely certain.¹¹⁵ Nonetheless, most likely, fragment A preserves Leviticus 4:24-26 partially.¹¹⁶ This identification depends on proximity of the verbs שָׁפַךְ and סָפַר. These verbs only occur in the same context in three passages. Moreover, the partially preserved line 2 also indicates that fragment A likely preserves Leviticus 4:24-26.¹¹⁷ The reading of 11Q1 under discussion is הָעֹלָה וְשָׁפַךְ “of burnt offering and he will pou[r].” The MT has וְשָׁפַךְ יְשַׁפֵּךְ “of burnt offering and he will pour out its blood.” If this variant was an omission, 11Q1 would have omitted the direct object “its blood,” which is fronted before the verb in the MT. If the variant is transposition, then 11Q1 would be preserving the typically word order of BH. A similar passage occurs at Leviticus 17:13 of the MT and places the verb before the direct object וְשָׁפַךְ אֶת־דָּמוֹ “and he will pour its blood.”¹¹⁸ Thus, transposition is a likely explanation. Spatial considerations are of no help since the difference in letter spaces between an omission and transposition is small: eight

¹¹³ Mathews, “The Leviticus Scroll (11QpaleoLev),” 183.

¹¹⁴ *Ibid.*

¹¹⁵ Freedman and Mathews, *The Paleo-Hebrew Leviticus Scroll*, 26.

¹¹⁶ See Brooke’s discussion in “The Textual Tradition,” 274.

¹¹⁷ Freedman and Mathews, *The Paleo-Hebrew Leviticus Scroll*, 26.

¹¹⁸ *Ibid.*

letter spaces. Moreover, the fragment only preserves partially four lines: the most letter spaces preserved in a line of this fragment is ten letter spaces and the smallest is only one letter space. These reasons make any theory dependent on spatial considerations highly tentative.

The second variant with an unclear description is preserved at FA:L4 (Lev 4:26b). The reading preserved in 11Q1 is הַכֹּפֶר עַל־יָדָיו “[to the Lor]d. And he will make atonement fo[r him].” The MT reads הַשְּׁלָמִים וְכֹפֶר עָלָיו “of peace offering. And he will make atonement for him.” The fact that a variant exists between 11Q1 and the MT depends on the fact that the word before וְכֹפֶר in the MT ends with a *mem*, not *he*. Freedman and Mathews list several explanations that could have accounted for the *he*. The less invasive explanation appears to be the simple addition of לַיהוָה. Although this is not certain, this addition is the most conservative approach in the statistics.

Statistics and Conclusion of 11Q1’s Textual Tradition

The above descriptions and categorizations demonstrate that all the differences between 11Q1 and the MT can be ascribed to the scribal process.¹¹⁹ Most of these differences represent synonymous spellings and constructions. The remaining eleven differences are slightly more significant but provide shaky grounds for postulating a textual tradition besides the MT since these can all be reasonably attributed to the scribal process. The previous descriptions and categorization demonstrate that 11Q1 fits well within the Masoretic tradition. Furthermore, the following three sets of statistics reinforce this conclusion.

¹¹⁹ Freedman and Mathews estimate that “the scrolls height was roughly four times greater than the extant lower portion.” *Ibid.*, 4. Nonetheless, the scroll contains roughly 1,600 words according to the word counts in Accordance. Because of the size of this scroll, the total word count calculations will only account for the total word count according to Accordance plus suffixes and minus those variants that depend on insufficient manuscript evidence and remains of words from unidentifiable fragments (46 words derive from unidentifiable fragments).

Table 6. The statistical relationship between 11Q1 and the MT

Total # of Words in 11Q1	Categories 1, 2, and 3	Statistical Relationship	Categories 2 and 3	Statistical Relationship	Category 3	Statistical Relationship
1594	39	97.55%	20	98.75%	0	100%

11Q2

11Q2 (11QLeviticus^b) exists as nine fragments and preserves readings from Leviticus 7-10, 13-15, and 25. Fragments 2 and 6 are the only fragments readable to the naked eye.¹²⁰ The scribe wrote 11Q2 in a formal late Herodian style (ca. AD 50) and wrote *plene* in every possible case, but does not use the long third masculine plural suffix.¹²¹ Martínez, Tigchelaar, and van der Woude describe the textual character of 11Q2 as somewhere between the MT and the LXX based on general agreements and disagreements.¹²² Tov lists 11Q2 as non-aligned¹²³ while Lange argues that the textual tradition of 11Q2 cannot be identified because of textual damage.¹²⁴ The fact that the divine name is written in paleo-Hebrew may be a clue that 11Q2 was a non-biblical text.¹²⁵

Description and Categorization of Variants

Thirteen variants are listed by the editors between 11Q2 and the MT. One of these variants, however, depends on insufficient manuscript evidence and will not be included in this discussion. This difference occurs at F2:L4 (Lev 10:1). One other variant

¹²⁰ Florentino García Martínez, Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, and A. S. van der Woude, "11QLeviticusb," in *Qumran Cave 11, Discoveries in the Judaean Desert 23* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1998), 1.

¹²¹ *Ibid.*, 2.

¹²² *Ibid.*

¹²³ See Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 332.

¹²⁴ Lange, "Textual Plurality," 56.

¹²⁵ See Baillet's observations about the nature of 2Q3 in Maurice Baillet, eds., "Textes Des Grottes 2Q, 3Q, 6Q, 7Q A, 10Q," in *Les "Petites Grottes" de Qumran*, 53. Tov makes similar comments in Tov, "4QReworked Pentateuch," 23.

listed by the editors is only partially accepted here again because it depends on insufficient manuscript evidence. This variant occurs at F7:L3 (Lev 25:33). The reading supplied by the editors is ביתו עיר “his house in a c[ity]”¹²⁶ while the MT reads בַּיִת וְעִיר “house and in a city.” If the proposal is original, then the difference is most likely a scribal error resulting from uncertainty about the placement of the *vav*.¹²⁷ Although this reading is possible, the *ayin* is not clearly visible so that one cannot determine if עיר has a *vav* or not. Thus, only the reading ביתו “his house” is accepted here; it represents an addition.

Category 1. Three variants belong to category 1. There is one substitution at F3:L5 (Lev 13:59) and two instances where an article is omitted at F3:L4 (Lev 13:59).

Category 2. Four differences belong to category 2. They are additions. The first addition occurs at F2:L1 (Lev 9:23). 11Q2 reads אֵת כֹּל הָעָם [“all the people”] whereas the MT reads אֶת־הָעָם “the people.” The MT’s omission of כֹּל “all” does not imply that Moses and Aaron only blessed some of the people. Rather, 11Q2 simply makes the text more explicit. This fact is evident since the people are described in the next clause, and again, in the next verse of the MT as כָּל־הָעָם “all the people.” Thus, 11Q2 simply makes the MT explicit by harmonizing this clause to the immediate context.

The next addition is preserved at F2:L3 (Lev 9:24). Here, 11Q2 reads הַחֵלֶב הַשְּׁלֵמִים “the fat, that is the peace offerings,” while the MT simply reads הַחֵלֶבִים “the fat pieces.”¹²⁸ 11Q2’s reading specifies that the fat pieces belonged to the peace offering.¹²⁹

¹²⁶ See the translation of Martin G. Abegg, Peter W. Flint, and Eugene Charles Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible: The Oldest Known Bible* (San Francisco: HarperSan Francisco, 1999), 104, but note that the translation does not account for the pronominal suffix.

¹²⁷ García Martínez, Tigchelaar, and van der Woude, “11QLeviticusb,” 7.

¹²⁸ Furthermore, unlike the MT, 11Q2 refers to the fat pieces as a collective singular, not a plural entity (the difference of number is a category 1 variant).

¹²⁹ It is possible that 11Q2 also specified that the fat pieces belonged to the sin offerings, but the line is damaged so that the rest of the line is not available. Cf. Lev 9:8-10, 15.

The addition of 11Q2 harmonizes Leviticus 9:24 to the immediate context and, likely, to the wider teaching of peace offerings in Leviticus. Leviticus 19:20 demonstrates that fat pieces from peace offerings were sacrificed on behalf of the people. Thus, specifying that the fat pieces belonged to the peace offerings four verses later is not alarming.

Moreover, the wider teaching on peace offerings may have influenced the scribe. Leviticus 3:1-5 and 6:5 [Eng., 6:12] link burnt offering with the fat of peace offerings as does 11Q2's addition at F2:L3 (Lev 9:24). Leviticus 3:1-5 identifies the fat of the entrails, the two kidneys with fat, and the long lobe of the liver of a peace offering as a food offering to be burnt on top of the burnt offering. Leviticus 6:5 [Eng., 6:12] preserves a phrase almost identical to 11Q1: *הַלֶּבֶי הַשְּׁלֵמִים*: “the fat pieces of the peace offerings.” This text states that the burnt offering and the fat of the peace offerings are to be burnt together on the altar.¹³⁰ 11Q2's addition, therefore, clearly indicates that Leviticus 5:5 [Eng., 6:12] has occurred; namely, the burnt offering and the fat of the peace offering were burning together when the Lord consumed them. Therefore, the addition of 11Q1 simply conforms Leviticus 9:24 both to the immediate and wider context.

The third addition occurs at F2:L7 (Lev 10:1). 11Q2 simply identifies the subject implied in the MT. 11Q2 *לוֹא צִוָּה יְהוָה אֹתָם* “[the Lor]d [did not command] them” while the MT reads *לֹא צִוָּה אֹתָם* “he did not command them.” The subject of the verb is the Lord in the MT; 11Q2 simply makes this explicit.

The fourth addition is found at F7:L3 (Lev 25:33).¹³¹ The exact nature of this variant is ambiguous. The reading supplied by the editors is *בֵּיתוֹ עִיר* “his house in a c[ity],” while the MT reads *בֵּיתוֹ עִיר* “house even in a city.” If this proposed reading is original, the

¹³⁰ Interestingly, the law concerning the burnt offerings of Lev 6:2 [Eng., 6:9] specifies that the burnt offerings are to remain on the altar all night until the morning. However, the Lord consumes these offerings in a moment in Lev 9:24. The fact that the burnt offering along with the fat of the peace offering are to be left on the altar until morning further confirms that the fat of Lev 9:24 belonged to the peace offerings.

¹³¹ In this chap, see paragraph 1 under the heading “Description and Categorization of the Variants” for a brief discussion of this variant.

difference would most likely be a scribal error resulting from uncertainty about the placement of the ך. ¹³² Although this reading is possible, the *ayin* is not clearly visible so that one cannot determine if עיר has a *vav* or not. Thus, the reading עיר] is not accepted here. The reading ביתו, therefore, regardless of how it was derived was read as “his house.” This addition is minor. It simply identified further the owner of the home; namely, the home of a Levite.

Category 3. 11Q2 does not preserve category 3 variants.

Statistics and Conclusion of 11Q2's Textual Tradition

Overall, 11Q2 agrees with the MT in most cases while disagreeing in only minor details. ¹³³ Moreover, regarding the minor disagreements, three out of seven of them are occasions where the scribe made the MT more explicit while one additional difference is most likely the result of a scribal error. The last three differences are minor, but harder to explain (e.g., the omissions of the article twice). The analysis of 11Q2 demonstrates that 11Q2 can reasonably be understood as belonging to the Masoretic tradition. The editors' description that the textual character of 11Q2 is somewhere between the MT and the LXX is understandable, but not entirely accurate. 11Q2 only agrees with LXX against the MT in two instances. ¹³⁴ In both of these instances, 11Q2 simply makes the text of the MT explicit. ¹³⁵ Therefore, 11Q2 is best described as belonging to the Masoretic tradition. More

¹³² García Martínez, Tigchelaar, and van der Woude, “11QLeviticusb,” 7.

¹³³ Since only fragments 2 and 6 are legible to the naked eye, the total word counts accept those words transcribed by Martínez, Tigchelaar, and van der Woude as probable for all fragments besides fragments 2 and 6. Words transcribed as possible will not be accounted for in the statistics. In total, eight words are marked as possible readings and seven words derive from unidentifiable fragments.

¹³⁴ See García Martínez, Tigchelaar, and Woude, “11QLeviticusb,” 2. They list three agreements between the LXX and 11Q2, but the variant at F2:L4 (Lev 10:1) depends on insufficient manuscript evidence. Furthermore, even if one were to accept this variant, all three agreements shared between 11Q2 and the LXX are instances where 11Q2 makes the text of the MT more explicit.

¹³⁵ *Ibid.*

precisely, it belongs to the Masoretic tradition while preserving a few additions in agreement with the LXX that make the text more explicit.

Table 7. The statistical relationship between 11Q2 and the MT

Total # of Words in 11Q2	Categories 1, 2, and 3	Statistical Relationship	Categories 2 and 3	Statistical Relationship	Category 3	Statistical Relationship
93	8	91.40%	5	94.62%	0	100%

4Q29

4Q29 (4QDeut^b) exists in eight fragments and preserves text partially from Deuteronomy 29-32.¹³⁶ The scribe wrote in an early Hasmonaean hand dating to ca., 150-100 B.C.¹³⁷ Duncan describes the orthography as follows: it conforms generally to the orthography found in the MT and the Samaritan Pentateuch; unaccented \bar{a} to \bar{o} is typically not represented; accented \bar{a} to \bar{o} is represented; u to \bar{o} is not marked in accented or unaccented syllabus; aw to \bar{o} , ay to \hat{e} , and ay to \bar{i} are marked.¹³⁸

4Q29's textual tradition is described by Duncan as belonging to the Judean, (i.e., the Masoretic tradition), not the Samaritan form of Deuteronomy because of 4Q29's agreement with the MT against the Samaritan Pentateuch at F2ii:L3 (Col 2:10 [Deut 31:11]).¹³⁹ Knoppers too argues that 4Q29 belongs to the Masoretic tradition¹⁴⁰ while

¹³⁶ Duncan, "4QDeutb," 9. See also Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, "Minuscule Qumranica. I," *Revue de Qumran* 84 (2004): 646. Tigchelaar suggests that two other fragments preserving portions of Deuteronomy may belong to 4Q29 since these fragments share a similar script.

¹³⁷ Duncan, "4QDeutb," 9.

¹³⁸ *Ibid.*

¹³⁹ *Ibid.*, 10. The readings of 4Q29 can be referenced in multiple ways. First, a reading can be referenced by the exact fragment and line number of the reading. Second, the reading can be referenced by its reconstructed column number and corresponding reconstructed line number. Both references will be given here. The first reference is to the exact fragment and corresponding line number while the reference in parenthesis corresponds to the reconstructed column and line number.

¹⁴⁰ Gary N. Knoppers, "Qumran Cave 4 V 9 Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Kings," *Journal of*

Tov and Lange, contrary to Duncan and Knoppers, both list 4Q29 as non-aligned.¹⁴¹ Like Duncan and Knoppers, it is argued here that 4Q29 belongs to the Masoretic Tradition.

Description and Categorization of Variants

4Q29 disagrees with the MT at twelve places according to Duncan.¹⁴² However, only nine of these twelve variants are accepted here. Two of these variants read הַיָּה, where the MT reads הַיָּהוָה and occur at F3:L3 (Col 1:16 [Deut 30:11]) and F3:L4 (Col 1:17 [Deut 30:13]). Moreover, the proposed reading at F8:L3 (Col 3:13 [Deut 32:3]) of גְּדוּלַּתְּהָ against the MT's לְגֵל depends on insufficient manuscript evidence.

Category 1.¹⁴³ Out of the nine remaining variants that exist between the MT and 4Q29, six of these belong to category 1. These variants include the omission of a relative particle at F1:L1 (Col 1:1 [Deut 29:24]), the omission of a preposition at F4:L1 (Col 2:15 [Deut 31:15]), the substitution of number and gender at F2i:L7 (Col 1:14 [Deut 30:10]), a case of the substitution of number at F2ii:L3 (Col 2:10 [Deut 31:11]), and gender at F7:L2 (Col 3:2 [Deut 31:26]). Last, a variant has an unclear description at F2i:L6 (Col 1:13 [Deut 30:9]).

One variant's exact nature remains ambiguous because of the fragmentary nature of the text. This variant occurs at F2i:L6 (Col 1:13 [Deut 30:9]) and could be understood as either an omission or transposition. 4Q29 reads וּבְפִרְיֵי אֲדָמְתְּךָ וּבְפִרְיֵי [בְּהֵמְתְּךָ בְּהֵמְתְּךָ] לְטוֹבָה “[and in the fruit of your land and in the fruit of] your cattle for goodness.” Although this line is fragmentary, the preserved text indicates that there is a variant since

Biblical Literature 118, no. 1 (1999): 174.

¹⁴¹ See Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 332. See also Lange, “Textual Plurality,” 54.

¹⁴² Duncan, “4QDeutb,” 10-14.

¹⁴³ See appendix 1 for a list of the variants.

the MT reads *וּבְפְרֵי בְהֵמָתְךָ וּבְפְרֵי אֲדָמָתְךָ לְטוֹבָה* “and in the fruit of your cattle and in the fruit of your land for goodness.” Duncan’s reconstruction indicates her opinion that 4Q29 simply transposes two elements in the list; namely, 4Q29 transposes “and in the fruit of your cattle” with “and in the fruit of your land.”¹⁴⁴ This option is highly likely since parallel verses indicate that there is not a standard order to the objects that the Lord will bless if Israel obeys the Lord. For example, 4Q29’s listing of the object “fruit of the land” before “fruit of the cattle” has precedent in Deuteronomy 28:4 of the MT while Deuteronomy 28:11 of the MT preserves the order “fruit of the cattle” and then “fruit of the land” in accordance with the list found in Deuteronomy 30:9 of the MT. Thus, the transposition of forms is likely.

Category 2. Three variants belong to category 2. Three of these variants are additions while the nature of the last variant is unclear. The first variant of 4Q29 adds a prepositional phrase at F3:L3 (Col 1:16 [Deut 30:11]). The MT reads *לֹא־נִפְלְאוֹת הוּא מִמֶּךָ וְלֹא* “it is not too wonderful for you nor is it far” while 4Q29 reads *[לֹא נִפְלְאוֹת הוּא* “it is not too wonderful for you nor is] it far from you.” The addition simply makes explicit what is omitted in the MT.

The second variant is the addition of the prepositional phrase *וּבִידְךָ* “and in your hand” at F3:L5 (Col 1:18 [Deut 30:14]). Whereas the MT reads that the word is in your mouth and heart, 4Q29 adds that it is also in your hand. This addition does not have precedent in the MT. Nonetheless, this addition functions to emphasize further the closeness of the commandment of the Lord. Hebrew idiomatically says that someone spoke with the idiomatic expression “by the hand of.” Versions of this idiom occur in 1 Kings 14:18; 15:29; 16:34; 17:16; 2 Kings 24:2; Jeremiah 37:2; Haggai 1:1, 3; and Zachariah 7:7. Perhaps the addition emphasizes that Israel has heard the commandment of the Lord, and thus, ought to keep it.

¹⁴⁴ Duncan, “4QDeutb,” 10.

The third variant is a further addition and is preserved at F7:L5 (Col 3:5 [Deut 31:28]). 4Q29 again adds an element to a list. The MT states that Moses is to assemble to the Lord אֶת־כָּל־זִקְנֵי שְׁבֵטֵיכֶם וְשֹׁטְרֵיכֶם “all the elders of the your tribes and your officers,” while 4Q29 reads that Moses is to assemble to the Lord [וּזְקִינֵיכֶם] [את כל זקני] וְשֹׁטְרֵיכֶם וְשֹׁטְרֵיכֶם “[all the elders of] your tribes, [and your elders,] your judges, and your officers.” Although this line is highly fragmentary, 4Q29 does preserve the reading “your judges,” which is not found in the MT. This addition fills out the list to include another profession within Israel, not included at Deuteronomy 31:28 of the MT.

This addition likely does not intend to include a broader audience than intended by the MT. Rather, it is likely that 4Q29’s fuller list simply makes the MT explicit. This explanation is persuasive for several reasons. First, when designating the leaders of Israel, the MT has no uniform procedure. Sometimes the list is fuller than others. For example, Joshua 8:33 and 23:2 are like 4Q29 in that these verses directly refer to the elders, the officers, and the judges.

Second, 4Q29’s added office שֹׁטֵר “judge” is functionally connected to the term שֹׁטֵר “officer.” Deuteronomy 16:18 records that these two offices serve the same function: to ensure the promulgation of justice.

Third, the term שֹׁטֵר simply refers to a generic subordinate officer.¹⁴⁵ The generic nature of this title is evident in Numbers 11:16 where it functions as a generic title for the term זָקֵן. Deuteronomy 1:15 further demonstrates that this title functions as a generic title for שָׂר “commander.” Thus, 4Q29’s fuller list is likely synonymous to that found in the MT: no person included by 4Q29 is excluded by the MT and vis-à-vis.

Category 3. 4Q29 does not preserve category 3 variants.

¹⁴⁵ David J. A. Clines, ed., *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2011), s.v. “שֹׁטֵר.”

Statistics and Conclusion of 4Q29's Textual Tradition

The previous analysis indicates that the variants of 4Q29 are minor.¹⁴⁶ These variants either concern synonymous forms (category 1) or variations that make the text of the MT fuller. In light of the discussion and the overarching similarity between these texts (as illustrated in table 8), 4Q29 can reasonably be categorized as belonging to the Masoretic tradition

Table 8. The statistical relationship between 4Q29 and the MT

Total # of Words in 4Q29	Categories 1, 2, and 3	Statistical Relationship	Categories 2 and 3	Statistical Relationship	Category 3	Statistical Relationship
227	15	93.39%	8	96.48%	0	100%

4Q30

4Q30 (4QDeut^c) is the largest text of Deuteronomy from Cave IV consisting of 66 fragments.¹⁴⁷ It preserves text from eighteen separate chapters of Deuteronomy in fragmentary form. The scribe of 4Q30 wrote in a typical Hasmonean hand that dates to ca. 150-100 BC.¹⁴⁸ While the orthography does not correspond to Emanuel Tov's Qumran Scribal Practice,¹⁴⁹ the orthography is fuller than that of the MT. It consistently

¹⁴⁶ 4Q29 contains several words transcribed by Accordance and Duncan that are not accepted in the final word counts because they depend on insufficient manuscript evidence. One word from fragment 1; 4 words from fragment 2i; 7 words from fragment 3; 2 words from fragment 2ii; 9 words from fragment 4; and 27 words from fragment 5i-8 are not included in the final word count.

¹⁴⁷ Sidnie White Crawford, "4QDeut^c," in Ulrich and Cross, *Qumran Cave 4: Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Kings*, 15.

¹⁴⁸ Ibid.

¹⁴⁹ See Emanuel Tov, "Groups of Biblical Texts Found at Qumran," in *Time to Prepare the Way in the Wilderness: Papers on the Qumran Scrolls by Fellows of the Institute for Advanced Studies of the Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1989-1990*, ed. D. Dimant and L. H. Schiffman, Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 16 (Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 1995), 94-96. See also Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 261-73. Furthermore, see Tov's appendix where he lists all of the texts and indicates which texts are written in Qumran Scribal Practice. Ibid., 333.

represents the contractions *aw* to *ô*, *ay* to *ê*, and *ā* to *ō* when accented in *plene* form.¹⁵⁰

Sidnie White Crawford, George Brooke, Gary Knoppers, Emanuel Tov, and Armin Lange have each discussed the textual tradition of 4Q30. For her doctoral dissertation, Crawford published the first critical edition of 4Q30 plus six other Deuteronomy manuscripts from Cave IV.¹⁵¹ She reasoned that evidence exists for grouping 4Q30 within the Masoretic Tradition or the Septuagintal Tradition. In the end, she concludes that 4Q30 ought to be grouped within the Septuagintal tradition based on the following evidence: 4Q30 agree with the LXX in five explicating pluses,¹⁵² one case of conflation,¹⁵³ and three cases of agreements against the other witnesses within two verses, Deut 31:16ff.¹⁵⁴ Tov and Lange, contrary to Crawford's classification, have classified 4Q30 as non-aligned.¹⁵⁵ Contrary to Crawford, Tov, and Lange, Gary Knoppers argues that the 4Q30 belongs to the Masoretic tradition.¹⁵⁶ George Brooke argues that the majority of the Deuteronomy manuscripts found in DJD 9 align with the

¹⁵⁰ Crawford, "4QDeute," 16.

¹⁵¹ Sidnie Ann White [Crawford], "A Critical Edition of Seven Manuscripts of Deuteronomy: 4QDT (A, C, F, G, I and N)" (Ph.D. diss., Harvard University, 1988).

¹⁵² *Ibid.*, 121. In two of these variants, 4Q30 agrees with the LXX with the MT. See the variants at F10:L4 (Deut 10:7) and F11:L2 (Deut 11:3). The third variant in this group agrees with LXX^{mss}, not the LXX at F42:L2 (Deut 26:19). Additionally, the fourth variant of this category is quite minor: the addition of *הזאת* modifying *המציה* at F42:L3 (Deut 27:1). Moreover, the reading of the fifth variant in this category is uncertain at F54i:L7 (Frgs. 54i, 55:L7 [Deut 31:9]). Thus, these five pluses do not persuasively indicate that 4Q30 is related to the Septuagint against the MT.

¹⁵³ White [Crawford], "A Critical Edition of Seven Manuscripts," 121. The case of conflation, according to Crawford, concerns the divine name at F55:L2 (Frgs. 54i, 55:L5 [Deut 31:17]).

¹⁵⁴ Sidnie Ann White [Crawford], "Special Features of Four Biblical Manuscripts from Cave IV, Qumran: 4QDta, 4QDtc, 4QDtd, and 4QDtg," *Revue de Qumran* 15, nos. 1-2 (September 1991): 162. The three cases of agreement between 4Q30 and the LXX concern the representation of the collective singulars of the MT as plurals at F54:L2-3 (Deut 31:16-17). Although these changes represent a difference, they imply no change in meaning since they still refer to the same referent.

¹⁵⁵ See Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 333; and Lange, "Textual Plurality," 55.

¹⁵⁶ See also Knoppers, "Qumran Cave 4 V 9 Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Kings," 174.

MT without designating specific texts.¹⁵⁷ With Knoppers and contrary to Crawford, Tov and Lange, 4Q30 ought to be grouped with the Masoretic tradition because of its overwhelming agreement with the MT.

Description and Categorization of Variants

Crawford proposes that 4Q30 differs from the MT in thirty-nine places.¹⁵⁸ However, the following readings are uncertain due to the fragmentary nature of the evidence; and thus, they are not included in the following discussion and statistics.

First, Crawford proposes that F4:L2 (Deut 7:4) adds אלהי[כּם] to יהוה of the MT. The letters אלהי appear in this fragment. However, the fact that these letters are an addition is complicated because the word אלהים appears in the MT fifteen letter spaces before the word יהוה. Thus, one cannot be certain that the אלהי found in fragment 4 really is an addition.¹⁵⁹ It may be representing אלהים earlier in the line.

Second, Crawford proposes that F17:L3 (Frgs. 17-18:L3 [Deut 12:19])¹⁶⁰ may have omitted the ך pronominal suffix on the noun אדמה as found in the MT. Again, the fragmentary nature of the evidence makes her proposal uncertain.¹⁶¹

¹⁵⁷ George J. Brooke, "Qumran Cave 4. Vol. 9, Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Kings," *The Journal of Theological Studies* 48, no. 2 (October 1997): 570.

¹⁵⁸ The variants are divided here into forty different units since the variant at F32:L4 (Deut 16:8) contains both a category 1 (substitution of number) and a category 2 variant (transposition).

¹⁵⁹ White [Crawford] does not discuss the possibility that the letters אלהי could correspond to the אלהים found earlier in the verse of the MT. See White [Crawford], "A Critical Edition of Seven Manuscripts," 32. Crawford does not discuss this possibility either in Crawford, "4QDeutc," 18.

¹⁶⁰ The readings of 4Q30 can be referenced in multiple ways. First, a reading can be referenced by the exact fragment and line number of the reading. Second, the reading can be referenced by a group of fragments believed to have originally belonged to the same column and the corresponding reconstructed line number. Both references will be given in this discussion. The first reference is to the exact fragment and corresponding line number while the reference in parenthesis corresponds to the group of fragments and the reconstructed line number.

¹⁶¹ See Bernard Levinson who questions the reading proposed by Crawford in Bernard M. Levinson, "Textual Criticism, Assyriology, and the History of Interpretation: Deuteronomy 13:7a as a Test

Third, F22:L1 (Frgs. 22-23:L1 [Deut 13:7]) may add בן אביך to the list of those who may entice an Israelite to follow other gods. Several traditions preserve this reading, including the Samaritan Pentateuch and the LXX, but whether 4Q30 has this addition is less clear. The fragmentary nature of the text plus the obscured second radical makes it uncertain if the reading is אביך or אמך.

Fourth, Crawford proposes that that F47:L4 (Frgs. 46-47:L5 [Deut 28:11]) adds ובפרי אדמתך to the list of areas in which the Lord will cause the people to prosper. However, the reading again is not certain. Even Crawford cites this reading as conjectural.¹⁶²

Fifth, Crawford proposes that F54i:L7 (Frgs. 54i, 55:L7 [Deut 31:19]) reads ועת instead of MT's ועתה. For the same reasons as listed previously, one cannot be certain of the proposed reading.

Sixth, there appears to be an addition at F54i:L7 (Frgs. 54i, 55:L7 [Deut 31:19]).¹⁶³ Crawford proposes the reading [דב]רי. This is possible, but all that is present is the very top of a *yod*.¹⁶⁴ This complicates the situation. Initially, one would think that this must be an addition of some kind. However, 4Q30 does correct the text by means of crossing out words. This word may be crossed out. There is not enough information to be sure that an addition exists.

Moreover, two further readings listed as variants by Crawford are excluded from the following discussion and statistics. These include the reading at F12:L3 (Frgs.

Case in Method," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 120, no. 2 (2001): 220.

¹⁶² Levinson, "Textual Criticism, Assyriology, and the History of Interpretation," 100.

¹⁶³ For a discussion of this variant, see Crawford, "4QDeutc," 33.

¹⁶⁴ See White [Crawford], "A Critical Edition of Seven Manuscripts," 118. Here she marks the רי as certain. However, she marks only the *yod* as certain in Crawford, "4QDeutc," 33.

12-15:L3 [Deut 11:10]) since 4Q30 agrees with the *qere perpetuum* and the reading at F21:L1 (Deut 13:5) since the addition concerns the addition of the indicative *nun* of 4Q30.

Category 1.¹⁶⁵ Several variants belong to category 1. A sampling of these variants includes the addition or omission of particles, the substitution of number, gender, tense, and an adjective for a noun.

Moreover, the categorization of three further variants is uncertain but could be examples of transpositions. The first variant whose description is unclear is preserved at F23:L1 (Deut 13:7). Whereas the MT reads אֹיְבֹנְךָ אֹיְבֹתְךָ אוֹ אִשְׁתְּ חֵיקְךָ “or your son or your daughter or the wife of your bosom,” 4Q30 reads אֹן בְּנְךָ אוֹ אִשְׁ[תְּ חֵיקְךָ] “or your son or the wi[fe of your bosom.” Again, the problem is determining if אוֹ בְּתֶרְךָ “or your daughter” is omitted or transposed. Crawford argues that the phrase has been omitted and that the text has suffered from haplography.¹⁶⁶ While this is not certain, what is certain is that the list of whom may entice an Israelite to idolatry is not the same as found in the MT. However, this may simply be a transposition of words.

The second variant whose description is uncertain is preserved at F26:L4 (Deut 15:2). Whereas the MT says, לֹא־יִגְשׁ אֶת־רֵעֵהוּ וְאֶת־אָחִיו “he shall not oppress his friend or his brother,” Crawford proposes that 4Q30 reads, אִן יִגְשׁ “He shall not oppress” thereby omitting the double direct object. This reading is uncertain for two reasons. First, fragment 26 does not preserve a margin. Second, only thirteen to fifteen letter spaces are preserved for this line. Since both of these reasons complicate a reconstruction based on spatial considerations, one cannot be sure that the double direct object is omitted. The object might be transposed before the verb.

Nonetheless, even if the double object was omitted, as Crawford suggests, this variant should still be placed in category 2, not category 3 as the Brill Database would

¹⁶⁵ See appendix 1 for details about these variants.

¹⁶⁶ White [Crawford], “A Critical Edition of Seven Manuscripts,” 63.

suggest. The Brill Database states,

Deuteronomy 15:2 prohibits the exacting of debts at the end of every seven years. In the Masoretic Text and the Samaritan Pentateuch we are told that debt repayment is not to be required of one's neighbor or brother, whereas the Septuagint exempts only one's neighbor from debts. But 4QDeut^c specifies no party from whom debts cannot be exacted, which seems to make the prohibition applicable to everyone who owes debt (and is thus more wide-ranging). Comparison of these different rulings shows that legal differences arose early on as to exactly who was exempted from paying debts at the end of the seventh year.¹⁶⁷

This conclusion is unlikely for several reasons. First, Deuteronomy 15's designation of the one whom Israel should not oppress in the Sabbatical Year is not monolithic. The MT refers to this person as a neighbor (Deut 15:2) and a brother (Deut 15:2), not a foreigner (Deut 15:3). Deuteronomy 15:11 further clarifies the identity of this person: he is a brother, a needy one, or a poor one. Thus, Deuteronomy 15 can refer to this person in either an expansive or abbreviated manner. This fact makes the conclusions of the Brill database unlikely.

Second, 11Q3 (11QDeut) interprets Leviticus 25:13 in light of Deuteronomy 15:2, and this fact weakens the conclusions of the Brill Database. The scribe of 11Q3 has identified "the year of release of Deuteronomy 15 with the sabbatical cycles in Leviticus."¹⁶⁸ Such a connection strengthens this argument that those in Qumran understood Deuteronomy 15 as applying only to Israelites since the Jubilee is clearly restricted to Israelites in the MT (e.g., Lev 25:14, Isa 61:3) and in non-biblical DSS (e.g., 4Q271 F3:L5).¹⁶⁹ Again, it appears that the person not to be oppressed in Deuteronomy

¹⁶⁷ Brill Online, "The Dead Sea Scrolls Electronic Reference Library," accessed March 20, 2017, http://referenceworks.brillonline.com.ezproxy.sbts.edu/entries/dead-sea-scrolls-electronic-library-biblical-texts/4q30-DSS_EL_BT_4Q30.

¹⁶⁸ Shani Tzoref, "Qumran Pesharim and the Pentateuch: Explicit Citation, Overt Typologies, and Implicit Interpretive Traditions," *Dead Sea Discoveries* 16 (2009): 202.

¹⁶⁹ Furthermore, Crawford does not accept the conclusions of the Brill Database. See White [Crawford], "A Critical Edition of Seven Manuscripts," 70.

15:2 is restricted to Israelites (i.e., a neighbor or brother). The conclusion of Brill Database is unlikely.

The third variant is found at F42:L1 (Deut 26:19). This variant again is either a transposition of the words of the MT or an omission of the words לַשֵּׁם. Whereas MT has לְתִהְיֶה וְלִשְׁמֵךְ וְלִתְפָאֳרֶת “for praise, and for a name, and for honor,” 4Q30 appears to have לְשֵׁם וְ[לְתִהְיֶה וְ] לְתִהְיֶה וְלִשְׁמֵךְ וְלִתְפָאֳרֶת.¹⁷⁰ Due to the fragmentary nature of the evidence, one cannot determine if the variant is an omission or a transposition, despite Crawford’s reconstruction indicating that the variant is merely transposition.

Category 2. Several additions belong to category 2. The first addition makes a minor detail implicit in the MT explicit. This is the addition of the direct object הַיַּרְדֵּן at F3i:L3 (Frgs. 2, 3i:L3 [Deut 4:14]). When Israel is described as crossing over into the Promised Land, sometimes it specifies that they are crossing over “the Jordan” while other times this detail is implicit. On the one hand, this detail is implied in the MT of Deuteronomy 4:14, 26; 6:1, 11; 11:11, and here, at 31:17. On the other hand, this detail is explicit in the MT of Numbers 33:51; 35:10, Deuteronomy 11:31; 31:13; 32:47, and Joshua 1:11. Thus, the addition of הַיַּרְדֵּן is implied in the MT because the MT makes this point explicit on numerous other occasions. This is only a slight alteration.

The second addition is preserved at F9:L3 (Deut 10:2) and reads יְהוָה “Lord.” This addition is a unique reading that is hard to explain due to the textual damage of the fragment. Crawford suggests that the scribe may have transcribed יְהוָה in anticipation of (Deut 10:4).¹⁷¹

¹⁷⁰ Crawford argues that the variant is a case of transposition, not omission. *Ibid.*, 90. See also Crawford, “4QDeutc,” 28.

¹⁷¹ See Crawford, “4QDeutc,” 32, for a discussion of this variant.

The third addition makes the MT explicit. This is the addition of the prepositional phrase **בּו כּל** “on it any” at F32i:L5 (Frgs. 32i, 33:L5 [Deut 16:8]). This addition of **בּו** “on it” stresses the time on which Israel is not to work: “on it,” namely, the Sabbath. The MT of Jeremiah 17:24 also makes this point explicit. The addition of the **כּל** “any” makes the universality of the Sabbath command explicit, meaning that one cannot do any work at all on the Sabbath. Although this aspect of the command is not explicit in this verse, it is implied since parallel texts make the universality of the Sabbath command explicit (Exod 20:10; Lev 23:3; Deut 5:14; Jer 17:22, 24). Moreover, the universality of this prohibition is strengthened by Leviticus 23:18, 31, and Numbers 29:7. These verses refer to the Day of Atonement, which is said to be a Sabbath for Israel, a day in which no work is to be done.

The fourth addition concerns the prepositional phrase **לָךְ** “to you” at F42:L2 (Deut 26:19). This addition makes explicit the person to whom God speaks. Explicitly identifying the one whom God speaks is a common feature of MT Deuteronomy. For example, the identity of the one whom God speaks with is indicated with a **ל** preposition in Deuteronomy 1:11 and 9:3 just as it is here in 4Q30. The **לָךְ** preposition serves a similar function in Deuteronomy 1:6; 2:1; 3:26, and 4:15 as does the **עָמָּךְ** preposition in Deuteronomy 5:4 and 9:10. Thus, the scribe of 4Q30 has made a minor detail explicit. Several other MT passages have done likewise.

The fifth addition of the article and demonstrative pronoun **הַזֶּה** “this” at F42:L3 (Deut 27:1) also makes the MT more explicit. Here 4Q30 specifies which commandment is to be kept, “this commandment.”

The sixth addition expands the divine title at F55:L2 (Frgs. 54i, 55:L5 [Deut 31:17]). Whereas MT reads **אֱלֹהֵי** “my God,” 4Q30 read **אֱלֹהֵי לַיהוָה** [“Lord ^א[my]

G[od]^.” The adaption to the formulaic expression יהוה אלהים/אלהיכם “Lord God/Lord your God” represents only a slight change.¹⁷²

4Q30 preserves the seventh category 2 addition at F55:L3 (Frgs. 54i, 55:L6 [Deut 31:18]) and reads ממנו [ו] “from [him].” This addition specifies that God will turn his face from Israel when they follow after foreign gods. Moreover, Deuteronomy 32:20, like 4Q30 at Deuteronomy 31:18, specifies that the Lord will hide his face מהם “from them.” Thus, the detail made explicit in 4Q30 has precedent in the MT.

Two omissions belong to category 2. The first omission is the result of a scribal correction concerning בשערך אשר at F32i:L10 (Frgs. 32i, 33:L10 [Deut 16:11]).¹⁷³ Here, the scribe has corrected the text against the MT. However, this correction does not necessitate a drastic change from the MT. Deuteronomy 16:11b reads, והלוי אשר בשעריך והגר והיתום והאלמנה אשר בקרבך “And the Levite who are in your gates, and the sojourner, orphan, and the widow who are in your midst.” The accents of Deuteronomy 16:11 indicate that the first relative clause modifies the Levites while the second relative clause modifies not only the widow, but also the sojourner and the orphan. The relative clauses are similar: “who are in your gates” (i.e., in your cities) and “who are in your midst” (i.e., in your presence).¹⁷⁴ 4Q30’s representation of one relative clause to modify the Levite, the sojourner, the orphan, and the widow has precedent in the MT. Deuteronomy 16:14 reads, ועבדך ואמטך והלוי והגר והיתום והאלמנה אשר בשעריך ושמחת בחגגך אתה ובנך ובתך “You shall rejoice at your feast: you, your son, your daughter, your servant, your maid-servant, the Levite, the sojourners, the orphan, and the widow who are in your gates.” The accents

¹⁷² Tov, “Textual Harmonizations,” 19.

¹⁷³ The scribe has used the medial כ here.

¹⁷⁴ The first relative clause of the MT was initially included and used to modify בשערך. However, the scribe crossed out בשערך, but not אשר. Thus, the אשר that originally modified בשערך was reused. It now stood for the second אשר in the MT.

here indicate that the relative clause—in your gates—modifies the Levities, the sojourner, the orphan, and the widow. This appears to be the same syntax found in 4Q30 after the correction.¹⁷⁵

Furthermore, Deuteronomy describes the Levite in several different contexts, but the description is not uniform. On the one hand, several passages describe the Levite as one who is “in your gate” (Deut 12:12, 18; 14:27; 16:11; 16:14; 26:12) or “in your midst” (Deut 26:11). On the other hand, other passages simply identify the Levite without any further description (Deut 12:19; 26:13). Interestingly, within three verses, Moses describes the Levite in three separate ways: one “who is in your midst” (Deut 26:11), “who is in your gate” (Deut 26:12), and without a description in (Deut 26:13). Such variety indicates that the difference between F32i:L10 (Deut 16:11) and the MT is minor.

The second omission concerns the prepositional phrase לשמר at F45i:L5 (Deut 28:1). The prepositional phrase of the MT adds an additional adverbial idea in the MT, probably one of explanation or specification. Israel is to truly listen to the voice of the Lord God “by watching” to do all his commandments.¹⁷⁶ Both forms have precedent in the MT.¹⁷⁷ The reading of the MT has precedent in Deuteronomy 28:15 whereas a construction like 4Q30 occurs at the MT of Deuteronomy 13:19. The omission of the infinitive is a slight change that has precedent in the MT.

¹⁷⁵ Interestingly, on the one hand, Crawford claims that manuscripts of the Septuagint and manuscripts of the Targum both omit בשערך. See Crawford, “4QDeutc,” 26. On the other hand, Targum Neofiti Esther Sheni corrects its text to include דאית בקורייכו (who exist in your gates). Thus, the inclusion or exclusion of this relative clause appears to have a complicated textual history.

¹⁷⁶ See Fuller and Choi for a discussion of the infinitive construct in Fuller and Choi, *Invitation to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*, §18f. See further Gesenius, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, §114o; Paul, and Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*, §124o.

¹⁷⁷ The form of the 4Q30 is not identical to the form in the MT of Deut 13:19. While both forms only have one infinitive construct, 4Q30 uses the root עשה “to do” while the MT of Deut 13:19 uses the root שמר “to keep.” Both are similar though in that they do not include an additional infinitive construct explaining how one it to do the law.

Several substitutions belong to the category 2. These variants include the substitution of nouns, the substitution of a pronominal suffix, and the transposition of word order. The first substitution that belongs to category 2 occurs at F32i:L4 (Frgs. 32i, 33:L4 [Deut 16:8]). 4Q30 substitutes MT's שש "six" for שבעת "seven." Although this change appears material (the MT says Israel is to abstain from unleavened bread for six days while 4Q30 says seven days), the change is merely a case of harmonization on the part of 4Q30. The substitution of 4Q30 results in the harmonization of the less common phrase "six days" in the MT to the more common phrase "seven days." Israel is commanded to abstain from leavened bread for seven days, twenty-five times in the OT (i.e., Exod 12:15; 13:6, 7; 23:15, 34:18; Lev 23:6; Num 28:17; Ezra 6:22; 2 Chron 30:21; 35:17), whereas the designation of "six days" only occurs here at Deuteronomy 16:8. Moreover, the immediate context of Deuteronomy 16:8 has already specified that unleavened bread is to be eaten for seven days (Deut 16:3). Thus, the substitution simply harmonizing a less common phrase with the more common designation.

Several valid interpretations of Deuteronomy 16:8 account for the designation "six days" as opposed to "seven days." Jeffrey Tigay records several of these in the JPS commentary on Deuteronomy. Concerning Deuteronomy 16:8, he comments,

That is, for the first six of the seven days on which it must be eaten (v.3)." Another possible interpretation is: After leaving for home on the first day (v. 7), you shall eat unleavened bread for six days more. According to the halakhah, eaten unleavened bread is obligatory only on the first day; on the remaining days, as long as nothing leavened is eaten, it is not obligatory to eat unleavened bread.¹⁷⁸

Thus, several explanations can account for the difference. The change, therefore, appears to simply harmonize Deuteronomy 16:8 with both the immediate and wider context.

The second substitution is the transposition of the word order of MT at F32i:L4 (Frgs. 32i, 33:L4 [Deut 16:8]). Whereas MT reads תאכל מצות "you shall eat

¹⁷⁸ Jeffrey H. Tigay, *Deuteronomy* דברים, JPS Torah Commentary (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1996), 155-56.

unleavened bread,” 4Q30 has מצות תאכלו “unleavened bread, you (plural) shall eat.” The change is slight; emphasis is placed on the object.

The third substitution is the substitution of the verb of MT, וְרָבְצָה “will settle” for וּדְבָקָה “will cling” at F53:L5 (Deut 29:19). The scribe of 4Q30 has substituted רָבַץ for a more common verb.¹⁷⁹ This is evident for several reasons.

1. Deuteronomy 29:19 is the only place in the MT that employs the verb רָבַץ to describe the covenantal curses. On two other occasions, the term דְּבַק is used to describe the covenantal curses (Deut 29:19; 28:60).
2. Deuteronomy 29:19 is only preserved in one Qumran biblical text: 4Q30, which reads דְּבַק.
3. רָבַץ only occurs one time in the non-biblical DSS: 11Q19 Col 65:L3, the context of which is not covenantal disobedience, but Deuteronomy 22:6-7.
4. Contrary to רָבַץ, which declines drastically in usage in post-biblical Hebrew, דְּבַק is used more in post-biblical Hebrew than in biblical Hebrew.¹⁸⁰
5. CD Col 1:17, 1QS Col 2:14-16, and 4Q504 F1-2Riii:L11¹⁸¹ all allude to the covenant curses as “clinging” (דְּבַק) to pervious disobedient generations, not “settling” (רָבַץ) on them.¹⁸² Moreover, 1QS 2:14-16 alludes directly to Deuteronomy 29:18-19, but uses the word דְּבַק, not רָבַץ.¹⁸³
6. Although 4Q410 F1:L14 is fragmentary, it appears to allude to the covenant curses “clinging” to the disobedient as opposed to “settling” on the disobedient (4Q410F1:L4).

Thus, the scribe of 4Q30 has substituted a less common verb for a more common verb.

¹⁷⁹ I put this variant into category 2, not category 1, because (1) the words are not synonyms and (2) the word used by the MT is still used in post-biblical Hebrew, although its usage has declined.

¹⁸⁰ See Clines, *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew*, s.v. “דְּבַק.” Here, he states that דְּבַק appears 54 times in biblical Hebrew. According to Accordance 11.2.5, דְּבַק occurs 59 times, not including reconstructions, in the non-biblical DSS. רָבַץ, on the other hand, occurs 30 times in biblical Hebrew. According to Accordance, רָבַץ only appear once in the non-biblical DSS.

¹⁸¹ This fragment is difficult to find. See B-496378 plate 982 at The Leon Levy Dead Sea Scrolls, “Plate 982,” accessed July 1, 2017, <http://www.deadseascrolls.org.il/explore-the-archive/image/B-496378>.

¹⁸² The subject of תִּדְרָקוּ in 4Q504 appears in a lacuna, but the context confirms that the covenant curses are what “clings” to past generations.

¹⁸³ Interestingly, 1QS Col 2:16 does not render the collective singular of the MT כָּל־הָאָלֶה, but renders the curse as a plural כּוֹל אֵלוֹת. This same tendency is prevalent throughout 4Q30.

The fourth substitution is the substitution of the 3mp pronominal suffix of the MT for a 2ms pronominal suffix F54i:L3 (Frgs. 54i, 55:L3 [Deut 31:17]). The identification of the antecedent of the 2ms suffix in 4Q30 is uncertain. It could refer to Moses. Deuteronomy 31:16 specifies that God is talking to Moses. However, the immediate context implies that the antecedent is the people. In the end, a complete understanding of this substitutions is uncertain. Regardless, the substitution appears minor: a change in number or antecedent.

Category 3. 4Q30 does not preserve any category 3 variants.

Statistics and Conclusion of 4Q30's Textual Tradition

4Q30 belongs to Masoretic tradition contrary to Crawford who argues that 4Q30 belongs to the Septuagintal family¹⁸⁴ and contrary to Tov and Lange, who argue that 4Q30 ought to be classified as non-aligned.¹⁸⁵ This conclusion is based upon the agreements and disagreements between 4Q30 and the MT. Regarding agreements, 4Q30 agrees with the MT in most minor and major details. Its disagreements are insignificant

¹⁸⁴ She also mentioned that there is evidence for grouping 4Q30 within the Masoretic tradition, but she opts for identifying it as a manuscript of the Septuagintal family. She argues that 4Q30 agrees with the LXX against the MT in 5 explicating pluses, 1 case of conflation, and 3 cases of agreements against the other witnesses in 2 verses, 31:16ff. Based on the analysis of 4Q30, 4Q30 agrees with the LXX against the MT 6 times. Four of these agreements belong to category 1. The first is found at F5:L3's (Deut 8:2) which concerns an instance of an addition of the *vav*, and 3 instances of representing the people with a plural as opposed to the singular of the MT. These differences are preserved at F45i:L4 (Deut 27:26) and F54i:L2 (Frgs. 54i, 55:L2 [Deut 31:16])^{twice}. Two other agreements belong to category 2: the addition of the prepositional phrases בְּ כֵל at F32i:L5 (Frgs. 32i, 33:L5 [Deut 16:8]), and the addition of יהוה at F55:L2 (Frgs. 54i, 55:L5 (Deut 31:17)). Thus, 4Q30's agreement with LXX against MT consists of a limited amount of minor details. These statistics do not account for the instances where 4Q30 agrees with LXX^{mss} against the LXX and the MT. Furthermore, these statistics do not account for the instances where the reading proposed by Crawford agrees with the LXX but appears uncertain upon further analysis. In short, these statistics only account for the cases where the LXX certainly agrees with 4Q30 against MT. See her argument in White [Crawford], "A Critical Edition of Seven Manuscripts," 121-23.

¹⁸⁵ The total word count of 4Q30 here is 787 words. This number is determined by Accordance. 825 words are counted in Accordance, but 31 words derive from undeniable fragments and 7 words belong to variants not accepted here. Because of the size of 4Q30, all other transcribed words by Crawford and Accordance are accepted here.

and do not provide an adequate basis for grouping 4Q30 as belonging to a tradition besides the Masoretic tradition.

Table 9. The statistical relationship between 4Q30 and the MT

Total # of Words in 4Q30	Categories 1, 2, and 3	Statistical Relationship	Categories 2 and 3	Statistical Relationship	Category 3	Statistical Relationship
787	42	94.66%	23	97.08%	0	100%

4Q35

4Q35 (4QDeut^h) consists of fifteen fragments preserving portions of Deuteronomy 1, 2, 4, 19, 31, and 33.¹⁸⁶ Most of the fragments preserve very wide columns (75-95 letter spaces).¹⁸⁷ The letters are small (2 mm high) and are written in a hand between the Hasmonaean and early Herodian periods dating to ca. 50-1 BC.¹⁸⁸ The orthography is fuller than the MT in all the chapters preserved except for Deuteronomy 33. In Deuteronomy 33, 4Q35 preserves a more defective spelling practice described by Duncan as archaic.¹⁸⁹ The paragraph divisions correspond to that found in the MT and the Samaritan Pentateuch.¹⁹⁰

Scholars are divided about how to describe the textual tradition of 4Q35. Lange and Tov identify 4Q35 as textually non-aligned.¹⁹¹ Duncan argues that the preservation of both the first and the last chapter of Deuteronomy indicates that 4Q35 was a complete

¹⁸⁶ Julie A. Duncan, "4QDeuth," in Ulrich and Cross, *Qumrân Cave 4: Genesis to Numbers*, 61.

¹⁸⁷ Ibid.

¹⁸⁸ Ibid.

¹⁸⁹ Ibid.

¹⁹⁰ Ibid., 61-62.

¹⁹¹ See Lange, "Textual Plurality," 55. See also Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 333.

scroll of Deuteronomy, not a *peshet*, catena text of quotations, or liturgical text.¹⁹²

Moreover, Duncan argues that 4Q35's number of shared errors is limited but is generally affiliated with the Septuagint.¹⁹³

Duncan further reasons that the shared readings between 4Q35 and 4Q175 demonstrate that the textual tradition of 4Q175 (4QTestimonia) is dependent on a textual tradition like 4Q35.¹⁹⁴ This reasoning depends on the presumed conjunctive error at F11:L4 (Frgs. 11-15:L4 [Deut 33:11]) and several other minor agreements. However, the reading of 4Q35 at F11:L4 (Frgs. 11-15:L4 [Deut 33:11]) is uncertain as noted by Edward Greenstein and as discussed next.¹⁹⁵ Further, Duncan links 4Q175 with 4Q35 and against the MT by stating that 4Q175 and 4Q35 share five readings against the MT. Although this evidence appears persuasive, three of these readings in 4Q175 have been corrected against the reading of 4Q35 toward the text of the MT. Duncan's analysis implies that these corrections were secondary: made by a subsequent hand. However, this fact is uncertain due to similarity in script between the corrections and the base text.¹⁹⁶ In short, the corrected forms could have come from the first hand, and this issue would call into question Duncan's practice of separating the corrected form and uncorrected form into two separate witnesses. The fact that Duncan does not follow this practice elsewhere further calls into question her conclusion that 4Q175 and 4Q35 share a common tradition.

¹⁹² Julie Duncan, "New Readings for the 'Blessing of Moses' from Qumran," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 114, no. 2 (1995): 275.

¹⁹³ *Ibid.*, 288.

¹⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, 290.

¹⁹⁵ Edward L. Greenstein, "Misquotation of Scripture in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *The Frank Talmage Memorial Volume*, ed. Barry Walfish, vol. 1, Jewish History 6 (Haifa, Israel: Haifa University Press, 1993), 77.

¹⁹⁶ For example, see the *aleph* of the correction ויאירי at 4Q175 Col 1:17. It resembles the *aleph* of the text well. The same fact is true of the *tav* at 4Q175 Col 1:19. The fact that the upper stroke of the *tav* does not extend as high as a normal *tav* is probably due to the closeness of the correction to the line above it.

For example, when describing the variants of 4Q37, specifically a correction at 4Q37 Col 3:7 (Deut 5:25) that makes the text of 4Q37 read against the MT, Duncan does not segregate the corrected form as a subsequent witness to the base text.¹⁹⁷ Thus, Duncan's argument that 4Q175 shares a background with 4Q35 rests on shaky grounds.

Contrary to Duncan, Lange, and Tov, it is demonstrated here that 4Q35 can reasonably be grouped within the Masoretic tradition since it agrees with the MT in most details while preserving only a few minor differences.

Description and Categorization of Variants

Duncan lists twenty-six variants between 4Q35 and the MT.¹⁹⁸ Six of these variants, however, are not accepted as variants here. Three variants proposed by Duncan depend on insufficient manuscript evidence. First, at F11:L2 (Frgs. 11-15:L2 [Deut 33:9]), Duncan proposes the reading ראיִתךְ] "I see you," where the MT reads ראיִתִּי "I see him." Duncan reads the final letter as a final *kap* and argues that no letter appears between the *tav* and the final *kap*. It is true that no letter appears to exist between the *tav* and the final letter of the word, but the proposed final *kap* of Duncan is tentative. This reading is possible. The downward stroke of the letter bends slightly to the left resembling the scribe's final *kap*. Furthermore, the top of the letter appears to extend horizontally like a final *kap*. Two things, however, obscure this reading. (1) The tear obscures the upper horizontal stroke. (2) The upper right of the letter is hooked shape and, thus, resembles a *yod* or *vav*. Thus, this form may be ראיִתךְ as proposed by Duncan, but it could also be ראיִתו in conjunction with the MT (although defective). Both forms are possible.

Second, Duncan proposes a variant at F11:L4 (Frgs. 11-15:L4 [Deut 33:11]). She suggests that 4Q35 reads מְתַנֵּי[ת]נִי whereas the MT reads מְתַנֵּי. If this proposal is right,

¹⁹⁷ Duncan, "4QDeath," 83.

¹⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, 63-70.

then the difference would be small. The reading of 4Q35 would be a construct phrase while the MT would preserve a form of apposition. Nonetheless, the reading is not certain as Duncan herself notes.¹⁹⁹

Third, the form at F12:L2 (Frgs. 11-15:L4 [Deut 33:11]). also depends on insufficient manuscript evidence. Here, Duncan proposes that 4Q35 reads ב[ל “not” which is possible. There is an upper stroke to the right of the form יקומ[ו “[they] arise.” However, several Qumran manuscripts have stray marks that are likely not the remnants of words. For example, 4Q37 Col 1 has the appearance of two stray marks or possible ink marks above the *shen* of שג[ע] in the upper margin. If the readings proposed by Duncan are correct, then this would be a category 1 variant since the reading of 4Q35 and the MT function similarly.²⁰⁰ Nonetheless, the manuscript evidence to support this reading is not sufficient. The stray mark may not be the remains of a *lamed*.

Two other variants can be described adequately as differing only in orthography. First, at F6:L6 (Frgs. 5-6:L9 [Deut 2:4]), the MT represents ירא as יִירָאוּ “and they will fear” with a quiescence *yod* (like original first *yod* roots), while 4Q35 represents ירא as יִירָאוּ “and they will fear” with the *yod* assimilating (like original first *vav* roots).²⁰¹ The MT at times represents the form of ירא as an original first *vav* as 4Q35 does at Deuteronomy 2:4 (e.g., Deut 13:12; 17:13; 19:20; 21:21; 1 Kgs 8:40). Second, F12:L6 (Frgs. 11-15:L8 [Deut 33:17]) preserves another form that could differ from the MT only in orthography. 4Q35 reads קרנו while the MT reads קַרְנָיו. This difference could be a variant: a substitution of number. 4Q35 would read “his horn” and the MT would read “his horns.” However, the difference may simply be orthographic: קרנו written defectively. Since the form could

¹⁹⁹ Duncan, “4QDeath,” 68.

²⁰⁰ The ׀ preposition can be used to express negative final clause. For examples and discussion, see Gesenius, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, §119x, §165b; Clines, *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew* (2011), s.v. “׀.”

²⁰¹ Russell Thomas Fuller and Kyoungwon Choi, *Invitation to Biblical Hebrew: A Beginning Grammar* (Grand Rapids: Kregel, 2006), 240-41.

be read as synonymous to the MT, the variant will not be discussed in the description or statistics.

Last, a proposed variant at F12:L1 (Frgs. 11-15:L3 [Deut 33:9]) will not be included in the categories or statistics for two reasons. First, the form of 4Q35 agrees with the *kethiv*. 4Q35 preserves the form בְּנוּ “his son” with the *kethiv* of the MT reads בְּנֵי “his son” against the *qere* reads בְּנָיו “his sons.” Second, the difference between the *kethiv* and the *qere* only concerns orthography.

Category 1.²⁰² Several differences between 4Q35 and the MT concern synonymous forms and belong to category 1. These differences include the addition of particles such as the excessive article,²⁰³ the accusative *he*, and conjunctive *vav*. Moreover, the text further preserves the omission of three conjunctive *vavs* along with several minor substitutions.

One category 1 variant necessitates further discussion: the variant at F15:L2 (Frgs. 11-15:19 [Deut 33:19]). Duncan proposes the reading הָדוּ “praise” (imperative) for 4Q35 while the MT reads הָר “mountain.”²⁰⁴ Duncan argues that this form arose likely because of graphic confusion between the *dalet* and the *resh* and a case of dittography involving the first letter of the following word (יִקְרְאוּ).²⁰⁵ This explanation, although possible, is not the only possible explanation. It is possible to read 4Q35 as הָרִי “mountains” as Duncan notes, as opposed to הָדוּ “praise” as she prefers.²⁰⁶ In favor of her proposal, Duncan argues that the *dalet* and *resh* and the *vav* and *yod* are generally

²⁰² See appendix 1 for the table for the table of variants from 4Q35.

²⁰³ Fuller and Choi, *Invitation to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*, §36a.

²⁰⁴ Duncan, “4QDeath,” 70.

²⁰⁵ *Ibid.*

²⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, 68.

distinguished in 4Q35 so that the reading הרו is preferred to הרי “mountains.”²⁰⁷ Duncan is right, but the second letter proposed by Duncan as *dalet* is a peculiar form when compared to the typical *dalet* of 4Q35. The top two upper strokes of the letter are less pronounced than the typical *dalet*. The reading of הדר “majesty,” the fifth word preserved at F12:L6 (Frgs. 11-15:L8), provides an example of the scribe’s typical *dalet* and *resh*. Here, one can clearly see that the left-hand upper stroke of the *resh* typically extends higher than the *dalet* and that the *resh* typically does not have a right-hand upper stroke as the *dalet*. However, the *resh* at F12:L6 (Frgs. 11-15:L8) of שורו “his ox” and the *resh* at F12:L9 (Frgs. 11-15:L11) of וירא “and he saw” are both typologically similar to the letter in question. This analysis calls into question Duncan’s proposal since it shows that there is paleographic precedent for identifying the second letter as a *resh*.

Moreover, Duncan’s suggestion that the *vav* and the *yod* are generally distinguished is true, but not without exception. F15:L3 (Frgs. 11-15:L10) preserves the readings כלביא , but the י extends all the way to the line. Duncan’s proposed reading depends on the confusion of the *vav* with the *yod*; she may propose that this confusion happened in the text’s *Vorlage*. Nonetheless, the fact that *yod* and *vav* are not always distinguished graphically in 4Q35 complicates a precise identification of the third letter of the word in question. The reading הרי “mountains” is possible.

Category 2. The four remaining variants belong to category 2. Two of these variants are additions. The first addition is preserved at F10:L1 (Deut 31:9). Duncan proposes the reading $\text{על}^{\text{ן}} \text{ספר}$ “[n a book].” All that remains of this reading is the *ayin*, but enough of the *ayin* remains to substantiate a variant. This addition harmonizes the text to parallel passages and common usage. Deuteronomy 31:24 restates that Moses wrote this law (Deut 31:9) and adds that he wrote it “in a book” על-ספר . The addition of על-ספר is also included in Deuteronomy 17:18 where the king is commanded to copy the

²⁰⁷ Duncan, “4QDeath,” 68.

law of Moses. When describing something as recorded in a book in Hebrew, it is common to include the phrase עֲלֵי־סֵפֶר as is clear by the many references to written works in the OT (e.g., 1 Kgs 11:41, 14:19, 29). The addition likely conforms Deuteronomy 31:9 to a parallel passage and common usage.

The second addition is preserved at F11:L1 (Deut 33:8) and reads הָבוּ לְלֵוִיׁן] “Give to Levi” with the LXX and with 4QTestim.²⁰⁸ 4Q35 introduces Moses’ blessing to Levi by stating “Give to Levi.” Explanations for this variant are difficult. Whether this variant arose because of parablepsis in the MT or expansion in 4Q35 is difficult to say. Moreover, the text is highly fragmentary so that all that is known of Deuteronomy 33:8 of 4Q35 is this phrase. Therefore, the dearth of manuscript evidence precludes a detailed discussion of the nature of this variant. Nonetheless, the difference is likely one of parallelism. The MT conveys Deuteronomy 33:8 with three lines: “the Thummin and the Urim belong to your godly one,” followed by two lines modifying whom the godly one is. The LXX conveys Deuteronomy 33:8 as four lines: “Give to Levi his Thummin, and his Urim to the godly man,” followed by two modifying lines.” It is possible that 4Q35 follows the LXX’s structure. If this is so, the one line of the MT conveys what the LXX does in two lines; namely, that the Thummin and the Urim belong to Levi.

4Q35 preserves one omission preserved at F4:L1 (Frgs. 2-4:L26 [Deut 1:32]). 4Q35 omits the pronominal suffix functioning as the object of an infinitive construct. 4Q35 reads לְהַרְאוֹת “to show” where the MT reads לְרַאֲתְכֶם “to show you.” This difference only slightly affects the text since the object is implied in 4Q35. Moreover, 4Q35 represents the typical *hiphil* form of the infinitive construct; it does not syncopate the performative

²⁰⁸ Duncan, “4QDeath,” 69. The inclusion of this phrase is nearly universal within Septuagintal manuscripts as evident in the Apparati of Wevers’ critical edition. Only Symmachus follows the reading of the MT. See Frederick Field, *Origenis Hexaplorum quae Supersunt; Sive Veterum interpretum Graecorum in Totum Vetus Testamentum Fragmenta*, vol. 1 (Hildesheim, Germany: G. Olms, 1964), 325. See also John William Wevers, ed., *Deuteronomium: Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Göttingensis editum*, vol. 3, pt. 2, Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum (Göttingen, Germany: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1977), 364.

he (see also Gen 2:10; 24:19; Deut 3:24; Esth 1:4, 11, 4:8). Supplying the performative *he* clarifies the root of the infinitive since the MT's reading in an un-pointed text could easily be confused as a *qal*. Overall, the difference between these readings is slight.

The nature of the last variant is unclear. It can either be a substitution or, and more likely, an omission and then an addition. The variant is preserved F12:L3 (Frgs. 11-15:L5 [Deut 33:12]). Here, 4Q35 reads אל while the MT reads עָלָיו. The reading of the MT is difficult: יִשְׁכֵן לְבֵטַח עָלָיו חֲפָף עָלָיו כָּל־הַיּוֹם: "he [Benjamin] dwells in safety because of him; he is who surrounds over him every day." 4Q35, however, has different syntax. It reads, יוֹ, עָלָיו חֲפָף מְהוֹפֵף עָלָיו, "he dwells in safety; God is who surrounds ov[er him]."

This difference may at first appear substantial, but it is not. The change eliminates a non-essential element of the verse and makes the subject of the second clause explicit.²⁰⁹ This difference can be explained in two ways. First, the difficulty of the MT may indicate that the 4Q35 is interpretative here. The subject of the first verb in the MT is Benjamin, but the participle of the next clause clearly describes God. Wevers argues that the Samaritan Pentateuch, and the LXX following the Samaritan Pentateuch, may have omitted the first עָלָיו as *otiose* (severing no practical purpose) since the same prepositional phrase occurs before and after the participle חֲפָף.²¹⁰ The LXX, then, added a conjunctive and the subject καὶ ὁ θεός to make the new subject explicit.²¹¹

Second, the fact that עָלָיו "because of him" (MT) is consonantly close to עליון "the Most High" (possible original reading of 4Q35) provides fertile ground for explaining a connection between these variants. Postulating confusion of gutturals could explain the interchange between the *aleph* and the *ayin*, but not the omission of the pronominal suffix

²⁰⁹ As discussed, the text also preserves a change in stem.

²¹⁰ John William Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Deuteronomy*, Septuagint and Cognate Studies Series 39 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995), 546.

²¹¹ *Ibid.*

(see y. Ber 1:3, b. Ber 5:1, b. Erub 5:1). Wevers, argues against this explanation when discussing the reading of the LXX by noting that the LXX never translated עֲלִיִּין as ὁ θεός “God,” but consistently renders עֲלִיִּין as ὑψιστος “most high.”²¹² Moreover, he notes that the addition of the conjunctive καί, which has no precedent in the MT, weakens this explanation and strengthens the first.²¹³ Nonetheless, 4Q35 does not preserve a conjunctive *vav*, but simply reads לֹא. Thus, the reading is different from the LXX, but the omission is expected. 4Q35 omits the conjunctive *vav* of the MT on three other occasions: twice within fragment 12 (Deut 33).

Thus, Wevers’ suggestion that the LXX omits an unnecessary component of a sentence and makes the subject of the second clause explicit is likely the most reasonable explanation for the reading of 4Q35.²¹⁴ This difference is a category 2 variant worth three points in the statistics.

Category 3. 4Q35 does not preserve category 3 variants.

Statistics and Conclusion of 4Q35’s Textual Tradition

Based on the previous analysis, 4Q35 can be reasonably grouped as a text within the Masoretic tradition.²¹⁵ It overwhelmingly agrees with the MT in most details. Duncan’s proposal that 4Q35 be tentatively grouped with the LXX against the MT is weakened by three factors: First, the one presumed conjunctive error between 4Q35 and the LXX of

²¹² Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Deuteronomy*, 546.

²¹³ *Ibid.*

²¹⁴ It should be noted also that 4QLXXNum and 4QLXXLev^a both appear to clarify their base text(s). See Nicholas Petersen, “An Analysis of Two Early LXX Manuscripts from Qumran: 4QLXXNum and 4QLXXLev^a in the Light of Previous Studies,” *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 19, no. 4 (2009): 481-510.

²¹⁵ Forty-two words depend on insufficient manuscript evidence while 5 words derive from fragment 5: the identification of which is uncertain. See Duncan, “4QDeutb,” 67. After subtracting these words from the word count supplied by Accordance, the total word count becomes 520 words.

בל יקומ]ן “they shall not arise” at F11:L4 (Frgs. 11-15:L4 [Deut 33:11]) depends on little manuscript evidence. Second, even if 4Q35 indeed contained the reading בל יקומו, it is possible that these readings occurred independent of one another since the construction of the MT is difficult: מן־יקומון “from rising”²¹⁶ In short, the LXX’s reading of the MT μη ἀναστήτωσαν does not necessitate the *Vorlage* בל יקומו but could be an interpretative rendering of the MT’s מן־יקומון as indicated by Wevers.²¹⁷ Thus, it is possible that the LXX’s reading is an interpretation of the MT. This fact plus the fact that the proposed reading בל יקומ]ן is uncertain complicates Duncan’s reasoning.

Third, all of the differences between the LXX, 4Q35, and the MT can reasonably be ascribed to the scribal process.²¹⁸ Thus, the shared readings between the LXX and 4Q35 do not indicate a shared tradition against the MT. The textual tradition of 4Q35 is summed up here as follows: the requisite requirement for postulating an alternative textual tradition—namely, a significant number of category 3 variants—is not met in the places where 4Q35 is preserved. Thus, the tradition of 4Q35 matches that found in the MT, which also happens to be the tradition preserved in the LXX.

Table 10. The statistical relationship between 4Q35 and the MT

Total # of Words in 4Q35	Categories 1, 2, and 3	Statistical Relationship	Categories 2 and 3	Statistical Relationship	Category 3	Statistical Relationship
520	25	95.19%	9	98.27%	0	100%

²¹⁶ Gesenius’ comments about this construction demonstrates how difficult the construction is. He remarks that this reading is quite exceptional so much that he wonders if the reading is right. However, one should note, as Gesenius points out, that the imperfect tense is what makes this form difficult, and 4Q35 agrees with the MT in reading an imperfect. See Gesenius, *Gesenius’ Hebrew Grammar*, §165b.

²¹⁷ Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Deuteronomy*, 545. See also Duncan, “New Readings,” 283-84.

²¹⁸ Duncan alludes to a similar assessment in Duncan, “New Readings,” 287-88.

4Q37

4Q37 (4QDeut^f) preserves content in twelve columns from Deuteronomy 5, 6, 8, 11, 32, and Exodus 12 and 13.²¹⁹ It is possible that these fragments originally belonged to at least two separate manuscripts, but Duncan reasons that they belong to one excerpted text because the fragments correspond in material features and measurements.²²⁰ For example, the script of all the fragments is described by Duncan as “inscribed by the same classic formal hand, firm and practiced, dating from the late Herodian Period” ca. AD 50. Moreover, the fragmentary nature of the text makes the exact arrangement of the columns uncertain,²²¹ although Duncan reasons that the order is the same as 4Q41 (4QDeutⁿ).²²² The orthography of 4Q37 is fuller than the MT and the Samaritan Pentateuch.²²³ Duncan describes the orthography as generally marking accented \bar{a} to \bar{o} and always marking unaccented \bar{a} to \bar{o} while u to \bar{o} is marked in both accented and unaccented syllables.²²⁴ Furthermore, the scribe employs some short form and some long form pronominal suffixes.²²⁵ Two preserved paragraph markers are preserved that correspond to the MT. The first occurs at Col 8:13 (Deut 11:13) and corresponds to the MT’s ב while the second occurs at Col 9:12 (either after Exod 12:42, which would correspond to the MT’s ב , or

²¹⁹ Julie A Duncan, “4QDeutj,” in *Qumran Cave 4: Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Kings*, ed. Ulrich and Cross, Discoveries in the Judaean Deserts 14 (Oxford: Clarendon, 1995), 76.

²²⁰ *Ibid.*, 75.

²²¹ *Ibid.*, 76.

²²² Duncan, “Excerpted Texts of Deuteronomy at Qumran,” 46.

²²³ Duncan, “4QDeutj,” 77.

²²⁴ Tov identifies the orthography as QSP. See Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 333.

²²⁵ Duncan, “4QDeurb,” 77.

Deut 11:21, which would correspond to the MT's ו).²²⁶ Duncan notes that 4Q37 has three corrections.²²⁷

Several scholars have commented on the textual tradition of 4Q37. Duncan describes 4Q37 as an excerpted text since the text preserves “special use” passages and the fragments preserves smaller column heights.²²⁸ Moshe Weinfeld also identifies 4Q37 as an excerpted text, more specifically, a liturgical text.²²⁹ Beyond identifying 4Q37 as an excerpted text, Duncan argues that 4Q37 aligns typologically with the Samaritan Pentateuch since 4Q37 is subject to harmonizations from parallel passages.²³⁰ Nonetheless, Duncan suggests that the type and the range of variants found in 4Q37 could also be attributed to the scribe copying from memory, which would suggest that the differences found in 4Q37 cannot reasonably indicate the text’s textual tradition.²³¹ Tov asserts that 4Q37 significantly diverges from the other texts, and is thus, really independent.²³² Lange also identifies the text as non-aligned.²³³

Contrary to Tov and Lange, it is reasoned here that 4Q37 is an excerpted text belonging to the Masoretic tradition. The textual analysis of excerpted texts must be done with great caution since variants of an excerpted text may not always be evidence of the text’s textual tradition. Differences may have derived from a scribe copying the text from

²²⁶ Duncan, “4QDeurb,” 78.

²²⁷ *Ibid.*, 79.

²²⁸ *Ibid.*, 75.

²²⁹ M. Weinfeld, “Grace after Meals in Qumran,” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 111, no. 3 (1992): 428.

²³⁰ Duncan, “Excerpted Texts of Deuteronomy at Qumran,” 60.

²³¹ *Ibid.*, 61.

²³² Tov, “Groups of Biblical Texts Found at Qumran,” 98.

²³³ See Lange, “Textual Plurality,” 55. See also Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 333.

memory, as Greenstein indicates²³⁴ and as Duncan proposes.²³⁵ Rabbinic tradition permitted *mezuzot* and *phylacteries* to be written by heart, not from a written text (b. Megilla 18b).²³⁶ Thus, it is at least possible that excerpted texts were afforded the same freedom since *mezuzot*, and *phylacteries* are a form of excerpted texts. Besides minor differences deriving from possible slips in memory, differences in sequence cannot be used as evidence for identifying the excerpted text's textual tradition.²³⁷ If one assumes that 4Q37 originally existed as one manuscript, then the text can reasonably be classified as belonging to the Masoretic tradition when one adequately accounts for its excerpted nature.

Description and Categorization of Variants

Several variants listed by Duncan will not be discussed in the following descriptions and statistics. Seven proposed variants depend on insufficient manuscript data. Two additional proposed readings depend completely on reconstruction and will not be included in the following discussion or statistics: the placement of column 5 and 12 in their respective placements according to Duncan. One final variant is merely an orthographic difference.

Category 1.²³⁸ Eight variants belong to category 1. These variants involve the addition or omission of particles such as a conjunctive *vav* and an article. Moreover,

²³⁴ Duncan, "Excerpted Texts of Deuteronomy at Qumran," 60. See also Greenstein who argues that misquotation instead of a different textual tradition may account for several variants found among the Biblical-DSS in Greenstein, "Misquotation of Scripture."

²³⁵ Duncan, "Excerpted Texts of Deuteronomy at Qumran," 60-61.

²³⁶ See especially *ibid.*, 61n68.

²³⁷ See Tov, "Excerpted and Abbreviated Biblical Texts," 599.

²³⁸ See appendix 1 for details about category 1 variants.

several substitutions of synonymous forms, such as the substitution of number, are also preserved in 4Q37.

Category 2. Seven differences between 4Q37 and the MT belong to category 2. Four of these differences are additions that have precedent in MT parallel passages. The first addition is preserved at Col 1:2 (Deut 5:1) and concerns the addition of הַזֶּה “the this,” which modifies הַיּוֹם “to day.” The addition specifies that the commandments Moses spoke in the ear of Israel happened *this* day. On the one hand, 4Q37’s reading is paralleled at Deuteronomy 15:15 and 26:16. On the other hand, numerous parallel verses do not specify that the commandment is given *this day*, but just today (e.g., Deut 5:1; 8:1, 11; 10:13; 11:8). Furthermore, the difference between saying הַיּוֹם “today” and הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה “this day” is slight.²³⁹ Both constructions are definite and refer to today. Thus, the addition of 4Q37 fits within the Masoretic tradition and is similar to it syntactically. The addition is minor and involves only a slight change of emphasis.

The second addition occurs at Col 5:3 (Deut 8:6) and consists of the addition of a particle כל “all.” Whereas 4Q37 reads לְ[לֶכֶת בְּ]כֹל דַּרְכָיו “to walk in all of his ways,” the MT reads לְלֶכֶת בְּדַרְכָיו “to walk in his ways.” The MT, like 4Q37, is commanding Israel “to walk in all of his ways” despite the MT omitting the כל particle. This fact is evident from the immediate context. Deuteronomy 8:2 specifies that Israel is to remember “every way” כָּל-הַדְּרָוֹת, not just some ways. Moreover, the commandment “to walk in all of God’s ways,” the reading preserved in 4Q37, occurs numerous times in the MT (e.g., Deut 5:33; 8:2; 11:22). The reading of the MT is less numerous but occurs at least five times in the MT of Deuteronomy (Deut 8:6; 19:9; 26:17; 28:9; 30:16). Thus, based on the immediate context and based on parallel passages, this addition is a slight change and only makes the MT more explicit.

²³⁹ The article is labeled an *excessive article* or an *alternating particle* when it attaches to a demonstrative pronoun. See Fuller and Choi, *Invitation to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*, §20b, §36a.

The third addition occurs at Col 5:5 (Deut 8:7) and concerns the addition of the adjective וְרַחְבָּה “and spacious.”²⁴⁰ The MT of Deuteronomy 8:7 describes the Promised Land 8:7 as “a good land” while 4Q37 describes the Promised Land as “a good and spacious land.” Duncan notes that the scribe of 4Q37 is likely expansionistic here in light of Exodus 3:8, which modifies the Promised Land as both “good and spacious” אֶל־אֶרֶץ טוֹבָה וְרַחְבָּה.²⁴¹

The fourth addition is found at Col 8:4 (Deut 11:8) and reads וְהַמְשַׁפְּטִים “and judgments.” Although Duncan proposes that this addition also includes the phrase הַחֻקִּים “and statutes,” this is not certain since הַחֻקִּים has no manuscript evidence to support it. Moreover, spatial considerations are of little help due to the textual damage of the fragment. Her reading, therefore, depends on the fact that parallel verses often include both nouns. However, the inclusion of הַחֻקִּים “the statutes” is tentative since the MT exhibits great variety when describing God’s commandments. At times, God’s commandments are described simply as commandments (e.g., Deut 11:8, 22; 15:5; 19:9; 27:1). Elsewhere they are described as statutes and commandments (e.g., Exod 15:26; Deut 4:40; 27:10). Moreover, they are also described as commandments and judgments (e.g., Num 36:13; Dan 9:5; Neh 9:29). Duncan’s proposed reading is also prevalent in Scripture (e.g., Deut 5:31; 6:1; 8:11; 11:1). Thus, whether 4Q37 reads הַחֻקִּים is uncertain. Nonetheless, it is certain that 4Q37 reads וְהַמְשַׁפְּטִים. This change is minor.

Besides the four additions, 4Q37 also preserves three substitutions that belong to category 2. The first occurs at Col 8:2 (Deut 11:6) and concerns the substitution of prepositions. 4Q37 reads מִקְרֵב “from the midst,” while the MT reads בְּקֶרֶב “in the midst.” Graphic or linguistic confusion is most certainly the reason for this change. The

²⁴⁰ 4Q41 preserves the same reading at Col 1:2 (Deut 8:6).

²⁴¹ Duncan, “4QDeutj,” 86.

substitution of the prepositions *bet* and *mem* is a common phenomenon.²⁴² Moreover, the recording of this account in Numbers 16:33 reads מִתּוֹךְ “from the midst.” The difference, therefore, is slight.

The second substitution is preserved at Col 10:13 (Exod 13:5) and has precedent in parallel contexts. 4Q37 reads כאשׁןר “just as,” while the MT reads אֲשֶׁר “that.” The broader context is the Lord bringing Israel to the Promised Land that (MT)/just as (4Q37) he swore to their Fathers. In the MT, the Land that God swore to give to their fathers is a relative clause. In 4Q37, the clause is a comparative clause. This is a difference, but the phrase of 4Q37 has precedent in the MT (e.g., Deut 29:12) and is conceptually similar. Thus, the difference belongs to category 2.

The last substitution occurs at Col 12:14 (Deut 32:8). Here, 4Q37 reads בני אלוהים “sons of God” with the LXX against the MT, which reads בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל “sons of Israel.” The meaning of the phrase בני אלוהים of 4Q37 and the phrase of the LXX υἱοὶ θεοῦ “sons of God” likely refers to divine beings.²⁴³

²⁴² For a discussion of the interchange between *mem* and *bet*, see Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 230. Here he argues that these letters are similar both graphically and phonologically. This similarity makes it difficult to determine if the interchange arose from textual or linguistic grounds.

²⁴³ In the MT, the phrase בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים or the related phrase בְּנֵי אֱלִים likely only refers to divine beings (e.g., Gen 6:2, 4; Ps 29:1 89:7). See 4Q381 15:6 that also uses the phrase בני אלים to refer to angels although the evidence is fragmentary, so an exact identification is difficult. A similar phrase occurs in the non-biblical DSS, but refers exclusively to divine beings (e.g., the phrase בני שמים “sons of heaven” at IQS 4:22; 11:8; 4Q416 1:12//4Q118 2:4, 4Q427 7ii:18). Notice that related terms such as בְּנֵי עֲלִיּוֹן (Ps 82:6) and בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים (Hos 2:1) refer to God’s people, not divine beings. In Greek literature, the LXX refers to God’s people as υἱοὶ τοῦ ὑψίστου “sons of the Most High” (LXX Ps 81:6] and υἱοὶ θεοῦ ζῶντος “sons of the Living God” (Hos 2:1) while Wisdom 2:18; 18.13 and Solomon 17:27 use variations of the phrase υἱοὶ θεοῦ “sons of God” to refer to God’s people, not divine beings. Odes 2:43 contains a variation of this phrase, but determining if the referent is a divine being or a human is difficult. Textual damage to column 12 prohibits context to help aid interpretation of this phrase. Nonetheless, even if one were to supply the reading of the MT and the LXX for the rest of the verse, the meaning of בני אלוהים “sons of God” would still be ambiguous on internal grounds. On the one hand, one may argue that the reading בני אלוהים (referring here to divine beings) better contrasts with the phrase בני אדם “sons of man.” On the other hand, one might argue that since this phrase has three parallels and since each of these parallels phrases refer to humans (גוֹיִם “nations,” בְּנֵי אָדָם “sons of man,” and גְּבֻלַת עַמִּים “borders of the peoples”), then interpreting בני אלוהים might better be interpreted as referring to human rather than to angels. Thus, internal evidence does not help determine the referent of 4Q37’s reading.

Tov asserts that the reading found in 4Q37 and the LXX is original and that the scribe of the MT gives the text a different direction by altering a single word.²⁴⁴ Furthermore, he asserts that the scribe of the MT altered the text in order to avoid polytheistic connotations.²⁴⁵ He states that the term בני אלהים “sons of God” referred not to the sons of the Lord, but to gods of the Canaanite and Ugaritic pantheon.²⁴⁶ His explanation is possible, but not certain. Tov argues that the scribe of the MT altered the text because he did not feel comfortable with the polytheistic connotations of בני אלהים.²⁴⁷ His explanation provides an alleviating solution, but lacks explanatory power since the terms בני אלהים and בני אלים refer to divine beings elsewhere in the MT (בני אלהים occurs at Gen 6:2, 4, Job 1:6; 2:1; 38:7, while the term בני אלים occurs at Ps 29:1, 89:7). Moreover, polytheistic connotations of Deuteronomy 32:8 are not limited to the phrase בני אלהים. Deuteronomy 32:12 states that “no foreign god existed with him [Israel],” while Deuteronomy 32:16a reads, “They [Israel] made him [God] to jealousy with strange things” (i.e., gods). Furthermore, Deuteronomy 32:17 states clearly that “they [Israel] sacrificed to demons that were not God: gods that they did not know.” Thus, Tov’s explanation that the MT eliminated the phrase because of anti-polytheistic tendencies is

²⁴⁴ Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 249. See also Rofé who explains that colon b of the LXX and 4Q44 F5ii:L7 (4QDeut⁹) Deut 32:43 was deleted by an ‘orthodox’ scribe “who could not admit to the existence of deities, even those belonging to a lower rank.” Alexander Rofé, *Deuteronomy: Issues and Interpretations* (London: T & T Clark, 2002), 50.

²⁴⁵ Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 247-50. See also Emanuel Tov, “Theological Tendencies in the Masoretic Text of Samuel,” in *After Qumran: Old and Modern Editions of the Biblical Texts—The Historical Books*, ed. Hans Ausloos, Bénédicte Lemmelijn, and Julio Trebolle Barrera, *Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium* 246 (Leuven, Belgium: Peeters, 2012), 9-11.

²⁴⁶ Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 249. See also Tigay, who says the scribes of the MT likely changed the term בני אלהים to בני ישראל for one of two reasons. First, the scribes did not want Israel to worship these beings, a possible response if Israel envisioned them as having power. See Tigay, *Deuteronomy* דברים, 514. Second, he suggests that the scribes may have changed the text because they felt that the term was too similar to the Canaanite “assembly of the אל.” *Ibid.*, 515.

²⁴⁷ Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 249.

tentative since polytheistic connotations are pervasive in the immediate context and since this phrase occurs elsewhere in the MT to refer to divine beings.

Contrary to Tov, who argues for the originality of the LXX and 4Q37, explanations do exist in favor of reading the MT as original. For example, it is possible that the original reading was בני ישראל “sons of Israel,” but the letters ישר were dropped.²⁴⁸ Michael Heiser dismisses this suggestion since it does not explain how the letters והים could have been added to 4Q37. It is possible that 4Q37 was copied from memory, it was an excerpted text. This fact, plus the fact that the phrase בני אל never occurs in the MT,²⁴⁹ Samaritan Pentateuch, biblical-DSS, or non-biblical-DSS,²⁵⁰ could have led the scribe of 4Q37 to write אלוהים as opposed to אל. Thus, it is at least possible that the MT reading is original.

Although it is difficult to determine which reading is original, both readings are connected in ancient Judaism and in Masoretic sources. Targum Pseudo-Jonathan gives helpful insight into this variant since it interprets לְמִסְפָּר בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל “to number the sons of Israel” of Deuteronomy 32:8 as implying both a reference to Israel and to angels.²⁵¹ The angelic interpretation of Targum Pseudo-Jonathan depends on the scribe identifying God’s divisions of the nations in Deuteronomy 32:8 as referring to the Table of nations in Genesis 10.²⁵² An ancient Jewish tradition connects the division of the nations with an angelic being. This tradition, therefore, provides the ground in which one

²⁴⁸ See Michael S. Heiser, “Deuteronomy 32:8 and the Sons of God,” *Bibliotheca Sacra* 158, no. 629 (January 2001): 58.

²⁴⁹ The phrase בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים occurs at Hos 2:1.

²⁵⁰ The phrase may occur at 11Q13 2:14, but this spot of the line is fragmentary.

²⁵¹ Tov makes this point in *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 249. See also Tigay’s comments in *Deuteronomy* דברים, 514-15.

²⁵² Eldon Clem, *Targum Ps. Jonathan (English)*, version 1.4, electronic ed. (Altamonte Springs, FL: Accordance Bible Software; Oaktree Software, 2006), n359, n360.

could interpret Deuteronomy 32:8 as referring to either divine beings (likely meaning of 4Q37) or humanity (interpretation of MT) or both (Tag. Ps. Jo). Eldon Clem states,

There was an ancient Jewish tradition that each of the nations of the world has an angelic being watching over it, which seems to be reflected in Daniel 9:13, 20-21; Deuteronomy 4:19; Psalm 82. In the Table of Nations in Genesis 10 there are seventy nations that came out of Noah, hence there are seventy angels (cf. Targum Pseudo-Yonatan (Jonathan) on Gen 1:16; 11:8; as well as *Pirque de Rabbi Eliezer* 177).²⁵³

Thus, the two readings appear connected to an ancient Jewish tradition that is tied to Genesis 10.²⁵⁴

The scribe also interprets Deuteronomy 32:8 as a reference to Israel by drawing on the word “seventy.” Just as seventy nations came out from Noah, so seventy sons of Jacob went into Egypt (Gen 46:27; Exod 1:5; Deut 10:22).²⁵⁵ The Targum implies that “God established the nations according to the number of the children of Israel.”²⁵⁶ Thus, the reading of 4Q37 and the LXX was known amongst the rabbis and derived within Masoretic sources (e.g., Tar. Ps-Jon Gen 11:8). Since this tradition is likely responsible for the difference between the MT, LXX, and 4Q35, identifying the reading of 4Q35 as non-Masoretic is questionable.²⁵⁷

Category 3. 4Q37 does not preserve a category 3 variant.

Statistics and Conclusion of 4Q37’s Textual Tradition

4Q37 is an excerpted text that preserves several differences that can be

²⁵³ Clem, *Targum Ps. Jonathan*, n361. Tigay argues that this tradition is known until the tenth century AD. See Tigay, *Deuteronomy* דברים, 515.

²⁵⁴ Cf. Samuel R Driver, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Deuteronomy*, 2nd ed. The International Critical Commentary, vol. 5 (Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1896), 356.

²⁵⁵ Clem, *Targum Onkelos and Jonathan (English)*, 362.

²⁵⁶ Ibid.

²⁵⁷ Cf. Edward M Cook, “Rewriting the Bible: The Text and Language of the Pseudo-Jonathan Targum” (Ph.D. diss., University of California Los Angeles, 1986).

ascribed to the scribal process.²⁵⁸ Six of the category 2 variants harmonize to parallel passages within the MT while the last likely depends on an ancient Jewish tradition present within Masoretic sources. Thus, all of the differences between the MT and 4Q37 can be ascribed to the scribal process. It is concluded here that the MT and 4Q37 share a common background.

Table 11. The statistical relationship between 4Q37 and the MT

Total # of Words in 4Q37	Categories 1, 2, and 3	Statistical Relationship	Categories 2 and 3	Statistical Relationship	Category 3	Statistical Relationship
373	19	94.91%	11	97.05%	0	100%

4Q38

4Q38 (4QDeut^{k1}) consists of five fragments: one large fragment and four smaller ones preserving portions from Deuteronomy 5, 11, and 32.²⁵⁹ Although 4Q38 and 4Q38a were originally identified as belonging to the same manuscript, Duncan reasons that they should be viewed as separate manuscripts since the letter size in 4Q38 is 3mm while the letter size of 4Q38a measures 2mm, and since the scribe of 4Q38 writes the divine name in square script while the scribe of 4Q38a writes it in paleo-Hebrew.²⁶⁰ She describes the script as characteristic of an Early Herodian formal hand ca., 30-1 BC.²⁶¹ Duncan describes the orthography of 4Q38 as the following: fuller than that of the MT and the Samaritan Pentateuch, inconsistent in representing suffixed forms, marking both accented and unaccented \bar{a} to \bar{o} and u to \bar{o} .²⁶² Paragraph markers follow the MT and Samaritan

²⁵⁸ Seventy-seven words depend on insufficient manuscript evidence. After subtracting these words from the word count supplied by Accordance, the total word count becomes 373 words.

²⁵⁹ Julie A. Duncan, "4QDeutk1," in Ulrich and Cross, *Qumran Cave 4: Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Kings*, 93.

²⁶⁰ *Ibid.*

²⁶¹ Duncan, "4QDeutk1," 94.

²⁶² Duncan, "4QDeutk1," 94. Tov identifies this spelling practice as QSP in *Scribal Practices*

Pentateuch at F2:L13 (Deut 11:12-13), but not at F2:L8 (Deut 11:9).²⁶³

Duncan argues that 4Q38 is an excerpted text because it preserves passages common among excerpted texts.²⁶⁴ She reasons that preservation from these chapters may be by chance, but “it is more likely, given the emergence of 4QDeutⁱ (4Q37) and the other excerpted texts, that this manuscript belongs to the same genre.”²⁶⁵

Only a few scholars have commented on the textual tradition of 4Q38. Duncan argues that 4Q37 aligns typologically with the Samaritan Pentateuch since it is subject to parallel passages,²⁶⁶ but does not group it with the Samaritan family. Instead, Duncan suggests that the type and the range of variants found in 4Q37 could be attributed to the scribe copying from memory.²⁶⁷ Tov and Lange identify 4Q38 as non-aligned.²⁶⁸

Contrary to Tov and Lange, 4Q38 is grouped here as an excerpted text belonging to the Masoretic tradition. It differs from the MT in only a few minor details, which can reasonably be attributed to the scribal process. Duncan’s suggestion that 4Q38 is subject to the influence of parallel passages, and her explanation that these differences could have derived from the scribe copying from memory, is more persuasive than Tov and Lange’s suggestion that 4Q38 represents a textual tradition besides the MT.

and Approaches, 333

²⁶³ Duncan, “4QDeutk1,” 95.

²⁶⁴ Ibid. See also Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 112, who lists Deut 5, 11, and 32 as texts commonly included in *mezuzot* and *tefillin*.

²⁶⁵ Duncan, “Excerpted Texts of Deuteronomy at Qumran,” 47.

²⁶⁶ Ibid., 60.

²⁶⁷ Ibid., 61.

²⁶⁸ See Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 333. See also Lange, “Textual Plurality,” 55.

Description and Categorization of Variants

Duncan proposes eleven differences between 4Q38 and the MT. Two of these differences are not included in the following discussions and statistics because they differ only orthographically from the MT. The first difference concerns the addition of an indicative *nun* at F2:L6 (Deut 11:9), while the second concerns a *qere perpetuum* at F2:L9 (Deut 11:10).

Category 1.²⁶⁹ Five variants belong to category 1: the omission of a marker of the accusative at F1:L2 (Deut 5:29), the omission of the article at F2:L13 (Deut 11:12), and three instances of the substitution of number at F2:L3 (Deut 11:7), F2:L8 (Deut 11:10), and F2:L10 (Deut 11:10).

Category 2. Four variants belong to category 2. Three of these are additions. The first addition is preserved at F2:L4 (Deut 11:8) and reads כול המצוה החוקים [והמשפטים] “the entire commandment, the statutes, and the judgments,” where the MT reads כָּל־הַמִּצְוָה “the entire commandment.”²⁷⁰ The reading of 4Q38 has precedent in the MT (e.g., Deut 5:31; 6:1; 8:11; 11:1).

The second addition is found at F2:L5 (Deut 11:8) and reads תחזקו ורבייתם “that you might be strong and great,” while the MT simply reads תִּחְזְקוּ “that you might be strong.” Deuteronomy 8:1 of the MT preserves a similar construction with the verb וּרְבִיתֶם.²⁷¹ Duncan further notes that 8Q4 F1:L25 (8QMez) contains this expanded form.²⁷²

²⁶⁹ See appendix 1 for details of these variants.

²⁷⁰ The manuscript evidence for the reading וְהַמִּשְׁפָּטִים is small, but is accepted because of the presence of the *mem*. This variant has the least amount of manuscript evidence to be accepted. A similar addition occurs at 4Q37, Col 8:L4 (Deut 11:8).

²⁷¹ Duncan, “4QDeutk1,” 97. However, the verbs of the MT in Deut 8:1 are תִּחְיוּ וּרְבִיתֶם וּבִאתֶם “that you might live and be great and enter and possess,” while the verbs of the MT at Deut 11:8 are תִּחְזְקוּ וּבִאתֶם וּרְבִיתֶם “be strong and enter and possess.”

²⁷² Duncan, “Excerpted Texts of Deuteronomy at Qumran,” 52.

The third addition is found at F2:L6 (Deut 11:8) and preserves the readings אַתְּ הַיַּרְדֵּן “the Jordan.” 4Q30 F3i:L3 (Deut 4:14) also preserves this addition. As illustrated when discussing that text, when Israel is described as crossing into the Promised Land, sometimes it specifies that they are crossing over “the Jordan” while other times this detail is implicit. On the one hand, this detail is implied in the MT of Deuteronomy 4:14, 26; 6:1, 11; 11:11, and here, at 31:17. On the other hand, this detail is explicit in the MT of Numbers 33:51; 35:10, Deuteronomy 11:31; 31:13; 32:47, and Joshua 1:11. Thus, the addition of הַיַּרְדֵּן is implied in the MT of Deuteronomy 11:8. This is only a slight alteration.

Besides preserving three additions, 4Q38 also preserves one omission: the omission of the כֹּל particle “all” at F1:L2 (Deut 5:29). Whereas the MT reads וְלִשְׁמֹר אֶת־ כָּל־מִצְוֹתַי “and to keep all of my commandments,” 4Q38 reads [וְלִשְׁמֹר מִצְוֹתַי] “[and to ke]ep my commandment[s].” This variant is similar to that found at 4Q37 Col 5:L 3 (Deut 8:6). As discussed, that variant was likely influenced by parallel passages. The same is true for this variant. Similar passages exclude a כֹּל particle at Exodus 16:28; Deuteronomy 4:2; 10:13; 30:10, and 16, but include one at Deuteronomy 5:29; 6:2; 13:15; 26:17; 28:1, and 28:15. Thus, the reading of 4Q38 has precedent in the MT.

Category 3. 4Q38 does not preserve category 3 variants.

Statistics and Conclusion of 4Q38’s Textual Tradition

Overall, 4Q38 shares a high level of agreement with the MT.²⁷³ Moreover, all of the variants have precedent within the MT. Thus, 4Q38 is grouped here as an excerpted text belonging to the Masoretic tradition.

²⁷³ Seven words are transcribed by Duncan and Accordance but depend on insufficient manuscript evidence. The total word count accepted here is 371 words.

Table 12. The statistical relationship between 4Q38 and the MT

Total # of Words in 4Q38	Categories 1, 2, and 3	Statistical Relationship	Categories 2 and 3	Statistical Relationship	Category 3	Statistical Relationship
166	14	91.57%	9	94.58%	0	100%

4Q38a

4Q38a (4QDeut^{k2}) consists of thirteen fragments; six are certainly identifiable, two remain tentative, and five others remain uncertain.²⁷⁴ Concerning script, Duncan notes that the scribe wrote in an Early Herodian formal hand ca. 30-1 BC.²⁷⁵ The orthography is generally fuller than that of the MT or Samaritan Pentateuch.²⁷⁶ It consistently marks *ā* to *ō* in both accented and unaccented syllables.²⁷⁷ Other notes on orthography include the use of the long forms of the suffixes, the omissions of the *aleph* once, and the use of *אֵי*.²⁷⁸ Text is preserved at three places where a paragraphing mark occurs in the MT, but 4Q38a only coincides with the paragraph system of the MT once.²⁷⁹ One scribal correction is found at F3:L5 (Frgs. 2-3:L15 [Deut 20:19]).²⁸⁰

²⁷⁴ Duncan, “New Readings,” 99. For a discussion of the reasons 4Q38 and 4Q38a are now understood as distinct manuscripts, see Duncan, “4QDeutk1,” 93.

²⁷⁵ Julie A. Duncan, “4QDeutk2,” in Ulrich and Cross, *Qumran Cave 4: Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Kings*, 99.

²⁷⁶ *Ibid.*

²⁷⁷ *Ibid.*

²⁷⁸ *Ibid.* Tov labels this spelling practice as QSP in Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 333.

²⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, 100. Duncan lists here one further possible paragraph break that may coincide with the system of the MT.

²⁸⁰ *Ibid.* Some of the readings of 4Q38a can be referenced in multiple ways. First, a reading can be referenced by the exact fragment and line number of the reading. Second, the reading can be referenced regarding a group of fragments believed to have originally belonged to the same column and the corresponding line number. Both references will be given here. The first reference is to the exact fragment and corresponding line number while the reference in parenthesis corresponds to the group of fragments and the reconstructed line number.

Description and Categorization of Variants

Duncan proposes that 4Q38a differs from the MT at eight places. Two of these variants, however, will not be included in the following discussions and statistics. First, at F1:L6 (Deut 19:11), 4Q38a substitutes the rare demonstrative pronoun of MT הָאֵלֶּה for the more common form הָאֵלֶּה. Second, at F4:L8 (Deut 24:3), Duncan proposes an addition based on spatial considerations. Her proposal is possible, but uncertain. Thus, six differences remain between 4Q38a and the MT that belong to categories 1 and 2.

Category 1.²⁸¹ Four of these variants belong to category 1: the addition of the בן preposition at F1:L6 (Deut 19:11), the addition of a conjunctive *vav* at F3:L2 (Frgs. 2-3:L12 [Deut 20:17]), the addition of the marker of accusative at F5:L7 (Deut 26:4), and the substitution of number at F1:L3 (Deut 13:3).

Category 2. Two variants belong to category 2. The first variant involves the substitution of an office in ancient Israel and is preserved at F2:L3 (Frgs. 2-3:L3 [Deut 20:8]).²⁸² 4Q38a reads הַשׁוֹפְטִים “judges,” while the MT reads הַשְׂטָרִים “officers.” Three reasons demonstrate that this difference is small. First, these two words are graphically similar; thus, the difference can reasonably be attributed to the scribal process. Second, the term שָׂטָר is a generic leadership position in Israel that can be used to represent other more specific titles. Third, Deuteronomy 16:18 demonstrates that these offices serve the same function: to ensure the promulgation of justice. Fourth, the term שָׂטָר is a generic title that can substitute for other titles. For example, at Numbers 11:16, the title שָׂטָר functions as a synonym to the term זָקֵן “elder” and, at Deuteronomy 1:15, it functions as a synonymy for שָׂר “prince.” Thus, the substitution of these terms is only a slight

²⁸¹ See appendix 1 for details about variants.

²⁸² This variant is similar to that found at 4Q29 Col 3, F5:L5 (Deut 31:28) although not identical.

change.²⁸³

The second difference concerns the substitution of prepositions. 4Q38a reads לפני יהוה “before the Lord” at F5:L6 (Deut 26:3), while the MT reads ליהוה “to the Lord.” The difference here is slight. The prepositional phrase of 4Q38a conveys that when Israel enters into the Promised Land, they are to go to the priest and declare *before* the Lord that they have entered into the Promised Land. The prepositional phrase of the MT conveys that Israel is to declare that they have entered into the Promised Land *to* the Lord. To declare something in the presence of someone (4Q38a) is in effect to declare something to someone. Thus, the variant represents a slight change in perspective and belongs to category 2.

Category 3. 4Q38a does not preserve category 3 variants.

Statistics and Conclusion of 4Q38a’s Textual Tradition

Based on the analysis, 4Q38a can reasonably be grouped within the Masoretic tradition.²⁸⁴ Only six insignificant variants from categories 1 and 2 exist between 4Q38a and the MT.

Table 13. The statistical relationship between 4Q38a and the MT

Total # of Words in 4Q38a	Categories 1, 2, and 3	Statistical Relationship	Categories 2 and 3	Statistical Relationship	Category 3	Statistical Relationship
174	6	96.55%	2	98.85%	0	100%

4Q40

4Q40 (4QDeut^m) consists of five fragments preserving content from

²⁸³ For a similar variant and a more in-depth discussion, see variant at Col 3, F5:L5 (Deut 31:28).

²⁸⁴ Eight words depend on insufficient manuscript evidence transcribed by Duncan and Accordance and six words counted by Accordance that derive from unidentifiable fragments. The total number of words accepted here are 174 words.

Deuteronomy 3, 4, and 7.²⁸⁵ The script is described by Duncan as a formal hand dating to ca. 50-1 BC, during the transitional period between the late Hasmonaean and early Herodian periods.²⁸⁶ Duncan describes the orthography as fuller than that of the MT and the Samaritan Pentateuch.²⁸⁷ Long forms of the pronominal suffixes and the independent pronouns are used.²⁸⁸ Two corrections, most likely from the hand of the scribe who copied the text, occur in 4Q40.²⁸⁹

The textual tradition of 4Q40 has not been assessed by many scholars. On the one hand, George Brooke comments that 4Q40 is too “difficult to assess in any case, because the extant fragments are too few or too small.”²⁹⁰ Like Brooke, Lange too identifies 4Q40 as a text whose textual tradition is unable to be identified because of textual damage.²⁹¹ On the other hand, Tov identifies 4Q40 as non-aligned.²⁹² Contrary to these scholars, the preserved content is assessed here as corresponding to Masoretic tradition. Overall, this text preserves a high level of agreement with the MT.

Description and Categorization of Variants

Duncan proposes that 4Q40 deviates from the MT at six places. Two of these will not be included in the following discussions and statistics. Several reasons prohibit

²⁸⁵ Julie A. Duncan, “4QDeutm,” in Ulrich and Cross, *Qumran Cave 4: Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Kings*, 113.

²⁸⁶ Duncan, “4QDeutm,” 113.

²⁸⁷ *Ibid.*

²⁸⁸ *Ibid.* Tov labels this spelling practice as QSP in Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 333.

²⁸⁹ Duncan, “4QDeutm,” 114.

²⁹⁰ Brooke, “Qumran Cave 4,” 570.

²⁹¹ Lange, “Textual Plurality,” 56.

²⁹² Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 333.

the first possible variant proposed at F1:L5 (Frgs. 1-3:L5 [Deut 3:21]) from being included in the following discussions. First, if Duncan’s reading is right, the difference concerns a *qere perpetuum*. Second, the fragment is damaged so that the reading is obscured: it is uncertain if 4Q40 read הַהִיאָה or הַהִוָּאָה. Regardless, even if one grants the reading of Duncan, the difference is orthographic. The second difference occurs at F1:L7 (Frgs. 1-3:L7 [Deut 3:21]), but depends on insufficient manuscript evidence. Thus, four differences between 4Q40 and the MT belong to categories 1 and 2.

Category 1.²⁹³ 4Q40 preserves three variants that belong to category 1: the addition of a preposition suffixed to an infinitive construct at F5:L6 (Deut 7:22), the omission of a conjunctive *vav* at F1-2:L7 (Deut 3:22), and the substitution of number at F4:L3 (Deut 4:33).

Category 2. 4Q40 preserves one category 2 variant at F1-2:L3 (Deut 3:20). This variant is a correction against the MT and provides an expansion of the divine title. 4Q40 reads הַהִוָּאָה יְהוָה “the Lord ^your God^,” while the MT reads הַהִוָּאָה “the Lord.” The difference is slight, especially since the fuller phrase preserved by 4Q40—“The Lord your God”—occurs in the MT later in the verse. Moreover, the addition of “your God” is an adaption to a formulaic expression and represents only a slight change.²⁹⁴ Thus, this variant only represents a slight change. The addition belongs to category 2.

Category 3. 4Q40 does not preserve category 3 variants.

²⁹³ See appendix 1 for details about these variants.

²⁹⁴ See Tov, “Textual Harmonizations,” 19.

Statistics and Conclusion of 4Q40's Textual Tradition

4Q40 has suffered a high degree of textual damage.²⁹⁵ However, as the previous discussion demonstrates, the preserved content aligns closely with the MT so that it can reasonably be described as belonging to the Masoretic tradition. The text's one category 2 variant has immediate parallels in the MT.

Table 14. The statistical relationship between 4Q40 and the MT

Total # of Words in 4Q40	Categories 1, 2, and 3	Statistical Relationship	Categories 2 and 3	Statistical Relationship	Category 3	Statistical Relationship
96	5	94.79%	2	97.92%	0	100%

4Q41

4Q41 (4QDeutⁿ) preserves text from Deuteronomy 5 and 8, but in a different order than MT: Deuteronomy 8:5-10 is placed prior to Deuteronomy 5:1-6:1 and contains the reason for the Sabbath command from both Exodus 20:11 and Deuteronomy 5:15.²⁹⁶ Crawford describes the script as deriving from the early Herodian period ca. 30-1 BC.²⁹⁷ The orthography is described as follows: it is full and marks *aw* to *ô* (except in *hip 'il* first *yod/vav* verbs) and *ay* to *ê*. It also marks *ī*, *ū* and typically marks *ā* to *ō* in both accented and unaccented syllables. It further usually marks *u* to *o*.²⁹⁸ Moreover, it typically uses the short forms of the suffixes and occasionally drops the quiescent *aleph*.²⁹⁹ 4Q41 preserves at least six paragraph divisions. One agrees with the MT (Col 4:12 [Deut 5:21]) while

²⁹⁵ Fifteen words transcribed by Duncan are not included in the final word count because they depend on insufficient manuscript evidence.

²⁹⁶ See also Sidnie White Crawford, "4QDeutn," in Ulrich and Cross, *Qumran Cave 4: Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Kings*, 117. See *ibid.*, 117-18, for a discussion of the relationship between column 1 and the remaining columns.

²⁹⁷ Crawford, "4QDeutn," 117.

²⁹⁸ *Ibid.*

²⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, 118.

two others might agree, but the evidence is not certain in these two cases (Col 3:8 [Deut 5:11] and Col 4:7 [Deut 5:15]).³⁰⁰

Scholars agree that 4Q41 is an excerpted text.³⁰¹ Eshel suggests more specifically that 4Q41 served a liturgical purpose: namely, a prayer book.³⁰² Weinfeld too identifies 4Q41 as a prayer book.³⁰³ Crawford, on the other hand, suggests that 4Q41 was excerpted for the purpose of studying.³⁰⁴ Elizabeth Owen merely recognizes that scholars classify 4Q41 as an excerpted text for liturgical or devotional purposes, but goes on to suggest that this may not be the case.³⁰⁵

Several scholars further discuss the textual tradition preserved in 4Q41. Eshel groups 4Q41 as belonging to the group of texts labeled proto-Samaritan.³⁰⁶ By this, Eshel does not mean that the text is a proto-Samaritan text, but that it derived from the same tradition in which the Samaritan Pentateuch and proto-Samaritan texts derived.³⁰⁷ He suggests labeling these text as “The Harmonistic Texts.”³⁰⁸ He describes these texts as

³⁰⁰ Ibid., 121.

³⁰¹ Crawford, “4QDeutn,” 117. Duncan, “Excerpted Texts of Deuteronomy at Qumran,” 44-45; Strawn, “Excerpted Manuscripts at Qumran,” 113. See also Stegemann, “Weitere Stücke von 4 Q P Psalm 37,” 221-27.

³⁰² Esther Eshel, “4QDeut[n]—A Text That Has Undergone Harmonistic Editing,” *Hebrew Union College Annual* 62 (1991): 148-52.

³⁰³ Weinfeld, “Grace after Meals in Qumran,” 427-28.

³⁰⁴ Sidnie Crawford, “The Pentateuch as Found in the Pre-Samaritan Texts and 4QReworked Pentateuch,” in *Changes in Scripture: Rewriting and Interpreting Authoritative Traditions in the Second Temple Period*, ed. Hanne von Weissenberg, Juha Pakkala, and Marko Marttila, Beihefte Zur Zeitschrift Für Die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 419 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2011), 128.

³⁰⁵ Elizabeth Owen discusses the possibility that 4Q41 could have originally contained the entire book of Deuteronomy. Elizabeth Owen, “4QDeutn: A Pre-Samaritan Text?” *Dead Sea Discoveries* 4, no. 2 (1997): 164n11.

³⁰⁶ Eshel, “4QDeut[n],” 120.

³⁰⁷ Ibid., 120-23.

³⁰⁸ Ibid., 148.

“made rather consistently and may be described as compromising an altogether harmonistic reworking of the text.”³⁰⁹ One of the goals of these texts is to clarify the text by replacing archaic forms and by clarifying syntax.³¹⁰

Crawford’s view of the 4Q41 has undergone development. She initially classified 4Q41 as deriving from the MT/Samaritan Pentateuch tradition based on the order of the commandments and based on shared errors.³¹¹ Nonetheless, in a 1990 work, Crawford argued that there is not enough evidence to conclusively identify the tradition of 4Q41 since there are only two cases of shared errors.³¹² In her discussion of 4Q41 in DJD, she withholds judgment about the textual tradition of 4Q41.³¹³ Last, in a 1998 article, Crawford claims that 4Q41 is non-aligned because it is an excerpted text.³¹⁴

Owen concludes that 4Q41 is best classified as non-aligned. She argued that the variants Crawford claimed to be shared errors between 4Q41 and the MT/Samaritan

³⁰⁹ Eshel, “4QDeut[n],” 148.

³¹⁰ Ibid. Interestingly, most of the variants from the Pentateuchal non-aligned texts achieve this result: greater clarity.

³¹¹ White [Crawford], “A Critical Edition of Seven Manuscripts,” 295.

³¹² Sidnie Ann White [Crawford], “The All Souls Deuteronomy and the Decalogue,” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 109, no. 2 (1990): 206.

³¹³ Duncan, “4QDeutb,” 117-28. See also Crawford’s discussion of how her view of the textual tradition of 4Q41 has developed in Sidnie Crawford, “A Response to Elizabeth Owen’s ‘4QDeutn : A Pre-Samaritan Text?’” *Dead Sea Discoveries* 5, no. 1 (1998): 92-94.

³¹⁴ Crawford, “A Response to Elizabeth Owen’s ‘4QDeutn,” 94. Crawford’s view, as expressed in her article, appears to allow for a text to be classified as textually non-aligned while still following a different textual tradition. See a similar view expressed in Tov’s framework in Tov, “Groups of Biblical Texts Found at Qumran,” 155-56. Notice how he classifies 4Q41 (4QDeutⁿ) as belonging to the pre-Samaritan category although secondarily in Tov, “The Biblical Texts from the Judaean Desert,” 155. At the same time, he categorizes 4Q41 as a special sub-group of non-aligned texts in the same work Ibid., 156. Tov, however, no longer views 4Q41 as belonging to the pre-Samaritan family as evident in Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 91. See especially 91n147. The point is that simply because a text is labeled as non-aligned by Crawford and Tov does not necessarily mean it cannot also be adequately described as representing a different tradition.

Pentateuch could have been the original text.³¹⁵ Moreover, she argued that where 4Q41 agrees with the LXX, MT, and Samaritan Pentateuch, these readings “can be shown to have the *preferred reading*.”³¹⁶ The non-aligned nature of this text is further identified by the inclusion of Exodus 20:11, which Owen describes as a significant secondary development that separates 4Q41 from the MT and Samaritan Pentateuch.³¹⁷ Owen admits that 4Q41 resembles the nature of the Samaritan Pentateuch: both texts are characterized by harmonizations.³¹⁸ However, since 4Q41 does not share the exact harmonizations found in the Samaritan Pentateuch, it should not be classified as pre-Samaritan, but as textually non-aligned.³¹⁹ Owen’s assessment of the textual tradition of 4Q41 seems to embody the same principle articulated most recently by Crawford; namely, 4Q41 is non-aligned by virtue of it being an excerpted text.³²⁰

Several other scholars argue that 4Q41 is non-aligned. Tov, like Crawford and Owen, states that excerpted texts are necessarily non-aligned.³²¹ Lange too classifies 4Q41 as non-aligned, but not because it is an excerpted text. He argues that 4Q41 is non-

³¹⁵ Owen, “4QDeutn,” 176.

³¹⁶ Owen, “4QDeutn,” 176.

³¹⁷ *Ibid.*

³¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 177.

³¹⁹ *Ibid.* Owen defines a non-aligned text according to Tov’s criteria. See Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 109.

³²⁰ Crawford, “A Response to Elizabeth Owen’s ‘4QDeutn,’” 94.

³²¹ See Tov, “The Biblical Texts from the Judaean Desert,” 156. He also grouped 4Q41 as belonging to the pre-Samaritan family although secondarily. *Ibid.*, 155. Tov, however, no longer views 4Q41 as belonging to the pre-Samaritan family as evident in Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 91. Crawford, “A Response to Elizabeth Owen’s ‘4QDeutn,’” 94, expresses this opinion. See also Tov’s comments that 4Q41 along with the other liturgical texts (he defines the liturgical texts he has in mind on pp. 245-46) “probably branched off from MT.” Emanuel Tov, “The Textual Development of the Torah,” in Maier, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible, Qumran, Septuagint*, 3:248-49.

aligned because the harmonizing passages of 4Q41 do not always align with one textual tradition against the others.³²²

In agreement with Eshel, it is argued here that 4Q41 combines elements from parallel passages to produce a fuller text, but unlike Eshel, this text is grouped here as belonging to the Masoretic tradition. Many of the smaller harmonizations may have been unintentional. They could have derived from the scribe copying from memory.³²³

Nonetheless, the inclusion of the reason for the Sabbath command from Exodus 20:11 was likely occasioned for liturgical purposes as is the different sequence of texts.

Therefore, classifying 4Q41 as a “harmonistic text” has warrant, but does not ultimately answer the question of textual tradition. Which textual tradition is preserved in 4Q41?

4Q41 is reasoned to belong to the Masoretic tradition here because of 4Q41’s

overwhelming agreement with the MT while differing in only minor details. 4Q41 can

reasonably be classified as a proto-MT Deuteronomy text harmonized with a proto-MT

Exodus text with minor differences attributable to the scribal process.

Description and Categorization of Variants

Since Crawford’s main objective in DJD is to list the differences between 4Q41 and the other witnesses, she groups variants together that occur in close proximity, even if the nature of each variant is quite different. For example, there are three variants at Col 5:2 (Deut 5:22): two omit the article and the other is an added word. This group of variants is discussed together as one unit by Crawford. These variants are divided into two separate discussions here since these variants represent both omissions and an addition and since these variants likely do not influence each other. Therefore, all of the differences discussed by Crawford are accounted for here but divided slightly differently.

³²² Lange, “Textual Plurality,” 87.

³²³ Greenstein, “Misquotation of Scripture.”

Overall, Crawford proposes that 4Q41 differs from the MT at 30 places.³²⁴ However, one of these proposed variants depends on insufficient manuscript evidence, seven differ only with regard to orthography, and one derives from the excerpted nature of the text.

Crawford proposes reading the form *ואתה* “you” at Col 5:10 (Deut 5:27) against the MT’s reading *ואת*. Since only the top of the final letter, possibly a *he*, is visible, this reading is excluded from the following discussion and statistics. It depends on too little manuscript evidence. However, even if this difference were to be accepted, it would be minor. Both readings are second person singular forms of the independent pronoun. The remaining twenty-four proposals of Crawford are accepted here, but the variants are divided slightly differently.

The first variant that concerns only orthography is the difference between the MT’s long reading of *וימהרריה* “its mountains” at Col 1:7 (Deut 8:9) and 4Q41’s collapsed form of *וימהריה* “its mountains.”

The second is preserved at Col 3:4 (Deut 5:9). This is excluded since this difference concerns Qumran spelling. Whereas the MT reads *תעבדום* “serve them,” 4Q41 reads *תעובדם* “serve them.”³²⁵

Third, the proposed reading of *מצוותי* “my commandments” at Col 3:7 (Deut 5:10) is excluded here as a genuine variant. The *yod* and *vav* are indistinguishable in this manuscript.³²⁶ Moreover, if one reads the suffix as a *yod*, as Crawford proposes, the form reads with the *qere*. If one reads the suffix as a *vav*, then 4Q41 agrees with the *kethiv*. Regardless, the form fits within the Masoretic tradition.

³²⁴ The table of variants for 4Q41 in appendix 1 divides the variants into 34 different units, not 30 units.

³²⁵ Elisha Qimron, *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986), §311.13d.

³²⁶ Crawford, “4QDeutn,” 124.

Fourth, the proposed difference at Col 4:6 (Exod 20:11). Explaining the form of 4Q41 here is difficult.³²⁷ 4Q41 reads וינחה “and rested,” while the MT reads the typical form וינח “and rested.” נח is a second *yod/vav* verb. In the *vav*-consecutive form, the accent retracts from the *ultimate* syllable to the *penultimate* causing the final vowel to reduce.³²⁸ However, the form of 4Q41 has not reduced. The lack of reduction may be because the final *het* has become quiescence.³²⁹ If this happened, then the final syllable would remain open and prohibit the accent from retracting.³³⁰ Nonetheless, evidence from the biblical-DSS weakens this explanation since the phenomenon of not retracting the accent from the *ultima* to the *penultima* of second *yod/vav* verbs occurs with verbs that are not third gutturals (e.g., עוף “fly” (1QIsa^a Col 5:28 (Isa 6:6)), שׁוּב “return” (1QIsa^a Col 30:12 (Isa 37:8)), and קוּם “arise” (4Q27 F1-4:L1 (Num 11:31))). In light of this evidence, it is clear that the difference between these forms is merely orthographic.

The fifth and sixth variants are preserved at Col 4:10-11 and 4:11-12 (Deut 5:21) preserves the reading רעײך “your friends” while the MT reads רעײך “your friends/your friend.” 4Q41’s form may be a pausal form where the third *yod* reappears.³³¹ This difference occurs twice.

Seventh, Col 5:2 (Deut 5:22) preserves the readings ויכתבם “and wrote them,”

³²⁷ See 4Q134 F1:L22 (Exod 20:11) for the same form as found in 4Q41 (וינחה). This same reading is found in 4Q134 (4Phyl G).

³²⁸ Fuller and Choi, *Invitation to Biblical Hebrew*, 254.

³²⁹ For a discussion of the weakening of the *het* at Qumran, see Reymond, *Qumran Hebrew*, 107-14.

³³⁰ See the *vav*-consecutive of בוא in biblical Hebrew. The final *aleph* becomes silent and thus the accent does not retract. Another example of the accent not retracting, and thus, the vowel remaining stable is found when the subject of a *vav*-consecutive second *vav* verb is plural. Here, the accent does not retract and the vowel *û* remains (i.e., 1 Sam 25:9). See Fuller and Choi, *Invitation to Biblical Hebrew*, 254; Gesenius, *Gesenius’ Hebrew Grammar*, §72t.

³³¹ It is typical for a third *yod* to reappear when the a third *yod/vav* verb is in pause. See Gesenius, *Gesenius’ Hebrew Grammar*, §75u.

while the MT reads וַיִּכְתְּבֵם “and wrote them.” It is common for a *vav* to be placed after the root’s first consonant in the imperfect when pronominal suffixes are attached.³³²

Thus, this too is an alternative spelling of the form in the MT.

One more addition should not be included in the following discussion and statistics because its addition likely depends on the excerpted nature of 4Q41: the inclusion of the ground for keeping the Sabbath command as found in Exodus 20:11 at Col 4:5-7 (Exod 20:11).³³³ When discussing this addition, therefore, one should compare it to Exodus 20:11 in the MT, and only count as variants those differences between 4Q41 and the Exodus account. These versions are identical except for the omission of a marker of accusative found in the MT version of Exodus and the substitution of a *vav*-consecutive for an infinitive construct. The Exodus version of the MT concludes the ground by saying וַיִּקְדְּשֶׁהוּ “and consecrate it,” while 4Q41 reads לקדשו “to consecrate it.”³³⁴ There is also an orthographic difference concerning the form of a *vav*-consecutive second *yod/vav* verb found at Col 4:6 (Exod 20:11) and discussed under “Description and Categorization of Variants” (fourth orthographic variant). Therefore, this addition preserves one orthographic difference not counted in the statistics, one category 1 variant, and one category 2 variant.

Category 1.³³⁵ Several variants belong to category 1. These variants include the omission and addition of particles such as the conjunctive *vav*, the marker of the accusative, prepositions, and the article. It further includes the substitution of synonymous

³³² Qimron, *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, §311.13d.

³³³ Crawford notes that the Nash Papyri, like 4Q41, gives both reasons for the Sabbath, but in reverse order Crawford, “4QDeutn,” 126. See also Albright who argues that the best date of the Nash Papyri is the second half of the second century BC. William Foxwell Albright, “A Biblical Fragment from the Maccabean Age: The Nash Papyrus,” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 56, no. 3 (1937): 172.

³³⁴ The difference is not alarming since *vav*-consecutive is absent in post-biblical Hebrew. See Eduard Kutschera, *A History of the Hebrew Language* (Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 1982), 131. I am thankful to Peter Gentry for this comment.

³³⁵ See appendix 1 for a table listing and briefly discussing all of the variants of 4Q41.

forms of the imperative, the number of an adjective, and synonymous verbal roots.

Category 2. 4Q41 preserves several category 2. Six of these variants are additions. The first addition is preserved at Col 1:2 (Deut 8:7). 4Q41 reads אל ארץ טובה ורחבה “to a good and spacious land,” whereas the MT reads אֶל-אֶרֶץ טוֹבָה “to a good land.” 4Q41’s further modification of the Promised Land has precedent in the MT: Exodus 3:8 describes the Promised Land as אֶל-אֶרֶץ טוֹבָה וְרַחְבָּה “to a good and spacious land.”³³⁶

The second addition occurs at Col 2:7 (Deut 5:3). Here, 4Q41 reads כולנו חיים “all of us living today,” whereas the MT simply reads כָּל־נֹשְׁבֵי הַיּוֹם “all of us living.” The reading of 4Q41 further emphasizes the identity of the generation about to enter the Promised Land. They are the ones with whom God made this covenant: those who are living *today*. Deuteronomy 4:4 preserves a similar construction כָּל־יְהוּדֵי הַיּוֹם “all of you living today.” Moses asserts that those alive *today* were the faithful of Israel at Baal-peor (Deut 4:4). Thus, the difference is one of emphasis and has precedent in the MT of Deuteronomy to stress that Moses is talking to the current generation, not past generations.

The third addition is preserved at Col 2:10-11 (Deut 5:5) and elaborates on the divine name. 4Q41 reads דברי יהוה אלוהיכם “the words of the Lord your God,” while the MT reads דְּבַר יְהוָה “the word of the Lord.”³³⁷ The addition of “your God” is an adaption to a formulaic expression and represents only a slight change.³³⁸ The difference is slight, especially since the fuller phrase preserved in 4Q41 is found in the prior verse of the MT: יהוה אֱלֹהֵינוּ “Lord our God” (however, notice the substitution of pronominal suffixes). Thus, the difference is slight; the addition belongs to category 2.

The fourth addition is preserved at Col 3:14 (Deut 5:14). 4Q41 לוא תעשה בו כל

³³⁶ 4Q37 has the same reading at Col 8:5 (Deut 8:7).

³³⁷ The difference in number between the MT’s דְּבַר “word” and 4Q41’s דְּבָרִי “words” is a category 1 variant. See appendix 1 for details.

³³⁸ Tov, “Textual Harmonizations,” 19.

מלאכה “you will not do, on it, any work,” while the MT reads לא תַעֲשֶׂה כְּלִמְלָאכָה “you will not do any work.” The addition of the prepositional phrase בו “on it” further identifies the day that Israel shall not work, on it; namely the Sabbath. On the one hand, Exodus 16:26 and Jeremiah 17:24 have this additional element. On the other hand, the element is omitted in Leviticus 16:29; 23:31, and Numbers 29:7. These passages refer to the Day of Atonement, which is said to be a Sabbath for Israel, a day in which no work is to be done.³³⁹ Thus, the reading of 4Q41, although different, fits within the Masoretic tradition.

The fifth addition is preserved at Col 4:5 (Deut 5:15) and reads לקדשו “to consecrate it.” In Deuteronomy 5:15, Moses concludes the Sabbath command by saying על־כֵּן צִוָּךְ יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ לַעֲשׂוֹת אֶת־יְמֵי הַשַּׁבָּת “Therefore, the Lord your God has commanded you to do the Sabbath day.” However, Exodus 20:11 reads על־כֵּן בֵּרַךְ יְהוָה אֶת־יְמֵי הַשַּׁבָּת “therefore, God blessed the seventh day and he consecrated it.” The most interesting aspect of 4Q41 is that it contains the reason preserved in Deuteronomy for keeping the Sabbath and the reason preserved in Exodus. In addition, Col 4:5’s (Deut 5:15) addition of לקדשו “to consecrate it” conforms the conclusion of the reason for the Sabbath command in Deuteronomy to the conclusion of the reason for the Sabbath in Exodus.³⁴⁰

The last addition is preserved at Col 5:2 (Deut 5:22) and consists of the added word חושך “darkness.” 4Q41 further describes where God was when he spoke with Israel. He spoke from on the mountain from the fire, *darkness*, cloud, and thick darkness. The fact that God spoke from darkness is present in the MT in Deuteronomy 5:23. This verse simply states that God’s voice came from the darkness. Thus, the addition is likely a

³³⁹ See also a similar syntactical construction with a *bet* preposition although a different genitive in Lev 23:30.

³⁴⁰ 4Q41 does differ slightly from Exod 20:11 morphologically. 4Q41 uses an infinitive construct while Exodus utilizes a *vav*-consecutive imperfect. This substitution in 4Q41 is likely influenced by Deut 5:12, which introduces the Sabbath day by stating that לשַׁמֹּר אֶת־יְמֵי הַשַּׁבָּת לְקַדְשׁוֹ “Keep the Sabbath day by consecrating it.” See Crawford for other possible explanations in White [Crawford], “The All Souls Deuteronomy,” 200-201.

harmonization to the immediate context.

Besides additions, 4Q41 preserves one omission. That omission occurs at Col 3:12-Col 4:1 (Deut 5:14) and consists of a כל particle. Deuteronomy 5:14 of the MT reads “or any beast,” while 4Q41 reads ובהמתך “or beasts.” The omission of the כל particle in 4Q41 likely does not entail less strenuous regulations since the MT version in Exodus omits this particle too (Exod 20:10). The difference is one of perspective, perhaps emphasis, but not meaning.

4Q41 also preserves three substitutions. The first substitution occurs at Col 1:3 (Deut 8:6). 4Q41 reads ושמרתה את מצות יהוה אלוהיך ללכת בדרכיו ולאהבה אותו “and you will keep the commandments of the Lord your God by walking in his ways and by loving him.” The last infinitive of 4Q41 is a substitution for וליירא “and by fearing him.” The replacement of fearing him with loving him is an understandable substitution since similar passages describe obedience as loving God.³⁴¹

The second substitution is preserved at Col 4:4 (Deut 5:15). 4Q41 reads לשמור while the MT reads לעשות. This substitution involves little to no change in meaning,³⁴² which is evident since both Deuteronomy 5 and Exodus 31 use these verbs interchangeably. Deuteronomy 5:12 uses the verb שמר “keep the Sabbath,” while Deuteronomy 5:15 uses the verb עשה “do” the Sabbath.” Moreover, Exodus 31:13 and 14 use the verb שמר while Exodus 31:16 uses the verb עשה.³⁴³

The third substitution is preserved at Col 5:6 (Deut 5:24). Here, 4Q41 replaces אלהים with יהוה. Substitutions involving the divine name are not uncommon. Furthermore, the fact that the verses before and after Deuteronomy 5:24 refer to the Lord as the “Lord

³⁴¹ Crawford cites Deut 11:13, 22; 19:9; 30:6, 16, for comparison in “4QDeutc,” 122.

³⁴² Moshe Weinfeld observes that 4Q41’s replacement of the verbal root עשה with the root שמר forms an *inclusio* with the introduction to the command at verse 12. See Moshe Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy I-II*, The Anchor Bible, vol. 5 (New York: Doubleday, 1991), 281.

³⁴³ The verb שמר “to keep” is the verb typically used in connection with the Sabbath. (e.g., 19:3, 30; 26:2; Isa 56:2, 4, 6, and Ezek 44:24).

our God” demonstrates the variability involved when referring to God in the immediate context.

Category 3. 4Q41 does not preserve category 3 variants.

Differences likely caused by excerpted nature. The different sequence of text preserved at columns 1-2 and the inclusion of the ground of the Sabbath found in Exodus 20:11 likely derive from the text’s excerpted nature.

Statistics and Conclusion of 4Q41’s Textual Tradition

4Q41 is a liturgical text deriving from the Masoretic tradition.³⁴⁴ The previous discussion indicates that, regarding disagreements, most of the variants are additions that harmonize the text with parallel passages.³⁴⁵ Moreover, the statistics shown next demonstrate that 4Q41 shares a high level of agreement with the MT. This agreement is even high if one compares 4Q41’s addition of Exodus 40:11 to the MT of Exodus 40:11 instead of counting these thirty-seven words as an addition. If one does this, then the texts agree 94.83 percent if variants from category 1, 2, and 3 are considered. If one only considered those variants from category 2 and 3, then the texts agree 98.11 percent of the time. Last, the case for classifying 4Q41 as belonging to the Masoretic tradition is strong when considering that misquotation is a possible explanation for the smaller textual variants, especially among excerpted texts,³⁴⁶ that the different sequence is due to the text’s excerpted nature,³⁴⁷ and that the inclusion of Exodus 20:11 is occasioned for liturgical

³⁴⁴ 4Q41 is preserved extraordinarily well. Only four words from fragment 4 and three words from fragment 6 transcribed by Crawford are not accepted here.

³⁴⁵ Eshel, “4QDeut,” 122, defines 4Q41 as a harmonistic text. A harmonistic text is defined by him as a text that has undergone consistent editing. *Ibid.*, 121.

³⁴⁶ Greenstein, “Misquotation of Scripture.”

³⁴⁷ Tov, “Excerpted and Abbreviated Biblical Texts,” 599.

purposes.³⁴⁸

Table 15. The statistical relationship between 4Q41 and the MT

Total # of Words in 4Q41	Categories 1, 2, and 3	Statistical Relationship	Categories 2 and 3	Statistical Relationship	Category 3	Statistical Relationship
793	39	95.08%	13	98.36%	0	100%

5Q1

5Q1 (5QDeut) preserves portions of Deuteronomy 7-9 in two columns. Milik describes 5Q1 as belonging to a small group of archaic Qumran texts, specifically regarding orthography.³⁴⁹ He dates 5Q1 as deriving from first half of the second century BC.³⁵⁰ Milik proposes four corrections made above the line, which he identified as deriving from a second hand for the purpose of systematically making the text conform to the *Vorlage* of the LXX.³⁵¹ He further notes that two of the corrections were occasioned for the purpose of facilitating the reading.³⁵² Tov, however, disagrees that the corrections of 5Q1 are an attempt to conform 5Q1 to the *Vorlage* of the LXX since one example could have been a correction based on homoioteleuton, one could have been made independent of the LXX, and the last is irrelevant.³⁵³ Tov concludes that the correction at Col 2:L6 (Deut 8:12) could have been a correction to a text like the LXX, but since the text does

³⁴⁸ Eshel, "4QDeut[n]," 148-52. See also Weinfeld's discussion of 4Q41 in Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy 1-11*, 427-29.

³⁴⁹ Józef Tadeusz Milik, "Textes de La Grotte 5Q: Deutéronome," in *Les "Petites Grottes" de Qumrân*, 169. I am thankful to my friend Benjamin Tilson for translating the French of this text for me.

³⁵⁰ *Ibid.*

³⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 170. Milik argues that two of these corrections are corrected toward the *Vorlage* of the LXX, one in uncertain, and one conforms a word with its Greek pronunciation.

³⁵² Milik, "Textes de La Grotte 5Q," 169.

³⁵³ Emanuel Tov, "The Textual Base of the Corrections in the Biblical Texts Found at Qumran," in Dimant and Rappaport, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research*, 307-8.

not always correct toward the LXX, Tov suggests that 5Q1 only coincidentally agrees with the LXX.³⁵⁴

Few scholars have commented about the textual tradition of 5Q1. In his discussion of 5Q1 in DJD, Milik argues that 5Q1 more closely resembles the text of the Samaritan Pentateuch than the MT based on spellings from Col 1:3 (Deut 7:17).³⁵⁵ Tov assesses Milik's reasoning for understanding this reasoning as unpersuasive.³⁵⁶ Furthermore, Tov identified 5Q1 as non-aligned and possibly an excerpted text.³⁵⁷ Lange, who usually agrees with Tov's assessment of a text's textual tradition, argues that 5Q1 is equally close to the MT and the Samaritan Pentateuch.³⁵⁸ It is argued here that 5Q1 reasonably fits within the Masoretic tradition.

Description and Categorization of Variants

Milik proposes that 5Q1 possesses three textual variants when compared to the MT. Two of these variants depend on insufficient manuscript evidence and are not included in the following discussion and statistics. The first proposed variant occurs at Col 2:6 (Deut 8:13) and concerns the omission of a conjunctive *vav*. The second proposed variant occurs at Col 2:9 (Deut 8:17), but the letter in question is obscured because of textual damage.

³⁵⁴ Ibid., 308.

³⁵⁵ Milik, "Textes de La Grotte 5Q: Deutéronome," 169. The readings of this text can be referenced in multiple ways. For example, Milik's column 2 is made up of more than one fragment, but the fragments are not labeled in either DJD or in the plates on the PAM 42.322. Therefore, for consistency, the readings refer to the column numbers provided by Milik.

³⁵⁶ Tov, "The Textual Base," 307.

³⁵⁷ Tov identifies 5Q1 as non-aligned in Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 333. For Tov's identification of 5Q1 as a possible excerpted text, see Tov, "Excerpted and Abbreviated Biblical Texts," 596-97. Tov understands excerpted texts as a special sub-group of the non-aligned category. See Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 109; Tov, "Excerpted and Abbreviated Biblical Texts," 596-97.

³⁵⁸ Lange, "Textual Plurality," 55.

Moreover, Milik proposes that 5Q1 possesses four corrections. Three of these corrections move the text further away from the MT. However, none of these corrections are discussed in the categories or statistics since these corrections either appear to derive from a second hand, do not contain enough manuscript evidence, or represent only an orthographic difference.³⁵⁹

After the corrections that likely derive from a subsequent hand and those variants that depend on insufficient manuscript evidence are removed, two textual variants remain between 5Q1 and the MT.

Category 1.³⁶⁰ One variant belongs to category 1. This variant is an addition and is preserved at Col 1:5 (Deut 7:19) and reads [הע]. Although Milik proposes a potentially different reading, the only certain difference between 5Q1 and the MT is the omission of the conjunctive *vav*.³⁶¹

Category 2. One variant belongs to category 2. It is an addition preserved at

³⁵⁹ The first correction is clearly preserved on the text but differs orthographically from the base text. The correction reads ראייה ואשר “you saw and which.” This correction likely does not derive from the first hand because 5Q1 is a very *defective* text while this correction contains a suffix written *plene*. The base text of 5Q1 never represents a suffixed form *plene* (cf. the parallel verb in this construction at Col 1:1 (Deut 7:15)). The extremely defective nature of 5Q1 is further evident in its representation of the *hiphil* stem (cf. להורשם “to dispossess them” at Col 1:3 (Deut 7:17)). Thus, the correction likely does not belong to the first hand. See Milik who contrasts the orthography of this correction with the first hand in Milik, “Textes de La Grotte 5Q:Deutéronome,” 170. The next correction that preserves a textual variant occurs at Col 2:L6 (Deut 8:12) and reads במ “in them.” This correction is problematic on paleographic grounds. Although the *bet* resembles the *bet* of 5Q1, the final *mem* does not. Final *mems* extend far below the line of 5Q1. This *mem* when compared to the final *mems* of the text is highly truncated. This phenomenon may have been occasioned by the desire of the scribe not to blur the content of the line above or below. However, Col 2:7 (Deut 8:14) preserves an example of a final *kap* extending into the subsequent line (e.g., המוציאך “who brought you out”). Thus, there is evidence to argue that this correction also came from a subsequent hand. For a discussion of corrections found in 5Q1, see Emanuel Tov, “The Qumran Hebrew Texts and the Septuagint: An Overview,” in Maier, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible, Qumran, Septuagint*, 3:363. The last proposed correction that potentially preserves a textual variant has insufficient evidence to substantiate it. This proposed correction occurs at Col 2:15 (Deut 9:2). There is a fourth correction at Col 2:15 (Deut 9:2), but it concerns orthography.

³⁶⁰ See appendix 1 for a discussion of the variants of 4Q41.

³⁶¹ Milik, “Textes de La Grotte 5Q:Deutéronome,” 170.

Col 1:5 (Deut 7:19) and reads הַיּוֹם “today.” This addition is a unique reading that emphasizes the day when Israel saw God’s great deeds.³⁶² Although parallel verses do occur in the MT, none add הַיּוֹם “today” as 5Q1 does (e.g., Deut 10:21; 29:2). Nonetheless, the difference is one of perspective.

Statistics and Conclusion of 5Q1’s Textual Tradition

5Q1 can reasonably be identified as belonging to the Masoretic Tradition since it agrees with the MT in most details while disagreeing in only a few minor details.³⁶³ The following statistics illustrate 5Q1’s close relationship to the MT.

Table 16. The statistical relationship between 5Q1 and the MT

Total # of Words in 5Q1	Categories 1, 2, and 3	Statistical Relationship	Categories 2 and 3	Statistical Relationship	Category 3	Statistical Relationship
166	3	98.19%	2	98.80%	0	100%

The Pentateuchal manuscripts from Qumran that Emanuel Tov identifies as exclusively belonging to the non-aligned category should be classified as preserving the Masoretic tradition for two reasons. First, the majority of variants preserved in these texts are minor and do not provide an adequate basis for supposing a textual tradition other than the MT. Second, each text agrees with the MT in most readings. These two facts reasonably demonstrate that these Pentateuch manuscripts reflect the Masoretic tradition. This conclusion also applies to the excerpted texts from the Pentateuch since the major differences in these texts do not derive from each excerpted text’s tradition, but likely derive from the excerpted process.

³⁶² Ibid.

³⁶³ Milik transcribes 23 words that are not accepted here. Five belong to column 1 while 18 belong to column 2. Moreover, 5 words are clearly preserved as corrections, but likely derive from a second hand. In all, 5Q1 preserves 166 words.

CHAPTER 3

THE PROPHETIC NON-ALIGNED TEXTS

This chapter analyzes the Prophetic manuscripts from Qumran that Emanuel Tov identifies exclusively as non-aligned. First, each respective manuscript is introduced. Then, the text's orthographic and paleographic character is surveyed. The history of how scholars have viewed the textual tradition of each manuscript is reviewed. Second, the variants are listed and discussed. Whereas category 1 variants are discussed briefly and in an abbreviated manner, the nature of categories 2 and 3 variants are discussed more thoroughly. Third, three sets of statistics provide the reader with the overarching relationship between each respective Prophetic manuscript to the MT. The first set of statistics accounts for all categories 1, 2, and 3 variants. The second set accounts for only category 2 and 3 variants. The most conservative set of statistics is the third: it only accounts for category 3 variants. Fourth, conclusions are drawn based on the nature of the variants (section 2) and based on the overarching statistical relationship (section 3). This analysis demonstrates that although the traditions of a few texts from the Prophetic manuscripts remain ambiguous (i.e., 4Q47 and 4Q49), most of these Prophetic manuscripts can be reasonably grouped as belonging to the Masoretic tradition.

4Q47

4Q47 (4QJosh^a) is preserved in up to twenty-two fragments and preserves text from Joshua 5, 6-8, 10 and possibly chapter 4.¹ The text is written in a formal Hasmonaean

¹Fragment 15 may not belong to 4Q47. This is discussed in detail in the section "A Potential Omission of Joshua 8:11b-13."

book hand ca. second half of the second century or the first half of the first century BC.² The orthography is slightly more *plene* than that of the MT, but is inconsistent.³ For example, Ulrich indicates that the name Joshua is spelled three different ways.⁴ It is spelled defectively as יהשע (F1:L1, 5 [Col 1:1, 5]), partially *plene* at יהושע (F3:L2 [Col 2:2]), and fully *plene* at יהושוע (F1:L1 [Col 1:1], F3:L4 [Col 2:4], F8:L5 [Col 2:8], and F9ii:L1 [Col 5:1]).⁵

Ulrich argues that fragment 1 of 4Q47 preserves a sequence of events about the building of the first altar in the Promised Land at odds with the MT and the LXX. Namely, he argues that fragment 1 depicts that the first altar—the altar that Moses commanded Israel to build in Deuteronomy 27:4-8—was erected immediately after crossing the Jordan, contrary to the MT and LXX, which placed it after the defeat of Ai (MT: Josh 8:30-35; LXX: Josh 9:2a-2f).⁶ This different sequence, according to Ulrich, depicts a different tradition about the building of this altar. Ulrich states,

First, 4QJosh^a and Josephus present an early form of the narrative which places the building of the altar at Gilgal at the end of chapter 4, in accord with the command as read in Deut 27:2-3 and Deut 27:4 without the insertion of a place-name. Secondly, the Samaritan tradition includes בהר גריזין at Deut 27:4, constituting a Samaritan claim. A tertiary sequence is preserved in MT and LXX, with בהר עיבל in M at Deut 27:4 as a Judaeian counterclaim to בהר גריזין. According to this hypothesis then, the narrative about the building of the altar, which originally followed the crossing of the Jordan and preceded the circumcision account, was subsequently transposed in

² Eugene Ulrich, “4QJosh^a,” in *Qumran Cave 4. Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Kings*, ed. Eugene Ulrich et al., vol. 9, Discoveries in the Judaean Desert 14 (Oxford: Clarendon, 1995), 143. One can refer to the reconstructed column and line number provided by the editors, or one can refer to the exact fragment and line number corresponding to the actual fragment. Both are provided in this dissertation. The first reference given is the reference to the fragment number and the corresponding line of the fragment while the second reference is that of the reconstructed column or group of fragments grouped together by Ulrich and the corresponding reconstructed line number.

³ Ibid., 144.

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ Ibid., 143.

accordance with Moses' revised command in MT to its present, curious position at Joshua 8:30-35.⁷

Not all scholars agree with Ulrich that 4Q47 preserves the original sequence. Contrary to Ulrich, Kristen de Troyer argues that the LXX is the oldest stratum of the book of Joshua, followed by the MT.⁸ De Troyer claims that 4Q47 reworked this original order. The order of events found in 4Q47, according to de Troyer, is as follows: 4Q47 fragments 1-2 preserves the reading of the law (MT Josh 8:34-35), immediately followed by a temporal clause not found in any other text that may record the priests exiting the Jordan river labeled 5:X, followed by the account of the circumcision (MT Josh 5:2-3).

De Troyer further argues that the rearrangement of events found in 4Q47 was occasioned by the Qumranites' literary hermeneutic. This hermeneutic led them to situate the building of the altar immediately after crossing the Jordan in accord with Moses' prescription in Deuteronomy 27:4-8.⁹ Moreover, de Troyer speculates that the rearranged sequence of events found in 4Q47 enabled the Qumranites to avoid having the altar built on Mt. Ebal, something that could not be allowed in her mind, since Mt. Ebal is the mountain of curses.¹⁰ In short, de Troyer argues that by "relocating the text, the community of Qumran used scripture to interpret their experience of being the true Israelites."¹¹

⁷ Ulrich, "4QJosh^a," 146.

⁸ Kristin de Troyer, "Building the Altar and Reading the Law: The Journeys of Joshua 8:30-35," in *Reading the Present in the Qumran Library: The Perception of the Contemporary by Means of Scriptural Interpretations*, ed. Kristin de Troyer and Armin Lange, Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series 30 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005), 162. The order of events in the LXX and the MT are not identical. In the LXX, the report that the kings beyond the Jordan gathered themselves to fight Israel (LXX 9:1-2) occurs right after the destruction of Ai (LXX 8:1-29). The LXX then places the building of the altar and the reading of the law after both of these episodes (Josh 9:2a-f). The MT, however, records the building of the altar and the reading of the words of the law (Josh 8:30-35) between the destruction of Ai (Josh 8:1-29) and the account of the kings beyond the Jordan gathering themselves to fight Israel (Josh 9:1-2).

⁹Ibid., 161-62.

¹⁰ Ibid., 161.

¹¹ Ibid.

Alexander Rofé argues that the different sequence of events found in 4Q47, the MT, and the LXX derived from different opinions about how Joshua carried out the commandment of the Torah (i.e., Duet 27).¹² The scribe of the tradition that became the MT, in Rofé’s opinion, inserted the building of the altar at Joshua 8:30-35 for topographical reasons: namely, “Joshua had just conquered a foothold in the hill country [Ai].”¹³ The distance between Ai and Shechem is much shorter than other places on Joshua’s campaign.¹⁴ Thus, “on practical grounds, the placing of the Ebal-story after 8:29 seems appropriate.”¹⁵ According to Rofé, the LXX reflects the same literary stage as the MT, but has been situated after Joshua 9:2 because of scribal error.¹⁶

4Q47 is unlike the MT and the LXX in Rofé’s mind. Whereas the sequence of events found in MT and LXX derived for strategic reasons (proximity of Ai to Ebal), the sequence of events found in 4Q47 derived from a desire to obey Deuteronomy 27:1-8.¹⁷ Rofé concludes that “an editor of Joshua appointed the erection of the altar and the reading of the Torah as the first action of Joshua in Canaan” in accord with Moses’ command.¹⁸

Contrary to the above scholars, van der Meer offers a more cautious approach to 4Q47, and in particular, his analysis of fragment 1, which not only questions Ulrich’s conclusion that 4Q47 is more original than the MT, but also his conclusion about the

¹² Alexander Rofé, “The Editing of the Book of Joshua in the Light of 4QJosh^a,” in *New Qumran Texts and Studies: Proceedings of the First Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Paris, 1992*, ed. George J. Brooke and Florentino García Martínez, *Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 15* (Leiden, The Netherlands: E. J. Brill, 1994), 80.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 88.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 77.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*

¹⁶ *Ibid.*

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 78.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*

contents of 4Q47. Unlike de Troyer, Rofé, and Ulrich, van der Meer does not argue that Joshua 8:30-35 was *transposed* from its location in MT/LXX or vice versa. Rather, he proposes,

Those verses of this passage that narrate the writing of the *torah* on stones and its recitation (i.e., Josh 8:32, 34-35) were duplicated and added to the text of 4QJosh^a after Joshua 5:1. The aim of this duplication of existing material was to bring the Joshua narratives in complete accordance with the two commandments contained in Deut 27:2 and Deut 27:4. The scribe responsible for the doublet in 4QJosh^a must have understood the commandments in Deut 27:2 and 4 as two separate commands.¹⁹

Van der Meer, therefore, suggests that the reading of the law immediately after crossing the Jordan is not a case of *transposition*, but *duplication* or *addition* for interpretive reasons. Moreover, since the text does not say that the altar was erected after the crossing of the Jordan, one cannot argue that this text presents a different tradition about the building of the altar (cf. Ulrich). Rather, the evidence suggests that the scribe only duplicated the reading of the law, not the building of the altar.

The textual tradition of 4Q47 is discussed extensively by scholars. On the one hand, Cross argues that the “Joshua manuscripts at Qumran are systematically ‘Septuagintal’ in character.”²⁰ Contrary to Cross, Greenspoon argues that 4Q47 belongs to the Masoretic tradition²¹ since these texts show “a wide acquaintance with distinctive

¹⁹ Michaël N. van der Meer, *Formation and Reformation: The Redaction of the Book of Joshua in the Light of the Oldest Textual Witnesses*, Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 102 (Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 2004), 513. See van der Meer’s summarizing thoughts on this topic on pp. 532-33.

²⁰ Frank Moore Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran*, 3rd ed., The Biblical Seminar (Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 151. However, Greenspoon’s comments that “although Cross has not formally, or at least publicly, abandoned it [the view that the Qumran Joshua manuscripts are Septuagintal,] in private correspondence he has indicated a marked change in the direction of his thinking on this issue.” Leonard Greenspoon, “The Qumran Fragments of Joshua: Which Puzzle Are They Part of and Where Do They Fit?” in *Septuagint, Scrolls, and Cognate Writings: Papers Presented to the International Symposium on the Septuagint and Its Relations to the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Writings (Manchester, 1990)*, ed. George J. Brooke and Barnabas Lindars, *Septuagint, Scrolls, and Cognate Writings* 33 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992), 161.

²¹ Greenspoon states, “We have portrayed the scribes responsible for 4QJoshua as working largely within an MT ‘context.’” Greenspoon, “The Qumran Fragments of Joshua,” 177.

readings preserved in the MT, usually in the direction of full texts judged to be secondary expansions.”²² Contrary to Cross, Greenspoon states, “This (or, these) scribe(s) had no knowledge of the distinctive features of the LXX tradition for the book of Joshua. To put it another way, there are no qualitatively important readings definitely shared by the LXX and 4QJoshua.”²³ Van der Meer too argues that 4Q47 does not represent an alternative text form of the book of Joshua (cf. Ulrich), but follows the MT closely.²⁴ He states that the relationship between the LXX, 4Q47, and the MT accord with the traditional model of understanding the history of the Old Testament text. Namely, the proto-MT text is the *Urtext* from which 4Q47, the LXX, and the MT all derive. These texts do not exist as distinct literary editions, but all preserve the same tradition.²⁵

Contrary to Cross, Greenspoon, and van der Meer, many other scholars label 4Q47 as independent or non-aligned. Ulrich, for example, characterizes 4Q47 as independent in significant readings, despite agreement in minor details with the MT and the LXX.²⁶ Tov too identifies 4Q47 as non-aligned, and qualifies this categorization by stating that this text is “actually independent” since it contains “readings that diverge significantly from the other texts.”²⁷ Elsewhere, Tov identifies 4Q47 [4QJosh^a] as a

²² Greenspoon, “The Qumran Fragments of Joshua,” 175.

²³ *Ibid.*, 164.

²⁴ Van der Meer’s writes, “These versions [MT, LXX, and 4QJosh^a] all attest to more or less the same version of the book.” Van der Meer, *Formation and Reformation*, 534.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 535-36.

²⁶ Ulrich, “4QJosh^a,” 145. Ulrich further argues that although the LXX and the MT differ from one another slightly about the exact location of the building of the altar, both belong to the same editorial decision or tradition. Eugene Ulrich, “4QJoshua^a and Joshua’s First Altar in the Promised Land,” in Brooke and Martínez, *New Qumran Texts and Studies*, 92.

²⁷ Emanuel Tov, “The Biblical Texts from the Judaean Desert—An Overview and Analysis of the Published Texts,” in *The Bible as Book: The Hebrew Bible and the Judaean Desert Discoveries*, ed. Edward D. Herbert and Emanuel Tov (New Castle, DE: Oak Knoll, 2002), 157. In appendix 8 of his book *Scribal Practices*, Tov marks 4Q47 with an exclamation mark. See Emanuel Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert*, ed. Florentino García Martínez, Peter W.

source that cannot be grouped as preserving the tradition found in the MT or LXX, but represents an additional source.²⁸ He further comments, “In small details, 4QJosh^a goes its own way but the scroll usually follows MT+ in large details.”²⁹ According to Tov, this fact is true with the exception of three sections: (1) Col 1:1-4 amalgamates verses from chapters 8, 4, and 5 in that order with an additional verse not found in any text,³⁰ and Joshua 4:19-5:1 is not found in 4Q47; (2) 4Q47 is missing most of 8:11b-13; and (3) 4Q47 may lack 8:14b-17.³¹

De Troyer too contributes to this discussion, but she remains unsure about the textual tradition of 4Q47. She does identify the sequence of events from fragment 1 as independent. However, de Troyer comments, “The three texts [MT, LXX, and 4Q47] may witness to a linear and chronological development of the text of the book of Joshua, or they may witness to a plurality of texts.”³² Thus, in de Troyer’s mind, the diversity of

Flint, and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, *Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 54* (Boston: Brill, 2004), 333. Lange too labels 4Q47 as non-aligned. Armin Lange, “The Textual Plurality of the Jewish Scriptures in the Second Temple Period in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *Qumran and the Bible: Studying the Jewish and Christian Scriptures in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. Nóra Dávid and Armin Lange, *Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology 57* (Leuven, Belgium: Peeters, 2010), 55. Last, Treballe labels 4QJosh^a as existing in an independent literary tradition. Julio Treballe, “A ‘Canon within a Canon’: Two Series of Old Testament Books Differently Transmitted, Interpreted and Authorized,” *Revue de Qumrân* 19, no. 3 (75) (2000): 385.

²⁸ Emanuel Tov, “Hebrew Biblical Manuscripts from the Judaean Desert: Their Contribution to Textual Criticism,” *Journal of Jewish Studies* 39, no. 1 (1988): 32. Tov, however, claims that 4Q47 preserves the same redactional stage as the LXX in Emanuel Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 3rd ed. (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2012), 140.

²⁹ Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 314. See also his comments in Emanuel Tov, “The Literary Development of the Book of Joshua as Reflected in the Masoretic Text, the LXX, and 4QJosh^a,” in *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible, Qumran, Septuagint: Collected Essays*, ed. Christl M. Maier, *Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 167* (Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 2015), 3:147.

³⁰ The content labeled by Tov as belonging to chap. 4 is labeled by most other scholars as X, which indicates that it is a reading not found in any other text. See Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 314-15.

³¹ *Ibid.*

³² De Troyer, “Building the Altar and Reading the Law,” 159.

readings found among the MT, LXX, and the 4Q47 may be ascribed to the scribal process (see van der Meer), and thus, represent one tradition, or they may represent a plurality of textual traditions (see Ulrich).

As evident from this discussion, scholarship is divided about how to categorize the textual tradition found in 4Q47. Does 4Q47 represent a linear development of the book of Joshua? Or does 4Q47 represent a text independent of the MT and LXX: one that derived not from the MT, but existed as a literary independent unit? Or is it possible to categorize 4Q47 as non-biblical?

The following discussion will focus on two issues. First, 4Q47 preserves several minor differences that at times agree with the MT, at other times agree with the LXX, and are unique in other cases. These inconsistencies, however, do not qualify the text to be considered non-aligned according to the guidelines advanced here since these differences are all minor and can be ascribed to the scribal process.³³

Second, the three potential differences identified by Tov above could potentially mark this text as independent or textually non-aligned. These differences will be discussed in detail after the minor differences are surveyed.

After discussing these two issues, statistics will be provided to illustrate the overarching quantitative relationship between the two texts. This discussion and these statistics will provide a basis for discussing the textual tradition preserved in 4Q47.

Description and Categorization of Variants

Ulrich lists twenty-three differences between the MT and 4Q47. However, eight of these proposed variants are not included in the following discussion or statistics. Three of these proposed variants depend on insufficient manuscript evidence. These proposed differences include the difference between a collective singular and a plural at F9i:L1

³³ Van der Meer, *Formation and Reformation*, 97, also makes this point.

(Col 4:1 [Josh 7:12]) and the substitution of עָלָה “having gone up” with הָלַךְ “having walked” at F20:2 (Frgs. 19-22:L2 [Josh 10:9]). The proposed omission at F21-22:L2 (Frgs. 19-22:L5 [Josh 10:11]) may omit the adjective גדולות “great,” but there is a tear in the manuscript at this precise location so that this adjective could possibly occur in the lacuna between fragments 21 and 22.

One further proposed variant preserves a synonymous spelling corrected to align with the MT. The difference could be the omission of a quiescent *aleph* at F19:L2 (Frgs. 19-22:L2 [Josh 10:9]) or a case of haplography. Nonetheless, this difference too is not clear enough in the manuscript. Each of these proposed variants are minor, but none will be counted in the following discussion or statistics because they depend on insufficient manuscript evidence.

Four other proposed variants are found on fragment 15. Although these readings are clearly present in the text, sufficient evidence suggests that fragment 15 does not belong to 4Q47.³⁴ Therefore, these proposed variants will not be included in the following statistics.³⁵ These proposed variants include one proposed omission that would make the text less explicit. This omission occurs at F15:L1 (Col 5:10 [Josh 8:10]). Here, 4Q47 simply reads וְהַזְקֵנִים “[and] the elders” while the MT reads וְזִקְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל “and the elders of Israel.”

Two further proposed substitutions are found on fragment 15. The first is found at F15:L2 (Col 5:10 [Josh 8:11]). 4Q47 reads וַיָּשׁוּבוּ “and they returned.” Ulrich indicates in his transcription of the fragment the opinion that וַיָּשׁוּבוּ is submitting for עָלוּ “they went up.”³⁶ Ulrich transcribes the previous word as אַחַר, but the *tav* is uncertain. The second

³⁴ For a discussion of why fragment 15 likely does not belong to 4Q47, see the discussion under the section “A Potential Omission of Joshua 8:11b-13.”

³⁵ For a rationale, see the discussion under the section titled “A Potential Omission of Joshua 8:11b-13.”

³⁶ Ulrich, “4QJoshua,” 150.

substitution is found at F15:L13 (Col 5:10 [Josh 8:14]). 4Q47 reads לק[ר]אָהם “to meet them.” Ulrich suggests that this is a substitution for MT’s reading לקראת־יִשְׂרָאֵל “to meet Israel.”

One other proposed variant occurs at F15:L5 (Col 5:10 [possibly representing Josh 8:18]). This line reads ב[י]דךְ אלהעי “in your hand to Ai.” This addition clearly derives from a second hand, and therefore, is not included in the following statistics. Also, the fragmentary nature of fragment 15 makes this correction very enigmatic since the fragment is poorly preserved, preserves several variants, and a potential bottom margin.

Category 1. 4Q47 preserves seven category 1 variants. These variants include two additions: one is the addition of a conjunctive *vav* at F9i:L1 (Col 4:1 [Josh 7:12]) and the other is the addition of the marker of the accusative at F9i:L9 (Col 4:9 [Josh 7:16]). The text also preserves two omissions. A relative particle is omitted at F1:L1 (Col 1:1 [Josh 8:35]) while a conjunctive *vav* is omitted at F9i:L7 (Col 4:7 [Josh 7:15]). Last, there exists three substitutions with respect to the MT. Each of these substitutions concerns the difference between a plural and a collective singular. On the one hand, the MT has the plural form while 4Q47 has the collective singular at F4:L1 (Col 2:1 [Josh 6:5]). On the other hand, 4Q47 preserves the plural form in agreement with the LXX at F9i:L3 (Col 4:3 [Josh 7:13]) and F9i:L4 (Col 4:4 [Josh 7:13]) as opposed to the singular forms of the MT.

Category 2. 4Q47 preserves seven category 2 variants. Among these variants are four additions which make the text more explicit. At F1:L1 (Col 1:1 [Josh 8:35]), the object is made explicit. 4Q47 reads את יה[ו]שו “[Jo]shua.” Likewise, at F1:L2 (Col 1:2 [Josh 8:35]), the reading את הירד[ן] “after they crossed] the Jorda[n]” makes the text more explicit. This addition further designates the time when Joshua read the words that Moses commanded him; namely, after crossing the Jordan. The third addition of 4Q47 that makes the text more explicit occurs at F3:L4 (Col 2:4 [Josh 6:7]). Here 4Q47 reads יהושוע “Joshua.” This addition likely functions to make the subject of the verb, not

preserved in the MT, explicit. Last, the addition at F9i:L1 (Col 4:1 [Josh 7:12]) reads ולא עָרַף יָפְנוּ לַפָּנִי אֲיִבֵיהֶם “and not faces.” This addition provides a fuller orb picture of Israel’s turning from Ai in battle. They have not only turned their backs from their enemies אֲיִבֵיהֶם, but they have not faced them (4Q47). Jeremiah 2:27 and 32:33, like 4Q47, describe the act of turning as one of turning one’s back and not one’s face.³⁷ Therefore, 4Q47 has provided a fuller image than that found in the MT.

There is one category 2 omission preserved in 4Q47. This omission is preserved at F9i:5 (Col 4:5 [Josh 7:14]). Here, 4Q47 omits יִהְיֶה יְקָרֵב לְמִשְׁפָּחוֹת וְהַמִּשְׁפָּחָה אֲשֶׁר-יִלְכְּדָנָה “the Lord will draw near by families. And the family which (the Lord) takes . . .” This omission is likely a case of haplography. The scribe wrote יהוה once, instead of twice, and consequently omitted one step in determining who took the devoted things; specifically, that after the tribe is selected, then the right family is selected. 4Q47 omits this fact.

Two substitutions belong to category 2. The first substitution that belongs to category 2 occurs at F2:L5 (Col 1:10 [Josh 5:6]) and concerns the substitution of הָרְאוּתָם “he would not let them see,” a *hiphil* infinitive construct with an objective genitive for a *qal* infinitive construct ראוּת “[they would not] see.” The syntax is slightly different and is more implicit than the MT since the object of the infinitive is implied and not made explicit.

The second substitution occurs at F9i:L6 (Col 4:6 [Josh 7:15]). 4Q47 reads בהם “with them,” while the MT reads בְּחֵרָם “with the devoted things.” The difference between the versions concerns a pronoun (4Q47) substituting for a noun (MT). The substitution has the same effect as the omission at F15:L1 (Josh 8:10) and the substitution at F2:L5 (Josh 5:6); 4Q47 is less explicit than the MT. The closeness between the forms graphically might suggest that the difference derived from a type of graphic confusion.

³⁷ See also Jer 18:17, where the same concept is discussed, but a different verb is used. Here God *shows* his back and not his face. A similar example also occurs at 2 Chron 29:6. Israel’s fathers are described as turning their *faces*, not backs, and setting their backs.

Category 3. 4Q47 does not preserve certain category 3 variants.

Potential category 3 variants. 4Q47 is inconsistent in minor differences as demonstrated in the previous discussion. Most often these differences make the text more or less explicit. These inconsistencies, however, do not qualify the text to be considered non-aligned according to the guidelines advanced here since the differences can be ascribed to the scribal process.

Nonetheless, the three potential differences identified by Tov could potentially mark this text as independent or textually non-aligned. These differences are as follows: First, Col 1:1-4 potentially amalgamates verses from chapters 8, 4, and 5 in that order with additional elements not found in any text.³⁸ Moreover, Joshua 4:19-5:1 might be omitted in 4Q47. Second, 4Q47 may be missing most of 8:11b-13. Third, 4Q47 may lack 8:14b-17.³⁹

Fragment 1 and 2 (Col 1:1-4). Fragment 1 preserves an upper margin and four lines preserving legible text. On the basis of this fragment and fragment 2, several scholars propose that 4Q47 presents a sequence of text at variance with the MT and LXX. Ulrich argues that the demonstrable data of fragment 1 is as follows: The fragment begins with part of Joshua 8:34-35; namely, the reading of the law. Next, there is a transitional temporal clause initiated by אחר “after” not found in any other text. Last, the fragment ends with what appears to be the beginning of Joshua 5:2, the circumcision account. The sequence of events in fragment 1 according to Ulrich is Joshua 8:34-35, 5:X, and 5:2-3.⁴⁰

³⁸ The content labeled by Tov as belonging to chap. 4 is labeled by most other scholars as X, which indicates that it is a reading not found in any other text. See Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 314-15.

³⁹ Ibid.

⁴⁰ Ibid.

Tov identifies the remains of fragment 1 slightly differently. He argues that the sequence of events corresponds to Joshua 8:34-35 in lines 1-2, Joshua 4:18 in lines 2-3, and Joshua 5:2 in line 4.⁴¹ What Ulrich identifies as a unique verse (i.e., 5:X),⁴² Tov identifies as the remains of Joshua 4:18, although differing in detail from the MT and LXX.⁴³

Two facts about this datum are unclear. First, the nature of the temporal clause is unclear as evident from the disagreement between Ulrich and Tov. There is correspondence between these lines and Joshua 4:18 since the verb נהקו “be lifted out” occurs in both texts. Nonetheless, these lines differ in many details from Joshua 4:18. Deciding between Tov and Ulrich’s proposal is difficult because of the poor state of preservation. This, therefore, calls into question Tov’s claim that 4Q47 omitted Joshua 4:19-5:1 since this proposed omission depends on the proposal that lines 2-3 preserve Joshua 4:18.

Second, the suggestion that the circumcision account followed the crossing of the Jordan is plausible, but unsure. According to Ulrich’s analysis of F1:L4, the beginning of the circumcision account begins on fragment 1, but Ulrich has rightly noted that there is “little unique text [on line 4] to prove conclusively that chapter 5 followed 8:35” if one were to base their argument on fragment 1 alone.⁴⁴ Rather, Ulrich bases his conclusion on the proposal that fragment 2 immediately succeeds fragment 1. This proposal is possible. Ulrich argues that fragment 2’s “first partly preserved word fits perfectly with the last preserved letter on fragment 1.”⁴⁵ This reasoning sounds strong, but the entire first line of

⁴¹ Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 314-15.

⁴² See Ulrich, “4QJoshua^a and Joshua’s First Altar,” 91, who describes 5:X as a transitional temporal clause.

⁴³ Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 314-15.

⁴⁴ Ulrich, “4QJoshua^a and Joshua’s First Altar,” 92.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*

fragment 2 is inconclusive. Ulrich agrees with this point as is evident by the *sigla* he uses in his transcription: his transcription is marked as only a possible reading, not a probable reading, and definitely not the certain reading.⁴⁶ Ulrich's nuance that the circumcision *appears* to come after the reading of the law is appropriate.

The following is a more cautious assessment of fragment 1 and 2. Fragment 1 (Col 1) contains a reading of the law, but possibly not that of Joshua 8:34-35 (L1-2). It is entirely possible that lines 1-2 do not represent a *transposition* of the material from Joshua 8:34-35 (cf. Ulrich), but an addition (see van der Meer).⁴⁷ What follows is a temporal clause that might describe the crossing of the Jordan (3-4).⁴⁸ Whether or not the circumcision account immediately follows depends on the correct placement of fragment 2.

This more cautious assessment of fragment 1 and 2 not only calls into question the nature of lines 2-3 and the placement of the circumcision account after the reading of the law, but it further calls into question the consensus conclusion that 4Q47 preserves a literary tradition that records the building of the first altar in the Promised Land immediately after entering the land as opposed to after the battle with Ai (MT and LXX).⁴⁹ Ulrich, however, reasons that the building of the altar likely preceded Joshua's reading of the words of Moses found in fragment 1 line 1-2 since the reading of the law and the building of the altar are connected in Deuteronomy 27:1-8 and in the MT and LXX Joshua.⁵⁰

⁴⁶ Ulrich, "4QJoshua," 147.

⁴⁷ Van der Meer, *Formation and Reformation*, 513, also makes this point.

⁴⁸ As mentioned, the presence of the verb קָנַח certainly brings Josh 4:18 to mind, but not enough of the verse is present to make this connection. See Ulrich, "4QJoshua^a and Joshua's First Altar," 91, for a discussion of the demonstrable data.

⁴⁹ This is Tov's conclusion in Tov, "The Literary Development of the Book of Joshua," 152. Van der Meer, *Formation and Reformation*, 512, makes the same conclusion.

⁵⁰ Ulrich, "4QJoshua^a and Joshua's First Altar," 91. Here, he further argues that fragment 3 (preserving portions of Josh 6: the battle of Jericho) followed directly to the left of fragment 1 since these

Several factors weaken Ulrich's conclusion. First, the building of the altar is not preserved in the text at all.⁵¹ This fact causes Ulrich's conclusion to be tentative, which he admits.⁵² Second, is Ulrich right to assume that the reading of the Law must coincide with the building of the altar? He asserts that Deuteronomy 27:1-8 links the reading of the Law and the building of the altar, but a close reading of Deuteronomy 27:1-8 indicates that these verses say nothing about the reading of the law, but only that the words of the Law are to be written on these stones. Thus, Ulrich's conclusion depends on unproven assumptions.⁵³

Although many of Ulrich's conclusions are uncertain, he has rightly noted the peculiarity of fragment 1. What is the nature of lines 2-4? And what is the relationship between Joshua reading the Law in line 1 and these enigmatic lines? Contrary to Ulrich, van der Meer accounts for the demonstrable data without recourse to proposing extensive differences. He argues that fragment 1 *may have added* a detail not found in the MT; namely, Joshua read the law while Israel crossed the Jordan. This assertion is much more cautious than Ulrich's suggestion that 4Q47 originally *transposed* all of Joshua

pieces fit together incredibly well. Better evidence to support this proposal is found in the preserved text of fragment 1: it preserves the addition אֶת הַיַּרְדֵּן "the Jordan" at F1:L2 which situates the reading of the law at the Jordan. Van der Meer, *Formation and Reformation*, 512, makes this point. Nonetheless, even though good evidence suggests that fragment 1 preceded fragment 3, this proposal does not prove that Joshua erected an altar immediately after crossing the Jordan since it could be possible for Joshua to read the law without erecting an altar.

⁵¹ Ulrich, "4QJoshua and Joshua's First Altar," 91.

⁵² Ibid. Nonetheless, many have adopted a less nuanced conclusion about 4Q47. See an example of this phenomenon in Treballe, "A 'Canon within a Canon,'" 385. García Martínez's too is less nuanced than Ulrich in Florentino García Martínez, "Light on the Joshua Books from the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *After Qumran: Old and Modern Editions of the Biblical Texts: The Historical Books*, ed. Hans Ausloos, Bénédicte Lemmelijn, and Julio C. Treballe Barrera, Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 246 (Leuven, Belgium: Peeters, 2012), 147-48.

⁵³ Cf. Ulrich who says that 4Q47 "strongly suggests" the building of the altar immediately after crossing the Jordan. Eugene Ulrich, "The Absence of 'Sectarian Variants' in the Jewish Scriptural Scrolls Found at Qumran," in Herbert and Tov, *The Bible as Book*, 182.

8:30-35.⁵⁴ In light of van der Meer's suggestion, lines 2-4 may be a reworking of the crossing of the Jordan (Josh 4:18) to accommodate the new addition. What follows may be the circumcision account. This suggestion accounts for the data and represents a less invasive change than that suggested by Ulrich. Tov's point, therefore, that 4Q47 contains a sequence of text from Joshua 8, 4, and 5 in that order and the omission of Joshua 4:19-5:1 is uncertain.

A potential omission of Joshua 8:11b-13. Tov's second point that 4Q47 is missing large sections of Joshua 8 is also uncertain. This proposed omission depends on the following: approximately 40 letter spaces would need to fit between lines 1 and 2 of fragment 15 (based on reconstructions, these lines would correspond to Col 5:10-11) if 4Q47 read with the MT, 218 letter spaces would need to fit between its lines 2 and 3 (Col 5:11-12), and 48 letter spaces would need to fit between lines 2 and 3 (Col 5:12-13).⁵⁵ The fact that 218 letter spaces separate lines 2 and 3 of fragment 15 (Col 5:12-13) invites Tov's suggestion.

Although Tov's proposal appears plausible, it is not certain. First, as already mentioned, reconstructions should always be viewed tentatively.⁵⁶

Second, the discrepancy between letter spaces depends on Ulrich's proposed placement of fragment 16, which, according to Ulrich, corresponds to fragment 15 in that both lines preserve content from lines 12-13 of the reconstructed column 5. Ulrich's placement of fragment 16, however, is suspect, and thus, the large discrepancy between

⁵⁴ See van der Meer, *Formation and Reformation*, 513. See also Tov, "The Literary Development of the Book of Joshua," 151-53, who makes this conclusion.

⁵⁵ For a similar count of the letter spaces, see van der Meer, *Formation and Reformation*, 461. These counts were done manually so they are approximations.

⁵⁶ See Lucassen's comments about textual reconstructions in Birgit Lucassen, "Possibility and Probability of Textual Reconstruction: The Transition from 4QJoshb, Frg. 2 to Frg. 3 and the Transit of the Israelites through the Jordan," *Textus* 20 (2000): 73.

letter spaces may be a mere allusion.⁵⁷ Contrary to Ulrich, van der Meer, suggests that fragment 16 preserves content from Joshua 8:18-19, not Joshua 8:14.⁵⁸ This suggestion does not necessitate the large-scale omission proposed by Tov, and thus, it is preferable.⁵⁹

Third, a lack of correspondence between fragment 15 and Joshua 8 might suggest that this fragment does not belong to 4Q47. Out of the six partially preserved words, excluding the correction from a second hand, the fragment contains two minor variants in agreement with the LXX against the MT and one more peculiar variant that does not align with either the LXX or the MT (this is the reading וישוּבו at F15:L2 [Col 5:11]).⁶⁰

Further lack of correspondence includes a large vacant space that likely corresponds to a bottom margin.⁶¹ Other explanations offered to account for this vacant space are implausible. For example, the vacate could be explained as an open or closed section. However, van der Meer argues against this view since no other text preserves an open or closed section at this place in the narrative. He further argues that an open or closed section would be unusual from a narrative perspective.⁶² Moreover, the *vacat*

⁵⁷ If Ulrich's placement of fragment 15 and 16 is right, then the reconstructed line 12 of fragment 16 (F16:L1) would begin with content from Josh 8:11, but the line would end with content from Josh 8:14 (F15:3). This fact suggests that the text of 4Q47 was much shorter than the MT. Nonetheless, several factors suggest that the placement of fragment 16 is suspect.

⁵⁸ See van der Meer's comments about the verb שׁוּב of fragment 15 and how it is unclear how it could function in the context of Joshua 8:11, in Meer, *Formation and Reformation*, 461.

⁵⁹ Ulrich, however, reasons that the large-scale omission has precedent in the LXX. See Ulrich, "4QJosh^a," 150. Van der Meer, *Formation and Reformation*, 462, shows that reconstructing 4Q47 to the LXX does not solve the spatial problems since it would result in lines much shorter than expected. Van der Meer's reasoning is strong, but too depends on reconstructions based on spatial considerations; considerations that are not certain. For example, see column 52 of 1QIsa^a, which is much narrower than most other columns of the text.

⁶⁰ Van der Meer, *Formation and Reformation*, 463.

⁶¹ See how part of this vacant space is filled in with a correction deriving from a second hand.

⁶² Van der Meer, *Formation and Reformation*, 463.

could be the result of a scribe skipping space because of damaged leather, but this is not an adequate solution since a second hand has written in this space. The *vacat* space may further represent a phenomenon found in the second half of 1QIsa^a where the scribe of 1QIsa^a intentionally leaves several spaces blank, and these spaces are not paragraph markers or bottom margins, but likely depict an obscure exemplar.⁶³ The blank space found in 4Q47 corresponds in part to those *vacat* spaces found throughout the second half of 1QIsa^a since correctors of 1QIsa^a, at times, correct the text by filling in the originally blank space with the omitted text. A second hand has corrector the text here in the vacate space, or at least written in it. Despite this correspondence, blank spaces found in manuscripts more likely correspond to paragraph markers and margins rather than depicting obscure exemplars. A bottom margin, therefore, is still the better explanation for this vacate space.

Ulrich, however, argues that this blank space is not a bottom margin. This conclusion depends on his placement of the fragment in his reconstructed column that necessitates this column being 13 lines short if this *vacat* were a bottom margin.⁶⁴ However, this lack of correspondence is only a problem if one groups this fragment as belonging to 4Q47.

Despite this evidence, three facts suggest Ulrich's placement of fragment 15. First, there is not a suitable alternative location for this fragment if it originally preserved a text of Joshua.⁶⁵ Second, fragment 15 corresponds to the rest of the fragments of 4Q47 paleographically. Third, according to Ulrich, fragment 15 corresponds to 4Q47, materially

⁶³ See Drew Longacre, "Developmental Stage, Scribal Lapse, or Physical Defect? 1QIsaa's Damaged Exemplar for Isaiah's Chapters 34-66," *Dead Sea Discoveries* 20, no. 1 (2013): 17-50.

⁶⁴ Ulrich, "4QJosh," 150.

⁶⁵ See van der Meer's conclusion of fragment 15 in van der Meer, *Formation and Reformation*, 463.

since the leather preserves unusually large pores, as is the case with the rest of the fragments that make up column 4 and 5.⁶⁶ However, van der Meer argues that these facts do not necessarily mean that the fragment originally belonged to 4Q47. It is possible that the same scribe wrote this fragment and that it came from the same animal, but this does not necessitate that the fragments derived from the same work.⁶⁷

This evidence demonstrates that the placement of fragment 15 and 16 by Ulrich is uncertain. Fragment 16 may be situated further down the column and fragment 15 may not belong to 4Q47.⁶⁸ Tov's conclusion that 4Q47 omitted Joshua 8:11b-13 is uncertain since the evidence can be explained in alternative ways. In short, Tov's conclusion that 4Q47 omitted Joshua 8:11b-13 depends on one way of reading the evidence which is not the only way.

A potential omission of Joshua 8:14b-17. The third main point advanced by Tov to demonstrate the independent character of 4Q47 is also uncertain. This proposed omission concerns Joshua 8:14b-17 and depends on the reading found at F15:L5 reconstructed as Col 5:L14 (possibly Josh 8:18), which reads בַּיַּדְךָ אֱלֹהֵי אִי “your hand to Ai.”⁶⁹ Evidence for a large-scale omission depends on the fact that the prior line preserves text presumably deriving from Joshua 8:14. One line between Joshua 8:14 and the end of Joshua 8:18 seems too little space if the text originally contained Joshua 8:14b-17 of the MT. Thus, the evidence invites the proposal that 4Q47 originally preserved a large omission.

⁶⁶ Ulrich, “4QJoshua,” 144.

⁶⁷ See van der Meer, *Formation and Reformation*, 464.

⁶⁸ Klaus Bieberstein, *Lukian und Theodotion im Josuabuch: mit einem Beitrag zu den Josuarollen von Hirbet Qumrān*, Biblische Notizen. Beihefte 7 (München, Duetschland: M. Gorg, 1994), 81.

⁶⁹ The prepositional phrase is written as one word.

Many facts call into question this suggestion. First, it depends on the proper placement of fragment 15, which is not certain as just demonstrated. Second, both Ulrich and Tov are uncertain about the nature of this line. Ulrich tentatively reconstructs line 5 as preserving Joshua 8:18 וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אֶל יְהוֹשֻׁעַ נָטֵה בַכִּידוֹן אֲשֶׁר בְּיָדְךָ אֱלֹהֵי “[And the Lord said to Joshua, ‘Stretch out the javelin which is in] your hand to Ai.’”⁷⁰ Third, Tov himself admits that this omission is possible, not certain.⁷¹ Fourth, the text from line F15:L5 (Col 5:14) derives from a second hand, likely a corrector. Tov reasons that this hand may not be a corrector but may demonstrate that 4Q47 was originally coupled by multiple scribes.⁷² He asserts that “there are several parallels for the interchange of hands in the middle of Qumran scrolls” and this may be another example of this phenomenon.⁷³ Although this is possible, two facts may weaken Tov’s suggestion. The script of 4Q47 is quite different than that found in this line—they come from different time periods. The script of 4Q47, according to Ulrich, is “in larger letters, in different ink, and lacks a space between the two words אֶל הַעֵי. The form of the final *kap* in יָדְךָ was not common prior to the early Herodian period.”⁷⁴ Moreover, fragments 17-22 presumably preserve text after this line, and the hand resembles the script used throughout the text rather than that found in this line. The evidence as preserved, therefore, does not suggest Tov’s proposal, but suggests that this text is a correction. Fifth, van der Meer argues that these verses perform an essential function in the narrative, and therefore, could not be omitted⁷⁵ although Tov

⁷⁰ Ulrich, “4QJoshua,” 150.

⁷¹ See Tov, “The Literary Development of the Book of Joshua,” 147n18.

⁷² *Ibid.*, 135.

⁷³ *Ibid.* Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 20-21.

⁷⁴ Ulrich, “4QJoshua,” 150.

⁷⁵ Van der Meer, *Formation and Reformation*, 439.

disagrees with this point.⁷⁶ To van der Meer's point, the omission proposed by Tov would divide verse 14 in half, possible mid-clause.

Thus, the text written by a subsequent hand is likely a correction in the bottom margin or perhaps a marginal note. The limited amount of textual evidence precludes certainty, and thus, Tov's suggestion that 4Q47 may have originally omitted Joshua 8:14b-17 must be understood as a suggestion.

Statistics and Conclusion of 4Q47's Textual Tradition

The previous discussion demonstrates two facts. First, 4Q47 preserves several minor differences that at times agree with the MT, at other times agree with the LXX, and are unique in other cases. These inconsistencies, however, do not qualify the text to be considered non-aligned according to the guidelines advanced here since these differences are all minor and can be ascribed to the scribal process.⁷⁷

Second, the three potential differences identified by Tov that could potentially mark this text as independent or textually non-aligned can all be explained in different ways: some explanations are more extensive while others are less extensive.

Multiple conclusions could reasonably be drawn about the textual tradition of 4Q47. First, the fragmentary nature of the text plus the obscure nature of fragment 1 could reasonably lead scholars to withhold judgment about the textual tradition of this text.

Second, 4Q47 could be labeled as a reworked biblical text (namely, a non-biblical text). Tov identifies 4Q47 as a biblical text, but he describes it more specifically as an exegetical Bible text like 4QRP.⁷⁸ There is currently debate about whether reworked

⁷⁶ See Tov, "The Literary Development of the Book of Joshua," 135n20.

⁷⁷ Van der Meer also makes this point in van der Meer, *Formation and Reformation*, 97.

⁷⁸ Tov, "The Literary Development of the Book of Joshua," 152-53. For a critique of this opinion, see Joachim J. Krause, *Exodus und Eisodus: Komposition und Theologie von Josua 1-5*,

texts such as 4QRP are biblical or not.⁷⁹ Tov now categorizes 4QRP as a biblical text although this categorization appears more suggestive than definitive.⁸⁰ The evidence to suggest that 4Q47 is a non-biblical text is as follows: (1) Fragment 1 presents a unique sequence of events deriving from some type of reworking;⁸¹ (2) the book of Joshua was reworked in Second Temple Judaism;⁸² (3) some second temple Jews reworked the book of Joshua in order to link Joshua more closely with Moses⁸³—Rofé, de Troyer, Ulrich, Tov, and van der Meer suggest that this is the reason for the reworking of fragment 1;⁸⁴ and (4) Tov indicates that 4Q378-379 and 4Q522—all works built off of the canonical Joshua—at times stay close to the book of Joshua while diverging from it at other times.⁸⁵ This inconsistency may explain why a fragment such as fragment 9 of 4Q47 only

Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 161 (Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 2014), 275-96.

⁷⁹ See Sidnie White Crawford, “Textual Growth and the Activity of Scribes,” *Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok* 82 (2017): 6-27.

⁸⁰ See Tov’s discussion of why he now categorizes 4QRP as a biblical text in Emanuel Tov, “From 4QReworked Pentateuch to 4QPentateuch (?),” in Maier, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible, Qumran, Septuagint*, 3:45-59.

⁸¹ See Puech, who argues that the reworking is liturgical in Émile Puech, “Les Copies Du Livre de Josué Dans Les Manuscrits de La Mer Morte: 4Q47, 4Q48, 4Q123 et XJosué,” *Revue Biblique* 122 (2015): 495.

⁸² Wise labels 4Q378-379 as belonging to the category “rewritten Bible” in Michael Owen Wise, “4Q378-379,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Translation*, ed. Michael Owen Wise, Martin G. Abegg, and Edward M. Cook (San Francisco: HarperSan Francisco, 1996), 339. Dimant, likewise, appears to categorize 4Q378 as a reworked text. See her discussion of fragment 3 in Devorah Dimant, “Two Discourses from the Apocryphon of Joshua” and Their Context (‘4Q378’ 3i-li),” *Revue de Qumrân* 23, no. 1 (89) (2007): 43-61.

⁸³ Dimant, “Two Discourses from the Apocryphon of Joshua,” 58, claims in her discussion of fragment 3 of 4Q378 that the reworking of fragment 3, column 1 functions to “link Joshua’s words, both thematically and ideologically, to the legacy of his mentor Moses.”

⁸⁴ Rofé, “The Editing of the Book of Joshua,” 78; de Troyer, “Building the Altar and Reading the Law,” 161-62; Ulrich, “4QJosh^a,” 146; Tov, “The Literary Development of the Book of Joshua,” 151; van der Meer, *Formation and Reformation*, 513-14.

⁸⁵ Emanuel Tov, “The Rewritten Book of Joshua as Found at Qumran and Masada,” in *Hebrew Bible, Greek Bible and Qumran: Collected Essays*, Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism 121 (Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 15.

deviates from the biblical text in minor details while a fragment like fragment 1 appears to be completely reworked. Thus, labeling 4Q47 as non-biblical is reasonable in light of these factors.⁸⁶

If 4Q47 was a reworked text, then it is possible it was reworked from a base text that belonged to the Masoretic tradition. Evidence to support this fact is the following: (1) all of the certain differences can be explained as deriving from the scribal process; (2) the potential larger differences are uncertain but can be the result of abbreviating or reworking a text of the Masoretic tradition; and (3) 4Q47 still agrees with the MT in many details.⁸⁷ Nonetheless, because of the presence of large scale differences in a fragmentary setting, this text is labeled as ambiguous here.

Table 17. The statistical relationship between 4Q47 and the MT

Total # of Words in 4Q47	Categories 1, 2, and 3	Statistical Relationship	Categories 2 and 3	Statistical Relationship	Category 3	Statistical Relationship
302	48	84.11%	41	86.42%	0	100%

4Q49

4Q49 is preserved in one fragment and preserves portions from Judges 6:2-13.⁸⁸ Treballe Barrera characterizes the script as deriving from a late Hasmonaean or

⁸⁶ See Hess who suggests that 4Q47 may be a midrashic style text containing a collection of biblical passages along with commentary. Richard S. Hess, *Joshua*, TOTC, vol. 6 (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2008), 21.

⁸⁷ The words of fragment 15 (fifteen words) are not counted here, those variants that depend on insufficient manuscript evidence (three), and several readings that may align with the MT (fifty-three), but also depend on insufficient manuscript evidence. However, PAM photos of five words from fragments 19-22 transcribed by Ulrich cannot be found. These words have been included in the final word counts since Ulrich marks part of these words as certain or probable. Moreover, concerning the statistics, it is important to note that fragment 1 possesses 26 variants at odds with the MT. The addition of Josh 8:34-35 represents five variant words while the reworked section possesses fourteen variant words. All of the preserved words in this reworked section were counted as variants. Also, the discernable words of lines 4-5 of fragment 1, which Ulrich identifies as Josh 5:2-3, were also counted as variants. There are seven variant words here.

⁸⁸ Julio C. Treballe Barrera, "4QJuda," in Ulrich et al., *Qumran Cave 4*, 161.

early Herodian hand ca. 50-25 BC.⁸⁹ The scroll preserves two orthographic variants when compared to the MT. In both instances, 4Q49 is more defective than the reading of the MT.⁹⁰ Moreover, the scribe has corrected the text twice, and in both instances the corrected reading corresponds to the MT (L3 and L9). The first correction adds the phrase בִּישְׂרָאֵל “in Israel” supralinearly. The second correction is preserved at line 9; here, the scribe writes a quiescent *aleph* supralinearly.

One’s analysis of the textual tradition of 4Q49 depends on one’s assessment of 4Q49’s omission of Judges 6:7b-10. Based on this difference, many understand 4Q49 as representing a different literary edition of Judges,⁹¹ or at minimum, of Judges 6:2-13.⁹² Tov is less sure that 4Q49 represents an alternative literary edition, but does classify the text as non-aligned.⁹³ Contrary to these scholars, Richard Hess suggests that 4Q49 may be an abbreviated text, a suggestion which Fernández Marcos considers.⁹⁴ Lange, like

⁸⁹ Treballe Barrera, “4QJudga,” 161.

⁹⁰ Although Treballe Barrera classifies the difference found at L2 (Judg 6:4) as an orthographic difference, he also discusses the possibility of it being a morphological variant. *Ibid.*, 162.

⁹¹ *Ibid.* See also Eugene Ulrich, “Multiple Literary Editions: Reflections toward a Theory of the History of The Biblical Text,” in *Current Research and Technological Developments on the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. Donald W. Parry and Stephen David Ricks, Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 20 (New York: Brill, 1996), 86; and Erhard Blum, “The Literary Connection between the Books of Genesis and Exodus and the End of the Book of Joshua,” in *A Farewell to the Yahwist? The Composition of the Pentateuch in Recent European Interpretation*, ed. Thomas B. Dozeman and Konrad Schmid, Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series 34 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006), 103.

⁹² Robert Rezetko, “The Qumran Scrolls of the Book of Judges: Literary Formation, Textual Criticism, and Historical Linguistics,” *The Journal of Hebrew Scriptures* 13 (2013): 30-31.

⁹³ Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 313.

⁹⁴ Richard S. Hess, “The Dead Sea Scrolls and Higher Criticism of the Hebrew Bible: The Case of 4QJudga,” in *Scrolls and the Scriptures: Qumran Fifty Years After*, ed. Stanley Porter and Craig A. Evans, *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 26 (Sheffield: Sheffield University Press, 1997), 127. See also Natalio Fernández Marcos, “The Hebrew and Greek Texts of Judges,” in *The Earliest Text of the Hebrew Bible: The Relationship between the Masoretic Text and the Hebrew Base of the Septuagint Reconsidered*, ed. Adrian Schenker, Septuagint and Cognate Studies Series 52 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003), 16.

Fernández Marcos and Hess, understands the poor preservation of 4Q49 as prohibiting firm assessments about the tradition preserved by it.⁹⁵ Cross argues that 4Q49 reflects the type of text in the better Septuagint tradition, but also cautions that one “cannot extrapolate on much from these few fragments [4QJudg^a and 4QJudg^b].”⁹⁶

The following discussion demonstrates two facts: 4Q49 contains a limited number of minor variants while the omission of Judges 6:7-10 is not an adequate basis for postulating that 4Q49 existed as a separate literary edition.

Description and Categorization of Variants

Trebolle Barrera argues that 4Q49 differs from the MT in seven places. One of these differences is not included in the following discussion because it depends on insufficient manuscript evidence. One further potential difference may result from the excepting process (i.e., the potential large-scale omission at L5-6 of Judges 6:7b-10). This difference is discussed below as a potential category 3 variant but is not included in the statistics. Last, one other difference is simply a difference in spelling and is preserved at L6 (Judg 6:11).⁹⁷

⁹⁵ Lange, “Textual Plurality,” 56.

⁹⁶ Apud Robert G. Boling, *Judges*, The Anchor Bible, vol. 6a (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1975), 40.

⁹⁷ The difference at L6 (Judg 6:11) does not link 4Q49 to the LXX Antiochian tradition (e.g., A, Alexandrinus) contrary to Trebolle Barrera’s tentative suggestion. See Trebolle Barrera’s conclusion that some LXX manuscripts may follow the reading of 4Q49 against the MT in Trebolle Barrera, “4QJudg^a,” 164. He states that the prehexaplaric reading Αβιεζρι attested by the Antiochian MSS seems closer to the Qumran reading האביעורי. However, LXX A (Alexandrinus) reads πατρὸς Αβιεζρι which is not the reading of 4Q49 since the LXX scribe transliterates אבי twice: first as πατρὸς and second as the first three letters of the proper noun Αβιεζρι. Thus, the reading of these LXX manuscripts does not align with the reading of 4Q49. Rather, the reading of 4Q49 likely reads with the MT against Alexandrinus. The reading of the MT is a gentilic. Gentilics can be derived from compound proper names with an article inserted before the second part of the compound, thus, אָבִי הַעֲזָרָי. See Wilhelm Gesenius, *Gesenius’ Hebrew Grammar*, ed. E. Kautzsch and A. E. Cowley, 2nd English ed. (Oxford: Clarendon, 1910), §127. The reading of 4Q49 too is a gentilic; however, it is different in form since it is represented as one word, not two, and, consequently, the article is repositioned. Gesenius describes the form of the gentilic of the MT as follows: “When the original substantive is a *compound*, it is resolved again in two words.” See Gesenius, *Gesenius’ Hebrew*

Category 1. Three differences belong to category 1. The category 1 variants include the omission of two conjunctive *vavs* at L3 (Judg 6:4) and the substitution of the relative particle אֲשֶׁר to simply ׀ at L9 (Judg 6:13).

Category 2. 4Q49 also preserves two category 2 variants. There is a category 2 omission preserved at L2 (Judg 6:3). Here, 4Q49 omits the MT וְעָלוּ עָלֵינוּ “and they used to come up against them.” This omission is likely the result of haplography, an unintentional change.⁹⁸ The second category 2 variant involves the substitution of the divine name at L8 (Judg 6:13). Here 4Q49 reads אֱלֹהִים “God,” whereas the MT reads יְהוָה “the Lord.” This substitution is minor.

Category 3. 4Q49 does not preserve any certain category 3 variants.

Differences likely caused by excerpted nature. Each of the above differences discussed are minor since they can be ascribed to the scribal process. Although the variant now under consideration (i.e., the omission of Judg 6:7-10) too can be ascribed to the scribal process, many scholars choose rather to ascribe it to the realm of literary criticism, and thus, many identify this text as independent.⁹⁹ Scholars who classify 4Q49 as

Grammar, §86. Inversely, when a substantive is not conceived of as a compound, the word is represented as one word (the reading of 4Q49). Thus, the difference between the MT and 4Q49 is meager.

⁹⁸ Natalio Fernández Marcos, ed., *Biblia Hebraica: Quinta Editione cum Apparatu Critico Novis Curis Elaborato: Judges*, 5^a ed. cum Apparatu Critico novis Curis Elaborato. *Biblia Hebraica Quinta* 7 (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2011), 6.

⁹⁹ Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 313, claims that 4Q49 may not represent an independent literary edition, but still identifies it as independent or non-aligned. Thus, for Tov, the non-aligned category is quite expansive; it contains texts that differ in minor details (1QIsa^a) and others that may represent an alternative literary edition (possible 4Q49).

representing an alternative literary edition include Treballe Barrera,¹⁰⁰ Eugene Ulrich,¹⁰¹ Erhard Blum,¹⁰² and Rezetko.¹⁰³ Tov classifies 4Q49 as non-aligned, but is less than certain that the text represents an alternative literary edition.¹⁰⁴

Others disagree that 4Q49 represents an alternative literary edition. Hess claims that the evidence likely suggests that 4Q49 was a rearranged text, but that the

¹⁰⁰ Treballe Barrera, "4QJudg," 162. Julio C. Treballe Barrera, "Textual Variants in 4QJudg and the Textual and Editorial History of the Book of Judges," *Revue de Qumran* 14, no. 2 (December 1989): 238.

¹⁰¹ Ulrich, "Multiple Literary Editions," 86, claims that 4Q49 contains an early literary form of the book of Judges. Ulrich, "The Absence of 'Sectarian Variants,'" 182, comments that 4Q49 "retains the old, uninterrupted folk narrative on a single fragment." See also Eugene Charles Ulrich, "Deuteronomistically Inspired Scribal Insertions into the Developing Biblical Texts: 4QJudg and 4QJera," in *Houses Full of All Good Things: Essays in Memory of Timo Veijola*, ed. Juha Pakkala and Martti Nissinen (Helsinki: Finnish Exegetical Society; Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2008), 490. His view is largely based on the omission of Judg 6:7-10. He supports his conclusion with the following arguments: (1) Judg 6:7-10 is a coherent unit that differs from what comes before and after stylistically. (2) It is introduced with a resumptive clause, a common trait of secondary additions, see Ulrich, "Multiple Literary Editions," 86. (3) It has been viewed as a secondary addition for the past 100 years, see Ulrich, "Multiple Literary Editions," 86-87. (4) Paragraph markers mark these verses as a separate unity, see Ulrich, "Multiple Literary Editions," 87. Ulrich, "Multiple Literary Editions," 87, nuances his conclusion though, by stating that the poor state of the preservation of 4Q49 prohibits a firm conclusion on the nature of the entire text since one cannot be sure if this omission is a singular phenomenon or whether the entire text was originally a separate edition of Judges. See his similar comment in Ulrich, "Deuteronomistically Inspired Scribal Insertions," 492. Ulrich further discusses that it is unlikely that 4Q49 would preserve the original text in the first century BC against all other witnesses. Ulrich, "Deuteronomistically Inspired Scribal Insertions," 492. Thus, he claims that 4Q49 was likely the "dominant text in the early Second Temple period, and that this deuteronomistically inspired insertion in the MT and LXX is part of the late, widespread, developmental growth at the hands of numerous scribes seen in many biblical books." Ulrich, "Deuteronomistically Inspired Scribal Insertions," 492-93.

¹⁰² Blum, "The Literary Connection," 103.

¹⁰³ Rezetko, "The Qumran Scrolls of the Book of Judges," 30-31.

¹⁰⁴ Tov claimed in 2002 that "the texts which are most manifestly non-aligned, and actually independent, are texts which contain (groups of) readings that diverge significantly from the other texts, such as 4QJosh^a and 4QJudg^a." See Tov, "The Biblical Texts from the Judaean Desert," 156. Nonetheless, Tov is more cautious about the textual nature of 4Q49 in his 2012 edition of *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*. Tov states, "If this minus [the omission of Judges 6:7-10] did not stem from a textual accident, such as the omission of a complete paragraph, it could reflect an earlier literary version of the book, in which part of the Dtr⁺ framework, contained here in 6:7-10, had not yet been found" in Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 313.

fragmentary evidence should caution scholars from making definitive conclusions.¹⁰⁵ Rofé understands the omission as a mechanical error, and thus, it is not indicative of a separate literary edition.¹⁰⁶ Fernández Marcos is sympathetic to both Hess's and Rofé's view,¹⁰⁷ while O'Connell understands the omission as possibly intentional. He, therefore, too concludes that this difference does not indicate an independent literary edition.¹⁰⁸

Several details ought to shape the interpretation of this large omission. First, the text is poorly preserved as several scholars admit.¹⁰⁹ Whether one accepts the cautious count here (59 words as sufficiently present) or one accepts the word count of Treballe Barrera (he accepts 71 words as sufficiently present in the text), the fact remains that the text is poorly preserved. Moreover, only nine lines are partially present, and no line remains fully preserved. Line 5 only preserves partially fourteen letters while

¹⁰⁵ Hess, "The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible," 122-28.

¹⁰⁶ Rofé too disagrees with scholars who claim that 4Q49 represents an independent text. Rofé reasons that this passage was omitted by means of parablepsis. See Alexander Rofé, "Studying the Biblical Text in the light of Historico-Literary Criticism: The Reproach of the Prophet in Judg 6:7-10 and 4QJudg," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Context: Integrating the Dead Sea Scrolls in the Study of Ancient Texts, Languages, and Cultures*, ed. Armin Lange, Emanuel Tov, and Matthias Weigold, Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 140 (Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 2011), 121. It appears plausible that mechanical errors lead to the omission of more than a few lines. Mennahem Haran points out that the British Library MS 9399 from the thirteenth century omits Psalm 47 probably because of the similarity between the beginnings of Psalm 47 and 48. See Menahem Haran, "11QPsa and the Canonical Book of Psalms," in *Minḥah Le-Naḥum: Biblical and Other Studies Presented to Nahum M. Sarna in Honour of His 70th Birthday*, ed. Marc Zvi. Brettler and Michael A. Fishbane, Journal for the Study of the Old Testament. Supplement Series 154 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993), 195n3. Thus, one cannot rule out a mechanical error here.

¹⁰⁷ Natalio Fernández Marcos, "The Genuine Text of Judges," in *Sôfer Mahîr: Essays in Honour of Adrian Schenker*, ed. Adrian Schenker et al., Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 110 (Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 2006), 34.

¹⁰⁸ See Robert H. O'Connell, *The Rhetoric of the Book of Judges*, Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 63 (Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 1996), 147. Compare these comments to his comment that the omission may have been a deliberate change or it may attest a form of Judges that circulated without Judg 6:7-10. *Ibid.*, 467. See also O'Connell's comments that "the Hebrew text of Judges reflects a relatively reliable history of scribal transmission." *Ibid.*, 384.

¹⁰⁹ See Hess, "The Dead Sea Scrolls," 125. See also Fernández Marcos, *Biblia Hebraica*, 6.

Trebolle Barrera estimates that each line originally contained 59-65 letters per line.¹¹⁰

Any discussion of the textual tradition of this text must account for this fact.

Second, the text contains two supralinear corrections in the span of only nine very partially preserved lines. However, one should note that the space above the first line is missing. Thus, in reality, 4Q49 preserves two supralinear corrections in the span of only eight very partially preserved lines. Out of the fifty-nine sufficiently preserved words, two words are corrected, meaning that the scribe has corrected 3.4 percent of the preserved words. To put it another way, 4Q49 preserves eight lines where one can discern if a supralinear correction has occurred, and two of those lines have corrections. Thus, 25 percent of the lines that can be tested for supralinearly corrections have them.

Tov's very helpful appendix 8 of his book *Scribal Practices* provides a way to compare the amount of scribal activity found in 4Q49 to several other texts from Qumran and other Judean Desert locations since he lists the number of scribal interventions and the average number of lines between scribal interventions for 97 texts.¹¹¹ Out of the 97 texts surveyed, only three texts have a lower average number of lines between scribal interventions than 4Q49 (i.e., 5QDeut, 1QIsa^a, 4QJer^a) while one text has the same average number of lines between scribal interventions (4QQoh^a). One can see that this fragment has a considerable amount of scribal activity when compared to the other texts listed in this appendix. However, because of the poor preservation of this text, one cannot be sure that this fragment is representative of the entire text. Nonetheless, this evidence does indicate that *this fragment* was poorly copied or at least was copied from a poor

¹¹⁰ Trebolle Barrera, "4QJudg," 161.

¹¹¹ Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 331-35. Tov discusses 163 texts in his table, but only provides data for 97 of these texts. Tov does not provide data in columns 10 and 11 for 66 texts likely because of these texts poor preservation: 4Q49 is one of these texts.

exemplar. Fernández Marcos's conclusion that 4Q49 is a poorly copied text is, therefore, plausible.¹¹²

Third, the text contains one omission that likely derived from a mechanical error (i.e., haplography).¹¹³ The fact that there is one omission that most likely derived from haplography in the span of only 59 sufficiently preserved words is high. This fact, again, indicates that 4Q49 was either copied from a poor exemplar or was itself poorly copied.¹¹⁴

Fourth, the omission of Judges 6:7-10 occurs in a lacuna. This fact casts some doubt on the nature of this omission. Although the lacuna is far too small to contain Judges 6:7-10 written on the line in the same size font as the rest of the text, there is precedent for large amounts of text corrected in small spaces. For example, Col 30:11 of 1QIsa^a preserves a considerable amount of text written above the line by the original scribe and down the margin of the *next* column.¹¹⁵ Although this phenomenon happens infrequently, it does cast some doubt on the nature of this difference.

Fifth, the omitted text coincides closely with paragraph markers, a detail integral to Hess's argument.¹¹⁶ This fact is important since abbreviated texts exist in Qumran and the omitted material at times occurs between paragraph markers. For example, Tov argues that 4Q106 (4QCant^a) and 4Q107 (4QCant^b) omitted text between paragraph markers not because of scribal negligence or because they testify to a separate literary edition, but

¹¹² Fernández Marcos, "The Genuine Text of Judges," 39. Cf. Rezetko, "The Qumran Scrolls of the Book of Judges," 29n117, concludes that this claim is uncorroborated.

¹¹³ If one accepts the possible omission of מִן־הַיָּמִין at L4 (Judg 6:5), then two omissions in this text likely derived from mechanical errors. However, this second omission is possible, but uncertain due to insufficient manuscript evidence

¹¹⁴ Fernández Marcos, "The Genuine Text of Judges," 39, argues for the latter.

¹¹⁵ Col 32:14 and Col 33:7 of 1QIsa^a similarly preserve content supralinearly and down the margin but come from a secondary hand.

¹¹⁶ Hess, "The Dead Sea Scrolls," 125-27.

because of the scribes' conscious desire to shorten the texts.¹¹⁷ Tov further argues that 4Q15 (4QExod^d) may reasonably be labeled an abbreviated text,¹¹⁸ a point supported by Judith Sanderson, who suggests that 4Q15 may be a liturgical scroll.¹¹⁹ Like 4Q49, this text too omits material between paragraph markers. Thus, the fact that a complete literary unit is likely omitted in 4Q49 might suggest that the text is rearranged, abbreviated, or excerpted.

Sixth, 4Q49 is unique in omitting Judges 6:7-10.¹²⁰ Rezetko argues that this claim, pointed out by Fernández Marcos', is irrelevant because of the limited early textual evidence and other comparable textual situations.¹²¹ He argues that 4QJudg^a is the oldest surviving text to preserve Judges 6:2-13 and precedes Codex Vaticanus by at least 300 years.¹²² This gap in time could have resulted in numerous textual alterations and developments that could have led to 4Q49's shorter reading becoming unique among the manuscripts.¹²³ Rezetko's view is possible, but does not match the surviving evidence. Fernández Marcos's thorough examination of the Greek witnesses leads him to the conclusion that the "Hebrew text known by the translators [of the LXX] was only slightly different from M."¹²⁴ Moreover, it is hard to imagine how this addition would infiltrate all textual witnesses except 4Q49. Understanding 4Q49 as some type of abbreviated text

¹¹⁷ Emanuel Tov, "106-107. Introduction to 4QCanta-C," in *Qumran Cave 4. XI, Psalms to Chronicles*, vol. 11, Discoveries in the Judaean Desert 16 (Oxford: Clarendon, 2000), 195.

¹¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 196.

¹¹⁹ Judith E. Sanderson, "4QExodd," in *Qumrân Cave 4: Genesis to Numbers*, 127.

¹²⁰ Fernández Marcos, "The Hebrew and Greek Texts of Judges," 6.

¹²¹ Rezetko, "The Qumran Scrolls of the Book of Judges," 29.

¹²² *Ibid.*, 30.

¹²³ *Ibid.*

¹²⁴ Fernández Marcos, *Biblia Hebraica*, 8.

makes better sense of the data.

Statistics and Conclusion of 4Q49's Textual Tradition

The conclusion that 4Q49 represented a separate literary edition is not persuasive. Too little of the manuscript is preserved to substantiate this claim. Moreover, ample evidence suggests that the text was either poorly copied or copied from a poor exemplar. Last, the nature of the omission (it likely omits a complete literary unit) and the fact that the text alone preserves this reading suggests that this text is a type of abbreviated text. 4Q49 resembles other excerpted texts in at least two ways.¹²⁵ First, one complete literary unit is omitted. Second, these texts are at times unique in how they abbreviate/excerpt the biblical text, and thus, not all abbreviated texts need to be abbreviated in the exact same manner. The evidence suggests, therefore, that 4Q49 does not represent an independent textual edition of Judges but represents an abbreviated text. The base of this text could reasonably be understood as a text belonging to the Masoretic tradition.¹²⁶

The overarching statistical relationship between these texts furnishes some

¹²⁵ The text contains several minor differences that might indicate, although does not necessarily indicate, that the text was copied from memory. See Julie A Duncan, "Excerpted Texts of Deuteronomy at Qumran," *Revue de Qumran* 18, no. 1 (April 1997): 60. Rabbinic tradition permitted *mezuzot* and *phylacteries* to be written by heart, not from a written text (b. Megilla 18b). See *ibid.*, 61 n68. See also Edward L. Greenstein, "Misquotation of Scripture in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *The Frank Talmage Memorial Volume*, ed. Barry Walfish, vol. 1, Jewish History 6 (Haifa, Israel: Haifa University Press, 1993), 71-83. See also Brooke's comments about the nature of the *tefillin* and *mezuzot* from Qumran, in George J. Brooke, "The Textual Tradition of the Temple Scroll and Recently Published Manuscripts of the Pentateuch," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research*, ed. Devorah Dimant and Uriel Rappaport, Series on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 10 (Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 1992), 279-80. He says that the types of differences between these texts and biblical texts may not simply be the result of scribal memory, but they might be the result of a desire to make the Pentateuch more internally consistent through assimilation. However, the example of parablepsis at L2 (Judg 6:3) likely indicates that these small differences derive from poor copying, not copying from memory.

¹²⁶ Despite this evidence and due to the limited size of the text, one could reasonably withhold judgment on the nature of this text.

support for this explanation. The agreement is moderate, less than most other texts from the Prophets identified by Tov as textual non-aligned, but this is because half of the differences derive from an example of parablepsis.¹²⁷ The lower statistical relationship between the texts, therefore, is likely the result of poor copying. Nonetheless, because of the presence of a large-scale difference in a fragmentary setting, this text is labeled as ambiguous here.

Table 18. The statistical relationship between 4Q49 and the MT

Total # of Words in 4Q49	Categories 1, 2, and 3	Statistical Relationship	Categories 2 and 3	Statistical Relationship	Category 3	Statistical Relationship
59	8	86.44%	5	93.22%	0	100%

6Q4

6Q4 (6QpapKgs) is a text poorly preserved on 94 fragments of papyri.¹²⁸ The contents of only 17 fragments have been identified. The script is described as archaic and is dated to the second half of the second century BC.¹²⁹

Tov has discussed the nature of papyri at Qumran in detail. The use of papyrus as a writing material is not uncommon among literary works from Qumran even though most literary works (non-documentary) were written on leather, not papyrus.¹³⁰

According to Tov, 131 non-documentary works are preserved on papyri at Qumran—14

¹²⁷ Twelve words transcribed by Trebolle Barrera are not accepted here since they are not sufficiently preserved.

¹²⁸ Maurice Baillet, “Livres des Rois,” in *Les “Petites Grottes” de Qumran: Exploration de la Falaise, les Grottes 2Q, 3Q, 5Q, 7Q à 10Q, le Rouleau de Cuivre*, ed. Maurice Baillet, J. T. Milik, R. de Vaux, Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan 3 (Oxford: Clarendon, 1962), 107.

¹²⁹ *Ibid.*

¹³⁰ Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 32.

percent of the total number of texts,¹³¹ but biblical papyri only represents 1 percent of the texts found at Qumran.¹³² Tov characterizes the content of Qumran papyri as follows: “The collection of Qumran papyri is mainly sectarian and liturgical, and usually non-biblical. Most papyri may reflect personal copies owned by members of the Qumran community, while some may have been imported from other sources.”¹³³ Moreover, several non-documentary texts exist on papyri and on leather,¹³⁴ but no differences in content between these works distinguish them from each other.¹³⁵ Likewise, Tov argues that the scribal conventions—orthography, paragraphing system, word division, writing in columns, etc.—of those texts written on papyri do not differ from those written on leather although papyri do not evidence ruling, do not prefer correcting a text by means of crossing words out, and do not prefer cancelation dots.¹³⁶

The textual tradition of 6Q4 is debated. Baillet describes the text of 6Q4 as shorter than the MT and close to the LXX and Vulgate.¹³⁷ Trebolle Barrera describes the textual filiation by fragment. He states that fragments 1-9 agree with the MT while fragments 10-16 “show a certain divergence from MT, both in the comparatively few words which have survived and in the length of the text as indicated by the lacunae.”¹³⁸

¹³¹ Ibid., 45-46.

¹³² Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 47. This fact corresponds to the statement in m. Yad. 4:5 which says that only passages of Scripture written on skin make the hands unclean.

¹³³ Ibid., 51.

¹³⁴ See table 5 for a list of works that are preserved on both papyri and leather in *ibid.*, 48.

¹³⁵ Ibid., 51.

¹³⁶ Ibid., 52.

¹³⁷ Baillet, Milik, and Vaux, “Livres des Rois,” 107.

¹³⁸ Julio Trebolle Barrera, “Qumran Fragments of the Book of Kings,” in *The Books of Kings: Sources, Composition, Historiography and Reception*, ed. André Lemaire, Baruch Halpern, and Matthew J. Adams, Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 129 (Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 2010), 25.

He suggests that the “Greek proto-Lucianic recension could reflect an original Hebrew close to the textual form of these Qumran fragments.”¹³⁹ He further describes the content of fragments 16-17 as agreeing with the MT, and the final 76 fragments as too fragmentary to describe.¹⁴⁰ Tov identifies 6Q4 as textually non-aligned,¹⁴¹ as does Lange.¹⁴²

Description and Categorization of Variants

6Q4 is very poorly preserved. Nonetheless, Baillet’s epigraphic skill provides some attempt to comprehend this poorly preserved manuscript. It is important to note that his transcriptions often depend on little manuscript evidence (as he notes most often) and on reconstructions. The text is approached much more cautiously here than Baillet since comparison between Baillet’s transcriptions with photos of IAA demonstrate that most of his readings are less than certain. Therefore, Baillet’s four variants that depend on spatial reconstructions are not accepted here nor are seven further variants that depend on insufficient manuscript grounds.¹⁴³

¹³⁹ Treballe Barrera, “Qumran Fragments of the Book of Kings,” 25.

¹⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 26.

¹⁴¹ Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 33, 333.

¹⁴² Lange, “Textual Plurality,” 55.

¹⁴³ As mentioned, Baillet’s approach to 6Q4 is much more generous than the approach taken here. One of his proposed reconstructed variants illustrates the difference in approaches. This proposed variant is the substitution of *וַתַּעַשׂ* “and she did” for *וַתֵּלֶךְ* “and she went” at F15:L3 (2 Kgs 8:2). This proposal has no manuscript evidence to support it and no support among the versions but is based on a subsequent variant; namely the omission of *וַתֵּלֶךְ הִיא וּבֵיתָהּ וַתֵּגֵר* “and she went with her household, and she sojourned.” See Baillet, “*Livres des Rois*,” 109. His reasoning appears to be that since the text omits the form of the verb *הָלַךְ* later in the verse, it probably substituted the form of the verb *עָשָׂה* found in the MT and the versions earlier in the verse for a form of *הָלַךְ*. This reasoning is highly tentative but is further weakened by the fact that the supposed omission of *וַתֵּלֶךְ הִיא וּבֵיתָהּ וַתֵּגֵר* is far from certain. This omission depends on Baillet’s transcription of line 4, but his transcription is doubtful. Although this variant depends on insufficient manuscript evidence, if one accepted Baillet’s reading it would agree with the *qere*. Overall, very little of this line is preserved, and thus, the proposed omission of *וַתֵּלֶךְ הִיא וּבֵיתָהּ וַתֵּגֵר* is doubtful. Subsequently, his proposed variant with no support among the versions and no manuscript support is further cast into doubt. This proposed variant, thus, illustrates how drastically different the approach taken here is to the approach taken by Baillet. The

One of these variants depends on some evidence but is ultimately uncertain. This proposed reading of ׀[כדבר איש האלהי] “according to the word of the man of Go]d” at F15:L1 (2 Kgs 7:20) preserves clearly only the final *mem*. Baillet’s suggested variant depends on the conclusion that the following space is a *vacat* representing a paragraph break. However, the space may or may not have been an original paragraph break. Examination of line 5 of fragment 15 shows that the papyri has deteriorated so that the bottom half of some of these letters are now completely gone; the papyri is mostly blank *just like* the space after this final *mem* in line 1. Thus, this blank space could simply be the result of deterioration. The poor nature of this text precludes certainty about the addition proposed by Baillet.

The remaining six variants that depend on insufficient manuscript evidence are preserved at F5:L5 (1 Kgs 22:31), F10:L4 (Frgs. 10-14:L4 [2 Kgs 7:9]),¹⁴⁴ F15:L3 (2 Kgs 8:1),¹⁴⁵ F15:L4 (2 Kgs 8:2), F15:L4 (2 Kgs 8:2), and F15:L5 (2 Kgs 8:2). None of these variants are accepted as genuine variants. All of these variants illustrate that Baillet’s approach to the text was freer than the approach adopted here.

One further difference at F15:L4 (2 Kgs 8:1) could be an example of confusion of gutturals although it would also be reasonable to group this difference as a category 1 variant.¹⁴⁶

approach here is much less generous.

¹⁴⁴ One can refer to the fragments grouped together as belonging to the same column and corresponding line number provided by the editors, or one can refer to the exact fragment and line number corresponding to the actual fragment. Both are provided in this dissertation. The first reference given is the reference to the fragment number and the corresponding line of the fragment while the second reference is that of the fragments grouped together as belonging to the same column and the corresponding reconstructed line number.

¹⁴⁵ This variant depends on insufficient manuscript evidence but if one accepted Baillet’s reading, it would agree with the *qere*.

¹⁴⁶ For more about the nature of these variants, see table “6Q4: Description of variants” in appendix 2.

Category 1. 6Q4 does not preserve any certain category 1 variants.

Category 2. After Baillet's seven readings based on insufficient manuscript evidence and one potential difference concerning a synonymous reading are removed, only three category 2 variants remain. The first category 2 variant preserved in 6Q4 is found at F11:L2 (Frgs. 10-14:L2 [2 Kgs 7:8]).¹⁴⁷ 6Q4 reads וישאו [ו] משואם "and [they] lifted up their load as opposed to the MT which reads וישאו משאם "and they lifted up from there." The difference is that 6Q4 makes the object of the verb implied in the MT explicit.¹⁴⁸

The second category 2 substitution is found at F15:L6 (2 Kgs 8:4). 6Q4 reads ספר נא "tell me," whereas the MT reads ספֿר־ה־נָא "tell me." The difference is one of emphasis. Interchange between the long form and short form imperative is not unknown among the biblical-DSS.¹⁴⁹

The third category 2 substitution is found at F15:L6 (2 Kgs 8:4). 6Q4 reads אֵלִיָּהוּ "Elisha," while the MT reads אִישׁ־הָאֱלֹהִים "the man of God." 6Q4 substitutes the title of the MT for a proper noun. The title "man of God" is used often to refer to Elisha

¹⁴⁷ Although Baillet transcribes the reading as משואם "burden, load," the following transcription is more likely [מש]ואם. This transcription is based on PAM 42.945 Plate 894. See The Leon Levy Dead Sea Scrolls, "Plate 894," accessed November 3, 2017 <http://www.deadseascrolls.org.il/explore-the-archive/image/B-284843>. The reading according to Baillet is an aberrant spelling of משאם "load, burden." See Baillet, "Livres des Rois," 109. The Aramaic משוא "burden, load" supports this suggestion. See Marcus Jastrow, *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature: ת-ל*, vol. 2 (New York: Pardes, 1950), s.v. "משוא." However, the letter Baillet transcribes as a *vav* does not resemble the *vav* of this scribe. Notice how there is a horizontal stroke present on the very right-hand edge of fragment 12, line 2. This horizontal stroke argues against this being a *vav* and suggests that the letter may have been a *shin*. Thus, it is uncertain if 6Q4 preserves the aberrant spelling suggested by Baillet.

¹⁴⁸ A small lacuna between the verb and this object in 6Q4 may suggest that משאם was originally in the text, now in the lacuna. In this situation, [מש]ואם or [מ]שואם would be an addition, not a substitution, but this suggestion is not likely. The lacuna is very small.

¹⁴⁹ Reymond offers examples of this interchange, in Eric D. Reymond, *Qumran Hebrew: An Overview of Orthography, Phonology, and Morphology*, Resources for Biblical study 76 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2014), 204.

(e.g., 2 Kgs 4:7, 9, 1), and thus, the terms are interchangeable as is evident in 2 Kings 5:20 where Gehazi is describes as a boy (i.e., servant) of Elisha, the man of God. The substitution here, therefore, may be unintentional. However, Elisha is referred to twice in 2 Kings 8:4, once as “the man of God” and once as “Elisha.” Unfortunately, the second reference to Elisha is no longer preserved in 6Q4, but if it read with the MT, the substitution could be an intentional change: a case of harmonization so that both referents read “Elisha.”

Category 3. 6Q4 does not preserve category 3 variants.

Statistics and Conclusion of 6Q4's Textual Tradition

6Q4 is preserved very poorly and this fact calls into question Baillet's conclusion that 6Q4 is shorter than the MT and close to the LXX and Vulgate.¹⁵⁰ Out of the four clearly preserved variants, there are no agreements with the LXX or Vulgate against the MT. First, although Baillet argues that the LXX and the Vulgate read with 6Q4's preposition אַל against the MT's עַל at F15:L4 (2 Kgs 8:1), this conclusion is weakened by two facts: these prepositions share semantic overlap and the reading of 6Q4 could have derived from confusion of gutturals. Moreover, at F11:L2 (Frags. 10-14:L2 [2 Kgs 7:8]), 6Q4's reading וַיִּשְׂאוּ [ו] מִשּׁוֹאֵם “and they lifted their load” as opposed to the MT, which reads וַיִּשְׂאוּ מִשָּׁם “and they lifted from there,” agrees with only three LXX manuscripts.¹⁵¹ In addition, at F15:L6 (2 Kgs 8:4), 6Q4 reads לְיֵשׁוּעַ [י] אֵלִישָׁה “Elisha,” while the MT reads אִישׁ־הָאֱלֹהִים “the man of God,” and this reading of 6Q4 only agrees with one LXX manuscript according to Baillet.¹⁵² Thus, the proposed connection between 6Q4 and

¹⁵⁰ Baillet, “Livres des Rois,” 107.

¹⁵¹ Ibid., 109.

¹⁵² Ibid., 110.

the LXX and the Vulgate when one only considers those differences that depend on sufficient manuscript evidence is negligible.

Likewise, Treballe Barrera’s analysis that fragments 10-16 “show a certain divergence from MT, both in the comparatively few words which have survived and in the length of the text as indicated by the lacunae”¹⁵³ is also questionable. First, several words that Baillet claims are preserved are doubtful. Second, the extremely poor state of 6Q4 makes spatial reconstructions unhelpful for reconstructing the text of 6Q4. Thus, Treballe Barrera’s claims are dismissed here.

Contrary to Baillet and Treballe Barrera’s claims, the preserved manuscript evidence does not argue against categorizing the text as belonging to the Masoretic tradition. This conclusion depends on the fact that the text only preserves four variants which can all be ascribed to the scribal process. Moreover, the overarching statistical relationship between these texts when one only accounts for those readings that are sufficiently preserved, is high. Therefore, it is reasonable to classify what remains of 6Q4 as preserving the Masoretic tradition.¹⁵⁴

Table 19. The statistical relationship between 6Q4 and the MT

Total # of Words in 6Q4	Categories 1, 2, and 3	Statistical Relationship	Categories 2 and 3	Statistical Relationship	Category 3	Statistical Relationship
78	4	94.87%	4	94.87%	0	100%

1QIsa^a

1QIsa^a (St. Mark’s Isaiah) has received considerable treatment from numerous scholars because of its early discovery (ca., 1950) and its size (1QIsa^a preserves the entire

¹⁵³ Treballe Barrera, “Qumran Fragments of the Book of Kings,” 25.

¹⁵⁴ Overall, fifty-six words transcribed by Baillet depend on insufficient manuscript evidence.

text of Isaiah with few lacunae). This treatment has resulted in numerous editions, articles, and books,¹⁵⁵ as well as digital content.¹⁵⁶ 1QIsa^a dates ca. 150-125 B.C. on paleographical grounds.¹⁵⁷ Radiocarbon dating has furnished two date ranges. The 1σ¹⁵⁸ range is 335-122 BC and 2σ¹⁵⁹ is 356-291 BC (24 percent) and 250-103 BC (76 percent).¹⁶⁰

Bifurcation of 1QIsa^a

1QIsa^a is divided into two segments.¹⁶¹ Scholars argue that this bifurcation is evident on manuscript grounds (the scribe leaves space for three lines of text plus the typical bottom margin blank at the bottom of Col 27), on paleographic grounds, and on

¹⁵⁵ For a helpful bibliography of editions, photographs, articles, and books, see Eugene Ulrich, Peter W. Flint, and Martin G. Abegg, *Qumran Cave 1. II: The Isaiah Scrolls Part 2: Introductions, Commentary, and Textual Variants*, vol. 32, pt. 2 (Oxford: Clarendon, 2010), 42.

¹⁵⁶ See “The Digital Dead Sea Scrolls,” accessed February 6, 2018, <http://dss.collections.imj.org.il>. This website offers high quality photographs of several texts, including 1QIsa^a. Accordance too offers several digitized resources. See especially Martin G. Abegg, James E. Bowley, and Edward M. Cook, *Accordance 11.2.5 Dead Sea Scroll Biblical Corpus (Manuscript Order) (DSSB-M)*, version 3.2 (Langley, BC Canada: Oak Tree, 2009). These resources were consulted extensively here.

¹⁵⁷ See Emanuel Tov, “The Text of Isaiah at Qumran,” in *Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah: Studies of an Interpretive Tradition*, ed. Craig C. Broyles and Craig A. Evans, Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 70 (Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 1997), 494. See also Ulrich, Flint, and Abegg, *Qumran Cave 1*, 64.

¹⁵⁸ The siglum 1σ indicates that the date range reports with 68 percent accuracy. See Greg Doudna, “Dating the Scrolls on the Basis of Radiocarbon Analysis,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*, ed. Peter W Flint and James C VanderKam, vol. 1 (Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 1998), 435-36.

¹⁵⁹ The siglum 2σ indicates that the true date fits within this range with a 95 percent confidence rate. *Ibid.*, 436.

¹⁶⁰ See Timothy A. J. Jull et al., “Radiocarbon Dating of Scrolls and Linen Fragments from the Judean Desert,” *Radiocarbon* 37, no. 1 (June 2006): 14. See also Tov’s discussion of the radiocarbon testing in Tov, “The Text of Isaiah at Qumran,” 494. See especially n13. Doudna, “Dating the Scrolls,” 438, explains that two 2σ ranges were given for 1QIsa^a because of atmospheric ¹⁴C levels.

¹⁶¹ 1QIsa^a can be studied in digitized format at “The Digital Dead Sea Scrolls,” accessed July 22, 2017, <http://dss.collections.imj.org.il/isaiah>.

orthographic grounds.¹⁶² The first segment spans columns 1-27 (Isa 1-33), and the second segment spans columns 28-54 (Isa 34-66). This bifurcation has led many scholars to suggest that 1QIsa^a was penned by more than one scribe¹⁶³ while others contend that 1QIsa^a is the product of only one scribe despite the clear differences between columns 1-27 and 28-54.¹⁶⁴

Some scholars further see the bifurcation as evidence of the book's compositional history. On the one hand, Paul Kahle understood the bifurcation as validation that chapters 33-34 belonged to second Isaiah.¹⁶⁵ On the other hand, William Brownlee understood this bifurcation as evidence that "the book of Isaiah was the product of an Isaianic school whose final product was the achievement of a two-volume

¹⁶² William Hugh Brownlee, *The Meaning of the Qumrân Scrolls for the Bible* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1964), 247. See also Tov, "The Text of Isaiah at Qumran," 498-99n37. Cf. Longacre comments about the unreliability of ascribing 1QIsa^a to more than one scribe on the basis of the three blank lines between the two halves and the difference in orthography. Longacre, "Developmental Stage, Scribal Lapse, or Physical Defect?," 48. Abegg too argues that differences between the first half and the second half of 1QIsa^a may be the result of the *Vorlage* rather than the result of a second scribe, in Martin G. Abegg, "1QIsaa and 1QIsab: A Rematch," in Herbert and Tov, *The Bible as Book*, 223.

¹⁶³ E.g., Tov, "The Text of Isaiah at Qumran," 501, who states the same opinion in Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 21. Tov also identifies 1QH^a, 1QpHab, and 11QT^a as texts written by multiple scribes. See also Martin Noth, "Eine Bemerkung Zur Jesajarolle Vom Toten Meer," *Vetus Testamentum* 1, no. 3 (July 1951): 224-26.

¹⁶⁴ Kutscher argues that 1QIsa^a was the product of one scribe, in Edward Yechezkel Kutscher, *The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll (1 Q Isa [Superscript A])* (Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 1974), 566-68. See also Malachi Martin, *The Scribal Character of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, vol. 1, Bibliothéque Du Museon 44 (Louvain, Belgium: Publications Universitaires, 1958), 65-73. Martin argues that although 1QIsa^a is the product of three hands (possibly four), the first scribe is "extensive and runs naturally through the 54 Columns of the Scroll," in p. 65. He further argues the clear differences between both halves and the "strange break in Column at the end of Column 27" indicates that the scribe likely copied from two different documents, in p. 389. For other scholars who comment on whether 1QIsa^a was copied by one or multiple scribes, see Johann Cook ("Orthographical Peculiarities in the Dead Sea Biblical Scrolls," *Revue de Qumran* 14 [1989]: 303-4); Flint (Peter W. Flint, "The Book of Isaiah in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in Herbert and Tov, *The Bible as Book*, 236); and Tov (Emanuel Tov, "Scribal Features of Two Qumran Scrolls," in Maier, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible, Qumran, Septuagint*, 3:369); see also the opinion of Ulrich, Flint, and Abegg, *Qumran Cave 1*, 40. Last is the helpful study of R. L. Giese, "Further Evidence for the Bisection of 1QIsa," *Textus* 14 (1988): 61-70.

¹⁶⁵ Paul Kahle, *Die Hebräischen Handschriften aus der Höhle: Franz Delitzsch-Vorlesungen* (Stuttgart, Germany: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1951), 72.

edition of Isaianic material.¹⁶⁶ Brownlee cited Josephus as possibly confirming this opinion.¹⁶⁷ Kent Richard, likewise, appears to imply that the scribe of 1QIsa^a may have originally viewed Isaiah as two separate books. In a short note, Richards raises the possibility that b. *Baba Bathra* 13b may be applicable to 1QIsa^a.¹⁶⁸ B. *Baba Bathra* 13b states that four lines should be left between each book of the Torah and each book of the Prophets, but only three lines should be left between each book of the minor prophets (three lines appear at the bottom of Col 27). If, however, a book of the twelve is completed near the bottom of a page, it should be resumed at the top of the next sheet (this situation also applies to 1QIsa^a).

Peter Flint wonders if the bifurcation of 1QIsa^a is based on conceptual grounds; namely, Isaiah 34 has a more universal emphasis.¹⁶⁹ Although Flint makes this suggestion, he also suggests that multiple scribes copying the text could have resulted in the text's bifurcation.¹⁷⁰

George J. Brooke too discusses the bifurcation of 1QIsa^a and suggests that Isaiah may have been “commonly copied in two halves and that this has led over several generations to some distinctive characteristics emerging in the manuscript history of each half of the book.”¹⁷¹ He finds support for this statement from the fact that most manuscripts

¹⁶⁶ Brownlee, *The Meaning of the Qumrân Scrolls*, 247.

¹⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, 251. Josephus states that Isaiah wrote down his prophecies and left them behind in books (plural, not singular) (Ant. 10:2:2). *Ibid.*

¹⁶⁸ Kent H. Richards, “Note on the Bisection of Isaiah,” *Revue de Qumran* 5, no. 2 (April 1965): 257-58.

¹⁶⁹ Flint, “The Book of Isaiah in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 236.

¹⁷⁰ *Ibid.*

¹⁷¹ 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., *Journal of Semitic Studies*, Supplement 16 (Oxford: Oxford University Press on behalf of the University of Manchester, 2005), 89.

of Isaiah found at Qumran only preserve material from either the first half of Isaiah (Isa 1-33) or the second half (34-66).¹⁷² Furthermore, he argues that the content of 4QIsa^b and 4QIsa^c shows evidence akin to the bifurcation of 1QIsa^a.¹⁷³ Last, he argues that the Isaiah *peshet* from Qumran too demonstrate that Isaiah was handled and discussed as two separate halves.¹⁷⁴

Orthography

One distinctive feature of 1QIsa^a that indicates its bifurcated nature is its orthography. The orthography of columns 1-27 is more defective (closer to that of the MT and Samaritan Pentateuch) than the orthography found in columns 28-54.¹⁷⁵ Cook lists many examples that prove this point. For example, Cook notes that the particle כִּי “for, when, that, etc.,” occurs 323 in 1QIsa^a. On the one hand, in chapters 1-33, the defective form כִּי occurs 124 times while the *plene* form כִּיא occurs 37 times. On the other hand, according to Cook’s analysis, the *plene* form occurs 158 times in chapters 35-66.¹⁷⁶ A similar pattern is found with regard to the pronoun הוּא “he.” Cook notes that the defective form הוּא is used exclusively in chapters 1-33 while the *plene* form הוּאָה is used

¹⁷² Brooke, “The Bisection of Isaiah,” 79-88.

¹⁷³ *Ibid.*, 88-89.

¹⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, 90-92.

¹⁷⁵ See also Martin, *The Scribal Character of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, vol. 1, 363-81, who surveys and compares certain aspects of orthography, the generalized use of *vav*, the heavy form tradition (of pronominal suffixes, independent pronouns, and certain suffixes of the perfect), and the special vowel-letter tradition in several DSS manuscripts including 1QIsa^a.

¹⁷⁶ Cook, “Orthographical Peculiarities,” 297. Notice though that Cook does not include chap. 34 in his analysis. Slightly different results are found in the DSS-package in *Accordance*. *Accordance* shows that the defective form (כִּי) occurs 131 times in columns 1-27, while the *plene* form (כִּיא) occurs 36 times. Within columns 28-54, the defective form occurs 29 times while the *plene* form occurs 164 times. See Abegg, Bowley, and Cook, *Accordance 11.2.5*.

consistently in chapters 34-66 with only two exceptions.¹⁷⁷ More evidence for an orthographic bifurcation is found when analyzing the use of the second masculine plural pronominal suffix. The defective form כִּם “you (plural)” and *plene* כִּמֶה form are used simultaneously in chapters 1-33 whereas the *plene* form is used in all but four times in chapters 35-66.¹⁷⁸ Thus, there is a dichotomy concerning orthography in 1QIsa^a—the first half is more defective than the latter half.¹⁷⁹

Script

Scholars agree about many details of 1QIsa^a's script but disagree if the script of columns 1-27 differs from that found in columns 28-54.¹⁸⁰ The script is generally described as a typical middle Hasmonaean hand, ca. 125-100 BC.¹⁸¹ The scribe is not consistent in his use of final and medial letters. In fact, only final *mem* and *nun* are used in 1QIsa^a, although final *kap* and *sade* are usually longer when in final position.¹⁸² Moreover, the scribe usually distinguishes between *yod* and *vav* although there are exceptions.¹⁸³

¹⁷⁷ Cook, “Orthographical Peculiarities,” 298.

¹⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, 299.

¹⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, 300. Tov, “Scribal Features of Two Qumran Scrolls,” 370-76, comments on the differences in orthography between the first half and the second half of the book.

¹⁸⁰ Tov, “Scribal Features of Two Qumran Scrolls,” 370, argues that the script is different. Burrows, on the other hand, argues that the hand of 1QIsa^a is “very regular, showing considerable skill with the pen,” in Millar Burrows, ed., *The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery*, vol. 1 (New Haven, CT: American Schools of Oriental Research, 1950).

¹⁸¹ Ulrich, Flint, and Abegg, *Qumran Cave 1*, 61.

¹⁸² Burrows, *The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery*, 1:1. Ulrich, Flint, and Abegg, *Qumran Cave 1*, 61, also notes that final forms of *bet* and *vav* too can be elongated.

¹⁸³ This conclusion is made by Dewey M. Beegle, “Ligatures with Waw and Yodh in the Dead Sea Isaiah Scroll,” *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, no. 129 (1953): 14. See also Millar Burrows, “Waw and Yodh in the Isaiah Dead Sea Scroll (DSIa),” *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, no. 124 (1951): 18-20.

Marginal Readings

1QIsa^a further preserves additions that are not additions per se but are likely marginal readings. The addition at Col 28:25-26 (Isa 35:9) of לֹא “no” could be a marginal reading. The reading clearly appears in a margin. This evidence is insufficient since the scribe has written several lines into the margin on column 28 (e.g., L2, 3, 10). This line is unlike the others that extend into the margin since the reading in the margin is a redundant particle written in a smaller script. These factors seem to indicate that this is not an addition, but a marginal reading.¹⁸⁴ Another possible marginal reading is found at Col 29:16 (Isa 36:11). This reading, again, is clearly in the margin (the right margin). Here the addition of עִמָּנוּ “with us” could be a variant reading of the MT אֶל-עֲבָדֶיךָ “with your servants” or it could be a variant reading for the MT’s אֵלֵינוּ “to us.”¹⁸⁵

Textual Tradition

Scholars are divided about how to group the textual tradition of 1QIsa^a, although scholars agree that 1QIsa^a agrees in most details with the MT.¹⁸⁶ Several scholars group 1QIsa^a as belonging to the Masoretic Tradition, but identify it as a popular, modernized version of the MT.¹⁸⁷

¹⁸⁴ Kutscher, *Language and Linguistic Background*, 539.

¹⁸⁵ Ibid.

¹⁸⁶ Although scholars hoped that 1QIsa^a would preserve a textual tradition predating that found in the MT, Kutscher describes that all scholars were astounded by the close similarity between 1QIsa^a and the MT. Ibid., 2. See also Brownlee, *The Meaning of the Qumrân Scrolls for the Bible*, 18, who comments about the textual tradition of 1QIsa^a; Peter W. Flint, “The Isaiah Scrolls from the Judean Desert,” in Broyles and Evans, *Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah*, 483; Patrick William Skehan, “Text of Isaias at Qumran,” *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 17, no. 2 (April 1955): 159.

¹⁸⁷ This is the opinion of Kutscher, *Language and Linguistic Background*, 84. Kutscher explicitly identifies 1QIsa^a as a popular text possibly deriving from a text identical to the MT. It is not possible, in Kutscher’s mind, that the MT derived from 1QIsa^a in his pp. 2-3. Pulikottil agrees with Kutscher that 1QIsa^a likely derived from a text similar to the MT in Paulson Pulikottil *Transmission of Biblical Texts in Qumran: The Case of the Large Isaiah Scroll 1QIsa^a*, *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement Series* 34 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2001), 38. Brownlee, *The Meaning of the Qumrân Scrolls*, 165, identifies 1QIsa^a as a vulgar text made to aid the reader’s comprehension. Rosenbloom argues that 1QIsa^a is a popularized form of Isaiah in Joseph R. Rosenbloom, *The Dead Sea Isaiah Scroll: A Literary Analysis: A*

Patrick Skehan illustrates his opinion about the extreme closeness of 1QIsa^a and the rest of the Isaiah scrolls from Qumran to the MT:

One affirmation respecting the text of Isaias can safely be made now: though the manuscripts of Qumrân are not held, for the text they offer, to the rigidly controlled transmission of a definitively fixed consonantal text such as we later find in the Masora, those cases are extremely rare in which any combination of them, published or unpublished, gives exclusive or predominant witness to a non-masoretic reading.¹⁸⁸

Thus, Skehan understands 1QIsa^a as preserving the Masoretic tradition although not to the degree of the Medieval manuscripts.

Other scholars identify 1QIsa^a as non-aligned, although not all use this exact terminology. These scholars include Emanuel Tov, Dominique Barthélemy, and Eugene Ulrich. According to Tov, 1QIsa^a should be classified as non-aligned although it differs from the MT in the least “meaningful type of deviations, namely in orthography.”¹⁸⁹ In Tov’s mind, 1QIsa^a may have been copied from a proto-Masoretic text, but this cannot be

Comparison with the Masoretic Text and the Biblia Hebraica (Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1970), xiii. Orlinsky argues that if 1QIsa^a derived from the second Jewish Commonwealth (which it does), then the “chief value will consist of the fact that it [1QIsa^a] helps to demonstrate the reliability of the Masoretic text of the Hebrew Bible, to convince more biblical scholars that the traditionally preserved text of the Hebrew Bible should be treated with far greater respect than it has been.” Harry M. Orlinsky, “Studies in the St. Mark’s Isaiah Scroll,” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 69, no. 2 (1950): 164. Martin also argued that it is highly probable that the exemplar of the second (Scribe B) and third scribe (Scribe C) “belonged to the same current of text-transmission, which in turn was closely related to that of the MT. And both exemplars would have belonged to the phonetic tradition in orthographic matters.” Malachi Martin, *The Scribal Character of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, vol. 2, Bibliothéque Du Museon 45 (Louvain, Belgium: Publications Universitaires, 1958), 658. See also Iwry comments in 1957 that

[Some] variant readings found in the Scroll will engage our attention more particularly because of the unusual opportunity which they afford us to work out inductive methods for reconstructing an obscure phrase or a figure of speech long since fossilized in the official, rigidly supervised transmission of the M.T., but still much alive in a ‘vulgar’ text preserved for us in an uncritical and unrevised form.” (Samuel Iwry, “The Qumrân Isaiah and the End of the Dial of Ahaz,” *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, no. 147 [1957]: 27)

¹⁸⁸ Skehan, “Text of Isaias at Qumran,” 162.

¹⁸⁹ Emanuel Tov, “A Didactic and Gradual Approach towards the Biblical DSS,” in Maier, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible, Qumran, Septuagint*, 3:303. See Tov’s graphic representation of 1QIsa^a at Emanuel Tov, “Samples,” accessed April 24, 2017, <https://www.sbl-site.org/assets/pdfs/pubs/DSS/Tov.pdf>.

verified because the scribe approached the text freely.¹⁹⁰ Nonetheless, when assessing the *Vorlage* of the LXX-Isaiah, Tov indicates that 1QIsa^a and the MT are closely connected¹⁹¹ and even contends in a later publication that 1QIsa^a was probably copied from a proto-Masoretic text.¹⁹² Thus, Tov views 1QIsa^a as non-aligned because of the scribe's free approach to the text, which resulted mainly in orthographic differences. Orthography is not understood here as persuasive evidence for grouping a text as non-aligned.

Dominique Barthélemy too understands 1QIsa^a as non-aligned although he used the category "extra-Masoretic."¹⁹³ He analyzed the variants between the MT and the Isaiah manuscripts from the DSS wherever 1QIsa^b was preserved in order to determine the textual character of 1QIsa^a in relationship to 1QIsa^b.¹⁹⁴ Barthélemy discovered that 1QIsa^a differed from the MT 137 times.¹⁹⁵ Further evidence of 1QIsa^a's extra-Masoretic character is the presence of three corrections that move the text away from the MT.¹⁹⁶ Most indicative, however, of 1QIsa^a's extra-Masoretic character is the fact that 1QIsa^a agrees with 1QIsa^b, 4QIsa^d, and the LXX against the MT regarding three variants in close proximity to one another (the variants occur at Isa 53:11; 12, and 54:1).

¹⁹⁰ See Tov, "The Biblical Texts from the Judaean Desert," 154. Tov further describes the scribe of 1QIsa^a as careless in Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 185.

¹⁹¹ Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 137.

¹⁹² See Tov, "A Didactic and Gradual Approach," 304-5, for this opinion.

¹⁹³ Dominique Barthélemy, *Studies in the Text of the Old Testament: An Introduction to the Hebrew Old Testament Text Project*, ed. Roger L. Omanson, Textual Criticism and the Translator 3 (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2012), 389-404.

¹⁹⁴ His study is a mixed study since he did not list minor variants such as the addition or omission of a conjunctive *vav* or substitutions between לֹא and עַל. *Ibid.*, 392 However, he does label his study as more quantitative than qualitative. *Ibid.*, 404.

¹⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, 397.

¹⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, 405.

Regarding Barthélemy's analysis, one must keep in mind that his study is largely a quantitative analysis as he states.¹⁹⁷ Moreover, many of the differences singled out by Barthélemy are minor (category 1 and 2 variants). For example, among the 18 pluses Barthélemy singles out as indicative of 1QIsa^a "extra-Masoretic" character are several differences that simply make a particle omitted in the MT explicit (e.g., variants number 22, 86, and 116 of Barthélemy).¹⁹⁸ Moreover, the 3 corrections that Barthélemy lists as moving 1QIsa^a away from the MT are also quite minor. The first difference is found at Col 36:12 (Isa 43:3) and concerns the substitution of a synonymous title. The second difference is found at Col 36:13 (Isa 43:4) and concerns either the addition of an article or the substitution of the first-person singular imperfect form of the MT for a first-person singular cohortative form. Both forms are possible due to uncertainty about word division, but both differences are minor. The third correction is found at Col 42:22 (Isa 51:7). The difference concerns a synonymous term from the same root.

Last, the three variants found in close proximity to each other where 1QIsa^a agrees with 1QIsa^b, 4QIsa^d, and the LXX against the MT are intriguing, but it is questionable if they substantiate the extra-Masoretic label. One of these differences is the difference between a collective singular and a plural (Isa 53:12), while another substitutes a participle for a noun plus a pronominal suffix (Isa 53:12). The last variant is not an easy variant to describe—the addition of אור "light" at Isaiah 53:11. In the end, the majority of these variants Barthélemy highlights are minor.

Barthélemy concludes his analysis of 1QIsa^a, 1QIsa^b, and the MT by saying,

As these results demonstrate, 1QIsa^a is clearly further removed from what would become MT than 1QIsa^b is. For this reason, 1QIsa^a can be described as extra-Masoretic and 1QIsa^b as pre-Masoretic. However, it should be pointed out that,

¹⁹⁷ Barthélemy, *Studies in the Text of the Old Testament*, 404.

¹⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, 403.

while the difference between these two designations is fairly clear, it is nevertheless more quantitative than qualitative.¹⁹⁹

Simply because 1QIsa^a is further removed from the MT than 1QIsa^b does not automatically indicate that 1QIsa^a is extra-Masoretic contrary to Barthélemy's reasoning. The question remains how far removed is 1QIsa^a from the MT. According to Barthélemy's study, which only covers where 1QIsa^a and 1QIsa^b overlap (2,951 words), 1QIsa^a differs from the MT 137 times while agreeing in 2,814 words.²⁰⁰ Thus, the overarching statistical relationship between these texts is 95.54 percent. Does a text that disagrees mostly in minor details while preserving a high level of agreement substantiate the label "extra-Masoretic?" Barthélemy answers in the affirmative; the opposite is argued here.

Ulrich too identifies 1QIsa^a as not belonging to the Masoretic tradition (i.e., non-aligned) in his article, "The Developmental Composition of the Book of Isaiah: Light from 1QIsa^a on Additions in the MT."²⁰¹ Ulrich argues that 1QIsa^a routinely represents a textual form earlier than the MT since it routinely preserves a shorter text that reads smoothly.²⁰²

Although Ulrich understands the large omissions of text found throughout 1QIsa^a as evidence that 1QIsa^a represents an earlier form of Isaiah, others disagree. Drew Longacre, builds on William H. Brownlee's argument that 1QIsa^a was copied from a *Vorlage* with a damaged bottom edge in his article "Developmental Stage, Scribal Lapse, or Physical Defect? 1QIsa^a's Damaged Exemplar for Isaiah Chapters 34-66."²⁰³ Longacre

¹⁹⁹ Barthélemy, *Studies in the Text of the Old Testament*, 404.

²⁰⁰ One must remember that the most minor of differences are excluded from the discussion. Barthélemy, *Studies in the Text of the Old Testament*, 392.

²⁰¹ Eugene Charles Ulrich, "The Developmental Composition of the Book of Isaiah: Light from 1QIsa^a on Additions in the MT," *Dead Sea Discoveries* 8, no. 3 (2001): 288-305.

²⁰² *Ibid.*, 288-90.

²⁰³ Longacre, "Developmental Stage, Scribal Lapse, or Physical Defect?" Brownlee develops this theory in William Hugh Brownlee, "The Manuscripts of Isaiah from Which DSIa Was Copied,"

reasons that the omission of text from one or more lines, the corrupt nature of the minuses, the fact that many of these minuses have been filled in to align closer to the MT, and the fact that most of these examples occur at regular intervals, weakens Ulrich's thesis that these omissions indicate an earlier shorter literary form.²⁰⁴ Large scale omissions may not be indicative of 1QIsa^a textual tradition according to Longacre, but might be indicative that the scribe copied from a damaged exemplar.

The above survey demonstrates that scholars are divided concerning how best to categorize the textual tradition preserved in 1QIsa^a. Whereas many early scholars understood 1QIsa^a as reflecting the tradition found in the MT, many modern scholars disagree. Tov rests his reasoning on a high level of disagreements in minor details (i.e., orthography) while Barthélemy grounds his conclusion in its relationship to 1QIsa^b; namely, it contains more differences than 1QIsa^b, and since 1QIsa^b is a pre-Masoretic text, 1QIsa^a can reasonably be identified as extra-Masoretic. Ulrich, on the other hand, bases his conclusion on several large omissions found in 1QIsa^a. Proper identification of the textual tradition of 1QIsa^a must cover the entire text (contra Barthélemy) and focus on those variants most indicative of textual traditions (contra Tov and Barthélemy), while accounting for the physical qualities of the manuscript that surround the large-scale omissions and substitutions (contra Ulrich).²⁰⁵ This analysis demonstrates that 1QIsa^a, despite its many deviations from the MT which at times are major, can reasonably be grouped as belonging to the Masoretic tradition.

Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research, no. 127 (1952): 16-21. I am thankful Brian Davidson for making me aware of Longacre's article.

²⁰⁴ Longacre, "Developmental Stage, Scribal Lapse, or Physical Defect?," 20-21.

²⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, 49-50.

Description and Categorization of Variants

1QIsa^a preserves approximately 22,775 words.²⁰⁶ Ulrich proposes hundreds of variants, but several do not belong to categories 1, 2, or 3. For example, Ulrich lists variants that are likely marginal readings in his variant column. These readings occur at Col 28:25-26 (Isa 35:9) and Col 29:16 (Isa 36:11). Neither of these readings are categorized or counted in the statistics.

Although Ulrich distinguishes between the first hand and the second hands, at times a reading is labeled as deriving from a second hand here even when Ulrich does not make this distinction. For example, an interesting addition occurs at Col 30:18 (Isa 37:13): וְשׁוֹמְרוֹן “and Samaria.” Samaria is added to the list of cities that Assyria has conquered. This addition appears to be a case in harmonization to Isaiah 36:19 where Rabshakeh announces that the gods of Sepharvaim were unable to deliver Samaria from the king of Assyria. This variant, however, is not counted as a category 2 variant since וְשׁוֹמְרוֹן is written finer, darker, smaller, and is smudged unlike the surrounding text.²⁰⁷ It is likely written by a second hand.

Other interesting variants not included in one of the three categories concern the differences between *kethiv/qere*. The substitution at Col 42:6 (Isa 50:5) reads אֲדוֹנָי אֱלֹהִים in accordance with the *qere* of the MT אֲדֹנָי יְהוָה. Three are two substitutions concerning *qere perpetuum* at Col 50:10 (Isa 61:11). Here 1QIsa^a reads יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים, whereas the MT reads אֲדֹנָי יְהוָה.²⁰⁸ One further case involves a correction toward the *qere*

²⁰⁶ The total word count is provided by Abegg, Bowley, and Cook, *Accordance 11.2.5*. Some words are difficult to make out on column 54 (the last column), while a few lacunae make a few readings difficult. Typically, these readings would be excluded in the total word count, but due to the size of this text, *Accordance*'s total word count is accepted here except for a few proposed variants that depend on insufficient manuscript evidence.

²⁰⁷ Kutscher suggests that this reading derived from a second hand. Kutscher, *Language and Linguistic Background*, 540.

²⁰⁸ 1QIsa^a does not always follow the *qere* when substitutions concerning the divine title occur (e.g., Col 35:14 [Isa 42:5]). Other ambiguous cases include Col 3:24 (Isa 3:17) (here 1QIsa^a originally

of the MT at Col 3:25 (Isa 3:18). Here, the readings יהוה is corrected by means of cancelation dots and אדוני is written above the line.²⁰⁹

Several other differences proposed by Ulrich concern synonymous spellings and a few that depend on insufficient manuscript evidence.²¹⁰ These variants too do not belong to categories 1, 2, or 3.²¹¹

Sample of synonymous spellings because of phonologic confusion. Many differences between the MT and 1QIsa^a concern synonymous spellings. Many of these differences concern confusion of homorganic sounds that led to the interchange of several gutturals such as *aleph/he* Col 1:4 (Isa 1:4), at Col 1:9 (Isa 1:7), at Col 1:24 (1:21),²¹² and Col 42:18 (Isa 51:4), *aleph/ayin* at Col 2:8 (Isa 2:2), *het/he* at Col 4:1 (Isa 3:24),²¹³ sibilants (e.g., Col 3:25-26 [Isa 3:18], Col 38:3 [Isa 44:25], Col 41:16 [Isa 49:18], Col 47:4 [Isa 57:5]),²¹⁴ dentals (e.g., Col 51:23 [Isa 64:8 (Eng., 9)]), liquids (e.g., confusion between a *lamed/resh* at Col 42:7 [Isa 50:6]),²¹⁵ and nasals (e.g., Col 42:25 [Isa 51:9] and Col 49:9

agreed with the MT consonantly [i.e., the *kethiv*], but corrected to read יהוה), Col 6:6 (Isa 6:11), Col 8:27 (Isa 9:7), and Col 21:31 (Isa 28:2).

²⁰⁹ For a list of differences between the MT and 1QIsa^a, see Kutscher, *Language and Linguistic Background*, 519-20.

²¹⁰ See table in appendix 2 for more details about the few readings that depend on insufficient manuscript evidence.

²¹¹ This section largely reviews the linguistic profile of 1QIsa^a. For a more thorough description of the phonology of 1QIsa^a, see Ulrich, Flint, and Abegg, *Qumran Cave 1*, 29-31. See also the phonological profile of 1QIsa^a in Kutscher, *Language and Linguistic Background*, 452-518.

²¹² Confusion of *he* and *aleph* may not be because they are homorganic (i.e., produced by the same organ, but rather because they are weak (i.e., silent).

²¹³ Graphic confusion is another explanation for this interchange.

²¹⁴ See Rosenthal's comments about the sibilants in Franz Rosenthal, *A Grammar of Biblical Aramaic*, 2nd ed., Porta Linguarum Orientalium, Neue Serie 5 (Wiesbaden, Germany: Harrassowitz, 1963), §19.

²¹⁵ Russell T. Fuller and Kyoungwon Choi, *A Biblical Aramaic Grammar (Unpublished)*, n.d. See also the correction at Col 42:26 (Isa 51:11), where the scribe appeared to erase a word spelled with a

[Isa 60:6]).²¹⁶ This confusion also led to the omission of letters such as gutturals. *Ayin* is omitted at Col 40:19 (Isa 48:14), *aleph* at Col 42:15 (Isa 51:2, Col 47:9 [Isa 57:10]), and *het* Col 48:6 (Isa 58:11), some of which were corrected.²¹⁷

Several differences also exist because of confusion of the weak letters (i.e., *aleph*, *vav*, *yod*, and *he*). The weakness of *he* contributes to many differences in spelling between the MT and 1QIsa^a since its weakness leaves it prone to elision (e.g., inseparable prepositions preceding an article, *hiphil* imperfect forms,²¹⁸ the third masculine pronominal suffixes contracts from הוּ *hû* to וּ *ô*, and even the suppression of the *he* in the third masculine plural pronominal וְ (to וּ)).²¹⁹

The weakness of the *yod* and *vav* also led to different but synonymous spellings. For example, *āv* in final position (third masculine pronominal suffix וּ) contracts so that both וּ and ו are pronounced alike (*ō* or *ū*).²²⁰ Consequently, form becomes an inadequate indicator of the number of the base noun. Examples of this phenomenon occur at Col 3:10 (Isa 3:6) and Col 3:16 (Isa 3:10).

In addition to elision, the weak letters are also subject to interchange; a phenomenon that led to differences in spelling among the MT and 1QIsa^a. In particular,

lamed and transcribe a word with *resh*.

²¹⁶ Qimron argues that *mem* and *nun* were pronounced alike in final position, which led to their confusion. Elisha Qimron, *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986), §200.142. In addition to confusion of *mem* and *nun*, there are cases where a final nasal is either added (when a word ends in an open syllable) or dropped. Ibid., §200.143.

²¹⁷ Martin, *The Scribal Character of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, vol. 2, 622, provides a helpful chart of the cases where a scribe corrected a guttural of the original scribe. He provides a complimentary chart that graphs the cases where a corrector added a guttural where the original scribe first omitted one. Ibid., 623.

²¹⁸ For example, the MT represent a *hiphil* participle with a syncopated *he* at Isa 3:1, whereas 1QIsa^a at Col 3:3 (Isa 3:1) maintains the *he* as is typical in biblical Aramaic.

²¹⁹ Gesenius, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, §23k; Paul Joüon and T. Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*, rev. ed., Subsidia Biblica (Roma: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2003), §17e.

²²⁰ Qimron, *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, §200.18.

this interchange affects words that are originally third *yod/vav*.²²¹ For example, this weakening causes the number of מעשי “deed/deeds” at Col 30:24 (Isa 37:19) to be uncertain on form alone: the form could refer to a plural or singular noun.²²² Moreover, the *yod/vav* of final third *yod/vav* words often elides, but at other times remains in the MT (e.g., third *yod/vav* perfects with vocalic suffixes, pausal forms, and *qal* passive participles).²²³ The form of 1QIsa^a גְּדוּוּתִיו “its banks” at Col 7:29 (Isa 8:7) may differ from the MT in this regard, גְּדוּוּתִיו.²²⁴ Additionally, verbs with a *yod/vav* as a radical too exhibit differences in spelling. Notice how the verb ילל “to wail” is transcribed like a first *yod* verb in the MT at Isaiah 52:5 יְהִילִילוּ but as a first *vav* verb in 1QIsa^a וְהוֹלִלוּ at Col 43:19 (Isa 52:5).²²⁵ Thus, the weakening of these letters led to differences in spellings between the MT and 1QIsa^a.

Sample of synonymous spellings because of graphic confusion. Other

synonymous spellings are best described as deriving from graphic similarity. For example, 1QIsa^a has שׁוּב “return” where the MT has שָׂרַב “scorching heat” at Col 41:9 (Isa 49:10). See also 1QIsa^a’s confusion of אָפֶס “end” for אַכַס on graphic grounds at Col 45:14

²²¹ The form of the *qal* infinitive absolute is a prime example of the weakness of the *he* since it can be indicated formally with either a *he* or a *vav*. See Gesenius, *Gesenius’ Hebrew Grammar*, §75n. See also Qimron, *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, §100.34. See also Joüon’s discussion of third *yod/vav* verbs in Gesenius, *Gesenius’ Hebrew Grammar*, §23k; Joüon and Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*, §79c.

²²² Ambiguous readings like this are not included in the table or statistics.

²²³ Russell Thomas Fuller and Kyoungwon Choi, *Invitation to Biblical Hebrew: A Beginning Grammar* (Grand Rapids: Kregel, 2006), 265-66.

²²⁴ Qimron, *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, §100.9, does not mention that וו could be used for a consonantal *vav*. However, Palestinian Talmud and Midrashim Aramaic can represent a consonantal *vav* by means of וו. See William Barron Stevenson, *Grammar of Palestinian Jewish Aramaic* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1962), §2.1.

²²⁵ Graphic confusion may have resulted in this difference but see how the verbal forms ירא “to fear” and ירש “to possess” at times follow the first *yod* pattern and at other times the first *vav* pattern. See Fuller and Choi, *Invitation to Biblical Hebrew*, 242. Martin, *The Scribal Character of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, vol. 2, 647, also states that “confusion of *vav* and *yod* is always a danger in 1QIsa^a.”

(Isa 54:15). Proper names also provide examples of graphic confusion. For example, *dalet/resh* confusion occurs at Col 49:16 (Isa 60:13).²²⁶ Although *vav/yod* are commonly indistinguishable in 1QIsa^a, this is not always true as is the case at Col 1:25 (Isa 1:22) and Col 1:29 (Isa 1:25). Moreover, there are examples where 1QIsa^a clearly differs from the MT concerning *yod/vav*, but the difference still likely derived from *yod/vav* confusion. This phenomenon is clear when 1QIsa^a transcribes obscure words. For example, the MT reading לְסִיגִים “as dross” only occurs eight times in the Hebrew Bible²²⁷ and is consistently transcribed with a *yod*, not a *vav*.²²⁸ The transcription in 1QIsa^a of this word with a *vav* at Col 1:24 (Isa 1:22) and at Col 1:29 (Isa 1:25) likely derived from graphic confusion, possibly in the scribe’s exemplar.²²⁹

Sample of synonymous spellings because of other types of scribal error.

Other differences in spelling are best described as scribal errors, but not necessarily on grounds of phonetic or graphic confusion.²³⁰ Haplography explains a difference in spelling at Col 40:23 (Isa 48:17). Here, the MT’s מְדַרְיָה “who causes you to walk” is transcribed as הדריכה (notice the presence of only one *kap* in the 1QIsa^a form at the end of the word). The opposite phenomenon—a case of dittography—occurs at Col 26:32 (Isa 33:1) where the scribe of 1QIsa^a likely writes the *kap* of the pronominal suffix twice כהתמכך “when you complete” for the MT כִּהְתַּמְכֶּךָ. A case of metathesis explains a difference at Col 4:4 (Isa 4:1).

²²⁶ See also Col 1:1-2 (Isa 1:1), Col 1:11 (Isa 1:9) and Col 1:12 (Isa 1:10) for other places where 1QIsa^a and the MT differ from one another regarding proper names for reasons other than graphic similarity.

²²⁷ Clines, *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew*, vol. 6, s.v. “סִיגִ.”

²²⁸ However, see Ezek 22:18, where there is a *kethiv/qere* concerning this very issue. The *kethiv* לְסִיגִים has been corrected to לְסִיגִים.

²²⁹ See Col 7:7 (Isa 7:19) for another example of this phenomenon.

²³⁰ Martin, *The Scribal Character of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 2:649, argues that many of the irregular errors found throughout 1QIsa^a, both those that are corrected and those that are uncorrected, likely originate from “infringements of marginal observance, for instance, to Scribe A.”

Sample of synonymous spellings because of other types of scribal

phenomena. Other differences between letters may not properly be labeled errors, but nonetheless result in synonymous spellings. According to Martin, several peculiarities in spellings arise especially at the end of the line. There are a few examples where the scribe began transcribing a word toward the end of a line and ran out of room. On the next line he wrote the word from the start (cf. 11Q1 which simply finished the word begun on the previously line).²³¹ Martin further argues that there are six examples of a scribe running out of room at his margin and then failing to complete the word on the next line. These include the form in 1QIsa^a השמ for the MT form הַשְׁמִין at Col 6:3 (Isa 6:10).²³² This same phenomenon occurs by a corrector at Col 33:14 (Isa 40:14). Here the corrector abbreviates the final word of the MT יִדְעֵנּוּ “and make known to him,” transcribing only יִדֵּי . Martin also notes examples where the scribe writes the second half of a word interlineally.²³³ The spelling corresponds to the MT, but the end of the last word of the line is written above the line. Thus, several differences in spelling do not ultimately indicate different readings.

Sample of synonymous spellings because of Aramaic influence. Many other differences likely derive from Aramaic influence. In fact, the influence of Aramaic upon 1QIsa^a led Edward Kutscher to suggest that Aramaic was the mother tongue of the scribe.²³⁴ Aramaic influence is especially striking, according to Kutscher, in the realm of

²³¹ Martin detects one instance of the phenomenon prevalent in 11Q1 in 1QIsa^a at Col 48:19 where the scribe ends line 19 with נְחִיבוּתִי and begins the next line with הַמָּה . Martin, *The Scribal Character of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 2:645.

²³² The remaining five examples listed by Martin occur at Col 12:6 (Isa 14:4), Col 17:14 (Isa 22:11), Col 23:26 (Isa 29:16), and Col 31:9 (Isa 37:30). Ibid.

²³³ Martin lists the following examples: Col 3:13 (Isa 3:9), Col 3:19 (Isa 3:14), and Col 45:10 (Isa 54:11). Ibid., 2:646.

²³⁴ See Kutscher, *Language and Linguistic Background*, 24, for these and other examples.

the noun and pronoun.²³⁵ Regarding the pronoun, the third masculine singular pronominal suffix יהוי is found at Col 2:9 (Isa 2:2), Col 9:26 (Isa 10:12). Likewise, the third feminine singular suffix of the perfect יהי is used four times within two verses at Col 39:25-26 (Isa 47:6-7). Concerning the noun, Kutscher argues that the scribe wrote the Aramaic word as opposed to the Hebrew on several occasions, such as the form גופן for גֶּפֶן Col 19:4 (Isa 24:7) and עצרתה for עֲצָרָה at Col 1:16 (Isa 1:13).²³⁶ Moreover, the representation of short vowels with *matres* in Palestinian Talmud and Midrashim Aramaic may be the reason behind several alternative spellings of *segolate* nouns where the stem vowel of the inflected form is represented with a *mater*.²³⁷ Aramaic influence may also be evident in places where the performative *he* of the *hiphil* would typically elipted in Hebrew such as the *hiphil* participle מְסִיר transcribed as מהסיר at Col 3:3 (Isa 3:1).²³⁸ Another example of Aramaic influence concerns third *yod/vav* verb such as found at Col 4:13 (Isa 5:2). Here בנה is spelled with an *aleph*.²³⁹

Kutscher further argues that the scribe of 1QIsa^a avoided transcribing legitimate Hebrew forms because of their similarity to the Aramaic form, and thus, hypercorrected.²⁴⁰ For example, Kutscher argues that the scribe intentionally transcribed ממני “from me” as opposed to the MT מִנִּי “from” at Col 39:8 (Isa 46:3) since מְנִי can mean

²³⁵ Kutscher, *Language and Linguistic Background*, 24.

²³⁶ Ibid.

²³⁷ Stevenson, *Grammar of Palestinian Jewish Aramaic*, §2.1. Possible examples of this potential phenomenon include the *qatl* form as represented with a *vav* after the first radical (מְקוֹבֵרֵךְ “from your grave”) at Col 12:20 (Isa 14:19) and (בּוֹרְכִים “knees”)²³⁷ at Col 53:28 (Isa 66:12).

²³⁸ Kutscher, *Language and Linguistic Background*, 24.

²³⁹ See the discussion in Stevenson, *Grammar of Palestinian Jewish Aramaic*, §21, of the use of *aleph* and *he* to represent the final long vowel in the Aramaic of Onkelos and Jonathan, Palestinian Talmud and Midrashim Aramaic, and Old Testament Aramaic.

²⁴⁰ Kutscher, *Language and Linguistic Background*, 28. See also another possible case of hypercorrection at 4Q107 Col 3:7 (Song 4:8), again, due to Aramaic influence.

“from” or “from me” in Hebrew, but always means “from me” in Aramaic. Thus, the scribe transcribed ממני “from me” although the correct meaning was simply “from: a case of hyper-correction”²⁴¹

Sample of synonymous spellings because different word division. In some cases, the MT and 1QIsa^a differ about where to divide a word. For example, this phenomenon occurs with regard to titles such as Col 6:29 (Isa 7:14) and Col 8:24 (Isa 9:5 Eng., 9:6). Moreover, the form of 1QIsa^a מלכי “what is it to you” accurately follows the MT מה־לך use of the *maqfef*. A peculiar division occurs at Col 10:1 (Isa 10:15) where the *hiphil* participle מְנִיפוּ is transcribed as מניפיו.

Sample of synonymous spellings of *segolate* nouns. The spelling of *segolate* nouns also led to a variety of different spellings. For example, a *qatl* form is represented with a *yod* after the second radical (העכיסים^מ^ “anklets”) at Col 3:25 (Isa 3:18) while another *qatl* form is represented with a *vav* after the first radical (מקוברך “from your grave”) at Col 12:20 (Isa 14:19) and (בורכים “knees”) at Col 53:28 (Isa 66:12).²⁴² The *qutl* form can be spelled differently than the MT too. Differences include instances where a *vav* is placed after the second radical, not the first (ובסור “and unripe grapes”) at Col 14:30 (Isa 18:5) and at Col 5:9 (Isa 5:23). These differences too result in synonymous spellings and are not included in the following categories or statistics.

Sample of synonymous spellings (*plene/defective*). The orthography of 1QIsa^a can be generally described as more *plene* than the MT, especially in the second half of the scroll (Col 27-54). A common difference among DSS-manuscripts and found throughout

²⁴¹ Kutscher, *Language and Linguistic Background*, 28.

²⁴² Kutscher argues that the scribe wrote the Aramaic form of the word גופן for the Hebrew word גפן “vine” (a *qatl*) at Col 19:4 (Isa 24:7). This example is mentioned under the sub-section Aramaic Influence. Ibid., 24,

1QIsa^a is the representation of the *qal* imperfect and imperative plural *plene* with a *vav* after the second radical (e.g., the imperfect at Col 3:7 [Isa 3:4]) (e.g., the imperative at Col 1:20 [Isa 1:17] and Col 13:9 [Isa 15:3]).²⁴³ Other common differences in 1QIsa^a concern the long form pronominal suffixes (long forms typically end with a *he*).²⁴⁴ Furthermore, 1QIsa^a most often represents *qal* active participle *plene*.

Sample of unusual spellings. Moreover, there are times when an uncommon morphological form is substituted for a more common one and *vice versa*. For example, there is an example of a *pual* participle of a root that begins with a *mem* in the MT. 1QIsa^a only represents one *mem* at Col 14:25 (Isa 18:2). Another unusual form is found where the scribe of 1QIsa^a represents the verb נשא “lift up” as a third *he* verb at Col 53:28 (Isa 66:12) (Aramaic influence).²⁴⁵ It also elides the *he* of a *hiphil* at Col 47:16 (Isa 57:15 [the syncopation of *he* is not uncommon in biblical Hebrew]). Interestingly, both the MT and 1QIsa^a represent a *hitpael* of אמר “said” uniquely in slightly different ways at Isa 61:6 (Col 50:3).

Conclusion about synonymous spellings. 1QIsa^a preserves a later linguistic profile that differs from the MT in many ways.²⁴⁶ This latter profile is indicated by several of the spelling practices just surveyed. One further piece of evidence demonstrates this point: the state of the gutturals of 1QIsa^a. The weak state of the gutturals found throughout 1QIsa^a indicates a later linguistic profile since the gutturals are generally well distinguished in the Hebrew Bible although some weakening is present. For example,

²⁴³ See Qimron, *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, §311.13.

²⁴⁴ See the discussion of orthography.

²⁴⁵ The same phenomenon occurs at Col 52:10 (Isa 65:9) concerning the verb form יצא “to go out.” See also Col 53:2 (Isa 65:2), where the scribe transcribed ימלה for the MT’s ימלא “he will fill.”

²⁴⁶ Kutscher, *Language and Linguistic Background*, 2-3.

weakening of the *aleph* is present in several forms when *aleph* closes a syllable, such as certain first *aleph* verbs (e.g., יֹאמַר “he said”) and third *aleph* verbs (e.g., מָצָאתִי “I found”). Likewise, the weakening of the *he* is found in several forms in biblical Hebrew.²⁴⁷ These forms include imperfect *hiphil* forms where the *he* syncopates,²⁴⁸ third masculine singular form *ô* which is a contraction from *hû*,²⁴⁹ inseparable prepositions preceding an article, and even the suppression of the *he* in the third masculine plural pronominal suffix הֶן to ׁן.²⁵⁰ Despite these facts, the gutturals are generally distinguished.

Not only were the gutturals generally distinguished in biblical Hebrew, but the polyphonic nature of both the *ayin* and the *het* were distinguished at least until the translation of the Pentateuch into Greek as demonstrated by the Septuagint’s transcriptions of proper names. Blau argues in *On Polyphony in Biblical Hebrew* that the grapheme *ayin* represented both the proto-Semitic *ayin* and *gayin* since the Hebrew letter *ayin* was represented in one of two ways in the Greek Pentateuch: zero/vowel mutation corresponding to a proto-Semitic *ayin* and a *gamma* corresponding to a *gayin*.²⁵¹ Likewise, the *het* represented two sounds: proto-Semitic *het* and *chi*, and was thus represented in the Pentateuch of the Septuagint either by a zero/vowel mutation or a *kappa*.²⁵²

²⁴⁷ For a survey of the weakness of the *he*, see Joüon and Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*, §25.

²⁴⁸ For example, the MT represent a *hiphil* participle with a syncopated *he* at Isa 3:1, whereas 1QIsa^a at Col 3:3 (Isa 3:1) maintains the *he* as is typical in biblical Aramaic.

²⁴⁹ William Chomsky, *David Kimhi’s Hebrew Grammar: (Mikhlol): Systematically Presented and Critically Annotated* (New York: Bloch, 1952), §46e.

²⁵⁰ Gesenius, *Gesenius’ Hebrew Grammar*, §23k.

²⁵¹ Joshua Blau, *On Polyphony in Biblical Hebrew* (Jerusalem: Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1982), 5-40.

²⁵² *Ibid.*, 40-69.

1QIsa^a, however, represents a linguistic profile much later than that found in the MT or the LXX, as illustrated by the many examples of substitution and omission of gutturals discussed above. The weakening of the gutturals prevalent in 1QIsa^a is a late linguistic reality discussed in rabbinic literature. For example, y. Ber. 1:3 states that residents of Haifa, Beth Shean, and Tibon were not allowed to pass before the ark as leaders in prayer because they pronounce the *het* like the letter *he* and the *ayin* like the letter *aleph*. Similarly, b. Erub. 5:1 preserves a story of Galilean whose inability to distinguish the *het*, *ayin*, and *aleph* led to confusion.²⁵³

Therefore, in order to properly assess the textual tradition of 1QIsa^a, synonymous spellings must be removed from the discussion since they concern only the linguistic profile of the text, not its textual tradition. These differences cannot be included in the categories or statistics (contra Tov).

Category 1. Beyond synonymous spellings of the same word, 1QIsa^a contains many category 1 variants.²⁵⁴ These include additions (e.g., Col 1:4 [Isa 1:3]) and omissions of the conjunctive *vav* (e.g., Col 1:26 [Isa 1:23]), the substitution of synonymous verb tenses (e.g., Col 3:29 [Isa 3:24]), substitution of number (e.g., Col 2:10 [Isa 2:3]), substitution of gender (e.g., Col 2:19 [Isa 2:11]), substitution of an accusative for a prepositional phrase (e.g., Col 1:23 [Isa 1:20]), substitution of a first person imperfect with a cohortative (e.g., Col 6:2 [Isa 6:8]), and the omission of minor particles such as the marker of the accusative (e.g., Col 2:12 [Isa 2:4]), and the locative *he* (e.g., Col 2:16, 17 [Isa 2:7]).

²⁵³ See b. Meg. 3:8 for another example of guttural confusion in rabbinic literature. Brian Davidson first made me aware of several of these references.

²⁵⁴ Many of these variants involve syntactical synonymous forms. For a fuller discussion of the syntax of 1QIsa^a see Ulrich, Flint, and Abegg, *Qumran Cave 1*, 36-39.

Therefore, 1QIsa^a is by no means identical to the MT. As the above survey demonstrates, 1QIsa^a contains hundreds of minor differences. Nonetheless, in order to properly assess the textual tradition of 1QIsa^a, these differences should be set aside so that the more important differences, those most indicative of the text's tradition, can be analyzed (contrary to Tov and Barthélemy).

Category 2. In addition to preserving hundreds of synonymous spellings and category 1 variants, 1QIsa^a also contains hundreds of category 2 variants.²⁵⁵ These include numerous additions, omissions, and substitutions. Some of these variants are straightforward while others are quite complex. In addition to straightforward examples, the following discussion deals with the most complicated differences found between the MT and 1QIsa^a.

Additions. These variants include several different types of additions. Most often, additions in 1QIsa^a simply make the MT more explicit. For example, it is very common for 1QIsa^a to add a pronominal suffix that results in a more explicit text (e.g., Col 1:16 [Isa 1:13]). A more explicit text is also achieved by identifying the subject directly at Col 24:31 (Isa 30:19).

Additions in 1QIsa^a often result in a harmonized text. An example at Col 1:18-19 (Isa 1:15; cf. Isa 59:3) harmonizes a verse in Isaiah to another verse in the same book while the addition of זרים “strangers” at Col 31:3 (Isa 37:25) harmonizes the text of 1QIsa^a to a parallel passage found in another book (i.e., 2 Kgs 19:24).²⁵⁶

A different type of harmonization appears at Col 26:22 (Isa 32:11). 1QIsa^a reads חגורה על החלצים “grid and lament on the loins,” while the MT reads חגורה על-

²⁵⁵ For more information about the category 2 variants, see the table in appendix 2, titled “1QIsa^a: A description of variants.”

²⁵⁶ Kutscher, *Language and Linguistic Background*, 540.

חֲלָצִים “grid *sackcloth* on the loins.” This addition appears to harmonize Isaiah 32:11 not to a parallel verse, but to a common word pair found within judgment cycles.²⁵⁷

A similar harmonization occurs at Col 37:12 (Isa 44:6). Here 1QIsa^a adds שֵׁם “name.” This addition results in the common phrase יהוה צבאות שְׁמוֹ “the Lord of hosts is his name” (e.g., Isa 47:4, 48:2, 51:15, 54:5). Thus, several different types of harmonizations exist in 1QIsa^a.

A more difficult addition is found at Col 31:28-29 (Isa 38:8). This addition may be a case of dittography or an addition of a historical detail.²⁵⁸ 1QIsa^a reads במעלות עליה “on the sun dial of the upper chamber of Ahaz,” while the MT simply reads בַּמַּעְלוֹת אָהָז “on the sun dial of Ahaz.”²⁵⁹ The addition of the word עליה further defines the sun dial; namely, it is the sun dial of Ahaz of the *upper chamber*. Second Kings 23:12 mentions the upper chamber of Ahaz; specifically, that Josiah tore down the altars found there.²⁶⁰

Iwry argues that this addition is not a case of dittography. He reasoned that a reorientation in religious worship occurred during Ahaz’s reign because he was an Assyrian satellite (2 Kgs 16:7-18). He further argues that the introduction of the Assyrian sun dial would correspond with the new stellar cult.²⁶¹ Moreover, the reading עליה would not represent a perfect case of dittography (the prior word is במעלות, not במעליה). Although

²⁵⁷ Kutscher indicates that these roots are connected and cites several verses where the forms סַפֵּד and הִגֵּר occur together. Kutscher, *Language and Linguistic Background*, 538.

²⁵⁸ Ibid., 540.

²⁵⁹ Kutscher reads עליה. Ibid. Cf. the reading of עליה in Ulrich, Flint, and Abegg, *Qumran Cave 1*, 158. Ulrich’s reading seems more likely since the head of the letter is more hooked, although, as mentioned, the scribe does not always distinguish the *yod* and the *vav* graphically. Thus, both readings may be possible. See Iwry’s survey of this variant that this variant was completely overlooked by scholarship because the original editors of 1QIsa^a did not distinguish between *yod* and *vav*, but simply followed the MT. Iwry, “The Qumrân Isaiah,” 30.

²⁶⁰ See Kutscher, *Language and Linguistic Background*, 540.

²⁶¹ See Iwry, “The Qumrân Isaiah,” 31.

Iwry's point is right, there is overlap between the *vav/yod* in 1QIsa^a that would account with this discrepancy.²⁶² Moreover, contra Iwry, the fact that the root מעלה appears five times in this verse makes dittography a possible explanation. The exact nature of this addition, therefore, is uncertain.

Another difficult category 2 addition is עד יכין ועד יכונן ועד ישים “until he establishes (*hiphil*), until he establishes (*polel*), until he makes” preserved at Col 50:18 (Isa 62:7). This addition may be an incorporated marginal reading since no other major witness contains it (the prepositional phrase with the *polel* form of כון) and since the first prepositional phrase could be understood as synonymous to the second prepositional phrase. Indeed, there is significant overlap between the *hiphil* and the *polel* forms of כון.²⁶³ Nonetheless, this reading is not categorized as a marginal reading since it does not appear in the margin; rather, it is classified as an addition even though it may be an incorporated marginal reading.

Omissions. Besides additions, 1QIsa^a also preserves several types of omissions. Forty of these omissions can be described as simply making the text more implicit. These include the omission of particles such as the emphatic *he* at Col 5:5 (Isa 5:19), the ׀ particle at Col 4:12 (Isa 5:1), the כל particle at Col 18:24 (Isa 23:17), a prepositional phrase at Col 5:15 (Isa 5:27), and several pronominal suffixes such as found at Col 11:4 (Isa 11:15).

Other omissions may be better described as interpretative such as the omissions at Col 37:26 (Isa 44:20).

Several examples of omissions, both small and large-scale, also likely derived from parablepsis. A small-scale omission at Col 11:1 (Isa 11:12) could be attributed to

²⁶² See Ulrich, Flint, and Abegg, *Qumran Cave 1*, 61.

²⁶³ See the brief discussion of this variant in Kutscher, *Language and Linguistic Background*, 544. The Vulgate too follows the reading of the MT, not 1QIsa^a.

parablepsis.²⁶⁴ An example of a large-scale omission because of parablepsis resulting from haplography is found at Col 4:10 (Isa 4:5-6). The scribe's eyes likely skipped from one occurrence of יומם to the second, omitting the material in between.

One further omission represents a meaning opposite to the MT but can still be reasonable ascribed to the scribal process. This is an omission at Col 51:17 (Isa 64:2, Eng., 3). 1QIsa^a reads בעשותכה נוראות נקוה “when you did awesome deeds that we waited for,” while the MT reads בְּעִשׂוֹתֶיךָ נִרְאִוּת לֹא נִקְוָה “when you did awesome deeds that we did not wait for.” It is possible that this is an unintentional change caused by parablepsis which led to the omission of the negative particle. Rosenbloom, however, wonders if the verse in the MT was altered because it suggests that man underestimated the powers of God.²⁶⁵ Thus, the omission could be interpretative.

Substitutions: graphic confusion. Substitutions are by far the most common difference between 1QIsa^a and the MT. As with the additions and omissions found in 1QIsa^a, several different types of substitutions belong to category 2. Several of these substitutions are best described on the basis of graphic or phonological confusion such as confusion between *vav/yod* (e.g., Col 1:28 [Isa 1:24]²⁶⁶ and *bet/mem* at Col 39:11 [Isa 46:6]).²⁶⁷ Other substitutions are best described as involving both graphic and phonological confusion such as the difference at Col 10:24 (Isa 11:6). Still other substitutions appear to be more graphic than phonological such as the substitution of the *bet/kap* (e.g., Col 37:91-

²⁶⁴ It is possible that the scribe of 1QIsa^a is simplifying the idiom “four corners of the earth” to “corners.”

²⁶⁵ Rosenbloom, *The Dead Sea Isaiah Scroll*, 66.

²⁶⁶ This confusion is not uncommon in the manuscript tradition. See Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 229-30. Graphically, the scribe of 1QIsa^a routinely distinguishes these two letters. The *yod* consistently has a more hooked head than the *vav*. The extent to which each letter extends toward the line is not a reliable guide to distinguishing these letters (e.g., Col 23:7 [Isa 29:1] and Col 22:22 [Isa 28:17]).

²⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, 230-31.

0 [Isa 44:4]),²⁶⁸ *bet/samek* (e.g., Col 4:9 [Isa 4:4]), *dalet/resh* (e.g., Col 8:27 [Isa 9:7]). Likewise, some substitutions appear to be more phonological than graphic such as the confusion of a *dalet/zayin* (e.g., Col 12:14 [Isa 14:23]). Unlike those differences discussed under synonymous spellings, these differences result in cogent readings, and are therefore categorized as category 2 variants, not synonymous readings.

In some situations, graphic confusion can be quite complex such as cases where the differences concern multiple letters. For example, the substitution at Col 4:26 (Isa 5:11) likely resulted from a ligature including a *resh* and a *yod*.

One of the most extreme set of differences that may derive from graphic confusion may be the difference found at Col 37:22 (Isa 44:16).²⁶⁹ Here 1QIsa^a reads ועל גחליו ישב ויהם “and he sits beside his charcoal and he is warm,” whereas the MT reads וְצִלָּהּ יִשְׁכַּע אֶת-יָהֶם “and he roasts the roast, and he is satisfied. Also, he is warm.” Conceptually, these readings are very different, but graphic similarity suggests that the unique reading of 1QIsa^a derived from the MT.²⁷⁰ If one were to eliminate the אֶת “also, even” particle of the MT, the following illustration demonstrates how 1QIsa^a could have derived from the MT based on graphic confusion and faulty word division.²⁷¹

ועל גחליו ישב ויהם
יצל הצליו ישב עיחם

Moreover, the fact that ועל is corrected above the line in a hand very similar to the first hand suggests that the substitution derived from some type of graphic confusion in the

²⁶⁸ Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 231.

²⁶⁹ 1QIsa^a agrees with the MT, although the first preposition על of the verse is corrected above the line likely by the first hand. 1QIsa^a adds the conjunctive *vav* here, unlike the MT.

²⁷⁰ Ulrich, Flint, and Abegg, *Qumran Cave 1*, 166, lists 1QIsa^a's reading as unique, but suggests that the MT reading is erroneous.

²⁷¹ This technique of showing graphic similarity is modeled after Longacre, “Developmental Stage, Scribal Lapse, or Physical Defect?,” 46.

scribe's exemplar. In short, the graphic similarity between these clauses, the presence of numerous variants, and the supralinear correction all suggest that this reading derived from graphic confusion.²⁷²

Substitutions: harmonization. Just as several additions resulted in a harmonized text, so several substitutions found throughout 1QIsa^a result in a harmonized text. An example of harmonization to the immediate context occurs at Col 39:29 (Isa 47:9). Here 1QIsa^a transcribes אלמנה “widow” for the MT’s אֶלְמָן “widowhood.” 1QIsa^a’s reading results in a harmonized passage since עֲלֻמְנָה occurs earlier in the passage. The substitution at Col 54:7 (Isa 66:19) too appears to be a case of harmonization to the immediate context. 1QIsa^a reads אותות “signs” while the MT reads אות “sign.” Kutscher argues that the object פְּלִיטִים “survivors” not survivor, likely occasioned the change in 1QIsa^a.²⁷³

Two changes in person occurring at Col 40:12 (Isa 48:7) and Col 40:13 (Isa 48:8) appear to be further instances of harmonization, but harmonizations that result in decreased clarity. In both cases, a second person perfect verb (שָׁמַעְתָּם at Isa 48:7 and שָׁמַעְתָּ at Isa 48:8) is changed to a first-person perfect verb (שָׁמַעְתִּים at Col 40:12 [Isa 48:7] and שָׁמַעְתִּי at Col 40:13 [Isa 48:8]). In Isaiah 48:7 of the MT, the subject of the verb is Israel; you have not heard of them (i.e., new things) while the subject in 1QIsa^a Col 40:12 (Isa 48:7) is the Lord; the Lord has not heard of them (i.e., new things). Likewise, in Isaiah 48:8, the MT too supplies “you” as the subject (i.e., Israel); “you [Israel] has not heard” while 1QIsa^a reads a first-person subject; “I [the Lord] have not heard.” The interchange of subjects here is not alarming since the immediate contexts switches between first-person subjects and second person subjects. For example, God declares the former things, announces them, and does them in Isaiah 40:3 (first-person subjects). Isaiah 40:4 has an

²⁷² Three further interesting substitutions involve graphic similarities and faulty word division. These differences include the substitutions at Col 17:9 (Isa 22:5), Col 22:26-27 (Isa 28:20), and Col 39:6 (Isa 46:1).

²⁷³ Kutscher, *Language and Linguistic Background*, 397.

infinitive construct with a first-person subjective genitive: God knows that Israel is obstinate. Again, in Isaiah 40:5, God declares and announces them to Israel (first-person subjects). Isaiah 40:6, then transitions, and declares that Israel (second-person subject) has heard so God commands them to see all of this. Further, he asks Israel to declare these things. The text then transitions back to a first-person subject; God again announces the new things that Israel (second person subject) has not known. Isaiah 40:7 of the MT then says that Israel has not heard these things (second-person subject), while 1QIsa^a reads a first-person subject: I have not heard (i.e., God) lest you say (second-person subjects in both texts), behold I knew *them* (first person subjects in both texts). Isaiah 40:8 then reads in the MT that you have not heard, and you have not known (second-person subjects) while 1QIsa^a reads, “behold, I have not heard (first-person subject) and you have not known (second-person subject).”

This brief survey indicates two things. First, the constant switch between first person and second person might have provided a context for an unintentional or intentional harmonization. Rosenbloom indicates that the scribe sought to bring the verb found in Isaiah 48:7 (שמעתם) into agreement with the verb ידעתים.²⁷⁴ He further argues that the scribe failed to recognize that the subject of ידעתים had changed because it occurred in direct discourse, a device overlooked by the scribe on other occasions.²⁷⁵ Second, it may be important to note that both substitutions concern the same verbal root, שמע “to hear” which are conjugated as first-person verbs in vv. 5, 6. This fact could have triggered the substitution either intentionally or unintentionally.

The substitution at Col 28:3 (Isa 34:4) is also an example of a harmonization. 1QIsa^a reads והעמקים יתבקעו וכול צבא השמים יפולו “and the valleys will be split and every

²⁷⁴ Rosenbloom, *The Dead Sea Isaiah Scroll*, 57.

²⁷⁵ Rosenbloom claims that the scribe further explains the text with the addition of a כי particle later in the verse. This addition makes the syntax of the MT explicit (the presence of an object clause after the verbal form ידעתי “I knew *that* . . .”). Ibid.

host of heaven will fall” while the MT reads וְנִמְקוּ כָּל־צָבָא הַשָּׁמַיִם “and every host of heaven will rot.” Kutscher suggests that the scribe substituted וְנִמְקוּ “they will rot” for וְעַמְקִים “and the valleys” because of the previous clause of Isaiah 34:3, which reads וְנִמְסוּ הַהָרִים מִדָּמָם “and the mountains will melt with their blood.” The substitution of 1QIsa^a then results in the word pair mountains/valleys.²⁷⁶ The fact that the verbs of these clauses are phonologically similar too suggests an inherent connection between these clauses: וְנִמְסוּ “and they will melt” and וְנִמְקוּ “and they will rot.” Kutscher further suggests that the substitution may have been influenced by Micah 1:4, which reads in the MT וְנִמְסוּ הַהָרִים וְתִבְקְעוּ תַּחְתָּיו וְהָעֲמָקִים יִתְבַּקְּעוּ “and the mountains will melt under him and the valleys will split open.” Thus, several factors suggest that this difference derived from a desire to harmonize the text.

The substitution at Col 41:9 (Isa 49:9) of the MT’s עַל־דְּרָכִים “upon the ways” for עַל כּוֹל הָרִים “upon every mountain” too may be a case of harmonization to its immediate context. The parallel construction בְּכָל־שָׁפְיִים “on every bare height” makes 1QIsa^a’s reading a more exact parallel.²⁷⁷

The substitution at Col 26:30 (Isa 32:19) can either be described as a case of transposition or harmonization. Here 1QIsa^a transcribes הָעֵר “the wood” for the MT הָעִיר “the city.” First, the difference may be a mechanical error: transposition of letters. Second, the difference may be the result of harmonization (i.e., the first clause of the MT discusses hail coming down on the wood).

One further variant represents a very different meanings but can still be reasonably ascribed to the scribal process. This is a substitution found at Col 17:1 (Isa 21:16). 1QIsa^a reads שְׁלוֹשׁ שָׁנִים כַּשְׂנֵי שָׂכִיר “three years according to the years of a hired

²⁷⁶ Kutscher, *Language and Linguistic Background*, 273.

²⁷⁷ Rosenbloom, *The Dead Sea Isaiah Scrol*, 59. The addition of the כּוֹל “every” particle too supports this theory.

worker,” while the MT reads שְׁנָה כְּשָׁנֵי שָׂכִיר “a year according to the years of a hired worker.” Isaiah 21:13-16 records God’s judgment against Arabia. The oracle concludes by giving the time of the judgment: The MT states it will happen in a year while 1QIsa^a specifies that judgment will occur within three years. The most likely explanation for this difference is harmonization. The MT says, “A year (singular) according to the years (plural) of a hired hand.” Thus, the scribe of 1QIsa^a may be harmonizing the text to its immediate context. It is also important to note that Isaiah 16:14 records God’s judgment on Moab and states that the glory of Moab will be dishonored בְּשָׁלֹשׁ שָׁנִים כְּשָׁנֵי שָׂכִיר “in three years according to the years of a hired hand.” The similarity between this passage and Isaiah 21:16 is striking and could have led to this substitution. Thus, this variant could reasonably be a case of harmonization to the immediate construction or to a similar phrase in Isaiah 16:14.²⁷⁸

1QIsa^a contains category 2 substitutions that likely derived from the scribe’s desire to interpret the text: a type of harmonization. One example of this could be the difference at Col 31:6 (Isa 37:27). 1QIsa^a reads here הַנְּשָׂדֵף לְפָנַי קִדְמָה “which is scorched before an east wind,” while the MT reads וַיִּשְׂדָּמָה לְפָנַי קִמָּה “as a field before standing grain.” These phrases modify the inhabitants of the fortified cities that are about to lie in ruins (Isa 37:26-27). Thus, both phrases communicate a picture of judgment although slightly differently. The MT indicates that the inhabitants are like a field; namely, one that is before standing grain (i.e., maturity).²⁷⁹ The question immediately arises, “What does it mean for a field to be described as before standing grain (MT)?” The parallel passage in 2 Kings 19:26, Targum Jonathan and 1QIsa^a all read differently than the MT here. First, 2 Kings 19:26 reads identically to the MT except for a substitution of *mem*

²⁷⁸ Rosenbloom, *The Dead Sea Isaiah Scroll*, 32.

²⁷⁹ Clines interprets קִמָּה as possibly referring to maturity in David J. A. Clines, ed., *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew: Yodh-Lamedh*, vol. 4 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), s.v. “קִמָּה.”

(Isa 37:27 reads וישדפה (וישדפה) and a *pe* (2 Kgs 19:26 reads וישדפה). Second Kings 19:26 reads וישדפה לפני קמה “as scorched before standing grain.” The difference between these texts could have arisen because of graphic or phonological similarity: the *mem* and *pe* are similar graphically and phonologically. However, the ambiguity of Isaiah 37:27 of the MT makes interpretation a possible explanation too. Deciding between these two explanations is difficult. Targum Jonathan has the same reading as 2 Kings 19:26. Targum Jonathan reads וישדפה עד-לא מטה למהני שובלין “that is scorched before it reaches to be an ear of corn.”

1QIsa^a follows the Targum of Isaiah 37:27 and 2 Kings 19:26 in rendering לפני קדמ הגשדפ “as that which is scorched” but further deviates from the MT by reading לפני קדמ “before an east wind.” The supralinear *yod* appears graphically similar to the *yod* of the base text so it may have derived from the first hand. This further deviation interprets the MT so that the idea of “scorching” is explained: they are scorched before an east wind.

Substitutions: possible examples of harmonization. Other complex differences could be explained in several ways. The substitution at Col 1:9 (Isa 1:7) may have been an intentional change or it could have resulted from simple graphic confusion. 1QIsa^a reads ושממו עליה כמפכת זרים “they (the foreigners) desolate it, as one overthrown by strangers,” whereas the MT reads ושממה כמהפכת זרים “and it is desolate, as one overthrown by strangers.” The MT’s reading describes the land while the reading of 1QIsa^a shifts from describing the land to discussing the action of the foreigners. The reading of 1QIsa^a is achieved by substituting the noun שממה for the un-collapsed geminate verb ושממו plus the prepositional phrase עליה “it” (the suffix referring back to אדמה “the land”). Conceptually, the function of על would seem to introduce the direct object: it (i.e., the land: “they desolate it”), but על does not introduce the direct object with the verb שמם in the Hebrew Bible.²⁸⁰ Overall, by describing the desolate condition of the land, the MT

²⁸⁰ David J. A. Clines, ed., *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew: Sin-Taw*, vol. 8 (Sheffield:

hides the subject. 1QIsa^a, on the other hand, makes the subject explicit—they (i.e., the foreigners) desolate the land. The change, therefore, is one of agency and could be interpretative although graphic similarity between these readings is possible.

Another example that could have resulted from either graphic confusion or interpretation is the difference at Col 20:19 (Isa 26:8). Here, 1QIsa^a substitutes the prepositional phrase וְלִזְכָּרְךָ “and for your remembrance” with the prepositional phrase וְלִתּוֹרַתְךָ “and for your law.” Some graphic similarity between these phrases makes graphic confusion possibility, but the fact that both readings make conceptual sense suggests interpretation.

Complex category 2 variants. There are several complex category 2 variants. Scholars have proposed two alternative explanations to account for these variants. Drew Longacre proposes that several large-scale differences between 1QIsa^a Col 27-54 (Isa 34-66) and the MT result from a *Vorlage* with a damaged bottom edge.²⁸¹ Four features of the text suggest this proposal according to Longacre: First, 1QIsa^a contains spacing irregularities throughout columns 27-54 (Isa 34-66). Second, 1QIsa^a Col 27-54 is characterized by several literary and textual difficulties that are often unique readings. Third, many passages that originally omitted material from the MT are later supplemented to include the omitted material. Fourth, these three features often converge at the same locations in 1QIsa^a according to a similar distribution pattern.²⁸²

Sheffield Academic Press, 2011), s.v. “שָׁמַיִם.”

²⁸¹ Longacre, “Developmental Stage, Scribal Lapse, or Physical Defect?,” 17-50. His study builds on the study of Brownlee, “The Manuscripts of Isaiah.” Longacre and Brownlee are not the only scholars to suggest that differences between 1QIsa^a and the MT should be explained in this manner. Kutscher also made this suggestion when discussing large-scale omissions. See his discussion of Col 33:14-17 (Isa 40:14-16), in Kutscher, *Language and Linguistic Background*, 551.

²⁸² Longacre, “Developmental Stage, Scribal Lapse, or Physical Defect?,” 21-25.

Contrary to Drew Longacre, Ulrich understands the shorter readings from 1QIsa^a as indicative of a separate literary form of the book.²⁸³ He reasons that the shorter forms of 1QIsa^a are often smooth while lacking triggers for parablepsis.²⁸⁴

Longacre and Ulrich have proposed two alternative explanations for dealing with these large-scale differences, although Ulrich deals with less passages since he only discusses omissions. These differences are grouped as category 2 variants here since Longacre's explanation reasonably attributes these differences to the scribal process.²⁸⁵

Longacre discusses sixteen examples where the scribe of 1QIsa^a could have copied from an exemplar with a damaged bottom edge. These examples are found at Col 28:18-21 (Isa 34:17-35:2), Col 29:15-18 (Isa 36:11-12), Col 30:10-13 (Isa 37:4-7), Col 31:10-13 (Isa 37:31-33), Col 32: 11-15 (Isa 38:19-22), Col 33:14-17 (Isa 40:14-16), Col 34:14-17 (Isa 41:11-12), Col 36:11-13 (Isa 43:3), Col 38:13-15 (Isa 45:8), Col 42:19-22 (Isa 51:6), Col 44:15-16 (Isa 53:8), Col 45:16-18 (Isa 54:17), Col 46:16-19 (Isa 56:6), possibly at Col 47:12-14 (Isa 57:13-14), possibly at Col 50:29 (Isa 63:3), possibly at Col 51:29 (Isa 65:3), and Col 52:22-24 (Isa 65:15-16).²⁸⁶

Examples of complex category 2 variants. The large-scale difference at Col 32:12-14 can reasonably be described as deriving from some type of damage in the scribe's exemplar. These lines contain several corrections that largely correct the text to the MT, but this process is done in stages.²⁸⁷ The first correction derives from a second

²⁸³ Ulrich, "The Developmental Composition of the Book of Isaiah," 288-305.

²⁸⁴ See Ulrich's discussion of the omission at 1QIsa^a Col 28:18-20 (Isa 34:17-35:2) for an example of his argumentation. *Ibid.*, 298.

²⁸⁵ All differences that do not derive from the first hand are given a numerical point in the statistics, even when a corrector adds the reading originally omitted by 1QIsa^a.

²⁸⁶ Longacre, "Developmental Stage, Scribal Lapse, or Physical Defect?"

²⁸⁷ 1QIsa^a is identical to the MT minus the possible case of dittography, which if it is a case of dittography, is not a perfect case since there are a few differences. Most notably, the scribe transcribes אלוה "God" for אל "for." See Talmon for a discussion of this difference, in Shemaryahu Talmon, "Aspects of the

hand²⁸⁸ and reflects either a scribal error, a case of dittography,²⁸⁹ or the retention of a parallel reading.²⁹⁰ The first correction is found in line 12-13. The correction reads חזי יהוה להושיעני “the living, the living, he is the one who praises you as I do today as a father makes God known to sons. By your truth, O Lord, you will save me.” This addition repeats the content of line 11-12 (MT Isa 38:19-20a) with one adjustment (whereas the MT has אֵל “about/concerning” 1QIsa^a has אלוה “God”). The duplication of lines 11-12 in lines 12-13 can be explained a case of dittography or the inclusion of a parallel reading.

Beyond the case of dittography/inclusion of a parallel reading, a possible third scribe utilized the missing space to fill in Isaiah 38:21-22 of the MT still missing in 1QIsa^a.²⁹¹ This addition begins in line 14 and continues horizontally down the left-hand

Textual Transmission of the Bible in the Light of Qumran Manuscripts,” in *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text*, ed. Frank Moore Cross and Shemaryahu Talmon (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1975), 240-42. Also, he omits the verb ישאו “let them lift up” of the MT in Isa 38:21. See also Martin, *The Scribal Character of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, vol. 2, 543, who argues that lines 12-14 were not originally left blank, but were erased. He argues that some words of lines 12-14 resemble the script found elsewhere in the column rather than the script of the correction.

²⁸⁸ The evidence indicates lines 12-14a came from a second hand. This evidence includes the size of the letters (the letters are slightly larger than letters of the original scribe). See Ulrich, “The Developmental Composition of the Book of Isaiah,” 298. Moreover, the nature of the orthography (the addition is defective rather than *plene* like the surrounding text) suggests a second hand as does the sharpness of the script (the addition appears to be written more sharply possibly with a different writing utensil). Taken together, the evidence appears to indicate that this script came from a second hand.

²⁸⁹ Several scholars have argued that this addition is a case of dittography. See Martin G. Abegg, Peter W. Flint, and Eugene Charles Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible: The Oldest Known Bible* (San Francisco: HarperSan Francisco, 1999); Ulrich, “The Developmental Composition of the Book of Isaiah,” 298-99; and Longacre, “Developmental Stage, Scribal Lapse, or Physical Defect?,” 37-38. There is precedent for dittography occurring within a correction in 1QIsa^a. Extending from Col 33:7 down the left-hand margin (Isa 40:8), the corrector repeats the ודבר אלוהינו “and the word of our Go[d]” even though this reading is included in the original text.

²⁹⁰ See Talmon, “Aspects of the Textual Transmission,” 240-42.

²⁹¹ The scribe who filled in line 11-12 who either committed the dittography or included the parallel reading may have omitted vv. 21-22 because of a mechanical error. Parablepsis could have occurred from the phrase בית יהוה “house of the Lord” in v. 20b (the last words written before this correction), and the same phrase בית יהוה at the end of v. 22. Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 311, recognizes this possibility as does Ulrich in Ulrich, “The Developmental Composition of the Book of Isaiah,”

margin. Moreover, it is possibly that this correction extends to the first few words of chapter 39, בעת ההיא “at that time.”²⁹²

Ulrich has argued that this section of 1QIsa^a is indicative of an alternative literary form,²⁹³ whereas Longacre argues that the nature of the differences likely indicates a damaged exemplar.²⁹⁴ Longacre’s view is more plausible for several reasons.²⁹⁵ First, portions of three maybe four lines were left blank by the original scribe. The empty space likely indicates that the scribe knew something was wrong with his text and something needed to be added.²⁹⁶ Moreover, Longacre argues that the originally blank space would have been sufficient space to include the material omitted from the MT (Isa 38:20b-22).²⁹⁷ Second, the result of the later hands that filled in the *vacat* results in a text that conforms to the MT, almost perfectly. Third, it is difficult to image that the originally

299. van der Kooij reasons that parablepsis better explains the omission of this content by the scribe who filled in line 11-12 than postulating the existence of an alternative literary tradition. He further counters Tov’s argument that vv. 21-22 is an obvious secondary addition on internal grounds in Arie van der Kooij, “Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible Its Aim and Method,” in *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov*, ed. Emanuel Tov, Shalom M. Paul, and Eva Ben-David, Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 94 (Leiden. The Netherlands: Brill, 2003), 736. Cf. Tov’s reasoning at Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 310-11.

²⁹² See Longacre, “Developmental Stage, Scribal Lapse, or Physical Defect?,” 37-39, for a helpful analysis concerning vv. 21-22 and why these verses were likely in the *Vorlage* of 1QIsa^a prior to being damaged.

²⁹³ See Ulrich, “The Developmental Composition of the Book of Isaiah,” 299. Ulrich sees בעת ההיא as deriving from the first hand

²⁹⁴ See Longacre, “Developmental Stage, Scribal Lapse, or Physical Defect?,” 37-39. Note, however, that he explains בעת ההיא as deriving from the original hand. *Ibid.*, 37.

²⁹⁵ Contra Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 310-11. Ulrich argues that the two additions found in 1QIsa^a necessarily attempt to bring 1QIsa^a into conformity with the *secondarily* expanded tradition inherited in the MT. Ulrich, “The Developmental Composition of the Book of Isaiah,” 298-99.

²⁹⁶ Such a large vacate likely did not represent a paragraph marker nor could poor writing surface account for this original vacate since a corrector fills in the empty space.

²⁹⁷ Longacre, “Developmental Stage, Scribal Lapse, or Physical Defect?,” 38. Of course, the case of dittography/parallel passage found in lines 12-13 forces the final scribe to continue his correction down the left-hand margin.

omitted material was a secondary addition since it begins in the middle of verse 20 and may span to the first few words of the next chapter. Fourth, this passage accords with a consistent pattern of damage within the second half of 1QIsa^a (approx. every 29 lines).²⁹⁸ For these reasons, 1QIsa^a's original omission of Isaiah 38:20b-22 and possible even the first few words of 39:1a, although corrected in stages, likely does not indicate a separate literary edition.

Another complicated large-scale difference between the MT and 1QIsa^a is found at Col 52:23 (Isa 65:15-16). The scribe omits **וְלַעֲבָדָיו יִקְרָא שֵׁם אֲחֵרִי: אֲשֶׁר הִמְתַּבְּרָה בְּאֲרָץ יִתְבָּרַךְ** “and to his servants, he will call by another name so that the one who blesses himself in the land, will bless himself.”²⁹⁹ In addition to omitting this content, the scribe adds the words **תָּמִיד** “continually” at the beginning of line 23 and the words **וְהָיָה הַנִּשְׁבַּע** “and it will be that the one who swears” at the end of the line. This large-scale difference is unlike the prior example in two ways. First, the scribe omits material not corrected by a later hand. Second, the scribe adds words that do not have counterparts in the MT. In this situation, the scribe likely “attempted a partial reconstruction of the lacuna, inserting incorrect contextual guesses at both ends of the damaged text and omitting the correct text (attested with slight differences by the MT and the LXX).”³⁰⁰

A slightly different type of large-scale difference occurs at Col 51:29 (Isa 65:3). This difference is generally described as a substitution whose meaning is certainly different than the MT's, but not necessarily contradictory. The MT reads **וּמְקַטְרִים עַל-הַלְבָנִים** “and who makes incense upon bricks,” while 1QIsa^a reads **וַיִּנְקוּ יָדֵים עַל הָאֲבָנִים** “they clean hands upon the stones.” This substitution is complicated by several factors. First, what does it

²⁹⁸ Longacre, “Developmental Stage, Scribal Lapse, or Physical Defect?,” 37.

²⁹⁹ The accents are kept in this example to show how the differences break up the syntax of the MT.

³⁰⁰ Ibid.

mean for Israel to clean their hands upon stones (1QIsa^a)? This phrase stands in a list of accusations that God has against Israel. God has spread out his hands to a rebellious nation (65:2a) who walked in the way that is not good, went after their own devices (65:2b), provoked God to anger continually (65:3a), sacrificed in gardens, and made incense upon bricks (MT)/cleaned hands on stones (1QIsa^a) (65:3b). Second, it is interesting that in the MT God describes Israel in this passage exclusively with participles (vv.2-5). 1QIsa^a's break from this trend by substituting the participle וַיִּקְטְרוּ of the MT with an indicative וַיִּנְקוּ seems suspect although not necessarily. Third, the fact that scholarship emends 1QIsa^a demonstrates the internal difficulties with 1QIsa^a's reading.³⁰¹

Longacre's thesis that 1QIsa^a was copied from a damaged exemplar accounts for these differences more persuasively than Ulrich's theory that 1QIsa^a was copied from a literary tradition besides that of the MT. Unlike previous examples, the scribe leaves no blank line indicating a problem in his exemplar. Nonetheless, three facts indicate that 1QIsa^a's reading does not indicate a separate textual tradition. First, the substitution occurs where one would expect a damaged exemplar (approx. every 29 lines). Second, the reading of 1QIsa^a is highly enigmatic and obscure. Third, and more convincingly, Longacre draws attention to the similarity between the letters found in the MT and 1QIsa^a and graphically represents how 1QIsa^a and the MT could have derived from the same tradition.³⁰²

ו מ ק ט ר ים על ה ל בנים (MT)
ו י נ ק ו י ד ים על ה א בנים (1QIsa^a)

Thus, despite the difficulty of this substitution, this substitution likely derived from the scribe's attempt to transcribe a damaged Masoretic reading as best he could. As Longacre

³⁰¹ See Abegg's emendation of 1QIsa^a in Abegg, Flint, and Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible*, 377. Notice how he translates וַיִּנְקוּ as "waving." Kutscher, *Language and Linguistic Background*, 243, too proposes an emendation.

³⁰² Longacre, "Developmental Stage, Scribal Lapse, or Physical Defect?," 46.

points out, the scribe did one of two things when he reached a damaged section—he left a blank space(s) to be filled in later or attempted to fill in the lacuna as best he could.³⁰³

Category 3. 1QIsa^a preserves few category 3 variants: variants that are difficult to explain if one only appeals to the scribal process. One category 3 variant is preserved at Col 2:18 (Isa 2:9-10). Here, 1QIsa^a omits the following: **בְּוֹא וְאֵל-תְּשֵׂא לָהֶם: בְּצֹר וְהִטְמֵן בְּעֶפְרַר מִפְּנֵי פֶתַח יְהוָה וּמִהַדָּר גְּאוֹנוֹ: וְאֵל-תְּשֵׂא לָהֶם:** “Do not lift for them. Enter into the rock and hide oneself in the dust from before the terror of the Lord and from splendor of his majesty.” There is no compelling evidence that the first half of 1QIsa^a was copied from an exemplar with a damaged bottom edge according to Longacre,³⁰⁴ and there is not an obvious trigger for parablepsis such as a repeated word that could have led to the omission. Of course, all omissions could potentially be ascribed to parablepsis and the fact that the omitted material begins mid-verse makes this possible, but the absence of compelling evidence makes this difference a category 3 variant.

Ulrich asserts that this instance is not an omission properly but was rather an addition made by the MT.³⁰⁵ He bases this conclusion on external grounds and on internal grounds. He argues that the material omitted by 1QIsa^a (in Ulrich’s view, added by the MT) (vv. 9a-10) does not fit the context; namely, verses 9a and 11 discuss the “humbling of human pride and use similar dictation, expressed in the third person.”³⁰⁶ Meanwhile, “vv. 9b and 10 are second-person negative and positive commands, which sit uneasily in the context.”³⁰⁷

³⁰³ Longacre, “Developmental Stage, Scribal Lapse, or Physical Defect?,” 48-49.

³⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, 26.

³⁰⁵ Ulrich, “The Developmental Composition of the Book of Isaiah,” 291.

³⁰⁶ *Ibid.*

³⁰⁷ *Ibid.*

Overall, Ulrich's reasoning is tentative for two reasons. First, his reasoning of the internal grounds is weak since it presupposes a very static text. Second, and more importantly, is the external evidence. 1QIsa^a alone omits these verses. Although possible, it is questionable how 1QIsa^a would preserve the original text against all other witnesses, especially when it so often aligns with the MT. The alternative explanations are either the verses were lost through parablepsis or an intentional omission. No solution is entirely satisfactory. In the end, due to a lack of evidence for ascribing this variant to the scribal process, it is placed in category 3 although the fact that it alone preserves this reading should caution scholars from basing the textual tradition of 1QIsa^a solely on this difference.

The second category 3 variant is preserved at Col 40:2 (Isa 47:12-13) and is difficult to explain. It may be a case of interpretation. 1QIsa^a read כשפיד באשר יגעתי “your incantations, with which you have toiled from your youth until today according to your multiple schemes”³⁰⁸ while the MT reads כְּשִׁפְיָךְ בְּאֲשֶׁר יִגְעַתָּה “your sorceries in which you wearied from your youth. Perhaps you will be able to profit; perhaps you will cause terror. You are wearied by your many counsels.” This difference includes both an omission and a substitution. First, the scribe substitutes the MT's תַּעְרוּצֵי אֱלֹהֵי הַיָּמִים אֲשֶׁר יִגְעַתָּה “perhaps you will be able to profit; perhaps you will terrify” for ועד היום “and until now,” which completes the timeframe whereby Israel has made God weary: “from your youth *until today*.” Second, the scribe deletes the first word of verse 13: נְלֹאִיתָ “you are wearied.”³⁰⁹

This is a category 3 variant, but scholars should be cautious about basing an assessment on the textual tradition of 1QIsa^a on this difference since the reading is unique

³⁰⁸ See the translation of Abegg, Flint, and Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible*, 348.

³⁰⁹ Rosenbloom, *The Dead Sea Isaiah Scroll*, 57.

to 1QIsa^a. Moreover, Rosenbloom suggests that the substitution was made to resolve scribal confusion.³¹⁰

Statistics and Conclusion of 1QIsa^a Textual Tradition

The above survey demonstrates that 1QIsa^a fits well within the Masoretic tradition.³¹¹ The fact that 1QIsa^a is preserved incredibly well provides in depth analysis of most of its variants. This analysis demonstrates that hundreds of the differences merely concern synonymous spelling. Beyond synonymous spellings, hundreds more belong to category 1. These variants are often the presence or absence of small particles that result in synonymous syntactical constructions. In addition to these variants, hundreds of other differences concern changes in perspective or meaning that can reasonably be attributed to the scribal process. After all of these variants are removed, few category 3 variants remain. These variants only comprise thirty-one points in the statistics. It is possible that each of these differences too belong to the scribal process, but strong evidence for grouping them as category 2 variants is lacking. When considering these variants, one must account for the fact that they are unique. Thus, the basis for categorizing 1QIsa^a as non-aligned or independent are both limited and suspect.

In the end, 1QIsa^a preserves a text almost identical to the MT in meaning with hundreds of differences due to spelling and hundreds more due to the nature of the scribal process. This fact, coupled with the high statistical relationship between these texts, demonstrates that 1QIsa^a can reasonable be grouped as preserving the Masoretic tradition despite the presence of a handful of very difficult differences.³¹²

³¹⁰ Rosenbloom suggests that the substitution was made to resolve scribal confusion. Ibid, 56.

³¹¹ See the table “1QIsa^a: A description of its variants” in appendix 2 for all of the category 2 and 3 variants from 1QIsa^a.

³¹² One should further note that Isa 61:10-62:9 is represented stichometrically so that one is able to analysis the text’s sense divisions. 1QIsa^a follows the MT major accents with two exceptions: (i.e.,

Table 20. The statistical relationship between 1QIsaa and the MT

Total # of Words in 1QIsa ^a	Categories 2 and 3	Statistical Relationship	Category 3	Statistical Relationship
25,374	903	96.44%	31	99.88%

4Q57

4Q57 (4QIsa^c) is preserved in 82 fragments and preserves portions of Isaiah 9-12, 14, 22-26, 28, 30, 33, 44-46, 48-49, 51-55, 66.³¹³ Ulrich describes the script as a formal, developed Herodian hand from the middle third of the first century AD.³¹⁴

The orthography and morphology are much fuller than the MT. 4Q57 consistently represents the following forms *plene* אדוני, אלוהים, and זואת.³¹⁵ Tov designates this full orthography as Qumran Scribal Practice (QSP),³¹⁶ and describes it as the most developed orthographic system.³¹⁷ 1QIsa^a—at least the second half of the scroll—and 4Q57 are both written in QSP and preserve overlapping texts. Comparison between these texts, according to Tov, demonstrate that QSP is not monolithic; rather, certain principles are operative in all texts written in this fuller practice, but independence exists.³¹⁸

there is one difference at Col 50:10 (Isa 61:11) and one at Col 50:17 (Isa 62:6). See Tov *Scribal Practices*, 136, but not that the first difference is found at Isa 61:11, not 61:10 contrary to Tov. These differences were not given a statistical point because the statistics concern words, not sense divisions.

³¹³ See Flint, “The Isaiah Scrolls from the Judean Desert,” 485. 4Q57 is one of only twenty-nine scrolls from Qumran that preserves the end of the scroll. See Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 111.

³¹⁴ Eugene Ulrich and Patrick W Skehan, “4QIsac,” in *Qumrân Cave 4: The Prophets*, ed. Eugene Ulrich et al., vol. 10, Discoveries in the Judaean Desert 15 (Oxford: Clarendon, 1997), 46.

³¹⁵ Ibid. See also how the orthography of 4Q57 compares to 1QIsa^a, other Qumran texts, and MT in his orthography table. Ibid., 47-48.

³¹⁶ Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 333.

³¹⁷ Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 211.

³¹⁸ Ibid, 104. Tov further lists other manuscripts written in QSP that contain overlapping passages that support this point, in Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 268.

Moreover, 4Q57 transcribes several references to God in paleo-Hebrew. For example, the scribe always writes יהוה as well as inseparable prepositions and conjunctive *vavs* attached to it in paleo-Hebrew.³¹⁹ Likewise, אלוהים too is written in paleo-Hebrew along with its suffixes, although Ulrich notes that it is written in the square script once (F47:L16).³²⁰ Another example of this wide use of paleo-Hebrew includes the representation of צבאות twice in paleo-Hebrew when following יהוה (i.e., F24:L38 and F62:L1).³²¹ Likewise, 4Q57 typically transcribes אדוני in paleo-Hebrew when referring to God, but אל, קדוש ישראל, אל, and the pronouns אני and אנוכי are written in the square script.³²²

Scholars debate the textual tradition of 4Q57. Ulrich does not discuss the textual tradition in his discussion of 4Q57 although he does state that all “available manuscript traditions of Isaiah, despite their pluriformity, witness to a single edition.”³²³ Abegg, likewise, only indirectly comments about the textual tradition of 4Q57. He notes that 4Q57 (4QIsa^c) is primarily distinguished on orthographic grounds.³²⁴ Skehan claims that the Isaiah Qumran manuscripts do not attest to a different literary edition; rather, the cases where a Qumran Isaiah text testifies to a non-Masoretic reading is extremely rare.³²⁵

³¹⁹ Ulrich and Skehan, “4QIsac,” 46. Tov argues that 4Q57 (4QIsa^c) represents the most developed use of paleo-Hebrew to represent the divine name in Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 243.

³²⁰ Ulrich and Skehan, “4QIsac,” 46. Cf. Tov’s discussion of writing prefixes and suffixes in paleo-Hebrew, in Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 241.

³²¹ Ulrich and Skehan, “4QIsac,” 46. See Tov’s discussion of the paleo-Hebrew script in Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 238–48. Here, he argues that 4Q57 alone agrees with the rules of the Talmud (y. Meg 1.71d and Sof 4.1) in representing צבאות as a divine name, in Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 241.

³²² Ulrich and Skehan, “4QIsac,” 46.

³²³ Ulrich, Flint, and Abegg, *Qumran Cave 1*, 91.

³²⁴ Abegg, “1QIsaa and 1QIsab,” 224.

³²⁵ Skehan, “Text of Isaias at Qumran,” 162.

Tov agrees with this point.³²⁶ Nonetheless, he identifies 4Q57 as textually non-aligned since the text is not exclusively close to the MT or LXX while containing unique readings.³²⁷ Tov claims that 4Q57 may have been “copied from a text that did not differ much from the Isaiah scrolls from cave 4, or from 1QIsa^b, most of which are rather close to MT, but no certainty can be had.”³²⁸ Lange too lists 4Q57 as non-aligned.³²⁹

Description and Categorization of the Variants

Most of the differences noted by Ulrich in his list of variants concern orthography, phonology, and morphology only.³³⁰ A sampling of these variants include the addition of a prosthetic *aleph* at F36:L2 (Isa 52:10), differences in representing the third person masculine singular pronominal suffix because of *syncope* of the *he* (e.g., F30:L2 [Isa 48:15]),³³¹ substitution of gutturals at F9ii:L17 (Frgs. 9ii, 11, 12i, 52:L29 [Isa 24:2]) and F4:L3 (Isa 10:28), the omission of a final nasal at F6:L8 (Isa 11:8),³³² and alternative spellings of an infinitive absolute of a third *yod/vav* verb at F9i:L5 (F9i:L27 [Isa 22:13]).

³²⁶ Tov, “The Text of Isaiah at Qumran,” 511.

³²⁷ Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 109.

³²⁸ Tov, “The Text of Isaiah at Qumran,” 508-9.

³²⁹ Lange, “Textual Plurality,” 55.

³³⁰ Many of the citations in this text can be referenced in multiple ways. One can refer to the reconstructed column and line number provided by the editors, or one can refer to the exact fragment and line number corresponding to the actual fragment. Both are provided in this dissertation. The first reference given is the reference to the fragment number and the corresponding line of the fragment while the second reference is that of the fragments which make up the reconstructed column and the corresponding reconstructed line number.

³³¹ Gesenius, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, §23k.

³³² Qimron, *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, §200.143.

A few other minor differences are not included in the following discussion and statistics, such as one variant that agrees with the *kethiv* at F50 (Isa 10:32), one difference that agrees with the *qere* at F9ii:L15 (Frgs. 9ii, 11, 12, 52i:L27 [Isa 24:1]), five proposed variants that depend on insufficient manuscript evidence such as the difference at F13:1 (F13:L6 [Isa 24:19]), and two variants that are unclear paleographically. These differences are preserved at F6:L2 (Isa 11:4) and F9ii:L9 (Frgs. 9ii, 11, 12, 52i:L36 [Isa 24:8]).

Category 1. Several differences belong to category 1. A sampling of these variants includes the addition of conjunctive *vav*, the addition of the marker of the accusative, the addition of a form of the verb היה “to exist” omitted in the MT, the difference between a collective singular and a plural, and the substitution of tense.³³³

Category 2. Several differences belong to category 2. Seven of these are additions. Four of these additions concern the addition of a pronominal suffix that makes the text more explicit.

The other three additions are more complex and categorized less easily. First, 4Q57 reads את כבוד יהוה “the glory of the Lord” at F6:L6 (Isa 11:9) whereas the MT simply reads אֶת־יְהוָה “the Lord.” Isaiah 11:9 and Habakkuk 2:14 are very similar in the MT, and the addition of כבוד aligns 4Q57 even more closely to Habakkuk 2:14 as Ulrich notes.³³⁴ The Targum too reads against the MT here and with 4Q57 in rendering a genitive construction. However, the noun of the Targum is slightly different than that of 4Q57: 4Q57 adds כבוד “glory” whereas the Targum supplies דְּהִלְתָּא “fear.”³³⁵ The phrase

³³³ For more details about these variants, see table “4Q57: Description of variants” in appendix 2.

³³⁴ See Ulrich and Skehan, “4QIsac,” 52. The addition of a *lamed* preposition to the verbal noun דעה in F6:L6 (Isa 11:9) too aligns the text more closely to Hab 2:14.

³³⁵ The genitive of the Targum is not expressed by the case of the governing noun, but by the *di* particle.

כְּבוֹד יְהוָה “the glory of the Lord” is translated in the Targum typically with a form of the noun יָקָר (e.g., Tar. Isa 60:1), not דְּחָלָא “fear.” The addition in 4Q57 may correspond to the reverential attitude when speaking of God pervasive in the Targums or it could simply represent a harmonization to Habakkuk 2:14.³³⁶

The second addition is preserved at F9ii:L22 (Frgs. 9ii:L34 [Isa 24:7]). Here 4Q57 reads גֶּפֶן וַיֵּהָר גֶּפֶן יֵהָר “vine and oil” whereas the MT simply reads גֶּפֶן “vine.” 4Q57 transcribes a double subject so that both the vine and oil languish when God judges the earth contrary to the MT, which only lists a single subject as languishing. Ulrich cites Joel 1:10 for comparison since this verse is similar grammatically to 4Q57 in that יֵצֶקֶר “oil” is the subject of the *pulal* form of the verb אָמַל “languish” and conceptually since both passages describe God’s coming judgment as affecting the grounds ability to produce its fruit.³³⁷ Thus, this difference can be described as a harmonization.

The third addition is found at F9ii:L28 (Frgs. 9ii, 11, 12, 52i:L40 [Isa 24:15]). 4Q57 reads here [] בּוֹאֲרִים בְּאֲרָם כְּבוֹד [] “with the fires in Aram, glorify [the Lord],” whereas the MT reads בְּאֲרָם כְּבוֹד יְהוָה “in the east, glorify the Lord.” The word בּוֹאֲרִים of 4Q57 represents בְּאֲרָם of the MT albeit with the *mater* moved forward. The MT meaning of בְּאֲרָם (literally “with fire”) is difficult. Clines defines this occurrence as “region of light, east,” but this is the only example of אֹר meaning “east.”³³⁸ The Targum’s expansion supports this translation since it reads בְּמִיתֵי נְהוּרָא “when the light enters.”³³⁹ The major

³³⁶ Martin McNamara, *Targum and Testament Revisited: Aramaic Paraphrases of the Hebrew Bible: A Light on the New Testament*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2010), 141-45.

³³⁷ Ulrich and Skehan, “4QIsac,” 58.

³³⁸ Clines, *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew*, vol. 1, s.v. “אֹר.” See also Francis Brown et al., *The New Brown, Driver, Briggs, Gesenius Hebrew and English Lexicon* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1979), s.v. “אֲרָם,” who lists אֲרָם as a separate word.

³³⁹ On the other hand, the LXX appears to skip בְּאֲרָם, by rendering διὰ τοῦτο ἡ δόξα κυρίου ἐν ταῖς νήσοις ἔσται τῆς θαλάσσης “therefore, the glory of the Lord will be in the islands of the sea.” Moreover, the Vulgate interprets בְּאֲרָם as בְּאוּרִים “Urims” with *doctrinis*. See Brown et al., *The New Brown, Driver*,

difference between the MT and 4Q57 is the addition of בארם. This addition, unique among the manuscripts, is likely interpretative; namely, it further defines the word בוארים by specifying who is to praise the Lord in the east—Aram a people to the northeast of Israel.³⁴⁰ Thus, the difference again can be described as a case of harmonization.

There are two category 2 omissions. Both of these variants omit a pronominal suffix present in the MT. At F18:L1 (Frgs. 18-20:L2 [Isa 30:8]), 4Q57 reads כתו[ב “write” where the MT reads כְּתֹבָה “write it.” Furthermore, at F47:L4 (Frgs. 44-47:L18 [Isa 55:6]) 4Q57 reads צא[בהמ “while [he] may be found” where the MT reads בְּהִמָּצְאוֹ “while he may be found.” Both of these omissions are slight changes.

Besides additions and omissions, 4Q57 preserves category 2 substitutions. In three of these differences, the subject of the verb is changed from either a third or second person subject to a first-person subject. First, this occurs at F1:L1 (Isa 9:3). Here, 4Q57 reads תוּרתי[הה “I shatt[ered]” whereas the MT reads הִחַתְתָּ “you shattered.” In 4Q57, the change signifies that the Lord is speaking as opposed to the prophet in the MT. Second, at F28:L2 (Isa 48:11) 4Q57 reads אִיחַל “I am profaned,” while the MT reads יִהְיֶה “it (i.e., my name) is profaned.”³⁴¹ This difference represents a slight change in perspective. Third, at F30:L2 (Isa 48:15), 4Q57 transcribes “and I will ma[ke his way prosper]” וְאִצְלִיָּהּ for the MT’s וְהִצְלִיחַ “and he will prosper in his way [ESV].” 4Q57, again, appears interpretative since the servant prospering in his way depends on the Lord who first calls him and brings him. The *vav* plus perfect construction of the MT may indicate purpose/result: that he might prosper in his way.³⁴² Thus, in both readings, the person prospers because of the Lord. In

Briggs, s.v. “אורים.”

³⁴⁰ Clines, *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew*, vol. 1, “אַרם.”

³⁴¹ The *yod* of אִיחַל resembles a *vav* on paleographic grounds, but the *vav* and *yod* are not always clearly distinguished in 4Q57. If the letter is a *yod*, it represents a *sere plene*.

³⁴² Russell Fuller and Kyoungwon Choi, *Invitation to Biblical Hebrew Syntax: An Intermediate*

each of these three examples, 4Q57 identifies God as the subject of the verb and draws out a nuance implicit in the MT. This change too can be described as a harmonization.

Four substitutions that belong to category 2 involve the substitutions of lexemes. First, 4Q57 reads at F9ii:L4 (Frgs. 9ii, 11, 12, 52i:L16 [Isa 23:12]) עוז “strength,” whereas the MT reads עוד “again.” Phonological reasons could explain this difference since *dalet* and *zayin*.³⁴³ The interchange of these letters occurs in biblical Aramaic (e.g., BA דַּרְרָן, but BH זַרְרָן “memorandum” and דַּהַב, but זַהַב “gold”).³⁴⁴

The next difference is interesting. 4Q57 reads מיום “from the day” at F9ii:L28 (Frgs. 9ii, 11, 12, 52i:40:40 [Isa 24:14]), while the MT reads מים “from the sea.” The preposition *min* may have a causal function in 4Q57 “on account of, because of.”³⁴⁵ 4Q57 would then envision the people lifting up voices and rejoicing in Isaiah 24:14 “because of the day” (i.e., the day when the nations glorify God). This reading is different from the MT, which understands the prepositional phrase introduced by the *min* as indicating direction,³⁴⁶ the shout comes “from the sea” (MT), not “because of a day” (4Q57). Although this variant presents a different reading, the graphic difference between ים and יום is slight. A number of graphic issues could account for the substitution.

Another category 2 substitution concerns the substitution of an adjective of the MT צַדִּיק “righteous” with a noun צְדָקָה “righteousness” at F14:L11 (Frgs. 12ii, 14-15, 53:L33 [Isa 26:7]). The verse of 4Q57 is sufficiently preserved to conclude that the line likely does not vary from the MT in large details. The verse of the MT is composed of

Grammar (Grand Rapids: Kregel, 2017), §53a.

³⁴³ See Gesenius, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, §6; Joüon and Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*, §5c-5s, for a division of Hebrew consonants.

³⁴⁴ Rosenthal, *A Grammar of Biblical Aramaic*, §17.

³⁴⁵ David J. A. Clines, ed., *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew: Mem-Nun*, vol. 5 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), s.v. “מין” esp. 342-43.

³⁴⁶ David J. A. Clines, ed., *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew*, vol. 4, s.v. “ים” esp. 225.

two parallel lines. The first is a statement that the path of the righteous is upright. The second line develops the first line by identifying the Upright One as the one who makes the paths straight. The reading then of 4Q57 does not undermine this analysis; rather, it equates the paths of the righteous with the path of righteousness. This difference is minor.

A category 2 substitution is also preserved at F56:L2 (Frgs. 33-35, 55-57:L3 [Isa 51:9]). Ulrich transcribes 4Q57's reading as *המוה* [צת "who shattered" with 1QIsa^a and the Vulgate against the MT's reading of *המקצבת* "who struck down." However, as Ulrich's transcription denotes, the *sade* is not certain but probable. The difference between the MT and 4Q57, which agrees with 1QIsa^a, is interpretative. The root of the MT *הצב* means literally "to hew" in the *qal*. However, it is used figuratively to denote "to strike down" in only two passages: one in the *qal* at Hosea 6:5 and here in the *hiphil* at Isaiah 51:9.³⁴⁷ 4Q57 and 1QIsa^a, however, transcribe a form of the root *מחץ* that means literally "to strike through" and occurs fifteen times.³⁴⁸ Therefore, the reading of 4Q57 is likely a case of interpretation where the scribe transcribed a more common word for a less common word.³⁴⁹

Category 3. 4Q57 does preserve category 3 variants.

Statistics and Conclusion of 4Q57's Textual Tradition

The above discussion demonstrates that the differences between 4Q57 and the MT are all minor and can be ascribed to the scribal process. Three points are especially

³⁴⁷ David J. A. Clines, ed., *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew: Zayin-Teth*, vol. 3 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), s.v. "הצב" esp. 290.

³⁴⁸ Clines, *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew*, vol. 5, s.v. "מחץ".

³⁴⁹ The Vulgate, like 4Q57, reads a form of *percutio* that means to "strike through." Notice that this is the only time the Vulgate uses a form of the verb *percutio* to translate the verb *הצב* "to hew." This supports the conclusion that the MT's figurative use of *הצב* is uncommon and likely lead to the substitution of 4Q57.

striking about these variants. First, most of the differences can reasonably be explained as examples of harmonization. Second, the text only preserves two omissions with respect to the MT, but fifteen additions and twenty-seven substitutions. Third, two instances of confusion of gutturals and one instance of confusion of dentals indicates a later linguistic profile while a fuller orthographic system indicates a type of grammatical updating. Thus, 4Q57 appears to be an “updated” version of the MT akin to 1QIsa^a and previously described by many scholars as a type of “vulgar” manuscript when compared to the MT. Beyond these concluding thoughts about the *nature* of the variants, it is important to note that 4Q57, despite these differences, agrees with the MT in most details.

Table 21. The statistical relationship between 4Q57 and the MT

Total # of Words in 4Q57	Categories 1, 2, and 3	Statistical Relationship	Categories 2 and 3	Statistical Relationship	Category 3	Statistical Relationship
1043	45	95.69%	20	98.08%	0	100%

4Q64

4Q64 (4QIsa^k) preserves portions of Isaiah 28:26-29:9 in five fragments.³⁵⁰

Ulrich describes the script as a late Hasmonaean hand from the middle of the first century BC (ca. 50 BC). Concerning orthography, Ulrich lists five differences that distinguish 4Q64 from the MT.³⁵¹

Scholars do not agree about how to categorize 4Q64. Ulrich describes the textual tradition as uncertain, but problematic if the fragments are arranged according to

³⁵⁰ Eugene Ulrich and Patrick W Skehan, “4QIsak,” in Ulrich et al. *Qumrân Cave 4: The Prophets*, 125.

³⁵¹ Ibid. Flint, “The Isaiah Scrolls from the Judean Desert,” 486-87, states that the orthography of 4Q64 is fuller than that of the MT.

the MT, LXX, or 1QIsa^a.³⁵² Ulrich states,

Since fragments 2-3 are anchored at the left margin, the relative position of the words on fragment 1 shows either that line 1 was about seventeen letters shorter than the text of MT between fragments 1 and 2, or that line 2 had a different arrangement, perhaps the transposition of phrases in v.27. There is no reason to suppose an interval within line 2.³⁵³

Ulrich further notes that the textual evidence of Isaiah 28:26-29:9, the text preserved in 4Q64, is complex, and this fact suggests that 4Q64 represented a separate textual tradition.³⁵⁴ However, Skehan has a different understanding of the text of Isaiah at Qumran. He not only states that the Isaiah Qumran manuscripts do not attest to a different literary edition, he further states that the cases where a Qumran Isaiah text testifies to a non-Masoretic reading are extremely rare.³⁵⁵ Tov agrees with this point,³⁵⁶ and comments that although 4Q64 is too short for pronouncing a clear judgment on the nature of its tradition, it appears close to the MT and secondarily to the LXX.³⁵⁷ Nonetheless, Tov identifies 4Q64 as *possibly* non-aligned.³⁵⁸ Lange classifies most texts preserving less than 100 words as too badly damaged to be categorized.³⁵⁹ Thus, he withholds opinion about 4Q64.³⁶⁰

³⁵² Ulrich and Skehan, "4QIsak," 125.

³⁵³ *Ibid.*, 126.

³⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 125.

³⁵⁵ Skehan, "Text of Isaias at Qumran," 162.

³⁵⁶ Tov, "The Text of Isaiah at Qumran," 511.

³⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 507.

³⁵⁸ Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 333. Tov's assessment of 4Q64 indicates that a non-aligned text is not necessarily an independent literary tradition but can remain quite close to a textual tradition previously known.

³⁵⁹ Lange, "Textual Plurality," 54.

³⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, 56.

Categorization and Description of the Variants

Ulrich lists six differences between 4Q64 and the MT as variants.³⁶¹ However, one proposed variant is excluded in the following discussion and statistics. It is found at F1:L2 (Frgs. 1-5:L2 [Isa 28:28]) and concerns the addition of a conjunctive *vav* above the line ׁלֶחֶם “and bread.”³⁶² Ulrich notes an ink stroke above the *lamed* and states that it “appears to be the addition of a conjunction.”³⁶³ This stroke could be an addition of a conjunction, but the stroke is truncated and curved at the bottom so that it resembles a comma. No *vav* resembles this stroke in 4Q64. Moreover, an orthographic difference is preserved at F3:L2 (Frgs. 1-5:L2 [Isa 29:1]).

Category 1. There remain five sufficiently preserved variants. Four of these variants are categorized as category 1 variants, although one of these variants can also reasonably be grouped as a category 2 variant. The first variant is preserved at F3:L1 (Frgs. 1-5:L3 [Isa 28:29]) and concerns the substitution of gender. 4Q64 renders ׁלְׁ “-[this also] comes,” while the MT reads ׁלְׁ. The difference is small since the subject is a demonstrative pronoun referring back to the process of preparing dill and cumin. The MT understands this process as feminine while 4Q64 renders it as masculine. Moreover, the fact that the next word begins with a *he* suggests that the form of 4Q64 may be a case of haplography.

³⁶¹ Ulrich and Skehan, “4QIsak,” 125-27. Many of the citations in this text can be referenced in multiple ways. One can refer to the reconstructed column and line number provided by the editors, or one can refer to the exact fragment and line number corresponding to the actual fragment. Both are provided here. The first reference given is the reference to the fragment number and the corresponding line of the fragment while the second reference is that of the fragments which make up the reconstructed column and the corresponding reconstructed line number.

³⁶² This fragment is not found on either PAM photo 43.019 or 42.649 and can be viewed on the IAA database. Leon Levy Dead Sea Scrolls, “Plate 250, Frag 14,” accessed November 15, 2017, <http://www.deadseascrolls.org.il/explore-the-archive/image/B-360245>. See Ulrich and Skehan, “4QIsak,” 125-27.

³⁶³ Ulrich and Skehan, “4QIsak,” 126.

The second category 1 variant is a substitution that occurs at F2:L1 (Frgs. 1-5:L1 [Isa 28:27]). 4Q64 reads ידוּשׁ “it is threshed,” while the MT reads יוּדָשׁ “it is threshed.” Ulrich lists this variant in his variant column, but also indicates that the difference may be simply orthographic. The MT represents a *hophal* form of the verb דוּשׁ as one would expect with the *vav* between the performative and the first consonant of the root, while 4Q64 resembles the *qal* or *niphal* as indicated by the *vav* between the first and third consonant of the root. Although it is possible for a *hophal* to be written defectively so that no *vav* need exist between the performative vowel and the first consonant of the root (see 1QIsa^a here and also the form הָטַג “is turned back” at Isa 59:14),³⁶⁴ the fact that 4Q64 represents a *vav* between the first and third consonant of the root indicates that this is likely a *qal* or *niphal*, not a *hophal*. The poor state in which this text is preserved precludes certainty about the voice of the verb, but the *niphal* and *hophal* of דוּשׁ both indicate passive voice. Due to the overlap between these stems, this variant is best grouped as a category 1 variant, possibly an example of interpretation where the scribe renders a more common stem (i.e., *niphal*) for a less common stem (*hophal*).³⁶⁵

The third category 1 variant represents a change in gender concerning the noun אֲרִיאֵל “Ariel” and is preserved at F3:L2 (Frgs. 1-5:L2 [Isa 29:1]). 4Q64 has the form סוּפִי “add,” while the MT has סָפָה “add.” The feminine form of 4Q64, in agreement with 1QIsa^a, is an attempt to make the text more internally consistent (i.e., a harmonization). Ariel is consistently referred to as a feminine entity in the MT except here at Isaiah 29:1.³⁶⁶ This is a minor difference.

³⁶⁴ For a discussion of this form and examples of the form written defectively, see *Gesenius’ Hebrew Grammar*, §72ee.

³⁶⁵ The *hophal* form of the דוּשׁ only occurs once in the OT.

³⁶⁶ See especially the pronominal suffixes referring to Ariel in Isa 29:7.

Although there is a change in gender, the stem of 4Q64 and the MT can reasonably be understood as the same stem. It is common for a *qal* imperative to be spelled with a *vav* between the second and third root consonants,³⁶⁷ but this is not the common form of first *yod/vav* forms. However, there is a first *yod/vav* verb spelled with a *vav* at 4Q417 F1i:L14. The text reads רִוֶשׁ “possess” from יִרֶשׁ. This fact suggests that the lexical root of 4Q64 may be the same as the MT. This fact, plus the fact that סָרַף is much less common than the root סָרַף, (סָרַף occurs nine times in the MT, zero times in the biblical-DSS, and one time in the non-biblical DSS while the root יִסַּף occurs 215 times in the MT, sixty-three times in the biblical-DSS, and fifty-two times in the non-biblical DSS)³⁶⁸ indicates that the texts read the same lexical root.³⁶⁹

The fourth category 1 variant is a difference in tense and is preserved at F4:L1 (Frgs. 1-5:L5 [Isa 29:2]). Here, 4Q64 represents an imperfect וְיִהְיֶה “[and] there will be,” possibly with a conjunctive *vav*,³⁷⁰ while the MT renders a *vav*-consecutive perfect וְיִהְיֶה “and there will be.”

Category 2. 4Q64 preserves one category 2 variant: a substitution found at F3:L1 (Frgs. 1-5:L3 [Isa 28:29]). 4Q64 preserves the form הַפִּיל “cause to fall/cause to be wonderful,” while the MT has the form הַפְּלִיא “he causes to be wonderful.” The form of 4Q64 is a *hiphal* perfect from the root נָפַל “to fall,” while the form of the MT is a *hiphal* perfect from the root פָּלַא “to be wonderful.” Two facts suggest that this difference may

³⁶⁷ Qimron, *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, §311.14.

³⁶⁸ For the biblical-DSS and non-biblical DSS corpi, reconstructed words that occur inside of brackets were ignored. Searches were done in Abegg, Bowley, and Cook, *Accordance 11.2.5*.

³⁶⁹ Abegg, Bowley, and Cook, *Accordance 11.2.5*, describes this root as deriving from סָרַף, not סָרַף. See also the translation of the biblical-DSS in Abegg, Flint, and Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible*, 312, which reads the form of 4Q64 as a form of סָרַף, not סָרַף.

³⁷⁰ Notice how the *vav* is not actually in the manuscript. It is possible that the text omitted it, but it is more likely that it was originally present and now obscured by the lacuna.

not be a “real variant,” but rather a scribal error.³⁷¹ First, the reading of 4Q64 is very difficult. The *hiphil* form of נפל never takes the object עצה “counsel,” so it not clear what it would mean that “he causes coun[sel] to fall.” The only object similar to עצה listed in the article on נפל in *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew* is דָּבָר “word, thing” at Esther 6:10.³⁷² Here the idea is that no “word should fail or be left out.” This idea does not fit the context of Isaiah 28:29. Second, the form of 4Q64 is very similar to that of the MT, and thus, a type of graphic confusion and/or weakening of the third *aleph*, already quiet in the Hebrew Bible could explain the difference.³⁷³ Nonetheless, the form is intelligible, so the difference is grouped as a category 2 variant.

Category 3. 4Q64 does not preserve category 3 variants.

Statistics and Conclusion of 4Q64’s Textual Tradition

One can categorize what remains of 4Q64 as belonging to the Masoretic tradition. Several facts demonstrate this point. First, the differences between 4Q64 and the MT can reasonably be described as deriving from the scribal process. Second, the differences appear to indicate scribal negligence and a tendency to harmonize. Third, 4Q64 agrees with the MT in most details.³⁷⁴

³⁷¹ A real variant is a variant that cannot be explained as an orthographic or morphologic change. For this definition, see Abegg, “1QIsaa and 1QIsab,” 228n13.

³⁷² Clines, *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew*, vol. 5, s.v. “נפל.”

³⁷³ See Ulrich and Skehan, “4QIsak,” 125. See also the translation of the biblical-DSS in Abegg, Flint, and Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible*, 312, and how they omit any reference to 4Q64 (4QIsa^k) for this verse in the footnotes. However, this verb is described as deriving from the root נפל in Abegg, Bowley, and Cook, *Accordance 11.2.5*.

³⁷⁴ Seven words depend on insufficient manuscript evidence transcribed in Ulrich and Skehan, “4QIsak,” 125-27. Cf. also the total word of 4Q64 supplied in Abegg, “1QIsaa and 1QIsab,” 222-23. Abegg claims that 4Q64 preserves forty-two words as opposed to forty-three as listed in the table above. This difference is due to his methodology and likely differences of opinion about which words are *sufficiently* preserved. Abegg, “1QIsaa and 1QIsab,” 223, claims that there are six differences between 4Q64 and the

Table 22. The statistical relationship between 4Q64 and the MT

Total # of Words in 4Q64	Categories 1, 2, and 3	Statistical Relationship	Categories 2 and 3	Statistical Relationship	Category 3	Statistical Relationship
43	5	88.37%	1	97.67%	0	100%

2Q13

2Q13 (2QJer) is preserved in twenty-seven fragments, thirteen of which are identified. The text preserves portions from Jeremiah 42-44 and 46-49. Baillet describes the script as a beautiful Herodian hand, dating to the beginning of the Christian era, while the orthography and morphology are described as generally full.³⁷⁵ Tov labels this full spelling practice as QSP.³⁷⁶

Scholars debate how best to categorize the textual tradition preserved in 2Q13. Baillet describes the tradition as corresponding roughly to the MT even though the text strays from the MT frequently at first glance.³⁷⁷ He bases this conclusion on the following evidence. First, the order of chapters follows the order of the MT, not the LXX. Second, none of the sixteen omissions found in the LXX are found in 2Q13. Third, an additional thirty-four variants found in the LXX are not found in 2Q13.³⁷⁸ He further notes that the text tends to agree with the Vulgate: twenty times with the MT, four times with the LXX, and two times with 2Q13 against the MT and LXX.³⁷⁹ Armin Lange, like

MT, whereas cites five differences are accepted here. This discrepancy depends on the fact that one variant proposed by Ulrich depends on insufficient manuscript evidence.

³⁷⁵ Maurice Baillet, "Grotte 2: Jérémie," in Baillet, Milik, de Vaux, *Les "Petites Grottes" de Qumran*, 62.

³⁷⁶ Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 333. See his full discussion of QSP in Tov, 261-73.

³⁷⁷ Baillet, "Grotte 2: Jérémie," 62-63.

³⁷⁸ *Ibid.*

³⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, 63.

Baillet, categorizes 2Q13 as corresponding roughly to the MT. He categorizes the text as semi-Masoretic.³⁸⁰ Contrary to Baillet and Lange, Tov identifies 2Q13 as non-aligned.³⁸¹

Description and Categorization of the Variants

Baillet suggests that 2Q13 has twenty-seven textual variants when compared to the MT.³⁸² Out of these twenty-seven proposed variants, four depend on insufficient manuscript evidence.³⁸³ Nonetheless, one should note that these are all minor. Two concern the substitution of gender at F9ii:L2 (Frgs. 9ii-12:L2 [Jer 48:26]) and F9ii:L4 (Frgs. 9ii-12:L4 [Jer 48:28]) (a substitution prevalent in this text), while one at F9ii:L4 (Frgs. 9ii-12:L4 [Jer 48:28]) concerns the substitution of number and gender. The last proposed variant that depends on insufficient manuscript evidence concerns the omission of an article at F9ii:L8 (Frgs. 9ii-12:L8 [Jer 48:31]).

Other differences preserved in the text, but not discussed in the following discussion and statistics, are synonymous spellings such as the rendering of a masculine plural gentilic with two *yods* instead of one *yod*—see F3:L2 (Frgs. 3-4:L2 [Jer 43:9]) where the MT reads יהודים and 2Q13 reads יהודים “Judeans,” and F8:L8 (Frgs. 7-8:L8 [Jer 47:4]) where the MT reads פְּלִשְׁתִּים “Philistines” where 2Q13 reads פלשתיים.³⁸⁴ Moreover,

³⁸⁰ Lange, “Textual Plurality,” 55. The semi-Masoretic label is ascribed to texts that are close to the text of MT but deviate from it more than 2 percent. *Ibid.*, 53-54.

³⁸¹ Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 333.

³⁸² Baillet, “Grotte 2: Jérémie,” 62-69. This total does not account for those variants based completely on reconstruction.

³⁸³ One can refer to the reconstructed column and line number provided by the editor, or one can refer to the exact fragment and line number corresponding to the actual fragment. Both are provided in this dissertation. The first reference given is the reference to the fragment number and the corresponding line of the fragment while the second reference is that of the fragments which make up the reconstructed column and the corresponding reconstructed line number.

³⁸⁴ The gentilic יהודים is found consistently as the *kethiv* in Esther (e.g., Esth 4:7; 8:1, 7, 13; 9:15, 18). See Gesenius, *Gesenius’ Hebrew Grammar*, §24b.

one further difference at F9ii:L3 (Frgs. 9ii-12:L3 [Jer 48:27]) agrees with the *qere* and is, therefore, not discussed in the following discussion or statistics.

One further difference not counted in the statistics should be discussed in some detail. This difference is preserved at F1:L3 (Frgs. 1-2:L3 [Jer 42:9]). 2Q13's reading likely derives from graphic confusion. It reads אלוהימה "their God," while the MT reads אֲלֵיהֶם "to them." Baillet states that the scribe naturally thought to transcribe אלוהים "God" after ויאמר "and he said." He did this, but noticed his mistake, and so transcribed a *yod*, but did not erase the *vav*.³⁸⁵ Abegg, Flint, and Ulrich translate 2Q13 as "and *their* god, [s]aid," but cite this reading as a possible error.³⁸⁶ The difference likely derived from some type of scribal error since the form of 2Q13 never occurs in DSS corpus.

Category 1. Thirteen of the preserved variants between 2Q13 and the MT belong to category 1. Two are additions of a conjunctive *vav*, and the remaining eleven variants mostly concern substitution of gender and number.³⁸⁷

Category 2. There are ten category 2 variants. Three of these variants are additions. The first addition is preserved at F9ii:L3 (Frgs. 9ii-12:L3 [Jer 48:27]). 2Q13 adds the personal pronoun היא "she." The MT is a verbal clause ואם לוא השחק הנה לה "did not Israel exist to you as an object of laughter?" 2Q13 reads ואם ל[וא לשחוק] היא "did not she, Israel e[xist to you as an object of laughter]?" The construction of 2Q13 is a *casus pendens* construction (or extraposition). The addition of היא "she" functions as the suspended noun referring to Israel, the subject of the verbal

³⁸⁵ Baillet, "Grotte 2: Jérémie," 63.

³⁸⁶ Abegg, Flint, and Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible*, 401. See also 401n67.

³⁸⁷ See table "2Q13: Description of variants" in appendix 2 for more information on the differences not counted as category 1, 2, or 3 variants as well as the category 1 variants.

clause. The MT does not suspend the subject; rather, it renders a verbal clause with an accusative placed before the verb. The construction of 2Q13 indicates emphasis.

The second addition is found at F9ii:L3 (Frgs. 9ii-12:L3 [Jer 48:27]). 2Q13 reads בְּגִנְבֵיכֶם “among your thieves,” while the MT reads בְּגִנְבֵימ “among thieves.” Baillet argues that this word is a *piel* infinitive “to steal,” contrary to the MT which reads this word as a noun “thieves” because the word is not spelled *plene*.³⁸⁸ Baillet’s suggestion that the scribe would have spelled this form *plene* is not persuasive even though the spelling practice of this scribe can be grouped as QSP since texts written in QSP do not necessarily represent every vowel.³⁸⁹ Thus, the difference between these readings might simply be an addition of a pronominal suffix.³⁹⁰ This addition identifies the thieves of the MT as those of Moab and intensifies Moab’s guilt. This addition appears interpretative.

Another pronominal suffix is added in 2Q13 at F9ii:L4 (Frgs. 9ii-12:L4 [Jer 48:28]). The MT reads עָרִים “the cities,” whereas 2Q13 reads עַרְיך “your [cities].” The addition simply makes the MT more explicit.

In addition to preserving three additions, 2Q13 also preserves three category 2 substitutions. The first category 2 substitution is also best described as resulting from a scribal error and is preserved at F8:L10 (Frgs. 7-8:10 [Jer 47:5]). The MT reads תִּתְגַּדְדִּי “you will cut yourself,” while 2Q13 reads תִּתְגַּרְרִי “you will drag/chew/scratch yourself.” Substitution of *dalet/resh* deriving from graphic confusion is not an uncommon interchange (e.g., 1QIsa^a Col 49:16 [Isa 60:13] and 1QIsa^a Col 8:27 [Isa 9:7]). Both of the verbs involved in the substitution of 4Q64 are uncommon, but the root גָּרַר—the verb supplied by 2Q13—likely derived from the MT for several reasons. First, the *hithpolel* stem of גָּרַר

³⁸⁸ Baillet, “Grotte 2: Jérémie,” 67.

³⁸⁹ See Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 268.

³⁹⁰ The LXX too adds a pronominal suffix like 2Q13 but interprets the MT or has a different exemplar. If the LXX is based on a different exemplar than the MT here, then 2Q13 is not the exemplar since what is preserved follows the MT, not the LXX, with the exception of the addition of the pronominal suffix.

meaning “to drag, to chew, to scratch” does not occur in the OT and only once in the biblical and non-biblical Judean Desert texts (here in 2Q13), whereas the root גג “to cut oneself” occurs six times in the OT and only in the *hithpolel* stem. Second, this passage records God’s judgment against the Philistines, and thus, the reading of 4Q64 is puzzling. The context favors the reading the root גג as original. Thus, it seems best to understand the reading of 2Q13 as secondary. Regardless though of which reading is primary, the difference likely derived from graphic confusion: confusion of *dalet/resh*.

The second substitution is preserved at F9ii:L5 (Frgs. 9ii-12:L5 [Jer 48:29]). 2Q13 reads שמעו נא “listen, please,” while the MT reads שמענו “we have heard.”³⁹¹ The substitution involves tense—2Q13 reads an imperative while the MT has a perfect. Whereas the MT states a known fact—Jeremiah’s audience have heard of Moab’s pride—2Q13 tells the audience to listen to the pride of Moab. Graphic confusion is a possible explanation for this difference, but the use of an imperative in the prior verse (v. 28) may have occasioned the use of the imperative again in verse 29 either intentionally or unintentionally. One should note that in 2Q13, the audience is commanded to listen to the pride, but the pride is not described. The text simply states that Moab is prideful. Regardless of what text is primary, the difference can be ascribed to the scribal process: possibly a case of harmonization to the immediate context.

The third substitution is preserved at F12:L2 (Frgs. 9ii-12:L15 [Jer 48:37]). 2Q13 reads תגור “will be cut,” while the MT reads גרעה “is cut.”³⁹² The passage is an announcement of judgment concerning Moab (Jer 48:1). The MT portrayal of God’s judgment of Moab is not confined to one tense; rather, God’s judgment of Moab is described with perfects (e.g., Jer 48:25), imperatives (e.g., 48:26), imperfects (e.g., 48:20),

³⁹¹ The use of the נ particle in 2Q13 demonstrates that the verb of 2Q13 is to be read as an imperative, not a perfect. The נ particle is used once with the *vav*-consecutive perfect to indicate a wish (Gen 40:14), but this particle never occurs with a perfect. Gesenius, *Gesenius’ Hebrew Grammar*, §105b, §112aa.

³⁹² 2Q13 reads with the LXX here. See Baillet, “Grotte 2: Jérémie,” 68.

and participles and nouns (e.g., Jer 48:37). The substitution of a *qal* passive participle with an imperfect is minor and fits within the variety of tenses and other parts of speech used by the MT in this passage.

Besides additions and substitutions, 2Q13 also preserves three variants whose exact description is ambiguous. The first ambiguous variant preserved in 2Q13 is found at F5:L4 (Jer 44:2). 2Q13 reads היום הזה מ “this day *mem*,” while the MT reads היום הזה ואין בהם יושב מפני “this day and there is none who dwell in them. Because . . .” The presence of the *mem* in 2Q13 might indicate that 2Q13 has omitted יושב בהם ואין or it might indicate that these words were transposed before the phrase היום הזה. The limited amount of textual evidence precludes certainty about the nature of this variant.³⁹³

The second unclear variant(s) is/are found at F9ii:L6 (Frgs. 9ii-12:L6 [Jer 48:29]). 2Q13 reads שמעו נא גאון מואב [ג]אה מ[אוד] גאונו ואיננו [וגאותו] ורו]ם לבבו “listen, please, to the pride of Moab: how ver[y pr]oud, his pride and [she] is no more, her pride [and the loftines]s of his heart.”³⁹⁴ The MT reads שְׁמַעְנוּ גְאוֹן־מוֹאֵב גְּאָה מְאֹד גְּבֹהוּ וְגִאוֹנוֹ וְגִאֲוָתוֹ “we have heard of the pride of Moab, how very proud, his pride and his arrogance, his pride and the loftiness of his heart.” Two differences have unclear descriptions after the *athnach* of the MT. The differences concern the words גְּבֹהוּ וְגִאוֹנוֹ “his pride and his arrogance” of the MT that are transcribed according to Baillet as גאונו ואיננו “his pride and [his] vanity.”³⁹⁵ If Baillet’s transcription is correct,³⁹⁶ the differences concern two

³⁹³ Although this variant is uncertain, it needs to have a point value in the statistics. It will be assigned one point in the statistics (the most cautious approach).

³⁹⁴ See Baillet, “Grotte 2: Jérémie,” 67, for a discussion of these differences and his translation.

³⁹⁵ See Abegg, Flint, and Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible*, 405, but note that the translators do not account for the conjunctive.

³⁹⁶ There is sufficient space in the lacuna at the end of line 5 for the scribe to have transcribed גבוה in accordance with the MT. It is likely though that גאונו ואיננו arose due to graphic confusion of גאונו. Thus, Baillet’s proposal that the difference between these texts involves two substitutions is a satisfactory explanation.

substitutions. 2Q13 substitutes גָּבְהוּ of the MT for גֵּאוּנוּ for a word with semantic overlap (the next word of the MT) and וַיִּגְאוּנוּ for וַיִּגְבְּנוּ—another substitution concerning semantically similar words. The graphic similarity between the readings suggest a type of graphic confusion.

The third unclear variant is found at F13i:L4 (Jer 48:45). 2Q13 reads מְקִרִית “from the city,” according to Baillet, but the *min* preposition depends on insufficient evidence. Nonetheless, the noun קְרִיָּה “city,” in construct, “city of” is sufficiently present. Unfortunately, fragment 13 only preserves the last word of three lines so that all that is known about this variant is that it is an addition.³⁹⁷ Baillet transcribes the end of this line and the beginning of the next as follows: [-- סִיחֹן] מְקִרִית [וְלֵהבָה] “and a flame from the city of Sihon.”³⁹⁸ The MT, however, reads וְלֵהבָה מִבֵּין סִיחֹן “and a flame from among Sihon.” Baillet’s proposal would be strengthened if the text indeed read מְקִרִית “from the city,” but as mentioned, the *min* is not sufficiently preserved as he himself notes.³⁹⁹ Thus, one cannot be certain of Baillet’s proposal. The variant may simply be an addition rather than a substitution. The reading of 2Q13 could be “[from among] city of [Sihon]” as opposed to the substitution proposed by Baillet.

Category 3. 2Q13 does not preserve category 3 variants.

Statistics and Conclusion of 2Q13’s Textual Tradition

One can categorize what remains of 2Q13 as belonging to the Masoretic tradition. Three facts demonstrate this point. First, the differences between this text and

³⁹⁷ Baillet reads a *he* as present on the first line, but the evidence for this letter is small. If one accepts his reading, then portions of four lines are partially preserved. See Baillet, “Grotte 2: Jérémie,” 68.

³⁹⁸ Ibid.

³⁹⁹ Ibid., 69.

the MT can reasonably be explained as deriving from the scribal process. Second, the differences indicate scribal negligence and a tendency to interpret. Third, 2Q13 preserves a high degree of agreement with the MT despite its several disagreements in minor details.⁴⁰⁰

Table 23. The statistical relationship between 2Q13 and the MT

Total # of Words in 2Q13	Categories 1, 2, and 3	Statistical Relationship	Categories 2 and 3	Statistical Relationship	Category 3	Statistical Relationship
267	23	91.39%	10	96.25%	0	100%

4Q73

4Q73 (4QEzek^a) preserves portions of Ezekiel 10-11, 23, and 41 in four fragments.⁴⁰¹ Sanderson describes the script as late Hasmonaean with some characteristics of an early Herodian semiformal hand, which dates to ca. middle of the first century BC.⁴⁰² She describes the orthography as close to that of MT.⁴⁰³ In fact, Sanderson lists only four orthographic variants: one is more defective than the MT, while three are more *plene*.⁴⁰⁴ Sanderson further states that 4Q73 preserves one supralinear correction and one possible error caused by phonetic confusion.⁴⁰⁵ Moreover, the text's paragraph markers

⁴⁰⁰ Sixty-nine words transcribed by Baillet depend on insufficient manuscript evidence. These words are excluded from the total word count.

⁴⁰¹ Judith E. Sanderson, "4QEzeka," in Ulrich et al., *Qumrân Cave 4: The Prophets*, 209.

⁴⁰² *Ibid.*

⁴⁰³ *Ibid.*, 210.

⁴⁰⁴ *Ibid.*

⁴⁰⁵ *Ibid.*

agree with those of the MT twice (between 11:1-2 and between 23:45-46) and disagree in one, possibly two, instances.⁴⁰⁶

Tov describes 4Q73 as a *de luxe* edition. Common characteristics of *de luxe* editions are the use of large top and bottom margins, the presence of a large writing block (i.e., the space divided by horizontal and vertical lines designated for writing),⁴⁰⁷ fine calligraphy, the proto-rabbinic text form of Scripture, and a limited amount of scribal interventions.⁴⁰⁸ He further notes that although only 21.5 percent of the texts found at Qumran are biblical, 73.3 percent of the texts with wide top and bottom margins (i.e., *de luxe* editions) are biblical. Thus, according to Tov, the “large-format inscription was used especially for the books of Hebrew Scripture.”⁴⁰⁹

The textual tradition of 4Q73 is debated. Sanderson argues that 4Q73 is “very close to that [text] preserved in the later MT. Only six variants have been preserved, all of them quite minor.”⁴¹⁰ Lange, like Sanderson, categorizes 4Q73 as a text very close to the MT: he designates it as a proto-MT text.⁴¹¹ Tov, however, identifies 4Q73 as non-

⁴⁰⁶ Sanderson, “4QEzeka,” 210.

⁴⁰⁷ See Tov’s discussion of writing blocks, columns, and margins in Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 82-104.

⁴⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, 126.

⁴⁰⁹ Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 127.

⁴¹⁰ Sanderson, “4QEzeka,” 210. Davila’s review of *Qumran Cave 4* accepts Sanderson’s claim that all three of the Ezekiel manuscripts from Cave 4 are very close to the MT. James R. Davila, “Qumran Cave 4 V 10 The Prophets,” *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 62, no. 2 (April 2000): 346. Cf. Herbert’s review of *Qumran Cave 4*, who claims that Sanderson’s suggestion appears correct, but states that she has not determined that these texts are closer to the MT than any other text. Edward D. Herbert, “Qumran Cave 4 V 10 The Prophets,” *Journal of Semitic Studies* 43, no. 2 (1998): 378.

⁴¹¹ Lange, “Textual Plurality,” 55. Lange identifies texts that deviate less than 2 percent from the MT as proto-MT texts. *Ibid.*, 53-54. Lange makes this same point in his review: Armin Lange, “Qumran Cave 4 V 10 The Prophets,” *Zeitschrift Für Die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 110, no. 3 (1998): 482.

aligned⁴¹²—one of only two *de luxe* texts characterized by Tov as exclusively independent.⁴¹³ George Brooke likewise comments about the nature of 4Q73 by questioning its biblical status. He says,

Perhaps it is worth noting even at this early stage in our investigation that all these passages feature variously in other non-biblical texts from the Qumran Caves. Is it merely accidental that it is these sections of Ezekiel which have survived in 4QEzek^a or was it an anthology of excerpted Ezekiel texts which were of some special significance to its compiler?⁴¹⁴

Thus, the exact status of 4Q73 along with its textual tradition is debated among scholars.

Description and Categorization of the Variants

Sanderson lists six variants that distinguish 4Q73 from the MT.⁴¹⁵ Although she lists six variants, she reasons that three may not be real textual variants. Rather, the difference at F3ii:L2 (Ezek 23:45) may be a phonetic error caused by confusing of dentals, the difference at F3ii:L2 (Ezek 23:45) may be defective spelling, and the difference at F5:L1 (Ezek 41:5-6) depends on proper placement of fragment 5, but she notes that based on the preserved content, the fragment can be placed elsewhere (e.g., Ezek 41:6-7).⁴¹⁶ Therefore, only three variants are explained here as textual variants.

⁴¹² Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 334.

⁴¹³ Tov also identifies 4QDeut^{k1} as independent and reflecting the QSP, and categorizes 4QSam^a as *de luxe* edition, but the textual tradition of 4QSam^a is complex. He identifies it as independent and relating to the LXX. See his table of biblical *de luxe* texts. Ibid, 126.

⁴¹⁴ George J. Brooke, “Ezekiel in Some Qumran and New Testament Texts,” in *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. Julio Trebolle Barrera and Luis Vegas Montaner, Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 11 (Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 1992), 319.

⁴¹⁵ Sanderson proposes one other possible difference in the variant list. This potential difference is the omission of Ezek 23:16 by means of parablepsis. Sanderson proposes this variant based on spatial considerations; namely, vv.16-17 would need to fit on just one line, line 4. Sanderson suggests, to the contrary, that if Ezek 23:16 was preserved as found in the MT, the content would fill two lines. Sanderson, “4QEzeka,” 213.

⁴¹⁶ Ibid., 214.

The three remaining textual variants all belong to category 1. Two of these variants involve the substitution of number (i.e., F1:L6 (Ezek 10:8) and F3ii:L1 (Ezek 23:44) while one involves the substitution of gender F2:L6 (Ezek 10:21). Moreover, each of these differences can reasonably be understood as instances of harmonizations. The reading of 4Q73 at F1:L6 (Ezek 10:8) of ידי “hands of” conforms the text to Ezekiel 1:8 and 10:21 while the reading ויבאו “they come” at F3ii:L1 (Ezek 23:44) conforms the number of the subject to the immediate context. The reading of וארבעה “and four” as feminine at F2:L6 (Ezek 10:21) finds precedent in the *kethiv* of Ezekiel 7:2, but not at Ezekiel 1:6.

Statistics and Conclusion of 4Q73’s Textual Tradition

One can categorize what remains of 4Q73 as belonging to the Masoretic tradition. Three facts demonstrate this point: the variants are minor and can be understood as instances of harmonizations. Moreover, 4Q73 preserves an extremely high degree of agreement with the MT.⁴¹⁷

Table 24. The statistical relationship between 4Q73 and the MT

Total # of Words in 4Q73	Categories 1, 2, and 3	Statistical Relationship	Categories 2 and 3	Statistical Relationship	Category 3	Statistical Relationship
214	3	98.60%	0	100%	0	100%

4Q76

4Q76 (4QXII^a) preserves portions of Zechariah 14; Malachi 2; 3; and Jonah 1, 2 in twenty-one identified fragments.⁴¹⁸ Russell E. Fuller describes the script as one of the

⁴¹⁷ Twenty-five words transcribed by Sanderson depend on insufficient manuscript evidence. These words are excluded from the total word count.

⁴¹⁸ Russell E. Fuller, “4QXIIa,” in Ulrich et al., *Qumrân Cave 4. X: The Prophets*, 222.

few biblical manuscripts from Qumran written in a semi-cursive script.⁴¹⁹ Fuller further described the script as dating from the early Hasmonaean period, ca. 150-125 BC.⁴²⁰ Paleographically, *vav* and *yod* are not always easily distinguished, although *yod* is typically shorter than the *vav* while having a less sharp, more shaded head than the *vav*.⁴²¹ Fuller describes the orthography as similar to the orthography of the MT, but utilizes *vav* as a *mater* more often than the MT.⁴²² He further points out two supralinear corrections made by the original scribe.⁴²³

Scholars consistently label 4Q76 as non-aligned. Moreover, according to Fuller, the preserved portions of Jonah indicate that “Jonah was placed in the second half and probably in the final third of the collection.”⁴²⁴ More specifically, he argues based on his reconstructions that Jonah followed Malachi in this collection.⁴²⁵ According to Fuller, this is a significant feature of this scroll that illustrates its non-aligned status.⁴²⁶ Hanne

⁴¹⁹ Fuller, “4QXIIa,” 221.

⁴²⁰ *Ibid.*

⁴²¹ *Ibid.*, 222.

⁴²² *Ibid.*

⁴²³ *Ibid.*

⁴²⁴ *Ibid.*

⁴²⁵ *Ibid.*

⁴²⁶ *Ibid.* See also Russell E. Fuller, “The Text of the Twelve Minor Prophets,” *Currents in Research: Biblical Studies* 7 (October 1999): 83-84. In his dissertation, Fuller was less definitive about the textual tradition of 4Q76. He stated that 4Q76 occupied a middle position between the LXX and the MT. Russell E. Fuller, “The Minor Prophets Manuscripts from Qumrân, Cave IV” (Ph.D. diss., Harvard University, 1988), 38.

von Weissenberg,⁴²⁷ Tov,⁴²⁸ Lange⁴²⁹ Brooke,⁴³⁰ and García Martínez,⁴³¹ likewise, label 4Q76 as non-aligned.

Description and Categorization of the Variants

Several differences that Fuller lists as variants between 4Q76 and the MT do not belong to either category 1, 2, or 3. Five of these differences concern synonymous spellings: two of the differences could be instances where 4Q76 is more defective than the MT. These occur at F4ii:L3 (Col 3:11 [Mal 3:10]) and F17:L2 (Col 5:18 [Jon 1:8]).⁴³² One further difference concerns the representation of the proper name “Elijah” and is found at F10:L3 (Col 4:16 [Mal 3:23]). The last two differences concern synonymous spellings. These differences are preserved at F2i:L2 (Col 1:13 [Mal 2:10]) which concerns the difference between a contracted form of the third masculine singular pronominal suffix and an uncontracted form and a third *yod/vav* verb represented with a third *aleph* at F3:L4 (Col 2:4 [Mal 2:16]). Beyond synonymous spellings, six proposed

⁴²⁷ Hanne von Weissenberg, “‘Aligned’ or ‘Non-Aligned’? The Textual Status of the Qumran Cave 4 Manuscripts of the Minor Prophets,” in *Perspectives on the Formation of the Book of the Twelve*, ed. Rainer Albertz, James Nogalski, and Jakob Wöhrle, Beihefte Zur Zeitschrift Für Die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 433 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2012), 386.

⁴²⁸ Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 334.

⁴²⁹ Lange, “Textual Plurality,” 55.

⁴³⁰ George J. Brooke, “The Twelve Minor Prophets and the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *Congress Volume Leiden 2004* (Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 2006), 21. Brooke identifies 4Q76 as non-aligned, but appears uncertain if Jonah originally followed Malachi in this manuscript.

⁴³¹ Florentino García Martínez, “The Text of the XII Prophets at Qumran,” *Old Testament Essays* 17 (2004): 106.

⁴³² One can refer to the reconstructed column and line number provided by the editor, or to the exact fragment and line number corresponding to the actual fragment. Both are provided here. The first reference given is the reference to the fragment number and the corresponding line of the fragment while the second reference is that of the fragments which make up the reconstructed column and the corresponding reconstructed line number.

variants depend on insufficient manuscript evidence. One further difference concerns the differences between *vav* and *yod*, but the script is not conclusive.⁴³³

Category 1. After these proposed differences are removed, 4Q76 preserves sixteen category 1 variants.⁴³⁴ These variants include the addition of a conjunctive *vav* three times, the omission of an article and accusative *he*, and the substitution of number, tense, and other synonymous forms.⁴³⁵

Category 2. 4Q76 preserves two category 2 additions. The first addition simply makes the subject of the participle explicit and is found at F2ii:L4 (Col 2:14 [Mal 3:1]). 4Q76 reads יהוה צב[א]ות “Behold, he is the one who comes says the Lord of ho[sts],” while the MT reads הַנְּהִי־בָא אָמַר יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת “Behold, (he) is the one who comes says the Lord of hosts.” The addition of the pronominal suffix attached to the participle הנה simply makes the subject explicit.

The second addition concerns the addition the prepositional phrase הקרי[אה] כזות “according to this message” found at F22:L1 (Jonah 3:2). Fuller argues that this reading agrees with the LXX and the Old Latin against the MT, but two reasons weaken this assertion.⁴³⁶ First, the demonstrative pronoun is clearly present, but the letter that precedes

⁴³³ For more about these variants, see table titled “4Q76: Description of variants” in appendix 2.

⁴³⁴ Although two differences are found at F4ii:L5 (Col 3:L13 [Mal 3:10]), the differences have been counted as one variant, but have two points in the statistics. The difference concerns the addition of an article and a marker of the accusative.

⁴³⁵ See the table “4Q76: Description of variants” in appendix 2. Also, see the addition at F3:L4 (Col 2:4 [Mal 2:16]). 4Q76 reads כי אם שנחה שלח “for if you hate so that you divorce,” while the MT reads פִּי שֶׁנָּא שֶׁלַח “if one hates so that he divorces.” There are two differences here: one addition and one substitution. The addition interprets the syntactical relationship of Mal 2:16 and 17 as causal. Namely, according to 4Q76, Mal 2:17 provides the ground of Mal 2:16. The addition may be considered interpretative, but minor since Hebrew can depict causal clauses simply by juxtaposing clauses together as is done in the MT. See Fuller and Choi, *Invitation to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*, §72. Thus, the texts can be read synonymously.

⁴³⁶ Fuller, “4QXIIa,” 231.

the pronoun is not clearly a *kap* preposition, contrary to Fuller’s transcriptions, but is more closely related to a *he*.⁴³⁷ No horizontal base stroke is preserved and the letter possesses two downward strokes much like the letter that immediately precedes this word: a *he*. Thus, the pronoun is certainly to be read against the MT, but the preposition is less clear, and thus, the reading does not necessarily agree with the LXX and the Old Latin. The LXX has the preposition *κατά* “according to” while the Old Latin has the preposition *secundum* “according to.” Second, the pronoun *זוּת* simply means “this,” whereas the reading of the LXX *ἔμπροσθεν* “before” and the Old Latin *priorem* “prior” both indicate that the message Jonah is now to preach is the same message God previously told him to proclaim. This detail is not necessarily communicated by the demonstrative pronoun *זוּת*; rather, 4Q76 is more naturally translated as “this,” not “prior.” 4Q76, then, simply indicates that Jonah is to proclaim “this message.” In short, agreement between 4Q76 and the LXX and Old Latin depend on the presence of the preposition *kap*. In the end, 4Q76 clearly differs from the MT only by denoting the message as “*this* message.”

Besides preserving two additions, 4Q76 preserves one omission. This omission occurs at F2i:L7 (Col 1:20 [Mal 2:14]) and concerns the omission of the relative clause *אֲשֶׁר אֶתָּהּ בְּגִדְתָּהּ בָּהּ* “with whom you betrayed,” which further describes the divorced Israelite wives. There is no motivation for parablepsis, although a scribe can unintentionally skip material without a motivation present. It is more likely though that 4Q76 omitted the phrase *אֲשֶׁר אֶתָּהּ בְּגִדְתָּהּ בָּהּ* “with whom you *betrayed*” in order to harmonize the text to the wider context. The wider context seems to indicate that the Israelite husbands *have not yet* betrayed their Israelite wives as indicated by the admonition *וּנְשַׁמְרֵתֶם בְּרוּחְכֶם* “and guard yourself in your spirit,” which is partially preserved at F3:L3 and fully preserved at F3:L6. Moreover, the prohibition signaled by the *לֹא* plus the imperfect *אֲתִבְגְּדוּ* “you

⁴³⁷ See Leon Levy Dead Sea Scrolls, “Plate 314, Frag 13, accessed December 5, 2017, <http://www.deadseascrolls.org.il/explore-the-archive/image/B-360680>.

shall not betray” suggests that at least some of the Israelites have not yet betrayed their Israelite wives. Thus, this omission may be the result of harmonization to the immediate context.

4Q76 also preserves four substitutions that belong to category 2. The first is found at F2i:L4 (Col 1:15 [Mal 2:11]). From a graphic standpoint, the difference is quite small, the addition of a *yod*. 4Q76 reads *וּבַעַל בֵּית אֵל נָכַר* “[and he has married] the house of a foreign god,” while the MT reads *וּבַעַל בֵּית אֵל נָכַר* “and he has married the daughter of a foreign god.” The difference though is likely interpretative. The reading of the MT identifies Israel’s abandonment of the wife of their youth for foreign women as idolatry since they have married *בָּת־אֵל נָכַר* “daughters of a foreign god.” This act equates to defiling the holiness of the Lord (Mal 2:11)⁴³⁸ and results in the defilement of the covenant of their fathers (Mal 2:11). Furthermore, those who have married foreign women will be “cut off” from being God’s people because they have acted like the people of another god. The reading of the LXX, *καὶ ἐπετίθεισεν εἰς θεοὺς ἀλλοτρίους* “and he pursued foreign gods,” makes the notion of idolatry more explicit by means of its substitution: in marrying foreign women, Israel has pursued other gods. Thus, Israel’s divorce of their Israelite wives is closely linked to idolatry both in the MT and the LXX.

4Q76 interprets the MT so that divorce becomes more closely linked to idolatry. In 4Q76, Israel has not just married *בָּת* “daughter” of a foreign god, but has married *בֵּית* “house” the house of a foreign god.⁴³⁹ In effect, the substitution further highlights the

⁴³⁸ See the Targum’s rendering of Mal 2:11. The text interprets the noun *קִדְּוֹשׁ* “holiness” as referring to the people of Judah themselves. The text reads *אֲרִי אֶפְסִיּוֹ דְּבֵית יְהוּדָה נִפְשְׁהוֹן דְּהִנְתָּ קְדִישָׁא קְדָם יי* “because those of the house of Judah have desecrated themselves who existed as holy before the Lord.” Thus, according to the Targum, the people have desecrated themselves. This fact too stresses the notion of idolatry since the people were to be “holy to the Lord,” but now they have profaned themselves.

⁴³⁹ Interestingly, the Targum’s interpretation of this passage highlights the notion of “house” since it identifies Judah as *דְּבֵית יְהוּדָה* “those of the house of Judah” twice in Mal 2:11, not just *יְהוּדָה* as in the MT. See the one other occurrence of *יְהוּדָה* in the Targum Malachi, which translates *יְהוּדָה* as *אֲנָשׁ יְהוּדָה* “men of Judah,” not *בֵּית יְהוּדָה* “house of Judah.” The topic of family and idolatry is deeply weeded together in Mal 2:10-12.

meaning of the MT: divorcing an Israelite wife and remarrying a foreign woman amounts to rejecting Israel's common father and common God (Mal 2:10), to betraying the covenant of the fathers (Mal 2:10), and to committing an abomination in Israel and in Jerusalem that is in fact defiling (i.e., desecrating) God's holiness. Ultimately, it leads to being rejected as God's people (Mal 2:12). The substitution of the MT's בַּיִת with בֵּית then interprets the MT with the result that the essence of the divorce is highlighted: divorce is idolatry and rejection of God's family (i.e., his house).

The next substitution occurs at F3:L4 (Col 2:4 [Mal 2:16]). 4Q76 reads כִּי אִם שְׂנֵאתָ שְׂלָחָה “for if you hate so that you divorce,” while the MT reads כִּי־שֵׂנֵאתָ שְׂלָחָה “if one hates so that he divorces.” There are two differences here. The first is minor: a category 1 addition that makes the syntax explicit. This category 1 variant is the substitution of the כִּי particle of the MT with אִם.⁴⁴⁰ The second difference concerns a change in subject: 4Q76 represents the subject as second-person while the MT represents the subject as third-person. The ambiguity of the subject of the MT verb שֵׂנֵאתָ “he hates” likely led to the genesis of this variant since it is unclear if the subject is God or a man of Israel.⁴⁴¹ While the KJV, NRSV, and NLT identify the subject as the Lord, the HCSB, ESV, and NIV all identify the subject as an Israelite, but keep the subject as a third person like the MT (i.e., any man). The LXX, Targum, and Vulgate, like the HCSB, ESV, and NIV, interpret the subject as referring to an Israelite, not to God (contra. KJV, NRSV, and NLT), but they mark this interpretation by conjugating the verb, not as a third person, but as a second person. 4Q76 does likewise. Thus, the difference is interpretative: it interprets the ambiguous subject of the MT as an Israelite.

⁴⁴⁰ This variant is classified as a substitution, not an addition, because the particles אִם כִּי convey one meaning, not two.

⁴⁴¹ The history of this verse's interpretation is ancient and extensive. 4Q76 interprets the verse by means of changing the subject as does the LXX, Targum, and Vulgate. Modern translators too recognize the difficulty of this verse.

The next category 2 substitution is at F2ii:L5 (Col 2:15 [Mal 3:2]). 4Q76 represents the object as אֹתָם “them,” whereas the MT reads אֶת-יּוֹם “the day.” Graphic confusion likely resulted in this difference since *vav* and *yod* can both extend to the base of the line in this text.⁴⁴² Moreover, one could easily imagine how a litigated *tav*, *yod*, and *vav* would contribute to this graphic substitution. Nonetheless, the reading of 4Q76 makes conceptual sense, and thus, may not have alarmed the scribe. The difference is essentially one of focus. The MT emphasizes the fact that Israel will not be able to endure *the day* of his coming whereas 4Q76 emphasizes those coming to judge Israel: they [i.e., Israel] will not be able to endure *them* when he comes.

The last substitution preserved in 4Q76 is found at F91:L5 (Col 4:12 [Mal 3:17]). This difference represents a change in lexeme. The MT reads וְעָסוּתְהֶם “and you will tread down,” while 4Q76 reads וְעוֹצוּתְהֶם “and you shall counsel.” The difference may have derived from a misunderstanding of the MT since it is a *hapax*. Against this view is the fact that the versions appear to have understood it.⁴⁴³ The difference, however, could have derived from graphic or phonetic confusion, although this proposal is not without difficulties. The difficulty of this proposal is to account for the interchange of the *sade* and *samek*, which Fuller asserts is nowhere attested at Qumran.⁴⁴⁴ Therefore, explanations that attribute this difference to the scribal process are not without problems although the closeness between the words suggest either phonological or graphic confusion.

Attributing this difference to an editorial process too is problematic. First, what exactly is the form of 4Q76. If the form is *qal* (the only stem in which the lexeme of 4Q76 occurs in the MT and at Qumran), then the added *vav* is problematic. The stem could be an intensive (either a *piel* or a *pual*) since the doubling of the second radical would result

⁴⁴² Fuller, “4QXIIa,” 222.

⁴⁴³ Fuller, “The Minor Prophets Manuscripts,” 29.

⁴⁴⁴ *Ibid.*

in a fuller form with all three radicals present. Nonetheless, this root does not occur as an intensive. Second, the reading of 4Q76 is very difficult. If the voice of the verbal form is active, then what does it mean for the righteous to give counsel to the wicked in this context? If one reads the voice as a passive, further ambiguity arises. Thus, the difficulty of 4Q76 along with the similarity between the words graphically and phonologically suggest an unintentional error. Although this is the most likely explanation for the variant, no one explanation is without problems.

Potential category 3. Scholars generally accept Fuller’s reconstruction of the order of books (i.e., Jonah was situated after Malachi), but this suggestion is far from certain. Fuller’s argument that the book of Jonah followed the book of Malachi depends on two pieces of evidence: one certain and one suggestive. First, Malachi is clearly not the last text written on this manuscript since fragment 9 preserves content from two columns (Col 4 and 5 according to Fuller’s reconstruction), one of which follows the ending of the book of Malachi and preserves two letters.⁴⁴⁵ Second, Fuller identifies these letters as remains of Jonah 1:5.⁴⁴⁶ This suggestion depends on physically joining fragment 9 with fragment 15, which preserves Jonah 1:3-5 partially. The suggestion is then supported by Fuller’s placement of fragments 11-14: all of which preserve portions of Jonah in Fuller’s reconstructed column 5.⁴⁴⁷

Several factors, however, weaken Fuller reconstruction of column 5, and his

⁴⁴⁵ Russell E. Fuller, ed., “4QXIIg,” in *Qumrân Cave 4: The Prophets*, 228. See Fuller’s even more cautious treatment of the remains of fragment 9 ii in his dissertation. Fuller, “The Minor Prophets Manuscripts,” 30. See also Philippe Guillaume, “The Unlikely Malachi-Jonah Sequence (4QXIIa),” *The Journal of Hebrew Scriptures* 7 (2007): 3.

⁴⁴⁶ The beginning of lines 10 and 11 of column 5 are preserved on fragment 9ii in Fuller, “4QXIIa,” 229.

⁴⁴⁷ For a critique of Fuller’s placement of fragments 11-14, see Guillaume in “The Unlikely Malachi-Jonah Sequence (4QXIIa),” 4.

suggestion that Jonah followed Malachi in this manuscript.⁴⁴⁸ First, Guillaume notes that the actual join suggested by Fuller between fragment 9 and 15 is very narrow, ca. 5 mm and no letters or marks begin on one fragment and are completed on the next.⁴⁴⁹

Second, Fuller's placement of fragments 11-14, which strengthens his proposal if proven, is not without problems. These problems include the suggestion that fragment 11 preserves the beginning of Jonah and occupied lines 3-4 of the reconstructed column 5. However, fragment 11 is poorly preserved.⁴⁵⁰ All that is sufficiently preserved from this fragment are the letters \aleph .⁴⁵¹ Moreover, Fuller's placement of fragment 11 depends on postulating an usually large space between fragment 11 and 12."⁴⁵² Moreover, the placement of fragments 11-14, if correct, also suggest that Jonah 1:3 was shorter than the text of the MT.⁴⁵³

Third, fragments 11-14 do not preserve any margins, and thus, cannot be anchored to a specific place of column 5.⁴⁵⁴

Last, although fragments 17-18 do preserve portions of Jonah and a bottom margin, four lines separate these lines from fragments 11-15 according to Fuller's

⁴⁴⁸ Many of the following reasons along with others are found in Guillaume in Guillaume in "The Unlikely Malachi-Jonah Sequence (4QXIIa)," 4-10.

⁴⁴⁹ Ibid., 3.

⁴⁵⁰ See Leon Levy Dead Sea Scrolls, "Plate 314, Frag 1," accessed December 5, 2017, <http://www.deadseascrolls.org.il/explore-the-archive/image/B-360655>. The fragmentary nature of this fragment weakens Fuller's proposal as also pointed out by Guillaume in "The Unlikely Malachi-Jonah Sequence (4QXIIa)," 6.

⁴⁵¹ See Guillaume who argues that three letters are preserved on fragment 11 line 2 in Guillaume, "The Unlikely Malachi-Jonah Sequence (4QXIIa)," 6.

⁴⁵² See Russell E. Fuller, ed., "4QXIIg," in *Qumrân Cave 4: The Prophets*, 230. Guillaume also makes this point in "The Unlikely Malachi-Jonah Sequence (4QXIIa)," 6.

⁴⁵³ See Russell E. Fuller, ed., "4QXIIg," in *Qumrân Cave 4: The Prophets*, 230.

⁴⁵⁴ See Guillaume, "The Unlikely Malachi-Jonah Sequence (4QXIIa)," 4.

reconstruction. Such a large gap illustrates the fragmentary nature of Fuller’s reconstructed column 5 and casts doubt on the suggestion that the fragments 11-15 belong to the same column as the second column found on fragment 9 that contains some enigmatic text after Malachi (perhaps a colophon).⁴⁵⁵ In the end, Fuller’s suggestion depends on two preserved letters on the left-hand column of fragment 9, which are unable to be physically joined to any fragment that clearly preserves portions of Jonah. As Heinz-Josef Fabry notes, this is far too little evidence to substantiate a sequence Malachi—Jonah.⁴⁵⁶

Statistics and Conclusion of 4Q76’s Textual Tradition

One can reasonably categorize what remains of 4Q76 as belonging to the Masoretic tradition. Three facts demonstrate this point. First, the differences between this text and the MT are minor. Second, the differences indicate a tendency to interpret. Third, 4Q76 preserves a high degree of agreement with the MT.⁴⁵⁷

Table 25. The statistical relationship between 4Q76 and the MT

Total # of Words in 4Q76	Categories 1, 2, and 3	Statistical Relationship	Categories 2 and 3	Statistical Relationship	Category 3	Statistical Relationship
436	29	93.35%	12	97.25%	0	100%

4Q78

4Q78 (4QXII^c) consists of fifty-one fragments (thirty-six of which are

⁴⁵⁵ Guillaume rightly concludes that Mal 3 is not the end of this manuscript in Guillaume in “The Unlikely Malachi-Jonah Sequence (4QXIIa),” 9.

⁴⁵⁶ Heinz-Josef Fabry, “The Reception of Nahum and Habakkuk in the Septuagint and Qumran,” in Tov, Paul, and Ben-David, *Emanuel*, 246.

⁴⁵⁷ Eighty-six words transcribed by Fuller depend on insufficient manuscript evidence. These words are excluded from the total word count.

identified) preserving portions of Hosea, Joel, Amos, and Zephaniah.⁴⁵⁸ Fuller describes the script as closest to the semiformal tradition (ca. 75 BC).⁴⁵⁹ The orthography and morphology is more *plene* than the MT. Longer forms of verbal affirmatives as well as suffixes are used.⁴⁶⁰ Tov labels the spelling practice as QSP.⁴⁶¹

4Q78 contains a high level of scribal intervention. Fuller notes that at least twelve supralinear insertions are found throughout the manuscript (while two further interventions are suggested), all of which he attributes to the original hand.⁴⁶² Tov lists 4Q78 as possessing thirteen instances of scribal intervention:⁴⁶³ one intervention every eight lines.

The textual tradition of 4Q78 is debated. Fuller classifies 4Q78 as relatively close to the *Vorlage* of the LXX.⁴⁶⁴ Contrary to Fuller, Brooke is unsure if agreement between 4Q78 and the LXX is sufficient to label the text as aligning with the LXX.⁴⁶⁵ Tov has identified 4Q78 as non-aligned⁴⁶⁶ as has Lange⁴⁶⁷ and García Martínez.⁴⁶⁸

⁴⁵⁸ Russell Fuller, ed., “4QXIIc,” in Ulrich et al., *Qumrân Cave 4: The Prophets*, 237-50.

⁴⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, 238.

⁴⁶⁰ Fuller, “4QXIIc,” 238.

⁴⁶¹ Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 334.

⁴⁶² Fuller, “4QXIIc,” 239.

⁴⁶³ Tov includes in his list of thirteen cases of scribal intervention one instance of cancelation dots/strokes occurring above and below the letter found at 4Q78 F34:L3 (Zeph 3:1). See Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 191.

⁴⁶⁴ Fuller, “The Text of the Twelve Minor Prophets,” 83.

⁴⁶⁵ See Brooke, “The Twelve Minor Prophets,” 23.

⁴⁶⁶ Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 334.

⁴⁶⁷ Lange, “Textual Plurality,” 55.

⁴⁶⁸ García Martínez, “The Text of the XII Prophets,” 108.

Description and Categorization of the Variants

Several differences that Fuller lists as variants between 4Q76 and the MT belong neither to category 1, 2, nor 3. These differences include examples that may be erased; namely, the erasure of an article at F12:L5 (Frgs. 10-12:L8 [Joel 1:18]) and at F12:L6 (Frgs. 10-12:L9 [Joel 1:19]).⁴⁶⁹ Moreover, the apparent omission of Joel 4:6b-8 based on spatial considerations is corrected so that some, maybe everything initially omitted, would have been present if the manuscript were better preserved. Furthermore, four examples of synonymous spellings, one scribal error that led to a very difficult reading, and one difference that depends on insufficient manuscript evidence are not included in the following discussions and statistics.⁴⁷⁰ One difference could be a synonymous reading: 4Q78 being the more defective reading.⁴⁷¹

Category 1. Ten differences belong to category 1. Three category 1 variants are additions: two concern the addition of a conjunctive *vav* while one concerns the addition of an article. Two further category 1 variants are omissions of a conjunctive *vav*. The last five category 1 variants are substitutions: two concern the substitution of a verbal

⁴⁶⁹ One can refer to the reconstructed column and line number provided by the editors, or one can refer to the exact fragment and line number corresponding to the actual fragment. Both are provided here. The first reference given is the reference to the fragment number and the corresponding line of the fragment while the second reference is that of the fragments which make up the reconstructed column and the corresponding reconstructed line number.

⁴⁷⁰ See table “4Q78: Description of variants” in appendix 2 for more details about the differences not included in categories 1, 2, nor 3.

⁴⁷¹ 4Q78 reads וַיִּבֹשׁ מִקְוֵוֹ [“and it will dry up [its] foun[tain],” while the MT reads וַיִּבֹשׁ מִקְוֵוֹ “and its fountain will be ashamed.” This substitution could be described as a mere orthographic difference: 4Q78 simply represents the form of the MT defectively. Although 4Q78 is written in QSP, 4Q78 reads בְּצַר “who gathered the heavens” a *qal* participle written defectively at F8:L2 (Hos 13:4). If one understood this difference as a variant, it would likely be a case of interpretation where 4Q78 interprets the lexeme בֹּשׂ “to be ashamed” of the MT as יָבֵשׁ “to be dry.” This interpretation is implied by the MT itself since shaming a fountain is to dry it up. This interpretation is further found in the LXX (i.e., *ἀναξηρανεῖ* “it will dry up”) and in the Vulgate (i.e., *siccabit* “it will dry up”). If one understands this as a textual variant, 4Q78 does not necessarily depend on the LXX or Vulgate for the reading since the MT itself invites this interpretation. It is reasonable though to identify this as a mere orthographic difference.

stem, one concerns the substitution of number, one concerns the substitution of tense, and one concerns the substitution of forms of the imperative.⁴⁷²

Category 2. 4Q78 possesses ten category 2 variants: five are additions. The first addition is a large expansion found at F8:L2-3 (Hos 13:4). Fuller reconstructs the addition in accordance with the LXX: אנוכי יהוה אלוהיכם]ה בצר שמים]וקונה ארץ אשר ידיו ברא [אנוכי העלותיכה [מארץ מצרים [I, the Lord yo]u[r God], who gathered the heavens [and creating the land, whose hands created all the hosts of heaven, and I did not reveal them to you to walk after them, but] I brought you up [from the land of Egypt.” The MT’s reading is much shorter: ואָנֹכִי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ מֵאֶרֶץ [אנוכי יהוה אלוהיך מארץ מצרים] “and I am the Lord your God from the land of Egypt.” Fragment 8 is fragmentary and only contains the far-left hand side of a column with its left-hand margin. The fact that the addition spans at least two full lines and that no marks of correction are visible indicates that 4Q82 likely read with the longer text of the LXX.

Reasonable evidence suggests that this difference derived from the scribal process. First, this difference could be an instance where the LXX and 4Q78 preserve the original reading against the MT. Fuller makes this suggestion; he claims that the MT suffered from haplography from העלותיכה to אלוהיכה.⁴⁷³ Second, one could argue that the LXX is expansive and 4Q78 either copied from a text with this expansion or copied from a text without it but conflated his text to include the longer reading of the LXX.⁴⁷⁴ Both reasons would account for the differences as deriving from the scribal process. The fact

⁴⁷² See table “4Q78: Description of variants” in appendix 2 for more details about the category 1 variants of 4Q78.

⁴⁷³ Russell Fuller, “A Critical Note on Hosea 12:10 and 13:4,” *Revue Biblique* 98, no. 3 (1991): 349, 352.

⁴⁷⁴ Fuller sees this as an unlikely explanation in *ibid*, 356-57.

that 4Q78 preserves only two omissions when compared against the other texts suggest that 4Q78 may be a conflated text.⁴⁷⁵

The second addition is found at F14:L10 (Frgs. 14-17:L10 [Joel 2:19]) and concerns a supralinear correction against the majority of texts. The addition is [^]ואכלתמה[^]ה] [“and you will eat and be filled” while the MT simply reads שְׂבַעְתֶּם “and you will be satisfied.” The passage describes how God will show mercy to his people. Instead of setting the name of his people as a reproach, he will send grain, new wine, and oil that his people might be satisfied (MT). 4Q78 reads “*that you will eat* and that you will be satisfied.” This addition is likely a case of harmonization since the combination of the verbal forms אכל “to eat” and שבע “to be satisfied” is a common word-pair found throughout the OT.⁴⁷⁶ Moreover, Joel 2:26 describes that God will show mercy to Israel by sending them grain, new wine, and oil (2:24). Then, God’s people will indeed eat and be satisfied (2:26). This addition further echoes Deuteronomy 11:14-15 in stating that covenantal obedience results in gathering וְהִירִשְׁתָּ וְיִצְהַרְתָּ “your grain and your new wine and you oil” (v.14) and in stating that וְאָכַלְתָּ וְשָׂבַעְתָּ “and you will eat and be satisfied.” Therefore, the addition is a harmonization.

The third addition occurs at F20:L2 (Frgs. 18-20:L13 [Joel 4:18]) and concerns the supralinear addition of [^]כול[^] “all.” 4Q78 reads [את [^]כול[^] נחל השט]ים “and irrigate] the entire valley of Shitt[im,” while the MT reads וְהִשְׁקָה אֶת-נַחַל הַשְּׁטִי “and irrigate the valley of Shittim.” The difference interprets the MT by clarifying that *all* of the valley of Shittim will be irrigated by the fountain from the house of the Lord (2:18).

The fourth addition again concerns a supralinear correction. This addition is found at F19:L3 (Frgs. 18-20:L14 [Joel 4:19]). 4Q78 reads [ל]מדבר [^]למדבר[^] שממ]ה [ואדום]

⁴⁷⁵ See the section “Statistics and Conclusion of 4Q78’s Textual Tradition.” Sungjim Kim suggests that 4Q78 may be a conflated text in Sungjim Kim, “Is the Masoretic Text Still a Reliable Primary Text for the Book of Hosea,” *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 28, no. 1 (2018): 44-45.

⁴⁷⁶ Fuller, “The Minor Prophets Manuscripts,” 85.

“and Edom will exist] as a wilderness, a desolate ^wilderness^,” whereas the MT reads וְאֵדוֹם לְמִדְבָּר שְׁמֵמָה תִּהְיֶה “And Edom will exist as a desolate wilderness.” The addition alters the syntax so that 4Q78 modifies לְמִדְבָּר “[as] a desert” with an appositional clause שְׁמֵמָה “as a desolate wilderness[s],” while the MT simply modifies לְמִדְבָּר with a genitive שְׁמֵמָה “desolation” without recourse to apposition. The difference is slight and could have derived from a case of dittography. Perhaps 4Q78 represents a more emphatic construction by means of repeating the prepositional phrase.

The fifth addition is found at F18:L1-2 (Frgs. 18-20:L1-2 [Joel 4:6b-8]). This addition is part of a longer correction no longer preserved that attempted to correct an original omission that spanned parts of Joel 4:6-9. An original omission likely existed since the end of line 1 of fragment 18 is preserved and corresponds to Joel 4:6 while the end of line 2 of fragment 18 is preserved and corresponds to Joel 4:9.⁴⁷⁷ Spatial considerations, therefore, indicate a large-scale omission possibly caused by homoioteleuton of בְּנֵי of 4:6 and בְּנֵי of 4:8, as suggested by Cross.⁴⁷⁸ Nonetheless, the presence of text written in the left margin of line 1, as noted by Cross,⁴⁷⁹ and above line 2, demonstrates that this omission was corrected, either in part or in full.⁴⁸⁰ Although the extent of this correction is not knowable, the presence of צַב־אוֹת דְּבַר written above the line does demonstrate that the correction involves one variant from the MT. Namely, the MT of Joel 4:8 reads יְהוָה דִּבֶּר “the Lord has spoken,” but 4Q78 reads צַב־אוֹת דְּבַר “^of ho]sts has spoken^” so that the difference is likely an expansion of a divine title, a minor difference.

⁴⁷⁷ Fuller, “4QXIIc,” 245.

⁴⁷⁸ Ibid.

⁴⁷⁹ Ibid.

⁴⁸⁰ Unfortunately, the majority of line 1 and line 2 are not preserved. In addition, the entire right-hand margin is no longer extant. Thus, the extent to which the scribe corrected the text cannot be known.

4Q78 further preserves five category 2 substitutions. The first and second substitution are found at F12:L4 (Frags. 10-12:L7 [Joel 1:17]). 4Q78 reads עפֿשֿוֹ פֿורוֹת “the heifers decay”⁴⁸¹ whereas the MT reads עֲבָשׁוּ פְּרָדוֹת “those things that are separated shrivel.” The first difference concerns the reading of 4Q78 עפֿשֿוֹ against the MT’s עֲבָשׁוּ. This difference was likely unintentional: a scribal error either arising on graphic or phonological grounds.⁴⁸² However, it could also be described as intentional possibly due to unfamiliarity with the root עבש, since this root is a *hapax* in the OT and never occurs at Qumran or in rabbinic literature. 4Q78’s transcription of עפֿשֿוֹ “decay,” although also uncommon (it never occurs in the OT and only here at Qumran), is used in rabbinic literature to mean “to grow moldy, to decay.”⁴⁸³ However, the similarity between the forms graphically points to an unintentional change. Notice also that the Vulgate interprets the text like 4Q78 by transcribing *computruerunt* “they have rotted,” whereas the Targum appears to follow the MT by reading אֲתִמְסִיאוּ “they are melted.”⁴⁸⁴ This difference likely derived from the scribal process.

The second substitution in this clause is 4Q78’s reading פֿורוֹת “heifers” for the MT’s פְּרָדוֹת “those things that are separated.” On the one hand, the reading of the MT is either a *qal* passive participle from the root פָּרַד “to separate” or a noun built of a *qal* passive form “i.e., seed or dried figs.”⁴⁸⁵ On the other hand, the reading of 4Q78 likely refers to cows: a reading supported by the LXX (i.e., δαμάλεις “heifers” and Vulgate

⁴⁸¹ 4Q78’s reading is highly enigmatic. The translation provided is that of Abegg, Flint, and Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible*, 429

⁴⁸² Fuller, “The Minor Prophets Manuscripts,” 78.

⁴⁸³ Jastrow, *A Dictionary of the Targumim*, s.v. “עֲבָשׁוּ.”

⁴⁸⁴ See the discussion of this variant in Fuller, “The Minor Prophets Manuscripts,” 77-79.

⁴⁸⁵ Clines, *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew*, vol. 6, s.v. “פְּרָדָה”.

(i.e., *iumenta* “beasts of burden”). The reading again likely derived from the scribal process: graphic confusion or interpretation.

The next category 2 substitution is preserved at F14:L3 (Frgs. 14-17:L3 [Joel 2:13]). 4Q78 reads גדיכִּימָה “your young kid goats,” while the MT reads בְּגָדֵיכֶם “your garments.” This difference likely derived from a simple scribal error: omission of a single letter.⁴⁸⁶ The scribe, according to Fuller’s transcriptions, writes a single letter above the line four times which likely demonstrates that the scribe committed parablepsis of one letter on more than one occasion.⁴⁸⁷ The internal evidence too supports seeing this difference as an example of parablepsis since the verb קָרַע “to tear” never takes the object גָּדִי in the OT⁴⁸⁸ in the non-biblical DSS,⁴⁸⁹ or in the Mishna.⁴⁹⁰

The next category 2 substitution is found at F21:L4 (Frgs. 21-23:L4 [Amos 2:16]). 4Q78 reads וּמוֹצֵא “the one who finds,” while the MT reads וְאֶמְיִץ “he who is strong.” Again, graphic confusion is a likely explanation for this variant since each reading shares the same consonants albeit substitution of *yod/vav*. Fuller suggests that the reading of 4Q78 is the result of unintentional metathesis or intentional metathesis because of confusion of the idiom.⁴⁹¹ As Fuller notes, the idiom וְאֶמְיִץ לְבוֹ “strong of his heart” only occurs here in Amos 2:16 to denote courage or strength.⁴⁹² Thus, the rarity of this idiom and the graphic

⁴⁸⁶ Fuller, “The Minor Prophets Manuscripts,” 82.

⁴⁸⁷ Fuller goes as far as to say that this scribe is prone to single letter omissions. *Ibid.*

⁴⁸⁸ David J. A. Clines, ed., *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew: Sade-Resh*, vol. 7 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2010), s.v. “קָרַע.”

⁴⁸⁹ Martin G. Abegg, *Dead Sea Scrolls Non-Biblical Texts*, Accordance Bible Software (Langley, BC Canada: Oak Tree Software, 2009).

⁴⁹⁰ Martin G. Abegg, *Mishna (Kaufmann)*, version 3.2, Accordance Bible Software (Langley, BC Canada: Oak Tree Software, 2009).

⁴⁹¹ Fuller, “The Minor Prophets Manuscripts,” 93.

⁴⁹² David J. A. Clines, ed., *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew: Beth-Waw*, vol. 2 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), s.v. “לָב.” Notice that Ps 27:14 uses the verbal form of the root אָמַץ to

similarly demonstrates that this difference likely derived from the scribal process.⁴⁹³

Another category 2 substitution is preserved at F31:L2 (Frgs. 30-33:L9 [Amos 7:8]). 4Q78 reads]שִׁמְתִּי “I set,” whereas the MT reads םֶשֶׁ “(I) am a setter.” 4Q78 has substituted a participle for a perfect verb. While 4Q78 declares an action to have occurred—God has “set” the plumb-line (4Q78)—the MT’s use of a participle is highly descriptive: God is a setter of the plumb-line.⁴⁹⁴ Thus, the substitution shifts the focus.

Category 3. 4Q78 does not preserve category 3 variants.

Statistics and Conclusion of 4Q78’s Textual Tradition

Several concluding comments should be considered when assessing the variants preserved in 4Q78. First, many of the differences appear to derive from scribal error. This is evident at F29:L3 (Frgs. 24-29, 48:L10 [Amos 4:2]) where the reading ךֶּבֶסוּפֹר is unintelligible. Fuller’s discussion of this variant suggests that the scribe may have intended סִיפֹרָה a plural of סָף “basin” and, thus, substituted dentals.⁴⁹⁵ Moreover, the fact that the versions support the MT, not 4Q78,⁴⁹⁶ further supports understanding this reading as a scribal error. Other possible examples of scribal error include the difference preserved at F12:L4 (Frgs. 10-12:L7 [Joel 1:17]) where either graphic or phonological confusion may have led to an interchange of a *bet* and a *pe*. Graphic similarity could also be the reason for the differences at F12:L4 (Frgs. 10-12:L7 [Joel 1:17]) and F21:L4 (Frgs. 21-23:L4 [Amos 2:16]). Second, the text preserves a high proportion of scribal

denote courage: וַיִּצְמַח לִבָּךְ “and let your heart be strong.”

⁴⁹³ Fuller, “The Minor Prophets Manuscripts,” 93.

⁴⁹⁴ Fuller and Choi, *Invitation to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*, §16a.

⁴⁹⁵ Fuller, “The Minor Prophets Manuscripts,” 96.

⁴⁹⁶ *Ibid.*

intervention. Fuller claims that 4Q78 has at least twelve supralinear insertions⁴⁹⁷ while Tov indicates that 4Q78 possesses thirteen instances of scribal intervention (e.g., supralinear corrections, deletions, erasures, and reshaping of letters).⁴⁹⁸ One should note that among these interventions is the correction of one large omission likely caused by parablepsis, and one large scale erasure found on F18:L4. Third, one difference appears to derive from the scribe skipping one letter, an error made by the scribe on more than this occasion (see the examples of supralinear corrections of just one letter above the line).⁴⁹⁹ Fourth, it is possible to read the supralinear correction at F19:L3 (Frgs. 18-20:L14 [Joel 4:19]) as a case of dittography. Thus, ample evidence suggests that 4Q78 contains several scribal errors and perhaps suggests that the manuscript was poorly copied.

In addition to noting that the text was perhaps copied poorly, it is also important to note that the text is generally fuller than the MT. Overall, when one accounts for all category 1, 2, and 3 variants, the text preserves eight additions, only two omissions (both concern the omission of a conjunctive *vav* while one original omission was corrected above the line), and eleven substitutions. This fact suggests that the scribe was more prone to expanding his text rather than omitting it.

This tendency may account for the scribe including the longer reading of the LXX at Hosea 13:4 and might present an alternative proposal to Fuller's suggestion that 4Q78 is directly related to the LXX. Contrary to Fuller, it is possible that the scribe of 4Q78 copied from a text belonging to the Masoretic tradition, but made various types of additions (e.g., interpretations based on context and conflated readings from separate texts)

⁴⁹⁷ Fuller, "4QXIIc," 239.

⁴⁹⁸ Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 334.

⁴⁹⁹ See the instances where the scribe corrects his text by merely adding one letter above the line. Notice also that the scribe only makes three clear omissions: two of which are omissions of the conjunctive *vav*.

to produce a fuller text. This suggestion is supported by the fact that 4Q78 only preserves two omissions when compared to the textual evidence: two omissions of a conjunctive *vav* against the MT, very minor differences.⁵⁰⁰ Thus, 4Q78 may be a conflated text.⁵⁰¹

Thus, based on the nature of the manuscript and the overarching statistical relationship between this text and the MT, one can reasonable categorize what remains of 4Q78 as belonging to the Masoretic tradition.⁵⁰²

Table 26. The statistical relationship between 4Q78 and the MT

Total # of Words in 4Q78	Categories 1, 2, and 3	Statistical Relationship	Categories 2 and 3	Statistical Relationship	Category 3	Statistical Relationship
503	25	95.03%	15	97.02%	0	100%

4Q79

4Q79 (4QXII^d) is preserved as two joined fragments containing Hosea 1:6-2:5.⁵⁰³ Fuller describes the script as difficult to date since it preserves several unique forms while also evidencing archaic and younger forms.⁵⁰⁴ He suggests dating the text to

⁵⁰⁰ The Targum has a slightly longer reading than 4Q78 at Joel 2:11. Whereas 4Q78 reads וְיָמִי יִכְלֶנּוּ “and who can endure it,” the Targum reads וְיָמֵן יָכוֹל לְסַבְרָתֵיהּ “and who is able to bear it.” However, the difference between the Targum and 4Q78 should not be classified as an omission but a substitution. The Targum transcribes the verb יָכַל “to be able” not כוּל “to endure” like the MT and 4Q78. The Targum needs an infinitive to complete the meaning of the verb, which is not the case with the verb כוּל “to endure.” In fact, the verb כוּל “to endure” never takes an infinitive to complete its meaning in the OT or the non-biblical-DSS.

⁵⁰¹ See Kim, “Is the Masoretic Text Still a Reliable Primary Text for the Book of Hosea,” 44-45.

⁵⁰² Sixty words are transcribed by Fuller in Fuller, “4QXIIc,” 237-51, which depend on insufficient manuscript evidence. These words are excluded from the total word count.

⁵⁰³ Russell E. Fuller, ed., “4QXIIId,” in Ulrich et al., *Qumrân Cave 4: The Prophets*, 253.

⁵⁰⁴ *Ibid.*

the end of the first half of the first century BC.⁵⁰⁵ Moreover, Fuller describes the orthography as idiosyncratic in that a *yod* is omitted twice where the MT has it and is added once while omitting an *aleph* four times.⁵⁰⁶

Scholars debate the textual tradition of 4Q79. On the one hand, Fuller classifies the text as close to the proto-Masoretic tradition,⁵⁰⁷ while Tov cautiously classifies the text as non-aligned.⁵⁰⁸ Lange lists 4Q79 as a manuscript too damaged for classification⁵⁰⁹ as does Brooke.⁵¹⁰

Description and Categorization of the Variants

Four differences listed by Fuller are not discussed in the following section since these forms can be reasonably described as synonymous to the reading of the MT. Three of these differences concern the omission of a quiescent *aleph*, including the puzzling form הָרָץ “the land” for the MT’s הָרָץ “the land” at F2:L4 (Frgs. 1-2:L9 [Hos 2:2]).⁵¹¹ The fourth difference likely represents a *sere* of a *niphal* imperfect *plene* at F1:L6 (Frgs. 1-2:L6 [Hos 2:1]).⁵¹²

⁵⁰⁵ Fuller, ed., “4QXIId,” 253.

⁵⁰⁶ Ibid., 255. The omission of the *aleph* at F1:L6 (Hos 2:1), although possible, is not certain. Fuller makes this point in *ibid.*

⁵⁰⁷ Fuller, “The Text of the Twelve Minor Prophets,” 85.

⁵⁰⁸ Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 334.

⁵⁰⁹ Lange, “Textual Plurality,” 55.

⁵¹⁰ Brooke, “The Twelve Minor Prophets,” 23.

⁵¹¹ One can refer to the reconstructed column and line number provided by the editor, or to the exact fragment and line number corresponding to the actual fragment. Both are provided here. The first reference given is the reference to the fragment number and corresponding line of the fragment while the second reference is that of the fragments which make up the reconstructed column and the corresponding reconstructed line number.

⁵¹² For a description of these variants, see table “4Q79: Description of variants,” in appendix 2.

Category 1. 4Q79 does not preserve category 1 variants.

Category 2. 4Q79 preserves two category 2 variants. The first is found at F2:L2 (Frgs. 1-2:L1 [Hos 2:1]) and concerns the substitution of voice. 4Q70 reads יֹמַר “and he used to say” a *qal* imperfect with a quiescent *aleph*, while the MT reads a *niphal* imperfect יִאָמַר “and it used to be said.” The interchange of voice is slight.

The exact description of the next variant preserved at F2:L7 (Frgs. 1-2:L12 [Hos 2:4]) is unclear due to the fragmentary nature of the text. 4Q79 reads זְנוּוֹיָהּ מִבֵּין פְּנֵיהָ “her prostitutions from betwe[en her face and her adulteries from between her breasts . . .],” while the MT reads זְנוּוֹיָהּ מִפְּנֵיהָ וְנִאֲפֹפִיָּהּ מִבֵּין שְׁדֵיהָ “her prostitutions from before her and her adulteries from between her breasts.” Fuller notes that this difference could either be explained as a transposition of clauses, a variant text (i.e., omission caused by parablepsis), or a scribal error (i.e., graphic or phonetic confusion of *bet* with *pe*).⁵¹³ Unfortunately, the poor state of the text prohibits a clearer description of the difference.⁵¹⁴

Category 3. 4Q79 does not preserve category 3 variants.

Statistics and Conclusion of 4Q79's Textual Tradition

4Q79 is poorly preserved, and thus, conclusions about the textual tradition of this text must be made cautiously. Nonetheless, the text preserves only two category 2 variants while maintaining a high statistical relationship with the MT. Moreover, one of the category 2 variants can reasonably be described as deriving either from parablepsis or

⁵¹³ Fuller, “4QXIId,” 256.

⁵¹⁴ This variant will be given one-point value in the statistics as if the variant was a transposition even though the exact identity of the variant is impossible to know. This approach accounts for a variant but approaches the difference conservatively.

graphic/phonological confusion. This fact coupled with the phenomenon of omitting four *alephs* may indicate that the text was poorly copied.⁵¹⁵ Thus, this evidence indicates that 4Q79 can reasonably be grouped as belonging to the Masoretic tradition.

Table 27. The statistical relationship between 4Q79 and the MT

Total # of Words in 4Q79	Categories 1, 2, and 3	Statistical Relationship	Categories 2 and 3	Statistical Relationship	Category 3	Statistical Relationship
39	2	94.87%	2	94.87%	0	100%

4Q80

4Q80 (4QXII^e) preserves portions of Haggai and Zechariah in twenty-five fragments, seven of which are unidentifiable.⁵¹⁶ Fuller describes the script as consisting of elements from the semi-cursive tradition, the semiformal tradition, and the formal tradition. He summarizes the script as either a semiformal or formal hand of the late Hasmonaean period, ca. 75-50 BC; Fuller describes the orthography as slightly fuller than the MT since it always marks \bar{a} to \bar{o} and u to \bar{o} ,⁵¹⁷ whereas Tov identifies the orthography as corresponding to QSP.⁵¹⁸ Fuller further notes the presence of four supralinear corrections, three of which derive from the original hand, multiple cases of erasure, and one example of text written down a left margin.⁵¹⁹

⁵¹⁵ The omission of the *aleph* at F2:L4 (F1-2:L9 [Hos 2:2]) coincides with a pausal form in the MT.

⁵¹⁶ Russell E. Fuller, ed., “4QXIIe,” in Ulrich et al., *Qumrân Cave 4: The Prophets*, 257.

⁵¹⁷ *Ibid.*

⁵¹⁸ Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 334.

⁵¹⁹ Fuller, “4QXIIe,” 259.

Scholars debate the proper classification of 4Q80. Fuller, for example, argues that 4Q80 “stands very close to the textual tradition represented by LXX.”⁵²⁰ Tov, however, disagrees. He lists 4Q80 as non-aligned.⁵²¹ Brooke, like Tov, identifies the text as non-aligned and notes that the text does not appear to agree with the LXX in any significant variant.⁵²² Lange classifies 4Q80 as a proto-Masoretic text,⁵²³ while García Martínez claims that the text agrees with the MT in most cases.⁵²⁴

Description and Categorization of the Variants

Fuller lists six differences between the MT and 4Q80 that are not considered in the following discussions and statistics because they either represent synonymous forms or depend on insufficient manuscript evidence. Four differences listed as variants represent mere orthographic differences. These differences occur at F10:L9 (Frgs. 8-13:L13 [Zech 3:9]), F17:L1 (Zech 8:6), F18:L2 (Zech 12:8), and F18:L3 (Zech 12:9).⁵²⁵ Two further differences depend on insufficient manuscript evidence. The first difference is found at F15:L5 (Frgs. 14-15:L12 [Zech 6:5]).⁵²⁶

⁵²⁰ Fuller, “The Text of the Twelve Minor Prophets,” 85.

⁵²¹ Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 334.

⁵²² Brooke, “The Twelve Minor Prophets,” 24.

⁵²³ Lange, “Textual Plurality,” 55. Lange classifies texts that deviate less than 2 percent from the medieval MT as proto-Masoretic. See this definition in *ibid.*, 53-54.

⁵²⁴ García Martínez, “The Text of the XII Prophets,” 109.

⁵²⁵ One can refer to the reconstructed column and line number provided by the editor, or to the exact fragment and line number corresponding to the actual fragment. Both are provided here. The first reference given is the reference to the fragment number and the corresponding line of the fragment while the second reference is that of the fragments which make up the reconstructed column and the corresponding reconstructed line number.

⁵²⁶ Fuller reads אֲדֹנָי “Lord” like the MT, but argues that traces of the prior letter remain which do not correspond to the MT. See Fuller’s discussion of this variant in Fuller, “4QXIIe,” 263. Nonetheless, the traces in question appear to belong not to the prior word, but to the first letter of this word: the *aleph*.

The second variant that depends on insufficient evidence is highly complex and is preserved at F14:L2 (Frags. 14-15:L2 [Zech 5:9]). 4Q80 reads { {ואש[אה עיני] } }] והנה ^ואר[אה^ “[and I lif]ted my eyes ^and I saw^ and behold,” while the MT reads ואָשָׂא וְהִנֵּה עֵינַי וְאָרָא וְהִנֵּה “and I lifted up my eyes and I saw and behold.” The poor state of the text complicates the analysis of the supralinear correction and the cancelation dots (cancelation dots are marked by the brackets { }). Regarding the supralinear correction, a possible *aleph* and a *he* are all that remain. These letters could either represent the originally omitted וארא “and I saw” of the MT or they could represent the verb ואשא “and I lifted up” originally present in the text, but now marked out by cancelation dots.⁵²⁷ The supralinear correction appears to derive from a second hand on paleographic grounds, but an adequate explanation of the correction remains elusive.⁵²⁸ Regarding the cancelation of ואש[אה עיני “and I lifted up my eyes,” one is unable to determine if they derived from the first or a subsequent hand.⁵²⁹ The cancelation of ואש[אה עיני by either the first or second hand would represent a unique and peculiar reading unless the scribe committed dittography when writing עיני ואש[אה. This explanation is speculative but demonstrates that a clear understanding of these corrections eludes modern readers: the text is too poorly preserved.⁵³⁰

Category 1. 4Q80 further preserves three category 1 variants. There is one addition of an interrogative *he* at F17:L1 (Zech 8:6), a substitution of gender at F15:L1

⁵²⁷ Cancelation dots function to delete the dotted words according to Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 189.

⁵²⁸ Fuller, “4QXIIe,” 263.

⁵²⁹ *Ibid.*

⁵³⁰ See the table “4Q80: Description of variants” in appendix 2 for more details about these differences.

(Frgs. 14-15:L8 [Zech 6:1]), and a further substitution of a synonymous lexical root at F15:L3 (Frgs. 14-15:L10 [Zech 6:3]).⁵³¹

Category 2. 4Q80 preserves one category 2 variant. This variant is an omission, and it is preserved at F3:L5 (Zech 1:6). It concerns the omission of the prepositional phrase לָנוּ “to us” of the MT. The difference results in 4Q80 being more implicit than the MT. Whereas the MT reads, “Just as the Lord of hosts has purposed to do *to us*” 4Q80 reads [just as the Lord of ho]st[s has purposed] to [d]o.”

Category 3. 4Q80 does not preserve category 3 variants.

Statistics and Conclusion of 4Q80’s Textual Tradition

4Q80 can be reasonably grouped as a text belonging to the Masoretic tradition. As noted, the manuscript contains several differences that concern synonymous spellings while only preserving three category 1 variants and one category 2 variant. The fact that 4Q80 has a high degree of scribal intervention is one further fact that should be accounted for when classifying the textual tradition of 4Q80 since scribal intervention may indicate careless copying.⁵³² These interventions include additions made above the line, corrections made in the margin, and omissions made by erasing and cancellation dots. Thus, the high degree of correspondence between 4Q80 and the MT, and the fact that most differences are minor, indicate that 4Q80 can reasonably be grouped as belonging to the Masoretic tradition.

⁵³¹ See the table “4Q80: Description of variants” in appendix 2 for more details about these differences.

⁵³² One correction per ten lines indicates a high degree of scribal intervention according to Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 253. Tov claims that 4Q80 has an average of one correction per every eight lines. *Ibid.*, 334.

Table 28. The statistical relationship between 4Q80 and the MT

Total # of Words in 4Q80	Categories 1, 2, and 3	Statistical Relationship	Categories 2 and 3	Statistical Relationship	Category 3	Statistical Relationship
166	5	96.99%	2	98.80%	0	100%

4Q82

4Q82 (4QXII^g) poorly preserves portions of Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Jonah, Micah, Nahum, possibly Habakkuk, Zephaniah, and Zechariah in approximately 100 identifiable fragments.⁵³³ Fuller describes that the poor state of preservation results in several difficult problems:

First, many fragments consist of multiple layers of the scroll stuck on top of each other. Some of these have deteriorated in such a way that adjacent letters do not necessarily belong to the same word but may derive from different layers, different revolutions of the scroll as it lay prior to deterioration. Secondly, on some fragments the ink of one layer has impressed itself in mirror image on the verso of the layer that lay above it. Thirdly, the writing on most of the fragments is illegible to the unaided eye, and thus direct work on the original manuscript in the museum often does not offer the correctives it usually does to work based on the photographs.⁵³⁴

Fuller describes the script of 4Q82 as a late Hasmonean or early Herodian formal hand from the last third of the first century BC.⁵³⁵ Fuller describes the orthography

⁵³³ Fuller, “4QXIIe,” in Ulrich et al., *Qumrân Cave 4: The Prophets*, 271-318.

⁵³⁴ *Ibid.*, 271. Due to the extremely poor state in which 4Q82 is preserved, the transcriptions provided by Fuller are accepted here. Thus, all transcriptions denoted by him as probable or certain are accepted as valid whereas readings that depend mainly on possible letters, as indicated by Fuller, are not accepted here. Citations of the texts here, therefore, follow the column, fragment, and line numbers provided by Fuller in *ibid.*, 271-318. In the citations, “Greek letters are used to designate the layers of a given fragment with ‘ α ’ signifying the lowest visible layer with identifiable text, ‘ β ’ indicating the next visible layer with identifiable text lying above ‘ α ’, and so on.” *Ibid.*, 274-75. Fuller states that more layers of leather may have intervened between the sequence ‘ α - β - γ ’ in *ibid.*, 275. Moreover, the terms *recto* and *verso* are used in the following citations. When referring to leather, *recto* refers to the “hairy, usually inscribed side, while the *verso* indicates the uninscribed flesh side. Here also [as with identifying the *recto* versus the *verso* side of papyri] the distinction is sometimes hard to make, and some scholars call any inscribed surface ‘*recto*,’ even if it happens to be the flesh side.” See Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 68-9.

⁵³⁵ Fuller, “4QXIIg,” 272.

as “somewhat fuller than that of the MT.”⁵³⁶ Tov suggests that the writing practice of 4Q82 might belong to QSP.⁵³⁷ The text, according to Fuller, is a carefully copied manuscript exhibiting few errors with only nine corrections made by the original scribe (six corrections agree with the MT while three disagree).⁵³⁸ Tov agrees with Fuller that 4Q82 preserves nine instances of scribal intervention, which amounts to an intervention every thirty-eight lines.⁵³⁹ Since Fuller estimates approximately 30 lines per column, this text on average would preserve less than one correction per column.⁵⁴⁰

Scholars debate the textual tradition of 4Q82. Fuller describes the textual tradition as closer to the MT than the LXX.⁵⁴¹ Similarly, Lange lists 4Q82 as a semi-Masoretic text.⁵⁴² More specifically, he categorized 4Q82 as an editorial text.⁵⁴³ García Martínez too states that 4Q82 agrees generally with the MT.⁵⁴⁴ Tov, however, lists 4Q82 as textually non-aligned⁵⁴⁵ as does Brooke.⁵⁴⁶

⁵³⁶ Fuller, “4QXIIg,” 272.

⁵³⁷ Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 334.

⁵³⁸ Fuller, “4QXIIg,” 274.

⁵³⁹ Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 334.

⁵⁴⁰ Fuller, “4QXIIg,” 272.

⁵⁴¹ Fuller, “The Text of the Twelve Minor Prophets,” 86.

⁵⁴² See Lange, “Textual Plurality,” 55. A semi-Masoretic text is a text that is close to the MT, but deviates more than 2 percent from it. For this definition, see *ibid.*, 54.

⁵⁴³ Lange defines an editorial text as a text “in which one or more scribes alter a parent text intentionally to improve its linguistics and stylistic quality and to achieve coherence,” and further states, “Editorial work concerns mostly small textual changes typical of modern copyediting.” Armin Lange, “4QXIIg (4Q82) as an Editorial Text,” *Textus* 26 (2016): 1-2.

⁵⁴⁴ García Martínez, “The Text of the XII Prophets,” 111.

⁵⁴⁵ Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 334.

⁵⁴⁶ Brooke, “The Twelve Minor Prophets,” 25.

Description and Categorization of the Variants

Seventeen of the differences listed by Fuller are not included in the following statistics and discussions. Eight of these differences concern words that are only possible readings according to Fuller's transcriptions.⁵⁴⁷ Moreover, seven differences depend on sufficient manuscript evidence, yet can reasonably be described as synonymous forms and spellings of the same word. One further difference concerns an unintelligible reading classified as a scribal error here. Last, two differences are not discussed in this section because they concern *kethiv/qere*.⁵⁴⁸

Category 1. Once these readings are removed from the discussion, twelve variants remain that belong to category 1, including five additions, one omission, and six substitutions.⁵⁴⁹

Category 2. There are three category 2 additions, six category 2 substitutions, three category 2 variant whose description is unclear, and two more complex variants.

The first and second additions concern elaborations on the divine name. The additions found at Frgs. 52β, 53β, 54β, 56β, 59-60 verso, 61 verso-64:L1 (Amos 7:8), and L14 (Amos 7:17), read יהוה[אד]וני יהוה "Lord Yahweh," while the MT reads יהוה "Yahweh." Lange suggests that the difference may further correspond to the use of the divine name in Amos.⁵⁵⁰ He suggests that the commonality of the phrase יהוה אֱלֹהֵינוּ could have caused these changes.⁵⁵¹ This may be true since this phrase is common, but the designation of

⁵⁴⁷ For a detailed discussion about these readings and those that follow, see table "4Q82: Description of variants" in appendix 2.

⁵⁴⁸ For a list of the of these differences, see table "4Q82: Description of variants" in appendix 2.

⁵⁴⁹ For a list of the category 1 variants, see table "4Q82: Description of variants" in appendix 2.

⁵⁵⁰ The name Yahweh is used here in translation in order to indicate the nature of the variant.

⁵⁵¹ Lange, "4QXIIg (4Q82) as an Editorial Text," 21-22.

God as merely יהוה “Yahweh” is also common. Thus, the difference may merely indicate that the scribe tended to add material rather than omit it.

The third addition is found at Frgs. 78ii, 82-87:L6 (Jonah 2:7 [Eng., 6]). 4Q82 reads חַיִּי נַפְשִׁי “my life, my soul,” while the MT reads חַיִּי “my life.” The difference simply further describes חַיִּי “my life” by identifying it also as נַפְשִׁי “my soul.” The noun נַפְשִׁי occurs in the MT in Jonah 2:6 [Eng., 5] and 8 [Eng., 7], and in both instances, the soul is described graphically as dying: “The waters surrounded me unto the *soul*,” while Jonah 2:8 [Eng., 7] says while “my *soul* was feeble beside me.” After describing *the soul* in terms of judgment and death, Jonah states that his deliverance concerned his “life,” not “soul.” Thus, the immediate context provides fertile ground for the addition.⁵⁵² The difference is likely a harmonization to the immediate context.

The first category 2 substitution is found at Frgs. 52β, 53β, 54β, 56β, 59-60 verso, 61 verso-64:L2 (Amos 7:8). 4Q82 reads יהוה “Yahweh,” while the MT reads אֲדֹנָי “the Lord.” The difference is minor, but may correspond to the how Amos depicts the divine name.⁵⁵³ On the one hand, depicting God as merely אֲדֹנָי “the Lord” occurs only three times in the MT of Amos (i.e., 7:7, 8; 9:1), whereas denoting God as only יהוה “Yahweh” occurs eight times in Amos 1 alone. This difference, therefore, harmonizes this occurrence to its wider usage.

The second category 2 substitution is found at Frgs. 70-75:L10 (Obad 4). 4Q82 reads תְּשִׁים “you will put,” while the MT reads שִׁים “to put.” The difference is likely a harmonization made to the immediate context since the verb parallel to the variant in question is a second person imperfect (i.e., תִּגְבִּיהַ “you are high”). The fact that the *tav* is made in the right-hand margin of 4Q82 made by the original scribe suggests that the

⁵⁵² Lange, “4QXIIg (4Q82) as an Editorial Text,” 25.

⁵⁵³ Lange offers a similar explanation for the other two instances where variants concern the divine name. *Ibid.*, 21-22.

imperfect form is an intentional correction made after the word was written, likely because of a desire to harmonize the text.⁵⁵⁴

The third substitution is not listed by Fuller in his variant column but is found at Frgs. 72ii, 82-87 (Jonah 2:10 [Eng., 9]).⁵⁵⁵ The difference is minor, but one of emphasis. 4Q82 reads a regular first-person imperfect form אֶשְׁלַם “I will repay,” while the MT reads a cohortative אֶשְׁלַמְּךָ “I will repay!” The difference between a first-person imperfect and forms with the affirmative *he* is blurred in Qumran Hebrew, but as Qimron mentions, these forms are not entirely interchangeable.⁵⁵⁶ In fact, the usage of the cohortative form increases drastically in Qumran Hebrew, so if these variants merely represented synonymous forms, one would expect the MT to read a simple imperfect and the Qumran text to read the form with the affirmative. Since the reverse is true here, the forms likely represent a variant although this may be a case of hyper-correction. The difference may be one of emphasis.

The fourth category 2 substitution is found at Frgs. 88-91i:L2 (Jonah 4:6) and again concerns the divine name. This time 4Q82 reads אֲדוֹנֵי יְהוָה “the Lord Yahweh,” while the MT reads יְהוָה-אֱלֹהִים “the Lord God.” As with the other variants concerning the divine name, this difference also appears to result from harmonization. The phrase אֲדוֹנֵי יְהוָה appears twenty-five times in the MT Minor Prophets.⁵⁵⁷ In the MT Minor Prophets, if the author wanted to elaborate further on the divine title by adding a genitive, either a pronominal suffix (i.e., the Lord *your* God) or a noun (i.e., the Lord God of hosts), then the author did not use אֲדוֹנֵי יְהוָה, but a form of יְהוָה-אֱלֹהִים plus a pronominal suffix or

⁵⁵⁴ Fuller, “4QXIIg,” 309, notes that the *tav* is likely a correction made by the original scribe since the *tav* is written well into the right margin.

⁵⁵⁵ This must have been an error since Fuller’s transcription of the column indicates a variant.

⁵⁵⁶ Qimron, *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, §311.122.

⁵⁵⁷ Each time the consonants יְהוָה are pointed with the vowels of אֱלֹהִים.

genitive. In the Minor Prophets, the only time יהוה אֱלֹהִים is used without a genitive is here. Thus, the reading of 4Q82 is likely a case of harmonization.

The fifth category 2 substitution is preserved at Frgs. 91ii, 93-94i:L9 (Mic 2:3). 4Q82 reads צוּאֵי רְוִתֵיהֶם “their [nec]ks,” while the MT reads צוּאֵי רְתִיכֶם “your necks.” The passage discusses God’s indictment against this wicked family (i.e., God’s people). This family is described with third person subjects and pronominal suffixes in verses 1-3a of the MT. After the *athnach* of verse 3, however, the same subject is described as second person subjects in the MT. This substitution, therefore, harmonizes the person (i.e., 4Q82 represents the people as a third person entity, not a second person) to its immediate context. However, this explanation is weakened by the subsequent second person verb, which is partially preserved in 4Q82 וְלֹא תֵלְכְוּ “and you shall not walk,” not “and he/they shall not walk.” In light of this fact, Lange suggests that the text evidences unsystematic grammatical updating.⁵⁵⁸ This explanation is possible, but could the scribe also have confused the *het* and the *kap* of this substitution on phonological grounds?⁵⁵⁹

The sixth category 2 variant is found at F104:L2 (Zech 10:12). 4Q82 reads וּבִשְׁמוֹ יִתְהַלְלוּ “[and they will bo]ast [in his name],” while the MT reads וּבִשְׁמוֹ יִתְהַלְכוּ “they shall walk in his name.” On the one hand, the change could be interpretative. The MT reads, “They will walk in the name of the Lord;” this usage is obviously figurative. 4Q82’s substitution, therefore, may simply be interpreting the figurative meaning of the MT. On the one hand, if the verb of 4Q82 is הִלֵּל “praise, boast,” then it is important to note that it often takes the noun שֵׁם “name” as an object (e.g., Joel 2:26; Ps 74:21; 113:1; 135:1; 148:2, 5, 13; 149:3) or a form of the prepositional phrase בְּשֵׁם (e.g., Ps 105:3; 1 Chron

⁵⁵⁸ Lange, “4QXIIg (4Q82) as an Editorial Text,” 26-27.

⁵⁵⁹ A category 1 variant concerns a change in number at Frgs. 91ii, 93-94i:L10 (Mic 2:4), which Lange suggests also derives from grammatical editing. This explanation too is possible, but the parallel verb is no longer preserved. Therefore, we cannot be certain about the exact nature of this change.

16:10). On the other hand, the combination of the verb הלך “to walk” with the object שם “name” occurs once at 2 Chronicles 26:8, but in a different context while the combination of הלך with the prepositional phrase בְּשֵׁם occurs twice in Micah 4:5. Thus, the difference may be interpretive.⁵⁶⁰

Three further variants whose exact description remains unclear are preserved in 4Q82. The first variant that belongs to this category is found at Frgs. 52β, 53β, 54β, 56β, 59-60 verso, 61 verso-64:L12 (Amos 7:15). 4Q82 reads וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה “and the Lord said,” while the MT reads וַיֹּאמֶר אֵלַי יְהוָה “and the Lord said to me.” The difference could be an omission as suggested by Fuller⁵⁶¹ and Lange,⁵⁶² but this difference could also be a case of transposition. Lange notes the peculiarity of positioning the prepositional phrase prior to the subject and suggests that this peculiar word order led to the phrase’s omission.⁵⁶³ This is possible, but this same argument suggests transposition of the prepositional phrase. The fragmentary nature of the line precludes certainty about this variant.

The exact nature of the variant at Frgs. 19β· 27-30α, 31 verso-32:L:16 (Hos 12:10) is also unclear: it could either be an addition or a substitution. 4Q82 may read כִּימֵי מְעֻלָּה מֵעַד [“[as in the days] when I brought you up to the appointed time/feast,”⁵⁶⁴ whereas the MT reads כִּימֵי מוֹעֵד “as in the days of the appointed time.” The entire verse of the MT reads, “I am the Lord your God from the land of Egypt. I will cause you to dwell again in

⁵⁶⁰ It should also be noted that the readings are closely related graphically. In fact, these two letters are similar in most square scripts minus the fact that the *lamed* extends above the line. Textual damage (e.g., peeled leather) or slightly smudged ink could have obscured the reading.

⁵⁶¹ Fuller, “4QXIIg,” 306.

⁵⁶² Lange, “4QXIIg (4Q82) as an Editorial Text,” 12-13.

⁵⁶³ Ibid.

⁵⁶⁴ It is possible that the prepositional phrase כִּימֵי was not originally found in 4Q82.

tents as in the days of the appointed time/feast.” Regardless of whether the variant is an addition or a substitution,⁵⁶⁵ both texts connect Israel’s future of dwelling in tents to their past. The MT does this by stating that their future in tents will be *as the days* of the appointed feast/time, while 4Q82 does this by stating that their future in tents will be like when God brought them up to the appointed time/feast. Thus, although the exact nature of the variant is unclear, both texts appear to connect the passage more closely to the Exodus image already evident in the verse.⁵⁶⁶

Lange argues that this change is interpretative and was occasioned by the ambiguity of the MT and Psalm 81:11:

The 4QXII^g-text was most probably influenced by Ps 81:11 in reading מְעַלְכָּה. The MT-text of Hos 12:10 was difficult to understand in late Second Temple period. The phrase כִּימֵי מוֹעֵד is relatively disconnected from the rest of the verse. Hos 12:10 threatens addresses that because of their crimes they will live in tents again, i.e. they will suffer the same punishment as the desert generation did for its apostasy. The adverbial addition ‘as in the days of the appointed festival (כִּימֵי מוֹעֵד) makes no sense in this context. Therefore the text of 4QXII^g substituted כִּימֵי מוֹעֵד with מְעַלְכָּה in light of Ps 81:11.⁵⁶⁷

The considerable amount of textual overlap between Psalm 81:11 and Hosea 12:10 and the difficulty of understanding the meaning of “the days of the appointed time/feast” support Lange’s assertion, but this reasoning does not establish if 4Q82 originally omitted the phrase כִּימֵי. It is possible that the text simply added מְעַלְכָּה “when I brought you up” for the interpretive reasons suggested by Lange.

⁵⁶⁵ Fuller, “4QXIIg,” 287, argues that spatial considerations suggest that 4Q82 did not preserve the entire text of the MT. Thus, Lange, “4QXIIg (4Q82) as an Editorial Text,” 18, does not understand this difference as an addition, but as a substitution: מְעַלְכָּה “that brought you up” substitutes for the MT’s כִּימֵי “as in the days.” This suggestion is weakened by the fact that this line only preserve nine letters partially. This fact plus the few letters needed to preserve the MT’s כִּימֵי suggest that such precision is elusive; simply, not enough data remain to determine if this difference is an addition or a substitution. Contrary to Fuller and Lange, Abegg, Flint, and Ulrich translate Hos 12:10 [Eng., 9] as an addition, not a substitution in Abegg, Flint, and Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible*, 426.

⁵⁶⁶ This conclusion is made in Lange, “4QXIIg (4Q82) as an Editorial Text,” 18-19.

⁵⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, 18.

The third variant whose description is unclear is found at Frgs. 97 recto-99i:L1 (Nah 2:9). 4Q82 reads]מימיה׃ “her days,” while the MT reads מימי היא׃ “from the days, she is.” The exact identity of the reading of 4Q82 is uncertain since the text is missing after the pronominal suffix—the text may substitute the MT’s personal pronoun with the pronominal suffix (see LXX and Vulgate) or it may add the pronominal suffix while keeping the pronoun. Moreover, the MT too is uncertain; not because of fragmentary evidence, but due to syntactical peculiarity.⁵⁶⁸

The MT reading, although difficult, can reasonably account for the divergent readings of Nahum 2:9. The Targum reads מימי קדם היא׃ “from ancient days, she is,” interprets the difficulty of the MT by means of an addition (i.e., קדם). The LXX and Vulgate are more complex but may likewise be the result of interpretation. The LXX reads τὰ ὕδατα αὐτῆς “her waters” like the Vulgate which reads *aquae eius* “her waters.” Among the differences between the LXX and the Vulgate against the MT is the fact that the LXX and Vulgate substitute a genitive personal pronoun “her” for the personal pronoun.⁵⁶⁹ 4Q82 reads like the LXX and the Vulgate in supplying a pronominal suffix. This move could be occasioned by the reading of the MT; namely, מימי is in the construct state, not the absolute state. Thus, this difference, although enigmatic at points, likely derives from the difficult syntax of the MT.

The first more complex variant concerns an addition and a substitution and is preserved at F19β, 27-30α, 31 verso-32:L5 (Hos 11:10). 4Q82 reads אחריו]^ [יהוה] ^ [ילך׃ “after him, ^the Lord^ walks, and as a lion,” while the MT reads אַחֲרַי יְהוָה יֵלֶכֶ׃

⁵⁶⁸ See Clines, *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew*, vol. 4, s.v. “יום.” See also Gesenius’ comment that Nah 2:9 “is evidently very corrupt,” in Gesenius, *Gesenius’ Hebrew Grammar*, 130dn3. Although the MT reading is difficult, it is old as evident from MurXII which reads with the MT.

⁵⁶⁹ The LXX and Vulgate further disagree with the MT here in two other instances. First, these texts understand the consonants מים as waters, not days. Second, these texts understand the consonants מים as a nominative, not a genitive of a preposition.

כְּאַרְיֵה “after the Lord, they walk; as a lion.” The differences between these texts concern the addition of a pronominal suffix (i.e., אַרְיֵה), a substitution of the number of the subject (the MT reads a plural subject and refers to Ephraim while 4Q82 is singular and refers to the Lord), and an addition of a conjunctive *vav*.⁵⁷⁰ On the one hand, the high concentration of small changes that remain graphically similar to the MT suggest that the differences arose from some type of graphic confusion, perhaps a damaged exemplar. The fact that the text has few examples of scribal intervention, however, may suggest otherwise.⁵⁷¹

The immediate context suggests that the difference is interpretative. These differences may be a case of harmonization since the Lord is the subject of the prior two verses and the verb that immediately precedes the verb in question. Moreover, Hosea 11:7 states that God’s people turn from the Lord, not to him.

The sequence of events of verse 10 further suggest explaining this difference as interpretative. The sequence of events of 4Q82, assuming the text reads like the MT where missing, would have read, “The Lord walks [af]ter him (Ephraim) and as a li[on, he roars. When he roars, then his sons tremble from the sea] (Hos 12:10).” The MT, on the other hand, reads, “They walk after the Lord. He roars as a lion. When he roars, then his sons tremble from the sea. (Hos 12:10).” The sequence of 4Q82 is smoother than the MT since, on conceptual grounds, it makes sense that the Lord would go after his people, roar, and then they would come to him (4Q82).

The second more complex variant concerns an addition and a substitution and is preserved at Frgs. 47*a* ii, 50:L14 (Amos 5:15), and both differences appear to be interpretative. The first difference is a substitution. 4Q82 reads שְׂנֵאוּנוּ “we have hated,”

⁵⁷⁰ Although יהוה was originally omitted from the text, the original scribe likely made this correction, and thus, it is possible that יהוה was in the scribe’s exemplar. In fact, Fuller argues that all nine corrections were made by the original scribe, in Fuller, “4QXIIg,” 274.

⁵⁷¹ For a discussion of this variant, see Lange, “4QXIIg (4Q82) as an Editorial Text,” 15-16.

while the MT reads ψ אָר “hate.” This difference is a change in aspect: the 4Q82 has a first-person plural perfect while the MT reads an imperative. The second difference is an addition. 4Q82 reads יִהְיֶה “he may be gracious *to us*,” while the MT reads יִהְיֶה “he may be gracious.” Lange notes that these two differences are interpretative. By means of employing the first-person, both differences indicate that the scribe interpreted verse 15 as direct speech, a fact not entirely clear when reading the MT.⁵⁷²

Category 3. 4Q82 does not preserve category 3 variants.

Statistics and Conclusion of 4Q82’s Textual Tradition

As the previous discussion demonstrates, the differences between 4Q82 and the MT can reasonably be ascribed to the scribal process. Several other facts are important to note when assessing the nature of these variants. First, the text is fuller than the MT—from those differences that belong to category 1, 2, and 3, the text preserves eight additions, twelve substitutions, two sets of complex variants, three unclear variants, and *only one* sure omission. Second, the text has a tendency to interpret. Third, the text preserves few instances of scribal intervention. In addition to these comments about the nature of these variants, it is also important to note that 4Q82 and the MT share a high statistical relationship. These factors indicate that 4Q82 can reasonably be classified as belonging to the Masoretic tradition.

Table 29. The statistical relationship between 4Q82 and the MT

Total # of Words in 4Q82	Categories 1, 2, and 3	Statistical Relationship	Categories 2 and 3	Statistical Relationship	Category 3	Statistical Relationship
982	31	96.84%	18	98.17%	0	100%

⁵⁷² Lange, “4QXIIg (4Q82) as an Editorial Text,” 21.

Most of the Prophetic manuscripts from Qumran that Emanuel Tov identifies as exclusively belonging to the non-aligned category should be classified as preserving the Masoretic tradition for at least two reasons. First, the majority of variants preserved in these texts are minor and do not provide an adequate basis for supposing a textual tradition other than the MT. Second, each text agrees with the MT in most readings. Exceptions to the conclusion that these texts should be classified as belonging to the Masoretic tradition, may be 4Q47 and 4Q49. These texts preserve differences that can be explained in different directions while existing in highly fragmentary states. These texts are labeled ambiguous here.

CHAPTER 4

THE NON-ALIGNED TEXTS OF THE WRITINGS

This chapter analyzes the manuscripts of the Writings from Qumran that Emanuel Tov identifies exclusively as non-aligned. Each text is analyzed according to the methodology outlined in chapter 1. Then, conclusions are drawn about the textual tradition of each text. It will be demonstrated that these manuscripts, or what remains of them, can be reasonably grouped as belonging to the Masoretic tradition with few exceptions. This conclusion even applies to most of those texts that preserve Psalms: the texts potentially most at odds with their MT counterpart. In short, the argument concerning the texts preserving Psalms is largely that these texts should be understood as preserving a text belonging to the Masoretic tradition, but one that has been adapted for liturgical purposes.

4Q83

4Q83 (4QPs^a) preserves portions of Psalms 5, 25, 31, 33-36, 38, 71, 47, 53-54, 56, 62-63, 66-67, 69 in twenty fragments.¹ Ulrich, Skehan, and Flint (the editors) describe

¹ Eugene Ulrich, Patrick W. Skehan, and Peter W. Flint, eds., “4QPs^a,” in *Qumran Cave 4. XI, Psalms to Chronicles*, vol. 11, Discoveries in the Judaean Desert 16 (Oxford: Clarendon, 2000), 7-22. Based on the pattern of deterioration, Stegemann argued that 4Q83 originally preserved a large amount of text following the last identifiable fragments so that the manuscript may have originally contained a complete Psalter. *Ibid.*, 7-8. Moreover, the writing block of 4Q83 is very large (ca. 35 lines per column, see *ibid.*, 7; the term *very large* is found in Emanuel Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert*, ed. Florentino García Martínez, Peter W. Flint, and Eibert J. C. Tigheelaar, Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 54 [Boston: Brill, 2004], 88]), and this too might suggest that the text originally contained the entire Psalter. Compare Flint’s comments about 4Q83 in Peter W. Flint, *The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls and the Book of Psalms*, Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah (Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 1997), 156-57, 168.

the script as an early semiformal hand from the second century BC.² 4Q83 is likely the oldest preserved manuscript preserving psalms.³ It also preserves the second largest text in terms of content from the Psalms among the DSS (only 11Q5 preserves more content).⁴ The orthography of 4Q83 is slightly fuller than the MT: the editors note that the *vav* is used to represent *o/u*, and possibly *ā* while *vav* and *yod* are at times used to represent the *šewa*.⁵ Moreover, כּוּל and לוֹא are consistently written *plene* as are the second person pronominal suffix (כה) and the second person perfect affirmative (תה).⁶ The editors only note one possible correction written above the line, which may indicate that the scribe copied the text carefully.⁷ The text is not written in a stichographic layout.⁸

Scholars debate the textual character of 4Q83. Tov categorizes 4Q83 as a liturgical text—a Scripture-like composition—which, according to his classification grid, is a special sub-group of the non-aligned category.⁹ Lange too categorizes the text as

² Ulrich, Skehan, and Flint, “4QPsa,” 8.

³ However, 4Q98g (4QPs^x or 4QPs 89) may be older, as noted by Peter W. Flint and Andrea E. Alvarez, “The Oldest of All the Psalms Scrolls: The Text and Translation of 4QPsa,” in *The Scrolls and the Scriptures: Qumran Fifty Years After*, ed. Stanley Porter and Craig A. Evans, Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement Series 26 (Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 146.

⁴ Eugene Ulrich, “The Oldest Psalms Manuscript: 4QPsa (4Q83),” in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues*, ed. Donald W. Parry and Eugene Ulrich, Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 30 (Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 1999), 72.

⁵ Ulrich, Skehan, and Flint, “4QPsa,” 8.

⁶ *Ibid.*

⁷ *Ibid.*, 10. The amount of scribal intervention in this text is indeed meager. See Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 334. Compare the amount of scribal intervention found in other texts in *ibid.*, 332-35.

⁸ Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 168; Ulrich, “The Oldest Psalms Manuscript: 4QPsa (4Q83),” 75.

⁹ Emanuel Tov, “The Biblical Texts from the Judaean Desert—An Overview and Analysis of the Published Texts,” in *The Bible as Book: The Hebrew Bible and the Judaean Desert Discoveries*, ed. Edward D. Herbert and Emanuel Tov (New Castle, DE: Oak Knoll, 2002) 156. See also Tov’s discussion of Scripture-like compositions in Emanuel Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 3rd ed. (Minneapolis:

textually non-aligned.¹⁰

Flint does not describe 4Q83 as non-aligned but suggests that 4Q83 preserves an earlier form of the Hebrew text: “The fact that 4QPs^a contains one of the highest number of variants in proportion to its size suggests that earlier manuscripts such as this tend to preserve earlier forms of the Hebrew text.”¹¹ The preservation of “major variants,” likewise, suggests that 4Q83 preserves an alternative form of the Psalter, in Flint’s opinion.¹²

Flint further suggests that this earlier form should be understood as a different edition of the Psalter beginning with Psalms 1 or 2 and ending with 89: he labels this edition, Edition I.¹³ Ulrich, however, states, “A definite conclusion regarding the extent of this Psalter seems to be impossible, but in view of the small script and the large columns, it is possible that this scroll originally contained a complete Psalter” (i.e., Pss 1-150), contrary to Flint’s suggestion.¹⁴

Therefore, the textual nature of 4Q83 is debated: is it a liturgical text—a Scripture like text (Tov), or does it represent an earlier text form that may even represent a separate edition of the Psalter (Flint)? It is demonstrated here that despite the higher proportion of differences preserved in 4Q83, the text can still be reasonably understood

Fortress, 2012), 320-21.

¹⁰ Armin Lange, “The Textual Plurality of the Jewish Scriptures in the second Temple Period in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *Qumran and the Bible: Studying the Jewish and Christian Scriptures in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. Nóra Dávid and Armin Lange, Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology 57 (Leuven, Belgium: Peeters, 2010), 55.

¹¹ Flint and Alvarez, “The Oldest of All the Psalms Scrolls,” 147.

¹² *Ibid.*, 148-49.

¹³ Flint, *The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls*, 168. However, compare his comments here with more tentative comments made prior on pp. 156-57.

¹⁴ Ulrich, “The Oldest Psalms Manuscript: 4QPsa (4Q83),” 73.

as belonging to the Masoretic tradition (contrary to Flint). Tov's suggestion that the text is liturgical is probable.

Description and Categorization of Variants

Several proposed differences between 4Q83 and the MT are not included in the following discussion or statistics. These proposed differences include examples that depend on insufficient manuscript evidence, examples of scribal error, examples of synonymous spellings,¹⁵ and a difference concerning a *kethiv/qere*.¹⁶

Category 1. 4Q83 preserved several category 1 variants. These variants include three examples of additions, eight omissions, thirteen substitutions, and one variant with an unclear description.

Category 2. Most of the variants preserved in 4Q83 belong to category 2. Four of these category 2 variants are additions. The first addition is preserved at F4ii:L7 (Ps 36:7). Here 4Q83 adds the prepositional phrase **בֵּה** “by it.”¹⁷ The fragmentary nature of

¹⁵ One possible example of synonymous forms should be noted here. It is preserved at F20:L11 (Col 3:34 [Ps 69:17]). 4Q83 reads **כַּטוֹב הַסְדֵכָה**: “According to the goodness of your steadfast love”; contrary to the MT, which reads **כִּי־טוֹב הַסְדָּךְ**: “For your steadfast love is good.” Flint and Alvarez categorize this variant as a major variant that seems preferable due to the parallelism of this verse. Flint and Alvarez, “The Oldest of All the Psalms Scrolls,” 148. The second half of this verse states that **יָרַב רַחֲמֶיךָ פְּנֵה אֵלַי**: “According to the abundance of your mercy, turn to me.” Flint's and Alvarez's reasoning, however, is faulty since it assumes Hebrew poetry always prefers the more synonymous line. The flexibility and diversity of Hebrew parallelism, however, cautions against this reasoning. Ulrich, Skehan, and Flint, “4QPSa,” 8, suggest that the reading of 4Q83 may be an example of **כִּי** joined to the following word. This explanation would reduce this difference to a mere orthographic difference. Analogous examples of **כִּי** attached to the following word are preserved in the non-biblical DSS (i.e., 1QSa Col 1:10, 1QHa Col 7:25, 4Q504 Frgs. 1-2Riv:L13 [R referring to recto]) and in the Mishnah (i.e., m. Sukk 1:2). In each of these instances the *yod* of the **כִּי** particle remains. There are only two (possibly one) examples of the **כִּי** particle attaching to a subsequent word and apocopating the *yod*: 4Q491 F10ii:L15 (this reading, however, is not certain) and 4Q513 F13:L7. This difference may be a third example of this phenomenon.

¹⁶ For details about these proposed variants, see table “4Q83: Description of variants,” in appendix 3.

¹⁷ Martin G. Abegg, Peter W. Flint, and Eugene Charles Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible*:

the text precludes certainty about the function of the *bet* preposition and the referent of the pronominal suffix. Abegg, Flint, and Ulrich suggest that the *bet* denotes instrument and that the pronominal suffix refers back to צדקתך “your righteousness.”¹⁸ This explanation is possible, but uncertain. The text is too poorly preserved for definitive conclusions.

The second addition is preserved at F9ii:L4 (Ps 38:20). 4Q83 reads שקרי “by deceiving me,”¹⁹ while the MT reads שֶׁקֶר “without cause.”²⁰ The texts are similar albeit the addition of the pronominal suffix which functions to make the MT explicit.

The third addition is the addition of the prepositional phrase לי “to me,” preserved at F9ii:L5 (Ps 38:23). The addition simply makes the MT explicit by indicating the direction of the verb “make haste *to me*.”

The fourth category 2 addition is the addition of an entire colon preserved at F19ii:L10 (Col 3:33 [Ps 69:15]).²¹ 4Q83 reads וְאַל־אֶטְבַּעְ[ה] וְיִיקַחֲנִי גִזְלִי “[and] do not let me sink; and do not let the one who robs me take me,” while the MT reads וְאַל־אֶטְבַּעַךְ “and do not let me sink.”²² 4Q83 adds a line to David’s prayer that further identifies his enemies.

The Oldest Known Bible (San Francisco: HarperSan Francisco, 1999), 524.

¹⁸ Abegg, Flint, and Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible*, 524.

¹⁹ See the translation “by deceiving me,” in *ibid.*, 526.

²⁰ David J. A. Clines, ed., *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2011), s.v. “שֶׁקֶר.”

²¹ One can refer to the reconstructed column and line number provided by the editors (or even the fragments grouped together to form a reconstructed column), or one can refer to the exact fragment and line number corresponding to the actual fragment when citing this text. Both are provided here. The first reference given is the reference to the fragment number and the corresponding line of the fragment while the second reference is that of either the reconstructed column or the group of fragments grouped together by the editors and the corresponding reconstructed line number. If the editors reconstruct the column, the group of fragments is not listed so that the citations do not become unclear.

²² Context suggests that the negative particle applies to the additional line too. See also the translation of Abegg, Flint, and Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible*, 533.

His enemies are those who “rob/seize him,” and the prayer is that these people would not “take/conquer” David. David asks earlier in the Psalm (in both the MT and in 4Q83) “what I did not steal must I now restore? (ESV)” (Ps 69:5). In the next verse, 4Q83 preserves two variants (not found in the MT) that continue to stress David’s innocence in respect to stealing:²³ 4Q83 reads “[O God], you know that I have not borrowed that I should repay [it] (Ps 69:6).²⁴ The addition of the phrase ויקחני גזלי “and *do not* let those who rob me capture me” in Psalm 69:15, therefore, identifies the enemies as those who rob David. David is not the robber that he should repay (69:5), his enemies are (69:15 [4Q83]). The addition appears to be interpretative. Moreover, there is not a motivation for parablepsis in the MT if one assumes 4Q83 to have been the original reading.

In addition to these category 2 additions, 4Q83 preserves two omissions. The first category 2 omission is preserved at F11:L2 (Frgs. 11-12:L2 [Ps 53:4]). 4Q83 simply reads כול [“all” while the MT reads כָּל “everyone.” The omission is slight since the particle לַ can function substantially. The difference could have derived from metathesis.

The second category 2 omission is preserved at F20:L11 (Col 3:34 [Ps 69:17]). 4Q83 omits יהוה “the Lord,” which functions as a vocative in the MT. In both texts, David is still portrayed as crying out to the Lord, but the MT highlights the urgency and personal cry of David. The omission may have derived from a desire to harmonize the text since no immediate verse preserves a vocative in the MT or in 4Q83.

Substitutions in 4Q83 outnumber the instances of additions and omissions by far. The first category 2 substitution is preserved at F4ii:L5 (Ps 36:5). 4Q83 reads יחיעץ כול דרך, “he takes counsel on every way,” while the MT reads יתניצב על־דָרְךָ, “he sets himself upon the way.” Two facts indicate that this difference most likely derived from

²³ For comments about this reading, see Ulrich, Skehan, and Flint, “4QPSa,” 20.

²⁴ Compare the translation of Abegg, Flint, and Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible*, 533. This translation is based on the transcription of Flint and Alvarez, “The Oldest of All the Psalms Scrolls,” 166.

the scribal process. First, despite the two differences—the substitution of lexical stem and the substitution of the preposition על for the particle כול—the phrases are graphically similar. Second, 4Q83’s reading replaces the more general verb of the MT with a more specific verb that harmonizes to the immediate context. The MT—יִתְיַצֵּב “sets himself”—is general and its exact meaning is determined by the context. 4Q83 has interpreted this general verb in light of the context by substituting it with the verbal form יִתְיַעֵץ—to take counsel. The difference may have derived from a combination of graphic confusion and interpretation.

The second category 2 substitution is preserved at F4ii:L6 (Ps 36:6). The difference here is common. 4Q83 described God’s loving-kindness as מִהַשְׁמַיִם “from heaven,” while the MT describes it as בְּהַשְׁמַיִם “in heaven.” The substitution of the prepositions *min* and *bet* could derive from either graphic or phonological confusion.

Another category 2 substitution is preserved at F9ii:L6 (Ps 71:3). 4Q83 reads]לבי עדמׁי “my heart/a lion ????” while the MT reads לְבוֹא תָמִיד “that I might enter continually.”²⁵ The fragmentary nature of this line precludes an adequate understanding of this variant. However, again, the available evidence indicates that the confusion could have resulted from a paleographic issue. The word לבי “my heart” in 4Q83 is graphically similar to the reading of the MT: לְבוֹא “might enter.” Although the *yod/vav* are formally distinct in this manuscript,²⁶ graphic confusion between *yod/vav* could have occurred in the scribe’s exemplar. The partially preserved word]לבי “????” likewise may derive from a paleographic problem. Half of the letters of the MT’s תָּמִיד “continually” are represented by 4Q83 albeit with metathesis of *mem* and *dalet*. One should note that the letters עדמׁ do not begin any word in the MT. Thus, there is strong evidence that the reading of 4Q83 resulted from a paleographic issue, perhaps a damaged exemplar.

²⁵ See the translation of Abegg, Flint, and Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible*, 526.

²⁶ Ulrich, Skehan, and Flint, “4QPsa,” 8.

The next category 2 substitution is preserved at F9ii:L8 (Ps 71:6). This difference concerns the representation of עוֹזִי “my refuge” in 4Q83 for גּוֹי, “who took me.” This difference likewise can either be explained as deriving from interpretation or a paleographic problem. Two factors suggest that the difference derived from interpretation. First, the MT’s reading is a *hapax*, and second, the following verse declares God to be a “strong refuge.” 4Q83 might be interpreting the text in light of its immediate context.

The next category 2 substitution is preserved at F18:L4 (Col 2:35 [Ps 67:8]). 4Q83 reads]יברכוכה אלהים], “may they bless you, O God,” while the MT reads יְבָרְכֵנוּ אֱלֹהִים, “may God bless us.” While the difference between a singular noun and a plural noun most often denotes a difference between a collective singular and a plural, in this instance, the difference is material as indicated by the interchange of pronominal suffixes. The MT alternates subjects in the immediate context: at times God is the subject, and at other times humanity is the subject. The scribe may be harmonizing the text by substituting the subjects, but the poor state of the text’s preservation prohibits a thorough investigation of this theory.

The next substitution is preserved at F20:L2 (Col 3:25 [Ps 69:3]). 4Q83 reads בֵּין, “between,” while the MT reads בֵּינָן, “in mud.” On the one hand, the readings are similar graphically and phonologically, and this fact suggests a type of unintentional change. The word of the MT only occurs twice in the OT, but it was well known by scribes. This fact is clear since the LXX and Vulgate translate the word literally. The Targums figurative translation also indicates that they were familiar with the word as does the Mishnah’s interpretation of the word of Psalm 40:3 at m. Miqw 9:2. The difference, then, likely did not derive from a misunderstanding of the word.

The difference is likely a case of interpretation. It is possible that the scribe attempted to make the lines more synonymous. Notice how in the MT of verse 3 David is said to first, sink into the depths of the mud; second, to enter into the depths of the waters; and third, to be overflowed with floods. By substituting “mud” for “between,” the

scribe describes David's troubles in terms of water in all three occasions. A more probable explanation explains the difference in light of the word *מְצוּלָה*. This noun often denotes depths of water (e.g., Jonah 2:4; Ps 68:23), not mud, and this may have triggered the reading *בִּין*.

The variant is likely just one case of substitution and is preserved at F19ii:L5 (Col 3:28 [Ps 69:6]). 4Q83 reads]אתה ידעתה לוא לויחי ואשלמנ] “you know that I have not borrowed that I shall repay,” while the MT reads אַתָּה יָדַעְתָּ לְאוֹלְתִי וְאִשְׁמוֹתִי “you know my folly. My guilt . . .” Like most category 2 variants that result in a major difference, this category 2 substitution resembles the MT reading graphically. Moreover, the differences harmonize the verse to the immediate context. David prays in the previous verse, “What I did not steal must I now restore? (ESV).²⁷ 4Q83, therefore, continues this thought by means of its substitutions. This text has demonstrated a tendency toward interpretation and this tendency may again be evident here.

Faulty word division and perhaps graphic confusion could have resulted in 4Q83's reading מי זר הייתי] “Oh, I exist as a stranger,” which substitutes for the MT's מוֹזֵר הָיִיתִי “I exist as a stranger” at F20:L6 (Col 3:29 [Ps 69:9]). Initial confusion of *vav/yod* would have led to the word division preserved in 4Q83. It should be noted that the *hophal* of זור “be strange” occurs only once in the MT. Perhaps this unique form led to the reading in 4Q83.

The next category 2 substitution is preserved at F20:L7 (Col 3:30 [Ps 69:11]). 4Q83 reads ואך בצום נפשי “but I struck my soul with fasting,”²⁸ while the MT reads וְאָרְבָּקָה וְנָפְשִׁי “My soul—I wept with fasting.”²⁹ Flint and Alvarez categorize this variant as a

²⁷ Ulrich, Skehan, and Flint, “4QPSa,” 20.

²⁸ Abegg, Flint, and Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible*, 533.

²⁹ This phrase includes two subjects—one of the person (first person subject of the verb) and one of a thing (my soul). This idiom is described in Wilhelm Gesenius, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, ed. E. Kautzsch and A. E. Cowley, 2nd English ed. (Oxford: Clarendon, 1910), §144l. This idiom is distinct from

major variant that makes better contextual sense.³⁰ However, it is important to note that the verbal root *בכה*, “to smite” (the verb of 4Q83), never occurs with the object *צום* “fasting.” Rather, if a verbal root is used to denote fasting, the verbal root *ענה*, “to afflict,” is often used in conjunction with the object *צום*, “fasting,” or the verbal root *צום*, “to fast,” is used. Flint and Alvarez’s suggestion would be a unique construction found nowhere else in the MT. On the other hand, the MT phrase too is unique and obscure: what exactly does it mean for one’s soul to weep? The reading of 4Q83, therefore, can be explained as an interpretation that attempts to make sense of an exemplar close to the MT without drastically altering the exemplar’s reading. This phenomenon is pervasive in this text.

The next category 2 substitution is preserved at F19ii:L8 (Col 3:31 [Ps 69:12]). 4Q83 reads *ויהי*, “and it existed,” while the MT reads *וַיֵּאָרֶה*, “and I existed.” The reading of 4Q83 harmonizes the subject of the verse’s second clause to the immediate context since the same verb occurs in the previous verse but with a 3fs subject (*נַפְשִׁי* “soul”). The difference, therefore, is slight, since both subjects refer to the same person and likely indicates the scribe’s tendency to interpret.

The next category 2 substitution is preserved at F19ii:L8 (Col 3:31 [Ps 69:13]). Here 4Q83 transposes a prepositional phrase.³¹ 4Q83 reads *יְשִׁיחוּ בִּי יֹשְׁבֵי שַׁעַר*, “[th]ose who sit in the gate talk about me,” whereas the MT reads *יְשִׁיחוּ בִּי יֹשְׁבֵי שַׁעַר*, “those who sit in the gate talk about me” (the difference being the word order and placement of the prepositional phrase). This difference represents only a slight difference.

the accusative of the organ, which often accompanies verbs of speaking (ibid., §117s) since the subject of the thing always takes a “suffix in the same person as the personal subject.” Ibid., §144l.

³⁰ Flint and Alvarez, “The Oldest of All the Psalms Scrolls,” 148.

³¹ Ulrich, Skehan, and Flint, “4QPsa,” 21, argue that this variant is not an instance of transposition, but an instance of omission and addition; namely, the *בִּי* of 4Q83 is to be read with the second half of the verse, not the first, contrary to the MT. This explanation, however, is unnecessarily convoluted since transposition also accounts for the difference.

The next category 2 substitution is preserved at F20:L8 (Col 3:31 [Ps 69:13]). 4Q83 reads ׀נגנון, “they sing,” contrary to the MT which reads וּנְגִינוֹת, “and songs.” The first letter of 4Q83 is likely a *yod*, not a *vav* like the reading of the MT. The second and third letters match both readings, but the fourth again appears to side with the editors’ proposed reading against the MT. The most common explanations for the differences in this manuscript are again applicable here: the difference could have arisen from graphic confusion, interpretation, or a combination of the two. The MT reading, וּנְגִינוֹת שׁוֹתֵי שֶׁכָּר, “with songs those who drink strong drink,” implies a verb corresponding to the act of “singing.” 4Q83 supplies this verb.

Two category 2 substitutions are preserved at F19ii:L9 (Col 3:32 [Ps 69:14]). 4Q83 reads וְאֲנִי תְּפִלַּתִּי לְמָהּ [יְהוָה] עַתָּה רְצוֹן, “and I, what is my prayer, [O Lor]d? Now is (a time of) acceptance,” while the MT reads וְאֲנִי תְּפִלַּתִּי לְךָ יְהוָה עַת רְצוֹן, “and I, my prayer is to you, O Lord, at the acceptable time.” Both of these substitutions share at least two features. First, the similarity graphically is striking. This fact is evident in the first substitution where 4Q83 substitutes the prepositional phrase לְךָ “to you” of the MT with the interrogative pronoun of 4Q83 לְמָהּ “what/why.” The main difference regarding this substitution is between the letters *mem* and *kap*, which is usually, minimal. The second variant—4Q83’s reading of עַתָּה “now” against the MT’s עַת “time”—are likewise graphically similar. Second, in both of these variants 4Q83 adds a nuance not found in the MT by means of the substitution. However, the detail of the MT which 4Q83 substituted is supplied by the context in both variants. Thus, the difference, appearing to be more intentional than unintentional, might suggest another instance of interpretation.

The next category 2 substitution is found at F19ii:L10 (Col 3:33 [Ps 69:15]). 4Q83 reads הַצְּלֵנוּ [הַצְּ] יְלֵנִי, “[deliv]er me,” while the MT reads אֲנַצְּלֵךְ, “let me be delivered.” The *hiphal* imperative preserved in 4Q83 here is found in both the MT and 4Q83 earlier in the verse. The fluctuation of tense and verbal stem in the MT is, thus, harmonized in 4Q83.

The next category 2 substitution is found at F19ii:L11 (Col 3:34 [Ps 69:16]). 4Q83 reads פִּי “my mouth,” while the MT reads פִּיהָ, “its mouth.” According to 4Q83, David’s prayer is that “or the pit [close] my mouth [on me].”³² The prayer according to the MT is that “or the pit close *its mouth* on me.” The substitution of pronominal suffixes changes the perspective slightly, but the imagery remains the same: David is praying that he would figuratively not drown.

The final two category 2 variants concern forms of the imperative and are found at F19ii:L12 (Col 3:35 [Ps 69:18]) and F19ii:L12 (Col 3:35 [Ps 69:19]). Interestingly, each text reads an emphatic imperative where the other text reads a simple imperative. In Psalm 69:18, just enough of the form of 4Q83 is present to indicate that the form was an emphatic imperative מֵהָרָה “make haste!” contrary to the MT’s form מְהֵרָה “hasten.” The reverse is found in Psalms 69:19. 4Q83 reads קִרְבֵּךְ “draw near,” while the MT reads קְרַבְּךָ, “draw near!”

Three further category 2 variants cannot be precisely described. The first unclear variant is preserved at F7:L6 (Frgs. 7-8:L6 [Ps 38:12]). 4Q83 reads מִנְּגִד רְעִי וּמִיּוֹדָעִי, “before my friends and compani[ons],”³³ contrary to the MT which reads אֶהְבֵּי וְרְעִי מִנְּגִד נְגַעֵי יַעֲמָדוּ, “my friends and my companions, they stand away from my plagues.” Unfortunately, the fragment is poorly preserved so one cannot be sure about the exact nature of these differences. Graphic similarity between the MT’s אֶהְבֵּי וְרְעִי מִנְּגִד נְגַעֵי יַעֲמָדוּ and מִנְּגִד רְעִי וּמִיּוֹדָעִי may suggest that the scribe has substituted יַעֲמָדוּ for רְעִי וּמִיּוֹדָעִי and נְגַעֵי for רְעִי. However, it is possible that 4Q83’s reading substitutes אֶהְבֵּי for רְעִי וּמִיּוֹדָעִי and rearranges the word order. The fragmentary evidence precludes any firm conclusions.³⁴ However, 4Q83 preserves some type of substitution.

³² Abegg, Flint, and Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible*, 533.

³³ *Ibid.*, 525.

³⁴ Although this variant is unclear, the reading certainly represents a variant. Therefore, it will

Another category 2 variant is unclear: it may either represent an omission or a transposition. Although fragmentary evidence precludes an exact understanding of the variant, enough evidence is preserved to indicate a variant. The variant occurs at F20:L5 (Col 3:28 [Ps 69:7]). 4Q83 reads *אל יבֹּשׁוּ קוֹיִכָּה אֲדֹנָי יְהוִה צְבָאוֹת* [Do not] let those who hope in you be [as]hamed, O L[ord G]o[d of hosts,]” which reads contrary to the MT: *אֲלֵי־בֹשׁוּ בִי קוֹיִךְ אֲדֹנָי יְהוִה צְבָאוֹת*, “do not let those who hope in you be ashamed because of me, O Lord God of hosts.” Although this transcription describes the variant as an omission, not enough of the *aleph* of אֲדֹנָי “Lord” is present to substantiate this claim. It is possible that the prepositional phrase *בִּי* “because of me” was present in the lacuna after קוֹיִכָּה “those who hope in you.” Conclusions about this variant, therefore, are uncertain. The evidence is too sparse.³⁵

The next unclear variant is very similar to the last one: it may either represent an omission or a transposition of the same prepositional phrase. It is preserved at F20:L6 (Col 3:29 [Ps 69:7]). Again, although fragmentary evidence precludes an exact understanding of the variant, enough evidence is preserved to indicate a variant. 4Q83 reads *אל [י] כְּלָמוּ מִבְּקִשְׁיִכָּה*, “do not let those who seek you be humiliated.” The MT reads *אלֵי־יְכַלְמוּ בִּי מִבְּקִשְׁיִךְ*, “do not let those who seek you be humiliated because of me.” The prepositional phrase could be positioned before the negative particle. The fragmentary evidence, again, precludes certainty.

The first complex variant that belongs to category 2 is preserved at F9ii:L2 (Ps 38:16) and is composed of several smaller variants. 4Q83 reads *אֲדֹנָי אַתָּה תַעֲנֵנִי כִּי אֱלֹהֵי*, “O Lord, you will answer me for my God” while the MT reads *אַתָּה תַעֲנֵנִי אֱלֹהֵי* “you will answer, O Lord my God.” There are three differences between these two texts, all of which

receive two points in the statistics, which corresponds to the difference deriving from graphic confusion. This approach would yield a more conservative statistical relationship between the texts.

³⁵ This variant will receive one point in the statistics as if it were a mere transposition of words since this yields the more conservative statistical relationship.

can be ascribed to the scribal process. First, the word order is slightly different. Part of the vocative—O Lord—of the MT is moved forward to the beginning of the clause. Second, by only moving part of the MT’s vocative forward, the second component of the divine title of the MT now serves a second function not found in the MT; namely, to state the reason why God will answer David. The scribe states this reason by adding a כִּי “because” particle.³⁶ Third, 4Q83 makes the object of the verb explicit. One should notice that this difference could have resulted from graphic confusion: the MT’s *he* could be mistaken for a *nun* and *yod*. Overall, these differences result in a more explicit text with an added additional nuance.

The second complex category 2 group of variants is preserved at F9ii:L4 (Ps 38:21). 4Q83 reads *וְשֹׁנֵי תַחַת דְּבַר טוֹב*, “he plunder(s) me because (I) speak good,” while the MT reads *וְשֹׁטְנוּנֵי תַחַת דְּוֹפִי-רָדְפָי טוֹב*, “they accuse me because I follow good (ESV).” This section of verse 21 preserves several variants. Two variants concern the substitution of lexical stems: the MT has *שָׁטַן* “to accuse,” while 4Q83 has *שָׁסַס* “to plunder.” The readings are graphically similar. Moreover, the infinitive construct of the MT is from the root *דָּרַף* “to pursue,” while 4Q83 has either a noun or an infinitive construct from the root *דָּבַר* “word” or “to speak.”³⁷ 4Q83’s reading *דְּבַר* “word” fits the context since it contrasts with the activity of the enemies of the prior verse: they hate David “with lies.” One further variant concerns the omission of the pronominal suffix. This difference is minor and could be supplied by context. The similarity between these forms graphically suggests that a type of graphic confusion caused them, but perhaps interpretation was also a motivation.

The third complex category 2 group of variants is preserved at F12:L2 (Frgs. 11-12:L4 [Ps 53:7]). 4Q83 reads *בְּיוֹם צִיּוֹן*, “on the day of Zion,” while the MT reads *מִצִּיּוֹן*,

³⁶ Verses 16-19 all begin with *ki* clauses in the MT.

³⁷ The imperfect verb of 4Q83 may not differ regarding number—it may be defective.

“from Zion.” This substitution of these prepositions is common and could derive from either graphic or phonological confusion. However, the addition of יום “day” is more complicated to explain. Perhaps the difference could be conceived as developing in two stages. First, a scribe confused the *mem* preposition for a *bet*. Second, in order to make sense of the *bet* preposition, the scribe added יום “day.” This addition would indicate that salvation comes to Israel at a certain time (4Q83),³⁸ as opposed to salvation coming from a certain location (MT).

The next complex group of variants that occur together are preserved at F20:L3 (Col 3:26 [Ps 69:4]). 4Q82’s reads [ישראל] כלי שני בחיל לאלהי יש, “my teeth have become consumed with agony for the God of Israel,” while the MT reads קלו עיני מניחל לאלהי, “my eyes have become dim as they waited for my God.” The reading of 4Q83 is very difficult and lacks precedent in the MT since שן “tooth” is never the subject of the verb כלה “be complete, be finished.” Abegg, Flint, and Ulrich too note that the meaning of 4Q83 is uncertain.³⁹ This difference may have derived from graphic confusion. The sequence עי could be construed as ש especially if the *yod* approached the base line. Graphic similarity also explains the substitution of the *mem* performative and the *bet* preposition. The reading of 4Q83 בחיל evidences metathesis of letters—MT reads מניחל. Moreover, the substitution of the MT’s לאלהי “for my God” as [ישראל] לאלהי “for the God of Israel” harmonizes this verse to verse 7. It is imaginable that if a scribe was copying from a damaged text, he would at times look to the surrounding context to aid his transcriptions.⁴⁰ Thus, the high proportion of graphically similar differences might indicate a paleographic problem.

³⁸ One should note that the second half of this verse begins with a temporal clause.

³⁹ See Abegg, Flint, and Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible*, 532n115.

⁴⁰ Drew Longacre suggests that this is the approach, at times, of the scribe of 1QIsa^a. See Drew Longacre, “Developmental Stage, Scribal Lapse, or Physical Defect? 1QIsaa’s Damaged Exemplar for Isaiah’s Chapters 34-66,” *Dead Sea Discoveries* 20, no. 1 (2013): 49.

Category 3. 4Q83 does not possess any certain category 3 variants.

Differences likely caused by excerpted nature. 4Q83 may possess up to three category 3 variants, but these variants are better categorized as differences deriving from the excerpted nature, and thus, not included in categories 1, 2, or 3. The first potential category 3 variant concerns the order of psalms found in the manuscript. Flint labels this type of variant a “macro variant.”⁴¹ 4Q83 preserves the sequence Psalm 31 to 33 omitting or transposing Psalm 32 as does 4Q98. The fact that many scrolls preserving Psalms are excerpted texts gives some precedent for understanding 4Q83 as excerpted. However, one should note that 4Q83 possesses a very large writing block (35 lines per column);⁴² excerpted texts are typically much smaller. Tov is right to indicate that differences that derive from the nature of the excerpted text—such as rearranged text and large-scale omissions—cannot be evidence for a different textual tradition.⁴³

The second and third difference that likely derive from the text’s function concerns disagreements about how to divide the Psalms. 4Q83 begins Psalm 71 on the same line as the ending of Psalm 38 with only a slight interval in between them. Ulrich, Skehan, and Flint argue that the continuation of Psalm 71 on the same line with a dearth of space between it and Psalm 38 suggests that the Psalms were conceived as a single psalm.⁴⁴ However, Tov understands the space between these psalms as corresponding to a closed section, a phenomenon that occurs elsewhere among the DSS.⁴⁵ Thus, the

⁴¹ Flint, *The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls*, 153.

⁴² Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 88.

⁴³ See Emanuel Tov, “Excerpted and Abbreviated Biblical Texts from Qumran,” *Revue de Qumran* 16, no. 4 (December 1995): 599.

⁴⁴ Ulrich, Skehan, and Flint, “4QPsa,” 15.

⁴⁵ Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 164.

conclusion of the editors is not conclusive. Furthermore, Ulrich, Skehan, and Flint suggest that a reconstructed interval between Psalm 36:5 and 36:6 suggests that the scribe understood what follows Psalm 36:5 as a new psalm.⁴⁶ One should note that this interval is based on spatial reconstructions. It is possible that the scribe skipped this space for reasons besides indicating a content division (e.g., the leather could be damaged).

Even though the editors' conclusions are not conclusive, the phenomenon of representing two psalms as one or one psalm as two are phenomena not uncommon among the Hebrew manuscripts, even manuscripts that clearly belong to the Masoretic tradition.⁴⁷ Yarchin discusses that liturgical reasons affected the layout of the Great Hallel; namely, whether it was regarded as two psalms or one. For example, both Leningrad and Aleppo understand Psalms 114 and 115 as a single psalm resulting in a Psalter comprised of 149 psalms, not 150.⁴⁸ Further differences concerning the exact division between the psalms is also present in other Medieval manuscripts—manuscripts that clearly preserve the Masoretic tradition. For instances, at times Psalms 92 and 93 are represented as one psalm as are Psalms 96 and 97.⁴⁹ Moreover, rabbinic literature demonstrates that the Psalter was not always divided into 150 individual Psalms (see y. Šabb. 16:1, 15c, which states that the book of Psalms was comprised of 147 Psalms). This statement by no means indicates that there was not a standard authoritative Psalter since the precise number of *hallejahs* (123) is cited in this discussion. Knowledge of the precise number of *hallejahs* would only be possible if there was a standard text. Therefore, the statement that the Psalter contained 147 psalms concerns disagreements

⁴⁶ See Ulrich, Skehan, and Flint, “4QPsa,” 14.

⁴⁷ William Yarchin, “Were the Psalms Collections at Qumran True Psalters?” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 134, no. 4 (2015): 775-89.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 780.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 786. See also the LXX that groups Ps 9 and 10 together as a single psalm and yet it is well known that the LXX preserves a Masoretic edition of the Psalter.

about how to divide the psalms of the canonical Psalter. Thus, grouping two psalms as one or one as two within Masoretic texts undermines the value of these proposed variants since these differences are found in later stable Masoretic texts. Nonetheless, one should note that whether 4Q83 attests to differences at all in these two instances is uncertain.

Statistics and Conclusion of 4Q83's Textual Tradition

The textual tradition preserved in 4Q83 can reasonably be identified as belonging to the Masoretic tradition.⁵⁰ The text preserves a number of variants, but contrary to Flint and Alvarez, who state that the high proportion of variants indicates its independent nature,⁵¹ most of these variants can reasonably be described as interpretations. Interestingly, an overwhelming majority of the category 2 substitutions appear to be interpretations but also remain graphically and phonetically similar to the reading of the MT.⁵² This phenomenon may indicate a tendency to interpret an exemplar close to the MT without changing the text drastically or possibly that the scribe copied the text from memory or diction.⁵³

⁵⁰ The editors transcribe 64 that depend on insufficient manuscript evidence. Lange argues that 420 words are preserved in this text in Armin Lange, "Collecting Psalms in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *A Teacher for All Generations: Essays in Honor of James C. Vanderkam*, ed. Eric F. Mason et al., vol. 2, Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 153 (Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 2012), 300. The methodologies employed are similar except for how a word is counted. For Lange, מלכו is one word. Here, it is two. This difference likely results in the discrepancies found between these word counts although subjective judgment about what is adequately preserved and what is not likely accounts for some differences too.

⁵¹ Flint and Alvarez, "The Oldest of All the Psalms Scrolls," 147.

⁵² This feature might indicate that the scribe copied from a damaged exemplar. Longacre argues that 1QIsa^a was copied from a damaged exemplar in Longacre, "Developmental Stage, Scribal Lapse, or Physical Defect?," 17-50.

⁵³ There is no omission with a clear motivation for parablepsis in this text, a typical error when texts are copied from an exemplar.

Table 30. Graphically similar variants

Variants that are Graphically Similar					
Category	Description of Variant	Fragment, Line, and Verse	4Q83	MT	Detailed Description of Variant
Graphically Similar Variants that are likely Interpretive					
2	Substitution	F1:L4 (Ps 5:13)	בצנה	כצנה	Substitution of Similar Preposition
		F9ii:L8 (Ps 71:6)	עווי	גווי	Substitutions of lexeme
		F20:L2 (Col 3:25) (Ps 69:3)	בין	ביון	Substitution: Graphic Similarity
		F19ii:L5 (Col 3:28) (Ps 69:6)	אתה ידעתה לוא לוייתו ואשלמנן]	אתה ידעתה לאולתי ואשמותי	Substitution: Likely graphic confusion
		F20:L7 (Col 3:30) (Ps 69:11)	ואך בצום נפשי	ואכפה בצום נפשי	Substitution of Lexeme
	F20:L8 (Col 3:31) (Ps 69:13)	ינגנון]	ונגינות	Substitution: graphic similarity or interpretation	
Complex Variants	F9ii:L2 (Ps 38:16)	אדני אתה תענני כי אלהי	אתה מענה אדני אלהי	Transposition and Additions	
Graphically Similar Variants, but not Likely Interpretive					
1	Substitution	F9ii:L6 (Ps 71:2)	הצילני	מצילני	Substitution of Tense
2	Substitution	F4ii:L6 (Ps 36:6)	מהשמים	מהשמים	Substitution of Preposition: graphic/phonologic similarity
Graphically Similar Variants: Uncertain					
1	Addition	F18:L3 (Col 2:34) (Ps 67:6)	וידוכה	יודוה	Addition of Conjunctive vav
2	Substitution	F4ii:L5 (Ps 36:5)	יתיעץ כול דרך	יתעצב על-דרך	Substitution: Lexeme and particle - graphic similarity
		F9ii:L6 (Ps 71:3)	לבי עדמם]	לבוא תמיד	Substitution: Graphic Similarity
		F20:L6 (Col 3:29) (Ps 69:9)	מי זר הייתי]	מוזר הייתי	Substitution: Likely graphic confusion
		F20:L8 (Col 3:31) (Ps 69:13)	ינגנון]	ונגינות	Substitution: graphic similarity or interpretation
		F19ii:L9 (Col 3:32) (Ps 69:14)	ואני תפלתי למה יהוה עתה רצון	ואני תפלקתי לך יהוה עת רצון	Substitution: Graphic Similarity
	Complex Variants	F9ii:L4 (Ps 38:21)	יישסני תחת דבר טוב	ישטנוני תחת דודפי-רדפי-טוב	Substitutions
	F20:L3 (Col 3:26) (Ps 69:4)	כליו שני בחיל לאלהי יש[ראל]	כלו עיני מוחל לאלהי	Substitutions and Addition	

These variants, therefore, suggest that the high proportion of variants preserved

in 4Q83 do not necessarily indicate the text’s independent status, but might indicate it as an interpretative text (perhaps an updated text), as a text copied from an exemplar with paleographic problems, as a text with a combination of these issues, or a text copied from memory. Presupposing the MT as this text’s exemplar makes sense of all of the differences, and thus, the text can reasonably be categorized as belonging to the Masoretic tradition.

Table 31. The statistical relationship between 4Q83 and the MT

Total # of Words in 4Q83	Categories 1, 2, and 3	Statistical Relationship	Categories 2 and 3	Statistical Relationship	Category 3	Statistical Relationship
558	73	86.92%	48	91.40%	0	100%

4Q84

4Q84 (4QPs^b) preserves portions of Psalms 91-94, 96, 98-100, 102-103, 112-113, 115, 116-118.⁵⁴ Ulrich, Skehan, and Flint (the editors) describe the script as a late Herodian hand from the middle of the first century AD, while the orthography is less full than the MT.⁵⁵ The text is written in a stichometric format with three to four words per line, except from Psalm 118, which has a full verse per line.⁵⁶ An average of one correction is made per every 43 lines by the original scribe.⁵⁷

Scholars debate the textual character of 4Q84. Tov categorizes 4Q84 as a liturgical text (a type of excerpted text)—a Scripture-like composition—which, according

⁵⁴ Eugene Ulrich, Patrick W. Skehan, and Peter W. Flint, “4QPs^b,” in *Qumran Cave 4. XI, Psalms to Chronicles*, 23-48.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, 24.

⁵⁶ Patrick William Skehan, “Psalm Manuscript from Qumran (4Q Psb),” *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 26, no. 3 (July 1964): 3134; Ulrich, Skehan, and Flint, “4QPs^b,” 24.

⁵⁷ Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 334. See also Ulrich, Flint, and Skehan who list the four corrections in Ulrich, Skehan, and Flint, “4QPs^b,” 26.

to his classification grid, is a special sub-group of the non-aligned text.⁵⁸ The text is small, which likely indicates that it did not contain the whole book of Psalms; rather, it appears to be excerpted, possibly for liturgical reasons, per Tov's suggestion.⁵⁹ Tov further suggests that the same collection of Psalms preserved in 11Q5, 11Q6, 4Q87 is also likely preserved in 4Q84.⁶⁰ Flint, however, disagrees with this point since 4Q84 conflicts with 11Q5 regarding the position of Psalm 93.⁶¹ Lange categorizes the text as textually non-aligned.⁶² Although Ulrich, Skehan, and Flint do not use the label non-aligned, they argue that the omission or transposition of Psalms 104-111 in 4Q84 represents a major variant against the Masoretic Psalter.⁶³

Description and Categorization of Variants

Several variants listed by the editors will not be included in the following discussion or statistics. These include two proposed variants that depend on insufficient manuscript evidence, three differences that might be synonymous spellings, one example of 4Q84 representing *הללוייה* as one word, not two, one difference that is corrected to the

⁵⁸ Tov, "The Biblical Texts from the Judaean Desert," 156. See also Tov's discussion of Scripture-like compositions in Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 320-21; Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 334.

⁵⁹ Tov, "Excerpted and Abbreviated Biblical Texts," 594-95. Tov argues that small dimensions of a scroll might indicate a text's excerpted nature since "it is difficult to imagine how the scroll would have contained all of the biblical book in a scroll of limited dimensions." *Ibid.*, 596. He cites b. B. Bat 14a to support this suggestion.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, 594-95.

⁶¹ Flint, *The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls*, 165.

⁶² Lange, "Textual Plurality," 55.

⁶³ Ulrich, Skehan, and Flint, "4QPsb," 23. It is important to note that the omission or transposition of Pss 104-111 is only a major variant if 4Q84 is an actual Psalter. However, strong evidence suggests that the text is an excerpted text, and thus, one should not understand differences that derive from the excerpting process—such as rearranged text and large-scale omissions—as evidence for a text's alternative textual tradition. See Tov, "Excerpted and Abbreviated Biblical Texts," 599.

MT by the original scribe, and one further example concerning a *kethiv/qere* (4Q84 follows the *qere*).⁶⁴

Category 1. 4Q84 preserves several category 1 variants. These include two additions, three omissions, and eight substitutions.

Category 2. 4Q84 preserves one category 2 addition at F5ii:L4 (Col 4:15 [Ps 92:15]).⁶⁵ 4Q84 reads בְּשִׂיבָה טוֹבָה, “in a good old age,” while the MT reads בְּשִׂיבָה, “in old age.” The addition harmonizes Psalm 92:15 to a common idiom. The prepositional phrase *bet*, plus the noun שִׂיבָה, “old age,” occurs five times in the MT (Gen 15:15; 25:8; Jdg 8:32; Ps 92:15; 1 Chr 29:28). In each of these occurrences, the noun שִׂיבָה is modified by the adjective טוֹב, except for here at Psalm 92:15. The addition, therefore, either intentionally or unintentionally harmonizes this unique reading to the more common expression.

In addition to one category 2 addition, 4Q84 further preserves two category 2 omissions. The first omission is preserved at F18i:L7 (Col 20:16 [Ps 102:17]). 4Q84 reads בְּכָבוֹד, “in glory,” while the MT reads בְּכָבוֹדוֹ, “in his glory.” The omission simply makes the text less explicit. Whereas the MT describes the Lord as appearing in *his* glory, 4Q84 simply describes the Lord appearing *in* glory.

The second omission is preserved at F28ii:L6–7 (Col 34:14 [Ps 118:11–12]). 4Q84 omits גַּם־סָבְבוּנִי בְּשֵׁם יְהוָה כִּי אֶמְלֵם: סָבְבוּנִי “indeed, they have surrounded me; in the name of the Lord indeed I cut them off. They surround me . . .” The omission can be

⁶⁴ For further information concerning these differences, see table “4Q84: Description of variants,” in appendix 3.

⁶⁵ One can refer to the reconstructed column and line number provided by the editors (or even the fragments grouped together to form a reconstructed column), or to the exact fragment and line number corresponding to the actual fragment. Both are provided here. The first reference given is the reference to the fragment number and the corresponding line of the fragment while the second reference is that of either the reconstructed column or the group of fragments grouped together by the editors and the corresponding reconstructed line number. If the editors reconstruct the column, the group of fragments is not listed so that the citations do not become unclear.

described as a case of parablepsis due to haplography: the scribe's eyes skipping from סבוני to סבוני.

The text preserves two category 2 substitutions. The first category 2 substitution is preserved at F18i:L5: (Col 20:14 [Ps 102:16]). 4Q84 reads כבודו, “his glory,” while the MT reads כְּבוֹדְךָ, “your glory.”⁶⁶ Psalm 102:16 is comprised of two synonymous lines that describe the response of the nations/kings of the earth to the Lord rebuilding Zion. The first line of the MT and 4Q84 reads “and the nations fear the name of the Lord,”⁶⁷ but the second lines differs in one detail. Whereas the MT represents the psalmist as speaking directly to God, “your glory,” 4Q84 does not; it says, “his glory.” 4Q84 harmonizes the lines so that both lines speak about God, not to God. The difference is a harmonization to the immediate context.

A harmonization to a common phrase reasonably explains the second category 2 substitution preserved at F15ii:L5 (Col 21:5 [Ps 102:20]). Here 4Q84 reads מִמְעוֹן קֹדְשׁוֹ, “from his holy habitation,” while the MT reads מִמְרוֹם קֹדְשׁוֹ, “from his holy height.” God's actions in three passages take place מִמְעוֹן קֹדְשׁוֹ/וֹ, “from your/his holy habitation” (i.e., Deut 26:15; Jer 25:30; Zech 2:13), but are only once said to occur מִמְרוֹם קֹדְשׁוֹ, “from his holy height” (i.e., Ps 102:20). Moreover, God's dwelling is described as a מִמְעוֹן קֹדְשׁוֹ/וֹ five times in the MT (i.e., Deut 28:15; Jer 25:30; Zech 2:13; Ps 68:6; 2 Chr 30:27), whereas God's dwelling is only described once in the MT as his holy height (i.e., here at Ps 102:20).⁶⁸ The difference is an example of harmonization to a more common phrase.⁶⁹

⁶⁶ The actual form of the MT is a pausal form, כְּבוֹדְךָ.

⁶⁷ The only difference in this line is that 4Q84 has omitted a conjunctive *vav* found in the MT.

⁶⁸ However, see Ezek 20:40 where God's dwelling is described as בְּהַר־קֹדְשׁוֹ “on my holy mountain” with the appositional clause בְּהַר מְרוֹם יִשְׂרָאֵל “on the mountain height of Israel.”

⁶⁹ It is possible to suggest that this substitution was not just a case of harmonization to a more common phrase, but a case of harmonization to a particular text: namely, Deut 26:16 (see Ulrich, Skehan, and Flint, “4QPs^b,” 39). There is a high level of correspondence between these texts including the similar prepositional phrase, the root of the verb, and the juxtaposition of God's holy habitation/height with the

Category 3. 4Q84 does not preserve any category 3 variants.

Differences likely caused by excerpted nature. 4Q84 preserves a slightly different arrangement of psalms. On fragment 25, the scroll moves from Psalm 103 to Psalm 112, and thus, either omits or transposes Psalms 104-111. Ulrich, Flint, and Skehan argue that this variant is “the single most significant variant in the scroll.”⁷⁰ However, the small dimensions of this manuscript and the fact that the Psalms were often subjugated to excerpting indicates that this variant likely does not indicate a separate textual tradition, but results from the excerpting process.

Statistics and Conclusion of 4Q84’s Textual Tradition

The textual tradition preserved in 4Q84 can reasonably be identified as the Masoretic tradition.⁷¹ Several reasons suggest this conclusion. First, the variants can reasonably be explained as deriving from the scribal process. Second, the texts agree in most readings. Third, the texts, not only agree in most readings, but is the vast majority of sense units. In fact, Tov argues that the proto-MT scribes are those responsible for developing the stichometric layout.⁷² Thus, this text is most likely excerpted from a

phrase “from heaven.” This correspondence might suggest that that the scribe is harmonizing 4Q84 to Deuteronomy 26:16 in particular.

⁷⁰ Ulrich, Flint, and Skehan, “4QPsb,” 42.

⁷¹ Ninety-three words are transcribed by the editors but not accepted as sufficiently preserved in the total word counts. Compare the total word count in Lange, “Collecting Psalms,” 300. He states that 490 words are sufficiently preserved in 4Q84, but note how he counts a word: he understands מלכו as one word whereas here it is understood as two. *Ibid.*, 299.

⁷² Emanuel Tov, “The Background of the Stichometric Arrangements of Poetry in The Judean Desert Scrolls,” in *Prayer and Poetry in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature: Essays on Prayer and Poetry in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature in Honor of Eileen Schuller on the Occasion of Her 65th Birthday*, ed. Jeremy Penner, Ken M. Penner, and Cecilia Wassen, *Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah* 98 (Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 2012), 409-20.

Masoretic exemplar. It belongs to the Masoretic tradition.⁷³

Table 32. The statistical relationship between 4Q84 and the MT

Total # of Words in 4Q84	Categories 1, 2, and 3	Statistical Relationship	Categories 2 and 3	Statistical Relationship	Category 3	Statistical Relationship
595	28	95.29%	15	97.48%	0	100%

4Q86

4Q86 (4QPs^d) preserves portions of Psalms 106 (possibly), 147, and 104 in fourteen fragments.⁷⁴ The script is described as a late Hasmonaen hand from the mid-first century BC while the orthography is described as close to the MT. Tov claims that the text is written in both stichometric (one hemistich per line) and prose format.⁷⁵ Ulrich, Skehan, and Flint (the editors) note that articular participles in the MT appear anarthrous, the fuller second masculine singular affirmative ending is used, and the scribe inconsistently spells the third masculine plural imperfect with an indicative *nun*.⁷⁶ They argue that the text was copied carefully since the remaining fragments contain few corrections, although they note the supralinear addition of an entire hemistich above line

⁷³ It should be further noted that 4Q84 is arranged in a stichometric format, and thus, comparison can be made not only between the words, but also between the sense divisions. There is one instance where 4Q84 diverges from the MT regarding sense units. It is preserved at F18ii:L4-7 (Col 21:13-16 [Ps 102:24-25]), but this difference is not given a point value in the statistics since the statistics only cover words, not sense divisions. Nonetheless, the overwhelming agreement between 4Q84 and the MT regarding sense divisions is further evidence for the text belonging to the Masoretic tradition. See Ulrich, Skehan, and Flint, “4QPsd,” 29.

⁷⁴ Ibid., 63.

⁷⁵ Ibid., 64, argue that the stichometric format begins on the first line of fragment 7. Thus, one cannot be sure about where the prose format ends and the stichometric format begins. See also Tov, *Scriptural Practices and Approaches*, 171; Tov, “The Background of the Stichometric Arrangements,” 415.

⁷⁶ Ulrich, Skehan, and Flint, “4QPsd,” 64.

13 in column 2.⁷⁷

Scholars debate the textual character of 4Q86. The editors argue that this text is distinctive (i.e., non-aligned) due to the presence of several significant variants.⁷⁸ Wilson, on the other hand, recommends caution when analyzing this text: it is too fragmentary.⁷⁹ Tov categorizes 4Q86 as a liturgical text—a Scripture-like composition—which, according to Tov’s classification grid, is a special sub-group of the non-aligned text.⁸⁰ Lange too categorizes the text as textually non-aligned.⁸¹

Description and Categorization of Variants

Several differences recorded by the editors do not belong to categories 1, 2, or 3. These variants include examples that depend on insufficient manuscript evidence as well as differences that may simply be synonymous spellings. In addition, they suggest that Psalm 106 immediately precedes Psalm 147 in this manuscript because of a downward stroke of ink that extends below the line. They argue that the downward stroke does not correspond to the ending of Psalm 146 *וְדֹר וְדֹר הַלְלוּ-יְהוָה*, “and generations, praise the Lord;” rather, it likely corresponds to the ending of Psalm 106. They transcribe the remains of the line as *אָמֵן [הַלְלוּ-יְהוָה]*, “amen, praise the Lord. Although part of the

⁷⁷ Ulrich, Skehan, and Flint, “4QPsd,” 64.

⁷⁸ Ulrich, Skehan, and Flint, “4QPsd,” 65. See also the preliminary edition where Flint labels this text as a mixed text in Peter W. Flint, “A Preliminary Edition of 4QPsd (4Q86),” in Parry and Ulrich, *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 95-96. See also table 4, “Distinctive and Affiliated Variant Readings” in *ibid.*, 97.

⁷⁹ Gerald Henry Wilson, *The Editing of the Hebrew Psalter*, Dissertation Series, Society of Biblical Literature 76 (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1985), 67-68.

⁸⁰ Tov, “The Biblical Texts from the Judaean Desert,” 156. See also Tov’s discussion of Scripture-like compositions in Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 320-21. Furthermore, see Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 334.

⁸¹ Lange, “Textual Plurality,” 55.

downward stroke is visible, the evidence is too sparse to substantiate this claim. First, the ink could be an errant stroke, a feature not uncommon among the DSS.⁸² Second, there could be a textual variant here, perhaps this Psalm transposes צִיּוֹן, “Zion.” These two suggestions indicate that the Psalm 106 does not necessarily precede Psalm 147.⁸³

Category 1. 4Q86 preserves several category 1 variants. Among these variants are instances of the addition of small particles such as the conjunctive *vav*, omission of small particles such as the article, and substitution of tense.

Two category 1 additions should be mentioned. They are preserved at F5ii:L5 (Col 3:5 [Ps 104:11]).⁸⁴ Here 4Q86 reads אֶת הַחַיּוֹת הַיְשָׁקוּ חֵיּוֹת, “the wild animals drink the ?????,”⁸⁵ while the MT reads יִשְׁקוּ כָּל־חַיְהוֹת שָׂדֵי, “they cause all of its beasts to drink.” The reading of 4Q86 is complicated. The editors suggest that the leather has either been damaged or the text has been erased,⁸⁶ and Abegg, Flint, and Ulrich note the uncertainty of the verb’s object.⁸⁷ Unfortunately, the rest of the line after this obscured

⁸² For example, on this very fragment, above this very line, Ulrich, Skehan, and Flint, “4QPsd,” 66, ascribe traces of ink to a random spot rather than the remains of a letter.

⁸³ Ulrich, Skehan, and Flint, “4QPsd,” 63, note that this identification is merely a suggestion. See also Flint, “A Preliminary Edition of 4QPsd (4Q86),” 95.

⁸⁴ One can refer to the reconstructed column and line number provided by the editors (or even the fragments grouped together to form a reconstructed column), or to the exact fragment and line number corresponding to the actual fragment. Both are provided here. The first reference given is the reference to the fragment number and the corresponding line of the fragment while the second reference is that of either the reconstructed column or the group of fragments grouped together by the editors and the corresponding reconstructed line number. Note that if the editors reconstruct the column, the group of fragments is not listed so that the citations do not become unclear.

⁸⁵ Abegg, Flint, and Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible*, 552.

⁸⁶ See the discussion of this reading in Ulrich, Skehan, and Flint, “4QPsd,” 69.

⁸⁷ Abegg, Flint, and Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible*, 552n251.

reading is lost. The text preserves at least two additions: the addition of the marker of the accusative and an article.⁸⁸

Category 2. 4Q86 preserves two category 2 omissions. The first two are preserved at F5ii:L5 (Col 3:5 [Ps 104:11]). 4Q86 reads *היִית*, “beast,” whereas the MT reads *כָּל־חַיָּוִהוּ*, “all its beasts.” The omission of the pronominal suffix and *כל* particle are slight differences and simply make the MT more implicit.

The second omission is preserved at F14:L1 (Col 5:17 [Ps 104:34]). 4Q86 has omitted *אֶנְכִי אֶשְׂמַח בַּיהוָה*, “I will rejoice in the Lord.” This omission may have been caused by parablepsis due to haplography: the eyes may have skipped from the end of *שִׂיחִי* to *כִּי*.⁸⁹ This proposed motivation depends on the similarity of only one letter. For many this will appear tentative grounds. However, the scribe originally omitted the hemistich *נוֹטְ [י]* *שָׁמַיִם כִּירִיעָה*, “who stretches out the heavens as a curtain,” but later added it supralinearly. It is important to note that this original omission was likely caused by parablepsis of one letter (the scribe’s eyes likely skipped from *כִּירִיעָה* to *כַּשְׁלֵמָה*). Thus, this explanation has precedent.

The first category 2 substitution is preserved at F6:L8 (Col 2:16 [Ps 104:5]) and concerns the substitution of a perfect verb of the MT, *יָסַד*, “he established,” for a participles *יֹסֵד*, “he is one who established.” The difference between the perfect and the participle is one of focus: whereas a verb stresses action as occurring, the participle expresses habitual or abiding state.⁹⁰ The difference may harmonize the reading to the immediate context since Psalm 104 describes God with participles in verse 2a *עֹטֵה*, “he

⁸⁸ Ulrich, Skehan, and Flint, “4QPsd,” 86.

⁸⁹ The fragment preserves Ps 104 in stichometric format preserving one colon per line. Also, note the blank space after *שִׂיחִי* on fragment 14 of column 5. These two facts indicate that this phrase was likely omitted.

⁹⁰ Russell Fuller and Kyoungwon Choi, *Invitation to Biblical Hebrew Syntax: An Intermediate Grammar* (Grand Rapids: Kregel, 2017), §16a.

who covers;” verse 2b נוֹטֵה, “he who stretches;” verse 3a הַמְקַרֵה, “he who lays;” verse 3b הַמְהַלֵךְ, “he who walks;” and verse 4 עוֹשֵׂה, “he who makes.” Thus, it is reasonable to understand why the next verb would be substituted for a participle (i.e., the MT’s יֹסֵד for יוֹסֵד). The substitution is a harmonization to the immediate context.

The next category 2 substitution is preserved at F5ii:L6 (Col 3:6 [Ps 104:11]). 4Q86 reads וַיִּשְׁכְּרוּ פְּרָאִים צְמָאָם, “they cause the donkeys to be drunk with their thirst,” while the MT reads וַיִּשְׁבְּרוּ פְּרָאִים צְמָאָם, “the donkeys quench their thirst.” There are two variants here: the substitution of the verbal stem (a *qal* for a *hiphil*) and the lexical stem (שָׁבַר for שָׁכַר).⁹¹ Both differences appear to be cases of harmonization. First, the substitution of the *qal* stem for the *hiphil* stem harmonizes this verse to the prior verse so that “springs” are the subjects of both verbs (i.e., the springs of v. 10 give drink to the beasts and make the donkeys drunk). Second, the substitution of the lexical stem substitutes the MT’s less common usage for a word more commonly used in this context. The only place the verb שָׁכַר, “to break,” is used figuratively to mean “to quench thirst,” is here.⁹² The verb שָׁכַר, however, is often connected to the idea of drinking too much; namely, being drunk.⁹³ The variants remain graphically similar, so this might suggest that the differences arose due to graphic similarity. Interpretation is a better explanation for the difference since 4Q86 reads more smoothly.

The last category 2 substitution is preserved at F10ii:L6 (Col 4:15 [Ps 104:24]). Here, 4Q86 reads וְנֵעְשׂוּ, “they are done,” whereas the MT reads וְעָשִׂיתָ, “you have done.” The difference is mainly one of voice: the MT is active while 4Q86 is passive. The direct object of the MT is the subject of 4Q86.

⁹¹ Although there are two differences here, these differences only represent one point in the statistics since the differences concern only one word. One word equals one point in the statistics.

⁹² Clines, *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew*, s.v., “שָׁבַר.”

⁹³ Ibid., s.v., “שָׁכַר.”

Category 3. 4Q86 does not preserve any certain category 3 variants.

Differences likely caused by excerpted nature. 4Q86 preserves a sequence of psalms that differs from the MT at F6:L2 (Col 2:11 [Ps 147, 104]). Here Psalm 147 ends and a large *vacat* space is left corresponding to the end of a psalm. The text that follows is Psalm 104. The editors argue that this difference in sequence is a significant variant,⁹⁴ but the difference is more likely the result of the excerpting process, and thus, does not necessarily indicate the text's textual tradition. The text preserves a medium sized writing block according to Tov⁹⁵ and is estimated to have originally preserved ca. 19 lines per column.⁹⁶ These dimensions make it highly unlikely that this text preserved the entire Psalter. Thus, it is best to understand this difference as evidence of the text's excerpted nature.⁹⁷

Statistics and Conclusion of 4Q86's Textual Tradition

The textual tradition preserved in 4Q86 can reasonably be identified as the Masoretic tradition since the variants can reasonably be ascribed to the scribal process.⁹⁸ The different sequence and the liturgical nature of the Psalms suggest that the manuscript was an excerpted text, possibly excerpted for liturgical purposes. When compared to

⁹⁴ Ulrich, Skehan, and Flint, "4QPsd," 64. See also Flint, "A Preliminary Edition of 4QPsd (4Q86)," 95.

⁹⁵ Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 86.

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, 96.

⁹⁷ This opinion is held by Tov, "Excerpted and Abbreviated Biblical Texts," 595. Flint, "A Preliminary Edition of 4QPsd (4Q86)," 93, may allude to this opinion by stating that the manuscript contained at least nine columns.

⁹⁸ Twenty-five words transcribed by the editors are not accepted in this total word count. Compare the total word count by Lange, "Collecting Psalms," 300. He states that 139 words are sufficiently preserved in 4Q86, but note how he counts a word: he understands מלכו as one word whereas it is understood as two here. Lange, "Collecting Psalms," 299.

many other non-aligned texts, 4Q86 shares a lower statistical relationship with the MT; yet, many of these differences appear to be interpretative. One should additionally note that a fifth of the differences belonging to categories 1 and 2 derive from one instance of parablepsis. Thus, this text is most likely excerpted from a Masoretic exemplar. It belongs to the Masoretic tradition.

Table 33. The statistical relationship between 4Q86 and the MT

Total # of Words in 4Q86	Categories 1, 2, and 3	Statistical Relationship	Categories 2 and 3	Statistical Relationship	Category 3	Statistical Relationship
171	20	88.30%	10	94.15%	0	100%

4Q87

4Q87 (4QPs^e) preserves portions of Psalms 76, 78, 81, 86, 88, 89, 103, 109, 114-116, 118, 104, 105, 106/146 (?), 120, 125, 126, 129, and 130 in an order that differs from the MT, according to Ulrich, Skehan, and Flint (the editors).⁹⁹ The editors describe the script as a late Herodian hand ca. mid-first century AD with elongated final *mem* and *aleph*. The *nun* is ornate with *kerai*. Moreover, the text is written in prose format,¹⁰⁰ while the orthography is fuller than the MT.¹⁰¹ The supralinear corrections and headings are written in a more slender and cursive script.¹⁰² Thus, the editors suggest,

It appears that the scribe first copied a text in which the superscriptions to Psalms 126-130 and other elements were not present, and later inserted these headings and

⁹⁹ Eugene Ulrich, Patrick W. Skehan, and Peter W. Flint, “4QPse,” in *Qumran Cave 4. XI, Psalms to Chronicles*, 73-84. The exact sequence of psalms is not always conclusive because of the poor state of preservation, but manuscript evidence does demonstrate that Ps 118 immediately preceded Ps 104 (see fragment 14). See table 1 in *ibid.*, 73. Moreover, the remains of F1:L5—what the editors transcribe as Ps 77—is very poorly preserved.

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, 74.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*

¹⁰² *Ibid.*

made other changes with the purpose of conforming to another Hebrew text similar to consonantal MT.¹⁰³

Overall, the text preserves six instances of scribal intervention, which averages to one scribal intervention per every twelve lines.¹⁰⁴

Scholars debate the exact nature and the tradition preserved in 4Q87. The editors argue that this text, although poorly preserved, appears to preserve the same Psalter preserved in 11Q5 and 11Q6. Correspondence between 4Q87 and 11Q5 includes the sequence of Psalms 103 to 109, which may also be found in 11Q5; a shared variant at Psalm 125:4; and a shorter reading in the base-text (non-corrected text) at Psalm 125:5, which is corrected in 4Q87 to the MT.¹⁰⁵

In his preliminary edition of 4Q87, Flint is more certain that 4Q87 represents the same collection as preserved in 11Q5: “My own research on the Psalms scrolls shows that Cave 4 contained at least one copy of the 11QPs^a-Psalter in the form of 4QPs^c (4Q87).”¹⁰⁶ Correspondence between these texts includes agreement in macro-variants¹⁰⁷—the sequence Psalm 118 then Psalm 104, the possibly arrangement of Psalm 104 then Psalm 147 and Psalm 105, and the possible sequence of Psalm 105 to Psalm 146—as well as individual variants.¹⁰⁸ Flint summarizes the macro variants by stating

¹⁰³ Ulrich, Skehan, and Flint, “4QPse,” 74.

¹⁰⁴ Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 334.

¹⁰⁵ Ulrich, Skehan, and Flint, “4QPse,” 76.

¹⁰⁶ Peter W. Flint, “‘11QPs^a-Psalter’ in the Dead Sea Scrolls, Including the Preliminary Edition of 4QPse,” in *The Quest for Context and Meaning: Studies in Biblical Intertextuality in Honor of James A. Sanders*, ed. Craig A. Evans and Shemaryahu Talmon, Biblical Interpretation Series 28 (Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 1997), 178.

¹⁰⁷ This term is used by Flint to describe differences in sequence and inclusion of non-Masoretic Psalms. See Flint, *The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls*, 182.

¹⁰⁸ For a table listing the instances where 4Q87 agrees with 11Q5 against the MT, with the MT against 11Q5, and where the text is corrected to fit the MT, see Flint, “‘11QPs^a-Psalter’ in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 182-83.

that the sequence of Psalms 118, 104, [147], 105, 146 is very likely preserved in 4Q87.¹⁰⁹

Tov agrees with the editors' suggestion that 4Q87 preserves the same collection as found in 11Q5.¹¹⁰ However, Tov does not see this collection as a genuine "Psalter" but as a liturgical text (i.e., a prayer book)—a Scripture-like composition—which, according to Tov's classification grid, is a special sub-group of the non-aligned text.¹¹¹ Lange too categorizes the text as textually non-aligned.¹¹²

Contrary to these scholars, Dahmen argues that the points of similarities advanced by Ulrich, Skehan, and Flint cannot be proven.¹¹³ Cabajosa, in his discussion of the Peshitta-Psalms, claims that 4Q87 does not disagree with the MT in any significant way.¹¹⁴ In fact, it should be noted that each of the differences can be ascribed to the scribal process. These facts, plus the tendency to correct the base text to a Masoretic like text, indicate that this text is not clearly a 11Q5 like text.

Description and Categorization of Variants

Several proposed variants are not included in the following discussion and statistics. These proposed variants include examples that depend on insufficient

¹⁰⁹ Flint, "'11QPsa-Psalter' in the Dead Sea Scrolls," 182.

¹¹⁰ Tov, "Excerpted and Abbreviated Biblical Texts," 594-95.

¹¹¹ Tov, "The Biblical Texts from the Judaean Desert," 156. See also Tov's discussion of Scripture-like compositions in Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 320-21; Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 334.

¹¹² Lange, "Textual Plurality," 55.

¹¹³ Ulrich Dahmen, *Psalm- und Psalter-Rezeption im Frühjudentum: Rekonstruktion, Textbestand, Struktur und Pragmatik der Psalmenrolle 11QPsa aus Qumran*, *Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah* 49 (Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 2003), 52-59.

¹¹⁴ Ignacio Carbajosa, *The Character of the Syriac Version of Psalms: A Study of Psalms 90-150 in the Peshitta*, *Monographs of the Peshitta Institute Studies in the Syriac Versions of the Bible and Their Cultural Contexts*, vol. 17 (Leiden, The Netherlands, Brill, 2008), 347.

manuscript evidence and differences that have been corrected to align the text more closely with the MT.¹¹⁵

Category 1. 4Q87 preserves several category 1 variants. These variants include one addition of a preposition, one omission of a preposition and one article, and four substitutions: two substitutions of number, one substitution of a similar lexeme, and an instance of transposition.¹¹⁶

Category 2. 4Q87 preserves two category 2 omissions. In both instances, 4Q87 omits a pronominal suffix. The first omission is preserved at F26i:L5 (Ps 125:4).¹¹⁷ 4Q87 reads בלב “in heart” while the MT reads בְּלִבֹּתָם “in their hearts.”¹¹⁸ This omission may be an instance of parablepsis: the scribes eyes skipping from the *vav* of בְּלִבֹּתָם to the conjunctive *vav* beginning the next verse. The second omission is preserved at F26i:L4 (Ps 125:3). 4Q87 reads יָדֵיָא “hands” whereas the MT reads יְדֵיהֶם “their hands.” Both of these omissions simply make the text more implicit.

4Q87 further preserves one category 2 substitution. It is preserved at F20:L1 (Frgs. 18 col ii, 20-24:L1 [Ps 105:37]). 4Q87 reads וַיּוֹצֵא עִמּוֹ, “and he brought [his] people out,” for the MT’s וַיּוֹצִיאֵם, “and he brought them out.” The substitution is an

¹¹⁵ These corrections are made by the original scribe as noted by Ulrich, Skehan, and Flint, “4QPse,” 74.

¹¹⁶ For more information about the proposed variants not categorized in either category 1, 2, or 3 and those that belong to category 1, see table “4Q87: Description of variants,” in appendix 3.

¹¹⁷ One can refer to the reconstructed column and line number provided by the editors (or even the fragments grouped together to form a reconstructed column), or one can refer to the exact fragment and line number corresponding to the actual fragment. Both are provided in this dissertation. The first reference given is the reference to the fragment number and the corresponding line of the fragment while the second reference is that of either the reconstructed column or the group of fragments grouped together by the editors and the corresponding reconstructed line number. If the editors reconstruct the column, the group of fragments is not listed so that the citations do not become unclear.

¹¹⁸ The substitution of number is a category 1 variant. For information about this and other category 1 variants, see table “4Q87: Description of variants,” in appendix 3.

interpretation that simply makes the text more explicit. In verse 36, the psalmist describes how God struck down the first born of Egypt. Then, the psalmist describes how God brought Israel out from Egypt with silver and gold, but the psalmists uses a pronoun, not the noun, “his people” or “Israel.” The context, therefore, clearly indicates that the antecedent is Israel. 4Q87 makes this point clear by defining more specifically the object of the verb: they are “his people.”¹¹⁹

A complex variant is preserved at F25:L1 (Ps 120:6). 4Q87 reads רַבַּת שְׁכָנָה [ל]נַפְשִׁי, “[lo]ng (it) has dwelt with my soul,”¹²⁰ whereas the MT reads רַבַּת שְׁכָנָה-לָּהּ נַפְשִׁי, “long, my soul has dwelt with itself.” The text omits the pronominal suffix of the *lamed* preposition and attaches the *lamed* preposition to נַפְשִׁי, “[my] sou[l].” The MT construction is emphatic, the prepositional phrase functions like a *dativus commodi*.¹²¹ 4Q87 may be smoothing out the construction or the reading may have resulted from a scribal error: omission of one letter, the *he*.

Category 3. 4Q87 does not preserve any category 3 variants.

Differences likely caused by excerpted nature. Ulrich, Skehan, and Flint propose that 4Q87 preserves the sequence Psalms 103 to 109 and Psalms 118, 104, 147,

¹¹⁹ The same reasons most have motivated the translators of the ESV and the NIV who, likewise, translate, “Then he brought out Israel with silver and gold.” Neither the MT, LXX, Vulgate, Targum, nor the DSS read “Israel.” Rather, the translation committee of the ESV and the NIV were motivated by the same desire as 4Q87: clarity. Of course, the clarity is achieved in 4Q87 slightly differently since 4Q87 renders the object as “his people.”

¹²⁰ The text is fragmentary so that the subject is not known. However, see the translation in Abegg, Flint, and Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible*, 557.

¹²¹ Gesenius, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, §119s. Joüon states that “the ל of the *dativus commodi* is used in a very particular way with the pronoun of the *same person* as that of the verb.” Paul Joüon and T. Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*, Subsidia Biblica, 14/1-14/2 (Roma: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2003), §133d, emphasis original

105, and possibly 146.¹²² However, it should be noted that the transition between psalms is only preserved in four instances in 4Q87, and out of these four instances, two examples probably differ from the MT (i.e., the sequence Pss 118 to 104 on fragment 14 and the sequence 104, 147 [possibly], and 105).¹²³

The sequence Psalm 118 then 104 is possible since the first line of fragment fourteen corresponds to Psalm 118:29, not Psalm 103. It is, however, possible that the remains of the first line coincide with a variant: perhaps an addition of the phrase *הודו לעולם חסדו*, “give thanks to the Lord for he is good; his steadfast love is forever,” to the end of Psalm 103.¹²⁴ The fact that this explanation could be proposed illustrates the fragmentary nature of this difference.

The proposed sequence of Psalm 103 then 109 is uncertain as the editors claim.¹²⁵ The text is extremely fragmentary: all that is transcribed of the first line of this fragment are the bottom two strokes of a *he*.

The proposed sequence of Psalms 104, 147, and 105 is uncertain, but enough data remains to indicate that the sequence likely does not follow the MT. Ulrich, Skehan, and Flint claim that Psalm 105 could not have followed Psalm 104.¹²⁶ They argue that a composition of 15 lines would need to occur between Psalms 104 and 105 in order to account material details of these fragments (top margins are preserved for both Psalms 104 and 105), the supposed number of lines per column (i.e., 25-26),¹²⁷ and the

¹²² Ulrich, Skehan, and Flint, “4QPse,” 74, 76.

¹²³ *Ibid.*, 74.

¹²⁴ Flint suggests this explanation but dismisses it in Flint, “‘11QPsa-Psalter’ in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 179.

¹²⁵ *Ibid.*, 79.

¹²⁶ Ulrich, Skehan, and Flint, “4QPse,” 76.

¹²⁷ *Ibid.*, 74.

approximate number of letter spaces per line (i.e., 35-37, but up to ca. 44 in fragments 18-24).¹²⁸ Thus, they suggest that Psalm 147 was likely originally present between Psalm 104 and 105 in agreement with 11Q5.

This suggestion is possible, but some evidence suggests that Psalm 105 could have immediately followed Psalm 104. Psalm 104:20-22 is preserved along with a top margin. It would take approximately 536 letter spaces to complete Psalm 104 if Psalm 104 read with the MT. On the low end, if one calculated approximately 35 letter spaces per line, then Psalm 104 would have been preserved in the subsequent 15 lines of this column. If one calculated on the high end—44 letter spaces per line, Psalm 104 would have been preserved in the subsequent 12 lines. This would leave approximately 7-10 lines remaining in this column. Psalm 105:36 begins at the top of another column, and if one assumes that Psalm 105 immediately followed Psalm 104 then there would be approximately 32-37 lines between the ending of Psalm 104 and the beginning of Psalm 105:36. If one presumed that the lines preserved 35 letter spaces, then the text fitting this lacuna would need to be approximately 1,100 letter spaces; this is approximately how many letter spaces would be needed to reconstruct Psalm 105:1-35 according to the Masoretic spelling. However, if one calculated 44 letter spaces per line and understood there to be 37 lines, then there would need to be approximately 1,600 letter spaces. Thus, based on the margins, the letter spaces, and the presumed column heights, the MT order is not impossible.

However, this hypothesis is complicated by fragment 18, which preserves portions of two subsequent columns. If one understands the remains of fragment 18 col i as corresponding to Psalm 105:1-3, then reconstructing the MT is severely complicated since it would necessitate a composition other than Psalm 105 as occupying the approximately 7-10 lines after the ending of Psalm 104. One should note though that

¹²⁸ Ulrich, Skehan, and Flint, "4QPse," 74.

fragment 18 col i is extremely fragmentary and perhaps the remains represent a textual variant. Therefore, in light of this data, the Masoretic order should not be completely ruled out, but in light of fragment 18, it should be understood as unlikely. Moreover, one should further note that whether or not the text originally had Psalm 147 after Psalm 104 is a suggestion that cannot be confirmed due to the fragmentary nature of the text.¹²⁹

The last proposed sequence is preserved at fragments 19 ii, 20-24 and might attest to the order Psalm 105 followed by Psalm 146 in agreement with 11Q5 against the MT and LXX.¹³⁰ However, all that is preserved of the psalm following Psalm 105 is הללויה, “Halleluiah,” which also corresponds to the beginning of Psalm 106. Thus, the text does not necessarily agree with 11Q5 against the MT here.¹³¹

Thus, of all the macro-variants, there appear two probable deviations from the Masoretic sequence. This evidence casts doubt on whether 4Q87 represents the same collection as preserved in 11Q5.

Even if one granted each of these proposed macro-variants, Ulrich, Skehan, and Flint’s suggestion that 4Q87 and 11Q5 are copies of the same Psalter depends on the assumption that 4Q87 in fact preserves a Psalter and not a Scripture-like composition such as a prayer book. The text preserves a large writing block (25-26 lines per column), which suggests that it originally could have possessed a large amount of text.¹³² Nonetheless, the text still could conceivably be understood as a liturgical text, perhaps a larger

¹²⁹ This is indicated in Dahmen, *Psalmen- und Psalter-Rezeption im Frühjudentum*, 53.

¹³⁰ Ulrich, Skehan, and Flint, “4QPse,” 82-83. The editors base this reasoning on other shared agreements between 4Q87 and 11Q5. *Ibid.*, 74-76.

¹³¹ See Flint’s discussion of this ambiguity in Flint, “‘11QPsa-Psalter’ in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 182.

¹³² Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 87.

liturgical text.¹³³ Tov understands 11Q8 to be a *de luxe* text and also liturgical.¹³⁴

Statistics and Conclusion of 4Q87's Textual Tradition

The textual tradition preserved in 4Q87 can reasonably be identified as the Masoretic tradition since the variants can all be ascribed to the scribal process.¹³⁵ The text deviates in minor details and shows an inclination to correct its base text to a Masoretic like text. Additionally, 4Q87 preserves a high statistical relationship when compared to the MT. It is possible that the text was an excerpted text. Thus, it is perhaps better to label the text as an excerpted text belonging to the Masoretic tradition.

Table 34. The statistical relationship between 4Q87 and the MT

Total # of Words in 4Q87	Categories 1, 2, and 3	Statistical Relationship	Categories 2 and 3	Statistical Relationship	Category 3	Statistical Relationship
234	11	95.30%	4	98.29%	0	100%

4Q88

4Q88 (4QPs^f) preserves portions of Psalms 22, 107, 109, and three apocryphal psalms: the *Apostrophe to Zion*, the *Eschatological Hymn*, and the *Apostrophe to Judah*.¹³⁶ The manuscript is not written in stichometric format.¹³⁷ Ulrich, Skehan, and Flint (the

¹³³ Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 320-21.

¹³⁴ See Tov, "The Biblical Texts from the Judaean Desert," 156; Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 334; Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 129.

¹³⁵ The editors transcribe 52 words that depend on insufficient manuscript evidence and they are not counted in the total word count. Compare the total word count by Lange, "Collecting Psalms," 300. He states that 220 words are sufficiently preserved in 4Q87, but note how he counts a word: he understands מלכו as one word whereas it is understood as two here. *Ibid.*, 299.

¹³⁶ Eugene Ulrich, Patrick W. Skehan, and Peter W. Flint, "4QPs^f," in *Qumran Cave 4. XI, Psalms to Chronicles*, 85-106.

¹³⁷ *Ibid.*, 86. Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 169, 334. However, in the preliminary edition, Ulrich, Skehan, and Flint indicate that the text was written stichometrically with one hemistich per

editors) describe the script as a Hasmonaean semicursive script from ca. 50 BC while they describe the orthography as fuller than the MT including the longer form of the 2ms pronominal suffix (כה) ¹³⁸. The editors note two supralinear corrections: one in Psalm 107 and one in the *Apostrophe to Judah*.¹³⁹ The text averages a correction every sixty-one lines.¹⁴⁰ Additionally, the text has been cut horizontally right at the division between the biblical and apocryphal psalms. The editors suggest that the damage was done by “a knife, sword, or other sharp instrument, most likely by Roman soldiers who were ravaging the Qumran site in 68 CE.”¹⁴¹

Scholars debate the nature of 4Q88 and its textual tradition. The editors do not label the text but describe the extent to which it differs from the MT. These differences include individual variants and the inclusion of non-Masoretic Psalms.¹⁴² Wilson recommends that scholars approach 4Q88 cautiously due to the text’s fragmentary nature.¹⁴³ Caution is further recommended since no material joint connects the biblical psalms with the apocryphal psalms, but, according to Wilson, “only a highly probable positioning of two separate fragments.”¹⁴⁴ Moreover, Wilson argues that the text does not

line from col 3:6 to the end of col. 4. See Patrick William Skehan, Eugene Charles Ulrich, and Peter W. Flint, “A Scroll Containing ‘Biblical’ and ‘Apocryphal’ Psalms: A Preliminary Edition of 4QPsf (4Q88),” *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 60, no. 2 (April 1998): 269-70.

¹³⁸ Ulrich, Skehan, and Flint, “4QPsf,” 86.

¹³⁹ *Ibid.*, 86.

¹⁴⁰ Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 334.

¹⁴¹ Ulrich, Skehan, and Flint, “4QPsf,” 85.

¹⁴² *Ibid.*, 86-88.

¹⁴³ Wilson, *The Editing of the Hebrew Psalter*, 68.

¹⁴⁴ *Ibid.*

preserve the collection of psalms preserved in 11Q5 since the “Apocrypha of Zion” appears in a different sequence in each text.¹⁴⁵

Tov, likewise, does not group 4Q88 as preserving the same collection as 11Q5 despite preserving the “Apocrypha of Zion.”¹⁴⁶ He further identifies the text not as a genuine “Psalter” but as a liturgical text (i.e., a prayer book)—a Scripture-like composition—which according to Tov’s classification grid is a special sub-group of the non-aligned category.¹⁴⁷ Lange too categorizes the text as textually non-aligned.¹⁴⁸

Description and Categorization of Variants

There are several proposed variants that are not counted in either category 1, 2, or 3. For example, some variants depend on insufficient manuscript evidence while several others merely represent synonymous spellings.

Category 1. 4Q88 preserves twelve category 1 variants. A sampling of the category 1 variants includes the addition of conjunctive *vav*, the omissions of conjunctive *vav*, and substitution of number.

Category 2. 4Q88 preserves several category 2 variants. One of these variants is an omission preserved at F9:L1 (Col 6:1 [Ps 109:4]).¹⁴⁹ 4Q88 reads יסימוני יסי]מו,

¹⁴⁵ Wilson, *The Editing of the Hebrew Psalter*, 68.

¹⁴⁶ Tov, “Excerpted and Abbreviated Biblical Texts,” 594-95.

¹⁴⁷ Tov, “The Biblical Texts from the Judaean Desert,” 156. See also Tov’s discussion of Scripture-like compositions in Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 320-21; Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 334.

¹⁴⁸ Lange, “Textual Plurality,” 55.

¹⁴⁹ One can refer to the reconstructed column and line number provided by the editors (or even the fragments grouped together to form a reconstructed column), or the exact fragment and line number corresponding to the actual fragment. Both are provided here. The first reference given is the reference to the fragment number and the corresponding line of the fragment while the second reference is that of either the reconstructed column or the group of fragments grouped together by the editors and the corresponding

“they accuse me. They se[t]. . .”¹⁵⁰ while the MT reads וַיִּשְׁימוּ וַאֲנִי תְּפִלָּה וַיִּשְׁימוּ, “they accuse me, but I am in prayer. They set . . .” This difference can be explained as an example of parablepsis: the eyes skipping תְּפִלָּה וַאֲנִי because of the initial *vav*.

4Q88 further preserves several category 2 substitutions. The first category 2 substitution is preserved at F1:L6 (Frgs. 1-2:L23 [Ps 22:16]). Here 4Q88 reads עַפְרַיִם מוֹת שׁוֹפֵט] “he who places [me] in the dust of death,”¹⁵¹ while the MT reads וְלִעֲפָר־מָוֶת תִּשְׁפָּתֵנִי, “you lay me to the dust of death.” The difference may have derived from a misunderstanding of the word since the verb שָׁפַח only occurs five times in the MT,¹⁵² zero times in the non-biblical-DSS,¹⁵³ possibly once in the biblical-DSS (5/6Hev1b Frgs. 8-9:L11 [Ps 22:16]),¹⁵⁴ and five times in the Mishnah.¹⁵⁵ However, the scribes of the translations properly understood the word. Haplography may be a better explanation (the scribe wrote the *tav* once instead of twice leading to the substitution of an imperfect verb for a participle) and then confused a *tav* for a *tet*. The confusion of phonetically similar letters such as sibilants is prevalent in this text and may provide some evidence for this suggestion.

The next category 2 substitution is preserved at F5:L2-3 (Col 2:7-8 [Ps 107:9]). Here the MT reads כִּי־הִשְׁבִּיעַ נְפֶשׁ שֶׁקָּקָה וְנַפְשׁ רַעְבָּה מִלֶּא־טוֹב, “for he causes the longing soul

reconstructed line number. If the editors reconstruct the column, the group of fragments is not listed so that the citations do not become unclear.

¹⁵⁰ Notice here the interchange of sibilants.

¹⁵¹ Compare the translation of Abegg, Flint, and Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible*, 519.

¹⁵² See Clines, *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew*, s.v. “שָׁפַח.”

¹⁵³ Martin G. Abegg, *Dead Sea Scrolls Non-Biblical Texts*, Accordance Bible Software (BC, Canada: Oak Tree Software, n.d.).

¹⁵⁴ Martin G. Abegg, James E. Bowley, and Edward M. Cook, *Accordance 11.2.5 Dead Sea Scroll Biblical Corpus (Manuscript Order) (DSSB-M)*, version 3.0 (BC, Canada: Oak Tree Software, 2009).

¹⁵⁵ Martin G. Abegg, *Mishnah (Kaufmann)*, version 3.0, Accordance Bible Software (BC, Canada: Oak Tree Software, n.d.).

to be satisfied; and the hungry soul, he fills with good.” 4Q88 is fragmentary, but enough of the evidence is preserved to conclude that the scribe transposed the participle שקקה with the adjective רעבה. 4Q88 read [מ]לא [טוב] [כי השביע נפש] [רעבה] “for he causes the hungry soul to be satisfied; and the longing soul, he fills with good.” The difference is slight especially since the parallel lines are synonymous.

The next two category 2 substitutions are found at F3ii:L6 (Col 2:19 [Ps 107:15]). Here 4Q88 reads ה[ו]ה[ו] ליהוה חסידו, “gi[ve thanks] to the Lord all his godly ones,” while the MT reads יודו ליהוה חסדו, “Let them give thanks to the Lord because of his steadfast love.” The first difference substitutes a jussive for an imperative, which represents a slight change of perspective. The second difference is more substantial since it actually changes the word’s role in the sentence. In the MT, the word functions as an adverbial clause specifying why “Israel ought to praise the Lord.” In 4Q88, the word functions as a vocative in order to specify who is to praise the Lord; namely, “his godly ones.” The main theme of this psalm is the steadfast-love of the Lord as indicated by the introduction (v. 1), the conclusion (v. 43), and the common refrain יודו ליהוה חסדו, “Let them give thanks to the Lord because of his steadfast-love” (see vv. 8, 15, 21, 31). Unfortunately, none of these other readings are preserved in 4Q88 to help explain the difference here. The similarity of the words graphically might suggest a type of graphic confusion, but the evidence is too fragmentary to be more definitive.

Alternatively, the LXX reading τὰ ἐλέη αὐτοῦ, “his mercies,” is reconstructed by the editors of DJD as חסדיי. This reading understands God’s acts as plural as opposed to a collective singular. The difference between the LXX and the MT is simple: the difference in number that could have arisen based on the particular scribe’s conception of God’s mercies or possibly due to the contraction of the diphthong יי so that both this form

and ך were pronounced alike.¹⁵⁶ Perhaps 4Q88 originally read a plural and then suffered metathesis of the *dalet* and *yod*.

Finally, the difference can be explained as a type of harmonization. It could be a harmonization to the immediate context since verses 2-3 commands that the “redeemed of the Lord” and “those gathered from the lands” sing this psalm. It is also possible that the scribe is applying the text to his contemporary audience, and thus, the difference can be explained as a type of updating. The scribe may be doing this when he substitutes the jussive (third person volatile) for an imperative (second-person). The effect is that the psalm no longer commands them (the past audience) to praise the Lord, but his contemporary audience. The substitution of לְרַחֵם, “loving-kindness” for לְרַחֵם, “his godly ones,” may too be derived for a desire to apply the text. Namely, he is identifying those of the community as the godly ones, contrary to those who rebelled against God’s words and spurned his counsel (Ps 107:11), who were fools because of their inequity (Ps 107:17),¹⁵⁷ who went on business trips on ships with evil intentions (Ps 107:23-26), and whose evil caused the land to turn into a desert (Ps 107:33-34). This tendency—if this is the motive for these changes—might be analogous to David’s use of Exodus 17:1-7 in Psalm 95:7-11¹⁵⁸ and the author of Hebrews use of Psalm 95:7-11 in Hebrews 3-4. In both instances, the authors indicate that their audience is reliving the wilderness wandering’s place in human history. Thus, several explanations can be posited for this difference.

¹⁵⁶ See Qimron’s discussion of this feature in Elisha Qimron, *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986), §200.18.

¹⁵⁷ Notice how the sailors are described as those who went on business trips and describes them as melting away on account of evil (Ps 107:26). “Evil” does not refer to ethical evil, but to misfortune (i.e., the waves are crashing upon them). See Clines, *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew*, s.v. “רָעָה.”

¹⁵⁸ The author of Hebrews attributes these words to David in Heb 4:7.

The next category 2 substitution is found at F3iii:L2 (Col 4:17 [Ps 107:26]). Here 4Q88 reads [ם]בה, “on account of them,” while the MT reads בְּרָעָה, “on account of evil.” 4Q88 interprets the MT since רָעָה in the MT likely does not refer to ethical evil, but to misfortune. The sailors are in distress because *waves* (third-person masculine plural noun) that go up to the heavens and then down to the depths. This evil is what makes their hearts melt. Thus, when 4Q88 reads [ם]יעלו שמים [יר]דו תהומות ונפשם בה[ם], the pronominal suffix attached to the *bet* preposition refers to the גלים, “waves,” of verse 25 and demonstrates what makes their hearts melt: them (i.e., the waves). This substitution is likely occasioned by a desire to interpret the MT.

The next category 2 substitution is found at F8i:L9 (Col 3:21 [Ps 107:28]). Here 4Q88 reads וישיעם, “he saves them,” while the MT reads יוציאם, “he brings them out.” 4Q88 again is interpreting the MT to make the meaning clearer: God is not just bringing the sailors out of their distress, but he is saving them. 4Q88 has interpreted the MT in light of its immediate context and supplied the more specific verb.

A further category 2 substitution is preserved at F8i:L9 (Col 3:21 [Ps 107:29]). Here 4Q88 reads ויופך שערה, “he overthrew the storm,” while the MT reads יקם סערה, “he calmed the storm down.” Again, this difference is likely the result of interpretation since the verb קום typically denotes the concept of “rising,” but the context clearly indicates that God is bringing an end to the storm as is evident by the prepositional phrase לְדָמְמָה, “for silence.” In fact, this is the only occasion where the verb קום denotes the concept of “settling” or “calming down.” The context, therefore, again leads the scribe to substitute a verb more common for this particular context. This difference too is likely an interpretation.

The next category 2 substitution, likewise, may have derived from interpretation and is preserved at F8i:L10 (Col 3:22 [Ps 107:29]). Here 4Q88 reads גלי ים, “waves of the sea,” where the MT reads גליהם, “their waves.” 4Q88 has simply identified the referent of

the MT: it is the waves of the water. The difference may be an interpretation, or it may be faulty word division.

The next category 2 substitution is preserved at F8i:L2 (Col 4:14 [Ps 107:36]). Here 4Q88 reads עם רב, “a great people,” while the MT reads רעבים, “the hungry.” The substitution could be explained as an internal harmonization since this section of the psalm is now discussing God’s restoration. However, a paleographic problem too may have caused the substitution.

The next category 2 substitution is preserved at F8i:L10 (Col 4:22 [Ps 107:41]). Here 4Q88 reads בעני, “in their affliction,” while the MT reads מעוני, “from affliction.” Graphic or phonologic confusion could easily account for this change. Phonetic confusion appears more likely due to the pervasive interchange between sibilants: a phonetic error.

The last category 2 substitution is preserved at F9:L1 (Col 6:1 [Ps 109:4]). 4Q88 reads יסטמונין, “they are hostile to me,” whereas the MT reads ישטנוני, “they accuse me.” Both verbs depict the opponents as against David. The best solution appears to be phonetic confusion, but one should note that the verbal root שטן found in the MT is preserved two times in the biblical-DSS and both times the verbal root is substituted: here in 4Q88 and in 4Q83 F9ii:L4 (Ps 36:21). Both words, however, occur only sparingly in Hebrew literature, so it is difficult to say if the substitution was occasioned by the scribe’s contemporary usage. Concerning שטן, the verbal root is never used in the non-biblical DSS¹⁵⁹ while neither the nominal nor the verbal root of occurs in the Mishnah.¹⁶⁰ The root שטם is only used once in the non-biblical DSS, once in the biblical-DSS, and never

¹⁵⁹ Abegg, *Dead Sea Scrolls Non-Biblical Texts*.

¹⁶⁰ Abegg, *Mishnah (Kaufmann)*.

in the Mishnah. The best explanation for this reading again is phonetic confusion which is clearly evident already in this word (i.e., the scribe has confused the sibilants).¹⁶¹

There are two unclear variants preserved in 4Q88. The first is preserved at F8i:L10-11 (Col 4:22-23 [Ps 107:41]). Here, 4Q88 reads עליוֹיִם [] כַּצְאֵן “on account [makes their families] like flo[cks]”¹⁶² while the MT reads וַיִּשֶׂם כַּצְאֵן מִשְׁפָּחוֹת “and sets as flocks (their) families.” The poor state of the text’s preservation precludes certainty about this variant. All that can be said is that 4Q88 reads עלוֹ which is not represented in the MT. It is unclear if this is an addition or a substitution.¹⁶³

The second is preserved at F5:L6 (Col 2:11 [Ps 107:11]). 4Q88 preserves a final *mem*, which suggests an addition. The editors have transcribed the following as a possible reading: הֵם הָ[מָרוּ] “they rebelled” whereas the MT reads כִּי־הֵמָּרָו “because they rebelled.” One cannot be certain if 4Q88 omitted the כִּי particle; the evidence is too fragmentary. Moreover, the presence of the final *mem* suggests an addition, but one cannot be sure about its nature; the text is too poorly preserved.

Category 3. 4Q88 does not preserve any certain category 3 variants.

Differences likely caused by excerpted nature. Some scholars argue that the inclusion of non-Masoretic Psalms among DSS represent a significant difference indicative of the text’s independent status. Combining into one scroll Apocryphal Psalms and biblical Psalms, however, is not indicative of this text’s textual tradition since the inclusion of non-canonical psalms within canonical psalms are found in texts that

¹⁶¹ For a discussion of the interchange between final nasals, see Qimron, *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, §200.142.

¹⁶² For this translation, see Abegg, Flint, and Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible*, 588.

¹⁶³ The translation provided by Abegg, Flint, and Ulrich understands the difference as a substitution. *Ibid.*, 588. However, the editors suggest that this variant may be an addition. See Ulrich, Skehan, and Flint, “4QPsf,” 95.

preserve the Masoretic Psalter. A prime example of this is the LXX, which includes Psalm 151, but clearly demarcates the text as non-canonical. The superscription reads Οὗτος ὁ ψαλμὸς ιδιόγραφος εἰς Δαυιδ καὶ ἔξωθεν τοῦ ἀριθμοῦ· ὅτε ἐμονομάχησεν τῷ Γολιαδ, “This Psalm is by the hand of David and outside the number *made* when he fought Goliath.”¹⁶⁴ Thus, this superscription demonstrates that ancient Jews did not have a fundamental problem with combining canonical and non-canonical psalms together in the same scroll.

Similarly, the inclusion of both biblical Psalms and apocryphal Psalms on the same scroll does not necessarily indicate the canonical status of the Apocryphal Psalms but may depend on thematic purposes. For example, 11Q11 (11QApPs^a or 11QP^sAp^a) partially preserves four psalms, three of which are apocryphal and Psalm 91—a Psalm of David. These texts appear to be arranged for thematic purposes. J. P. M. van der Ploeg suggests that these psalms are those sung over the stricken (i.e., the demon possessed).¹⁶⁵ The assumption that 4Q88 is a Psalms scroll is premature. 4Q88 may simply represent a collection of texts such as a prayer book.¹⁶⁶

Statistics and Conclusion of 4Q88’s Textual Tradition

The textual tradition preserved in 4Q88 of the Masoretic Psalms can reasonably

¹⁶⁴ Pietersma recognizes that the superscription prior to the ὅτε clause is likely original to the LXX. Albert Pietersma, “David in the Greek Psalms,” *Vetus Testamentum* 30 (1980): 226. Compare Wilson, *The Editing of the Hebrew Psalter*, 70.

¹⁶⁵ J. P. M. van der Ploeg, “Un Petit Rouleau de Psaumes Apocryphes,” in *Tradition und Glaube: Das Frühe Christentum in Seiner Umwelt. Festgabe für Karl Georg Kuhn zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. Gert Jeremias, Heinz-Wolfgang Kuhn, and Hartmut Stegemann (Göttingen, Germany: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971), 129. See also Craig A. Evans, “Jesus and Psalm 91 in Light of the Exorcism Scrolls,” in *Celebrating the Dead Sea Scrolls: A Canadian Collection*, ed. Peter W. Flint, Jean Duhaime, and Kyung S. Baek, *Early Judaism and Its Literature* 30 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011), 91.

¹⁶⁶ Tov, “Excerpted and Abbreviated Biblical Texts,” 594-95, suggests that this text may be a prayer book.

be identified as the Masoretic tradition.¹⁶⁷ Admittedly, the text agrees with the MT in less details than most non-aligned texts, but the differences can reasonably be ascribed to the scribal process. The differences suggest that the scribe made several phonetic errors and tended to interpret. Moreover, the inclusion of non-Masoretic psalms suggests that the text was a liturgical text, perhaps a prayer book (Tov), and do not necessarily depict the text as an independent Psalter.¹⁶⁸

Table 35. The statistical relationship between 4Q88 and the MT

Total # of Words in 4Q88	Categories 1, 2, and 3	Statistical Relationship	Categories 2 and 3	Statistical Relationship	Category 3	Statistical Relationship
203	29	85.71%	17	91.63%	0	100%

4Q92

4Q92 (4QPs^k) preserves portions of Psalm 135 and possibly Psalm 99 in 2 fragments.¹⁶⁹ The script is described as Hasmonaeen and dates to ca. 100-30 BC and is written in prose format.¹⁷⁰ Ulrich, Skehan, and Flint (the editors) describe the text as only preserving two orthographic differences when compared to other scrolls.¹⁷¹ The text

¹⁶⁷ The editors transcribe 35 words that depend on insufficient manuscript evidence and they are not counted in the total word count. Compare the total word count by Lange, "Collecting Psalms," 300. He states that 220 words are sufficiently preserved in 4Q92, but note how he counts a word: he understands מלכו as one word whereas it is understood as two here. *Ibid.*, 299.

¹⁶⁸ Tov, "Excerpted and Abbreviated Biblical Texts," 594-95.

¹⁶⁹ Eugene Ulrich, Patrick W. Skehan, and Peter W. Flint, "4QPs^k," in *Qumran Cave 4. XI, Psalms to Chronicles*, 123-25. The identification of col 2 as Ps 99 is uncertain due to the columns poor state of preservation. However, in light of what is visible, Ulrich, Skehan, and Flint have concluded that the text most likely belongs to Ps 99, although the column may be the remains of an apocryphal Psalm or biblical Psalms with a textual variant. *Ibid.*, 124-25.

¹⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, 123.

¹⁷¹ *Ibid.* Ulrich, Skehan, and Flint are right to indicate that only two words contain orthographic differences, but one of these words concerns two differences. Thus, there are three orthographic differences when 4Q92 is compared to the MT.

does not preserve any instance of scribal intervention.¹⁷²

Scholars debate the textual tradition of 4Q92. Tov identifies the text not as a genuine “Psalms” but as a liturgical text (i.e., a prayer book)—a Scripture-like composition—which, according to Tov’s classification grid, is a special sub-group of the non-aligned category.¹⁷³ Ulrich, Skehan, and Flint do not comment about the textual tradition of the text, likely due to the text’s poor state of preservation¹⁷⁴ as does Lange.¹⁷⁵

Description and Categorization of Variants

Four proposed variants are not discussed in the following discussion or included in the statistics. Three of these variants depend on insufficient evidence. The first insufficiently preserved difference is preserved at Col 1:1 (Ps 135:6). Ulrich proposes that the partial remains of two letters suggest the addition]יָא[אִין כִּיהוּה וּאִין] לַעֲשׂוֹת יַעֲשֶׂה אִין כִּי אִין כִּיהוּה וּאִין] in agreement with 4QPsⁿ (4Q95) and 11QPs^a (11Q5).¹⁷⁶ This suggestion is possible, but not certain since this line is poorly preserved. Moreover, although the identification of these letters corresponds to the reading suggested, they also correspond partially to the MT reading חִפֵּץ as Ulrich, Skehan, and Flint indicate.¹⁷⁷

The second proposed difference that depends on insufficient manuscript evidence is preserved at Col 2:3 (possibly Ps 99:1) and concerns the proposal of the

¹⁷² Ulrich, Skehan, and Flint, “4QPs^k,” 123.

¹⁷³ Tov, “The Biblical Texts from the Judaean Desert,” 156. Tov does not include this text in his discussion of Scripture-like compositions in Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 320-21. Note that it is listed as non-aligned in Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 334.

¹⁷⁴ Ulrich, Skehan, and Flint, “4QPs^k.”

¹⁷⁵ Lange, “Textual Plurality,” 55-56.

¹⁷⁶ Ulrich, Skehan, and Flint, “4QPs^k,” 124.

¹⁷⁷ Ibid. See The Leon Levy Dead Sea Scrolls, “Plate 1151, Frag 2,” accessed June 14, 2018 <http://www.deadseascrolls.org.il/explore-the-archive/image/B-487621>.

superscription לַדָּוִד, “to David.” The first two transcribed letters are probable as indicated by the sigla, but if the text read לַדָּוִד or even לַדָּוִי, there would likely be traces of the third letter. The lack of remains for the third letter calls this proposal into question.

The third proposed difference is a “macro-variant” (i.e., a difference in sequence). The second column only preserves six words partially. Although Psalm 99 corresponds best to this content, it is entirely possible that one of these words is a variant reading or that the column belongs to an altogether different composition.¹⁷⁸ Moreover, the content from column 1 preserves a portion of Psalm 135, but poorly. It is possible that column 1 merely represents a quote from Psalm 135. The claim that Psalm 99 followed Psalm 135 in this text, then, depends on insufficient evidence.

The fourth proposed variant may merely represent an orthographic difference (i.e., *yod* can represent final *e*)¹⁷⁹ rather than a textual variant (i.e., substitution of a collective singular for a plural noun). This difference is found at Col 1:5 (Ps 135:15).¹⁸⁰

Category 1. 4Q92 preserves no category 1 variants.

Category 2. 4Q92 perseveres two category 2 variants. The first category 2 variant is an omission preserved at Col 1:3 (Ps 135:10). 4Q92 omits וְהָרַג, “and has slain” of the MT. The difference likely derived from the scribe’s eyes skipping space on the manuscript, although no motivation is preserved. Nonetheless, the fact that only one word is skipped suggests this unintentional error. The difference between the texts is slight. The parallelism of the MT emphasizes God’s greatness above all other gods because he smote the mighty nations (i.e., the nations who formerly dwelt in the

¹⁷⁸ Ulrich, Skehan, and Flint, “4QPsk,” 124-25.

¹⁷⁹ See Qimron, *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, §100.34.

¹⁸⁰ For more details about these variants, see table “4Q92: Description of variants,” in appendix 3.

Promised Land) and *he slew* the mighty kings. The omission of the verb causes the verb of the previous line to be supplied here: (i.e., “he smote”). Since the lines are synonymous, the difference is slight.

4Q92 preserves one category 2 substitution. This substitution is found at Col 1:3 (Ps 135:11). 4Q92 reads אַתְּ סִיחֹן, “Sihon,” while the MT reads לְסִיחֹן, “namely, Sihon.” The use of *lamed* in the MT emphasizes the kings slain by God.¹⁸¹ The use of the marker of the accusative in 4Q92, however, simply identifies Sihon as the object of the verb in the prior verse. The difference is minor, one of emphasis.

Category 3. 4Q92 preserves no category 3 variants.

Statistics and Conclusion of 4Q92’s Textual Tradition

The textual tradition preserved in 4Q92 can reasonably be identified as the Masoretic tradition.¹⁸² However, the poor state of this text’s preservation makes any statement about the text’s tradition suggestive.¹⁸³ It further calls into question if this text is a biblical scroll since what is preserved may be a mere quote from a different composition. Nonetheless, the content from column 1 does not represent any significant variant when compared to the Masoretic text. Thus, what remains of the text can reasonably be identified as belonging to the Masoretic tradition.

¹⁸¹ Ulrich, Skehan, and Flint, “4QPsk,” 124-25.

¹⁸² The editors transcribe eleven words that depend on insufficient manuscript evidence and are not counted in the total word count. For the transcriptions, see *ibid.*, 123-25.

¹⁸³ Five words found in 4Q92 are not included in the total word count because they depend on insufficient manuscript evidence. Moreover, the six partially preserved words from column 2 are excluded also because they cannot be persuasively identified as preserving a biblical-psalm.

Table 36. The statistical relationship between 4Q92 and the MT

Total # of Words in 4Q92	Categories 1, 2, and 3	Statistical Relationship	Categories 2 and 3	Statistical Relationship	Category 3	Statistical Relationship
26	3	88.46%	3	88.46%	0	100%

4Q93

4Q93 (4QPs¹) preserves portions of Psalm 104 in one fragment spanning two columns.¹⁸⁴ Ulrich, Skehan, and Flint (the editors) describe the script as dating the manuscript to the second half of the first century BC.¹⁸⁵ Other paleographic notes include the use of a smaller *ayin*, the inability to distinguish *yod* and *vav* graphically, and the cramming of words together in order to accommodate the stichometric arrangement.¹⁸⁶ The text is written in a stichometric format: one hemistich per line.¹⁸⁷ The orthography is not consistent.¹⁸⁸ Moreover, there is no evidence of scribal intervention preserved in the text.¹⁸⁹

The textual tradition of 4Q93 is debated. Tov suggests that this text is excerpted,¹⁹⁰ and that is possible in the minds of the editors.¹⁹¹ Material features that

¹⁸⁴ Eugene Ulrich, Patrick W. Skehan, and Peter W. Flint, “4QPsl,” in *Qumran Cave 4. XI, Psalms to Chronicles*, 127-29.

¹⁸⁵ Ulrich, Skehan, and Flint, “4QPsl,” 127.

¹⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, 127-28.

¹⁸⁷ Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 171. See also the discussion of the stichometric format in Ulrich, Skehan, and Flint, “4QPsl,” 127. Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 170, notes that Ps 104 is always presented stichometrically.

¹⁸⁸ Ulrich, Skehan, and Flint, “4QPsl,” 128.

¹⁸⁹ *Ibid.*

¹⁹⁰ Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 98. Tov argues that the text only contained Ps 104, but elsewhere he does not list 4Q93 as a liturgical text (Tov, “The Biblical Texts from the Judaean Desert,” 156) or as a Scripture-like text; namely, a liturgical text or excerpted text for personal use (Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 320-21), perhaps because of its limited size. He questionably marks this text as non-aligned in Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 334.

¹⁹¹ Ulrich, Skehan, and Flint, “4QPsl,” 128.

support this conclusion include the dimensions of the columns (approx. 15 lines high and approx. 13-21 letter-spaces wide).¹⁹² Tov further categorizes the text as possibly non-aligned,¹⁹³ while Lange reserves judgment due to the text's poor state of preservation.¹⁹⁴

Description and Categorization of Variants

4Q93 contains several orthographic differences when compared to the MT. Noteworthy orthographic differences include a peculiar use of a *yod* at F1:L5 (Col 1:10 [Ps 104:4]) and the interchange of sibilants at F1:L6 (Col 1:11 [Ps 104:5]).¹⁹⁵

Three other differences can reasonably be grouped as either category 1 variants (e.g., differences between collective singulars and plurals) or orthographic differences. In the first example, the *yod* may represent final *e* preserved at F1:L4 (Col 1:9 [Ps 104:4]),¹⁹⁶ while the second ambiguity may depend on the contraction of the diphthong *aw* at F1:L4 (Col 1:9 [Ps 104:4]) and F1:L5 (Col 1:10 [Ps 104:4]).¹⁹⁷ These differences are considered orthographic variants here.

¹⁹² Ulrich, Skehan, and Flint, "4QPsI," 127. For a discussion of the size of texts as evidence for a text's excerpted nature, see Julie A. Duncan, "Excerpted Texts of Deuteronomy at Qumran," *Revue de Qumran* 18, no. 1 (April 1997): 49-50; Tov, "Excerpted and Abbreviated Biblical Texts," 596; Brent Strawn, "Excerpted Manuscripts at Qumran: Their Significance for the Textual History of the Hebrew Bible and the Socio-Religious History of the Qumran Community and Its Literature," in *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Second Princeton Symposium on Judaism and Christian Origins*, ed. James H Charlesworth (Waco, TX.: Baylor University Press, 2006), 2:114-16.

¹⁹³ Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 334; Tov, "The Biblical Texts from the Judaean Desert," 156.

¹⁹⁴ Lange, "Textual Plurality," 55-56.

¹⁹⁵ One can refer to the reconstructed line number when citing this text or to the actual line number of the fragment (only one fragment exists for this text, but the fragment preserves content from two consequent columns). The first reference given is the reference to the fragment number (there is only one) and the corresponding line of the fragment while the second reference refers to the column and the reconstructed line number.

¹⁹⁶ Qimron, *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, §100.34.

¹⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, §200.18. For information about these variants, see table "4Q93: Description of the

Category 1. 4Q93 preserves one category 1 variant. This variant concerns the addition of a *lamed* preposition at F1:L7 (Col 1:12 [Ps 104:5]).¹⁹⁸

Category 2. 4Q93 preserves no category 2 variants.

Category 3. 4Q93 preserves no category 3 variants.

Statistics and Conclusion of 4Q93's Textual Tradition

4Q93 is poorly preserved. Only 27 words are sufficiently preserved in two small columns.¹⁹⁹ Moreover, the small size of the columns strongly suggest that this manuscript was not a copy of the entire Psalter, but an excerpted text. However, due to the fragmentary nature of the remains, one cannot be certain that what remains was not a mere quotation. Nonetheless, what is preserved can reasonable be classified as Masoretic since the text only preserves one category 1 variant.

Table 37. The statistical relationship between 4Q93 and the MT

Total # of Words in 4Q93	Categories 1, 2, and 3	Statistical Relationship	Categories 2 and 3	Statistical Relationship	Category 3	Statistical Relationship
27	1	96.30%	0	100.00%	0	100%

4Q95

4Q95 (4QPsⁿ) may preserve portions of Psalms 135 and 136 in three fragments.²⁰⁰ Ulrich, Skehan, and Flint (the editors) describe the script as a Herodian

variants,” in appendix 4.

¹⁹⁸ For information about these variants, see table “4Q93: Description of the variants,” in appendix 4.

¹⁹⁹ Six words identified by Ulrich are not included in the total word count because they are insufficiently preserved.

²⁰⁰ Eugene Ulrich, Patrick W. Skehan, and Peter W. Flint, “4QPsⁿ,” in *Qumran Cave 4. XI*,

hand that dates to the end of the first century BC.²⁰¹ The text is written in prose format.²⁰² Conclusions are difficult to draw concerning the orthography of the text due to its poor preservation.²⁰³ The preserved text evidences no instances of scribal intervention.²⁰⁴

It is very difficult to determine the identity of 4Q95 because of its fragmentary nature. Fragment 1 preserves portions of Psalm 135 while the identity of the text preserved in fragments 2-3 is less clear. The editors propose that the first three lines of fragments 2-3 partially preserve Psalm 135:11-12 and that lines 4-5 partially preserve Psalm 136:23-24. They argue that “the compiler has succeeded in blending material from Psalm 135 with that of 136 at points where the separate Psalms contain very similar readings.”²⁰⁵ The result of this amalgamation is a new psalm.²⁰⁶ 11Q5 Col 16:1-6 may provide some precedent for this phenomenon since the scribe adds a catena of texts from Psalm 118 and appends it to Psalm 136 (the same Psalm in question in 4Q95).²⁰⁷ However, contrary to Ulrich, Skehan, and Flint, it is possible that fragments 2-3 of 4Q95 preserve Psalm 136:19-24 with only minor deviations when compared to the MT. The following discussion and statistics will account for both proposals.

The textual nature of this text is debated. The editors understand the text as closer to 11Q5 than the MT, but also as independent from 11Q5 in possibly amalgamating

Psalms to Chronicles, 135-37.

²⁰¹ Ulrich, Skehan, and Flint, “4QPsn,” 135.

²⁰² *Ibid.*

²⁰³ *Ibid.*

²⁰⁴ *Ibid.*

²⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, 137.

²⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, 135.

²⁰⁷ At the end of Ps 136, there is a blank space a few letter spaces wide that likely indicates that the scribe understood the catena from Ps 118 appended to Ps 136 as secondary.

portions of Psalms 135 and 136 into one “new Psalm.”²⁰⁸ Tov, likewise, sees the text as non-aligned²⁰⁹ and as an excerpted text.²¹⁰ Lange, however, classifies 4Q95 as a text that may not preserve a biblical book.²¹¹

Description and Categorization of Variants

On the one hand, there are two proposed variants, if one understands fragments 2-3 as preserving Psalm 136:20-24, that depend on insufficient evidence. These potential differences are found at F2:L2 (Frgs. 2-3:L2 [Ps 136:21 or 135:12]) and at F:2:L2 (F2-3:L2 [Ps 136:21 or 135:12]).²¹² On the other hand, two different variants depend on insufficient manuscript evidence if one understands fragments 2-3 as preserving Psalm 135:11-12 followed by 136:23-24. These are preserved at F2:L2 (Frgs. 2-3:L2 [Ps 136:21 or 135:12]) and F3:L2 (Frgs. 2-3:L3 [Ps 136:21 or 135:12]).²¹³

Category 1. 4Q95 does not preserve any category 1 variants.

Category 2. 4Q95 preserves a category 2 addition at F1:L1-2 (Ps 135:6). Here 4Q95 reads לעשות יעש[ה אין כי אין כיהוה ואין שיעשה] [כמלך אלוהים]

²⁰⁸ Ulrich, Skehan, and Flint, “4QPsn,” 135-37.

²⁰⁹ Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 334.

²¹⁰ Tov, “Excerpted and Abbreviated Biblical Texts,” 592. Though he does not include this text in his list in Tov, “The Biblical Texts from the Judaean Desert,” 156; or in his discussion of Scripture-like compositions in Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 320-21.

²¹¹ Lange, “Textual Plurality,” 56.

²¹² One can refer to the exact fragment number or to the group of fragments placed together as part of a reconstructed column. Both citations are given here. The first reference given is the reference to the fragment number and the corresponding line of the fragment (or the presumed line because at times the difference is now missing) while the second reference refers to the group of fragments (where applicable) and the line number.

²¹³ See table “4Q95: Description of variants,” in appendix 3.

none like the Lord, there is “to do, as do[es; there is none like the Lord, there is none like the Lord, and there is none who acts like the King of gods]”²¹⁴ in agreement with 11Q5.²¹⁵ This Psalm calls God’s people to praise him because of his uniqueness and greatness: The Lord is above all gods (v. 5); he does whatever he pleases (v. 6); he saved his people from Pharaoh and the mighty kings of Canaan (vv. 8-12). The addition of 4Q95 is also found in 11Q5 and simply expands on this idea.

Category 2 variant if fragments 2-3 preserve portions of Psalm 136:20-24.

A category 2 substitution is found at F3:L2 (F2-3:L3 [Ps 136:22 or Ps 135:12]) if the line preserves Psalm 136:22. 4Q95 reads עמו, “his people,” while the MT reads עֶבְדוֹ, “his servant.” In both texts, the construct phrase functions appositionally to further define Israel. 4Q95 defines Israel as “his people,” while the MT defines Israel as “his servant.” Both designations are common in Scripture (e.g., Israel is defined as God’s people at Exod 18:1; Deut 21:8; Judg 11:23; 1 Sam 9:16 while Israel is defined as God’s servant or at Isa 41:8; 44:21; Neh 1:6; 1 Chron 16:13). Moreover, Israel is designated as God’s people more commonly than God’s servant. If this reading corresponds to Psalm 136:22, then this fact may have led to this substitution.

Category 2 variants if fragments 2-3 preserves portions of Psalm 135:11-12 + 136:23-24.

A category 2 addition is preserved at F2:L2 (Frgs. 2-3:L2 [Ps 136:21 or 135:12]) if one understands this line as representing Psalm 135:12. Here the top of a *lamed* is preserved, which indicates some type of addition. The editors transcribe here the prepositional phrase [וְ]לְ which would make the text more explicit. However, if one

²¹⁴ Translation from Abegg, Flint, and Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible*, 568. They suggest that the entire addition of 11Q5 was originally found in 4Q95 since there are 70 letter spaces between the first partially preserved letter of line 1 (i.e., what Ulrich transcribes as a *sade*) to the corresponding position of line 2 contrary to the fourteen letter spaces if one were to read with the MT here.

²¹⁵ Ulrich, Skehan, and Flint, “4QPsn,” 136. Although they list 4QPs^k (4Q92) as reading with 11Q5 (11QPs^a) and 4Q92 (4QPs^b), the reading of 4Q92 is inconclusive.

understands this line as representing Psalm 136:21, then the partially preserved *lamed* may represent the preposition in the prepositional phrase לעולם “forever.”

Category 3. 4Q95 preserves no category 3 variants.

Statistics and Conclusion of 4Q95’s Textual Tradition

It is difficult to classify the textual tradition of 4Q95 since the text is poorly preserved. In fact, it is unclear what text this manuscript preserves. Fragment 1 preserves portions of Psalm 135 while fragments 2-3 may either preserve a new psalm (i.e., an amalgamation of Pss 135 and 136 or portions of Ps 136:20-24.²¹⁶ Moreover, due to the small amount of text preserved, one cannot be sure that this text actually preserved a biblical text, as suggested by Lange.²¹⁷ The text is ambiguous.

Table 38. The statistical relationship between 4Q95 and the MT if fragments 2-3 preserve portions of Psalm 136:20-24

Total # of Words in 4Q95	Categories 1, 2, and 3	Statistical Relationship	Categories 2 and 3	Statistical Relationship	Category 3	Statistical Relationship
28	4	85.71%	4	85.71%	0	100%

Table 39. The statistical relationship between 4Q95 and the MT if fragments 2-3 preserve portions of a Psalm 135:11-12 and 136:23-24 (i.e., a New Psalm)

Total # of Words in 4Q95	Categories 1, 2, and 3	Statistical Relationship	Categories 2 and 3	Statistical Relationship	Category 3	Statistical Relationship
28	5	82.14%	5	82.14%	0	100%

²¹⁶ This proposal is made in Abegg, Bowley, and Cook, *Accordance 11.2.5 Dead Sea Scroll Biblical Corpus*.

²¹⁷ Lange, “Textual Plurality,” 55-56.

4Q98

4Q98 (4QPs⁹)²¹⁸ is preserved in two adjoining columns preserving portions of Psalms 31, 33, and 35.²¹⁹ Ulrich, Skehan, and Flint (the editors) describe the manuscript as written in prose format in a Herodian script, resembling the early Herodian round semiformal hand dating to the late first century BC or early first century AD.²²⁰ The orthography is mixed: the manuscript spells the *kōl* particle *plene*, but often omits a *yod* where the MT supplies one.²²¹ The editors further note that no corrections or evidence of a later hand is preserved in the text.²²²

Scholars debate the nature of 4Q98. Milik understood this text as a copy of a genuine Psalter and noted its importance due its aberrant arrangement and individual textual variants.²²³ The editors' evaluation of the variants indicate the belief that the text is removed from the MT since the text's sequence is at odds with the MT: Psalm 31 is followed by Psalm 33, not Psalm 32;²²⁴ Psalm 33:13-22 begins on a new line which may indicate that these verses represent a "new Psalm;" a longer text is preserved at Psalm 33:7; and the texts disagree regarding a superscription at Psalm 33 (4Q98 and the LXX

²¹⁸ For a discussion of the provenance of this text, see Ulrich, Skehan, and Flint "4QPsq," in *Qumran Cave 4. XI, Psalms to Chronicles*, 145. Jozef Tadeusz Milik, "Deux Documents Inédits Du Désert de Juda," *Biblica* 38, no. 3 (1957): 245, grouped 4Q98 as deriving from Qumran Cave 4 rather than Nahal Hever because of its variants.

²¹⁹ Eugene Ulrich, Patrick W. Skehan, and Peter W. Flint, "4QPsq," in *Qumran Cave 4. XI, Psalms to Chronicles*, 145-49.

²²⁰ Ulrich, Skehan, and Flint, "4QPsq," 146.

²²¹ *Ibid.*

²²² *Ibid.*

²²³ Milik, "Deux Documents Inédits Du Désert de Juda," 246.

²²⁴ Flint identifies this as a major difference from the MT. Flint, *The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls*, 37.

add a superscription).²²⁵ Tov understands the text to be an excerpted text for liturgical purposes: a special sub-category of the non-aligned category.²²⁶ Lange likewise categorizes the text as non-aligned.²²⁷

Description and Categorization of Variants

Several of the differences proposed by the editors are not categorized in either category 1, 2, or 3. A sampling of these variants include examples that can reasonably be described as synonymous spellings, while others depend on insufficient manuscript evidence. There is one example of scribal error.²²⁸

Category 1. There are two category 1 variants. One concerns tense while the second concerns the substitution of a similar lexeme.

Category 2. 4Q98 preserves two category 2 additions. The first addition involves a superscription at Col 1:2 (Ps 33:1). 4Q98 reads לְדָוִד שִׁיר מְזֻמָּר, “to David, a song, a psalm.” This addition is not alarming for several reasons. First, scribes tended to add superscriptions to psalms over time. This fact is evident by comparing the superscriptions of the LXX to the MT.²²⁹ Albert Pietersma states that the superscriptions of “the LXX is an expansion on the MT. All that is in the MT is in the LXX, and at no

²²⁵ Ulrich, Skehan, and Flint, “4QPsq,” 146-49.

²²⁶ Tov, “The Biblical Texts from the Judaean Desert,” 156. See also Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 334.

²²⁷ Lange, “Textual Plurality,” 54-55.

²²⁸ The scribal error is preserved at Col 2:7 (Ps 35:15). Here 4Q98 reads תְּכִים, while the MT reads תְּכִים. The reading of 4Q98 is very difficult while remaining graphically similar to the MT. A ligatured *vav nun* could easily account for this confusion. Compare the phrase בְּכַמּוֹנָה in column 1 line 4. Here the *vav* and the *nun* if ligatured would be very similar to a *tav*. The translation in Abegg, Flint, and Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible*, 524, indicates that they view this difference as a scribal error.

²²⁹ Pietersma, “David in the Greek Psalms,” 213.

point do they contradict each other.”²³⁰ Second, this addition is not alarming since attribution of this psalm to David is preserved in the LXX. The superscription reads simply Τῷ Δαυιδ, “to David” [LXX Ps 32].²³¹ Third, within the first book of the Psalter (i.e., Pss 1-41) only four psalms in the MT lack a superscription (Pss 1, 2, 10, 33); all of the other psalms are attributed to David (לְדָוִד).²³² Moreover, the inclusion of שִׁיר מְזֻמֹּר, “a song, a psalm,” in the superscription is also not alarming since the audience is commanded to sing praise “זָמְרוּ” and sing “שִׁירֵי” to God (see Ps 33:3).

The second addition is preserved at Col 1:6 (Ps 33:7). Here, 4Q98 adds the colon]נֹוד[כמו]נצבו הַמִּים[שָׁם הָמִים, “There the waters [stood up like] a heap.”²³³ This added colon adds a phrase that resembles Exodus 15:8 and Psalm 78:13 and may be a case of harmonization. The exact extent to which this added phrase corresponds to these other passages, however, is unclear. In actuality, the adverb שָׁם transcribed by Ulrich, Skehan, and Flint depends on meager evidence as does the following article. All that is sufficiently present here is the noun מִים, but not its article, and the very last letter of the last word, quite possibly a *dalet*. What is sufficiently preserved corresponds to Exodus 15:8, but more so to Psalm 78:13. Nonetheless, the poor state of the fragment’s preservation precludes a more certain understanding of this variant.²³⁴

²³⁰ Pietersma, “David in the Greek Psalms,” 214.

²³¹ For a list of LXX manuscripts have a slightly fuller title, see Milik, “Deux Documents Inédits Du Désert de Juda,” 247.

²³² Only Pss 1, 2, 10, and 33 (this psalm under discussion) lack לְדָוִד. However, the LXX reads Pss 9 and 10 as one psalm.

²³³ For translation, albeit without the brackets, see Ulrich, Skehan, and Flint, “4QPsq,” 147.

²³⁴ One should note that the event discussed in Exod 15:8 and Ps 78:13 is the Exodus while the event sung about in Ps 33 is creation. It is possible that the psalmist is connecting the exodus and creation themes here. One further piece of evidence may support this conclusion. The next verse, Ps 33:8, in both the MT and 4Q98, states that the creation should cause the earth to fear the Lord. This reason is also the reason for the plagues against Egypt (e.g., Exod 8:22; 9:14, 29; 10:2), and this is the reason for Israel crossing the Red Sea (Exod 14:10). Thus, it is possible that this added phrase draws out the connection already present in

Category 3. 4Q98 preserves no category 3 variants.

Differences likely caused by excerpted nature. 4Q98 does not follow the order of the Psalms of the Masoretic Text since Psalm 33 immediately succeeds Psalm 31 as it does in 4Q83. Whether one categorizes the different order of psalms as a category 3 variant depends on one's conclusion about the nature of the manuscript: is 4Q98 a biblical-text or an excerpted text. If the text was originally intended as an excerpted text, then the rearranged order of Psalms does not indicate a different literary edition but reflects the text's excerpted nature. Tov is right to indicate that differences that derive from the nature of the excerpted text—such as rearranged text and large-scale omissions—cannot be evidence for a different textual tradition.²³⁵

A second difference noted by the editors as significant is the *vacat* space that separates Psalm 31:1-12 and Psalm 31:13-22 at Col 1:8-10. Ulrich, Skehan, and Flint suggest that this interval indicates that verses 13-22 constituted a “new Psalm.”²³⁶ The manuscript evidence indicates that *vacat* spaces often separate individual Psalms.²³⁷ However, one cannot be sure that every *vacat* space always indicates a transition between Psalms. Other factors could have led to the *vacat*. Unfortunately, the poor state of the text's preservation precludes any thorough investigation into the intervals preserved in the text. The other preserved interval is peculiar in some respects and may indicate a paragraphing system unique to this text. Moreover, one should also note that disagreements about the exact beginning and ending to Psalms is a difference found within texts that

this passage between creation and the Exodus. However, although there is some evidence for this suggestion, the evidence is fragmentary, and thus, the nature of this addition is merely suggestive.

²³⁵ See Tov, “Excerpted and Abbreviated Biblical Texts,” 599.

²³⁶ Ulrich, Skehan, and Flint, “4QPsq,” 148.

²³⁷ Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 163-64, lists four different types of scribal breaks used to indicate a new Psalm.

clearly preserve the Masoretic tradition. Thus, the difference is not indicative of a text's extra-Masoretic nature.²³⁸ Rather, it could possibly have derived from a liturgical use.

The question then is, is 4Q98 an excerpted text? A few facts suggest this conclusion. First, it is recognized that many manuscripts preserve a type of scribal break, *vacat*, and/or other scribal sign at the division of excerption.²³⁹ Most often, individual psalms are divided from other psalms by a *vacat*, but the *vacat* preserved in column 1 is unusual. Psalm 31 ends on line 1 prior to the end of the line and the next line begins after an indentation, which is not unusual among the manuscripts.²⁴⁰ However, what is unique is the length of the indentation. Moreover, all that is preserved on the first line of Psalm 33 is the superscription that is positioned to left hand margin.²⁴¹

Second, the text has a sequence that differs not only from the MT, but also from the LXX. Of course, this datum can be read in two different ways: as evidence of the text's excerpted nature or as evidence of the text's independent nature.²⁴² However, since the LXX translation predates 4Q98 (and likely 4Q83) and was clearly known as a true-Psalter scroll, the rearranged sequence of texts is more likely indicative of the text's excerpted nature rather than its independent status.

Third, for several reasons (e.g., their liturgical nature), Psalms were subject to excerption, and thus, there is precedent for labeling this text as an excerpted text.²⁴³

²³⁸ For a discussion of this phenomenon among texts preserving the Masoretic tradition, see the section on 4Q83 above titled "Differences likely caused by the excerpted nature" where 4Q83 may represent Pss 38 and 71 as one Psalm.

²³⁹ Strawn, "Excerpted Manuscripts at Qumran," 114.

²⁴⁰ Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 163-64.

²⁴¹ See *ibid.*, 177.

²⁴² See Strawn's interaction with this dilemma in Strawn, "Excerpted Manuscripts at Qumran," 132-33.

²⁴³ Tov understands most texts preserving Psalms from cave 4 and 11 as excerpted. See Tov, "The Biblical Texts from the Judaean Desert," 156. This reason corresponds to Strawn's third characteristic

Despite these facts, it is well known that a characteristic of most excerpted texts is their small dimensions—a characteristic that 4Q98 does not share.²⁴⁴ Ulrich, Skehan, and Flint claim that 4Q98 originally persevered ca. 29 lines per column at an estimated height 23.6 cm.²⁴⁵ In fact, Tov labels 4Q98 as a text with large dimensions that may have been a *de luxe* edition:²⁴⁶ a group of manuscripts with large margins, a large number of lines, a close relationship to the MT, and little scribal intervention.²⁴⁷ The main criterion supporting 4Q98 as a *de luxe* manuscript is its column height. However, one should note that column height as an indicator of an excerpted manuscript is relative since complete biblical books are not all the same size. The dimensions of a complete Psalter would be much longer than the dimensions of several other books. Thus, it would seem that an excerpted text preserving Psalms could be quite larger than an excerpted book of Deuteronomy. One should further note that the *de luxe* category is not used exclusively for biblical books.²⁴⁸ Thus, it is not beyond reason that an excerpted text likewise could be formatting as a *de luxe* edition.

Statistics and Conclusion of 4Q98's Textual Tradition

The textual tradition preserved in 4Q98 can be reasonably identified as the Masoretic tradition.²⁴⁹ The variants preserved are minor in that they can be attributed to

of excerpted texts. See Strawn, "Excerpted Manuscripts at Qumran," 116-18.

²⁴⁴ Strawn, "Excerpted Manuscripts at Qumran," 596.

²⁴⁵ The material features are discussed in detail in Ulrich, Skehan, and Flint, "4QPsq," 145.

²⁴⁶ Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 129.

²⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 128.

²⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 126-29.

²⁴⁹ Twenty-six words transcribed by Ulrich, Skehan, and Flint are not included in the final word count for this text because they depend on insufficient manuscript evidence. Compare the total word count by Lange, "Collecting Psalms," 300. He states that 111 words are sufficiently preserved in 4Q98, but note

the scribal process. Moreover, the two texts share a high statistical relationship as table 40 demonstrates. The text is likely an excerpted text, and this fact accounts for the omission or transposition of Psalm 32 and the possible conception of Psalm 31 as more than one Psalm.

Table 40. The statistical relationship between 4Q98 and the MT

Total # of Words in 4Q98	Categories 1, 2, and 3	Statistical Relationship	Categories 2 and 3	Statistical Relationship	Category 3	Statistical Relationship
127	8	93.70%	6	95.28%	0	100%

4Q98a

4Q98a (4QPs^r) is preserved in four fragments and preserves portions of Psalm 26-27 and 30.²⁵⁰ Ulrich, Skehan, and Flint (the editors) describe the text as written in prose format and the script as belonging to the Herodian period, while claiming that too little of the text remains for the orthography to be classified.²⁵¹ There is no evidence of scribal intervention.²⁵²

The textual tradition of 4Q98a is debated. The editors do not comment about the textual tradition or nature of 4Q98a. Tov categorizes the text as non-aligned.²⁵³

how he counts a word: he understands מלכו as one word whereas it is understood as two here. Ibid., 299. The photo of 4Q98 found at The British Library, Online Gallery, “Dead Sea Scrolls, Qumran, Israel, c50AD. Psalms Musée Bible et Terre Sainte, Paris,” accessed June 14, 2018, http://www.bl.uk/onlinegallery/sacredtexts/deadseascrolls_lg.html, was consulted to compare the editors’ transcriptions. Beatriz Riestra from the IAA was very kind to direct me to this photo.

²⁵⁰ Eugene Ulrich, Patrick W. Skehan, and Peter W. Flint, “4QPs^r,” in *Qumran Cave 4. XI, Psalms to Chronicles*, 160-62.

²⁵¹ Ibid., 160.

²⁵² Ibid.

²⁵³ Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 334. Notably, this is one of the texts from cave 4 preserving Psalms that he does not list as an excerpted text. See Tov, “The Biblical Texts from the Judaean Desert,” 156; Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 320-21.

Lange, however, withholds judgment about the textual nature of the text due to poor preservation.²⁵⁴

Description and Categorization of Variants

The editors propose two differences that depend on insufficient manuscript evidence.²⁵⁵ The first is partially preserved at F3:L3 (Col 1:5 [Ps 26:11]).²⁵⁶ The editors rightly state that the third to the last letter is likely a *yod*, and thus, the reading differs from the MT. However, none of the prior letters are preserved, which makes identifying this difference as a variant difficult since the *yod* may simply represent a *plene* spelling of the MT. The second proposed variant is found at F2ii:L3 (Col 2:3 [Ps 30:10]). Here, the first two letters are written closely together, perhaps ligatured, which makes the editors proposed reading of *vav* and *yod* possible, but the mark also resembles a *he*. If this letter is a *he*, then the reading of 4Q98a may be preserving content further down the light (i.e., the MT's יהנהּהּנהּהּ). Therefore, neither of these proposed variants are certain.

Category 1. The text preserves one category 1 variant. This difference is found at F2ii:L1 (Col 2:1 [Ps 30:10]) and concerns the substitution of similar prepositions.²⁵⁷

²⁵⁴ Lange, "Textual Plurality," 55-56.

²⁵⁵ See table 4Q98a: Description of variants, in appendix 3, for more details about these variants.

²⁵⁶ One can refer to the reconstructed column and reconstructed line number provided by the editors (or even the fragments grouped together to form a reconstructed column), or one can refer to the exact fragment and line number corresponding to the actual fragment when citing this text. Both are provided in this dissertation. The first reference given is the reference to the exact fragment number and the corresponding line of the fragment while the second reference is that of either the reconstructed column or the group of fragments grouped together by the editors and the corresponding reconstructed line number. Note that if the editors reconstruct the column, the group of fragments is not listed so that the citations do not become unclear.

²⁵⁷ See table "4Q98a: Description of variants," in appendix 3, for more details about this variant.

Category 2. 4Q98a preserves one category 2 variant at F2ii:L1 (Col 2:1 [Ps 30:9]). 4Q98a reads יהוה, “Yahweh,” while the MT reads אֲדֹנָי, “Lord.” Substitution of the divine name is very common among Hebrew manuscripts.

Category 3. 4Q98a preserves no category 3 variants.

Statistics and Conclusion of 4Q98a’s Textual Tradition

4Q98a is very poorly preserved (only 29 words are sufficiently preserved).²⁵⁸ Due to poor preservation (it preserves content from two columns partially), one cannot be sure if 4Q98a is a biblical text. The remaining content may be a quotation from a non-biblical text. Nonetheless, the text preserves no large-scale difference when compared to the MT. Thus, the content which remains can reasonably be classified as belonging to the Masoretic tradition.

Table 41. The statistical relationship between 4Q98a and the MT

Total # of Words in 4Q98a	Categories 1, 2, and 3	Statistical Relationship	Categories 2 and 3	Statistical Relationship	Category 3	Statistical Relationship
35	2	94.29%	1	97.14%	0	100%

4Q98g

4Q98g (4QPs^x) preserves in one fragment portions of Psalm 89.²⁵⁹ Ulrich, Skehan, and Flint (the editors) date 4Q98g paleographically to the Hasmonaean period and accept the date suggested by J. T. Milik: ca. 175-125 BC.²⁶⁰ By accepting Milik’s

²⁵⁸ Seven words transcribed by Ulrich depend on insufficient manuscript evidence.

²⁵⁹ Eugene Ulrich, Patrick W. Skehan, and Peter W. Flint, “4QPs^x,” in *Qumran Cave 4. XI, Psalms to Chronicles*, 163.

²⁶⁰ See Jozef Tadeusz Milik, “Fragment d’une Source Du Psautier (4Q Ps 89) et Fragments Des Jubilés, Du Document de Damas,” *Revue Biblique* 73, no. 1 (January 1966): 95, 102. Contrary to Milik’s proposal, see J. P. M. van der Ploeg, “Le Sens et Un Probleme Textuel Du Ps LXXXIX,” in

early date, the editors claim that this manuscript is one of the earliest Psalm scrolls extant.²⁶¹ Concerning orthography, they suggest that it is inconsistent and difficult to categorize.²⁶² Tov, likewise, categorizes the orthography as unclear²⁶³ but notes that the text does not consistently use final letters in final position such as the spelling מַע at F1:L2 (Ps 89:20).²⁶⁴ The difference found at F1:L1 (Ps 89:20) further illustrates the text's ambiguous spelling practice. 4Q98g reads מַע , which the editors suggest is a "Hebrew form with ancient orthography."²⁶⁵ This spelling, however, may rather be attributed to Aramaic influence as suggested by Skehan.²⁶⁶ Several characteristics of the text, including a high degree of scribal intervention, indicate that the scribe was either a beginner or unskilled.²⁶⁷

The nature of 4Q98g is unclear because of the text's poor preservation, the high proportion of differences, and the nature of these differences—verses are rearranged in an order very different than found in the MT. The sequence of verses from Psalm 89 are as follows: 20-22, 26, 23, 27-28, and 31. These facts have led to three general

Mélanges Bibliques Et Orientaux En l'honneur de M. Henri Cazelles, ed. André Caquot and Mathias Delcor, *Alter Orient Und Altes Testament* 212 (Kevelaer, Germany: Butzon & Bercker, 1981), 475. He dates the text to the second half of the first century BC.

²⁶¹ Ulrich, Skehan, and Flint, "4QPsx," 163.

²⁶² See the table of orthographic differences in Ulrich, Skehan, and Flint, "4QPsx," 163-64.

²⁶³ Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 198.

²⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, 231-32. Notice also a *sade* that formally appears to be a final *sade* written medially in line 2.

²⁶⁵ See Ulrich, Skehan, and Flint, "4QPsx," 166. This is the opinion of Milik, "Fragment d'une Source Du Psautier (4Q Ps 89)," 99-100.

²⁶⁶ See Patrick William Skehan, "Gleanings from Psalm Texts from Qumran," in Caquot and Delcor, *Mélanges Bibliques*, 442.

²⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, 441-42. See also Pajunen, who labels the scribe a beginner in Mika S. Pajunen, "4QPs[x]: A Collective Interpretation of Psalm 89:20-38," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 133, no. 3 (2014): 484.

suggestions about the nature of this text. First, this may be an independent form of Psalm 89.²⁶⁸ Second, the scroll is not a biblical text. Proponents of this view include Skehan, who argues that this fragment was a practice page written from memory.²⁶⁹ Van der Ploeg too believed that this scroll was not a biblical text, but the remains of a *libretto of messianic testimonia*.²⁷⁰ Tov categorizes 4Q98g as a non-biblical text; namely, a liturgical or excerpted text.²⁷¹ Third, the text is too badly damaged to know the text's nature.²⁷²

Pajunen discusses this text in depth and likewise claims that it did not preserve a biblical text. He claims that the material aspects of the text (i.e., estimated size of the fragment, indications of limited writing space, lack of ruling, and presence of stitching) indicate that "the fragment is part of the handle sheet preceding a scroll that was already written and sewn together before this text was put on it."²⁷³ Moreover, certain scribal features, such as the presence of several errors and corrections, indicate that this fragment was written by a beginner scribe.²⁷⁴ He also claims that the majority of the variants that differentiate this text from the MT derive from a tendency to interpret a Masoretic-like exemplar. Essentially, the scribe has taken "God's promises to David and adapted [them] to a collective use."²⁷⁵ Therefore, Pajunen assesses 4Q98g as an abbreviated form of

²⁶⁸ This opinion is evident in Ulrich, Skehan, and Flint, "4QPsx," 163-67; Milik, "Fragment d'une Source Du Psautier (4Q Ps 89)," 104.

²⁶⁹ See Skehan, "Gleanings from Psalm Texts from Qumran," 439-52. Inelegant and irregular handwriting has led other scholars to make similar suggestions about other texts. See Tov's discussion in Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 14.

²⁷⁰ Ploeg, "Le Sens et Un Probleme Textuel Du Ps LXXXIX," 475, 481.

²⁷¹ Tov, "The Biblical Texts from the Judaean Desert," 156.

²⁷² Lange, "Textual Plurality," 56.

²⁷³ Pajunen, "4QPs[X]," 485.

²⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, 484.

²⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, 489.

Psalm 89 beginning at verse 20 and not extending beyond verse 38 that is secondary to the MT: it is an interpretation of this Psalm.²⁷⁶

Description and Categorization of Variants

The editors propose several differences between 4Q98g and the MT that for various reasons do not belong to categories 1, 2, or 3. These proposed differences include four differences that depend on insufficient manuscript evidence.²⁷⁷ One additional difference depends on rightly distinguishing between a *vav* and *yod* that is inconclusive materially. Other differences derive from Aramaic influence and a different form of the personal pronoun.

Category 1. 4Q98g preserves two category 1 variants. These include the omission of a conjunctive *vav* at L5 (Ps 89:26) and the substitution of a similar lexeme at L6 (Ps 89:2).²⁷⁸

Category 2. 4Q98g preserves six category 2 variants when compared to the MT. These include two omissions. The first category 2 omission is found on L5 (Ps 89:26). Here 4Q98g reads 𐤇, “hand,” while the MT reads 𐤇𐤅, “his hand.” The omission of the pronominal suffix is a very common difference among the non-aligned texts. In this case, however, it is difficult to determine if 4Q98g implies the pronominal suffix or not: the text is too fragmentary.

²⁷⁶ Ibid., 494.

²⁷⁷ For more information about these differences, see table 4Q98g: Description of variants, in appendix 3. See also Ulrich, Skehan, and Flint, “4QPsx,” 166.

²⁷⁸ For more information about these category 1 variants, see table “4Q98g: Description of variants,” in appendix 4.

The second category 2 omission is preserved at L7 (Ps 89:28). Here 4Q98g omits the ׀א, “so; even,” of the MT.²⁷⁹ The omission of this particle does not necessarily change the syntax since context often denote syntactical relationships between clauses.

In addition to two category 2 omissions, 4Q98g further preserves three category 2 substitutions. The first category 2 substitution is preserved at L1 (Ps 89:20). 4Q98g reads לְבַחֲרֵיכָּ [לְ], “[to] your chosen ones,” while the MT reads לְקֹדְשֵׁי־יְהוָה, “to your godly ones.” The difference is likely an interpretation. The root בחר occurs twice in Psalm 89 (MT), and in both instances it refers to David (vv. 4, 20). By substituting the MT’s לְקֹדְשֵׁי־יְהוָה to your godly ones in verse 20 with לְבַחֲרֵיכָּ [לְ], “[to] your chosen ones,” the text identifies the one God is addressing as David. This interpretation accounts for the internal evidence since the subject of God’s message is David and God’s covenant with him. The difference is likely a case of harmonization.²⁸⁰

The harmonistic tendency of this scribe is evident in the reading שמן, “oil,” in L4 (Ps 89:22) crossed out by cancellation dots. The context (i.e., the previous verse which discusses how God has anointed my holy one with oil) and the syntax of the clause (i.e., the relative clause which begins this verse and functions to link these two verses closely together) led the scribe initially to transcribe שמן rather than ידִי or יָדוֹ.²⁸¹ The scribal intervention demonstrates that the scribe, at least here, harmonized the reading to the immediate context since he later corrected it.

The second category 2 substitution is found at L3 (Ps 89:21). 4Q98g reads מִן־שֶׁמֶן, “from/some oil,” while the MT reads בְּשֶׁמֶן, “with oil.” The substitution of the *bet*

²⁷⁹ Clines, *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew*, s.v. “אָ.” understands ׀א as denoting consequence.

²⁸⁰ Skehan, Ulrich, and Flint, “4QPsx,” 166, note the similarity between v. 4 and this substitution. For a slightly different explanation for this substitution, see Pajunen, “4QPs[X],” 490.

²⁸¹ Pajunen, “4QPs[X],” 488.

preposition of the MT with the *min* preposition changes the syntax of the verse slightly. Ulrich, Skehan, and Flint interpret the *min* as a partitive *min*²⁸² while the *bet* preposition of the MT denotes instrument: “with oil.”²⁸³ The substitution of the *bet* preposition and the *min* preposition, although representing a slightly different reading, is a common substitution among Hebrew manuscripts. Graphic or phonological confusion could occasion this substitution.

The third category 2 substitution is preserved at L4 (Ps 89:22). 4Q98g reads ידִי־וְתָמְךָ תִּכְנֹכֶם, “my hand will always remain with you,”²⁸⁴ while the MT reads יְדֵי־תִמְכֶנּוּ עָמִי, “for my hand shall sustain him” (ESV). Pajunen claims that this substitution is occasioned by interpretation; namely, the scribe has reinterpreted the Davidic promises as applying not to David, but to the collective community.²⁸⁵ However, this conclusion rests on reconstructions and other unclear readings. Thus, it is possible that this difference simply represents a change in perspective where God addresses David in the second person, not the third.

One complex group of variants cannot be precisely described because of the text’s poor preservation. This variant is found at L6 (Ps 89:23). 4Q98g read לֹא עַל־לַעֲוֹתָיִךְ לֹא יִשְׁמַח־וְיִשְׂמַח־בְּכֹל־עֲוֹנוֹתָיִךְ וְיִשְׂמַח־בְּכֹל־עֲוֹנוֹתָיִךְ, “[No longer shall] the enemy or the wicked [oppress him],”²⁸⁶ while the MT reads לֹא יִשְׂמַח־בְּכֹל־עֲוֹנוֹתָיִךְ לֹא יִשְׂמַח־בְּכֹל־עֲוֹנוֹתָיִךְ, “The enemy shall not outwit him nor shall the wicked oppress him.” These readings preserve at least two variants. First, 4Q98g omits or

²⁸² Ulrich, Skehan, and Flint, “4QPsx,” 165.

²⁸³ See Clines, *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew*, s.v. “שָׁמַח.”

²⁸⁴ Abegg, Flint, and Ulrich here understand the suffix to be a *vav*. Abegg, Flint, and Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible*, 538.

²⁸⁵ Pajunen, “4QPs[X],” 489.

²⁸⁶ For translation, see Ulrich, Skehan, and Flint, “4QPsx,” 165. However, the words “oppress him” are not sufficiently preserved in the fragment so the brackets are not from Ulrich.

transposes the prepositional phrase בּוֹ “him.”²⁸⁷ Second, the scribe substitutes the MT’s עֲלֶיךָ with the synonym עַל (this is a category 1 variant). Third, the scribe substitutes the negative particle of the MT אֵל for a *lamed* preposition. Fourth, the scribe substitutes the MT’s imperfect with an infinitive construct. The high concentration of variants in a short space suggests a paleographic issue or a text written from memory,²⁸⁸ especially since the meaning of the preserved words does not differ conceptually from the MT.

Category 3. 4Q98g does not preserve any category 3 variants.

Differences likely caused by excerpted nature. 4Q98g presents a sequence of verses at odds with the MT. The text preserves the sequence 20-22, 26, 23, 27-28, and 31. Rearranging verses has precedent in other scrolls. For example, 11Q5 Col 16:1-6 adds a catena of texts from Psalm 118 and appends it to Psalm 136.²⁸⁹ It is possible to understand this text as a liturgical text.²⁹⁰ More specifically, it appears to be a text that derives from Psalm 89, and not a copy of Psalm 89. The poor preservation of the text prohibits a

²⁸⁷ If the phrase is omitted, it may have been caused by parablepsis; namely, the scribe’s eyes have skipped from the *vav* suffix to the conjunctive *vav*.

²⁸⁸ Skehan, “Gleanings from Psalm Texts from Qumran,” 441. Compare Pajunen, “4QPs[X],” 484, who states that the scribe’s corrections argue against Skehan’s view that the text was written from memory. He cites the supralinear corrections in lines 6-7, the infralinear correction in line 1, the cancellation dots in line 4, and the reshaping of the *yod* to *resh* as evidence that the scribe used a prototype. However, the infralinear correction of line 1 and the supralinear corrections of lines 6-7 may not be corrections but may have resulted from not having enough space on the line to complete a final word. This is the opinion of Ulrich, Skehan, and Flint, “4QPsx,” 166, concerning the infralinear correction of line 1. Moreover, the supralinear correction occur as the last letters of lines 5, 6, and 7, and thus, are likely written supralinearly in an attempt to fit the entire word on the line. Thus, these marginal and supralinear writings are not corrections, but evidence of poor copying. The use of cancellation dots and the reshaping of the letters could have been occasioned without the aid of an exemplar. Thus, Skehan’s view that this text is written from memory is not weakened by the scribal intervention preserved in the text.

²⁸⁹ At the end of Ps 136 is a blank space a few letter spaces wide that likely indicates that the scribe understood the catena from Ps 118 appended to Ps 136 as secondary.

²⁹⁰ Tov, “The Biblical Texts from the Judaean Desert,” 156, understands this text to be a liturgical text.

thorough understanding of the nature of this text, but enough of this text is preserved to indicate that what is preserved is not a reliable indicator of the true text of Psalm 89.

Statistics and Conclusion of 4Q98g's Textual Tradition

It is difficult to classify the textual tradition of 4Q98g since the text is poorly preserved (4Q98g only preserves partially 35 words), the high proportion of differences, and the nature of these differences—verses are rearranged in an order very different than found in the MT. Moreover, substantial evidence suggests that the scribe was either a beginner or poor. For example, some letters are bigger than others (compare the letters from line 1 with the rest of the text); the text is not always written straight (see how lines 6 and 7 trail downward); some words are written higher than others (see the last word of line 3, which is written much higher than the prior word); words are crowded together at the end of some (possibly most) lines due to the scribe's inability to space properly the words (see lines 1, 4 and 5, and possibly even 6 and 7); the use of cancellation dots (see line 4); and a letter reshaped from a possible *yod* to a *resh* on line 2. Moreover, scribe is subject to Aramaic influence²⁹¹ and is inconsistent in the use of final letters (e.g., at times he uses final *mem* [line 4] but not at other times [line 2 and 5]).²⁹² All of these factors cast serious doubt on the ability of this scribe.

It is highly likely that this text was written from memory. Pajunen, however, states that the scribe's corrections argues against this view.²⁹³ He cites the supralinear corrections in lines 6-7, the infralinear correction in line 1, the cancellation dots in line 4, and the reshaping of the *yod* to *resh* as evidence that the scribe used a prototype.²⁹⁴

²⁹¹ Skehan, "Gleanings from Psalm Texts from Qumran," 441.

²⁹² Ibid.

²⁹³ Pajunen, "4QPs[X]," 484.

²⁹⁴ Pajunen, "4QPs[X]," 484.

However, the infralinear of line 1 and supralinear corrections of lines 6-7 may not be corrections but may have resulted because of a desire to transcribe too much content at the end of the line.²⁹⁵ Moreover, the supralinear writing occurs as the last letter of lines 5, 6, and 7, and thus, are likely written supralinearly in an attempt to fit the entire word on the line. The use of cancellation dots and the reshaping of the letters could have been occasioned without the aid of an exemplar. Thus, Skahan’s view that text is written from memory is not weakened by the scribal intervention preserved in the text. Moreover, the substitution of synonymous lexemes, harmonizations, and Aramaic influence²⁹⁶ likewise suggest that the text was written from memory.

Overall, this text appears to be written carelessly. The difference of sequence also suggests that this text is not a biblical text. Moreover, the text is poorly preserved so that an in-depth understanding of many of variants must remain suggestive. For these reasons, the overarching statistical relationship between this text and the MT is considerably low. However, one should not expect a text like this one to preserve a high statistical relationship. The text can be shown to be dependent on the MT as demonstrated here.²⁹⁷ Nonetheless, the text is labeled as ambiguous here due to the nature of the differences, the overarching statistical relationship, and the text’s poor preservation.

Table 42. The statistical relationship between 4Q98g and the MT if one does not account for the sequence of verses

Total # of Words in 4Q98g	Categories 1, 2, and 3	Statistical Relationship	Categories 2 and 3	Statistical Relationship	Category 3	Statistical Relationship
36	10	72.22%	8	77.78%	0	100%

²⁹⁵ This is the opinion of Ulrich, Skehan, and Flint, “4QPsx,” 166, concerning the infralinear correction of line 1.

²⁹⁶ Skehan, “Gleanings from Psalm Texts from Qumran,” 441.

²⁹⁷ Pajunen, “4QPs[X],” 479-95, makes this suggestion.

11Q5

11Q5 (11QPs^a) has received considerable treatment amongst scholars since it differs from the MT/LXX Psalter in several ways while being relatively well preserved. James Sanders identified 11Q5 as preserved in four separable leaves that make up the actual scroll along with four additional fragments (fragments A-D).²⁹⁸ Since Sanders's publication of 11Q5, two subsequent fragments have been identified as belonging to 11Q5 and were published in DJD, 23 (Fragments E-F).²⁹⁹ Fragments A-D preserve portions of Psalms 101, 102, 103, 104,³⁰⁰ and 109.³⁰¹ Fragments E-F preserve portions of Psalms 118, 104, 147, and 105.³⁰² The preserved columns of the scroll preserve portions of Psalms 105, 146, or perhaps a new psalm derived from Psalms 146, 148, 121-132, 119, 135-136, a catena based on Psalm 118 appended to Psalms 136, 145, and a psalm titled Psalm II (Syriac),³⁰³ elsewhere known as Psalm 154.³⁰⁴ A psalm unknown prior to the discovery of 11Q5 titled "Plea for Deliverance" by Sanders,³⁰⁵ Psalms 139, 137-138,

²⁹⁸ See James A. Sanders, *The Psalms Scroll of Qumran Cave 11 (11QPsa)*, vol. 4, Discoveries in the Judaean Desert 4 (Oxford: Clarendon, 1965), 3.

²⁹⁹ See Florentino García Martínez, Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, and van der Woude, eds., "11QPsalms^a, Fragments E, F," in *Qumran Cave 11: 11Q2-18, 11Q20-31*, vol. 2, Discoveries in the Judaean Desert 23 (Oxford: Clarendon, 1998), 29-36. However, one should note that fragment F is very small.

³⁰⁰ See the suggestion in Sanders, *The Psalms Scroll of Qumran Cave 11 (11QPsa)*, 5, that fragment C possibly preserves portions of Ps 104. However, fragment C does not preserve portions of Ps 104, as indicated by fragment E: Ps 104 is preserved there. See García Martínez, Tigchelaar, and van der Woude, "11QPsalms^a, Fragments E, F," 30.

³⁰¹ See Sanders, *The Psalms Scroll of Qumran Cave 11 (11QPsa)*, 5.

³⁰² See García Martínez, Tigchelaar, and van der Woude, "11QPsalms^a, Fragments E, F," 29-36. Fragment F is very fragmentary.

³⁰³ Sanders, *The Psalms Scroll of Qumran Cave 11 (11QPsa)*, 39.

³⁰⁴ Abegg, Flint, and Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible*, 572.

³⁰⁵ Sanders, *The Psalms Scroll of Qumran Cave 11 (11QPsa)*, 40. See Abegg, Flint, and Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible*, 573, for a brief introduction to this psalm.

portions of Sirach 51, another psalm unknown before discovery of Qumran titled “Apostrophe to Zion by Sander” are next.³⁰⁶ Psalms 93, 141, 133, 144, a psalm titled Psalm III (Syriac)³⁰⁷ or elsewhere Psalm 155,³⁰⁸ Psalms 142, 143, 149, 150, a psalm unknown outside of 11Q5 and titled “Hymn to the Creator by Sanders”³⁰⁹ are preserved next in the scroll. A portion 2 Samuel 23:7, a section of prose titled “David’s compositions by Sanders,”³¹⁰ Psalm 140, 134, 151A, and Psalm 151B³¹¹ conclude the scroll.³¹²

Sanders describes the script of 11Q5 in detail in his critical edition.³¹³ A sampling of his observations include the following: First, the scribe always wrote the divine name in paleo-Hebrew, although at times, he omits it or substitutes for it אדוני or אלוהים.³¹⁴ Second, the *vav* and *yod* are not always distinguishable in form especially when the letters are ligatured.³¹⁵ Third, Sanders notes that the script resembles the transition

³⁰⁶ Sanders, *The Psalms Scroll of Qumrañ Cave 11 (11QPsa)*, 43.

³⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, 45.

³⁰⁸ For a brief introduction to this psalm, see Abegg, Flint, and Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible*, 579.

³⁰⁹ Sanders, *The Psalms Scroll of Qumrañ Cave 11 (11QPsa)*, 47.

³¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 48. For a brief introduction to this prose section, see Abegg, Flint, and Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible*, 583.

³¹¹ See Sanders, *The Psalms Scroll of Qumrañ Cave 11 (11QPsa)*, 49. For a brief introduction to these psalms and a rationale for labeling them versions of the LXX Ps 151, see Abegg, Flint, and Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible*, 585.

³¹² Sanders, *The Psalms Scroll of Qumrañ Cave 11 (11QPsa)*, 5. For an introduction to this psalm, see Abegg, Flint, and Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible*, 576.

³¹³ García Martínez, Tigchelaar, and van der Woude state that the script of fragments E and F “is identical to the hand of the main body of the scroll,” in García Martínez, Tigchelaar, and van der Woude, “11QPsalmsa, Fragments E, F,” 29.

³¹⁴ Sanders, *The Psalms Scroll of Qumrañ Cave 11 (11QPsa)*, 6. However, in one instance the divine name is omitted, and space is left blank. *Ibid.*, 24. The practice of leaving space blank for the divine name is a practice found in a few manuscripts, according to Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 221.

³¹⁵ Sanders, *The Psalms Scroll of Qumrañ Cave 11 (11QPsa)*, 7.

from the early to the late Herodian period. Based on the text's script, Sanders assigns the scroll to the first half of the first century AD.³¹⁶

11Q5 is written in prose format except for Psalm 119, which is written stichometrically with two hemistichs per line without a space between them.³¹⁷

Regarding orthography, the scroll is much fuller than the MT.³¹⁸ Tov labels this spelling practice Qumran Scribal Practice (QSP),³¹⁹ while Sanders discusses the characteristics of this fuller orthography in detail.³²⁰ Sanders notes that the scroll uses a *vav* to mark *holem*, *shureq*, *qibbuṣ*, and *qameṣ haṭuf*.³²¹ Moreover, the use of *vav* is used in the *qal* imperative even when it reduces in the Tiberian pointing³²² as well as imperfects with suffixes (here the *vav* stands between the first and second root letters).³²³ Sanders further notes seven uncommon occurrences of *vav* in the scroll (e.g., עוורנו at Col 4:1).³²⁴ According to Sanders, the use of *yod* corresponds to its use in the Masoretic text with few exceptions.³²⁵ Among these exceptions are the spelling דריד for the MT's דָּוִד, and the

³¹⁶ Sanders, *The Psalms Scroll of Qumraṅ Cave 11 (11QPsa)*, 9.

³¹⁷ Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 170.

³¹⁸ The orthographic profile of fragments E and F is similar to that of the main scroll. See García Martínez, Tigchelaar, and van der Woude, "11QPsalmsa, Fragments E, F," 30.

³¹⁹ See Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 334.

³²⁰ Sanders, *The Psalms Scroll of Qumraṅ Cave 11 (11QPsa)*, 9-13.

³²¹ *Ibid.*, 9.

³²² *Ibid.*, 10.

³²³ *Ibid.*, 11. See the discussion of this phenomenon in Qimron, *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, §311.13.

³²⁴ Sanders, *The Psalms Scroll of Qumraṅ Cave 11 (11QPsa)*, 11.

³²⁵ *Ibid.*, 12.

spelling ירושלים, as opposed to the more defective spelling of the MT ירושלים.³²⁶ The *aleph* generally corresponds to the Masoretic text. For example, כִּי is always spelled defectively without a final *aleph* (an unexpected trait due to the fact that the text is written in QSP). There are, however, six examples of the omission of the *aleph* and three examples of the addition of an *aleph*.³²⁷ Concerning *he*, Sanders notes that the second-person masculine suffix is spelled *plene* as is the corresponding affirmative of the perfect (with one possible exception).³²⁸ However, see the form פִּיה in Col 21:6 (Ps 138:4). Sanders notes that the final *he* here is erased.³²⁹ The pronoun הוּא too is spelled *plene* הוּא, while the scroll uses the cohortative form with a final *he* much more often than the MT.³³⁰ With few exceptions, the orthographic profile of 11Q5 fits well within the QSP.³³¹

Sanders ends his introduction to 11Q5 by discussing surface observations.³³² Here, Sanders argues that scribal dots are found in four places.³³³ Other instances of scribal intervention include one example of a marginal marking, twenty-four examples of supralinear correction, and twenty-eight clear instances of erasures.³³⁴ Other observations about the surface include fourteen places where the scribe avoided writing on the leather

³²⁶ Sanders, *The Psalms Scroll of Qumrañ Cave 11 (11QPsa)*, 12.

³²⁷ *Ibid.*

³²⁸ *Ibid.*

³²⁹ *Ibid.*, 42.

³³⁰ *Ibid.*, 13.

³³¹ See Qimron, *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, §100.2-§100.9, for a full discussion of the orthography of Qumran Hebrew. See also the orthographic and morphological features of QSP in Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 266-70.

³³² Sanders, *The Psalms Scroll of Qumrañ Cave 11 (11QPsa)*, 13-14.

³³³ *Ibid.*, 13. Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 193, identifies two of these instances (e.g., Col 16:7 [Ps 145:1] and Col 21:2 [Ps 138:1]) as cancelation dots.

³³⁴ Sanders, *The Psalms Scroll of Qumrañ Cave 11 (11QPsa)*, 13-14.

and evidence for leather shrinkage.³³⁵ Tov calculates that this text averages a scribal intervention every nine lines.³³⁶

11Q5 is a difficult text to categorize. The text preserves forty psalms from the Masoretic psalter, but not in the order of the Masoretic text. Moreover, the scroll preserves several non-canonical psalms³³⁷ and two further psalms that derive from canonical psalms.³³⁸ The text further contains the remains of 2 Samuel 23:7 and a prose section that recounts David as a great song writer in column 27.³³⁹ The reordering of the canonical Psalms and the inclusion of non-canonical psalms has lead several scholars to categorize 11Q5 as a Qumran Psalter scroll (a genuine and independent Psalter), while many others have understood these features to indicate the text's non-biblical status: namely, its excerpted nature.

James Sanders asserts that 11Q5 is a Psalter scroll known by at least some Jews of that time.³⁴⁰ This view, however, is not immediately apparent in Sanders' first

³³⁵ Sanders, *The Psalms Scroll of Qumran Cave 11 (11QPsa)*, 14. Here, Sanders points out that leather shrinkage might give readers the impression that a lacuna is larger than it is.

³³⁶ Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 334.

³³⁷ See the suggestion of Eshel and Strugnell who point out that the *Eschatological Hymn* and the *Apostrophe of Zion* may actually be one alphabetical acrostic. Hanan Eshel and John Strugnell, "Alphabetical Acrostics in Pre-Tannaitic Hebrew," *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 62, no. 3 (July 2000): 447.

³³⁸ Sanders, and those who agree with him, base their understanding of 11Q5 as a Psalter scroll not dependent on the Masoretic Psalter on these two facts. See James A. Sanders, "The Modern History of the Qumran Psalms Scroll and Canonical Criticism," in *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov*, Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 94 (Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 2003), 404. See also Peter W. Flint, "Five Surprises in the Qumran Psalms Scrolls," in *Flores Florentino: Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino García Martínez* (Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 2007), 184.

³³⁹ The canonical psalms preserved in 11Q5 do not diverge from the known manuscripts in any large detail. Sanders claims that all known manuscripts of the Psalms belong to one basic recension. Sanders, "Variation in the Psalms Scroll (11QPsa)," 83.

³⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 93.

publications nor in his critical edition of the text.³⁴¹

Sanders' opinion that the scroll represented a genuine Psalter is perhaps first alluded to in an article titled "Two Non-Canonical Psalms in 11QPs."³⁴² In this publication, Sanders expressed his opinion that three Psalms, found only among late Syriac manuscripts but preserved in 11Q5, were considered canonical by those at Qumran. He reasoned that Syriac Psalm 3 is just as biblical as Psalm 22 due to its form—it combines the genres of thanksgiving and lament together.³⁴³ Moreover, all three of the psalms included in the Peshitta and preserved in 11Q5, but not in the MT, are interspersed amongst the Masoretic Psalms in 11Q5. In Sanders opinion, this fact demonstrates their canonical status.³⁴⁴

Sanders' view that 11Q5 represented a genuine Psalter is clearly stated in an article titled "Variorum in the Psalms Scroll."³⁴⁵ In this article, Sanders clearly states,

The material in the Psalms Scroll lacks any clearly theological or even liturgical bias, but on the contrary wants above all, and perhaps despite all, to be 'Davidic' in its cadences, it seems wise to view the Psalms scroll as evidence of a Psalter tradition distinct from the 'canonical' (Masoretic) which was accepted by the Rabbis after the First Jewish Revolt, in the last quarter of the first century A.D.³⁴⁶

This notion is further evident when he says, "There simply was no evidence that I could see to view the Psalms Scroll as somehow derivative of an already set Psalter; there were

³⁴¹ See Sanders, *The Psalms Scroll of Qumran Cave 11 (11QPsa)*. See also James A. Sanders, "The Scroll of Psalms (11QPss) from Cave 11: A Preliminary Report," *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 165 (1962): 11-15. See also James A. Sanders, "Ps 151 in 11QPss," *Zeitschrift Für Die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 75, no. 1 (1963): 85.

³⁴² James A. Sanders, "Two Non-Canonical Psalms in 11QPs," *Zeitschrift Für Die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 76, no. 1 (1964): 57-75. The provisional title given to the scroll of 11QPss does not necessarily indicate that Sanders viewed 11Q5 as canonical since this was a provisional title given to the text among scholars rather than by Sanders' himself. See Sanders, "The Scroll of Psalms (11QPss)," 11.

³⁴³ Sanders, "Two Non-Canonical Psalms in 11QPs," 73.

³⁴⁴ *Ibid.*

³⁴⁵ Sanders, "Variorum in the Psalms Scroll (11QPsa)," 83-94.

³⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 90. Compare how Sanders, "Cave 11 Surprises," 40, attributes the Psalm of 11Q5 Col 16 as "floating bits of liturgical material familiar from Psalm 118, 136 and elsewhere."

only old assumptions that, in my view, were being called in question in various ways.”³⁴⁷

Sanders sets forth several reasons for understanding 11Q5 as a genuine Psalter throughout his works. These reasons include his belief that the entire scroll was understood to have been written by David.³⁴⁸ He further argues that the non-canonical psalms followed the same format and style as the canonical ones.³⁴⁹ Additionally, the presence of larger editorial changes concerning superscriptions and the interjection *hallelujah* also suggest that 11Q5 was an alternative edition of the Psalter.³⁵⁰ Moreover, 11Q6 (11QPs^b) follows 11Q5 both in order and in content so that 11Q5, in Sanders’

³⁴⁷ Sanders, “The Modern History of the Qumran Psalms Scroll,” 404. Besides those surveyed in this paper, many others agree with Sanders’ conclusions about the nature of 11Q5. Among those are Angela Kim [Harkins]. See Angela Kim [Harkins], “Authorizing Interpretation in Poetic Compositions in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Later Jewish and Christian Traditions,” *Dead Sea Discoveries* 10, no. 1 (2003): 48. See also Eva Mroczek, who believes that Sanders’ and Flint’s conception of 11Q5 does not go far enough. Mroczek credits Sanders with revising “the established story of the biblical canon.” Eva Mroczek, “Psalms Unbound: Ancient Concepts of Textual Tradition in 11QPsalms^a and Related Texts” (Ph.D., diss., University of Toronto, 2012), 12. She further asks, “What does it mean to ask if a text is scriptural when there is no longer a firm standard of comparison, such as the MT . . . and when texts that we recognize as scripture and those that are ostensibly non-scriptural seem to display the same authorizing strategies and function similarly in a community?” *Ibid.*, 12. Although she credits Sanders with opening up a new avenue, she argues that his theory is still flawed because it “invites thinking in terms of ‘proto-Psalms,’ evolutionary moments on a timeline that marches toward the *telos* of the Bible, rather than describing the evidence on its own terms. My claim is stronger: the ‘Book of Psalms’ did not exist as a conceptual category in the Second Temple period.” Eva Mroczek, “The Hegemony of the Biblical in the Study of Second Temple Literature,” *Journal of Ancient Judaism* 6, no. 1 (2015): 13-14.

³⁴⁸ Sanders, “Ps 151 in 11QPs,” 85, argues that those at Qumran understood 11Q5 as Davidic. Sanders, “Variation in the Psalms Scroll (11QPs),” 90, explicitly cites this as evidence for the text’s canonical status. Sanders, “Cave 11 Surprises,” 48, appears to make this same connection. See Haran’s critique of this position in Menahem Haran, “11QPs and the Canonical Book of Psalms,” in *Minḥah Le-Nahum: Biblical and Other Studies Presented to Nahum M. Sarna in Honour of His 70th Birthday*, ed. Marc Zvi Brettler and Michael A. Fishbane, *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament, Supplement Series* 154 (Sheffield, England: JSOT Press, 1993), 200-201.

³⁴⁹ Sanders, “Cave 11 Surprises,” 47-48. See further brief comments in James A. Sanders, “The Qumran Psalms Scroll (11 QPs) Reviewed,” in *On Language, Culture and Religion: In Honor of Eugene A. Nida*, ed. Matthew Black and William Allen Smalley (Paris: Mouton [The Hague], 1974), 97.

³⁵⁰ Sanders, “Cave 11 Surprises,” 41-42.

mind,³⁵¹ cannot be simply a personal copy or maverick collection of the Psalms.³⁵² Rather, he explains, “The sum of it [agreement between 11Q6 and 11Q5] is that our surprising Cave 11 contained two copies of the one really imposing witness to the Hebrew Psalter in pre-Masoretic times.”³⁵³ Sanders’ understanding that 11Q5 was a true Psalter depends largely on these reasons.

Flint, likewise, agrees that 11Q5 witnessed to a genuine Psalter, an alternative edition of the book of Psalms.³⁵⁴ Flint surveys both external and internal evidence in his publications. He finds some external evidence to support his view since Jubilees 2:2-3 appears to depend on lines 4-5 of “The Hymn to the Creator.” According to Flint, this implies the Hymn’s authoritative status and confirms that the author viewed the text as scriptural: “If he selected the Hymn from a collection like 11QPs^a, the entire 11QPs^a-Psalter may have been authoritative to him.”³⁵⁵

Flint finds more persuasive support about the usage of 11Q5 in 11Q6 and 4Q87. Although he admits that determining the text’s usage is difficult,³⁵⁶ he attempts to show that 11Q5 was the “foremost representative of the Book of Psalms among the Dead Sea Scrolls.”³⁵⁷ Evidence to support this, according to Flint, is as follows: 4QPs^c may preserve the sequence Psalms 118, 104, [147], and 105 in agreement with 11Q5 fragments

³⁵¹ Sanders argues that Skehan’s view that 11Q5 represents a library edition of the book of Psalms is “quite viable . . . if 11QPs^a were the only copy of the Qumran Psalter which we possess. But it is not.” Sanders, “The Qumran Psalms Scroll (11 QPsa) Reviewed,” 96.

³⁵² Sanders, “Cave 11 Surprises,” 40.

³⁵³ *Ibid.*, 41.

³⁵⁴ Flint endorses Sanders conclusions of 11Q5. Flint, “Five Surprises in the Qumran Psalms Scrolls,” 184.

³⁵⁵ Flint, *The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls*, 223-24.

³⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, 227.

³⁵⁷ *Ibid.*

E-F although he admits that this sequence is partially tentative.³⁵⁸ Stronger correspondence, however, exists between 11Q6 (11QPs^b) and 11Q5 since 11Q6 preserves the sequence Psalms 141, 133, 144 found in 11Q5, portions of the catena from Psalm 118 (i.e., Psalms 118: 1, 15, 16) appended to Psalm 136 in 11Q5, portions of the Plea for Deliverance, and a small portion of the Apostrophe to Zion (two non-canonical psalms found only in 11Q5).³⁵⁹ These two manuscripts demonstrate, in Flint's mind, that 11Q5 is "the foremost representative of the Book of Psalms among the Dead Sea Scrolls."³⁶⁰

Flint further supports his theory based on internal evidence. He argues that the Davidic emphasis in the scroll (Flint argues that the compiler saw 11Q5 as a Davidic Psalter)³⁶¹ and the scroll's structure (it is organized according to the same organizational principles found in Book 4 and 5 of the MT Psalter) both demonstrate the scroll's canonical status.³⁶²

Therefore, based on the text's attribution to David, its structure and usage, Flint argues that the collection preserved in 11Q5 was "the foremost representative of the Book of Psalms among the Dead Sea scrolls."³⁶³

Ulrich, likewise, argues that 11Q5 represents a true Psalter rather than a liturgical text derived from the MT.³⁶⁴ Ulrich's proposal is in many ways identical to

³⁵⁸ Flint, "Five Surprises in the Qumran Psalms Scrolls," 188-91.

³⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, 191-92.

³⁶⁰ Flint, *The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls*, 227.

³⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 224.

³⁶² *Ibid.*, 225-27. Flint depends on the work of Wilson, *The Editing of the Hebrew Psalter*, 377-88.

³⁶³ Flint, *The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls*, 227.

³⁶⁴ Eugene Charles Ulrich, "Our Sharper Focus on the Bible and Theology Thanks to the Dead Sea Scrolls," *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 66, no. 1 (January 2004): 7-8.

Sanders' and Flint's. However, he suggests that the discovery of multiple literary editions of other biblical books allows the rearrangement of psalms and the inclusion of psalms not included in the Masoretic Psalter to be interpreted, not as evidence of the text's liturgical character, but as an independent literary edition.³⁶⁵

Talmon, Gottstein, and Skehan,³⁶⁶ disagree with Sanders' view that 11Q5 represented an alternative edition of the Psalter.³⁶⁷ Each of these scholars viewed 11Q5 not as an alternative form of the Psalter, but as a type of liturgical text *dependent* on the Masoretic Psalter. Talmon argues,

Already at this stage, I consider it safe to state that we are not at all concerned with a copy of the canonical Psalter, as both Sanders and Yadin appear to assume. The numerous non-canonical interpolations in the MS, a feature which distinguishes 11QPs^a from all other Psalter-texts found at Qumran, on Maṣada, and in Naḥal Ḥever, even more than the unorthodox arrangement of the canonical psalms, clearly indicate that we are dealing with a collection of liturgical compositions which the sect used for its sacred service.³⁶⁸

Talmon further argues that the prose section (Col 27:2-11) supports the liturgical nature of 11Q5 since a prose section would be out of place in a canonical Book of Psalms, but

³⁶⁵ Eugene Charles Ulrich, "The Dead Sea Scrolls and Their Implications for an Edition of the Septuagint Psalter," in *Der Septuaginta-Psalter und Seine Tochterübersetzungen: Symposium in Göttingen 1997*, ed. Anneli Aejmelaeus and Udo Quast, *Mitteilungen Des Septuaginta-Unternehmens* 24 (Göttingen, Germany: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000), 332-33.

³⁶⁶ Shemaryahu Talmon, "Pisqah Be'emṣa' Pasuq and 11QPsa," *Textus* 5 (1966): 11-21; Moshe H. Goshen-Gottstein, "The Psalms Scroll (11QPsa): A Problem of Canon and Text," *Textus* 5 (1966): 22-33; and Patrick William Skehan, "Liturgical Complex in 11QPsa," *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 35, no. 2 (April 1973): 195-205.

³⁶⁷ These three scholars quickly responded to Sanders' view. Several more recent scholars too disagree with Sanders' position. A sampling of these scholars include Beckwith (Roger T. Beckwith, *The Old Testament Canon of the New Testament Church and Its Background in Early Judaism* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986], 77-78), Haran (Haran, "11QPsa and the Canonical Book of Psalms"). Lange (Armin Lange, *Handbuch der Textfunde vom Toten Meer Bd. 1. Bd. 1. Die Handschriften biblischer Bücher von Qumran und den anderen Fundorten* [Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 2009], 415-50), and Tov (Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 69).

³⁶⁸ Talmon, "Pisqah Be'emṣa' Pasuq and 11QPsa," 12.

“it admirably fits a synagogue Psalter, an incipient prayer-book.”³⁶⁹

Moreover, Talmon argues that the incorporation of Psalms 151A and 151B in 11Q5 further depicts the text’s non-canonical status. Talmon argues that Psalm 151A is connected to 1 Samuel 16:12 by means of the *pisqah be’emša’ pasuq (pbp)*.³⁷⁰ The *pbp* of 1 Samuel 16:12 signals the reader to pause between David’s election and his anointment.³⁷¹ The author of Psalm 151A took the opportunity afforded him by the *parashah* to write a detailed exegesis of David’s election. Likewise, Talmon connects Psalm 151B in 11Q5—which may be a “poetical paraphrase of David’s battle with Goliath,” to a *pbp* in 1 Sam 17:37.³⁷² Talmon concludes his discussion by noting that these extra-biblical compositions were never understood as canonical.³⁷³

Goshen-Gottstein also quickly responded to Sanders’s claims that 11Q5 represented an alternative form of the Psalter. Goshen-Gottstein claims that the liturgical explanation of 11Q5 is much simpler and explains the evidence better than the theory proposed by Sanders.³⁷⁴ Contrary to Sanders, Goshen-Gottstein argues that the prose section of 11Q5 does not indicate canonicity, but claims ‘Davidic’ authorship for the apocryphal psalms: “No better way could be thought of to ensure future use of these hymns than to collect them together with a selection of ‘canonical’ Psalms.”³⁷⁵ He further

³⁶⁹ Talmon, “Pisqah Be’emša’ Pasuq and 11QPsa,” 13.

³⁷⁰ According to Talmon, a *pbp* is a Masoretic notation entirely extra-textual: namely, it alludes to “literary expansions of the sections in question for liturgical and homiletic purposes.” *Ibid.*, 18. On the other hand, see Tov’s discussion of *pbp* simply as a break in content, in Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 50.

³⁷¹ Talmon, “Pisqah Be’emša’ Pasuq and 11QPsa,” 19.

³⁷² *Ibid.*, 20.

³⁷³ *Ibid.*, 21.

³⁷⁴ Goshen-Gottstein, “The Psalms Scroll (11QPsa),” 29.

³⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, 27.

states that several features of 11Q5 are liturgically motivated. For example, the addition of an antiphon after each verse of Psalm 145 indicates a reworking of the text for liturgical reasons.³⁷⁶ Another example is the addition of various verses from Psalm 118 appended to Psalm 136. Goshen-Gottstein argues that this composition—Psalm 136 plus verses from Psalm 118—corresponds to later liturgies with a few loosely connected biblical verses with free variations.³⁷⁷ His conclusion about the nature of 11Q5 is strong: “The theory that 11 Ps-a (11Q5) represents a different ‘canon’ has little to commend it.”³⁷⁸

Skehan too disagrees with Sanders. He argues that the order of the psalms in 11Q5 can be explained on liturgical grounds. For example, he argues that Psalms 135, 136 plus parts of 118, and 145 are grouped together for liturgical reasons. This conclusion is supported by the liturgical notation זואת לזכרון, “this is a memorial,” in Col 17:17, which Skehan argues is the remains of a liturgical note spanning up to six lines.³⁷⁹ Moreover, the grouping of Psalms 104, 147, 105, 146, and 148 together form a collection for a service of praise.³⁸⁰ He further discusses that the “Hymn to the Creator functions as a pendant to Psalms 149 and 150.”³⁸¹ Skehan identifies 11Q5 rather as

an instruction book for budding Levite choristers at the Jerusalem temple in the time of Oniad high priests, c. 200 B.C. It is based on the last third of the canonical Psalter (Pss 101-150) with added materials. . . . Such an origin accounts for the emphasis on David (“author” of the Psalms), plus the various traces of liturgical adaptations and regrouping. . . . Finally, it explains how Ps 119, which occupies 8 columns of the scroll, could be functional in this anthology.³⁸²

³⁷⁶ Wilson, *The Editing of the Hebrew Psalter*, 91-92.

³⁷⁷ Goshen-Gottstein, “The Psalms Scroll (11QPsa),” 30.

³⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, 31.

³⁷⁹ Skehan, “Liturgical Complex in 11QPsa,” 195-201.

³⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, 202.

³⁸¹ *Ibid.*, 203.

³⁸² Patrick William Skehan, “The Divine Name at Qumran, in the Masada Scroll, and in the Septuagint,” *Bulletin of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 13 (September

Likewise, David Willgren argues that 11Q5 likely was not conceived of as a true Psalter.³⁸³ One major tenet of his argument derives from how non-biblical sources at Qumran and the NT used the Psalms. The *peshrim* that contain psalms—1Q16, 4Q171, 4Q173, 4Q174 and 4Q177, and 11Q13—interpret and comment on several Psalms from the Masoretic Psalter, but never comments on any psalm not included in it.³⁸⁴ Moreover, by analyzing the most apparent allusions to the Psalms among the non-biblical texts, Willgren demonstrates that the MT psalms had an extensive impact at Qumran while only one psalm not included in the Masoretic psalter is indirectly cited in 4Q370 and in Jubilees.³⁸⁵ According to this evidence, the *pesharim* indicate the scriptural status of many of the psalms in the MT-Psalter.³⁸⁶ Willgren further argues that the NT, like the non-biblical texts from Qumran, allude even more clearly to a Book of Psalms very close to the MT/LXX.³⁸⁷ Thus, Willgren concludes that those psalms from 11Q5 not found in the MT were likely not considered scripture, although they likely did possess some authority.³⁸⁸

1980): 41-42n16.

³⁸³ David Willgren, *The Formation of the “Book” of Psalms: Reconsidering the Transmission and Canonization of Psalmody in Light of Material Culture and the Poetics of Anthologies*, *Forschungen Zum Alten Testament 2. Reihe 88* (Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 2016), 366.

³⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, 324. See also Haran’s comments that *pesharim* on the Book of Psalms (they date much earlier than 11Q5) undermines Sanders’ argument. See Haran, “11QPsa and the Canonical Book of Psalms,” 198. The *pesharim* 4Q173 cover psalms from Book 5. See Willgren, *The Formation of the “Book” of Psalms*, 318. This section of the Psalms should be still fluid according to the theory in Sanders, “Cave 11 Surprises,” 45-48.

³⁸⁵ Willgren, *The Formation of the “Book” of Psalms*, 336-37.

³⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, 345.

³⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, 355-66. See esp., p. 366.

³⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, 345, 366.

Wilson remained agnostic about the nature of 11Q5: was it a liturgical text or an alternative form of the Psalter?³⁸⁹ Wilson's studies were marked by the availability of a substantiate number of sources unavailable to Sanders. This datum, at times, appears to support Sanders' view of the nature of 11Q5 and the gradual standardization of the Psalter in Wilson's opinion.³⁹⁰ For example, Wilson concluded that the Qumran texts largely support the order of Psalms found in Books 1-3, but not Books 4-5.³⁹¹ He also argued that the older Qumran texts often conflict with the MT regarding order.³⁹² Nonetheless, Wilson remained unsure of Sanders' claims that 11Q5 represented an authentic Psalter.³⁹³

Scholars are divided about how to categorize 11Q5: is it a competing edition of the Psalter scroll (See Sanders, Ulrich, Flint) or is it an excerpted text dependent on the Masoretic Psalter (See Talmon, Gottstein, Skehan, Willgren)? It is argued here that 11Q5 is not a genuine Psalter scroll, but a liturgical text.

The Differences of 11Q5 as Liturgical Differences

The arguments in favor of understanding 11Q5 as an alternative form of the

³⁸⁹ See his comments in Wilson, *The Editing of the Hebrew Psalter*, 92. Contrary to Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 320-21, Wilson does not seem to endorse Sanders' view in either his 1983 or 1985 publication.

³⁹⁰ Flint, *The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls*, 9, makes this point.

³⁹¹ See Gerald Henry Wilson, "The Qumran Psalms Manuscripts and the Consecutive Arrangement of Psalms in the Hebrew Psalter," *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 45, no. 3 (July 1983): 386-87. He does not endorse Sanders' view here, but only says his data is "compatible with it, especially when correlated with the relative age of the MSS in which the data occur." *Ibid.*, 387.

³⁹² *Ibid.*, 387-88.

³⁹³ Wilson, *The Editing of the Hebrew Psalter*, 91-92; Gerald Henry Wilson, "The Qumran Psalms Scroll [11QPsa] Reconsidered: Analysis of the Debate," *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 47, no. 4 (October 1985): 624-42. In a later work, Wilson refers the reader back to these works for his view about the nature of 11Q5. See Gerald Henry Wilson, "The Qumran 'Psalms Scroll' (11QPs^a) and the Canonical Psalter: Comparison of Editorial Shaping," *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 59, no. 3 (1997): 448n3.

Psalter are unpersuasive. First, the different sequence of Psalms—one main reason why Sanders and others classify 11Q5 as an aberrant Psalter scroll—can be attributed to liturgical traditions that clearly recognize the Masoretic tradition as the stable authoritative tradition. For example, m. Tamid 7:4 records the Psalms the Levites would sing in the temple and the order does not correspond to the Masoretic order even though the Masoretic order is clearly presumed.³⁹⁴ In short, liturgical traditions could explain the aberrant sequence of psalms.

Second, the inclusion of non-canonical psalms—another major tenet for those who argue that 11Q5 is an alternative Psalter—is a phenomenon found in texts that preserve the Masoretic Psalter. A prime example of this is the LXX which includes Psalm 151, but clearly demarcates the text as non-canonical.³⁹⁵ This superscription demonstrates that ancient Jews did not have a fundamental problem with combining canonical and non-canonical psalms together in the same scroll. The inclusion of non-Masoretic Psalms might also be explained by the text’s liturgical purpose. Ben Dov links the texts attributed to David in column 27 to the Qumran calendar.³⁹⁶

Third, besides the inclusion of non-Masoretic psalms and the order of Psalms, another major difference that differentiates 11Q5 from the MT are large-scale additions. These additions do not indicate the text as an independent Psalter but can be explained as

³⁹⁴ Psalm 24 was sung on the first day of the week, Ps 38 on the second, Ps 82 on the third, Ps 94 on the fourth, Ps 81 on the fifth, Ps 93 on the sixth, and Ps 92 on the seventh day. Beckwith makes this point in Roger T. Beckwith, “The Courses of the Levites and the Eccentric Psalms Scrolls from Qumran,” *Revue de Qumran* 11, no. 4 (December 1984): 499.

³⁹⁵ The superscription reads Οὗτος ὁ ψαλμὸς ιδιόγραφος εἰς Δαυιδ καὶ ἔξωθεν τοῦ ἀριθμοῦ ὅτε ἐμονομάχησεν τῷ Γολιαθ, “This Psalm is by the hand of David and outside the number [made when he fought Goliath].” Pietersma recognizes that the superscription prior to the ὅτε may be original to the LXX. See Pietersma, “David in the Greek Psalms,” 226. Compare Wilson’s comments about Pietersma in Wilson, *The Editing of the Hebrew Psalter*, 70.

³⁹⁶ Jonathan Ben-Dov, *Head of All Years: Astronomy and Calendars at Qumran in Their Ancient Context*, Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 78 (Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 2008), 49-52.

performing liturgical purposes. The fact that analogous phenomena are not infrequent among texts and traditions that recognize an authoritative stable Psalter weakens Sanders' view.³⁹⁷ For example, the liturgical function of the Hallel Psalms (Pss 113-118) during the feast of Booths led to additions in the liturgy. For example, if a slave, woman, or minor answers the reader of the Psalms, they were to repeat what was said. If an adult male answered the reader, he was only obligated to respond *halleluyah* (m. Sukk. 3:10). Further types of repetition are then described in accordance with local customs. Repetition of sections of the *Hallel* are also described by Maimonides according to local customs in his *Mishneh Torah ḥănukkah* iii, 14. Moreover, as the Levites walked around the altar, it was known that they would repeat portions of Psalm 118:25: אָנָּא יְיָ הוֹשִׁיעָה נָּא אָנָּא וְהוֹשִׁיעָה נָּא אָנָּא, “Please, O Lord, save us please, please; and save please” (m. Sukk. 4:5). Thus, there appears some precedent for dissecting and reworking Masoretic Psalms for liturgical purposes in later liturgical traditions that clearly recognized a stable Masoretic Psalter. This tendency, then, makes sense of the catena derived from Psalm 118 appended to Psalm 136 in 11Q5.

Later liturgical Jewish texts provide further analogies to the differences preserved in 11Q5.³⁹⁸ For example, the composition of prayers was debated among Karaites and Rabbinites as indicated by Goldberg. Whereas Rabbinites believed that prayers could be original compositions, some Karaites believed prayers should only be composed of scriptural texts.³⁹⁹ The prayers of the Karaites serve as analogies to the reworked Psalms found in 11Q5 that appear to derive from biblical psalms while the Rabbinic prayers serve as analogies for the compositions not preserved in the Masoretic

³⁹⁷ Haran, “11QPsa and the Canonical Book of Psalms,” 199-200.

³⁹⁸ See P. Selvin Goldberg, *Karaite Liturgy and Its Relation to Synagogue Worship* (Manchester, England: Manchester University Press, 1957), 96-103.

³⁹⁹ *Ibid.*

Psalter. Moreover, Goldberg notes, “Their [the Karaite] method was to end a series of Scriptural verses with the phrase *לְעוֹלָם אָמֵן וְאָמֵן* “Blessed be the Lord forever. Amen, Amen.”⁴⁰⁰ Other times, the word *בְּרוּךְ* could simply be added to a biblical verse.⁴⁰¹ Likewise, in the evening service according to Mainmonides, congregants are to respond by saying *בְּרוּךְ יְיָ הַמְּבֹרָךְ לְעוֹלָם וָעֶד* “blessed is the Lord who is to be blessed forever and ever” (Mishnah Torah, Laws of Prayer and of the priestly Blessings IX, 9). These practices suggest that additions such as the refrain added to each verse of Psalm 145 are liturgical and secondary features. The use of Psalm 145 in the liturgy too supports this conclusion. Psalm 145 was recited in the morning service (Mishnah Torah, Laws of Prayer and of the priestly Blessings IX, 6) in the afternoon service (Mishnah Torah, Laws of Prayer and of the priestly Blessings IX, 8), and on sabbaths and festivals (Mishnah Torah, Laws of Prayer and of the priestly Blessings IX, 14). Thus, many of the large scale-additions preserved in 11Q5 have precedent in later liturgical traditions: tradition that exist alongside a stable Psalter.

The “Davidic Nature” of 11Q5

Sanders’s view that 11Q5 should be understood as canonical because it was considered to be written by David is tentative. Ancient Jews clearly understood Psalm 151 as from David, and yet, also clearly understood it to be non-canonical.

In addition, one should note that the non-Masoretic Psalms preserved in 11Q5 are not attributed to David (except for Ps 151A). Sanders, however, claims that due to the high concentration of compositions attributed to David at the end of the scroll, the scroll as a whole should be attributed to David.⁴⁰² In response, it is important to note that

⁴⁰⁰ Goldberg, *Karaite Liturgy and Its Relation to Synagogue Worship*, 100-101.

⁴⁰¹ *Ibid.*, 101.

⁴⁰² Sanders, “Ps 151 in 11QPss,” 85. Sanders, “Variorum in the Psalms Scroll (11QPSa),” 84-88, esp. pp. 85-86, which clearly states that 11Q5 was believed to have been written by David.

simply because the end of 11Q5 makes many references to David, this does not necessarily mean that those who read this scroll envisioned him as the author of the entire scroll. The conclusion of Book 2 of the Psalter ends with the verse, “The prayers of David, the son of Jesse, are completed” (Ps 72:20). This ending, however, does not necessarily mean that every prior Psalm was written by David. In fact, Psalm 72, the last Psalm of Book 2, is said to have been of Solomon. Therefore, Sanders’ claim that the non-Masoretic psalms were understood to have been written by David (except for Ps 151A) depends on unsubstantiated assumptions.

A Widespread Fixed Masoretic Psalter

While the liturgical explanation reasonably accounts for the major differences preserved in 11Q5, external evidence strongly suggests that the Masoretic Psalter was fixed prior to the first century AD. This external evidence is both early and widespread.

It is agreed that the Masoretic Psalter is the only recension found among Hebrew manuscripts and among the early versions. Sanders agrees with this point: “The biblical psalms, whether in Hebrew or in early Greek, Latin, Aramaic, or Syriac translations, are in broad general agreement, that is, are of one basic recension.”⁴⁰³ Moreover, the fact that the LXX in particular, translated no later than the first half of the second century BC., preserves a Masoretic-Psalter and does not exhibit any of the large-scale differences found in 11Q5 strongly suggests the fixed and widespread acceptance of this Psalter.⁴⁰⁴ Thus, contrary to Sanders, the existence of the LXX indicates that a stable

⁴⁰³ Sanders, “Variorum in the Psalms Scroll (11QPSa),” 83. Concerning the Peshitta, Carbajosa identifies the Peshitta as a translation of a pre-MT text of the second century AD. See Carbajosa, *The Character of the Syriac Version of Psalms*, 345. For a discussion of the Targum of the Psalms, see David M. Stec, *The Targum of Psalms*, *The Aramaic Bible*, vol. 16 (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2004), 15. For the LXX, see Jellicoe, who argues that the Psalter “seems to have been the one work in which liberties have not been taken.” Sidney Jellicoe, *The Septuagint and Modern Study* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1968), 68. For the Vulgate, see Patrick Boylan’s work, *The Psalms a Study of the Vulgate Psalter in the Light of the Hebrew Text*, vol. 1 of *The Psalms*, 2nd ed. (Dublin: Gill & Son, 1921), xxxiii-xxxviii.

⁴⁰⁴ For this date and point, see Haran, “11QPSa and the Canonical Book of Psalms,” 194.

Psalter circulated in Egypt at the exclusion of any other “potential version:” this version is none other than the Masoretic Psalter.⁴⁰⁵

Also, the Masada Psalms scroll (MasPs^a) too undermines Sanders’ proposal since the text preserves the Masoretic Psalter (Talmon only lists six variants between it and the MT) and pre-dates the composition of 11Q5.⁴⁰⁶ Correspondence between the MaPs^a and Aleppo, however, extends beyond the consonantal text to include also the text’s sense divisions. Peter Gentry and John Meade note that the sense divisions marked in MaPs^a are identical to the sense divisions preserved in the MT Psalter.⁴⁰⁷ Thus, the stable Psalter circulating in Egypt was also circulating in Palestine prior to the composition of 11Q5.

Quotations and allusions to the Psalms in Qumran further cast doubt on Sanders’ proposal and instead support an understanding that the Masoretic Psalter was early and widespread at the time of 11Q5’s composition at Qumran.⁴⁰⁸ Concerning quotations, Willgren surveys the *peshrim* containing psalms: 1Q16, 4Q171, 4Q173, 4Q174 and 4Q177, and 11Q13. His survey indicates that only Masoretic Psalms are

Beckwith makes the same point in “The Courses of the Levites,” 503.

⁴⁰⁵ See Peter J. Gentry and John D. Meade, “The Masada Psalms Fragments and the Rewritten Psalters of Qumran,” *Unpublished*, n.d., 29.

⁴⁰⁶ See Yadin, who originally dated this scroll to the first half of the first century AD, in Yigael Yadin “The Excavations of Masada—1963/64: Preliminary Report,” *Israel Exploration Journal* 15 (1965): 103. Talmon dates the text slightly earlier: to the end of the last century BC, in Shemarayahu Talmon, “Fragments of a Psalms Scroll: MasPs^a Ps 81:2b-85:6a (1039-160; Masle; Final Photo 5255),” *Dead Sea Discoveries* 3 (1996): 305. Tov takes a neutral approach when dating this text in Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 29, in dating the text to 50 BC to AD 30. Gentry and Meade survey the history of how scholars have dated this text in Gentry and Meade, “The Masada Psalms Fragments,” 2.

⁴⁰⁷ Gentry and Meade, “The Masada Psalms Fragments,” 4.

⁴⁰⁸ See Willgren for a helpful examination of the quotation and allusions to the Psalms made at Qumran in Willgren, *The Formation of the “Book” of Psalms*, 316-38.

subjugated to commentary⁴⁰⁹ and that the Psalms are often commented in accordance with their Masoretic order.⁴¹⁰ Moreover, four psalms from Book 4 and 5 of the Masoretic Psalter are subject to commentary: that section of the Psalter still fluid in Sanders' mind.⁴¹¹

Regarding the most apparent allusions at Qumran, Willgren demonstrates that the MT psalms had an extensive impact at Qumran⁴¹² while evidence exists for only one non-Masoretic psalm being the subject of allusion.⁴¹³ On the contrary, the subjection of many Masoretic Psalms to commentary and their constant use by way of allusion suggests the canonical status of the Masoretic Psalms. Moreover, the fact that the LXX and MaPs^a follow the Masoretic tradition suggest that those at Qumran understood the Masoretic Psalter as canonical.

The NT likewise presumes a Psalter that resembles the MT/LXX psalter and not that of 11Q5⁴¹⁴ since NT authors never quote a non-Masoretic Psalm. On the contrary, NT authors quote Masoretic Psalms more than any other OT book and these quotations are not simply restricted to the first three books of the Psalms.⁴¹⁵ Thus, again,

⁴⁰⁹ Willgren, *The Formation of the "Book" of Psalms*, 324.

⁴¹⁰ Ibid. See for example 4Q174 and 177 that comment on Pss 1, 2, 5, 6, 10, 11, 12, 13, 16, and 17, in an order that does not conflict with the MT. Ibid., 320-21.

⁴¹¹ See analysis in ibid., 324. Compare Sanders, "Variorum in the Psalms Scroll (11QPSa)," 88-89.

⁴¹² See Willgren, *The Formation of the "Book" of Psalms*, 324-38.

⁴¹³ The allusion to *Hymn to the Creator* in 4Q370 according to ibid., 336-37. There is another possible allusion to *Hymn to the Creator* in Jubilees 2:18-21. Ibid., 337. A potential allusion to *Plea for Deliverance* is uncertain in Willgren's mind. Ibid., 336.

⁴¹⁴ See discussion of the use of the Book of Psalms in the NT in ibid., 355-59.

⁴¹⁵ A brief survey of the index of citation: OT order found in UBS Greek NT demonstrates this point. See Barbara Aland et al., eds., *The Greek New Testament*, 4th rev. ed. (Stuttgart: United Bible Societies, 2010), 887-88.

the evidence circulating at the time and shortly after 11Q5's composition weakens Sanders' proposal. Willgren makes this point when he says, "By the time of the Gospel of Luke, it would be reasonable to posit that a collection of psalms very much like the MT/LXX 'Book' of Psalms was the (only) one recognized as scripture by these authors."⁴¹⁶

The Mishnah, although codified after 11Q5 was written, certainly alludes to evidence germane to this discussion.⁴¹⁷ The Mishnah reveals a dependence on the Masoretic Psalter in many ways. First, the Mishnah quoted and commented pervasively on Psalms found in the Masoretic tradition (e.g., m. Ber 7:3 quotes Ps 68:27; m. Bil 3:4 quotes Ps 30:1; m. Šabb. 9:4 quotes Ps 109:18).⁴¹⁸ Second, the Mishnah demonstrates that the Masoretic Psalms shaped the liturgy in the past and present. For example, the Hallel Psalms (Pss 113-118) were sung at the festival of booths (m. Sukk 3:9) and the Passover (m. Pesah 5:7; 9:3), while other Masoretic Psalms were assigned to the Levities to be sung in the sanctuary on certain days of the week (m. Tamid. 7:4). Moreover, the *ḥamış ešerā šīr ha-mē'ōlōt*, "fifteen Songs of the Ascents" (Pss 120-134), were sung during the rejoicing of *šēlōbit hašō'āḇā*, "*bet hashshoebah*" (m. Sukk 5:4; m. Mid. 2:5). Third, the Mishnah, not only quotes individual Psalms and smaller groups of Psalms (e.g. the Hallel Psalms), but also alludes to a Book of Psalms. The Songs of the Ascents are described in m. Sukk 5:4 and m. Mid. 2:5 as those *šēbetilim*, "which are in the Praises" (i.e., the Book of Psalms).⁴¹⁹ Thus, the Mishnah alludes to a fixed Book of Psalms that is the Masoretic

⁴¹⁶ See discussion in Willgren, *The Formation of the "Book" of Psalms*, 366.

⁴¹⁷ For a discussion of concepts preserved in the Mishnah that date prior to the AD 70, see Jacob Neusner, *The Mishnah before 70*, Brown Judaic Studies, no. 51 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987). See also Willgren's use of the Mishnah in Willgren, *The Formation of the "Book" of Psalms*, 359-60.

⁴¹⁸ An accordance search in the Mishnah modular in accordance lists 45 instances where a Masoretic psalm is cited. Abegg, *Mishnah (Kaufmann)*.

⁴¹⁹ The name of the Book of Psalms in Hebrew is *tehilim*, "praises." In m. Sukk 5:4, a graphic error is made where a *shin* is confused with an *ayin* and *zayin*: *šēbetilim* (עז) (שׁ) בְּתִלִּים. One should note that 4Q491 F17:L4 also refers to a *šēbetilim*, "Book of Psalms," not *šēbetilim*, "Books of Psalms."

Psalter. As Gentry and Meade say, “It makes sense to see whether or not the data line up with later tradition rather than follow a skeptical approach that may end in agnosticism.”⁴²⁰ The data from the Mishnah lines up with the evidence from the LXX, MaPs^a, and the NT. Thus, the conclusion that the Masoretic Psalter is both stable and widespread prior to the composition of 11Q5 is compelling.

In conclusion, it is argued here that 11Q5 represents a liturgical text. This evidence accords with the data known about the text during the time of 11Q5’s composition (first century AD) and what is known about liturgical traditions in general. This explanation is preferred.

Description and Categorization of Variants

Sanders proposes that 11Q5 differs from the MT in hundreds of instances. However, several of these proposed differences do not belong to categories 1, 2, or 3. A sampling of these differences include seven proposals that depend on insufficient manuscript evidence,⁴²¹ two instances that depend on the distinction between *yod* and *vav*, but the difference in these instances paleographically is meager, two proposed differences that likely derive from scribal error, nine other instances that could be examples where 11Q5 is more defective than the MT, and three occasions where Sanders proposes a different reading even though the consonants between the MT and 11Q5 match identically. These instances, among others, are not considered genuine variants.⁴²²

⁴²⁰ See Gentry and Meade, “The Masada Psalms Fragments,” 24.

⁴²¹ 11Q5 is well preserved and Sanders’ transcriptions are generally substantiated by the manuscript evidence. 11Q5 perseveres nearly 4,000 words, and out of those nearly 4,000 sufficiently preserved words, only 124 words depend on insufficient manuscript evidence. Moreover, these 124 insufficiently preserved words only affect 7 variants proposed by Sanders.

⁴²² For further details about these proposed differences or the variants from category 1, 2, 3, or potential category 3 variants, see table “11Q5: Description of variants, in appendix 3.

Category 1. Over a hundred variants belong to category 1. Among these variants are several examples of addition and omission of small particles. Moreover, 11Q5 attests to several examples of small substitutions concerning number, similar lexemes, and tense.

Category 2. 11Q5 preserves several category 2 additions that interpret an exemplar close to the MT.⁴²³ Many of these additions function simply to make the text more explicit. For example, four instances of the addition of a prepositional phrase (i.e., FEii:L7 [Ps 104:27], Col 3:4 [Ps 121:5], Col 5:11 [Ps 130:2], and Col 14:1 [Ps 119:171]) have this effect. The same effect is achieved by means of adding one word, such as the addition of the subject at 11Q5 at Col 9:10 (Ps 119:68) and Col 11:6 (Ps 119:110), the addition of a *kōl* particle at Col 4:8 (Ps 125:5), and an addition of an omitted verb at Col 5:13 (Ps 130:6). Likewise, an addition of an adverb at FEii:L5 (Ps 104:25) connects two synonymous lines more closely, and achieves the same effect.

Several additions can reasonably be explained as harmonizations. Among these are two instances where 11Q5 adds the superscription לדוד (e.g., FEi:L6 [Ps 104:1] and Col 3:15 [Ps 123:1]). The addition of the superscription to Psalm 104 is also found in the LXX and may be a case of interpretation since Psalm 103 is similar contextually to Psalm 104 and attributed to David in the MT and LXX (11Q5 likely has the superscription in Ps 103, but this part of the line is missing). The addition of the superscription to Psalm 123 also may be a case of harmonization since the psalm before and after are both attributed to David in the MT and LXX.

Several other harmonizations are preserved in 11Q5. For example, the first verse of Psalm 105 in 11Q5 adds the phrase כי טוב כי לעולם חסדו, “for he is good, for [his

⁴²³ The discussion of the category 2 variants of 11Q5 is an abbreviated discussion as outlined in chap. 1 due to the size of the text. This discussion covers most of the category 2 variants preserved in 11Q5.

steadfast love is forever].” This addition is an addition to a very common liturgical phrase (e.g., Pss 106:1; 107:1; 118:1, 29; 136:1; Ezra 3:11 [the laying of the foundation of the Temple]; 1 Chron 16:34 [when the ark is brought to Jerusalem by David]; 2 Chron 5:13 [when the ark is brought into the temple]; 7:3 [when God’s glory consumed the burnt offerings after Solomon’s prayer of the dedication of the temple]). There was a proclivity to expand phrases that only contain a portion of *הַסְדוֹ לַיהוָה כִּי לְעוֹלָם טוֹב* “Give thanks to the Lord, for he is good, for his love is forever” to the fuller phrase as attested to in b. Meg 10b and b. Sanh. 39b. Here, Rabbi Jonathan asks why 2 Chronicles 20:21 does not contain the phrase *כִּי טוֹב*, “for he is good.” The question reveals that the shorter phrase *הַסְדוֹ לַיהוָה כִּי לְעוֹלָם טוֹב*, “Give thanks to the Lord for his love is forever,” recalled the fuller phrase, and thus, the shorter phrase was prone to be harmonized to the fuller phrase. The harmonization also could have been occasioned by the text’s context: in the MT, the beginning of the next two psalms have this phrase (Pss 106 and 107). The addition is likely a case of harmonization.

Another variant that harmonizes to similar passages is preserved at Col 23:11 (Ps 133:3). 11Q5 reads *שְׁלוֹם עַל יִשְׂרָאֵל*, “peace be upon Israel,” and harmonizes the ending of Psalm 133 to the ending of two of the other Songs of the Ascent (Pss 125, 128). Moreover, Sanders notes that a Medieval Manuscript (Ms # 125) has a similar addition at Psalm 122:9.⁴²⁴ This reading is also preserved in 11Q6 at F7d:L3 (Frgs. 7a-e:L5 [Ps 133:3]).⁴²⁵

A further category 2 addition is preserved at Col 14:9 (Ps 135:2) and is a harmonization possibly motivated by liturgical reasons. Here 11Q5 adds the phrase

⁴²⁴ Sanders, “Two Non-Canonical Psalms in 11QPs,” 44. See Benjamin Kennicott, ed., *Vetus Testamentum Hebraicum, cum Variis Lectionibus* (Oxford: E. Typographeo Clarendoniano, 1776), 2:421.

⁴²⁵ Frgs. 7a-e are joined together by the editors. See the discussion and history in Florentino García Martínez, Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, and van der Woude, eds., “11QPs,” in *Qumran Cave 11. 2:11Q2-18, 11Q20-31*, vol. 23, Discoveries in the Judaean Desert 16 (Oxford: Clarendon, 2000), 45

ובתוכך ירושלים, “and in your midst, O Jerusalem.” In 11Q5, the call to “praise the Lord!” is not just for those who stand in the house of the Lord; that is, in the courts of the house of our God (135:2), but also for “those who are in your midst, O Jerusalem.” This addition is likely an intentional change. Skehan notes that Psalms 135, 136, 118, and 145 (Col 14:7-17:23) have been grouped together for liturgical reasons “with a primary *locus* in the Jerusalem temple precincts.”⁴²⁶ This location is evident at the beginning of the Psalm—those called to praise the Lord are those in the temple courts—and at the end of the psalm—those called to bless the Lord are those who dwell in Jerusalem (135:21). Moreover, this addition is used in Psalm 116:19 to modify “the courts of the house of the Lord,” the same phrase it modifies in 11Q5, albeit with a substitution of the divine name. Influence among these psalms is not alarming since Psalm 116 and Psalm 135 belong to the same collection of Psalms: *Hallel* psalms.⁴²⁷

A Targumic expansion is preserved at Col 14:13-14 (Ps 135:6). 11Q5 reads לעשות יעשה אין כיה אין כיהוה ואין שיעשה כמלך אלוהים, “to do as he does; there is none like the Lord, there is none like the Lord, and there is none who acts like the King of gods,”⁴²⁸ at Col 14:13-14 (Ps 135:6). This Psalm calls God’s people to praise him because of his uniqueness and greatness: The Lord is above all gods (v. 5); he does whatever he pleases (v. 6); he saved his people from Pharaoh and the mighty kings of Canaan (vv. 8-12). The addition of 11Q5 simply expands on this idea. This addition accords well with the types of expansions found in the Targums. Philip Alexander has described the Targums as fitting into two general categories: those that consist of a base text plus an explanation (Type A), and those that are better described as a free paraphrase where the paraphrase is intricately

⁴²⁶ Skehan, “Liturgical Complex in 11QPsa,” 196.

⁴²⁷ See m. Pesah 5:7. Ps 135 is grouped with Ps 136 as the Great Hallel in some rabbinic traditions. See also b. Ber 4b.

⁴²⁸ Abegg, Flint, and Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible*, 568.

bound to the base text so one cannot extract the base text from the paraphrase.⁴²⁹ Targum Psalms largely belongs to the first category according to Stec,⁴³⁰ as does this addition found in 11Q5.

Another category 2 addition is preserved at $\text{ואת השמש } \{\{\text{ואת}\}\}$ וירח כי לעולם חסדו, “the sun and moon because his steadfast love is forever,” at Col 15:10-11 (Ps 136:8). Here, a line is added, which further explains the MT. Both texts identify the Lord as the one who made the great lights in verse 7. However, the MT follows this line by identifying the sun as the ruler over the day (v. 8) and the moon and stars as the rulers over the night (v. 9). 11Q5, on the other hand, identifies the great lights as the sun and the moon prior to describing their areas of dominion. The addition, therefore, explains the MT.

However, the difference could also be explained as a mechanical error. This instance is one of the few examples in this study where the MT reading is shorter and a motivation for parablepsis exists in the longer reading; namely, the scribe’s eyes of the MT could have jumped from ואת שמש to ואת שמש . The presence of this trigger makes this an attractive explanation, but the explanation is not entirely satisfactory. Specifically, the erasure of ואת in 11Q5 may indicate a type of dittography: the scribe’s eyes jumping from the beginning of verse 8 to the beginning of verse 9 and back again. Regardless, the difference likely derived from the scribal process and assumes a common heritage among the texts.

Another category 2 addition is preserved at Col 17:2-4 (Ps 145:13b) and harmonizes the text by supplying a missing letter in an acrostic poem.⁴³¹ It is possible

⁴²⁹ Philip S. Alexander, “The Targumim and the Rabbinic Rules for the Delivery of the Targum,” in *Congress Volume: Salamanca, 1983*, ed. J. A. Emerton, Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 36 (Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 1985), 17-21.

⁴³⁰ Stec, *The Targum of Psalms*, 2-3.

⁴³¹ It is possible that the LXX and 11Q5 are original here and that the MT has suffered omission by parablepsis.

that this is not properly an addition, but an omission on the part of the MT. The MT of Psalm 145 is an acrostic, but one that does not preserve the line beginning with the *nun*. Unsurprisingly, an ancient tradition in Judaism preserves this line as evident in the LXX, which is even found in a Medieval Manuscript (Ms #142).⁴³² The omission of the *nun* line was known to the Rabbis and discussed in rabbinic literature (b. Ber 4b). This ancient addition is also preserved in 11Q5: נאמן אלוהים בדבריו וחסידי בכול מעשיו ברוך יהוה “God is faithful in his words and godly in all his deeds; blessed be the Lord and blessed be his name forever and ever.” It is not immediately clear which reading is preferable since there are other Psalms that are acrostics that omit Hebrew letters.⁴³³ Psalm 25 of the MT omits the *bet*, *vav*, and *qof* line.⁴³⁴ Moreover, in Psalm 35, each verse begins with a subsequent letter of the Hebrew alphabet except for the *vav* line. Nonetheless, one should note that Psalm 35:7 preserves two clauses and the second clause begins with a *vav*. Thus, Psalm 35 is likely a complete acrostic unlike Psalm 25.

In addition to several category 2 additions, 11Q5 also preserves some category 2 omissions, several of which can be described as mechanical errors. For example, the omission of יִפְּהֶלוּן פָּנֶיךָ תִּסְתִּיר, “When you hide your face, they are dismayed (ESV),” FEii:L8 (Ps 104:29), is likely caused by parablepsis of homoioarcton (the scribe’s eyes skipped because of the similarity of the beginning of תִּסְתִּיר and תוֹסֵף). The same

⁴³² Kennicott, *Vetus Testamentum Hebraicumibus*, 2:434. Although Kennicott represents a space between the *mem* and *samek* line of Ps 145, neither Leningrad nor Aleppo preserve a space here. Ps 145 is the Psalm in the lower right-hand corner found on p. 797. See The Leningrad Codex (Codex Leningradensis), accessed June 14, 2018, https://archive.org/stream/Leningrad_Codex/Leningrad#page/n796/mode/2up. For the Aleppo Codex, see Aleppo Codex, accessed June 14, 2018 <http://www.aleppocodex.org/newsite/index.html>.

⁴³³ For example, in Ps 35 each verse begins with a subsequent letter of the Hebrew alphabet. It, however, omits a *vav* line. One should note though that Ps 35:7 preserves two clauses and the second clause begins with a *vav*.

⁴³⁴ The LXX supplies the *bet* by omitting the initial vocative of the MT אֱלֹהֵי “Oh my God”(Ps 25:2) and likely the *vav* line by adding the conjunctive καί in the second half of Ps 25:5. After the *athnach* the MT reads אֵיךָ “for you” without a conjunctive *vav*. One should note that the LXX like the MT omits the *qof* line.

explanation reasonably explains the omission of יהנה at Col 3:6 (Ps 121:8) and the omission of כָּל־פְּקוּדֵי “all of my precepts” at Col 12:1 (Ps 119:128) (the scribe’s eyes skipping because of the repetition of the כל particle). The omission of יה הללו at Col 26:4 (Ps 150:1) is likely a case of haplography: the MT reads יה הללו יה הללו־אל בְּקִדְשׁוֹ, “praise the Lord; praise God in his sanctuary.” The omission at Col 15:8 (Ps 136:4) of גדלות, “great,” could have been caused by homeoteleuton (the scribe’s eyes skipping from the ending of נפלאות to the ending of גדלות). Moreover, the omission of יהדו at Col 3:9 (Ps 122:3) could have been caused by parablepsis due to homeoteleuton (the scribe’s eye moving from לו to יהדו), although the omission may simply be the result of simplifying the text since the verb הבד, “to associate,” already conveys the idea of the adverb.

In several other instances an omission results in a simpler construction. For example, the omission of the emphatic particle נא “please” at Col 3:13 (Ps 122:8) and Col 11:4 (Ps 119:108), the omission of the pronominal suffix at Col 4:7 (Ps 125:4), Col 4:7 (Ps 125:5), Col 8:5 (Ps 119:41), Col 12:15 (Ps 119:142), Col 13:12 (Ps 119:160), Col 16:15 (Ps 145:6), Col 23:13 (Ps 144:2), Col 20:10 (Ps 139:18), the omission of the subject (i.e., initiator) at Col 14:10 (Ps 135:3), and the omission of a prepositional phrase at Col 8:8 (Ps 119:44). In many of these instances, 11Q5 may be simplifying the syntax.

The omission of the noun חַיִּים, “life,” at Col 23:10 (Ps 133:3) is perhaps the most difficult category 2 omission. It is possible the scribe accidentally skipped the word, although the text does not preserve a motivation for parablepsis. The scribe does at times originally omit text when there is motivation (see the supralinear correction of a single letter in Col 23:12). However, the MT reading is unique; namely, defining God’s blessings as “life” by means of apposition is unique among the MT, and this fact may provide a basis for the scribe of 11Q5 omitting the word. God commands a blessing twice in the MT—the subject, object, and verb of Psalms 133:3—(i.e., Lev 25:21; Deut 11:27), and the blessings is never defined as “life.” The uniqueness of the construction may, therefore, have led to its omission.

In other possible examples, an omission may have derived from a tendency to interpret. An example of this is the omission of a pronominal suffix at Col 23:14 (Ps 144:2). Also, there is at least one example of an omission resulting in a more harmonized text. This omission is preserved at Col 6:8 (Ps 132:16) and concerns the omission of the infinitive absolute. This omission results in a more synonymous line; namely, the previous line does not have an infinitive absolute.

The category 2 substitutions far outweigh the category 2 additions or omissions. Among these are substitutions in person or number that slightly change the perspective of the psalm. These variants include FEi:L7 (Ps 104:1), where 11Q5 reads אֱלֹהֵינוּ, “our God,” as opposed to אֱלֹהֵי, “my God;” FEii:L8 (Ps 104:29), where 11Q5 reads רוּחְכֶם, “your breath,” as opposed to רוּחָם, “their breath;” Col 3:9 (Ps 148:5), where 11Q5 reads an imperative הַלְלוּ, “praise,” while the MT reads יְהַלְלוּ, “let them praise;” and Col 3:8 (Ps 122:2), where 11Q5 reads רַגְלֵי, “my feet,” while the MT reads רַגְלֵינוּ, “our feet.” One further substitution of person changes the perspective but likely derived from graphic confusion. This variant is preserved at Col 13:3 (Ps 119:152). 11Q5 reads יִסְדַּתְנִי, “you have established me,” while the MT reads יִסְדְּתֶם, “you established them.” The combination of *nun*, *yod* (especially when *yod* extends to the baseline) easily accounts for this change in perspective.

On other occasions the perspective is slightly changed by substituting parts of speech. Examples of this include the substitution of a participle in the MT (עֹשֶׂה, “who does”) for a perfect (עָשָׂה, “does”) Col 16:3 (Ps 118:16) and the substitution of a noun in the MT (בְּתַקְעָה, “sound”) with an infinitive construct בַּתְּקִיעַ “sounding” at Col 26:5 (Ps 150:3).

In one further instance, a cohortative is substituted for a simple first-person imperfect at Col 16:14 (Ps 145:15). Here 11Q5 reads אֲשִׁיחָה, “I will meditate,” while the MT reads אֲשִׁיחָהּ, “I will indeed meditate.”

Several category 2 substitutions likely derived from a type of graphic confusion since the readings remain graphically similar. For these differences, the readings remain similar while recourse to other explanations are difficult. At FCii:L1 (Ps 102:18), 11Q5 reads תולעת הערער, “worm of the destitute,” while the MT reads תפלת הערער, “prayer of the destitute.” The readings are graphically similar, and unfortunately, the text is too fragmentary to draw any firm conclusions about this substitution. Another variant that could be attributed to graphic confusion is found at Col 12:2 (Ps 119:129), where 11Q5 reads פלגי נפה, “streams of honey,” while the MT reads פלאות, “wonderful.” Interestingly, in both of these differences, confusion of *pe vav* occur. The substitution of prepositions at Col 13:14 (Ps 119:162) is also perhaps best described as deriving from graphic confusion: 11Q5 reads ממוצא, “more than one who goes out,” while the MT reads כמוצא, “as one who goes out.” Moreover, 11Q5 reading of שְׁעֵ[ש]רעי, “my delight,” and the MT’s שְׁעֵשְׁעָתִי, “I delight,” is hard to explain due to the fragmentary nature of the reading; yet, again, the graphic similarity between the readings suggests a paleographic issue.

A common difference found between 11Q5 and the MT that can also be explained as deriving from graphic confusion are the six occasions that concern the reading חוּנִי in 11Q5, “show favor to me” for the the MT’s חַיִּי, “make me live” (Col 8:1 [Ps 119:37], Col 8:4 [Ps 119:40], Col 10:7 [Ps 119:88], Col 11:3 [Ps 119:107], Col 13:7 [Ps 119:156], and Col 13:11 [Ps 119:159]).⁴³⁵ Interesting to note, on one occasion both texts agree in reading “and show favor to me” (MT’s וְחַיִּי and 11Q5’s וְחוּנִי) at Col 12:5 (Ps 119:132), while at Col 13:5 (Ps 119:154) the texts agree in reading “make me live” (MT’s חַיִּי and 11Q5’s חִינִי). Sanders, therefore, is right to note that the six differences

⁴³⁵ The presence of *nun* occurring twice in 11Q5 does not weaken this argument since there are instances where 11Q5 represents the same letter twice where it would only be represented by one *vav* in the MT. For example, 11Q5 has *vav* occurring twice to represent both the consonantal *vav* and the δ at Col 10:11 (Ps 119:92) בעוּנִי “because of my iniquity” as opposed to what would be expected in the MT if it read with 11Q5 (it does not) בְּעוּן “because of my iniquity.”

may be real variants.⁴³⁶ However, simply noting this fact does not weaken understanding the differences as deriving from graphic confusion. It is quite possible that the scribe only confused some occurrences of *yod* for some occurrences of *vav* since *yod* at times only differs from *vav* regarding the length of the shaft. It is possible that these six variants arose because of a lack of uniformity regarding how far a *yod* extends to a baseline in the text's exemplar. This fact does not undermine that the text read differently than the MT on six occasions; rather, it simply reminds the reader that the two cases of agreement do not nullify explaining the differences as deriving from graphic confusion.

There appear at least three examples of variants deriving from metathesis. The first example is preserved at Col 13:3 (Ps 119:152). This variant likely derives from metathesis of *ayin*, *dalet*: 11Q5 reads מדעתכה, "your knowledge," while the MT reads מְעֵדוֹתֶיךָ, "your testimonies." The second example is preserved at Col 14:7 (Ps 135:1). Here 11Q5 and the MT differ with regard to the order of line: according to the MT order, 11Q5 reads line 3, 2, and then 1. The text transposes the first and third lines of the MT. Last, at Col 27:4 (Ps 140:4), 11Q5 reads עכביש, "spider," which also occurs in Job 8:14 and Isaiah 59:5, is found in the transcriptions of 1QIsa^a and 1QIsa^b of Isa 59:5, and is quoted in CD Col 5:14. The MT, though, of Psalm 140:4 reads עֶקְשׁוּב, "viper," and is a *hapax* in the MT and is not found among biblical-DSS or among non-biblical scrolls, but it is found in the Tosefta once at t. Parah 8:6.⁴³⁷ It is difficult to comment on this difference since both words are rare, but graphic similarity may indicate a type of graphic confusion or even interpretation. It is perhaps possible that the scribe was familiar with Isaiah 59:5 and corrected the word. Regardless, the similarity presupposes a common text.

⁴³⁶ Sanders, *The Psalms Scroll of Qumran Cave 11 (11QPsa)*, 11.

⁴³⁷ See Marcus Jastrow, *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature* (New York: Pardes, 1950), s.v. "עֶקְשׁוּב."

Three category 2 substitutions concern the divine name.⁴³⁸ The first reads רצונו, “his will,” at FEiii:L10-11 (Ps 105:3), while the MT reads יהוה, “the Lord.” 1QS Col 5:9 and 9:15 refer to the Lord by the same designation רצונו “his will.”⁴³⁹ 11Q5 further reads אלוהים for the MT’s יהוה at Col 23:14 (Ps 144:3) and Col 23:15 (Ps 144:5). Also, at Col 14:12 (Ps 135:5) 11Q5 reads ואלוהינו, “and our God,” while the MT reads ואלֹהֵינו, “and our Lord.” These types of differences are common and likely derive from unintentional factors.

Unlike the variants discussed as deriving from graphic confusion, several category 2 substitutions, although similar graphically, may perhaps better be explained as interpretations. Among these is the variant at Col 5:5 (Ps 129:3). Although graphically similar—11Q5 reads רשעים, “the wicked,” and the MT reads הַרְשִׁים, “the plowmen”—the context might suggest that the difference derived from interpretation.

These two explanations—graphic confusion or interpretation – can also account for a variant preserved at Col 9:13 (Ps 119:71). 11Q5 reads עניתי, “you afflicted me,” whereas the MT reads עֲנִיתִי, “I am afflicted.” The chief difference here is agency: in 11Q5 the Lord is specifically identified as the agent of the Psalmists affliction, whereas the agent is hidden in the MT. At first glance this change appears to derive from interpretation, but the surrounding context makes this less clear. Psalm 119:75, no longer extant in 11Q5, reads וְאֶמְנָה עֲנִיתִנִי, “and in faithfulness, you afflicted me.” Therefore, although the MT does not designate the Lord as the afflicter in Psalm 119:71, it does in verse 75.

Another variant that can be explained in multiple ways is preserved at Col 10:11 (Ps 119:92). 11Q5 reads בעוונתי, “because of my iniquity,” while the MT reads רָעָתִי, “because of my affliction.” The reading of 11Q5 fits the context well since the protasis of

⁴³⁸ There are two other differences concerning the divine name, but they involve the *qere perpetuum*. In these instances, 11Q5 reads אדוני, while the MT read יהוה (see Col 5:1 [Ps 128:5] and Col 5:6 [Ps 129:4]).

⁴³⁹ I am thankful to Dr. Peter Gentry for this suggestion.

the clause reads “if I had not delighted in your law.” Failing to delight in the law of God can easily be understood as iniquity, and thus, the apodosis could easily be construed as reading “then I would have perished in my iniquity” (11Q5). Although this interpretation has some conceptual support, one cannot rule out a paleographic issue.

The substitution of the *bet* preposition of the MT (בְּאִמְרָתְךָ, “in your word”) for a *lamed* preposition (לְאִמְרָתְךָ, “to your word”) at Col 12:6 (Ps 119:133) likely represents an interpretation.

Another interpretation is likely preserved in the reading גּוֹרָא אַתָּה נִפְלְאוֹת, “you are fearful; wondrous,”⁴⁴⁰ while the MT reads גּוֹרְאוֹת נִפְלְיֹתִי, “fearfully I am wonderfully made” at Col 20:5 (Ps 139:14). The readings are graphically similar, but the fact that 11Q5 reads more smoothly than the MT suggests that the difference derived from interpretation; albeit, an interpretation that attempted to make sense of a proto-MT reading.

11Q5’s reading of וְלֵילָה אִזְוֹר בְּעֵדֵי, “And night has girded me about,”⁴⁴¹ instead of the MT’s וְלֵילָה אִזְוֹר בְּעֵדֵי, “And night is light behind me,” at Col 20:3 (Ps 139:11) too could be an interpretation since 11Q5’s reading is smoother. The fact that the scribe originally transcribed both a *zayin* and a *vav* but later erased the *vav* may indicate some awareness of both readings, but it is possible that the scribe originally wrote the word *plene* as is often the case for *qal* imperatives but erased the *vav* for phonological reasons: namely, because of the third radical *resh*. Notice how roots with a third radical *resh* are at times written with a *vav* (e.g., Col 7:3 [Ps 119:17], Col 8:13 [Ps 119:49], Col 23:5 [Ps 141:9]) but not always (see Col 20:14 [Ps 139:23]).

⁴⁴⁰ Abegg, Flint, and Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible*, 574.

⁴⁴¹ Ibid.

The difference at Col 5:15 (Ps 130:7) is likely an instance of interpretation. 11Q5 reads הרב עמו פדה, “and with him is abundant redemption,”⁴⁴² whereas the MT reads וְהַרְבֵּה עִמּוֹ פְדוּת, “and plentifully is redemption with him.” The Hebrew of both texts are difficult, but graphic similarity and the fact that 11Q5 reads more smoothly suggests that the difference arose through interpretation.

Harmonization, a type of interpretation, explains several category 2 substitutions. For example, the substitution at Col 8:12 (Ps 119:48) results in a more harmonized text. 11Q5 reads ואשישה, “and I will rejoice,” as opposed to וְאָשִׁיחָהּ, “and I will meditate.” The result is that verse 48 is linked more closely to verse 47. In 11Q5, correspondence between these two verses not only concerns the genitive of the preposition and relative clauses—במ[צוותיכה א]שֶׁר אהבתי, “in [your] co[m]mandments w[h]ich I love” (v. 47), אל מצווי[תיכה אש]ר אהבתי, “toward [your] comma[ndments whi]ch I love (v. 48)—but, by means of the substitution, these verses now also correspond concerning the verb; namely, both verbs (אשתעשעה, “I will delight” [v. 47], and ואשישה, “I will rejoice” [v. 48]) denote the idea of joy.

The substitution at Col 13:11 (Ps 119:159), where 11Q5 reads כאמרתכה, “according to your word,” for the MT’s כְּהַסְדֵּךָ, “according to your steadfast love,” might also be a harmonization since the phrase of 11Q5 is found at Col 11:3 (Ps 119:107). However, it should be noted that 11Q5 reads “show me favor” כדברכה “according to your word” (Col 8:1 [Ps 119:37]), כהסדכה “according to your steadfast love (Col 10:7 [Ps 119:88]), כמשפט “according to justice” (Col 12: [Ps 119:132]), and כמשפטיכה “according to your justice (Col 13:7 [Ps 119:156]). Thus, if this is a case of harmonization, the scribe is not consistent in harmonizing similar passages.

⁴⁴² Abegg, Flint, and Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible*, 560. See n350 where Abegg, Flint, and Ulrich say, “Apparent meaning in 11QPs^a, although the Hebrew is difficult and somewhat different from that of MT.”

Concerning this variant, one should note that the topic of Psalm 119 is God's תּוֹרָה "instruction or *torah*." This concept is most often denoted in Psalm 119 by either תּוֹרָה, "instruction or *torah*;" עֲדוּת, "testimony;" פְּקוּד, "precept;" מִצְוָה, "commandment;" מִשְׁפָּט, "judgment;" חֹק, "statute;" or אִמְרָה, "word." These words are used as synonyms throughout the Psalm. Often each stanza (each stanza is made up of 8 lines) repeats one or two of these words. The MT never uses one of these words three times in a stanza when referring to God's Word. However, this substitution of 11Q5 makes אִמְרָה occur three times in this stanza, which may indicate a harmonization to the immediate context. Moreover, 11Q5 and MT preserve 116 overlapping instances where the תּוֹרָה of God is explicitly mentioned, mostly by one of the above terms, and these texts differ only eight times. Out of these eight differences, three concern 11Q5 reading "אִמְרָה" (i.e., Col 6:15 [Ps 119:5]); Col 11:3 [Ps 119:107]; and (Col 13:11 [Ps 119:159]). Thus, one should note that these texts overwhelmingly agree when rendering the topic of God's תּוֹרָה and that when they do not, 11Q5 often renders a form of אִמְרָה.

Another harmonization is preserved at Col 14:8 (Ps 135:2). 11Q5 reads וְרוֹמְמוּ יְהוָה, "exalt the Lord." The Psalmist in this verse and the surrounding verses calls those in the temple to Praise the Lord four times. This addition heightens this call by adding in a slightly different way, another call to worship. Moreover, the phrase וְרוֹמְמוּ יְהוָה, "exalt the Lord," is found in Psalm 99:5, 9, while slightly different forms of the phrase occur at Psalm 21:14 and 30:5.

A category 2 substitution preserved at Col 17:14 (Ps 145:20) too may be a harmonization. 11Q5 reads כֹּל יִרְאֵוּ אֶת-יְהוָה, "The Lord is one who keeps those who fear him," whereas the MT reads שׁוֹמֵר יְהוָה אֶת-כָּל-אֹהֲבָיו, "The Lord is one who keeps those who love him." Psalm 145:19 describes the obedient man as one who *fears* him. Thus, the scribe may be harmonizing the text to the immediate context. Additionally, Scripture closely relates the concepts of obedience to God, fear of God, and love of God. For example, fear of God in Genesis 20:11; 22:12; Exodus 1:17, 21; and Leviticus 19:14 are

just a sampling of verses that connect fear with obedience while obedience to God and love for God are linked in Deuteronomy 13:4. Like 11Q5, 4Q41 at Col 1:3 (Deut 8:6), too involves the substitution the roots ירא (MT) and אהב (4Q41). The difference is an interpretation either to the immediate context or to a wider theological truth.

Another substitution is best explained as an interpretation and harmonization and is preserved at Col 15:4 (Ps 135:21). 11Q5 reads יברככה יהוה, “may the Lord bless you,” while the MT reads בָּרוּךְ יְהוָה, “blessed be the Lord.” On the one hand, the Psalmists according to 11Q5 commands various groups of God’s people to bless the Lord in verses 19-21. This sequence is broken by the prayer that “God would bless you” (i.e., God’s people). The MT, on the other hand, provides a nominal clause בָּרוּךְ יְהוָה, “blessed be the Lord.” It is possible that the difference was occasioned by graphic confusion, but it is better to view this difference as an example of interpretation and harmonization to a common phrase. Nominal clauses can have an optative force בָּרוּךְ יְהוָה, “blessed be the Lord.” Joüon states concerning the optative force of a nominal clause, “The optative force is especially conspicuous when the predicate is a passive participle and precedes the subject.”⁴⁴³ This is the construction of the MT. Therefore, the substitution clarifies the syntax of the MT. Moreover, 11Q5’s reading has precedent at Psalm 128:5 and 134:3: יְבָרְכֶךָ יְהוָה מִצִּיּוֹן, “May the Lord bless you from Zion.” The reading of the MT at Psalm 135:21 is, however, unique in describing God as “blessed (passive participle) from Zion.” Thus, the substitution interprets the syntax of the MT and harmonizes 11Q5 to a more common phrase.

Phonological confusion is perhaps the best explanation for several category 2 variants. For example, confusion of liquids may have caused the difference at Col 7:3 (Ps 119:17): 11Q5 reads גמור על עבדכה, “fulfill on behalf of your servant” (see MT at Ps 57:3

⁴⁴³ Joüon and Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*, §154e. I am grateful to Dr. Peter Gentry who made this suggestion to me during the doctoral defense.

and Ps 138:8), while the MT reads $\text{גָּמַל עַל־עַבְדְּךָ}$, “deal generously with your servant (see MT Ps 13:6; 116:7; 142:8). Both phrases have precedent in the MT; nonetheless, the difference could reasonable be attributed to phonological confusion. The reading at Col 11:13 (Ps 119:117) of וְאֶשְׂאֵר , “and I will lift up,” instead of the MT’s וְאֶשְׂפָּד , “and I will regard,” could have resulted from guttural confusion. The reading תְּפִלָּה , “prayer,” in 11Q5, instead of the reading תְּהִלָּה , “praise,” may also have derive from phonological confusion.

In other instances, a category 2 difference can be explained on the basis of either graphic or phonological confusion. For example, 11Q5 reads מֵאֶרֶץ , “from the land” at Col 10:6 (Ps 119:87) while the MT reads בְּאֶרֶץ , “in the land.” Confusion of *bet/mem* is a common interchange that could derive on either phonological or graphic grounds. The substitution of verbs at Col 11:15 (Ps 119:119) too likely derived from *he* and *het* confusion which could be occasioned on phonological or graphic grounds.

Finally, several category 2 variants have unclear descriptions (i.e., additions, omissions, or substitutions) because of the fragmentary nature of the fragment or column. For example, some of these variants can either be described as omissions or transpositions (i.e., see FEii:L3 [Ps 104:23]) and FEii:L3 [Ps 104:23]). Other variants may be either additions or substitutions (i.e., see Col 1:4 [Ps 105:29]), while the variant at Col 5:10 (Ps 130:1) can either be described as a transposition or addition.

Category 3. In addition to preserving several category 2 variants, 11Q5 further preserved category 3 variants. The first category 3 variant is preserved at Col 23:12 (Ps 144:1). 11Q5 omits the superscription לְדָוִד , “to David.” There is no obvious motivation for parablepsis, but as already mentioned, a scribe’s eyes can omit material unintentionally without a motivation. Moreover, there appears little immediate evidence why the scribe would interpretatively omit the superscription. Additionally, the trend in the manuscript evidence is to add superscriptions, not to omit them. Pietersma

demonstrates that the superscriptions of “the LXX is an expansion on the MT. All that is in the MT is in the LXX, and at no point do they contradict each other.”⁴⁴⁴ The omission of the superscription of Psalm 144:1 in 11Q5 is, therefore, puzzling and warrants the variant being classified as a category 3 variant. However, the fact that four Medieval manuscript agrees (Kennicott # 97, 131, 133, 222) with 11Q5 in omitting this superscription cautions the reader from reading too much into it.⁴⁴⁵

Another category 3 variant is preserved at Col 16:9 (Ps 145:2). Although most of the differences found in Psalm 145 of 11Q5 likely derived from the liturgical function of the scroll, 11Q5’s reading of ברוך יום “blessed be the day” as opposed to the MT’s בְּכָל־יוֹם, “every day,” likely did not. It is possible that the difference was a simple error: the text preserves several occurrences of the word ברוך due to the addition of the antiphon at the end of each verse: ברוך יהוה וברוך שמו לעולם ועד, “blessed be the Lord and blessed be his name forever and ever.” Moreover, the phrase of 11Q5 ברוך יום, “blessed be the day,” never occurs in the MT, the biblical-DSS besides this occurrence,⁴⁴⁶ the non-biblical DSS,⁴⁴⁷ or the Mishnah.⁴⁴⁸ Thus, the difference appears to be an unintentional error. Nonetheless, the reading of 11Q5 is very different than the MT and there is not enough evidence to ascribe this variant to the scribal process with confidence. This variant perhaps is best classified as a category 3 variant.

Differences likely caused by excerpted nature. Several large-scale differences can reasonably be attributed to the excerpted/non-biblical nature of 11Q5.

⁴⁴⁴ Pietersma, “David in the Greek Psalms,” 214.

⁴⁴⁵ Kennicott, *Vetus Testamentum Hebraicum*, 2:432.

⁴⁴⁶ Abegg, Bowley, and Cook, *Accordance 11.2.5 Dead Sea Scroll Biblical Corpus*.

⁴⁴⁷ Abegg, *Dead Sea Scrolls Non-Biblical Texts*.

⁴⁴⁸ Abegg, *Mishnah (Kaufmann)*.

These differences are not categorized as variants here due to the opinion that this text is dependent on the Masoretic Psalter. However, for those who do not hold this opinion, the following differences would all likely be categorized as additional category 3 variants.

These differences include the presence of literary works not included in the Masoretic Psalter. A previously unknown psalm titled *Plea for Deliverance* by Sanders preserved in column 19, Ben Sira 51 preserved at columns 21-22, another previously unknown psalm titled *Apostrophe to Zion* by Sanders at column 22, Psalm 155 as found in some late Syriac manuscripts at column 24, the previously unknown psalm titled *Hymn to the Creator* at column 26 by Sanders, Psalm 151A at column 33, and Psalm 151B preserved at columns 33-34. In addition to these psalms, two psalms are not strictly Masoretic, but appear to be based on Masoretic Psalms. First, the remains of a Psalm at the top of column 2 may be the remains of Psalm 146 with a large-scale addition, it may be a psalm based on Psalm 146, or it may be an altogether new psalm. Too little of the psalm remains. Second, appended to the end of Psalm 136 is a catena from Psalm 118.⁴⁴⁹ This catena, although based on Psalm 118, is not Psalm 118. Last, in column 27, there is a portion from 2 Sam 23:7 and a prose section titled *David's Composition* by Sanders.

Moreover, the order of the Psalms too can be explained as either evidence for the text's excerpted nature or the text's independence. The following sequences are clearly at odds with the MT since the transition between the psalms are either fully or partially preserved: 118 to 104, 104 to 147, Pss 147 to 105, 146 to 148, 132 to 119, 119 to 135, 136 plus additions from 118 to 145, 139 to 137, 141 to 133, and 133 to 144. Overall, where 11Q5 preserves the transition between two Masoretic Psalms, the order is at variance with the MT on ten occasions.

⁴⁴⁹ At the end of Ps 136, a blank space a few letter spaces wide likely indicates that the scribe understood the catena from Ps 118 appended to Ps 136 as secondary.

Besides the inclusion of non-Masoretic Psalms and an alternative sequence of Psalms, many large-scale additions may be explained as serving a liturgical function. For example, the catena of verses that largely derive from Psalm 118 appended to the end of Psalm 136 are reworked into a tight literary structure. The catena is introduced with a phrase found at the beginning of Psalm 118 and 136 הודו ליהוה כי טוב כי לעולם חסדו, “Give thanks to the Lord for he is good; for his steadfast love is forever.” The catena then cites Psalm 118:15 and states where shouts of gladness exist; namely, in the tents of the righteous. Next, the catena has three phrases that begin with the noun ימין, “right hand” corresponding to Psalm 118:15b, 16a, and 16b. What follows is three further declarations that begin with the adjective טוב “good,” two of which correspond to Psalm 118:8 and 9, and a third that is exclusive to 11Q5, but certainly dependent on the structure of verses 8 and 9. The catena then restates the introduction כי טוב כי לעולם חסדו ליהוה following by הללו יה. The differences between Psalm 118 and the catena found here serve a clear liturgical purpose and appear dependent on Psalm 118.

Further liturgical additions are found throughout Psalm 145. This psalm is by far the psalm most at odds with its MT counterpart in 11Q5. The biggest difference being the inclusion of the antiphon שמו לעולם ועד ברוך יהוה וברוך שמו לעולם ועד, “blessed be the Lord and blessed be his name forever and ever,” at the end of each preserved verse (see Ps 136 in the MT for a Psalm that includes a refrain at the end of each verse). This refrain is preserved in full or in part sixteen times.⁴⁵⁰ As already noted, similar refrains were used in later Jewish liturgical practices as indicated in (Mishnah Torah, Laws of Prayer and of the priestly Blessings IX, 9). That Psalm 145 is the text most at odds with its MT counterpart is not alarming since this Psalm is one of the most popular Psalms recited in later Jewish gatherings as indicated by Maimonides.⁴⁵¹ One should not be too quick to

⁴⁵⁰ The scribe originally omitted the words וברוך and blessed at Col 16:10 (Ps 145:2).

⁴⁵¹ Psalm 145 was recited in the morning service (Mishnah Torah, Laws of Prayer and of the

dismiss later Jewish liturgical practices as germane evidence for an analysis of 11Q5, even though 11Q5 predates these practices by a millennium. Davila notes that “the process of development [of the Jewish liturgy] was a conservative one that drew reverently on earlier traditions.”⁴⁵²

There is also a liturgical addition of זואת לזכרון, “this is for a memorial,”⁴⁵³ preserved at Col 17:17 (Ps 145:21).⁴⁵⁴ It is difficult to know how this addition functioned in this text since what proceeds it is no longer extant. Skehan understands the notion as indicating the liturgical use of a group of Psalms; namely, Psalm 135, Psalm 136 plus the catena derived from Psalm 118, and Psalm 145 in this manuscript, not just Psalm 145.⁴⁵⁵ The high concentration of liturgical changes in these psalms supports this conclusion.⁴⁵⁶

Statistics and Conclusion of 11Q5’s Textual Tradition

The previous discussion, although helpful for classifying the textual tradition, is served by a bird’s eye view of the correspondence between these documents.⁴⁵⁷ These statistics account for differences present in the texts preserved in 11Q5 that are also found

priestly Blessings IX, 6) in the afternoon service (Mishnah Torah, Laws of Prayer and of the priestly Blessings IX, 8), and on sabbaths and festivals (Mishnah Torah, Laws of Prayer and of the priestly Blessings IX, 14).

⁴⁵² James R. Davila, *Liturgical Works*, Eerdmans Commentaries on the Dead Sea Scrolls (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 11.

⁴⁵³ Abegg, Flint, and Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible*, 572.

⁴⁵⁴ Skehan, “Liturgical Complex in 11Q5,” 195.

⁴⁵⁵ *Ibid.*

⁴⁵⁶ See Skehan’s discussion of the liturgical grouping of these psalms in *ibid.*, 195-202.

⁴⁵⁷ There are 124 words transcribed by the editor that are not included in the final word count. Lange argues that 3418 words are preserved in this text. Lange, “Collecting Psalms,” 300. The methodologies employed are similar except for how a word is counted. For Lange, מלכו is one word. Here, it is two. This difference likely results in the discrepancies found between these word counts although subjective judgment about what is adequately preserved and what is not likely accounts for some differences too.

in the MT. These statistics demonstrate that although 11Q5 differs from the MT regarding several liturgical secondary features, such as the inclusion of non-Masoretic psalms, the sequence of psalms, and the presence of large-scale additions, once these features are removed, it is shown that 11Q5 preserves a text closely connected to the Masoretic tradition. Thus, one can reasonably classify 11Q5 as preserving a text belonging to the Masoretic tradition, albeit with liturgical adaptations.

Table 43. The statistical relationship between 11Q5 and the MT

Total # of Words in 4Q95	Categories 1, 2, and 3	Statistical Relationship	Categories 2 and 3	Statistical Relationship	Category 3	Statistical Relationship
3563	333	90.65%	174	95.12%	3	99.92%

11Q6

11Q6 (11QPs^b) preserves portions of Psalms 77, 78, 119, 141, 133, 144, a catena of verses from Psalm 118 and possibly two non-Masoretic Psalms preserved also in 11Q5—*Plea for Deliverance* and *the Apostrophe to Zion*⁴⁵⁸—in twelve identifiable fragments.⁴⁵⁹ García Martínez, Tigchelaar, and van der Woude (the editors) describe the script as corresponding well to an early Herodian hand with traces of both formal and semi-formal features ca. beginning of the first century AD.⁴⁶⁰ The text is written in prose

⁴⁵⁸The remains labeled as *Apostrophe to Zion* are meager: two partial words on two lines of one small fragment. See Florentino García Martínez, Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, and van der Woude, eds., “11QPs^b,” in *Qumran Cave 11. 2:11Q2-18, 11Q20-31*, 44-45. J. P. M. van der Ploeg believed that the fragment labeled fragment 1 in 11Q6 preserving portions of Pss 77 and 78 belonged to 11Q7. See J. P. M. van der Ploeg, “Les Manuscrits de La Grotte XI de Qumrân : Aperçu Par J.P.M. van Der Ploeg, O.P.,” *Revue de Qumran* 12, no. 1 (1985): 13. On the basis of this fragment’s script, it was reassigned to 11Q6 in both the preliminary edition (F. García Martínez and E. J. C. Tigchelaar, “Psalms Manuscripts from Qumran Cave 11: A Preliminary Edition,” *Revue de Qumran* 17, no. 65 [1996]: 73-107, esp. 75) and the DJD edition (García Martínez, Tigchelaar, and van der Woude, “11QPs^b,” 38).

⁴⁵⁹ García Martínez, Tigchelaar, and van der Woude, “11QPs^b,” 37-47.

⁴⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, 38.

format except for Psalm 119, which is written stichometrically with two hemistichs per line with a space in between.⁴⁶¹ The orthography is fuller than the MT. For example, David is spelled in 11Q6 as לְדָוִד at F7c:L2 (Frgs. 7a-e:L2 [Ps 133:2]).⁴⁶² Tov labels this spelling practice as QSP.⁴⁶³ Garcia Martínez, Tigchelaar, and van der Woude explain that the original column sizes are difficult to estimate because of “the small number of fragments, the absence of unambiguous points of material correspondence, and the varying line lengths.”⁴⁶⁴

The textual character of 11Q6 is debated. The editors indicate that 11Q6 and 11Q5 “represent two copies of the same composition.”⁴⁶⁵ Tov, likewise, argues that 11Q6 preserves the same collection as 11Q5,⁴⁶⁶ but understands 11Q6, not as a genuine Psalter scroll, but as an excerpted text for liturgical purposes.⁴⁶⁷ On the other hand, Flint argues that 11Q6, along with 4Q87, vindicates Sanders’ hypothesis that 11Q5 represented an authentic Psalter scroll.⁴⁶⁸ The agreements between 11Q5, 11Q6, and 4Q87 demonstrate,

⁴⁶¹ Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 168, 170. Compare 11Q5, which does not have a space between the two hemistichs. *Ibid.*, 170. Comparison between the sense divisions and the MT can be made in two instances, and in each instance, the texts agree: 11Q6 divides the verse at the *athnach*, the largest accent in these two verses (Ps 119:163-164).

⁴⁶² Frgs. 7a-e are grouped together and a reference is provided to the location of the variant on the fragment and to the reconstructed group of fragments.

⁴⁶³ *Ibid.*, 334.

⁴⁶⁴ García Martínez, Tigchelaar, and van der Woude, “11QPs^b,” 37.

⁴⁶⁵ For a brief summary of instances where 11Q6 agrees with 11Q5 and disagrees with it, see *ibid.*, 38. Wilson, *The Editing of the Hebrew Psalter*, 114, also notes the similarity between these texts.

⁴⁶⁶ Tov, “Excerpted and Abbreviated Biblical Texts,” 594-95; Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 320-21.

⁴⁶⁷ Tov, “The Biblical Texts from the Judaean Desert,” 156.

⁴⁶⁸ Flint, *The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls*, 227; Peter W. Flint, “11QPs^b and the 11QPs^a-Psalter,” in *Diachronic and Synchronic: Reading the Psalms in Real Time: Proceedings of the Baylor Symposium on the Book of Psalms*, ed. Joel S. Burnett, W. H. Bellinger, Jr., and W. Dennis Tucker, Jr., Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 488 (New York: T & T Clark, 2007), 157-66. Correspondence between 11Q5 and 11Q6 includes the following features: 11Q6 preserves the sequence Pss 141, 133, 144 found in 11Q5

in Flint’s mind, that 11Q5 is “the foremost representative of the Book of Psalms among the Dead Sea Scrolls.”⁴⁶⁹

Other scholars who comment on the nature of 11Q6 include Lange, who labels it as non-aligned,⁴⁷⁰ and Campbell, who notes that 11Q6 does not differ much from the MT textually.⁴⁷¹

Description and Categorization of Variants

The editors list several differences in the variant column that are merely orthographic (e.g., the *plene* spelling of מוֹשֶׁה rather than the defective spelling of the MT מֹשֶׁה at F1:L3 [Ps 77:21]) or morphological (e.g., the longer form of certain suffixes). Besides these orthographic and morphological variants, they further suggest that F6 preserves portions of the *Apostrophe of Zion*. The remains of this fragment, however, are meager and do not suffice to constitute this claim.⁴⁷² The editors additionally claim that 11Q6 omits the superscription לְדָוִד, “to David,” of Psalm 144 like 11Q5. However, again, the evidence is too fragmentary to substantiate this claim. They rightly note a *vacat* at the beginning of the line, but the brevity of the superscription (only five letters) calls into question this variant.⁴⁷³

while preserving portions of Ps 118 (i.e., vv. 1, 15, 16), appended to Ps 136. Moreover, portions of the *Plea for Deliverance* and a small portion of the *Apostrophe to Zion* (two non-canonical psalms found in 11Q5) are also preserved in 11Q6. See Flint, “Five Surprises in the Qumran Psalms Scrolls,” 192.

⁴⁶⁹ Flint, *The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls*, 227.

⁴⁷⁰ Lange, “Textual Plurality,” 55.

⁴⁷¹ Jonathan G. Campbell, review of *Qumran Cave 11 V 2 11Q2-18, 11Q20-31* ed. Florentino García Martínez, Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, and van der Woude, *The Journal of Theological Studies* 52, no. 1 (2001): 197.

⁴⁷² García Martínez, Tigchelaar, and van der Woude, “11QPsb,” 44-45.

⁴⁷³ The closeness between 11Q5 and 11Q6 from a textual standpoint too suggests the omission, but the fragmentary nature of the line precludes listing it as a variant.

Category 1. Besides the above proposed variants, 11Q6 further preserves two category 1 substitutions. One substitution represents a case of harmonization—11Q6 reads מדיי, “his garments,” at Frgs. 7b:L1 and 7c:L4 (Frgs. 7a-e:L4 [Ps 133:2]), while the MT reads מדותיו. The MT always represents the noun מד, “garment,” as a masculine noun, except here. The second represents a substitution of tense.

Category 2. 11Q6, further, preserves one category 2 addition. F7d:L3 (Frgs. 7a-e:L5 [Ps 133:3]), 11Q6 reads עו[ן]לם שלום על[ן] ישראל “[for]ever; peace upon [Israel]” with 11Q5. This addition corresponds to the ending of two of the other Songs of the Ascent (Pss 125; 128). Thus, the addition results in a more harmonized text. This variant is also found in 11Q5 at Col 23:11 (Ps 133:3). Moreover, Sanders notes that a Medieval Manuscript (Ms # 125) has a similar addition at Psalm 122:9.⁴⁷⁴

Category 3. 11Q6 does not preserve any category 3 variants.

Differences likely caused by excerpted nature. 11Q6’s similarity to 11Q5 is also evident in that it includes two, possible three, non-Masoretic Psalms found in only these two manuscripts. These include a catena from Psalm 118 which, although fragmentary, corresponds to the catena derived from Psalm 118 in 11Q5 and the inclusion of the Psalm titled *Plea for Deliverance*. As mentioned, the editors further argue that 11Q6 preserves portions of *Apostrophe of Zion*, but this assertion is less than certain since only two partially preserved words are preserved on two lines of one small fragment (i.e., fragment 6).⁴⁷⁵ The inclusion of non-Masoretic Psalms together with Masoretic Psalms is

⁴⁷⁴ Sanders, “Two Non-Canonical Psalms in 11QPs,” 44. See Kennicott, *Vetus Testamentum Hebraicum*, 2:421.

⁴⁷⁵ García Martínez, Tigchelaar, and van der Woude, “11QPs,” 44-45.

not indicative of a text belonging to a different tradition, as argued elsewhere. The superscription to Psalm 151 of the LXX demonstrates this point.⁴⁷⁶

In addition to the inclusion of non-Masoretic Psalms, fragments 7a-e exhibit a sequence of Psalms at odds with the MT and in agreement with 11Q5: Psalms 141, 133, and 144. The difference in sequence among scrolls preserving Psalms is not necessarily indicative of a text’s independence but may indicate its excerpting nature.⁴⁷⁷

Statistics and Conclusion of 11Q6’s Textual Tradition

What remains of 11Q6 is quite close to 11Q5 even though the text is poorly preserved.⁴⁷⁸ However, two of the three major types of differences preserved in 11Q5 that distinguish it from the MT—a different sequence of Psalms and the inclusion of non-Masoretic Psalms—are found in 11Q6 despite its fragmentary state. 11Q6 does correspond closely to 11Q5. Thus, the analysis of 11Q5 applies also to 11Q6. 11Q6, like 11Q5, can reasonably be understood as an liturgical text dependent on the Masoretic Psalter.⁴⁷⁹

Table 44. The statistical relationship between 11Q6 and the MT

Total # of Words in 11Q6	Categories 1, 2, and 3	Statistical Relationship	Categories 2 and 3	Statistical Relationship	Category 3	Statistical Relationship
67	5	92.54%	3	95.52%	0	100%

⁴⁷⁶ See the discussion of this phenomenon under the section “Differences likely caused by Excerpted Nature” of 4Q88 and 11Q5.

⁴⁷⁷ For a discussion of this topic, see the discussion of 11Q5 above.

⁴⁷⁸ García Martínez, Tigchelaar, and van der Woude, “11QPsb,” 38.

⁴⁷⁹ Nine words transcribed by the editors are not included in the final word count. Lange argues that 102 words are preserved in this text. Lange, “Collecting Psalms,” 300. The methodologies employed are similar except for how a word is counted. For Lange, מלכו is one word. Here, it is two. This difference likely results in the discrepancies found between these word counts although subjective judgment about what is adequately preserved and what is not likely accounts for some differences too.

11Q7

11Q7 (11QPs^c) preserves portions of Psalms 2, 9, 12-14, 17-18, 19, and 25 in ten identifiable fragments.⁴⁸⁰ García Martínez, Tigchelaar, and van der Woude (the editors) describe the script as corresponding both to an early Herodian round semi-formal script and a developed Herodian formal scrip while the orthography is described as consistently *plene* along with the longer second-person singular pronominal suffix with a *he*.⁴⁸¹ Tov hesitantly labels this spelling practice as QSP.⁴⁸² Moreover, the text is written in prose format.⁴⁸³

The textual tradition of 11Q7 is debated. For example, the editors suggest that the text generally corresponds to the MT but preserves a large proportion of variants, which might indicate that 11Q7 either preserves “a separate textual tradition or a liberal interpretative treatment of the text.”⁴⁸⁴ Also, in the preliminary edition of 11Q7, García Martínez and Tigchelaar note that if the text originally contained the entire Psalter, the text would be very thin; thus, it likely only preserved the first part of the Psalter.⁴⁸⁵ Campbell notes the similarity between 11Q7 and the MT textually,⁴⁸⁶ while Flint and Wilson comment that the texts likely agreed with the MT regarding arrangement.⁴⁸⁷

⁴⁸⁰ Florentino García Martínez, Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, and van der Woude, eds., “11QPsc,” in *Qumran Cave 11. 2:11Q2-18, 11Q20-31*, 49-61. Fragment 9 is assigned to 11Q7, but the editors are uncertain about the text it preserves. *Ibid.*, 59.

⁴⁸¹ J. P. M. van der Ploeg, “Fragments d’un Psautier de Qumran,” in *Symbolae Biblicae et Mesopotamicae Francisco Mario Theodoro de Liagre Böhl Dedicatae*, ed. Franz Marius Theodor Böhl and M. A. Beek, *Studia Francisci Scholten Memoriae Dicata* 4 (Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 1973), 308-9.

⁴⁸² Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 334.

⁴⁸³ *Ibid.*, 169.

⁴⁸⁴ García Martínez, Tigchelaar, and van der Woude, “11QPsc,” 52.

⁴⁸⁵ García Martínez and Tigchelaar, “Psalms Manuscripts from Qumran Cave 11,” 83.

⁴⁸⁶ See Campbell, review of *Qumran Cave 11*, 197.

⁴⁸⁷ Flint, *The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls*, 42; Wilson, *The Editing of the Hebrew Psalter*, 115.

Lange and Tov both classify the text as non-aligned.⁴⁸⁸ Tov further classifies 11Q7 as an excerpted text for liturgical purposes.⁴⁸⁹

Description and Categorization of Variants

Several differences listed by the editors as variants are not included in the following discussion or statistics. First, many of the differences concern *plene*/defective spelling and long forms of the second-person pronominal suffix, and thus, are not included in the following discussions. Second, two differences can be described as synonymous forms. Third, two preserved differences likely resulted from scribal error. Fourth, three further examples depend on insufficient manuscript evidence. Fifth, one difference concerns the distinction between *yod* and *vav*, but the form of the letter is not conclusive.

Category 1. About half of the differences should be categorized as category 1 variants. The text preserves one category 1 omission (i.e., the omission of the conjunctive *vav* at F11:3 (Ps 25:5) and six category 1 substitutions.⁴⁹⁰ Moreover, one variant could either be a transposition of lines or a substitution of number. The poor state of the line's preservation precludes certainty.⁴⁹¹

Category 2. 11Q7 preserves several category 2 variants including one addition. The addition is the reading אֱלֹהֵי צְדִיקָא, “[to the righte]ous at F5:L1 (Frgs. 4-7:L3 [Ps 12:6]).

⁴⁸⁸ Lange, “Textual Plurality,” 55; Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 334.

⁴⁸⁹ Tov, “The Biblical Texts from the Judaean Desert,” 156.

⁴⁹⁰ One can refer to the fragments grouped together by the editors as one column and the reconstructed line number or one can refer to the and line number provided by the when citing this text. Both are provided here. The first reference given is the reference to the fragment number and the corresponding line of the fragment while the second reference is that of either the reconstructed column or the group of fragments grouped together by the editors and the corresponding reconstructed line number.

⁴⁹¹ For these suggestions, see García Martínez, Tigchelaar, and van der Woude, “11QPsc,” 60. Per the methodology here, the less invasive difference is suggested.

The evidence is fragmentary, but enough is preserved to categorize the variant as an addition. If the reconstruction is right, then 11Q7 simply makes the MT explicit by indicating who the Lord arises for: namely, for the righteous.

11Q7 preserves a category 2 substitution at F3:2 (Ps 9:5). 11Q7 reads שפטה, “you judge,” against the reading שופט, “as a judge,” of the MT. The difference changes the perspective from primarily describing God (participle) to stating what God has done (perfect). Furthermore, it is important to note that the difference results in a more harmonized text. The Psalm shifts focus to God in verses 4 and 5 and consistently uses second-person perfects. This is the only instance in verses 4 and 5 of the MT where a participle is used to describe God. Thus, the substitution of 11Q7 harmonizes the reading to the immediate context.

The second category 2 substitution is preserved at F6:L3 (Frgs. 4-7 [Ps 14:1]). 11Q7 reads עולה, “iniquity,” while the MT reads עֲלִילָה, “deed.” The reading of 11Q7 could be an interpretation to the immediate context since the word of the MT can have both a positive connotation (e.g., Ps 9:12; 66:5) or negative (e.g., Ps 144:4). Moreover, as noted by the editors, the text agrees closely with Psalm 38:12, which parallels this verse (Ps 14:1). Thus, the difference may be a harmonization.

The third category 2 substitution is preserved at F8:1 (Ps 17:9). 11Q7 reads דרשׁוּני, “[they] seek [me],” while the MT reads שׁדוּני, “they destroy me.” Van der Ploeg suggests that this substitution might be a case of replacing a rare poetic word for a more common one.⁴⁹² The verbal root שׁדד only occurs three times in the Psalms and nowhere else describes what the enemies do to David while the verbal root דרשׁ occurs twenty-five times and is used analogously at Psalm 38:12. Thus, this difference can reasonably be described as a harmonization.

⁴⁹² Van der Ploeg, “Fragments d’un Psautier de Qumran,” 308-9. Apud García Martínez, Tigchelaar, and van der Woude, “11QPsc,” 58.

The fourth category 2 substitution is preserved at F8:2 (Ps 17:11). 11Q7 reads גרשוני עתה סבב[וני] “they have expelled me; now they surround me,” while the MT reads אֲשַׁרְיָנוּ עָתָה סָבְבוּנִי [סָבְבוּנוּ] “our steps, now they surround me [us].” The integrity of the MT reading אֲשַׁרְיָנוּ “our steps,” has been debated.⁴⁹³ The ancient versions are divided: the MT, Targum, Peshitta, and Vulgate all read the basic root אִשַׁר although they do not unanimously interpret this root in the same way. The LXX and 11Q7, however, agree in reading not only the same root, גרש, but also the same form גרשוני “they have driven me out.” The editors suggest that 11Q7 again preserves a common word against the MT’s rarer poetic word.⁴⁹⁴ The difference is likely a case of interpretation.

Category 3. 11Q7 does not preserve any category 3 variants.

Statistics and Conclusion of 11Q7’s Textual Tradition

The above discussion demonstrates that 11Q7 does not differ much from the MT textually.⁴⁹⁵ Moreover, most of the category 1 variants and all of the category 2 variants indicate a tendency to clarify the MT.⁴⁹⁶ In light of the types of differences preserved in 11Q7 and the high statistical agreement shared among the texts, it is quite

⁴⁹³ See a short history of research in M. Cohen, “Assurênû Attâ Sebabûnî (Q. Sebabûnû) (Psaume Xvii 11a),” *Vetus Testamentum* 41 (1991): 137–44. See also Edward J Kissane, “Some Critical Notes on Psalm XVII,” *Biblica* 9, no. 1 (January 1928): 89-96; Raphael Weiss, “On Ligatures in the Hebrew Bible: Nw=m,” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 82, no. 2 (June 1963): 188-94.

⁴⁹⁴ García Martínez, Tigchelaar, and van der Woude, “11QPsc,” 58.

⁴⁹⁵ Thirty-one words transcribed by the editors are not included in the final word count. Lange argues that 189 words are preserved in this text in Lange, “Collecting Psalms,” 300. Note that the methodologies employed are similar except for how a word is counted. For Lange, מלכו is one word. Here, it is two. This difference likely results in the discrepancies found between these word counts although subjective judgment about what is adequately preserved and what is not likely accounts for some differences too.

⁴⁹⁶ The editors argue that the variants preserved in 11Q7 may indicate “a liberal interpretative treatment of the text.” García Martínez, Tigchelaar, and van der Woude, “11QPsc,” 52. The argument is more specific here: the scribe tended to clarify the MT.

reasonable to classify 11Q7 as belonging to the Masoretic tradition. It is likely an excerpted text preserving the Masoretic tradition.⁴⁹⁷

Table 45. The statistical relationship between 11Q7 and the MT

Total # of Words in 11Q	Categories 1, 2, and 3	Statistical Relationship	Categories 2 and 3	Statistical Relationship	Category 3	Statistical Relationship
226	13	94.25%	5	97.79%	0	100%

11Q8

11Q8 (11QPs^d) preserves portions of Psalms 6, 9, 18, 36-37, 39-40, 43, 45, 59, 68, 78, 81, 86, and 115 in fourteen identifiable fragments.⁴⁹⁸ García Martínez, Tigchelaar, and van der Woude (the editors) describe the script as corresponding to a developed to a late Herodian hand, ca. middle of the first-century AD, while the orthography is irregular with regard to its use of the *vav* and slightly more *plene* than the MT regarding the use of the *yod*. Additionally, it uses the longer second-person pronominal suffix twice.⁴⁹⁹ Tov questionably labels the spelling practice of 11Q8 as belonging to QSP.⁵⁰⁰ The text is written in prose format.⁵⁰¹

⁴⁹⁷ Tov, “The Biblical Texts from the Judaean Desert,” 156. However, note that 11Q7 is estimated to have been very large (according to Tov’s classification. See Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 88). Its height is estimated to be 28 cm with thirty-six lines per column. See García Martínez, Tigchelaar, and van der Woude, “11QPsc,” 49–50. Tov lists it as one of the larger texts preserving Psalms in Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 96.

⁴⁹⁸ Florentino García Martínez, Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, and van der Woude, eds., “11QPsd,” in *Qumran Cave 11. 2:11Q2-18, 11Q20-31*, 63-76. Notice the content preserved by fragment 4 is only suggestive. See García Martínez, Tigchelaar, and van der Woude, 67.

⁴⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, 64-65.

⁵⁰⁰ Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 334.

⁵⁰¹ *Ibid.*, 169.

The textual tradition of 11Q8 is debated. Disregarding spelling differences, the editors indicate that 11Q8 only differs from the MT in four cases, although spatial reconstructions in three fragments may, but not necessarily, indicate further differences.⁵⁰² Campbell believes that the text is close to the MT.⁵⁰³ Flint, similarly, argues that the text does not preserve any major disagreement with respect to the MT.⁵⁰⁴ Tov labels the text as an excerpted text for liturgical purposes, which is a special subset of the non-aligned category.⁵⁰⁵ Tov further categorizes 11Q8 as a possible *de luxe* edition due to the estimated amount of lines preserved per column (32-34).⁵⁰⁶ Lange classifies this text as too damaged for text-typological classification.⁵⁰⁷

Description and Categorization of Variants

Two differences suggested by the editors are not included in the following discussion and statistics. One depends on insufficient manuscript evidence and is preserved at F14:L3 (Ps 86:13), while the other may represent a synonymous spelling (i.e., F13:L4 [Ps 81:7]).

Category 1. 11Q8 preserves one category 1 variant. 11Q8 represents a collective noun of the MT as a plural (i.e., F13:L3 [Ps 81:6]).

⁵⁰² García Martínez, Tigchelaar, and van der Woude, “11QPsd,” 65.

⁵⁰³ Campbell, review of *Qumran Cave 11*, 197.

⁵⁰⁴ Flint, *The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls*, 42.

⁵⁰⁵ Tov, “The Biblical Texts from the Judaean Desert,” 156. See also Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 334.

⁵⁰⁶ Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 129.

⁵⁰⁷ Lange, “Textual Plurality,” 55-56.

Category 2. 11Q8 preserves two category 2 additions, but in both instances, the line is poorly preserved, which leads to uncertainty about these variants. The first variant is preserved at F8:L1 (Ps 45:6), but all that remains is $\text{ףל\text{א}}$, “a thousand.” The second addition is preserved at F11:L2 (Ps 68:16). 11Q8 preserves only a *zayin* $\text{ה]$, “this.” This addition may simply be an addition of a demonstrative pronoun modifying the noun ה , “mountain.”

Category 3. 11Q8 does not preserve any category 3 variants.

Statistics and Conclusion of 11Q8’s Textual Tradition

This discussion demonstrates that 11Q8 differs from the MT in only minor details.⁵⁰⁸ Also, the statistical relationship between 11Q8 and the MT is very high. There seems to be no compelling reason why 11Q8 should not be classified as belonging to the Masoretic tradition. It is also worth noting that the text may be an excerpted text, per Tov’s suggestion.⁵⁰⁹

Table 46. The statistical relationship between 11Q8 and the MT

Total # of Words in 11Q8	Categories 1, 2, and 3	Statistical Relationship	Categories 2 and 3	Statistical Relationship	Category 3	Statistical Relationship
131	3	97.71%	2	98.47%	0	100%

⁵⁰⁸ Twenty-five words transcribed by the editors are not accepted in the total word counts provided here. Lange argues that 420 words are preserved in this text. Lange, “Collecting Psalms,” 300. The methodologies employed are similar except for how a word is counted. For Lange, מלכו is one word. Here, it is two. This difference likely results in the discrepancies found between these word counts although subjective judgment about what is adequately preserved and what is not likely accounts for some differences too.

⁵⁰⁹ Tov, “The Biblical Texts from the Judaean Desert,” 156. Note though that 11Q8 is estimated to have been large—it is estimated that the text originally possessed 32 to 34 lines per column. See García Martínez, Tigchelaar, and van der Woude, “11QPsd,” 63.

4Q106

4Q106 (4QCant^a) preserves portions of Canticles 3, 4, 6, and 7 in four identifiable fragments reconstructed into three separate columns.⁵¹⁰ According to Tov, Ada Yardeni dates the manuscript to the early Herodian period, while the orthography is described by Tov as close to the MT.⁵¹¹

The textual tradition of 4Q106 is debated amongst scholars because the text omits Canticles 4:8-6:10. Tov understands this omission as intentional and classifies the text as an abbreviated text which is a Scripture-like composition.⁵¹² The reason for the abbreviation is uncertain but might reflect “the excerptors’ literary taste.”⁵¹³ However, Lange suggests that the small nature of the original scroll may have led the scribe to abbreviate. Lange states that the small handwriting supports this suggestion,⁵¹⁴ while Jarick explains that the abbreviation may be due to liturgical reasons, contrary to Tov and Lange.⁵¹⁵ Excerpted texts are classified as non-aligned texts in Tov’s classification

⁵¹⁰ Emanuel Tov, ed., “4QCanta,” in *Qumran Cave 4. XI, Psalms to Chronicles*, 199-204. Nebe observes that fragment 1 may preserve portions from 2 Chr 20:10-12 and that if it does, the writing does not correspond to that of 4Q118. See G. Wilhelm Nebe, “Qumranica I: Zu Unveröffentlichten Handschriften Aus Höhle 4 von Qumran,” *Zeitschrift Für Die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 106 (1994): 309-10. However, like Tov, Puech understands fragment 1 as partially preserving Song 3. See Émile Puech, “Le Cantique Des Cantiques Dans Les Manuscrits de Qumrân: 4Q106, 4Q107, 4Q108 et 6Q6,” *Revue Biblique* 123 (2016): 30.

⁵¹¹ Tov, “4QCanta,” 199.

⁵¹² Tov, “The Biblical Texts from the Judaean Desert,” 156; Tov, “Excerpted and Abbreviated Biblical Texts,” 591-92; Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 109. Tov further describes this text as a partial Scripture scroll. Ibid., 320-21. John Jarick likewise understands this omission as intentional. See John Jarick, “The Bible’s ‘Festival Scrolls’ among the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in Porter and Evans, *The Scrolls and the Scriptures*, 171.

⁵¹³ Tov, “Excerpted and Abbreviated Biblical Texts,” 591.

⁵¹⁴ Lange, “Textual Plurality,” 90.

⁵¹⁵ Jarick, “The Bible’s ‘Festival Scrolls,’” 173.

grid.⁵¹⁶ Lange too classifies the text as non-aligned.⁵¹⁷ Ulrich, however, argues that 4Q106 is more likely a variant literary edition of the Song.⁵¹⁸

Description and Categorization of Variants

Two proposed variants listed by Tov are not included in the following discussion and statistics. The first is found at F2i:L13 (Col 2:13 [Song 4:5]).⁵¹⁹ Here Tov argues that the letter immediately prior to רעים does not correspond to a *he* (the letter of the MT), but a *pe*. However, the textual evidence is quite minimal, and although Tov may be right, the remains of the letter do not correspond well with the *pe* either. For example, the downward stroke of the head is flatter in the *pe* preserved at F2ii:L4 (Col 3:4) and F2ii:L12 (Col 3:12). Moreover, in both of these examples, the base stroke extends to the left or beyond the head of the *pe*, but no base stroke is preserved here. Thus, the evidence is inconclusive.

The second proposed variant depends on spatial considerations, and thus, is not included in the following discussion or statistics. Tov suggests that 4Q106 originally omitted one of the imperatives, שׁוּבִי שׁוּבִי, “return, return,” which occurs twice in the MT.

⁵¹⁶ Tov, “The Biblical Texts from the Judaean Desert,” 156. Tov designates this text as non-aligned with an exclamation mark. Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 335; Tov, “Excerpted and Abbreviated Biblical Texts,” 591.

⁵¹⁷ Lange, “Textual Plurality,” 55.

⁵¹⁸ Ulrich, “Our Sharper Focus on the Bible and Theology,” 8. See also his slightly more thorough and less decided treatment of this text in Eugene Ulrich, “The Text of the Hebrew Scriptures at the Time of Hillel and Jesus,” ed. André Lemaire, *Supplements to Vetus Testamentum* 92 (Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 2002), 104-5, 108.

⁵¹⁹ One can refer to the reconstructed column and line number provided by the editor (or even the fragments grouped together to form a reconstructed column), or one can refer to the exact fragment and line number corresponding to the actual fragment when citing this text. Both are provided here. The first reference given is the reference to the fragment number and the corresponding line of the fragment while the second reference is that of the reconstructed column and the corresponding reconstructed line number.

However, line 12 of fragment 12i extends far into margin, and thus, the uneven margin complicates this suggestion.⁵²⁰

Category 1. Unlike most non-aligned texts, nearly all of the category 1 variants are omissions (e.g., omission of conjunctive *vav*, a relative particle, and interrogative *he*). Two further category 1 variants are substitutions: a substitution of prepositions and a substitution of similar lexemes.

Category 2. 4Q106, further, preserved six category 2 variants. A category 2 addition is preserved at F2i:L10 (Col 2:10 [Song 4:2]). 4Q106 reads אִינָהּ, “there is none for her,” while the MT simply reads אֵין, “there is none.” The pronoun is a resumptive pronoun, which resumes the subject. The difference is slight.

Several other category 2 variants are substitutions. The first category 2 substitution is preserved at F4:L3 (Col 2:5 [Song 3:11]). 4Q106 reads בְּנֹת יְרוּשָׁלַם, “daughter]rs of Jerusalem,” while the MT reads בְּנוֹת צִיּוֹן, “daughters of Zion.” Tov notes that the phrase בְּנוֹת צִיּוֹן only occurs in the MT here while the phrase of 4Q106 בְּנוֹת יְרוּשָׁלַם occurs in the prior verse.⁵²¹ The difference, therefore, harmonizes the verse to its immediate context.

Another category 2 substitution is preserved at F2i:L9 (Col 2:9 [Song 4:1]). 4Q106 is fragmentary, but enough of the text is preserved to indicate a type of substitution. Tov transcribes אִנְּוּ [שְׂגִלְשׁ] “who are the ones who come do]wn”—a participle—contrary to reading of the MT, אֲשֶׁר יָבִיאוּ, “which come down”—a perfect. Whereas the participle focuses on describing the beloved’s goats, the MT stresses the action as

⁵²⁰ Tov claims that this proposal is likely, but not certain. Tov, “4QCanta,” 204.

⁵²¹ Ibid., 201.

occurring. The relative particle attached to the perfect verb of the MT functions similarly to a participle. The substitution is, therefore, not alarming.⁵²²

Two cases of transposition are preserved at F2i:L8 (Col 2:8 [Song 4:1]) and F2i:L9 (Col 2:9 [Song 4:2]). 4Q106 reads *לְצִמְתֶּךָ כְּעֵדֶר הָעִזִּים שְׁעָרְךָ*, “your veil; like flocks of [goats is your hair,” while the MT (with 4Q107) reads *לְצִמְתֶּךָ שְׁעָרְךָ כְּעֵדֶר הָעִזִּים*, “your veil. Your hair is like a flock of goats.”⁵²³ Likewise, 4Q106 reads *כְּעֵדֶר הַקְּצוּבוֹת שְׁנִיךָ*, “like a flock of newly shorn ewes are your teeth,”⁵²⁴ at F2i:L9 (Col 2:9 [Song 4:2]), while the MT (with 4Q107) reads *שְׁנִיךָ כְּעֵדֶר הַקְּצוּבוֹת*, “your teeth are like a flock of shorn ewes” (ESV). These two transpositions function to make the text more internally consistent. Notice that when 4Q106 preserve a comparative clause in verses 1-5, the comparative clause begins the clause.

Category 3. 4Q106 does not preserve any category 3 variants.

Differences likely caused by excerpted nature. Fragment 2ii (Col 3) of 4Q106 preserves a portion of Song 4:7 at the top of line 1 followed by two unpreserved lines. Line 4, then, appears to preserve a portion of Song 6:11, while line 5 to the end of the column preserve partially Song 7:1-14. 4Q106, therefore, omits portions of chapter 4, all of chapter 5, and portions of chapter 6, and thus, skips, according to Tov’s calculations, around 30 percent of the book.⁵²⁵ Tov argues that the omitted material was

⁵²²I am thankful to Dr. Peter Gentry’s comment about this variant.

⁵²³ It is technically possible that 4Q106 has omitted *שְׁעָרְךָ*, although this is not likely since the phrase would omit an initiator that is not clear on context alone.

⁵²⁴ Abegg, Flint, and Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible*, 615.

⁵²⁵ Tov, “4QCanta,” 203.

likely 4:8-6:10 (material between Masoretic paragraph markers).⁵²⁶ Based on this omission, Tov identifies this text as an abbreviated text.

Several factors support Tov's conclusion about the abbreviated nature of 4Q106 rather than Ulrich's view that the text represents an alternative literary edition of the Song. First, the abbreviation likely begins at the end of Song 4:8 and continues to 6:10; thus, the text omits content between Masoretic paragraph breaks.⁵²⁷ Excerpting texts in accordance with scribal breaks is a common feature of excerpted texts, a feature that Tov argues is present in this text.⁵²⁸ Second, the omitted material would cover several columns:⁵²⁹ approximately 30 percent of the text.⁵³⁰ Tov rightly points that this much content likely did not derive from an unintentional error such as parablepsis.⁵³¹ Third, Strawn notes that excerpted texts are often identified "through *recourse to other, often more complete, copies.*"⁵³² Therefore, the uniqueness of this omission suggests intentionality and its secondary nature. Fourth, although small dimensions are often a major component in identifying a text as excerpted, this characteristic is less sure when dealing with small compositions, such as the Five *Megillot* (i.e., Song of Solomon, Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, and Esther).⁵³³ Each text from Qumran that preserves one of

⁵²⁶ Tov, "4QCanta," 203.

⁵²⁷ Ibid.

⁵²⁸ Strawn, "Excerpted Manuscripts at Qumran," 114. Reconstruction according to Tov indicates that 4Q106 had a partially empty line followed by a complete empty line. Tov, "Excerpted and Abbreviated Biblical Texts," 592.

⁵²⁹ Emmanuel Tov, "Three Manuscripts (Abbreviated Texts?) of Canticles from Qumran Cave 4," *Journal of Jewish Studies* 46, no. 1 (1995): 89.

⁵³⁰ Tov, "4QCanta," 203.

⁵³¹ Ibid. See also Lange, "Textual Plurality," 88-89.

⁵³² This quote refers to copies of Exodus and Deuteronomy, but it also applies to this discussion. See Strawn, "Excerpted Manuscripts at Qumran," 132-33, emphasis original.

⁵³³ Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 90. Note though that the remains of Esther have

these books is small except for 4Q109 (4QQoh^a), which preserves an estimated twenty lines per column.⁵³⁴ Nonetheless, the small size of this composition (14 lines per column),⁵³⁵ plus the other factors listed, strongly suggests that this text is an excerpted manuscript. Since the abbreviating was likely intentional, the abbreviating should not be considered a genuine variant since the difference derived from the excerpted nature of the manuscript. Tov's understanding of the text is preferred to Ulrich's.

Statistics and Conclusion of 4Q106's Textual Tradition

The previous discussion demonstrates that 4Q106 differs from the MT in only minor details and many of these differences result in a more harmonized text. Moreover, unlike most non-aligned texts, 4Q106 is distinguished from the MT mostly regarding omissions. Thus, the brevity of the text is not only evident in its omission of 4:8-6:10, but also its many omissions of small particles. This fact may give credence to Lange's view that the abbreviating was done for practical reasons; namely, due to the small size of the manuscript.⁵³⁶

When comparing the statistics of this text to others, one should note that the percentage of category 1 variant is higher than normal while the percentage of category 2 and 3 variants is normal.⁵³⁷ Overall, there is reasonable evidence for categorizing 4Q106

not been preserved in any text from Qumran.

⁵³⁴ Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 90.

⁵³⁵ *Ibid.*, 86.

⁵³⁶ Lange, "Textual Plurality," 90.

⁵³⁷ There are 34 words transcribed by Tov not included in the final statistics. Among these 34 words are the 8 partially preserved words of fragment 1 due to uncertainty about the content is preserved. Tov, "4QCanta," 199. Moreover, fragment 3 and 4 are very obscure on the Photos at IAA. Thus, the transcriptions of Tov have been accepted here as long as a reasonable portion of the letters were indicated as certain and/or probable rather than mainly possible. Most of the words transcribed by Tov not accepted

as belonging to the Masoretic tradition since it appears to be abbreviated from a text belonging to the Masoretic tradition.

Table 47. The statistical relationship between 4Q106 and the MT

Total # of Words in 4Q106	Categories 1, 2, and 3	Statistical Relationship	Categories 2 and 3	Statistical Relationship	Category 3	Statistical Relationship
119	13	89.08%	5	95.80%	0	100%

4Q107

4Q107 (4QCant^b) preserves portions of Song 2, 3, 4, and 5 in 3 fragments.⁵³⁸ Ada Yardeni dated the scroll to the end of the first century BC while the orthography is close to the MT.⁵³⁹ The scroll preserves a high proportion of scribal marks that correspond to paleo-Hebrew and Cryptic A letters.⁵⁴⁰ The Cryptic A script was used in Qumran sectarian writings, and thus, according to Tov, this “would point to either a sectarian scribal background or to the use of the manuscript by the Qumran community.”⁵⁴¹ The purpose of the scribal marks are not entirely clear.⁵⁴² Further scribal features include a scribal note or superscription at the top margin of fragment 1, possibly below fragment 1, line 15, and the crossing out of a word on one occasion.⁵⁴³

here came from fragments 2i-5. Several factors obscure these readings included folding leather, the leather splitting, shrinkage, and faint letters. See Tov, “4QCanta,” 201.

⁵³⁸ Emanuel Tov, ed., “4QCantb,” in *Qumran Cave 4. XI, Psalms to Chronicles*, 205-18.

⁵³⁹ Tov cites Yardeni’s opinion (private communication) in *ibid.*, 208.

⁵⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 205. Comparative to other texts, this text preserves one of the highest proportions of scribal signs. See Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 178.

⁵⁴¹ Tov, “4QCantb,” 205.

⁵⁴² See Tov’s section titled “Scribal Marks and Procedures,” in *Tov, Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 178-218.

⁵⁴³ Tov, “4QCantb,” 206.

The textual tradition of 4Q107 is debated. Tov notes that the high proportion of scribal errors and Aramaic influence indicate that the scroll was copied imprecisely.⁵⁴⁴ The fact that 4Q107 was unruled, contrary to most Qumran and Masada literary manuscripts written on leather, further adds to the text's imprecise nature.⁵⁴⁵ Also, the scroll omits two sections, which indicates the abbreviated nature of the scroll.⁵⁴⁶ In light of these facts, Tov designates 4Q107 as an abbreviated text, a Scripture-like composition that is a special sub-set of the non-aligned category.⁵⁴⁷ Lange also classified 4Q107 as a non-aligned text,⁵⁴⁸ one which attests to a high degree of scribal corruption, that if removed, gives evidence to an exemplar "rather close to the consonantal text of the MT,"⁵⁴⁹ and as an abbreviated text.⁵⁵⁰ Ulrich, however, argues that 4Q107 is more likely a variant literary edition of the Song.⁵⁵¹

Description and Categorization of Variants

Many of the differences listed by Tov are not included in the following discussion and statistics. Several of these differences depend on insufficient manuscript evidence. In some instances, the variant is proposed on spatial considerations (e.g., the

⁵⁴⁴ Tov, "4QCantb," 205-18.

⁵⁴⁵ Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 57-59.

⁵⁴⁶ 4Q107 omits Song 3:6-8 and 4:4-7. See Tov, "4QCantb," 205-18.

⁵⁴⁷ Tov, "The Biblical Texts from the Judaean Desert," 156; Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 96, 109, 320-21.

⁵⁴⁸ Lange, "Textual Plurality," 54-55, 66.

⁵⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 66.

⁵⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 90. Jarick, "The Bible's 'Festival Scrolls,'" 171, agrees that there is evidence for the text being intentionally abbreviated.

⁵⁵¹ Ulrich, "Our Sharper Focus on the Bible and Theology," 8. See also his slightly more thorough and less decided treatment of this text in Ulrich, "The Text of the Hebrew Scriptures," 104-5, 108.

proposal that the scribe wrote שועלים “foxes” once instead of twice at F1:L10 (Col 1:10 [Song 2:15]).⁵⁵² Other differences only concern spelling, many of which can be attributed to Aramaic influence such as confusion of *sade* and *tet* at F1:L12 (Col 1:12 [Song 2:17]), and the sonants *lamed* and *resh* at F1:8 (Col 1:8 [Song 2:14]).⁵⁵³

Category 1. 4Q107 preserves the addition of a conjunctive *vav* at F2ii:L6 (Col 3:6 [Song 4:3]), the substitution of gender at F1:L8 (Col 1:8 [Song 2:14]), the substitution of a similar lexeme at F1:L9 (Col 1:9 [Song 2:14]), the substitution of tense at F1:L15 (Col 1:15 [Song 3:2]), and the substitution of number at F2ii:L8 (Col 3:8 [Song 4:8]).⁵⁵⁴

Category 2. 4Q107 preserves four category 2 additions. Two of these additions involve the addition of the interjection הנה “behold” at F1:L3 (Col 1:3 [Song 2:12]) and F1:L5 (Col 1:5 [Song 2:13]). In this passage, the beloved says to the woman to arise and to come (3:10). Three reasons are then given followed by the admonition again for the woman to arise and to come. In the MT, the first reason begins with the interjection הנה (following the ו particle), while the subsequent two reasons do not include the interjection. The inclusion of the interjection at these two instances results in a more consistent text: each reason has an interjection. The difference is likely a harmonization.

⁵⁵² One can refer to the reconstructed column and line number provided by the editor or one can refer to the exact fragment and line number corresponding to the actual fragment when citing this text. Both are provided here. The first reference given is the reference to the fragment number and the corresponding line of the fragment while the second reference is that of the reconstructed column and the corresponding reconstructed line number.

⁵⁵³ For more details about these and all other differences not discussed in the following discussion and statistics, see table “4Q107: Description of variants,” in appendix 3.

⁵⁵⁴ For more details about the category 1 variants, see table “4Q107: Description of variants,” in appendix 3.

A third category 2 addition is preserved at F1:L14 (Col 1:14 [Song 3:1]). 4Q107 reads בלי לילות בלילות, “at night; at night,” while the MT only has one occurrence of the prepositional phrase בלילות, “at night.” The occurrence of two identical phrases is not uncommon in Hebrew Literature (see the MT of Song 2:15 where the reverse phenomenon occurs).⁵⁵⁵ The addition is minor and is likely an instance of dittography.

The next category 2 addition too results in a more harmonized text and is preserved at F2ii:L14 (Col 3:14 [Song 4:11]). 4Q107 adds the phrase אהותי, “my sister,” to further describe his bride. The Song elsewhere refers to the woman as both אהתי and כלה, “my sister, bride,” at Song 4:9, 10, 12; 5:1.⁵⁵⁶ Thus, this difference likewise appears to be an instance of harmonization.

Besides additions, 4Q107 also preserves a category 2 substitution. This variant is a possible example of hypercorrection as suggested by Tov at F2ii:L7 (Col 3:7 [Song 4:8]). Tov states that the scribe “may have explained אתי as the Aramaic 2nd person fem. pronoun, changed by him to the Hebrew את.”⁵⁵⁷ Hypercorrection is not unique to this text; Kutscher too suggests that the scribe of 1QIsa^a (another scribe influenced by Aramaic) hypercorrected the text at 1QIsa^a Col 39:8 (Isa 46:3).⁵⁵⁸

The reading אבאי, “Let me come,”⁵⁵⁹ preserved at F2ii:L8 (Col 3:8 [Song 4:8]) preserves two variants and is labeled here as a complex variant. With regard to form, this reading of 4Q107 only differs from the MT’s reading with regard to the first letter: MT

⁵⁵⁵ Tov, “4QCantb,” 212.

⁵⁵⁶ Although it is common for the woman to be described as both “my sister” and “bride,” both texts agree at Song 4:8 in only describing the woman as “bride.”

⁵⁵⁷ Tov, “4QCantb,” 216.

⁵⁵⁸ Edward Yechezkel Kutscher, *The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll (1 Q Isa [Superscript A])* (Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 1974), 28.

⁵⁵⁹ Abegg, Flint, and Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible*, 616.

reads תבוֹאִי, “You will come.” However, the substitution of the *tav* for an *aleph* (the reason is unclear) prohibits the final *yod* to be read as the second-person feminine imperfect ending. Instead, it is better read as a pronominal suffix. Thus, the differences here include a substitution and an addition. The similarity of the forms, however, suggests a paleographic issue. Tov lists this difference as a scribal error.⁵⁶⁰

Another complex category 2 variant is preserved at F3:L5 (Col 4:11 [Song 4:16]. 4Q107 reads מן ג[דיו], “from,” while the MT reads פְּרִי מְגִדִּי, “choicest fruits.” The difference likely derived from faulty interpretation. The scribe read the *mem* of the root as the *min* preposition and, as is customary for the scribe, makes the *min* separate. Tov helpfully cites the Vulgates rendering of Song 6:12 as an analogous example; here, the scribe too interprets the *mem* of the root as a *mem* preposition—*propter quadrigas* “near a team of four horses” for מְרִכְבוֹת, “chariots.”⁵⁶¹ Besides the example of faulty exegesis, not much can be said about how the text renders פְּרִי, “fruit.” The text is too fragmentary.

Category 3. 4Q107 does not possess any category 3 variants.

Differences likely caused by excerpted nature. The scribe omits Song 3:6-8 and 4:4-7. However, these omissions were likely intentional since the omissions concern complete literary units.⁵⁶² Tov further suggests that the nature of the scribal intervention—namely, the scribal signs and the remains of a superscription in fragment 1—may also indicate the text’s special nature.⁵⁶³

⁵⁶⁰ Tov, “4QCantb,” 208.

⁵⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 218.

⁵⁶² Tov, “Excerpted and Abbreviated Biblical Texts,” 591-92; Tov, “Three Manuscripts (Abbreviated Texts?),” 89; Tov, “106-107. Introduction to 4QCanta-C,” 195-98. Compare Ulrich, “Our Sharper Focus on the Bible and Theology,” 8; Ulrich, “The Text of the Hebrew Scriptures,” 104-5, 108.

⁵⁶³ Tov, “Three Manuscripts (Abbreviated Texts?),” 89.

Statistics and Conclusion of 4Q107's Textual Tradition

The previous discussion demonstrates that 4Q107 differs from the MT mostly in minor details. In fact, the vast majority of the differences do not belong in either category 1, 2, or 3 and the large proportion of these variants call into question the scribe's precision in copying the text.⁵⁶⁴ Lange is right to conclude that once these copyists errors are removed "it becomes clear that its underlying *Vorlage* is rather close to the consonantal text of MT."⁵⁶⁵ However, his insistence on categorizing 4Q107 as textually non-aligned is unhelpful since what makes this text non-aligned is insignificant in terms of understanding the state of the text in the Second Temple period (this text demonstrates that some texts during the Second Temple period are poor copies).⁵⁶⁶ The differences preserved in this text also demonstrate a free approach since many of the differences appear harmonistic. Understanding the unintentional and intentional proclivities of this scribe while noting the overarching statistical relationship between this text and the MT strongly suggest that the scribe worked from a text belonging to the Masoretic tradition. 4Q107 should therefore be understood as an abbreviated text belonging to this tradition.

Table 48. The statistical relationship between 4Q107 and the MT

Total # of Words in 4Q107	Categories 1, 2, and 3	Statistical Relationship	Categories 2 and 3	Statistical Relationship	Category 3	Statistical Relationship
228	15	93.42%	10	95.61%	0	100%

⁵⁶⁴ Tov, "4QCantb," 208. Lange also agrees and claims that these differences indicate "a large amount of scribal corruption." Lange, "Textual Plurality," 65.

⁵⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, 66.

⁵⁶⁶ *Ibid.*

6Q6

6Q6 (6QCant) preserves portions of Song 1 in 2 columns.⁵⁶⁷ Baillet described the script as highly advanced dating to ca. AD 50, while the orthography is labeled *plene* by Baillet.⁵⁶⁸ The text only preserves an estimated seven lines per column, which makes it one of the smaller scrolls found in the Judean Desert.⁵⁶⁹

The textual nature of 6Q6 is debated among scholars. Baillet does not categorize the text, but simply states that the text preserved four variants: once in agreement with the Vulgate, one the Syriac, and two that are unique.⁵⁷⁰ Tov classified it as non-aligned⁵⁷¹ but also states that it deviates from the MT in small details.⁵⁷² Lange reserves opinion due to the text's high level of fragmentation.⁵⁷³

Description and Categorization of Variants

6Q6 is poorly preserved. One variant proposed by Baillet is not discussed in the following discussion and statistics since it depends on too little manuscript evidence. It is preserved at Col 1:3 (Song 1:3). One other proposed difference at Col 1:6 (Song 1:5) is difficult to explain. 6Q6 reads בנות בנותי, “daughters,” in the MT. Baillet suggests that the form is either a scribal error or an archaic form with a *hireq compaginis*.⁵⁷⁴

⁵⁶⁷ Maurice Baillet, ed., “Cantique Des Cantiques,” in *Les “Petites Grottes” de Qumran: Exploration de la Falaise, les Grottes 2Q, 3Q, 5Q, 7Q à 10Q, le Rouleau de Cuivre*, Discoveries in the Judean desert 3 (Oxford: Clarendon, 1962), 112-14.

⁵⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, 112-13.

⁵⁶⁹ Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 84.

⁵⁷⁰ Baillet, “Cantique Des Cantiques,” 113.

⁵⁷¹ Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 335.

⁵⁷² Tov, “Three Manuscripts (Abbreviated Texts?),” 88.

⁵⁷³ Lange, “Textual Plurality,” 55-56.

⁵⁷⁴ Baillet, “Cantique Des Cantiques,” 113. For a discussion of the *hireq compaginis*, see Gesenius, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, §901-m.

Category 1. 6Q6 preserves one category 1 variant. The exact nature of this reading is uncertain—it could either be an instance of transposition or an omission. 6Q6 reads [ונגילה] ונשמחה, “we will rejoice [and exalt],” at Col 1:4-5 (Song 1:4), while the MT reads ונגילה ונשמחה, “we will exult and rejoice.” If the variant is a transposition, the effect is negligible since the words are similar conceptually.

Category 2. 6Q6 preserves two category 2 variants. The first category 2 variant is an omission preserved at Col 1:2 (Song 1:3). 6Q6 reads שמנים, “oils,” while the MT reads שמןיך, “your oils.” The difference between the readings is simply the difference between a *kap* and a *mem*. The graphic similarity might suggest a type of graphic confusion especially if the *exemplar* of 6Q6 did not use final *kap*. Regardless, the difference makes the text more abstract: it is not the beloved’s oils that are fragrant, but oils in general.

There is a complex variant at Col 1:5 (Song 1:4), 6Q6 reads מישרים אהובים, “how upright are your beloved ones,”⁵⁷⁵ while the MT reads מישרים אהוביך, “rightly do they love you (ESV).” In the MT, the virgins are said to love you—namely the king—while the comment in 6Q6 is about the king’s virgins: namely they are beloved. Graphic confusion again concerning *kap/mem* and *vav/yod* would account for this difference.

Category 3. 6Q6 does not possess any category 3 variants.

Statistics and Conclusion of 6Q6’s Textual Tradition

The previous discussion demonstrates that 6Q6 only preserves minor differences when compared to the MT. What remains differs from the MT in minor details, not in significant ones. Interestingly, both of the category 2 variants differ concerning the same letters: where the MT reads a *mem*, 6Q6 reads a *kap*. There is reasonable evidence to

⁵⁷⁵ Abegg, Flint, and Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible*, 613.

conclude that what remains of the text belongs to the Masoretic tradition, but one must keep in mind how poorly preserved the text is—only thirty-five words are sufficiently preserved.⁵⁷⁶

Table 49. The statistical relationship between 6Q6 and the MT

Total # of Words in 6Q6	Categories 1, 2, and 3	Statistical Relationship	Categories 2 and 3	Statistical Relationship	Category 3	Statistical Relationship
35	4	88.57%	3	91.43%	0	100%

4Q109

4Q109 (4QQoh^a) preserves portions of Ecclesiastes 5, 6, and 7 in seven fragments.⁵⁷⁷ Ulrich describes the script as “an archaic semiformal hand, spacious and graceful” that dates to 175-150 BC.⁵⁷⁸ The scribe uses the *vav* more often than the MT to represent a vowel but is inconsistent in using the longer forms of words such as כִּי but uses the long form הוּא once.⁵⁷⁹ Ulrich notes that the use of the longer form of הוּא indicates that these forms were used in areas beside Qumran.⁵⁸⁰ Tov categorizes the spelling practice of 4Q109 as belonging to QSP.⁵⁸¹ Ulrich further notes that the scribe made several errors, erasures, and secondary insertions, while Tov calculates that the

⁵⁷⁶ Nineteen words transcribed by Baillet are not counted toward the total word count because they depend on insufficient manuscript evidence.

⁵⁷⁷ Eugene Ulrich, ed., “4QQoha,” in *Qumran Cave 4. XI, Psalms to Chronicles*, 221-26.

⁵⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, 221.

⁵⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, 222.

⁵⁸⁰ *Ibid.*

⁵⁸¹ Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 335. This is the oldest biblical text written in QSP preserved from Qumran. See *ibid.*, 273. Tov notes that since this scroll predates the establishment of the Qumran community, it must have been written by a scribe with similar tendencies. See *ibid.*, 262.

scribe intervenes in the text on average once every five lines.⁵⁸² This high level scribal intervention indicates to Tov that this text, like many other biblical scrolls, were not “singled out for special care in copying.”⁵⁸³

The textual tradition of 4Q109 is debated. Ulrich states that 4Q109 “demonstrate[s], as do MSS generally, apparently minor but occasional individual textual variants from what later became the traditional text.”⁵⁸⁴ Tov and Lange classify it as non-aligned,⁵⁸⁵ while Jarick argues that the texts of Ecclesiastes from Qumran (including 4Q109) preserve the same edition as found in the MT.⁵⁸⁶

Description and Categorization of Variants

Ulrich proposes a few differences not included in the following discussion and statistics. These include one difference that depends on insufficient manuscript evidence which is preserved at F3-4:L1 (Col 2:12 [Ecc 6:12]).⁵⁸⁷ Moreover, some instances appear to be alternative spellings of the same word. These include the reading בָּה for the MT’s בָּהָ

⁵⁸² Ulrich, “4QQoha,” 222; Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 335.

⁵⁸³ Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 253.

⁵⁸⁴ Eugene Ulrich, “Ezra and Qoheleth Manuscripts from Qumran (4QEzra, 4QQoha,B,” in *Priests, Prophets, and Scribes: Essays on the Formation and Heritage of Second Temple Judaism in Honour of Joseph Blenkinsopp*, ed. Eugene Ulrich et al., *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 149 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992), 153. Notice though that Ulrich, “4QQoha,” 221-26, does not comment about the textual nature. Muilenburg, in his preliminary edition of this text, likewise withholds comment about the textual tradition of the text. See James Muilenburg, “A Qoheleth Scroll from Qumran,” *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, no. 135 (1954): 20-28.

⁵⁸⁵ Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 335; Lange, “Textual Plurality,” 55.

⁵⁸⁶ Jarick, “The Bible’s ‘Festival Scrolls,’” 177-79.

⁵⁸⁷ One can refer to the reconstructed column and line number provided by the editor or one can refer to the exact fragment and line number corresponding to the actual fragment when citing this text. Both are provided in this dissertation. The first reference given is the reference to the fragment number and the corresponding line of the fragment while the second reference is that of the reconstructed column and the corresponding reconstructed line number.

at F1ii:L1 (Col 2:1 [Eccl 6:4]) and the reading כמה, which may be an example of hypercorrection since the particle ׀ shares considerable overlap with the preposition ׀ in post-biblical Hebrew and Aramaic.⁵⁸⁸

Category 1. 4Q109 preserves several category 1 variants. A sampling of these variants includes the addition of a preposition, the omission of conjunctive *vav*, a preposition, and the substitution of tense, particles, and number.⁵⁸⁹

Category 2. 4Q109 preserves several category 2 substitutions. The first category 2 substitution is preserved at F1ii:L2 (Col 2:2 [Eccl 6:5]). 4Q109 reads גוהת, “he who goes down,” while the MT reads גוהת, “quietness.” Ulrich lists this variant as a possible example of an orthographic difference; namely, the *vav* represents the short *patah*. This explanation is possible, but it seems more likely that the reading גוהת is an example of substitution since the word makes conceptual sense and is much more common than the *segolate* noun גוהת. Whereas the word of 4Q109 occurs seventeen times in the non-biblical DSS, the *segolate* noun of the MT is nearly absent.⁵⁹⁰

A category 2 substitution is preserved at F6i:L1 (Col 2:15 [Ecc 7:2]). 4Q109 reads]מחה[ש, “joy” for the MT’s מְשֻׁתָּה, “feasting.” This difference may be an example of an unintentional error: metathesis of the *mem* and *shin*. However, it is more likely that the variant derived under influence from Ecclesiastes 7:4.⁵⁹¹

The third category 2 substitution concern the substitution of lexemes and is preserved at F1iii:L2 (Col 3:2 [Ecc 7:7]). 4Q109 reads]יעוה[י, “and he twists,” while the

⁵⁸⁸ Jastrow, *A Dictionary of the Targumim*, s.v. “׀”, “׀”.

⁵⁸⁹ For more information about these variants, see table “4Q109: Description of variants,” in appendix 4.

⁵⁹⁰ There is one possible example of it at 4Q163 F23ii:L3, but the reading lacks strong manuscript evidence Abegg, *Dead Sea Scrolls Non-Biblical Texts*.

⁵⁹¹ Ulrich cross references verse 4 in Ulrich, “4QQoha,” 224.

MT reads וַיִּאָכֵל, “and he kills.” A split in the leather occurs in the middle of the word obscuring the word slightly. The reading, nonetheless, is probable and likely an instance of interpretation where the scribe of 4Q109 links the acceptance of a bribe to committing wrong.

The fourth category 2 substitution also involves the substitution of lexemes and is preserved at F7:L1 (Col 3:18 [Ecc 7:19]). 4Q109 reads תַּעֲזֹר [הַחִכְמָה], “w[isdom] helps,” whereas the MT reads הַחִכְמָה תַּעֲזֹר, “wisdom makes strong.” The substitution interprets the text in a slightly different way than the MT and may be an instance of interpretation. However, it is also possible that graphic confusion led to the interchange. The forms are identical albeit 4Q109 has a third radical, a *resh*. One should note that geminate forms can be strong; namely, preserving both the second and third root radical. Thus, one might suggest that the text’s exemplar read תַּעֲזֹר. This fact would further link these forms graphically.

Category 3. 4Q109 does not possess any category 3 variants.

Statistics and Conclusion of 4Q109’s Textual Tradition

The previous discussion demonstrates that 4Q109 preserves minor differences when compared to the MT.⁵⁹² Moreover, it is important to note that the text preserves a high portion of scribal intervention (on average one intervention per every 5 lines),⁵⁹³ which may indicate imprecise copying. The large number of differences that appear to result from graphic confusion likewise indicates imprecise copying. Moreover, the fact that many of the difference harmonize the text while the text evidences a later grammatical profile, both indicate a free approach to the text. Understanding these facts

⁵⁹² Twenty-two words transcribed by Ulrich are not counted toward the total word count because they depend on insufficient manuscript evidence.

⁵⁹³ Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 335.

demonstrate that this text’s exemplar was likely very close to the MT. For these reasons, it is reasonable to classify it as belonging to the Masoretic tradition.

Table 50. The statistical relationship between 4Q109 and the MT

Total # of Words in 4Q109	Categories 1, 2, and 3	Statistical Relationship	Categories 2 and 3	Statistical Relationship	Category 3	Statistical Relationship
152	16	89.47%	4	97.37%	0	100%

4Q111

4Q111 (4QLam) preserves portions of Lamentations 1 and 2 in four fragments.⁵⁹⁴ Cross describes the script as “a vulgar semi-formal Herodian script from ca. 30 BC-AD 1 and the orthography as corresponding to the full Palestinian type (i.e., Tov’s QSP category).⁵⁹⁵ Tov describes its format as prose.⁵⁹⁶ Moreover, the text preserves only one example of scribal intervention in thirty-three lines.⁵⁹⁷

Scholars debate the nature of 4Q111. Cross describes the text as carelessly copied but “not far separated from that of the Proto-Rabbinic text.⁵⁹⁸ The carelessness of the copier is evident, according to Cross, based on the following facts: the text preserves one erasure, one supralinear insertion of a letter, short columns differing in width and number of lines, numerous plain mistakes such as omissions, pluses, wrong division of words, conflation, dittography, reinterpretation of readings, and multiple other

⁵⁹⁴Frank M. Cross, ed., “4QLam,” in *Qumran Cave 4. XI, Psalms to Chronicles*, 229-37. He also says it is conceivable that the book of Jeremiah preceded this text. *Ibid.*, 229. See also Tov’s reasoning that the scroll may have originally preserved another scroll or all five of the *Megillot* in Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 75.

⁵⁹⁵ Cross, “4QLam,” 229; Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 335.

⁵⁹⁶ Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 169.

⁵⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, 335.

⁵⁹⁸ Cross, “4QLam,” 229-30.

mistakes.⁵⁹⁹ Others, however, interpret 4Q111 differently. Tov and Lange, for example, categorize the text as non-aligned,⁶⁰⁰ while Rooy argues that the text preserves a different edition of the book.⁶⁰¹

Description and Categorization of Variants

Several variants proposed by Cross for various reasons are not included in the following discussion or statistics.⁶⁰² A sampling of these proposed variants include an example that depends on insufficient manuscript evidence at F3:L2, examples of scribal error (e.g., case of dittography at F2:L1 [Lam 1:6] and improper word division at F1:L6 [Lam 1:6]),⁶⁰³ and several examples that concern the differences between *kethiv/qere*.

Category 1. 4Q111 preserves several category 1 variants. A sampling of these include the addition of a *lamed* preposition to an infinitive construct at F3:L6 (Lam 1:14) and the substitution of an infinitive absolute for a noun: both function as absolute objects (i.e., F2:L5 [Lam 1:8]).⁶⁰⁴

Category 2. 4Q111 preserves several category 2 additions, omissions, and substitutions. Four category 2 additions concern pronominal suffixes and function to

⁵⁹⁹ Ibid., 229.

⁶⁰⁰ Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 335; Lange, “Textual Plurality,” 55.

⁶⁰¹ Herrie F. van Rooy, “Klaagliedere by Qumran: ’n Tweede Redaksie?” *Hervormde Teologiese Studies* 68, no. 1 (2012): 1-7.

⁶⁰² For 4Q111, the text can be cited either with reference to fragment or to column number. The text has been cited with reference to fragment number, not column number here. One should note that the only difference between citing this text with regard to column number verses fragment number is the designation fragment rather than column.

⁶⁰³ Cross, “4QLam,” 232.

⁶⁰⁴ Fuller and Choi, *Invitation to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*, §13a.

make the text more explicit. The first is preserved at F2:L4 (Lam 1:7). 4Q111 reads צרייה, “her foes,” while the MT reads צָרִים, “foes.” The second is preserved at F3:L1 (Lam 1:11). 4Q111 reads גַּפְשָׁה, “her soul,”⁶⁰⁵ while the MT simply reads נַפְשׁ, “soul.” Likewise, the addition of a pronominal suffix at F3:L3 (Lam 1:12) also functions to make the text explicit. 4Q111 reads הוּגִירָנִי יְהוָה, “[the Lor]d caused me to fear,” while the MT reads הוּגָה יְהוָה, “the Lord inflicted.”⁶⁰⁶ The addition of a pronominal suffix preserved at F3:9 (Lam 1:16) serves the same function. 4Q111 reads דַּמְעָתִי, “my tears” while the MT reads מַיִם, “water.”⁶⁰⁷

A similar result is achieved by a category 2 addition preserved at F2:L5 (Lam 1:7). The text adds ל[כּוּ], “a[ll].” The difference, according to Cross, accords with the tendency to add *kōl* in the transmission process.⁶⁰⁸

A more complex addition is preserved F3:8 (Lam 1:17 MT). Here 4Q111 reads מְכוּל אוֹהֲבֵיהָ צַדִּיק אַתָּה יְהוָה, “among all her lovers, you, O Lord, are righteous.”⁶⁰⁹ As Cross suggests, the addition can be explained as two separate additions. First, the addition of מְכוּל אוֹהֲבֵיהָ, “among all her lovers,” conforms to Lamentations 1:2, which reads אֵין-לָהּ מְנַחֵם מִכָּל-אוֹהֲבֵיהָ, “no comforter exists among any of her lovers.” Second, the scribe adds the nominal clause צַדִּיק אַתָּה יְהוָה, “you, O Lord, are righteous.” This phrase resembles the first clause of Lamentations 1:18, which reads צַדִּיק הוּא יְהוָה, “the Lord, he is righteous.” Cross concludes that this phrase was a marginal reading accidentally included into

⁶⁰⁵ Abegg, Flint, and Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible*, 624.

⁶⁰⁶ The substitution of roots is discussed as a category 2 substitution.

⁶⁰⁷ Again, the substitution of roots is discussed as a category 2 substitution.

⁶⁰⁸ Cross, “4QLam,” 233.

⁶⁰⁹ Abegg, Flint, and Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible*, 625.

4Q111.⁶¹⁰ Due to the presence of several factors which call into question the accuracy that this text was copied, this type of mistake does not seem beyond the scribe.

Besides additions, 4Q111 also preserves several omissions. The first omission is preserved at F2:L3-4 (Lam 1:7). 4Q111 reads זכורה יהוה [כו]ל מכאובנו “remember, O Lord, all our pains,”⁶¹¹ while the MT reads זָכְרָה יְרוּשָׁלַם יְמֵי עֲנִיָּה וּמְרוּדֶיהָ כָּל מַחְמַדֶּיהָ “Jerusalem remembers in the days of her affliction and wandering all the precious things” (ESV). This verse contains several variants. The variant discussed here is the omission of יְמֵי עֲנִיָּה וּמְרוּדֶיהָ, “days of her affliction and wandering.” One possible explanation for this variant is parablepsis due to homeoteleuton from יהוה to ומְרוּדֶיהָ.⁶¹²

Another category 2 omission is also preserved at F2:L4 (Lam 1:7). 4Q111 reads ואין עוזר צריה שחקו “and none did help; her adversaries mocked,” while the MT reads וְאֵין עֹזֵר לָהּ רְאוּיָה צָרִים “and there was none to help her, her foes gloated over her” (ESV). The difference was likely caused by parablepsis as noted by Cross.⁶¹³

Two omissions concerning pronominal suffixes are preserved in 4Q111. The first is preserved at F2:L6 (Lam 1:8). 4Q111 reads הִזְלִילוּ “they despise,” while the MT reads הִזְלִילוּהָ “they despise her.” The second is preserved at F3:10 (Lam 1:16) 4Q111 reads נַפְשִׁי “soul,” while the MT reads נַפְשִׁי “my soul.” In both of these instance, the MT is the more explicit text.

A large-scale omission is also preserved at F3:L1 (Lam 1:10-11). 4Q111 reads לֹא יָבִיאוּ מִחֲמַדֵּיהָ “they should not bring her precious things,” while the MT reads לֹא-יָבִיאוּ בַקְהָל לְךָ: ס כָּל-עֲמֻמָּה נֹאנְחִים מִבְּקָשִׁים לָהֶם נִתְּנוּ מִחֲמֻדֵּיהֶם [מִחֲמַדֵּיהֶם] “to enter your congregation.

⁶¹⁰ Cross, “4QLam,” 237.

⁶¹¹ Abegg, Flint, and Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible*, 624.

⁶¹² This explanation assumes that 4Q111 is reading יהוה in his text. For a different approach to this variant which is much more complex, see Cross, “4QLam,” 232-33.

⁶¹³ *Ibid.*, 233.

All her people groan as they search for bread; they trade their treasures.”⁶¹⁴ The large-scale omission is best described as an example of parablepsis even though there is no obvious motivation.⁶¹⁵ Several factors suggest this explanation. First, the omission breaks up the text mid verse. Second, this omission disturbs the acrostic structure of the poem. If כָּל־עַמָּה, “all her people,” is omitted, then the poem omits the *kap* line.⁶¹⁶ The omission of the *kap* line and the unnatural division the omission makes indicate a type of scribal error.⁶¹⁷ Third, several differences preserved in this text suggest that this text was not copied accurately.

The last category 2 omission is preserved at F3:L9 (Lam 1:16). 4Q111 reads עיני, “my eyes,” while the MT reads עֵינַי עֵינַי, “my eyes, my eyes.” The difference appears to be a case of haplography.

4Q111 further preserves several category 2 substitutions, some of which are quite peculiar. The first category 2 substitution is preserved at F2:L3 (Lam 1:7). 4Q111 reads כו[ל]ל מכאובנו, “all our pain,” whereas the MT reads כָּל מַחְמְדֵיהָ, “all her precious things.” The difference of the pronominal suffix is likely the result of graphic confusion.

The substitution of the lexical root, however, is perhaps a case of interpretation. Cross suggests that the phrase מַחְמְדֵיהָ, “her delights,” is inappropriate in

⁶¹⁴ The accents are preserved here in order for the reader to see how the omission breaks up the syntax of the MT.

⁶¹⁵ Cross, however, proposes that the text behind 4Q111 did not include the prepositional phrase בקהל לך corresponding to the MT, but ממועדיה “from her appointed place.” This reconstruction would account for the omission because it would provide the desired trigger. This explanation, although thoughtful, has no textual evidence to support it. It is possible, but not certain.

⁶¹⁶ Only one other word begins with a *kap* in the vicinity but postulating that word (כיא) as the beginning of the line is highly unlikely.

⁶¹⁷ Note that this variant is not analogous to the addition of the *nun* line in Ps 145 of the 11Q5 since the difference does not occur mid-verse.

this context.⁶¹⁸ Although the concept of “delight” may at first glance conflict with the ideas of “affliction” and “homelessness,” Lamentations 1:7 is not the only verse to couple together the concept of “precious things” and judgment. For example, Isaiah 64:10 uses a different word from the same root (מְהֵרָה) in the context of judgment as does Ezekiel 24:21. Thus, the reading of the MT is not inappropriate but fits conceptually within other judgment speeches. The scribe, nonetheless, has likely interpreted his exemplar.

Moreover, a category 2 substitution is preserved at F2:L5 (Lam 1:7). 4Q111 reads משבריה, “her calamities,”⁶¹⁹ while the MT reads מִשְׁבַּתָּהּ, “her downfall.” The difference does not severely alter the text and likely derives from graphic confusion—ת and רי.⁶²⁰

A further category 2 substitution is preserved at F2:L6 (Lam 1:8). 4Q111 reads לנוד, “to wander” or “to lament,”⁶²¹ while the MT reads לְנִידָה, “as impure.” The forms are graphically similar, and both make conceptual sense. Cross understands the MT as secondary and the result of anticipating Lamentations 1:17 (הִי־תָהּ יְרוּשָׁלַם לְנִדָה), “Jerusalem exists as impure”). He further reasons that the MT committed dittography by adding the *he* and confused *vav/yod*.⁶²² However, it is possible that the graphic confusion went in the other direction, especially since graphic confusion adequately explained several other variants found in 4Q111. Regardless, the difference clearly indicates a scribal phenomenon and does not indicate an alternative textual tradition.

The following category 2 substitution is preserved at F3:L3 (Lam 1:12). 4Q111 reads הוּגַרְנִי יְהוָה, “[the Lor]d caused me to fear,” while the MT reads הוּגָה יְהוָה, “the Lord

⁶¹⁸ Cross, “4QLam,” 233.

⁶¹⁹ Abegg, Flint, and Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible*, 624.

⁶²⁰ See Cross, “4QLam,” 233.

⁶²¹ Abegg, Flint, and Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible*, 624, understand this root as “grief.”

⁶²² Cross, “4QLam,” 233.

caused *me* to suffer.” The addition of the pronominal suffix preserved in 4Q111 is discussed above and results in a more explicit text. The change in stem, however, appears to be the result of graphic confusion. The forms are identical except for the יר and ה. One can image how a *he* could be mistaken for a *yod* and *resh* if the *yod* extended to the base line and was ligatured to a *resh*. The phrase הוֹיְגָהּ יְהוָה, “the Lord caused *me* to suffer,” found also in Lamentations 1:5 led Cross, however, to suggest that the MT has harmonized the text here.⁶²³

The next category 2 substitution is preserved at F3:L4 (Lam 1:13). 4Q111 reads וַיֹּרִידֵנִי, “and he has brought it down,”⁶²⁴ while the MT reads וַיִּרְדֵּנָהּ, “and he drives it” or “he has dominion over it.” The reading of the MT is notoriously difficult for modern interpreters and, in light of 4Q111, for ancient interpreters too. The forms differ in several aspects. First, the reading in 4Q111 is a *hiphil* while the MT is a *qal*. Second, 4Q111 reads the lexical root ירד, “to come down,” while the MT reads the root רדה, “to have dominion” or “to drive.” Third, the texts disagree concerning the pronominal suffix: 4Q111 has a first common singular suffix while the MT has a third person feminine singular energetic suffix. The reading of the MT is not immediately clear, but the reading of 4Q111 is smoother. The scribe of 4Q111, like the scribe of the LXX, has interpreted this ambiguous form in light of the immediate context. The verbal root ירד “to come down” is supplied because the Lord sends fire “from on high.” Moreover, the substitution of pronominal suffix too interprets the object in light of the context: the object is the author. The scribe of 4Q111 appears to have interpreted a difficult text.

⁶²³ Cross, “4QLam,” 235. One should also note that *resh* and *yod* are not always easily distinguishable in Hebrew script as made evident in 4Q114. See Ulrich, “4QDanc,” 273. Notice also that the *resh* is truncated at times in this text (i.e., 4Q114). See The Leon Levy Dead Sea Scrolls, “Plate 224.”

⁶²⁴ Abegg, Flint, and Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible*, 625, does not account for the first person pronominal suffix.

The next category 2 substitution is preserved at F3:5 (Lam 1:14). 4Q111 reads נקשרה על פשעי, “it was bound about my transgressions,”⁶²⁵ while the MT reads נשקד על פשעי, “the yoke of my transgression is bound.”⁶²⁶ The meaning of the MT is difficult. On the one hand, this difficulty suggests that the scribe attempted to interpret the text. On the other hand, Cross argues that the MT reading is secondary due to graphic confusion. However, graphic confusion could explain either reading as primary. The versions agree with the MT against 4Q111 in reading the letters שקד, although the Vulgate and LXX, in particular, read the verb שקד not שקד (like the MT). Thus, the reading of 4Q111 may be better explained as either an interpretation of the MT or a text that has suffered from a paleographic problem.

The following category 2 substitution is preserved at F3:L5 (Lam 1:14). 4Q111 reads עולו, “his yoke,” while the MT reads עלו, “they go up.” 4Q111 interprets the same text behind the MT in a slightly different direction by means of inserting a *vav*.

4Q111 preserves another category 2 substitution at F3:L7-10 (Lam 1:16-17). Here, 4Q111 has transposed the *pe* line for the *ayin* line. Most acrostics in the Scripture depict the alphabetic sequence *ayin-pe* (e.g., Ps 25 [LXX Ps 24], 34 [LXX 33], Psalm 119 [LXX, 118]), but some attest to the sequence *pe-ayin* (e.g., Psalm 9-10 [LXX 9],⁶²⁷ LXX Pro 31:10-31 [see LXX 31:25-26], Lam 2, 3, 4 [MT and LXX]). Cross argues that Lamentations 1 of 4Q111, by reading the sequence *pe-ayin*, thus, “conforms to the rare alphabetic order found in Lamentations 2, 3, and 4. One finds a parallel variation in the LXX of Proverbs 31:25-26. Although the MT has the order *ayin-pe*, the Greek text of

⁶²⁵ Abegg, Flint, and Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible*, 625.

⁶²⁶ See translation in Clines, *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew*, “שקד.”

⁶²⁷ Pietersma claims that this acrostic poem here is unreliable since it is defective. Albert Pietersma, “The Acrostic Poems of Lamentations in Greek Translation,” in *VIII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies*, ed. Leonard J Greenspoon and Olivier Munnich, Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Series 41 (Atlanta: Scholars’ Press, 1995), 184.

Proverbs the order *pe-ayin*.”⁶²⁸ The sequence *pe-ayin*, although less common than the sequence *ayin-pe* in scriptural acrostics, is also attested to by other archeological evidence from Israel including potsherds, a jar fragment, and possibly an inscribed stone from Tel Zayit.⁶²⁹ It is quite possible that the scribe of 4Q111 is harmonizing the acrostic of Lamentations 1 to those of 2-4 since the acrostics of Lamentations 2-4 of the MT also preserves the order *pe-ayin*.⁶³⁰ Furthermore, this variation might suggest that the order of *ayin-pe* in ancient Israel lacked consensus.⁶³¹

A substitution of lexical roots is preserved at F3:L8 (Lam 1:17 MT). 4Q111 reads צפה, “he watches,” whereas the MT reads צַוָּה, “he commands.” The forms are close graphically. Cross helpfully notes for comparison the form צויתה, “you command,” at 4Q111 F3:L1 (Lam 1:10) in order to show how easily the graphic confusion between the forms צוה and צפה could occur.⁶³²

4Q111 preserves another category 2 substitution at F3:9 (Lam 1:17). 4Q111 reads היתה ציון לנדוה, “Zion exists as banished,” whereas the MT reads הַיְתָה יְרוּשָׁלַם לְנִדָּה, “Jerusalem exists as unclean.” The difference between these forms, again, is minimal. There is confusion of *he* and *het* and the insertion of a *vav* in 4Q111.

⁶²⁸ Cross, “4QLam,” 236. For a discussion of the Hebrew alphabet and its forms, see Gesenius, *Gesenius’ Hebrew Grammar*, §5h. Compare Joüon and Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*, §5c n1.

⁶²⁹ See Mitchell First, “Using the Pe-Ayin Order of the Abecedaries of Ancient Israel to Date the Book of Psalms,” *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 38, no. 4 (June 2014): 473-76.

⁶³⁰ It should also be mentioned that the poem of Lamentations 1 not only reverses the order of *ayin-peh*, but also likely lacks a *kap* line, as mentioned above.

⁶³¹ This draws this conclusion in First, “Using the Pe-Ayin Order of the Abecedaries of Ancient Israel,” 484-485.

⁶³² See the second word in the first line of the second column. Notice how far the base stroke of the *sade* extends. One could easily mistake the *vav* as a *peh* if the *vav* extended all the way to the line in this form. See The Leon Levy Dead Sea Scrolls, “Plates 667, 667/1,” accessed June 14, 2018, <https://www.deadseascrolls.org.il/explore-the-archive/image/B-281138>.

A further category 2 substitution is preserved at F3:9 (Lam 1:16). 4Q111 reads בכּו עיני, “my eyes indeed weep,” whereas the MT reads אָנִי בּוֹכֶיָה עֵינַי, “I am he who weeps.” The gender of the participle likely led to the reading of 4Q111.

The final category 2 substitution is preserved at F3:9 (Lam 1:16). 4Q111 reads דמעהי, “my tears,” whereas the MT reads מַיִם, “water.” Although Cross points out that both readings are formulaic,⁶³³ the reading of 4Q111 provides the more specific meaning. It is not just water that comes down from my eyes, but tears. 4Q111 has interpreted the MT in light of the immediate context.

One variant has an unclear description. The variant is preserved at F3:L3 (Lam 1:12). Cross proposes that 4Q111 reads בּיּוֹם [הַרִי] הַגָּדוֹל, “[in the da]y [of] his f[ury],” whereas the MT reads בְּיּוֹם הַחֲרוֹן אַפּוֹ, “on the day of his fierce anger.” The proposal that 4Q111 omits אָף is certainly possible; the size of the lacuna suggests this proposal. The proposal would be probable if the *nun* in the transcription בּיּוֹם [הַרִי] were certain. The top of this letter is missing, and thus, one could possibly read these letters not as בּוּ but as פּוּ. The size of the lacuna suggests omission, but one cannot be certain.

Category 3. 4Q111 preserves one category 3 variant. F2:L3 (Lam 1:7) preserves two of these variants. First, 4Q111 reads יְהוָה, “the Lord,” whereas the MT reads יְרוּשָׁלַיִם, “Jerusalem.” There is little evidence to appeal to an unintentional error or to an intentional one that accords with scribal practices such as interpretation. Thus, this difference is best categorized as a category 3 variant. However, one must note that the line contains several differences when compared to the MT. It is possible that some type of unintentional difference led the scribe to interpret the text here, thereby replacing “Jerusalem with “the Lord.” Although possible, the evidence for this explanation is more speculative than desired for a category 2 variant.

⁶³³ Cross, “4QLam,” 237.

Statistics and Conclusion of 4Q111's Textual Tradition

4Q111 is the non-aligned text most at odds with its MT counterpart. Despite this fact, Cross still describes it as “not far separated from that of the Proto-Rabbinic text.”⁶³⁴ This statement illustrates how different the categorization grid of Cross is from that of Tov. For Cross, if a text can reasonably be explained as deriving from a MT text without agreeing in significant details with a different text against the MT, then the text is likely “not far removed.” For Tov, texts that can reasonably be understood as deriving from the MT are not categorized as MT, but as non-aligned.⁶³⁵ 4Q111, therefore, serves to demonstrate the difference between Cross, on the one hand, and Tov, on the other hand. Texts are categorized here more like Cross than Tov, and thus, it is concluded here that one can reasonably group 4Q111 as a text belonging to the Masoretic tradition albeit with a high percentage of differences. One should note that the many of the differences indicate a tendency to interpret while scribal error such as graphic or phonological confusion likewise explains many differences.

Table 51. The statistical relationship between 4Q111 and the MT

Total # of Words in 4Q111	Categories 1, 2, and 3	Statistical Relationship	Categories 2 and 3	Statistical Relationship	Category 3	Statistical Relationship
258	68	73.64%	56	78.29%	2	99.22%

⁶³⁴ Cross, “4QLam,” 230.

⁶³⁵ This tendency is evident in Tov’s discussion of the 1QIsa^a and 4Q57 (4QIsa^c) since these texts may have been “copied from a text that did not differ much from the Isaiah scrolls from cave 4, or from 1QIsa^b, most of which are rather close to MT, but no certainty can be had.” Emanuel Tov, “The Text of Isaiah at Qumran,” in *Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah: Studies of an Interpretive Tradition, Vol 2* (Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 1997), 508-9. This tendency can also be seen in Lange, “Textual Plurality,” 65-66, who understands, for example, 4Q107 (4QCant^b) as suffering from a high amount of scribal corruption even though it was copied from an exemplar close to the MT.

4Q112

4Q112 (4QDan^a) preserves portions from every chapter of Daniel except chapters 6, 9, and 12 in sixteen discernable fragments.⁶³⁶ Ulrich describes the script as an “elegant formal hand from the late Hasmonaean period or the transition into the Herodian period” corresponding closely to the script of 4Q61 (4QSam^a) dating ca. middle of the first century BC.⁶³⁷ *Vav* and *yod* have some unique characteristics, but their form is not always distinguishable.⁶³⁸ Moreover, Ulrich describes the orthography as similar to the MT although the texts tend to disagree when using *vav* to indicate *aw* and *ā* to *ô*.⁶³⁹ Ulrich further lists three (or possibly five) examples of scribal intervention, all presumably deriving from the original hand,⁶⁴⁰ while Tov lists the text as preserving five examples of scribal intervention occurring on average of once every 22 lines.⁶⁴¹ Ulrich notes that the scribe leaves two spaces between words at times (ca. .3 cm) to mark ‘sentence’-divisions, but Tov claims that the manuscript evidence does not sufficiently establish this point.⁶⁴²

Scholars debate the textual nature of 4Q112. Most scholars understand the Daniel texts from Qumran as witnessing to the Masoretic tradition.⁶⁴³ Tov and Lange,

⁶³⁶ Eugene Ulrich, ed., “4QDana,” in *Qumran Cave 4. XI, Psalms to Chronicles*, 239-54.

⁶³⁷ *Ibid.*, 240.

⁶³⁸ *Ibid.*, 240-41.

⁶³⁹ *Ibid.*, 241.

⁶⁴⁰ *Ibid.*

⁶⁴¹ Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 335.

⁶⁴² Ulrich, “4QDana,” 239; Eugene Ulrich, “Daniel Manuscripts from Qumran. Part 1: A Preliminary Edition of 4 QDan A,” *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 268 (1987): 20. Ulrich depends on Stephen Pfann (private communication) but compare Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 138.

⁶⁴³ See Eugene Ulrich, “The Text of Daniel in the Qumran Scrolls,” in *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception*, ed. John J. Collins and Peter W. Flint (Boston: Brill, 2002), 2:583. See also Flint, who says that seven of the eight manuscripts from Qumran “originally contained the entire book of

however, understand 4Q112 as textually non-aligned.⁶⁴⁴

Description and Categorization of Variants

Several variants listed by Ulrich do not belong to either categories 1, 2, or 3. A sampling of these include differences that depend on insufficient manuscript evidence, several differences that concern synonymous spellings, and examples that differ regarding *kethiv/qere*.

Category 1. 4Q112 preserves several examples of addition and omission of small particles such as conjunctive *vav*, the article, and the *di* particle. Moreover, a sampling of the category 1 substitutions includes substitutions of number and gender. One noteworthy category 1 variant is preserved at F15:L4 (F15:18 [Dan 10:19]). 4Q112 reads וְאָמַר, “and he said,” whereas the MT reads וַאֲמַרְךָ, “and he said.” The difference between the texts may be emphasis (the MT may be slightly more emphatic).⁶⁴⁵ Both forms are preterit and perfective aspect.⁶⁴⁶ One should note that according to Qimron’s

Daniel in a form very much like that found in the received Masoretic text, not the longer form as found in the Septuagint.” Peter W. Flint, “The Daniel Tradition at Qumran,” in Collins and Flint, *The Book of Daniel*, 2:330-31. Flint continues to argue that one text preserving portions of Daniel—4Q116 (4QDan^c)—may have been an excerpted text preserving only portions of Daniel’s Prayer in Dan 9. *Ibid.*, 331. Flint further argues that “all eight scrolls reveal no major disagreements against the Masoretic text, although individual readings differ in many instances” in *ibid.* Likewise, Collins says, “On the whole, the Qumran discoveries provide powerful evidence of the antiquity of the textual tradition of the MT.” John J. Collins, *Daniel, Hermeneia* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993), 3.

⁶⁴⁴ Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 335; Tov, “The Biblical Texts from the Judaean Desert,” 156; Lange, “Textual Plurality,” 54-55.

⁶⁴⁵ See Gesenius, *Gesenius’ Hebrew Grammar*, §49e. Compare Joüon who says the MT form is not more emphatic in Joüon and Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*, §48d.

⁶⁴⁶ See Gentry who argues that the *he* suffix functions like the Akkadian ventive in Peter Gentry, “The System of the Finite Verb in Classical Biblical Hebrew,” *Hebrew Studies* 39 (1998): 29. In this understanding, the form of 4Q112 the fact that the action benefits the speaker is least prevalent.

analysis, the first-person imperfect plus *vav* typically has the affirmative *he*.⁶⁴⁷ The fact that 4Q112 lacks the *he* is peculiar and may indicate an example of hypercorrection.

Category 2. 4Q112 preserves several category 2 additions. The first preserved category 2 addition is found at F3i:L1 (Frgs. 3i, 17:L1 [Dan 2:20]).⁶⁴⁸ 4Q112 adds the adjective רבא, “great,” which modifies the noun אלהא, “God,” whereas the MT simply reads אלקהא, “God.” The addition of the adjective has precedent in the MT (i.e., Dan 2:45) and can adequately be explained as an interpretation.

The second category 2 addition also concerns the addition of an adjective preserved at F3i:L14 (Frgs. 3i, 17:L14 [Dan 2:30]). 4Q112 reads יחירא, “exceptionally.”⁶⁴⁹ The addition highlights that the ability to interpret Nebuchadnezzar’s dream did not derive from Daniel. The fact that this adjective is used to describe Daniel in Daniel 5:12, 14; 6:3 makes this addition minor. It appears to be an interpretation.

The next category 2 addition preserved in 4Q112 is found at F5:L2 (Frgs. 3ii, 4-6:L9 [Dan 2:40]). Here, 4Q112 reads כל ארעא, “all the earth.” This difference is an instance of interpretation since 4Q112 supplies the object of the verb from the context.

The next category 2 addition is preserved at F9:L4 (F9:L17 [Dan 5:7]). 4Q112 reads לאשפיה חרטמיהא [כ]ש[דיא וגזריא], “the conjurers, the magicians, [the Ch]a[ldeans, and the astrologers],” whereas the MT reads לאשפיה כשדיהא [י][כשדא] וגזריא, “the conjurers, the Chaldeans, and the astrologers.” In Daniel, the foreign kings call their wise men to interpret dreams and foreign writing, and the list of wise men called to the king is not uniform in

⁶⁴⁷ Qimron, *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, §310.122.

⁶⁴⁸ Some readings can be referenced in more than one way for this text. Some have a reconstructed line number and some fragments are grouped together since the editor believes them to have originally belonged to the same column. For these readings that can be referenced in more than one way, both references are given. The first reference for the reading is to the exact fragment and line number of that fragment. The second reading in parenthesis is for the groups of fragments and/or to the reconstructed line number.

⁶⁴⁹ Abegg, Flint, and Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible*, 487.

the MT. At times the list can be abbreviated and at times expanded. For example, Nebuchadnezzar calls the *לְחַרְטָמִים וְלְאֲשָׁפִים וְלְמַכְשָׁפִים וְלְכַשְׁדִּים* “the magicians and the enchanters and the sorcerers and the Chaldeans” in Daniel 2:2 to reveal the king’s dream and give its interpretation.” However, it is only the “Chaldeans” who dialogue with Nebuchadnezzar in Daniel 2:3-11. Moreover, the Chaldeans respond to Nebuchadnezzar’s request not only to interpret the dream but to reveal the dream, by saying that no such request has been made to any *לְכָל־חַרְטָם וְאֲשָׁף וְכַשְׁדֵּי*, “to any magician, or enchanter or Chaldean” (Dan 2:11). Nebuchadnezzar’s edict, however, only specifies that the *וְחַכְמֵיָא*, “the wise men,” were to be killed (Dan 2:12). These facts demonstrate that the list of wise men is by no means monolithic and that the list can be abbreviated or expanded without any change of referent.

The next addition is preserved at F10:3 (Frgs. 10-11:L3 [Dan 5:12]). 4Q112 reads *וְיִקְרָא*, “and reads the writing.” The addition harmonizes the text to the immediate context since earlier in Daniel 5:7 Belshazzar requests some wise man to “read the writing.” Thus, the queen’s speech in Daniel 5:12 of 4Q112 adds what is implied by the wider context of the MT: Daniel is called to *read the writing* and declare its interpretation.

A further category 2 addition is preserved at F14:L10 (F14:L14 [Dan 8:3]); however, the evidence is fragmentary. 4Q112 might read *וְגֵד אֶחָד גָּדוֹל*, “a great ram,” or *אֶחָד אֶחָד גָּדוֹל*, “a ram. The ram,” as opposed to the MT that reads *אֶחָד אֶחָד*, “a ram.” In both instances, the addition harmonizes the text to the immediate context. If the addition is *גָּדוֹל*, “great,” then the addition may simply describe the ram in light of the immediate context since he is described as one who rules all the earth (Dan 8:3-4). If the addition is *אֶחָד*, “ram,” then the addition simply makes the subject of the following participle explicit.

A category 2 addition is preserved at F14:L12 (F14:16 [Dan 8:4]). 4Q112 reads *וְיָמָה וְצָפוֹנָה וְצָפוֹנָה וְצָפוֹנָה* “[I saw the ram goring we]stward, and eastward, northward, and southward” whereas the MT reads *וְצָפוֹנָה וְצָפוֹנָה וְצָפוֹנָה*

וַיִּגְדֹּה, “I saw the ram goring westward and northward and southward.” The tendency of this scribe or a previous scribe is to interpret the text. This reading likewise derives from this tendency.

There is only one category 2 omission preserved in 4Q112. It is preserved at F7:L7 (F7:L8 [Dan 3:2]). 4Q112 reads וּמַכְיָנֶזָר, “Nebuchad^dnezzar,” whereas the MT reads נְבוּכַדְנֶזָר מֶלֶכָא, “Nebuchadnezzar, the king.” The MT is more explicit than 4Q112, but the difference is not alarming since the MT at times refers to Nebuchadnezzar simply as “the king” (e.g., Dan 3:22), as “Nebuchadnezzar” (e.g., Dan 3:24), and elsewhere as “Nebuchadnezzar, the king” (e.g., Dan 3:24). The difference likely derived from an error of sight.

4Q112 further preserves several category 2 substitutions. The first category 2 substitution is preserved at F2:L2 (Frgs. 1-2:L6 [Dan 1:20]). 4Q112 reads הָ[כְמ]הָ ב[ינֵה], “w[isdo]m un[derstanding],” while the MT reads הַחֵמַת בִּינָה “wisdom of understanding.” 4Q112 agrees here with the LXX and Vulgate against the MT. The agreement between these texts represent an interpretation even followed by modern translations such as the ESV, NIV, and NASB. These translations do not derive their translation based on 4Q112 but based on their own interpretation of the MT as indicated by the lack of footnotes in these modern versions. The LXX’s and Vulgate’s reading too is likely an interpretation of an MT like text made independent of 4Q112.

The next category 2 substitution is preserved at F3i:L12 (Frgs. 3i, 17:L12 [Dan 2:28]). 4Q112 reads וּמַהוֹדֵעַ, “and one who makes known” (a participle), while the MT reads וְהוֹדֵעַ, “and he makes known” (an indicative). The substitution preserved in 4Q112 harmonizes to the immediate context since Daniel has just described God with a participle וְהוֹדֵעַ, “who is a revealer of mysteries.” The use of participles functioning as titles in the Aramaic section of Daniel is widespread.

A further substitution, more specifically a transposition of words, occurs at F3i:L15 (Frgs. 3i, 17:L15 [Dan 2:30]). 4Q112 reads לִי גִלִּי, “to me he revealed,” while the

MT reads גָּלִי לִי, “was revealed to me.” The difference is small. The positioning of the prepositional phrase before the verb in 4Q112 may provide some additional emphasis on Daniel.

A category 2 substitution preserved at F3i:L16 (Frgs. 3i, 17:L16 [Dan 2:31]) likely derives from graphic confusion.⁶⁵⁰ 4Q112 reads חֲזוֹה, “the vision,”⁶⁵¹ while the MT reads וְזִינָה, “and it countenance.” The similarity between these readings suggests a paleographic issue.

The last category 2 substitution is preserved at F15:L4 (F15:18 [Dan 10:19]). 4Q112 reads דַּבֵּר, “speak” (an imperative), whereas the MT reads יִדְבַּר, “let him speak” (a jussive). The substitution of the volitives from a jussive to an imperative is a minor change in perspective. Moreover, it may be a case of harmonization to the immediate contexts since the messenger speaking to Daniel used imperatives.

There is a further category 2 variant, but the difference is preserved in a fragmentary context, which makes an exact description of the variant elusive. It is preserved at F3i:L12 (Frgs. 3i, 17:L12 [Dan 2:28]). 4Q112 reads מְלֹכָא [בְּאַחֲרֵית יוֹמֵיָא, “in the end of days. O k[ing live forever, your dream],”⁶⁵² whereas the MT reads בְּאַחֲרֵית יוֹמֵיָא חֲלֻמָּךְ וְחֲזוֹנֵי רִאשְׁךָ, “in the latter days. Your dream and the visions of your head” (ESV). Ulrich proposes that 4Q112 omits the phrase וְחֲזוֹנֵי רִאשְׁךָ, “and the visions of your head,” but adds the phrase מְלֹכָא לְעֹלָמִין חַיִּי חֲלֻמָּךְ, “O king live forever.” All

⁶⁵⁰ Ulrich, “4QDana,” 241.

⁶⁵¹ See the translation of Abegg, Flint, and Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible*, 488. They argue that the reading is “appearance” in agreement with the LXX. However, since זָי (the reading of the MT) can mean appearance, one cannot be sure if the LXX followed 4Q112 against the MT here. Ulrich confirms the opinion here in Ulrich, “4QDana,” 241. See also Ludwig Köhler and Walter Baumgartner, eds., *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament: Volume 2 ט–ת*, study ed. (Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 2001), “זָי.”

⁶⁵² Abegg, Flint, and Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible*, 487.

that is known is that a word beginning with a *mem* follows יומיא. Ulrich’s proposal is possible, but the evidence is too fragmentary to make firm conclusions.

Category 3. 4Q112 does not preserve any category 3 variants.

Statistics and Conclusion of 4Q112’s Textual Tradition

The variants preserved in 4Q112 can all be described as minor as the previous discussion demonstrates.⁶⁵³ Moreover, many of the additions and substitutions result in a harmonized text. The text is fuller than the MT regarding content—it only preserves one clear category 2 omission as opposed to eight category 2 additions and five category 2 substitutions. Therefore, this text tends to interpret a MT-like exemplar by means of addition and substitution, not omission. The conclusion here that this scribe tended to harmonize is validating in F14:7 (F14:11 [Dan 8:1]) where the scribe originally writes the phrase דבר נגלה “a word was revealed” and then crosses it out. This addition is a harmonization to Daniel 10:1 occasioned by a similar context;⁶⁵⁴ and thus, provides strong evidence that this scribe tended toward harmonizations, likely unintentionally. Despite these minor disagreements, the two texts share a high statistical relationship. For these reasons, 4Q112 can reasonably be categorized as preserving the Masoretic tradition.

Table 52. The statistical relationship between 4Q112 and the MT

Total # of Words in 4Q112	Categories 1, 2, and 3	Statistical Relationship	Categories 2 and 3	Statistical Relationship	Category 3	Statistical Relationship
752	50	93.35%	24	96.81%	0	100%

⁶⁵³ There are 109 words transcribed by the editor that are not included in the final word count.

⁶⁵⁴ See Ulrich’s discussion of this variant at Ulrich, “4QDana,” 252-53.

4Q113

4Q113 (4QDan^b) preserves portions of Daniel 5, 6, 7, and 8 in nineteen identifiable fragments.⁶⁵⁵ Ulrich describes the script as a “large, clear, stately hand described by Cross as a ‘developed Herodian formal script’” dating ca. 20-50 AD.⁶⁵⁶ The orthography is fuller than the MT, which is illustrated by the scribe’s use of *vav*: it is used to represent long and short *o* and *u* while fuller suffixes are used five times.⁶⁵⁷ There are two scribal interventions; the original scribe makes two supralinear corrections.⁶⁵⁸ Tov calculates that there is an average of one intervention per thirty-nine lines.⁶⁵⁹

The textual tradition of 4Q113 is debated amongst scholars. On the one hand, many scholars understand 4Q113 as preserving a text close to the Masoretic tradition.⁶⁶⁰ On the other hand, Lange categorizes the text as non-aligned,⁶⁶¹ while Tov hesitantly categorizes the text as non-aligned.⁶⁶²

Description and Categorization of Variants

Some differences proposed by Ulrich are not included in the following discussion and statistics. These include an example that depends on insufficient

⁶⁵⁵ Eugene Ulrich, ed., “4QDanb,” in *Qumran Cave 4. XI, Psalms to Chronicles*, 255-67.

⁶⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, 256.

⁶⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 257.

⁶⁵⁸ *Ibid.*

⁶⁵⁹ Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 335.

⁶⁶⁰ Ulrich, “The Text of Daniel in the Qumran Scrolls,” 583; Flint, “The Daniel Tradition at Qumran,” 330-31; Collins, *Daniel*, 3.

⁶⁶¹ Lange, “Textual Plurality,” 54-55.

⁶⁶² Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 335; Tov, “The Biblical Texts from the Judaean Desert,” 156.

manuscript evidence, some differences regarding spelling,⁶⁶³ and a difference concerning a *kethiv/qere*.

Category 1. 4Q113 preserves several category 1 variants. Among these variants is an addition of a preposition, several substitutions, and an unclear variant.

Category 2. 4Q113 further preserves additions, omissions, substitutions, and unclear variants that belong to category 2. The first category 2 addition is preserved at F2:L2 (Frgs. 1-4:L8 [Dan 5:12]).⁶⁶⁴ 4Q113 reads א[יתקר] וכתבא, “all the earth,” with 4Q112. This addition harmonizes the text to the immediate context (i.e., Dan 5:7). The second category 2 addition reads גדול, “great,” which also likely results in a harmonized text at F17:L3 (Frgs. 16-18i, 19:L6 [Dan 8:3]) and may read with 4Q112, but 4Q112 is too fragmentary to be certain.

Beyond two category 2 additions, 4Q113 further preserves one category 2 omission. At F7ii:L12 (Frgs. 7ii, 8:L13 [Dan 6:18 {17}]), 4Q113 reads והתם מלכא, “and the king sealed,” whereas the MT reads והתמה מלכא, “and the king sealed it.”

⁶⁶³ A comment should be made concerning two differences. Both of these differences concern the substitution of an *aleph* for a *he*. The first is preserved at F7ii:L15 (Dan 6:19 [18]). 4Q113 reads להיכלא, “to the/his temple,” whereas the MT reads להיכלה, “to his temple.” The second is preserved at F7i:L17 (Dan 6:11 [10]). 4Q113 reads ב[ע]ליהא “in] his/the roof chamber,” whereas the MT reads בעליהא “in his roof chamber.” These differences likely derived from phonological reasons: the interchange between *he* and *aleph* which is not uncommon in B(iblical) A(ramaic). Unfortunately, one cannot be certain if 4Q113 reads with the MT in these instances due to the fact that an *aleph* can be used to denote the article and the pronominal suffix. Although it more often denotes the article, it is used twice to represent the 3ms pronominal suffix (i.e., Dan 4:15 and 16).

⁶⁶⁴ Some readings can be referenced in more than one way for this text. Some have a reconstructed line number and some fragments are grouped together since the editor believes them to have originally belonged to the same column. For the readings that can be referenced in more than one way, both references are given. The first reference for the reading is to the exact fragment and line number of that fragment. The second reading in parenthesis is for the groups of fragments and/or to the reconstructed line number.

A category 2 substitution is preserved at F7ii:L10 (Frgs. 7ii, 8:L11 (Dan 6:17 {16})). 4Q113 reads וּלְגַבֵּי דֵי אַרְיוֹתָא רַמְן, “and into] the den of the lions, they th[rew,”⁶⁶⁵ whereas the MT reads וּרְמוֹ לְגַבֵּי דֵי אַרְיוֹתָא, “and they threw to the den of the lions.” Transposing the prepositional phrase before the verb likely shifts the focus slightly.

Last, one variant has an unclear description. This variant may either be an omission or a transposition, and it is preserved at F8:L2 (Frgs. 7ii, 8:L16 [Dan 6:20 {19}]). 4Q113 reads מַלְכָּא בְּשַׁפְרָפְרָא בְּנִגְהָא, “[the ki]ng went hurried[ly],”⁶⁶⁶ whereas the MT reads מַלְכָּא בְּשַׁפְרָפְרָא יְקוּם בְּנִגְהָא, “the king, at dawn arose in the daylight.” Ulrich argues that spatial considerations suggest that 4Q113 has omitted יְקוּם, “he arose.”⁶⁶⁷ This explanation is possible, but the reading may also be transposed.

Category 3. 4Q113 does not preserve any category 3 variants.

Statistics and Conclusion of 4Q113’s Textual Tradition

4Q113 preserves only minor differences while maintaining a high statistical relationship to the MT. Therefore, the text can reasonably be identified as belonging to the Masoretic tradition.

Table 53. The statistical relationship between 4Q118 and the MT

Total # of Words in 4Q113	Categories 1, 2, and 3	Statistical Relationship	Categories 2 and 3	Statistical Relationship	Category 3	Statistical Relationship
330	16	95.15%	7	97.88%	0	100%

⁶⁶⁵ Abegg, Flint, and Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible*, 494.

⁶⁶⁶ Ibid.

⁶⁶⁷ Ulrich, “4QDanb,” 262.

4Q114

4Q114 (4QDan^c) preserves portions of Daniel 10 and 11 in four columns.⁶⁶⁸

Ulrich describes the script as an “early semicursive script” from the late second century BC.⁶⁶⁹ He notes that the orthography is inconsistent when compared to the MT.⁶⁷⁰ Ulrich identifies two examples of scribal intervention: one erasure and one supralinear correction by the original scribe.⁶⁷¹

Scholars debate how to categorize 4Q114. While many scholars understand 4Q114 as preserving a text close to the Masoretic tradition,⁶⁷² Lange categorizes the text as non-aligned,⁶⁷³ while Tov hesitantly categorizes the text as non-aligned.⁶⁷⁴ Ulrich, in a 2002 publication, states that the text is too fragmentary to determine which edition it aligns.⁶⁷⁵

Description and Categorization of Variants

Ulrich lists a few differences that do not belong to categories 1, 2, or 3. These differences include an example synonymous forms, two differences that appear to derive

⁶⁶⁸ Eugene Ulrich, ed., “4QDanc,” in *Qumran Cave 4. XI, Psalms to Chronicles*, 269-77. See also his discussion of how one of the large fragments was cut and then lost (or stolen) from the museum. *Ibid.*, 269.

⁶⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, 270.

⁶⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, 271.

⁶⁷¹ *Ibid.*

⁶⁷² Flint, “The Daniel Tradition at Qumran,” 330-31; Collins, *Daniel*, 3.

⁶⁷³ Lange, “Textual Plurality,” 54-55.

⁶⁷⁴ Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 335; Tov, “The Biblical Texts from the Judaean Desert,” 156.

⁶⁷⁵ Ulrich, “The Text of Daniel in the Qumran Scrolls,” 583. Compare his earlier statement that the text preserves the edition also preserved in the MT in Eugene Ulrich, ed., “4QDand,” in *Qumran Cave 4. XI, Psalms to Chronicles*, 279.

from scribal error (i.e., graphic confusion), and one example where the script is unclear.

Category 1. This text preserves one category 1 addition—the addition of a marker of the accusative—and several substitutions. Among the substitutions include examples of substitution of number, gender, tense, and similar prepositions.

Category 2. 4Q114 does not possess any category 2 omissions or additions. It does, however, preserve category 2 substitutions. The first category 2 substitution is preserved at F2i:L6 (Col 1:16 [Dan 10:12]).⁶⁷⁶ 4Q114 reads בַּעֲבֹרְךָ, “for your [sa]ke,”⁶⁷⁷ whereas the MT reads בְּדִבְרֵיךָ, “with your words.” This difference is best explained as deriving from a paleographic issue since the readings differ regarding graphically similar letters: *dalet* and *ayin*⁶⁷⁸ on the one hand, and *resh* and *yod*⁶⁷⁹ on the other hand.⁶⁸⁰ Confusion of *dalet/ayin* has precedent in another category 2 substitution preserved at F1i:L2 (Col 1:2 [Dan 10:6])

Furthermore, a second category 2 substitution is preserved at F2ii:L2 (Col 2:14 [Dan 11:1]). 4Q114 reads עִמַּדְחִי, “I stood,” whereas the MT reads עָמַדְחִי, “I stood.” The

⁶⁷⁶ The readings in this text can be referenced in more than one way since some readings have a reconstructed line number that does not always correspond to the exact reading of the fragment. Moreover, Ulrich identifies the fragments as columns. Thus, for these readings, the first reference for the reading is to the exact fragment and line number of that fragment. The second reading in parenthesis is for the column number and for the line on the reconstructed column.

⁶⁷⁷ Abegg, Flint, and Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible*, 498.

⁶⁷⁸ Notice how the upper left-hand stroke of the *ayin* of this word does not extend to the midway point of the right-hand stroke but connects almost perpendicularly like a *dalet*. See the middle fragment and bottom row of The Leon Levy Dead Sea Scrolls, “Plate 224,” accessed April 27, 2018, <https://www.deadseascrolls.org.il/explore-the-archive/image/B-284883>.

⁶⁷⁹ Notice the truncated nature of this *resh*. In fact, Ulrich points out that the *resh* may in fact be a *yod* or *vav* in Ulrich, “4QDanc,” 273. Nonetheless, the *ayin/dalet* confusion still indicates a variant. Notice though that the *resh* is truncated in other instances. See the very next word after the word in question and after the tear in the leather “שרי.” The *resh* is very much like a *yod* or *vav*. See The Leon Levy Dead Sea Scrolls, “Plate 224.”

⁶⁸⁰ Ulrich, “4QDanc,” 270-71.

meaning of the infinitive construct and the pronominal suffix in the MT depends on context. The pronominal suffix could be as an objective genitive or subjective genitive and the infinitive construct may function as the main verb (interpretation of 4Q114 and the Vulgate), or it may complete the idea of an elided verb (interpretation of LXX). The reading of 4Q114 solves these ambiguities by simply substituting the infinitive for a perfect. This difference is interpretative.

A third category 2 substitution is preserved at F3i:L4 (Col 3:15 [Dan 11:16]). 4Q114 reads בעזו, “in his power,”⁶⁸¹ whereas the MT reads בְּיָדוֹ, “in his hand.” This difference too likely derived from graphic confusion.⁶⁸² Metathesis of the letters plus confusion of *dalet/ayin* would account for the main differences here. Confusion of *dalet/ayin* has precedent in a previous category 2 substitution preserved at Col 1:16 (Dan 10:12).

A fourth category 2 substitution is preserved at F3i:L4 (Col 3:15 [Dan 11:17]). 4Q114 reads בינו, “his understanding,” whereas the MT reads פְּנֵי, “his face.” This difference can reasonably be explained on either graphic or phonological grounds.

Category 3. 4Q114 does not preserve any category 3 variants.

Statistics and Conclusion of 4Q114's Textual Tradition

4Q114 can reasonably be identified as belonging to the Masoretic tradition.⁶⁸³ At least one difference between this text and the MT indicates a tendency to interpret. Moreover, many of the differences remain graphically similar, which suggests scribal error or a paleographic problem. Despite these differences, the text agrees with the MT in

⁶⁸¹ Abegg, Flint, and Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible*, 500.

⁶⁸² Ulrich, “4QDanc,” 270-71.

⁶⁸³ Ulrich transcribes thirty words transcribed that are not included in the final word count.

most other details. Thus, it is reasonable to categorize this text as belonging to the Masoretic tradition.

Table 54. The statistical relationship between 4Q114 and the MT

Total # of Words in 4Q114	Categories 1, 2, and 3	Statistical Relationship	Categories 2 and 3	Statistical Relationship	Category 3	Statistical Relationship
302	15	95.03%	4	98.68%	0	100%

4Q115

4Q115 (4QDan^d) preserves portions of Daniel 4 and 7 in eight identified fragments (fragments 10-16 are unidentified).⁶⁸⁴ Ulrich describes the script as an early Herodian formal hand dating ca. last quarter of the first century BC and the orthography as close to the MT.⁶⁸⁵ Ulrich argues that 4Q115 is one of the few manuscripts that divides the text into units smaller than the open and closed sections.⁶⁸⁶ However, Tov notes that evidence for smaller sense division in 4Q115 is uncertain.⁶⁸⁷ Ulrich lists one example of a possible correction—an erasure at F5:L12⁶⁸⁸—while Tov identifies two instances of scribal intervention, one intervention per every 22 lines.⁶⁸⁹

⁶⁸⁴ Eugene Ulrich, ed., “4QDand,” in *Qumran Cave 4. XI, Psalms to Chronicles*, 279-86. Note that fragment 1 and 2i may preserve portions of Daniel 3, but this identification is not conclusive. *Ibid.*, 280-81.

⁶⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, 279.

⁶⁸⁶ *Ibid.*

⁶⁸⁷ Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 138.

⁶⁸⁸ See Ulrich, “4QDand,” 279, while he further notes here that a letter appears to be erased at F7:L3 (Frgs. 3-7:L19) and F12:L2.

⁶⁸⁹ Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 335.

The textual tradition of 4Q115 is debated. Most scholars understand 4Q115 as preserving a text close to the Masoretic tradition.⁶⁹⁰ Ulrich, for example, identifies the text as belonging to the edition of the MT since Daniel 3:24 directly follows 3:23 without the addition of the Prayer of Azariah and the Song of the Three Youths.⁶⁹¹ Lange too identifies the text as close to the Masoretic tradition. He identifies it as a semi-Masoretic manuscript⁶⁹² (i.e., texts that are “close to the text of the MT but deviate more than 2%”).⁶⁹³ Tov, however, cautiously groups the text as non-aligned.⁶⁹⁴

Description and Categorization of Variants

Ulrich lists three differences that are not included in the following discussion and statistics. Each of these readings depend on insufficient manuscript evidence.

Category 1. Two variants belong to category 1. The first difference is a substitution of similar lexemes at F4:L2 (Frgs. 3-7:L12 [Dan 4:12 {15}]).⁶⁹⁵ The second is a substitution of state which harmonizes the reading to the immediate context and is preserved at F4:L3 (Frgs. 3-7:L13 [Dan 4:13 {16}]).⁶⁹⁶

⁶⁹⁰ Ulrich, “The Text of Daniel in the Qumran Scrolls,” 583; Flint, “The Daniel Tradition at Qumran,” 330-31; Collins, *Daniel*, 3.

⁶⁹¹ Ulrich, “4QDand,” 279.

⁶⁹² Lange, “Textual Plurality,” 55.

⁶⁹³ *Ibid.*, 54.

⁶⁹⁴ Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 335.

⁶⁹⁵ Although this form may be simply an orthographic difference, it seems more likely that the form is a substitution of a synonymous word.

⁶⁹⁶ Some readings can be referenced in more than one way for this text. Some have a reconstructed line number and some fragments are grouped together since the editor believes them to have originally belonged to the same column. For the readings that can be referenced in more than one way, both references are given. The first reference for the reading is to the exact fragment and line number of that fragment. The second reading in parenthesis is for the groups of fragments and/or to the reconstructed line number.

Category 2. There are two category 2 variants preserved in 4Q115. The first is an addition preserved at F2ii:L5 (Dan 3:25). 4Q115 reads לַהֲדַבְּרוּהִי, “his counselors” and simply makes the text more explicit by identifying the recipient of the direct address. Moreover, the text harmonizes the reading to the immediate context since Daniel 3:24 identifies the recipient of the direct address in the MT: עָנָה וְאָמַר לְהַדְּבָרוּהִי, “he who answers and says to his counselors”

The second category 2 variant is a substitution and is preserved at F3:L2 (Frgs 3-7:L3 [Dan 4:6]). 4Q115 reads וּכְלִי [ר]ז לך לא אנוֹם, “[and n]o [myster]y for you is too difficult,” whereas the MT reads וְכִלְיָו לֹא-אֶנֶס לְךָ, “and no mystery is too difficult for you.” The difference simply concerns the transposition of the prepositional phrase, which perhaps slightly shifts the focus. Overall, the difference is small.

Category 3. 4Q115 does not preserve any category 3 variants.

Statistics and Conclusion of 4Q115’s Textual Tradition

4Q115 is poorly preserved.⁶⁹⁷ The ink in most places has eroded the leather so that often ink is not noticeable; rather, grooves in the leather remain which gives the impression of a photographic negative.⁶⁹⁸ Comparison of what is sufficiently preserved only yields a few minor differences, one that may indicate a tendency toward harmonization. Moreover, the text agrees with the MT in most details. For these reasons, it is reasonable to ascribed 4Q115 to the Masoretic tradition.

⁶⁹⁷ Seventy-five words that Ulrich transcribes are not included in the final word count.

⁶⁹⁸ See Ulrich’s discussion of the text’s state of preservation in Ulrich, “4QDand,” 279. Also, for a discussion of the ink used in Qumran scrolls, see Yoram Nir-El and Magen Broshi, “The Black Ink of the Qumran Scrolls,” *Dead Sea Discoveries* 3, no. 2 (1996): 157-67. The deterioration in 4Q115 was likely caused by traces of copper and lead deriving from the ink-wells. See *ibid.*, 164.

Table 55. The statistical relationship between 4Q115 and the MT

Total # of Words in 4Q115	Categories 1, 2, and 3	Statistical Relationship	Categories 2 and 3	Statistical Relationship	Category 3	Statistical Relationship
98	6	93.88%	4	95.92%	0	100%

6Q7

6Q7 (6QpapDan) preserves portions of Daniel 10 and 11 in six identifiable fragments.⁶⁹⁹ The script dates to 50 AD, according to Baillet, while the orthography is described as similar to that of the MT.⁷⁰⁰ The scribe omits an *aleph* on two, possibly three occasions, once when transcribing the name Daniel: דניל at F2:L2 (Frgs. 2-5:L8 [Dan 10:12]).⁷⁰¹

The textual tradition of 6Q6 is debated. Some scholars understand 6Q7 as preserving a text close to the Masoretic tradition,⁷⁰² Tov categorizes the text as non-aligned.⁷⁰³ Ulrich and Lange assert that the text is too fragmentary to determine which edition it aligns.⁷⁰⁴

Description and Categorization of Variants

Several differences proposed by Baillet are not included in the following

⁶⁹⁹ Maurice Baillet, ed., “6QDaniel,” in *Les “Petites Grottes” de Qumran: Exploration de la Falaise, les Grottes 2Q, 3Q, 5Q, 7Q à 10Q, le Rouleau de Cuivre*, Discoveries in the Judaean Desert 3 (Oxford: Clarendon, 1962), 114-16. The contents of fragments 1 and 8 are only suggestive while Baillet does not even suggest the text possibly preserved in fragments 9-13.

⁷⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, 114.

⁷⁰¹ For this text, fragments 2-5 are grouped together as originally preserving content from the same column. Here, readings from this group of fragments will first be cited according to the exact fragment and corresponding reading on the fragment, and second, according to the groups of fragments and the corresponding reconstructed line number of the group of fragments.

⁷⁰² Flint, “The Daniel Tradition at Qumran,” 330-31; Collins, *Daniel*, 3.

⁷⁰³ Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 335; Tov, “The Biblical Texts from the Judaean Desert,” 156.

⁷⁰⁴ Ulrich, “The Text of Daniel in the Qumran Scrolls,” 583; Lange, “Textual Plurality,” 55-56.

discussion and statistics. These include example that depend on insufficient manuscript evidence and others that concern synonymous spelling.

Category 1. There are no category 1 variants preserved in 6Q7.

Category 2. 6Q7 preserves two substitutions that belong to category 2. The first substitution is preserved at F4:L1 (Frgs. 2-5:L12 [Dan 10:13]). 6Q7 reads מ[לכות פרס, “the kingdom of Persia,” whereas the MT reads מְלָכֵי פָּרֶס, “kings of Persia.” The difference harmonizes the text to its immediate context. Earlier in the verse Daniel is told that the “prince of the kingdom of Persia stood opposite me for twenty-one days.”

The second substitution is preserved at F4:L4 (Frgs. 2-5:L15 [Dan 10:16]). 6Q7 reads]נג[עה, “he who touches,” whereas the MT reads נֹגֵעַ, “he who touches.” The difference concerns gender and refers to a slightly different antecedent. The feminine noun דְמוּת, “likeness,” earlier in the verse is the best candidate for this participle’s antecedent in 6Q7.

Category 3. There are no category 3 variants preserved in 6Q7.

Statistics and Conclusion of 6Q7’s Textual Tradition

6Q7 is poorly preserved.⁷⁰⁵ Therefore, conclusions about the textual tradition of 6Q7 derive from a small sample size. When analyzing what is preserved, it is important to note that the text only preserves two minor differences when compared to the MT. Furthermore, one of these differences may indicate a tendency toward harmonization. In light of these facts, it is reasonable to conclude that the remains of 6Q7 can be categorized as belonging to the Masoretic tradition.

⁷⁰⁵ Thirty-two proposed words are proposed by Baillet in his transcriptions of the text are not included in the final word count.

Table 56. The statistical relationship between 6Q7 and the MT

Total # of Words in 6Q7	Categories 1, 2, and 3	Statistical Relationship	Categories 2 and 3	Statistical Relationship	Category 3	Statistical Relationship
65	2	96.92%	2	96.92%	0	100%

4Q118

4Q118 (4QChr) preserves portions of 2 Chronicles 28:27-29:3 in one extant fragment although Treballe Barrera notes that the text is preceded by some additional unknown text.⁷⁰⁶ He describes the script as a formal script in which *vav* and *yod* are easily distinguished, while *ayin* shows older characteristics. Based on the *yod* and the *ayin*, Treballe Barrera dates the text to the late Hasmonaean period, ca. 50-25 BC.⁷⁰⁷ The orthography is described as similar to the MT and the text has no evidence of errors or corrections.⁷⁰⁸

Scholars debate the nature of 4Q118. Tov questionably classifies the text as non-aligned,⁷⁰⁹ while Lange categorizes the text as too small for text-typological comparison.⁷¹⁰ George Brooke⁷¹¹ and Rofé⁷¹² are unsure if 4Q118 preserves the book of Chronicles.

⁷⁰⁶ Julio Treballe Barrera, ed., “4QChr,” in *Qumran Cave 4. XI, Psalms to Chronicles*, 295.

⁷⁰⁷ Ibid.

⁷⁰⁸ Ibid., 296.

⁷⁰⁹ Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 335. His reasoning for this hesitancy seems to be that the fragment may not actually belong to a biblical text. See Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 95-96.

⁷¹⁰ Lange, “Textual Plurality,” 55-56.

⁷¹¹ George J. Brooke, “The Book of Chronicles and the Scrolls from Qumran,” in *Reflection and Refraction: Studies in Biblical Historiography in Honour of A. Graeme Auld*, ed. Robert. Rezetko, Timothy H. Lim, and W. Brian. Aucker, Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 113 (Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 2007), 35-48, esp. 38-40.

⁷¹² See Alexander Rofé, “No Ephod or Teraphim’—Oude Hierateias Oude Dēlōn: Hosea 3:4 in the LXX and in the Paraphrases of Chronicles and the Damascus Document,” in *Sefer Moshe: The Moshe Weinfeld Jubilee Volume: Studies in the Bible and the Ancient Near East, Qumran, and Post-*

Description and Categorization of Variants

4Q118 is preserved in only one fragment. Regarding spelling, this text differs in one instance when compared with the MT: 4Q118 reads אִיבָּה, “Abijah,” the MT reads אֲבִיָּה, “Abijah.” This difference is not discussed in the following discussion or statistics.

Category 1. 4Q118 preserves one category 1 variant: an addition of a conjunctive *vav* preserved at F1ii:L5 (2 Chron 29:3).

Category 2. 4Q118 preserves one category 2 variant: a substitution preserved at F1ii:L2 (2 Chron 28:27). 4Q118 reads]וּיְמַלֵּךְ יְהוֹזָבָב בֶּן־אֲחָז תְּחִלָּתוֹ, “[He]zek[iah] the son of Ahaz [reigned] i[n]s[tead] [of] him,” while the MT reads וַיְמַלֵּךְ יְהוֹזָבָב בְּנוֹ תְּחִלָּתוֹ, “Hezekiah, his son, reigned instead of him.” 4Q118 has substituted a pronoun בְּנוֹ, “his son,” for a personal name בֶּן־אֲחָז, “son of Ahaz,” a tendency of Chronicles in general according to Treballe Barrera—Treballe Barrera claims that Chronicles replaces a pronoun with a proper name sixteen times and replaces a name with a pronoun in eight instances.⁷¹³ The difference is minor.

Category 3. 4Q118 does not possess any category 3 variants.

Statistics and Conclusion of 4Q118’s Textual Tradition

Only twenty-five words are sufficiently preserved in 4Q118.⁷¹⁴ Thus, it is hard to be certain that this fragment indeed derived from a biblical manuscript as several

Biblical Judaism, ed. Chaim Cohen, Avi Hurvitz, and Shalom M. Paul (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2004), 143. Rofé suggests that 4Q118 may be the remains of a “homiletical revision of the book of Kings” on the basis of ותעליני “and cause me to go up.” See n22.

⁷¹³ Barrera, “4QChr,” 297.

⁷¹⁴ Eleven words transcribed by Barrera are not included in the final word count since they depend on insufficient manuscript evidence.

scholars note; it could have been a quotation in a different work. With that said, it is important to note that the text preserves only minor variants; none of which distinguish it as representing an alternative tradition.⁷¹⁵ Additionally, the texts agree in most details as indicated by the statistics. Thus, it is reasonable to categorize what remains of 4Q118 as depicting text from the Masoretic tradition.

Table 57. The statistical relationship between 4Q118 and the MT

Total # of Words in 4Q118	Categories 1, 2, and 3	Statistical Relationship	Categories 2 and 3	Statistical Relationship	Category 3	Statistical Relationship
25	2	92.00%	1	96.00%	0	100%

The manuscripts from the Writings from Qumran that Emanuel Tov identifies as exclusively belonging to the non-aligned category should largely be understood as preserving the Masoretic tradition for two reasons. First, the majority of variants preserved in these texts are minor and do not provide an adequate basis for supposing a textual tradition other than the MT. The majority of the differences can be explained as interpretations, instances deriving from parablepsis, scribal error, and instances possibly deriving from paleographic problems. Second, most of the texts agrees with the MT in most readings. These two facts reasonably demonstrate that these manuscripts reflect the Masoretic tradition or derive from a MT-like text.⁷¹⁶ 4Q95 and 4Q98g, however, preserve differences that can be explained in different directions while existing in highly fragmentary states. These texts are labeled ambiguous here.

⁷¹⁵ Brooke, “The Book of Chronicles and the Scrolls from Qumran,” 39, makes this point.

⁷¹⁶The texts from the Writings labeled ambiguous here, and thus, those that are exceptions to this conclusion are the following: (1) 4Q95, which is likely a liturgical text that may rework a biblical passage, but likewise is very fragmentary (possible Pss 135 and 136); and (2) 4Q98g, which is possibly a liturgical text that might rework a biblical passage, but again, exists in a poor state of preservation (Ps 89). These two texts are labeled ambiguous here.

One should further note that the texts preserving Psalms are potential one of the texts most at odds with their MT counterpart, and are perhaps the most likely texts to be identified as independent. Nonetheless, upon investigation into these texts and into the state of the Book of Psalms during the Second Temple period, it is concluded here that the majority of these texts are better understood as excerpted texts that depend on the Masoretic Psalter. In short, it is suggested here that these texts should be understood as preserving a text belonging to the Masoretic tradition, but one that has been adapted mostly for liturgical purposes.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

It has been demonstrated that most non-aligned texts can reasonably be classified as belonging to the Masoretic tradition.¹ First, a qualitative analysis of each variant demonstrated that common scribal explanations most often account for the variants between each non-aligned text and the MT. A sampling of the most common explanations includes interpretation by means of addition or substitution and omission (due to parablepsis). Furthermore, many of these texts exhibit signs that they were copied poorly.² These factors, among others, must all be weighted when analyzing each text's tradition.

Second, a quantitative analysis demonstrated that the majority of these texts preserve a high statistical relationship to the MT. Only two texts from the Pentateuch (i.e., 2Q2 and 4Q16) and three texts from the Prophets (i.e., 4Q47, 4Q49, 4Q64) exhibit a statistical relationship between 80 percent and 89.99 percent in the first set of statistics. In the second set of statistics, only one text aligns with the MT between 80 percent and 89.99 percent in the Pentateuch (i.e., 4Q16) and one from the Prophets (i.e., 4Q47). The only text to exhibit category 3 variants from the Pentateuch and the Prophets is 1QIsa^a.

¹ The ambiguous texts include (1) 4Q47, which appears to be a reworked text, but exists in a fragmentary state; (2) 4Q49, which may be a non-biblical text, perhaps an abbreviated text or reworked composition, but is very fragmentary; (3) 4Q95, which is likely a liturgical text that may rework a biblical passage, but likewise is very fragmentary (possible Pss 135 and 136); and (4) 4Q98g, which is possibly a liturgical text that might rework a biblical passage, but again, exists in a poor state of preservation (Ps 89).

² Emanuel Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert*, ed. Florentino García Martínez, Peter W. Flint, and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, *Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah* 54 (Boston: Brill, 2004), 253.

The writings exhibit a slightly different picture. In the first set of statistics, two texts align with the MT between 70 percent and 79.99 percent of their readings (i.e., 4Q98g and 4Q111), while eight texts align with the MT between 80 percent to 89.99 (i.e., 4Q83, 4Q86, 4Q88, 4Q92, 4Q95, 4Q106, 6Q6, 4Q109) percent of the readings. In the second set of statistics, the same two texts that aligned with the MT between 70 percent and 79.99 percent in the first set of statistics again align with the MT between 70 percent and 79.99 percent (i.e., 4Q98g and 4Q111). Two others align with the MT between 80 percent and 89.99 percent of the readings (i.e., 4Q92, 4Q95). Two texts preserve category 3 variants from the Writings: 11Q5 and 4Q111.

The texts preserving Psalms generally align with the MT less than the other books, but this finding does not invalidate this thesis for at least four reasons. First, although these texts generally align with the MT less than other non-aligned texts, many of them still preserve a relatively high statistical relationship to the MT. Second, these lower statistically aligned texts largely preserve category 1 and 2 variants and only a few from category 3. Third, many of these texts are excerpted texts, possibly for liturgical purposes, and thus, one ought to approach the differences found in these texts cautiously.³ Fourth, it is questionable whether 4Q95 and 4Q98g (2 of the lower statistically aligned texts preserving psalms) can be adequately analyzed according to the methodology proposed here since these texts are not merely excerpted passages but may be reworked liturgical compositions dependent on a respective biblical Psalm or Psalms (i.e., 4Q95 may amalgamate Pss 135 and 136 and 4Q98g likely derives from Ps 89).⁴ Thus, these texts are probably not biblical or even excerpted texts but may be reworked

³ See the approach taken here toward excerpted texts in chap. 1.

⁴ These texts do not preserve different literary editions of these texts. See the discussion of each of these texts in chap. 4 for more information.

texts. It is important to consider these facts when analyzing the quantitative data, especially the data from the texts preserving psalms.

Implications

Several implications follow. First, when classifying biblical texts from Qumran, it is important not only to account for the quantity of variants preserved (cf. Tov and Lange),⁵ but also the quality of the variant. This approach accounts for the fact that some variants are weightier than others when determining a text's textual tradition but still provides an overarching perspective to the differences.

Second, an assessment of a text's textual tradition must depend on sufficiently preserved variants, not on possible readings and not on reconstructions. Therefore, an in-depth understanding of a text's textual tradition cannot always rely on the variants listed in the variant columns of DJD because not all variants listed in the variant column are certain. We must rather appeal to the plates and digitized photos. The *sigla* used by the editors indicate that many variants listed in the variant columns depend on probable, and even, possible readings. By noting these readings with these *sigla*, the editors are indicating that although possible, the suggested variants are not certain.⁶ This factor must be considered when assessing a text's textual tradition. Similarly, every editor approaches the task of transcription differently. On the one hand, Baillet lists several variants that depend on scant evidence or reconstructions. In at least one instance, he lists a variant that depends on no manuscript evidence (i.e., 6Q4 F15:L3 [2 Kgs 8:2]).⁷ Sanderson, on the

⁵ Armin Lange, "Ancient and Late Ancient Hebrew and Aramaic Jewish Texts," in *Textual History of the Bible: The Hebrew Bible*, ed. Armin Lange and Emanuel Tov, Textual History of the Bible 1a (Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 2016), 127. See also Emanuel Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 3rd ed. (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2012), 158-60.

⁶ Most often the variants listed as depending on insufficient manuscript evidence here are marked with these *sigla*. See tables in the appendices for a thorough review of these proposed differences.

⁷ Maurice. Baillet, J. T. Milik, and Roland de Vaux, "Livres des Rois," in *Les "Petites Grottes" de Qumran: Exploration de la Falaise, les Grottes 2Q, 3Q, 5Q, 7Q à 10Q, le Rouleau de Cuivre*,

other hand, is more cautious in her approach. In her discussion of 4Q73, she suggests that the text may omit an entire verse based on reconstruction but does not include it in her variant column.⁸ Therefore, caution is recommended due to the different approaches of the editors.

Third, scholars must recognize that many of the biblical-DSS exist in fragments, often very small fragments. In fact, many texts are made of fragments that share few material joins but are grouped together based on material considerations (nature of the leather or papyrus), paleography, and content (whether fragments preserve the same composition). Moreover, there are times when a fragment preserves legible content that could correspond to more than one biblical passage. These factors should caution scholars from overstating their conclusions. Again, this factor reinforces the principle that assessments about the textual tradition of a text must be grounded on manuscript evidence, not on reconstructions. Scholars should be cautious when a fragment could correspond to multiple passages of a text.

Fourth, the non-aligned category is comprised of biblical texts and a variety of non-biblical texts. Among the non-biblical texts, there are at least five types of excerpted texts. First, some preserve passages from the same biblical book (e.g., 4Q15). Second, some preserve passages from different biblical books (e.g., 4Q41). Third, at least two texts intentionally abbreviated a biblical book (4Q106 and 4Q107). Fourth, some non-biblical texts combine biblical sources, in an excerpted manner, with non-biblical sources (e.g., 4Q88). Last, some texts (or portions of texts) may not properly be labeled excerpted since they do not necessarily excerpt passages but appear to rework them. These compositions include 4Q47, 4Q95, 4Q98g, 11Q5 Col 2:2-4, 11Q5 Col 16:1-6//11Q6 F3:1-2). These

Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan 3 (Oxford: Clarendon, 1962), 109.

⁸ Judith E. Sanderson, ed., "4QEzeka," in *Qumrân Cave 4. X: The Prophets*, vol. 10, Discoveries in the Judaean Desert 15 (Oxford: Clarendon, 1997), 213.

reworked texts may belong to the same genre as the Reworked Pentateuch and appear to be secondary to the MT. Due to the nature of these texts, none of these texts correspond well to the MT. However, one should not expect them to correspond since they are not biblical texts but altogether different compositions. The first four types of non-biblical texts can reasonably be analyzed by the methodology advanced here since they largely reflect biblical texts although in compositions that are not strictly biblical (rather they often appear liturgical). The last group of texts, on the other hand, are not biblical texts. The best option for these last texts is to set them aside as ambiguous texts.⁹

Fifth, the theory that the OT text existed in a fluid state prior to the first century AD does not necessarily find support from those texts that Tov labels non-aligned. A diversity of readings is preserved in the non-aligned texts and a few scrolls can be interpreted in different ways (e.g., 11Q5), but this diversity does not necessitate textual fluidity. Rather, a goal of this study has been to demonstrate the reasonableness of a unity in the midst of the diversity: that unity being the MT. If one postulates the MT as the exemplar to each non-aligned text, then the differences among these texts can reasonably be ascribed to the scribal process with few exceptions (i.e., 4Q47, 4Q49, 4Q95, and 4Q98g).¹⁰ This approach demonstrates that the diversity of readings among the non-aligned texts does not necessarily indicate the absence of unity.

Future Research

This study lends itself to several areas of further research. First, a helpful study would be to apply the methodology adopted here to Tov's other categories of biblical-DSS;

⁹ 11Q5 Col 2:2-4, 11Q5 Col 16:1-6//11Q6 F3:1-2 appear to be reworked texts but should not be categorized independent of their wider collection. 11Q5 and 11Q6 are classified as excerpted texts here despite the presence of psalms that appear to be reworked.

¹⁰ These exceptions do not prove that the theory of a fluid text since these texts are likely not biblical. For a discussion of these texts and their biblical/non-biblical status, see the discussion of each text in the dissertation. The discussion of 11Q5 is representative of the liturgical texts preserving psalms since every major difference found among the smaller texts preserving psalms is found in 11Q5.

namely, those texts he labels as proto-MT, proto-Samaritan, and proto-LXX. This study would grant further perspective about the nature of diversity among the biblical-DSS. A study of those texts labeled proto-MT would be especially helpful since it would give further perspective to this study. It would demonstrate exactly how far removed the non-aligned texts are, not only from the MT, but also from those texts labeled proto-MT from Qumran.

Second, the texts preserving psalms are some of the texts most divergent from the MT. Those texts preserving psalms, however, do not validate the theory of textual fluidity since these texts are better identified as excerpted compositions (i.e., non-biblical).¹¹ An exhaustive study of the Jewish liturgy with the goal of identifying analogous phenomenon would be extremely profitable.

Third, a handful of compositions belonging to the non-aligned category may be reworked compositions (i.e., 4Q47, 4Q95, 4Q98g, 11Q5 Col 2, 11Q5 col 16//11Q6 F3). It would be helpful to compare these texts to known reworked compositions to determine similarities and dissimilarities.

Fourth, the non-aligned texts from Qumran indicate that interpretation is often achieved by means of addition and substitution, much less by omission. In fact, the majority of omissions preserved among the non-aligned texts can reasonably be explained as deriving from parablepsis. Thus, a further profitable study would investigate if scribes tended to add and substitute material rather than omit material.

Fifth, the non-aligned texts give evidence both of graphic and aural confusion. A profitable area of research would be to determine which manuscripts exhibit only graphic confusion, only aural confusion, or a combination of the two. The goal would be

¹¹ Emanuel Tov, "The Biblical Texts from the Judaean Desert—An Overview and Analysis of the Published Texts," in *The Bible as Book: The Hebrew Bible and the Judaean Desert Discoveries*, ed. Edward D. Herbert and Emanuel Tov (New Castle, DE: Oak Knoll, 2002), 156; Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 320-21.

to determine which copying procedure (either by diction or by copying from an exemplar) was more dominant.

Conclusion

Although the non-aligned texts from Qumran preserve many difficult readings, the majority of these texts can reasonably be understood as preserving the Masoretic tradition.¹² When one presupposes the MT as the exemplar behind these texts, the vast majority of these differences are accounted for with recourse to common scribal tendencies (e.g., harmonization and parablepsis). Therefore, the consensus view that the OT text existed in a fluid state in the Second Temple period is not necessarily supported by the non-aligned texts; rather, these texts exhibit expected differences that, once accounted for, pave a trail to an MT-like text. A unity amongst these texts aligns with what scholars know as the Masoretic text.

¹² Again, the ambiguous texts include (1) 4Q47, which appears to be a reworked text, but exists in a fragmentary state; (2) 4Q49, which may be a non-biblical text, perhaps an abbreviated text or reworked composition, but is very fragmentary; (3) 4Q95, which is likely a liturgical text that may rework a biblical passage, but likewise is very fragmentary (possible Pss 135 and 136); and (4) 4Q98g, which is possibly a liturgical text that might rework a biblical passage, but again, exists in a poor state of preservation (Ps 89).

APPENDIX 1

TABLES OF THE PENTATEUCH TEXTS

Note to the Tables

These tables provide the reader with every single difference proposed by each respective DJD editor when compared to the MT except for differences that depend entirely on reconstructions. The purpose of the tables is to give an overview of all the differences sufficiently preserved in the texts. Thus, the column row titled “Detailed Description of Variant” in each table is a concise description. Citations are kept to a minimum for the tables in order that they might remain clear. Refer to the body of the dissertation to see the fuller discussion of each variant and the corresponding citations. Although citations are kept to a minimum in the tables, a few works are cited. Please note that when DJD is cited, it is simply cited as DJD. This, again, is done in order for the tables to remain clear. Other references include the following:

Qimron – *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls*

Kutscher - *The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll*

Martin - *The Scribal Character of the Dead Sea Scroll*

Gleanings – “Gleanings from Psalm Texts from Qumran” by Patrick Skehan

GKC - *Gesenius’ Hebrew Grammar*

DSSB - *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible: The Oldest Known Bible*

Longacre – “Developmental Stage, Scribal Lapse, or Physical Defect? 1QIsaa’s Damaged Exemplar for Isaiah’s Chapters 34-66” by Drew Longacre

Moreover, one should note that a word can only have one point in the statistics. Therefore, a problem arises when one word differs from the MT in multiple ways. Items are further complicated when these differences belong to different categories. In these instances, the word was grouped in the higher category (e.g., a difference at FE iii:L7 (Ps 147:20) in 11Q5).

Last, most differences are analyzed individually even if the differences depend on each other. However, a few group of variants have been kept together and labeled as complex variants (e.g., F9ii:L2 [Ps 38:16]).

Table A1. 4Q10: Description of variants

Category	Description of Variant	Fragment, Line, and Verse	4Q30	MT	Detailed Description of Variant	Statistical Weight
1	Addition	F2:L3 (Gen 1:14)	ולש[נים] [ושנים	Addition ל preposition	1
		F5:L2 (Gen 3:1)	האף	אף	Addition of an interrogative ה	1
2	No Variants					
3	No Variants					
Not Counted	Synonymous Spelling	F1:L1 (Gen 1:9)	ותרא	ותרא	Substitution of forms	

Table A2. 2Q2: Description of variants

Category	Description of Variant	Fragment, Line, and Verse	2Q2	MT	Detailed Description of Variant	Statistical Weight
1	Addition	F4:L1 (Exod 11:3)	בתו[ך]		Addition	1
	Substitution	F1:L2 (Exod 1:12)	י[ר]בו	ירבה	Substitution of Number	1
		F1:L2 (Exod 1:12)	ישרצו	יפרץ	Substitution to lexeme with overlapping semantic domain and parallel text	1
2	Addition	F1:L[5]-6 (Exod 1:14)	[כן ירבו וכן ישרצו במאד] [מאד]ויקוצו מצרים מפני בני ישראל[ל		Addition to Parallel Context	7
		F4:L2 (Exod 11:4)	אל פרע[ה]		Addition: Prepositional Phrase	2
		F9:L4 (Exod 30:25)	לדורות[יכם]		Addition: Prepositional Phrase	1
	Substitution	F5:L8 (Exod 12:39)	גרשום מצר[י]ם	גרשו ממצר[י]ם	Substitution (Probably wrong division of words)	1
	Unclear Variant	F3:L3 (Exod 9:29)	ויומר מושה[] אליו	ויאמר אליו משה	Omission of prepositional phrase or transposition	1
3	No Variants					
Not Included	Insufficient Manuscript Evidence	F3:L2 (Exod 9:28)	ואש		Possible Addition to Parallel Context	
		F6:L2 (Exod 6:20)	וכי יא	וקייפה איש	Unclear	

Table A3. 2Q3: Description of variants

Category	Description of Variant	Fragment, Line, and Verse	2Q3	MT	Detailed Description of Variant	Statistical Weight
1	No Variants					
2	Additions	F8:L3 (Exod 34:10).	יהוה		Addition of Divine Name	1
3	No Variants					
Differences likely caused by Excerpted Nature	Different Sequence of Text	F8:L1-3			Exod 19:9 to Exod 34:10	
Not Included	Insufficient Manuscript Evidence	F4:L5 (Exod 22:2).	לש[לם		Addition of Elided Prepositional Phrase	
		F7:L1 (Exod 31:16).	ליה[וה		Addition of Elided Prepositional Phrase	

Table A4. 4Q15: Description of variants

Category	Description of Variant	Fragment, Line, and Verse	4Q15	MT	Detailed Description of Variant	Statistical Weight
1	No Variants					
2	No Variants					
3	No Variants					
Not included	Substitution	L2 (Exod 13:16)	[א]נכי	אני	Substitution of Form	

Table A5. 4Q16: Description of variants

Category	Description of Variant	Fragment, Line, and Verse	4Q16	MT	Detailed Description of Variant	Statistical Weight
1	Omission	L6 (v. 13:5)	הַחֲתִי הַחֲוִי הָאֲמֵרִי הַיְבוּסִי	וְהַחֲתִי וְהָאֲמֵרִי וְהַחֲוִי וְהַיְבוּסִי	Omission of three conjunctives	3
	Substitution	L6 (v. 13:5)	הַחֲתִי הַחֲוִי הָאֲמֵרִי הַיְבוּסִי	וְהַחֲתִי וְהָאֲמֵרִי וְהַחֲוִי וְהַיְבוּסִי	Transposition of elements of a list	1
2	Addition	L2 (v. 13:3)	מֵאֲרִץ מִצְרַיִם	מִמִּצְרַיִם	Addition of modifier	1
		L5 (v. 13:5)	אֱלֹהֶיךָ		Addition to Divine Name	2
	Omission	L2 (v. 13:3)		מִבֵּית עֶבְדִים	Omission of modifier	3
	Substitution	L6 (v. 13:5)	כִּאֲשֶׁר	אֲשֶׁר	Addition of כ preposition to relative clause	1
3	No Variants					

Table A6. 11Q1: Description of variants, category 1

Description of Variant	Fragment, Line, and Verse	11Q1	MT	Detailed Description of Variant	Statistical Weight
Additions	FI:L7 (Lev 18:30b)	כי		Synonymous Syntactical Construction	1
	Col 6:L9 (Lev 27:19b)		את	Omission of marker of Accusative	1
Omissions	FB:L5 (Lev 10:7a)	ופתח	ומפתח	Omissions of preposition	1
	FJ:L4 (Lev 20:3b)	וחלל	ולחלל	Omission of ל preposition	1
	Fki:L4 (Lev 21:8a)		את	Omission of Marker of Accusative	1
	Col 4:L5 (Lev 25:31b)	ביובל	וביבל	Omission of Conjunctive ו	1
	Col 5:L.2 (Lev 26:19b)		את	Omission of marker of Accusative	1
Substitutions	FKi:L5 (Lev 21:8b)	מקדשמ	מקדשכם	Substitution of Number	1
	FJ:L1 (Lev 20:2a)	מבית	מבני	Substitution of common phrase	1
	FJ:L7 (Lev 20:5a)	וב[משפחו	ובמשפחתי	Substitution of Gender: Scribal Error (Freedman and Mathews, 38)	1
	F:L4 (Lev 22:23b)	תעשו	תעשה	Substitution of Number	1
	FL:L1 (Lev 22:21a)	לנדבה או בבקר	לנדבה או בכקר או	Substitution of Word Order (Scribal Error?)	1
	Col 1:3 (Lev 22:22a)	או ילפת או גרב או יבלת	או יבלת או גרב או ילפת	Transposition of elements in a list	1
	Col 3:5 (Lev 24:10b)	והאיש הישראלי	ואיש הישראלי	Addition of Article (Substitution of phrase: MT has construct while 11Q1 has apposition)	1
	Col 3:7-8 (Lev 24:12a)	ויניחו אתו	ויניחיהו	Substitution of Construction of DO	1
	Col 4:5 (Lev 25:31a)	יחשבו	תחשב	Substitution of Number	1
	Col 4:8 (Lev 25:34b)	היא	הוא	Substitution of Gender	1
	Col 5:5 (Lev 26:22a)	ושלחתי	והשלחתי	Substitution of Stem	1
	Col 6:2 (Lev 27:13)	יגאלנו	יגאלנה	Substitution of Gender of Pronominal Suffix	1

Table A7. 11Q1: Description of variants, category 2

Description of Variant	Fragment, Line, and Verse	11Q1	MT	Detailed Description of Variant	Statistical Weight
Additions	FG:L7 (Lev 15:3b)	בו כל ימי ז		Addition of Prepositional Phrase	5
	FL:L5, (Lev 22:24a)	תקריבו אלה ליהוה	תקריבו ליהוה	Addition of DO	1
	Col 5:7 (Lev 26:24a)	בחמת ק[ר]י	קרי	Addition of word	1
Omissions	FF:L2 (Lev 14:16b)		באצצעו	Omissions of Prepositional Phrase	3
	FH:L 2 (Lev 17:2a)		בניו ואל	Omission of Phrase: (Homoioarcton)	4
	Col 5:7 (Lev 26:24a)		אר-אני	Omission of adverbial phrase (maybe parablepsis)	2
Substitutions	FC:L1 (Lev 11:27a)	גחון]ניו	כפיו	Substitution of body parts (cf. Lev 11:42 , Freedman and Mathews, 28)	1
	Col 1:7 (Lev 22:25b)	משחתים המ	משחתם בדם	Substitution of Nominal phrase	1
Unclear Variants	FA:L3 (Lev 4:25)	העלה ושפ[כ]	העלה ואת-דמו ישפ[ך]	Omission of DO or Transposition of WO	1
	FA:L4 (Lev 4:26b)	ה וכפר עליו	השלים וכפר עליו	Uncertain: possibly the final ה of 11Q1 represents the remnant of יהוה	1

Table A8. 11Q1: Description of variants, category 3

Description of Variant	Fragment, Line, and Verse	11Q1	MT	Detailed Description of Variant	Statistical Weight
No Variants					

Table A9. 11Q1: Description of variants, not counted in statistics

Description of Variant	Fragment, Line, and Verse	11Q1	MT	Detailed Description of Variant
Insufficient Manuscript Evidence	FH:L7 (Lev 17:5a)	זב[היהמ	זָבָהיָהֶם	The Evidence is Unclear
	FKii:L2 (Lev 21:6b)	קדש[ימ]	קֹדֶשׁ	The Evidence is Unclear
	FE:L3 (Lev 13:42a)	ב^קרחתו^		Spatial Considerations
	FI:L7 (Lev 19:2a)	לאמר. [דבר אל ע[דת	לאמר 2 דָבָר אֶל-כָּל-עֵדֻת	Spatial Considerations
Correction	FI:L1-2] Lev 18:27-28)	א[תמ תירשון] את (אד מ[תמ)		Correction by means of Parenthesis (Freedman and Mathews, 36)
<i>Kethiv/Qere</i>	Col 4:7 (Lev 25:33b)	היא	הוא	<i>Qere Perpetuum</i>
	Col 4:3 (Lev 25:30a)	בעיר לו	בְּעִיר אֲשֶׁר-לא [לו]	Reads with <i>Qere</i>
Synonymous Spellings: Weakening of Gutturals	Col 4:6 (Lev 25:32a)	אזתמ	אָחֲזָתֶם	Omission of Guttural (ח)
	Col 4:7 (Lev 25:34a)	מגש	מִגְרֵשׁ	Omission of Guttural (ר)
	Col 4:9 (Lev 25:36a)	וירת	וְיִרְאֶתָּה	Omission of Guttural (א)
	Col 5:2 (Lev 26:18b)	חטתיכמ	חַטַּאתֵיכֶם	Omission of Guttural (א)
	Col 5:4 (Lev 26:21a)	תבו	תֵּאבֹוּ	Omission of Guttural (א)
	Col 5:5 (Lev 26:21b)	כחטתיכמ	כַּחַטַּאתֵיכֶם	Omission of Guttural (א)
Synonymous Spellings: Scribal Errors	FF:L7 (Lev 14:20b)	עלי	עָלִיו	Likely Scribal Error
	Col 5:3 (Lev 26:19b)	כנחה	כַּנְחִשָּׁה	Likely Scribal Error (Omission of <i>shen</i>)
Synonymous Spelling: Different Forms	FI:L1 (Lev 18:27a)	האלה	הָאֵל	Substitution to more common form
	Col 5:9 (Lev 26:25)	והביאתי	וְהִבֵּאתִי	Substitution of Spelling
Unclear Variants	FF:L3 (Lev 14:17a)	ראתנ[וכ	תְּנֹוּךְ	Likely Synonymous Spelling
Mis-categorization by Freedman and Matthews?	FD:L1 (Lev 13:3b)	וראהו	וְרָאָהוּ	The Texts Agree

Table A10. 11Q2: Description of variants

Category	Description of Variant	Fragment, Line, and Verse	11Q2	MT	Detailed Description of Variant	Statistical Weight
1	Omission	F3:L4 (Lev 13:59)	צמר	הצמר	Omission of the Article	1
		F3:L4 (Lev 13:59)	פושתיים	הפושתיים	Omission of the Article	1
	Substitution	F3:L5 (Lev 13:59)	טהרתו	לטְהַרוּ	Substitution of form	1
2	Additions	F2:L1 (Lev 9:23)	כוֹל		Addition of <i>kōl</i>	1
		F2:L3 (Lev 9:24)	החלב השלמים	המקלבים	Addition of Modifier and substitution of number	2
		F2:L7 (Lev 10:1)	יהוה		Addition (Make Subject Explicit)	1
		F7:L3 (Lev 25:33)	ביתו	בית	Addition of Pronominal Suffix	1
3	No Variants					
Not Counted	Insufficient Manuscript Evidence	F2:L4 (Lev 10:1)	שְׁנֵי		Addition to Context	
	Partially Accepted See Discussion of Variant for Details	F7:L3 (Lev 25:33)	ביתו	בית	Addition of Pronominal Suffix	

Table A11. 4Q29: Description of variants

Category	Description of Variant	Fragment, Line, and Verse	4Q29	MT	Detailed Description of Variant	Statistical Weight
1	Omissions	F1:L1 (Col 1:1 [Deut 29:24])		אֲשֶׁר	Omission of Relative Particle	1
		F4:L1 (Col 2:15 [Deut 31:15])	פֶּתַח	עַל־פֶּתַח	Omissions of Preposition	1
	Substitutions	F2i:L7 (Col 1:14 [Deut 30:10])	הַכְּתוּבִים	כְּתוּבָה	Substitution of Gender and Number	2
		F2ii:L3 (Col 2:10 [Deut 31:11])	תִּקְרָאוּ	תִּקְרָא	Substitution of Number	1
		F7:L2 (Col 3:2 [Deut 31:26])	הַזֹּאת	הַזֶּה	Substitution of Gender	1
	Unclear Variants	F2i:L6 (Col 1:13 [Deut 30:9])	ובפרי אדמתך [ובפרי] בהמתך לטובה	ובפרי בהמתך ובפרי אדמתך לטובה	Transposition or Omission	1
2	Additions	F3:L3 (Col 1:16 [Deut 30:11])	מִמֶּךָ		Addition of Prepositional Phrase	1
		F3:L5 (Col 1:18 [Deut 30:14])	ובידך		Addition of element in a list	4
		F7:L5 (Col 3:5 [Deut 31:28])	[וּזְקִינֵיכֶם וּשְׂפֹטֵיכֶם]		Addition of element in a list	3
3	No Variants					
Not Counted	Not enough manuscript evidence	F8:L3 (Col 3:13 [Deut 32:3])	[גְּדוּלָה]	גְּדָל	Insufficient Manuscript Evidence	
	Synonymous Spelling	F3:L3 (Col 1:16 [Deut 30:11])	היא	הוא	<i>Qere Perpetuum</i>	
		F3:L4 (Col 1:17 [Deut 30:13])	היא	הוא		

Table A12. 4Q30: Description of variants, category 1

Description of Variant	Fragment, Line, and Verse	4Q30	MT	Detailed Description of Variant	Statistical Weight
Additions	F5:L3 (Deut 8:2)	ולדעת	לדעת	Addition of Conjunctive <i>vav</i>	1
Omissions	F5:L3 (Deut 8:2),	נסותך	לנסתך	Omission of ל on Inf Construct	1
	F9:L2 (Deut 10:1)	הראשון]נים	פראשנים	Omission of preposition	1
	F33:L2 (Frgs. 32i, 33:10 [Deut 16:11])	בנך	ובנך	Omissions of conjunctive <i>vav</i>	1
Substitutions	F5:L6 (Deut 8:4)	שלמה	שמלה	Substitution of Nouns	1
	F29:L3 (Frgs. 28-30:L5 [Deut15:18])	שכר	שכיר	Substitution of Adjective for Noun	1
	F32i:L4 (Frgs. 32i, 33:L4 [Deut 16:8])	תאכלו	תאכל	Substitution of Number	1
	F32i:L8 (Frgs. 32i, 33:L8 [Deut 16:10])	מ]תת	מסת	Substitution of Similar Lexeme	1
	F32i:L8 (Frgs. 32i, 33:L8 [Deut 16:10])	נדבות	נדבת	Substitution of Number	1
	F41:L1 (Frgs. 36-41:L8 [Deut 17:19])	בה	בו	Substitution of Gender	1
	F45i:L4 (Deut 27:26)	ואמר	ואמר	Substitution of Number	1
	F45ii:L2 (Deut 28:22)	ירדפוך	ורדפוך	Substitution of Tense	1
	F54i:L2 (Frgs. 54i, 55:L2 [Deut 31:16])	ועזבוני	ועזבני	Substitution of Number	1
	F54i:L2 (Frgs. 54i, 55 [Deut 31:16])	והפרו	והפר	Substitution of Number	1
	F54i:L4 (Frgs. 54i, 55:L4 [Deut 31:17])	ואמרו	ואמר	Substitution of Number	1
	F54i:L8 (Frgs. 54i, 55:L8 [Deut 31:19])	שימיה	שימה	Substitution of Number	1
	Unclear Variants	F22:L1 (Frgs. 22-23:L1 [Deut 13:7])		בתך	Either Omission or Transposition of Words
F26:L4 (Frgs. 26-27:L4 [Deut 15:2])			אתרעהו ואת אחיו	Either Omission or Transposition of Words	1
F42:L1 (Deut 26:19)		ולתפ]ארת ו]לתהלה	לתהלה ולשם ולתפארת	Either Omission or Transposition of Words	1

Table A13. 4Q30: Description of variants, category 2

Description of Variant	Fragment, Line, and Verse	4Q30	MT	Detailed Description of Variant	Statistical Weight
Additions	F3i:L3 (Frgs. 2, 3i:L3 [Deut 4:14])	ה[ירדן		Addition of Accusative	2
	F9:L3 (Deut 10:2)	יהוה		Addition of Divine Name	1
	F32i:L5 (Frgs. 32i, 33:L5 [Deut 16:8])	בו כל		Addition of Prepositional Phrase	3
	F42:L2 (Deut 26:19)	לך		Addition of Prepositional Phrase	2
	F42:L3 (Deut 27:1)	הזאת		Addition of demonstrative pronoun and article	2
	F55:L2 (Frgs. 54i, 55:L5 (Deut 31:17))	יהוה		Addition of Divine Name	1
	F55:L3 (Frgs. 54i, 55:L6 [Deut 31:18])	ממנן		Addition of Prepositional Phrase	2
Omissions	F32i:L10 (Frgs. 32i, 33:L10 [Deut 16:11])		אשר בשעריך	Omission of Relative Clause	4
	F42:L5 (Deut 28:1)		לשמר	Omission of ל plus infinitive Clause	2
Substitutions	F32i:L4 (Frgs. 32i, 33:L4 [Deut 16:8])	שבעת	שש	Substitution of Cardinal Number	1
	F32i:L4 (Frgs. 32i, 33:L4 [Deut 16:8])	מצות תאכלו	תאכל מצות	Substitution: Transposition of Word Order	1
	F53:L5 (Deut 29:19)	ודבקה	ורבצה	Substitution of Nouns	1
	F54i:L3 (Frgs. 54i, 55:L3 [Deut 31:17])	ועזבתיך	ועזבתים	Substitution of Suffix (number and person)	1

Table A14. 4Q30: Description of variants, category 3

Description of Variant	Fragment, Line, and Verse	4Q30	MT	Detailed Description of Variant	Statistical Weight
No Variants					

Table A15. 4Q30: Description of variants, not counted in statistics

Description of Variant	Fragment, Line, and Verse	4Q30	MT	Detailed Description of Variant	Statistical Weight
Insufficient Manuscript Evidence	F4:L2 (Deut 7.4)]אלהי]		Addition of Divine Name	
	F17:L3 (Frgs. 17-18:L3 [Deut 12:19])	האד[מֵה]	אָדְמָה	Omission of Pronominal Suffix	
	F22:L1 (Frgs. 22-23:L1 [Deut 13:7])	בן אביך		Added Element to a List	
	F47:L4 (Frgs. 46-47:L5 [Deut 28:11])	ובפרי אדמתך		Added Element to a List	
	F54i:L7 (Frgs. 54i, 55:L7 [Deut 31:19])	ועת	ועתה	Substitution of Similar Particle	
	F54i:L7 (Frgs. 54i, 55:L7 [Deut 31:19])	דב[רִי		Addition of Modifier	
<i>Kethiv/Qere</i>	F12:L3 (Frgs. 12-15:L3 [Deut 11:10])	היא	הוא	<i>Qere Perpetuum</i>	
Synonymous Spellings	F21:L1 (Deut 13:5)	תלכון	תלכו	Indicative <i>Nun</i>	

Table A16. 4Q35: Description of variants

Category	Description of Variant	Fragment, Line, and Verse	4Q35	MT	Detailed Description of Variant	Statistical Weight
1	Addition	F4:L4 (Frgs. 2-4:L29 [Deut 1:37])	שמה	שם	Addition of Accusative <i>he</i>	1
		F6:L2 (Frgs. 5-6:L5 [Deut 1:44])	החרמה	הרמה	Addition of Article	1
		F12:L3 (Frgs. 11-15:L5 [Deut 33:12])	ולבנימן	לבנימן	Addition of Conjunctive <i>vav</i>	1
		F12:L5 (Frgs. 11-15:L6 [Deut 33:13])	וממגד	ממגד	Addition of Conjunctive <i>vav</i>	1
	Omission	F1:L6 (Deut 1:7)	בנגב	ובנגב	Omission of conjunctive <i>vav</i> in list	1
		F12:L1 (Frgs. 11-15:L3 [Deut 33:9])	בריתך	ובריתך	Omission of Conjunctive <i>vav</i>	1
		F12:L9 (Frgs. 11-15:L11 [Deut 33:20])	ואף	אף	Omission of Conjunctive <i>vav</i>	1
	Substitution	F4:L5 (Frgs. 2-4:L30 [Deut 1:39])	ידע	ידעו	Substitution of Number	1
		F6:L5 (Frgs. 5-6:L8 [Deut 2:3])	לך	לכם	Substitution of Number	1
		F12:L1 (Frgs. 11-15:L3 [Deut 33:9])	שמר	שמרו	Substitution of Number	1
		F12:L1 (Frgs. 11-15:L3 [Deut 33:10])	יור	יורו	Substitution of Number	1
		F13:L1 (Frgs. 11-15:L3 [Deut 33:10])	ישם	ישמו	Substitution of Number	1
		F12:L2 (Frgs. 11-15:L4 [Deut 33:11])	ופעלת	ופעל	Substitution of Gender	1
		F12:L3 (Frgs. 11-15:L5 [Deut 33:12])	מחופף	חפף	Substitution of Stem: Po'el/Qal	1
		F14:L1 (Frgs. 11-15:L6 [Deut 33:15])	וממגד	ומראש	Substitution of Synonym	1
		F15:L2 (Frgs. 11-15:19 [Deut 33:19])	הרי	הר	Substitution of Number	1

Table A16 continued

2	Addition	F10:L1 (Deut 31:9)	על] ספר		Addition of Prepositional Phrase	2
		F11:L1 (Deut 33:8)	[הבו ללו]		Addition of Phrase	3
	Omission	F4:L1 (Frgs. 2-4:L26 [Deut 1:33])	להראות	לראתכם	Omission of Pronominal Suffix	1
	Unclear: Likely Omission and Addition	F12:L3 (Frgs. 11- 15:L5 [Deut 33:12])	אל	עליו	Substitution: Scribal Error?	3
3	No Variants					
Not Counted	Insufficient Manuscript Evidence	F11:L2 (Frgs. 11- 15:L2 [Deut 33:9])	ראיתך]	ראיתיו	Final <i>kap</i> could be read as <i>vav</i>	
		F12:L2 (Frgs. 11- 15:L4 [Deut 33:11])	מ[ת]ני	מתנים	Insufficient Manuscript Evidence	
		F11:L4 (Frgs. 11- 15:L4 [Deut 33:11])	ב[ל	מן	Insufficient Manuscript Evidence	
	Synonymous Spellings	F6:L6 (Frgs. 5-6:L9 [Deut 2:4])	ויראו	וייראו	Synonymous Spellings	
		F12:L6 (Frgs. 11- 15:L8 [Deut 33:17])	קרנו	קרניו	Orthography or Substitution of Number	
	<i>Kethiv/Qere</i>	F12:L1 (Frgs. 11- 15:L3 [Deut 33:9])	בנו	בנו [בניו]	Agrees with <i>Kethiv</i> (orthographic only)	

Table A17. 4Q37: Description of variants

Category	Description of Variant	Fragment, Line, and Verse	4Q37	MT	Detailed Description of Variant	Statistical Weight
1	Addition	Col 5:2 (Deut 8:5)	כּן		Addition of particle	1
	Omission	Col 3:1 (Deut 5:22)	עָנָן וְעַרְפֵּל	הָעָנָן וְהָעַרְפֶּל	Omission of Article	1
		Col 4:4 (Deut 5:31)	הַ[ה] וְקִיָּם	וְהַקִּיָּם	Omission of Conjunctive vav	1
	Substitution	Col 3:4 (Deut 5:24)	הַנָּה	הֵן	Substitution of Synonym	1
		Col 3:7 (Deut 5:25)	מִן־סָפִים יָם	יָסָפִים	Substitution of Stem (See Qimron, §310.16)	1
		Col 8:3 (Deut 11:7)	הַגְּדֹלִים	הַגְּדֹל	Substitution of Number	1
		Col 10:1 (Exod 12:46)	לְחֹזֶן	חֹזֶה	Substitution of adverbial of place	1
		Col 10:2 (Exod 12:48)	אֶתְכֶם	אֶתְךָ	Substitution of Number	1
2	Addition	Col 1:2 (Deut 5:1)	הַזֶּה		Addition of Demonstrative Pronoun	2
		Col 5:3 (Deut 8:6)	בְּכֹל דַּרְכָּיו	בְּדַרְכָּיו	Addition of כל	1
		Col 5:5 (Deut 8:7)	וְרַחֲבָה		Addition from Parallel Context	2
		Col 8:4 (Deut 11:8)	וְהַמְשַׁפְּטִים		Addition from Parallel Context	3
	Substitution	Col 8:2 (Deut 11:6)	מִקְרָב	בְּקִרְבָּב	Substitution of Prepositional Phrases	1
		Col 10:13 (Exod 13:5)	כַּאֲשֶׁר	אֲשֶׁר	Substitution to Parallel Context	1
		Col 12:14 (Deut 32:8)	בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל	בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים	Substitution of Synonym	1
3	No Variants					

Table A17 continued

Not Counted	Insufficient Manuscript Evidence	Col 1:1 (Deut 5:1)	שג[ע]ה	שמע	Insufficient Manuscript Evidence	
		Col 3:10 (Deut 5:27)	אל"כ[ה]		Insufficient Manuscript Evidence	
		Col 3:10 (Deut 5:27)	ואתה[Insufficient Manuscript Evidence	
		Col 4:7 (Deut 5:33)	תלכ[ון]	תלכו	Insufficient Manuscript Evidence	
		Col 10:12 (Exod 13:5)	אל ה[ארץ]	אל-ארץ	Insufficient Manuscript Evidence	
		Col 10:12-13 (Deut 13:5)	החתי	והחתי	Addition of Conjunctive <i>vav</i>	
		Col 9:1 (Deut 11:21)?			Duncan says the text goes from Deut 11:21 to Ex 12:43, but the text is too fragmentary and depends on conjecture (DJD, 88)	
	Synonymous Spelling	Col 5:9 (Deut 8:9)	ומהריה	ומהרריה	4Q37 has Collapsed Form	

Table A18. 4Q38: Description of variants

Category	Description of Variant	Fragment, Line, and Verse	4Q38	MT	Detailed Description of Variant	Statistical Weight
1	Omission	F1:L2 (Deut 5:29)		אֵת	Omission of Marker of Accusative	1
		F2:L13 (Deut 11:12)	שנה	הַשָּׁנָה	Omission of Article	1
	Substitution	F2:L3 (Deut 11:7)	הגדלים	הַגְּדֹלִים	Substitution of Number	1
		F2:L8 (Deut 11:10)	אתמה באים	אֵתְמָה בָּאִים	Substitution of Number	1
		F2:L10 (Deut 11:10)	ברגליכה	בְּרַגְלֶיךָ	Substitution of Number	1
2	Addition	F2:L4 (Deut 11:8)	החוקים]ים [וְהַמִּשְׁפָּטִים		Addition of Parallel verse	3
		F2:L5 (Deut 11:8)	ורביתם		Addition of Parallel verse	2
		F2:L6 (Deut 11:8)	את הירדן		Addition of Parallel verse	3
	Omission	F1:L2 (Deut 5:29)		כָּל	Omission of <i>kōl</i>	1
3	No Variants					
Not Counted	Synonymous Spelling	F2:L6 (Deut 11:9)	תאריכון	תֵּאֲרִיכּוֹ	Addition of Indicative Nun	
		F2:L9 (Deut 11:10)	היאה	הוא	<i>Qere perpetuum</i>	

Table A19. 4Q38a: Description of variants

Category	Description of Variant	Fragment, Line, and Verse	4Q38a	MT	Detailed Description of Variant	Statistical Weight
1	Addition	F1:L6 (Deut 19:11)	אל אחת מן הערים האלה	אל-אחת הערים האל	Addition: Harmonization to Parallel Passage	1
		F3:L2 (Frgs. 2- 3:L12 [Deut 20:17])	והה[וי]	ההוי	Omission of Conjunctive Vav	1
		F5:L7 (Deut 26:4)	את		Addition of Marker of Accusative	1
	Substitution	F1:L3 (Deut 13:3)	מצו[כמה]	מְצוּדָה	Substitution of Number	1
2	Substitution	F2:L3 (Frgs. 2- 3:L3 [Deut 20:8])	השופטים	השֹׁטְרִים	Substitution of Noun	1
		F5:L6 (Deut 26:3)	לפני יהוה	ליהוָה	Substitution of Prepositions	1
3	No Variants					
Not Counted	Insufficient Manuscript Evidence	F4:L8 (Deut 24:3)	אשר לקחה [לו לאשה		Addition based on Spatial Considerations	
	Orthographic substitution	F1:L6 (Deut 19:11)	האלה	האל	More common Orthographic Form	

Table A20. 4Q40: Description of variants

Category	Description of Variant	Fragment, Line, and Verse	4Q40	MT	Detailed Description of Variant	Statistical Weight
1	Addition	F5:L6 (Deut 7:22)	לכלותמה	בלתם	Addition of Preposition	1
	Omission	F1:L7 (Frgs. 1-3:L7 [Deut 3:22])	ולוא	לא	Addition of Conjunctive <i>vav</i>	1
	Substitution	F4:L3 (Deut 4:33)	שמעתמה	שמעתך	Substitution of Number	1
2	Addition	F1:L3 (Frgs. 1-3:L3 [Deut 3:20])	אלוהיכמה ^		Addition of Divine Name	2
3	No Variants					
Not Counted	Insufficient Manuscript Evidence	F1:L7 (Frgs. 1-3:L7 [Deut 3:21])	ש[ש]°	שמה		
	<i>Kethiv/Qere</i>	F1:L5 (Frgs. 1-3:L5 [Deut 3:21])	ההוא	הוא	<i>Qere Perpetuum</i>	

Table A21. 4Q41: Description of variants, category 1

Description of Variant	Fragment, Line, and Verse	4Q41	MT	Detailed Description of Variant	Statistical Weight
Additions	Col 1:6, (Deut 8:9)	ולוא	לא	Addition of Conjunctive <i>vav</i>	1
	Col 2:2 (Deut 5:1)	שמעה	שָׁמַע	Addition of Emphatic <i>heh</i>	1
	Col 2:10-11 (Deut 5:5)	ואנוכי	אֲנֹכִי	Addition of Conjunctive <i>vav</i>	1
	Col 3:4 (Deut 5:9)	וכול	כָּל	Addition of Conjunctive <i>vav</i>	1
	Col 3:10 (Deut 5:13)	ועשית את כול	וְעָשִׂיתָ כָּל	Addition of Marker of Accusative	1
	Col 3:11 (Deut 5:14)	וביום השביעי	וַיּוֹם הַשְּׁבִיעִי	Addition of preposition (interpretative?)	1
	Col 5:6 (Deut 5:24)	ביום הזה	הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה	Addition of Preposition	1
Omissions	Col 1:4 (Deut 8:8)	חטה ושעורה וגפן תאנה ורמון	חֹטֶה וְשַׁעֲרָה וְגִפְנֵי יִתְאָנֶה וְרִמּוֹן	Omission of Conjunctive <i>vav</i>	1
	Col 3:6 (Deut 5:9)	על שלשים	וְעַל-שְׁלֹשִׁים	Omission of Conjunctive <i>vav</i>	1
	Col 3:6 (Deut 5:10)	עושה	וְעֹשֶׂה	Omission of Conjunctive <i>vav</i>	1
	Col 3:12-Col 4:1 (Deut 5:14)	אתה בנך בתך עבדך ואמתך שורך וחמורך ובהמתך גריד	וּבְנֶךָ וּבִתְךָ וְעַבְדְּךָ וְאִמְתְּךָ וְשׁוֹרְךָ וְחֲמֹרְךָ וְכָל-בְּהֵמַתְךָ וְגֵרְךָ	Omission of Conjunctive <i>vavs</i>	4
	Col 4:5-7 (Deut 5:15// Exod 20:11)		את	Omission of Marker of Accusative	1
	Col 4:10-11 (Deut 5:21)	לוא תחמוד אשת רעיך לוא תחמוד בית רעיך	וְלֹא תִחְמַד אִשְׁתְּ רֵעִיךָ וְלֹא תִחְמַד בַּיִת רֵעִיךָ	Omission of Conjunctive <i>vav</i>	2
	Col 4:11-12 (Deut 5:21)	שדהו עבדו אמתו שורו חמורו וכול אשר לרעיך	שָׂדֵהוּ וְעַבְדּוֹ וְאִמְתּוֹ שׁוֹרוֹ וְחֲמֹרּוֹ וְכָל אֲשֶׁר לְרֵעִיךָ	Omission of Conjunctive <i>vav</i>	3
	Col 5:2 (Deut 5:22)	ענן וערגל	הָעֲנָן וְהָעֲרָפֶל	Omission of Articles	2
Substitution	Col 2:10-11 (Deut 5:5)	דברי	דָּבָר	Substitution of Number	1
	Col 4:4 (Deut 5:15)	לשמור	לְעֲשׂוֹת	Substitution of Synonym	1
	Col 5:9 (Deut 5:26)	חי	חַיִּים	Substitution of Number	1
	Col 5:9 (Deut 5:27)	ידבר	יֵאמֵר	Substitution of Synonym	1

Table A22. 4Q41: Description of variants, category 2

Description of Variant	Fragment, Line, and Verse	4Q41	MT	Detailed Description of Variant	Statistical Weight
Addition	Col 1:2 (Deut 8:7)	אל ארץ טובה ורחבה	אֶל-אֶרֶץ טוֹבָה	Addition: Parallel Passage	1
	Col 2:7 (Deut 5:3)	היים היום	הַיּוֹם	Addition of today	2
	Col 2:10-11 (Deut 5:5)	דברי יהוה אלוהיכם	דְּבַר יְהוָה	Addition to Divine Name	2
	Col 3:14 (Deut 5:14)	תעשה בו כל	תַעֲשֶׂה כָּל	Addition of Prepositional Phrase	2
	Col 4:5-7 (Deut 5:15)	לקדשו		Addition of Inf Construct	1
	Col 5:2 (Deut 5:22)	חושך		Added Word	1
Omissions	Col 3:12-Col 4:1 (Deut 5:14)		וְכָל	Omission of <i>kōl</i> particle	1
Substitution	Col 1:3 (Deut 8:6)	ולאהבה	וּלְיִרְאָה	Substitution to Parallel Passage	1
	Col 4:4 (Deut 5:15).	לשמור	לַעֲשׂוֹת	Substitution to Parallel Passage	1
	Col 5:6 (Deut 5:24)	יהוה	אֱלֹהִים	Substitution of Divine Name	1

Table A23. 4Q41: Description of variants, category 3

Description of Variant	Fragment, Line, and Verse	4Q41	MT	Detailed Description of Variant	Statistical Weight
No Variants					

Table A24. 4Q41: Description of variants, not counted in statistics

Description of Variant	Fragment, Line, and Verse	4Q41	MT	Detailed Description of Variant	Statistical Weight
Insufficient Manuscript Evidence	Col 5:10 (Deut 5:27)	ואתה	ואת	Obscure but just orthography if given	
Synonymous Spelling	Col 1:7 (Deut 8:9)	ומהריה	ומהרריה	Orthography: collapsed form or full form	
	Col 3:4 (Deut 5:9)	תעובדם	תעבדם	Orthographic (DSS Spelling)	
	Col 3:7 (Deut 5:10)	מצוותי	מצויתו [מצויתי]	Yod/vav are indistinguishable (DJD, 124) Agrees with <i>qere</i>	
	Col 4:6 (Deut 5:15//Exod 20:11)	וינוח	וינח	Difference in orthography	
	Col 4:10-11 (Deut 5:21)	רעיד	רעיד	Orthography: 4Q41 could be pausal form (happens twice)	
	Col 4:11-12 (Deut 5:21)	רעיד	רעיד	Orthography: 4Q41 could be pausal form (happens twice)	
	Col 5:2 (Deut 5:22)	ויכותבם	ויכתבם	Orthographic (DSS Spelling)	
Addition due to Excerpted Nature	Col 4:5-7 (Exod 20:11)	כי ששת ימים עשה יהוה את השמים ואת הארץ את הים וכול אשר במ וינוח ביום השביעי על כן ברך יהוה את יום השבת לקדשו	כי נששת ימים עשה יהוה את השמים ואת הארץ את הים ואת כל אשר במ ונח ביום השביעי על כן ברך יהוה את יום השבת לקדשו	Addition from Parallel Passage	

Table A25. 5Q1: Description of variants

Category	Description of Variant	Fragment, Line, and Verse	5Q1	MT	Detailed Description of Variant	Statistical Weight	
1	Addition	Col 1:5 (Deut 7:19)	הע[]		Addition but the <i>ayin</i> is obscured.	1	
2	Addition	Col 1:5 (Deut 7:19)	היום		Addition of Day	2	
3	No Variants						
Not Counted	Insufficient Manuscript Evidence	Col 2:6 (Deut 8:13)	בקרד	ובקרד			
		Col 2:9 (Deut 8:17)	בלבבדם	בלבבד			
	Substitution of Spelling	Col 1:3 (Deut 7:17)	האל	האלה		Synonymous form of Demonstrative Pronoun	
		Col 1:3 (Deut 7:17)	איך	איכה		Substitution of Synonymous Pronoun	
		Col 2:4 (Deut 8:9)	ומ[הריה	ומהרריה		Substitution of Spelling	
	Corrections from a Second Hand	Col 1:1 (Deut 7:15)	^ראיתה ^ואשר			Correction not prima mana	
		Col 2:6 (Deut 8:12)	^בם^			Correction not prima mana	
		Col 2:6 (Deut 8:13)	בקרד	ובקרד		Omission of Conjunctive vav	
		Col 2:9 (Deut 8:17)	בלבבדם	בלבבד		Possible Correction, but too little evidence	
	Correction: Insufficient Manuscript Evidence	Col:15 (Deut 9:2)	את [השמים] ואת הארץ^			Correction but depends on too little evidence	

APPENDIX 2

TABLES OF THE PROPHETIC TEXTS

Table A26. 4Q47: Description of variants

Category	Description of Variant	Fragment, Line, and Verse	4Q47	MT	Detailed Description of Variant	Statistical Weight	
1	Addition	F9i:L1 (Col 4:1 [Josh 7:12])	ולא	לא	Addition of Conjunctive vav	1	
		F9i:L9 (Col 4:9 [Josh 7:16])	אֵת		Addition of Marker of Accusative	1	
	Omissions	F1:L1 (Col 1:1 [Josh 8:35])			אֲשֶׁר	Omission of Relative Particle	1
		F9i:L7 (Col 4:7 [Josh 7:15])	כי	וְכִי		Omission of Conjunctive vav	1
	Substitution	F4:L1 (Col 2:1 [Josh 6:5])	ועלה	וְעָלוּ		Substitution: Collective	1
		F9i:L3 (Col 4:3 [Josh 7:13])	בקרבתכם	בְּקִרְבְּךָ		Substitution: Collective	1
		F9i:L4 (Col 4:4 [Josh 7:13])	אויביכם	אֹיְבֵיךָ		Substitution: Collective	1
2	Addition	F1:L1 (Col 1:1 [Josh 8:35])	את [יה] וישו			Addition: Make Object Explicit	1
		F1:L2 (Col 1:2 [Josh 8:35])	את [בעברו] הירד [ו]			Addition: Make time Explicit	3
		F3:L4 (Col 2:4 [Josh 6:7])	יהושוע			Addition: Make Subject Explicit	1
		F9i:L1 (Col 4:1 [Josh 7:12])	ולא פנים			Harmonization to common phrase (cf. Jer 2:27; 18:17; 32:33; 2 Chron 29:6)	3
	Omission	F9i:5 (Col 4:5 [Josh 7:14])			יְהוָה יִקְרַב לְמִשְׁפַּחֹת וְהַמִּשְׁפָּחָה אֲשֶׁר-יִלְכְּדָנָה	Parablepsis due to haplography	10
	Substitution	F2:L5 (Col 1:10 [Josh 5:6])	ראות		הִרְאוּתָם	Substitution: Verbal Stem	1
		F9i:L6 (Col 4:6 [Josh 7:15])	בהם		בְּתָרְם	Substitution: Noun for Pronoun	1

Table A26 continued

Potential Category 3 variants	Addition plus reworked section	Addition of Joshua 8:34-35 and reworked section from Joshua 4:18		Fragment 1 and 2	Addition and Reworking	21
3	No Variants					
Not Counted	Insufficient Manuscript Evidence	F9i:L1 (Col 4:1 [Josh 7:12])	איביו	איביקם	Proposed difference in Number	
		F20:2 (Frgs. 19-22:L2 [Josh 10:9])	הלך	עלה	Proposed Substitution of Lexical Stem	
		F21-22:L2 (Frgs. 19-22:L5 [Josh 10:11])		גדלות	Proposed Omission: Further Description	
	Synonymous Spellings	F19:L2 (Frgs. 19-22:L2 [Josh 10:9])	ויבו^א^אל		Proposed Synonymous Spelling: Weakening of Gutturals	
	Uncertain Placement of Fragment 15	F15:L1 (Col 5:10 [Josh 8:10])	והוקנים	ווקני ישראל	Proposed Omission: Implicit	
		F15:L2 (Col 5:10 [Josh 8:11])	וישובו	עלו	Proposed Substitution of Lexical Stem	
		F15:L13 (Col 5:10 [Josh 8:14])	לקראתם	לקראת- ישראל	Proposed Substitution: Noun for Pronoun	
		F15:L5 (Col 5:10 [Josh 8:18?])	ב'ידך אלהעי		Ambiguous Correction	

Table A27. 4Q49: Description of variants

Category	Description of Variant	Fragment, Line, and Verse	4Q49	MT	Detailed Description of Variant	Statistical Weight
1	Omission	L3 (Judges 6:4)	שה שור	וְשָׁה וְשׁוֹר	Omission of Conjunctive <i>vavs</i>	2
	Substitution	L9 (Judges 6:13)	שספרו	אֲשֶׁר סָפְרוּ	Substitution of Relative Pronoun	1
2	Omission	L2 (Judges 6:3)	וְעָלוּ עָלָיו		Omission: Parablepsis	4
	Substitution	L8 (Judges 6:13)	אלהים	יְהוָה	Substitution of Divine Name	1
3	No Variants					
Not Counted	Differences from the Excerpting Process	L5-6 (Judges 6:5)			Omission of Judges 6:7b-10	
	Depends on Insufficient Manuscript Evidence	L4 (Judges 6:5)		וְלִגְמִלֵיהֶם	Proposed Omission	
	Synonymous Spelling	L6 (Judges 6:11)	האביעזרי	אָבִי הָעֶזְרִי	Synonymous Spelling of Gentilic	

Table A28. 6Q4: Description of variants

Category	Description of Variant	Fragment, Line, and Verse	6Q4	MT	Detailed Description of Variant	Statistical Weight
2	Substitution	F11:L2 (Frgs. 10-14:L2 [2 Kgs 7:8])	[משואם	משם	Different reading of Consonants	2
		F15:L6 (2 Kings 8:41)	ספר נא	ספֿרה־נָא	Emphasis	1
		F15:L6 (2 Kings 8:4)	א[ל[י]שע	איש־האלהים	Substitution: a name for a title	1
Not Counted	Insufficient Manuscript Evidence	F5:L5 (1 Kings 22:31)	[ויצו [מל[ך ארם	וּמְלֹךְ אֲרָם צָנִיָּה	Only the top of the lamed is visible	
		F10:L4 (Frgs. 10-14:L4 [2 Kings 7:9])	עֲתָהּ]	וְעַתָּה		
		F15:L1 (2 Kings 7:20)	כדבר איש האלהים]		The final <i>mem</i> is clear, but not enough text is present to identify the reading	
		F15:L3 (2 Kings 8:1)	את	אתי [את]	<i>Qere</i> may side with 6Q4 but evidence is insufficient	
		F15:L4 (2 Kings 8:2)		וּמְלֹךְ הַיָּא וּבֵיתָהּ וּתְגָר		
		F15:L4 (2 Kings 8:2)	[אל ארז]	בְּאֲרָז		
		F15:L5 (2 Kings 8:2)	ותבא א[ל העיר	וּתְבָא לְעֵקָה		
	Synonymous Spelling	F15:L4 (2 Kings 8:1)	על	אֵל	Confusion of Gutturals	

Table A29. 1QIsa^a: Description of variants (category 2, addition variants)

Fragment, Line, and Verse	1QIsa ^a	MT	Detailed Description of Variant	Statistical Weight
Col 1:16 (Isa 1:13)	ועצרתה	ועצרה	Addition of Pronominal Suffix: Explicit	1
Col 1:18-19 Isa 1:15)	אצבעותיכם בעאון		Addition: Parallel Context (cf. Isa 59:3 [DJD, 119])	4
Col 2:5 (Isa 1:31)	החסנכם	החסן	Addition of Pronominal Suffix: Explicit	1
Col 4:2 (Isa 3:24)	בשת		Addition: Interpretive	1
Col 4:6 (Isa 4:2)	ויהודה		Addition: Explicit/Dittography/Parablepsis	2
Col 5:21 (Isa 6:1)	כסאו	כסא	Addition of Pronominal Suffixes: Explicit	1
Col 7:16 (Isa 7:25)	יראת ^א ברזל ^א	יראת	Addition: Interpretive	1
Col 7:22 (Isa 8:4)	לקראו	קרא	Additions: Pronominal suffix: Explicit	1
Col 11:30 (Isa 13:22)	ענוגו	ענג	Addition of Pronominal Suffix: Explicit/Dittography or Parablepsis	1
Col 11:30 (Isa 13:22)	עוד		Addition of Adverb: Explicit	1
Col 12:2 (Isa 14:2)	רבים		Addition of Attributive Adjective: Explicit	1
Col 12:2 (Isa 14:2)	רבים		Addition: Parallel Context (cf. Isa 2:3)	1
Col 12:2 (Isa 14:2)	אל אדמתם		Addition: Explicit/Parablepsis	3
Col 15:14 (Isa 19:11)	חכמיה		Addition of Pronominal Suffix: Explicit	1
Col 15:21 (Isa 19:16)	מ ^א ה ^א ניף ידו		Addition: Explicit	2
Col 16:21 (Isa 21:7)	איש		Addition: Explicit	1
Col 17:29 (Isa 22:14)	לכם		Addition: Explicit	2
Col 20:7 (Isa 25:9)	יהוה		Addition: Expansion of Divine Name	1
Col 20:14 (Isa 26:2)	שעריך	שערים	Addition of Pronominal Suffix: Explicit	1
Col 20:29 (Isa 26:16)	לחשו	לחש	Addition of Pronominal Suffix: Explicit	1
Col 20:31 (Isa 26:18)	ישוטתך	ישועת	Addition of Pronominal Suffix: Explicit	1
Col 23:12 (Isa 30:6)	צרה וציה	צרה	Addition: Dittography/Parablepsis	2
Col 24:31 (Isa 30:19)	יהוה		Addition: Explicit	1
Col 25:16 (Isa 30:30)	השמיע השמיע	והשמיע	Addition: Dittography	1

Table A29 continued

Col 25:19 (Isa 30:32)	מוסדו	מוֹסְדָה	Addition of Pronominal Suffix: Explicit	1
Col 25:31 (Isa 30:33)	הכיני		Addition: Dittography/Parablepsis	1
Col 26:2 (Isa 31:6)	לאשר		Addition: Dittography	2
Col 26:22 (Isa 32:11)	וספדנה		Addition: Harmonization to Common Word Pair	1
Col 28:3 (Isa 34:4)	והעמקים יתבקעו		Addition: harmonization to Micah 1:4 (See Kutscher, 273)	4
Col 28:23 (Isa 35:6)	ילכו		Addition: Explicit	1
Col 28:24 (Isa 35:8)	שמה שמה	שָׁם	Addition: Dittography	1
Col 28:30 (Isa 36:2)	מאודה		Addition: Explicit	1
Col 29:4 (Isa 36:4)	אתה בטחתה בו	בְּטָחָתְךָ	Addition: Explicit	3
Col 30:13 (Isa 37:9)	וישוב		Addition: Explicit/Parablepsis	2
Col 30:26 (Isa 37:20)	אלוהים		Addition: Expansion of Divine Name	1
Col 31:3 (Isa 37:25)	זרים		Addition: Harmonization (cf. 2 Kings 19:24] Kutscher, 540)	1
Col 31:6 (Isa 37:27)	קומכם		Addition in a List: Parallel Passage or Parablepsis/Dittography	1
Col 31:27 (Isa 38:6)	למעני ולמען דויד עבדי		Addition: Harmonization	7
Col 31:28-29 (Isa 38:8)	במעלות עלית אחז	בְּמַעְלוֹת אָחָז	Addition: Adds Historical Detail	1
Col 32:7 (Isa 38:15)	ליא		Addition: Explicit	2
Col 32:17 (Isa 39:2)	כל		Addition: Explicit	1
Col 32:25 (Isa 39:6)	יבואו		Addition: Explicit	1
Col 33:12 (Isa 40:12)	בזרתו	בְּזָרְתָּ	Addition of Pronominal Suffix: Explicit	1
Col 33:17 (Isa 40:18)	תדמיוני	תְּדַמְיוֹנִי	Addition of Pronominal Suffix: Explicit	1
Col 33:18 (Isa 40:19)	ויעשה		Addition: Explicit	1
Col 33:26 (Isa 40:26)	כוחו	כֹּחַ	Addition of Pronominal Suffix: Explicit	1
Col 35:10 (Isa 42:1)	ומשפטו	מִשְׁפָּט	Addition of Pronominal Suffix: Explicit	1
Col 35:24 (Isa 42:14)	אך		Addition: Emphasis	1

Table A29 continued

Col 37:5 (Isa 43:25)	עוד		Addition: Emphasis	1
Col 37:12 (Isa 44:6)	שמו		Addition: Parallel Context (cf. Isa 47:4; 48:2; 51:15; 54:5 [DJD, 165])	2
Col 37:18 (Isa 44:13)	נטהו		Addition of Pronominal Suffix: Explicit	1
Col 37:24 (Isa 44:19)	לאמור		Addition: Dittography	1
Col 38:6 (Isa 44:28)	והיכל־אֵי	וְהִיכָל	Addition of Pronominal Suffix: Explicit	1
Col 38:16 (Isa 45:9)	אדם		Addition: Idiom Damaged Exemplar?	1
Col 39:16 (Isa 46:11)	יצרתיה	בְּצַרְתִּי	Addition of Pronominal Suffix: Explicit	1
Col 40:23 (Isa 48:17)	אשר תלך בה	מַלְךְ	Addition:	3
Col 41:5 (Isa 49:7)	אדוני		Addition: Divine Title	1
Col 41:5 (Isa 49:7)	גואלכה	גֹּאֵל	Addition of Pronominal Suffix: Explicit	2
Col 42:17 (Isa 51:3)	נס יגון ואנחה		Addition to Parallel Passages	4
Col 43:23 (Isa 52:8)	ברחמים		Addition: Parallel Passage	2
Col 43:28-29 (Isa 52:12)	אלוהי כול הארץ יקרא		Addition: Parallel Passage (Isa 54:5 [DJD, 175])	5
Col 44:2 (Isa 52:14)	משחתי	מִשַּׁחַת	Addition: Interpretative	1
Col 44:6 (Isa 53:2)	לו		Addition: Explicit	2
Col 44:8 (Isa 53:3)	ונבוזוהו	נִבְזָה	Addition of Pronominal Suffix: Explicit	1
Col 44:19 (Isa 53:11)	אור		Addition: Interpretive	1
Col 44:22 (Isa 53:12)	ולפשעיהמה	וְלַפְשָׁעִים	Addition: Explicit	1
Col 45:3 (Isa 54:6)	יהוה		Addition of Divine Name	1
Col 45:7 (Isa 54:9)	עוד		Addition: Adverbial Idea	1
Col 46:20 (Isa 56:7)	יעלו		Addition: Explicit (cf. Isa 60:7] DJD, 179)	1
Col 46:23 (Isa 56:10)	המה		Addition: Explicit	1
Col 47:10 (Isa 57:11)	ותיראיני	נִתְיָרָאִי	Addition: Pronominal Suffix (Interpretative)	1
Col 47:11 (Isa 57:11)	אלה		Addition: Explicit	1

Table A29 continued

Col 47:12 (Isa 57:12)	קובצִיךְ		Addition: Explicit	2
Col 47:14 (Isa 57:14)	המסלה		Addition: Parallel Passage	2
Col 47:18 (Isa 57:18)	לוא		Addition: Explicit	2
Col 48:2 (Isa 58:7)	בגד		Addition: Explicit	1
Col 48:19 (Isa 59:7)	וחמס		Addition in a List: Parallel Passage or Parablepsis	2
Col 49:15-16 (Isa 60:13)	נתן לך		Addition: Explicit	3
Col 49:17 (Isa 60:14)	כול		Addition: Explicit	1
Col 49:22 (Isa 60:19)	בלילה		Addition: Explicit	1
Col 49:25 (Isa 60:21)	יהוה		Addition: Explicit	1
Col 50:1 (Isa 61:4)	יקוממו		Addition: Explicit	1
Col 50:18 (Isa 62:7)	עד יכין ועד יכונן ועד ישים	עד־יְכוֹנֵן וְעַד־יְשִׁים	Addition: Marginal Reading?/Dittography	3
Col 50:20 (Isa 62:9)	אם		Addition: Emphasis	1
Col 50:21 (Isa 62:9)	את שם יהוה	אֶת־יְהוָה	Addition: Harmonization	1
Col 50:21-22 (Isa 62:9)	אמר אלוהיך		Addition: Explicit	3
Col 50:23 (Isa 62:10)	מאבן הנגף	מֵאֲבָן	Addition: Interpretive	2
Col 50:29 (Isa 63:3)	ומעמי	וּמְעַמִּים	Addition of Pronominal Suffix: Explicit	1
Col 51:12 (Isa 63:16)	הואה		Addition: Emphasis	1
Col 51:16 (Isa 64:1 [Eng 2])	לצריכה		Addition: Immediate Context/Interpretative	3
Col 51:27 (Isa 65:1)	שאלוני	שְׁאַלוּ	Addition of Pronominal Suffix: Explicit	1
Col 53:12 (66:2)	והחורד	וּחְרָד	Addition: Harmonization	1
Col 54:3 (Isa 66:16)	יבוא		Addition: Explicit	1
Col 54:13 (Isa 66:21)	ליא		Addition: Explicit	1

Table A30. 1QIsa^a: Description of variants (category 2, omission variants)

Fragment, Line, and Verse	1QIsaa	MT	Detailed Description of Variant	Statistical Weight
Col 2:10 (Isa 2:3)		אֶל־הַר־יְהוָה	Omission: parablepsis	3
Col 3:28 (Isa 3:22)		וְהַמְטָפְחוֹת	Omission in List: Parablepsis	3
Col 4:10 (Isa 4:5-6)		וְעָשׂוּ וְנָגַה אֵשׁ לְהִבָּה לְיָלֵה כִּי עַל־כָּל־כְּבוֹד הַקְּדוֹשׁ: וְסָקָה תַהֲרִיגָה לְצַל־יְיֹמָם	Omission: Parablepsis	18
Col 4:12 (Isa 5:1)		נָא	Omission: Implicit	1
Col 5:5 (Isa 5:19)	יחיש	יְחִישָׁה	Omission: Implicit	1
Col 5:15 (Isa 5:27)		בו	Omission of Prepositional Phrase: Implicit	2
Col 5:22 (Isa 6:2)		שֵׁשׁ כְּנָפִים	Omission: Parablepsis	2
Col 5:24 (Isa 6:3)		וְאָמַר קְדוֹשׁ	Omission: Parablepsis	3
Col 6:14 (Isa 7:2)		לְכַבּוֹ	Omission: Parablepsis	2
Col 8:2 (Isa 8:9)		הַתְּאֲזְרוּ נְחֹתוֹ	Omission: Parablepsis?	3
Col 8:17 (Isa 8:23)	ארץ... והארץ	אַרְצָה... וְאַרְצָה	Omission: Implicit	2
Col 9:20 (Isa 10:6)	ולשום	וּלְשׁוֹמוֹ	Omission: Implicit	1
Col 10:26 (Isa 11:9)		בְּכָל־הָר	Omission: Implicit	3
Col 11:1 (Isa 11:12)	מכנפות	מֵאַרְבַּע כְּנָפֹת	Omission: Parablepsis (Simplify idiom)	1
Col 11:4 (Isa 11:15)	רוח	רוּחוֹ	Omission: Implicit	1
Col 11:18 (Isa 13:9)	וחטאים	וְחַטָּאִים	Omission: Implicit	1
Col 12:19 (Isa 14:18)		כָּלָם	Omission: Implicit	2
Col 12:24 (Isa 14:23)	ושמתי	וְשַׁמְתִּיהָ	Omission: Implicit	1
Col 12:24-25 (Isa 14:23)	וטאטאתי	וְטֹאטַאֲתִיהָ	Omission: Implicit	1
Col 13:26 (Isa 16:8b-9a)		בְּעֵלֵי גוֹיִם הִלְמוּ שְׂרוּקֶיהָ עַד־יַעֲזֹר נִגְעוּ תַעֲוֵי מִדְּבַר שְׁלַחוֹתֶיהָ נִטְשׂוּ עֲבָרֵי יָם: עַל־כֵּן אֲבָרְכָהּ בְּכִי יַעֲזֹר גִּפְנוֹ שְׂבָמָה	Omission: parablepsis due to haplography	23
Col 14:10 (Isa 17:6)	בסעפי	בְּסַעְפֶּיהָ	Omission: Implicit	1
Col 14:12 (Isa 17:8)	מעשיו	מַעֲשֵׂה יָדָיו	Omission: Simplify idiom	1
Col 15:2 (Isa 18:7)		צְבָאוֹת	Omission: Abbreviated Divine Title	1
Col 15:32 (Isa 19:23)		מִצְרַיִם	Omission: Implicit	1

Table A30 continued

Col 16:31 (Isa 21:14)	בלהם	בְּלִחְמוֹ	Omission: Implicit	1
Col 17:2 (Isa 21:16)		כָּל	Omission: Implicit	1
Col 18:21 (Isa 23:15)	לצר	וְנִשְׁכַּחַת צֹר שְׁבָעִים שָׁנָה כִּימֵי מִלְדָּה אֶחָד מֵאֲרָץ שְׁבָעִים שָׁנָה יִהְיֶה	Omission: parablepsis	14
Col 18:24 (Isa 23:17)		כָּל	Omission: Implicit	1
Col 19:2 (Isa 24:6)		אֲרָץ	Omission: Implicit	1
Col 19:22 (Isa 24:22)		אֶסִיר	Omission: Implicit	1
Col 20:17 (Isa 26:5)		יִשְׁפִּילָהּ	Omission: Parablepsis	2
Col 20:17-18 (Isa 26:6)		רַגְלָהּ	Omission: Parablepsis	1
Col 1:4 (Isa 26:21)		הִנֵּה	Omission: Implicit	1
Col 20:19 (Isa 26:8)	קוינו	קוֹיֵנוּ	Omission: Implicit	1
Col 22:30 (Isa 28:22)		אֲדֹנָי	Omission: Simplify Divine Name	1
Col 23:4 (Isa 28:27-28)		לְחֵם	Omission: Implicit	1
Col 24:27 (Isa 30:17)	ומפני	מִפְּנֵי גִעַרְתִּי	Omission: Implicit	1
Col 28:17 (Isa 34:16)		מִהִנָּה	Omission: Implicit	2
Col 28:17 (Isa 34:16)		לֹא פָקְדוּ	Omission: Implicit	2
Col 28:18 (Isa 34:17)	חלקת	חִלְקֹתָהּ	Omission: Pronominal Suffix	1
Col 28:24 (Isa 35:8)	ודרך	וְדֶרֶךְ וְדֶרֶךְ	Omission: Haplography	2
Col 30:24 (Isa 37:18)		וְאֶת־אֲרָצָם	Omission: Parablepsis	4
Col 31:7 (Isa 37:29)		יַעַן הִתְרַגְּזָה אֵלַי	Omission: Parablepsis	5
Col 32:3 (Isa 38:11)		יְהִי	Omission: Haplography	1
Col 33:7 (Isa 40:7-8)		כִּי רִיחַ יִהְיֶה גִשְׁבָּה כִּי אֶבֶן חֲצִיר הָעָם: יִבֶשׂ חֲצִיר גַּבְלֵי צִיץ	Omission: Parablepsis	14 (corrected to MT) See how the hand of the corrector repeats ודבר אלוה[י]נו

Table A30 continued

Col 33:19 (Isa 40:20)	המסכן תרומה	המסכן תרומה	Omission: space left blank/erased and filled in later by corrector to align with MT (Martin, 546)	3
Col 35:2 (Isa 41:24)		מאפע	Omission: Implicit	2
Col 35:12 (Isa 42:3)	יכבה	יכבנה	Omission: Implicit	1
Col 36:18 (Isa 43:9)	ישמיעו	ישמיענו	Omission: Implicit	1
Col 36:28 (Isa 43:19)	תדעו	תדעוה	Omission: Implicit	1
Col 37:2 (Isa 43:23)	לעולה	עלתיה	Omission: Implicit	1
Col 37:26 (Isa 44:20)		הלוא	Omission: Implicit	2
Col 38: 10 (Isa 45:4)	ובשם הכהן נכה	בשמה אכנה	Omission: Implicit	1
Col 39:11 (Isa 46:6)	ויעשה	ויעשהו	Omission: Implicit	1
Col 40:20 (Isa 48:15)	קראתי	קראתיו	Omission: Implicit	1
Col 40:25 (Isa 48:20)		הוציאנה	Omission: Implicit	2
Col 40:26 (Isa 48:21)	הוליכו	הוליקם	Omission: Implicit	
Col 43:14 (Isa 52:1)	עוז	עוזך	Omission: Implicit	1
Col 43:14 (Isa 52:1)		עוד	Omission: Implicit	1
Col 43:17 (Isa 52:4)		אלני	Omission: Abbreviated Divine Title	1
Col 43:19 (Isa 52:5)		יהנה	Omission: Implicit	1
Col 43:22 (Isa 52:8)	קולם	קול	Omission: Implicit	1
Col 45:19 (Isa 55:1)		ואכלו ולכו שקרו	Omission: Parablepsis	5
Col 47:18 (Isa 57:18)		ואנחהו	Omission: Parablepsis	3
Col 47:19 (Isa 57:19)	שלום	שלום שלום	Omission: Haplography	1
Col 48:14 (Isa 59:3)		שפתותיכם דברו-שקר	Omission: Parablepsis (no trigger?)	4
Col 48:25 (Isa 59:13)		הרו	Omission: Parablepsis	1
Col 49:5 (Isa 59:21)		אמר יהנה	Omission: Implicit	2
Col 49:8 (Isa 60:5)		ופחד	Omission: Parablepsis	2

Table A30 continued

Col 49:12 (Isa 60:9)	בני	בְּנֵי	Omission: Implicit	1
Col 49:26 (Isa 61:1)	יהוה	אֲדֹנָי יְהוִה	Omission: Abbreviated Divine Title	1
Col 50:17 (Isa 62:6)		תְּמִיד	Omission: Implicit	1
Col 50:23 (Isa 62:10)	עברו	עֲבְרוּ עֲבְרוּ	Omission: Parablepsis/Dittography	1
Col 51:7 (Isa 63:11)	המעלה	הַמַּעֲלָם	Omission: Implicit	1
Col 51:9 (Isa 63:12)		לוֹ	Omission: Implicit	2
Col 51:17 (Isa 64:2 [Eng., 3])	בעשותה נוראות נקוה	בְּעֲשׂוֹתָהּ נֹרְאוֹת לֹא נִקְוָה	Omission: Different Fact	1
Col 51:22 (Isa 64:7 [Eng., 8])	חמר	הַחֲמֶר	Omission: Definiteness	1
Col 52: 6 (Isa 65:7)	הרים	הַהָרִים	Omission: Definiteness	1
Col 54:5 (Isa 66:17)		יָסֶפּוּ	Omission: Implicit	1
Col 54:10 (Isa 66:20)		מִכָּל	Omission: Implicit (Corrected by Second Hand to MT)	2
Col 54:14 (Isa 66:22)	חדשים	הַחֲדָשִׁים	Omission: Different Syntax	1

Table A31. 1QIsa^a: Description of variants (category 2, substitution variants)

Fragment, Line, and Verse	1QIsaa	MT	Detailed Description of Variant	Statistical Weight
Col 1:9 (Isa 1:7)	ושממו עליה כמ^א^פכת זרים	ושממה כמהפכת זרים	Substitution of Parts of Speech: Agency	1
Col 1:18 (Isa 1:15)	הרבו	תרבו	Substitution of Tense	1
Col 1:28 (Isa 1:24)	מצריו	מצרי	Substitution of Pronominal Suffix (Graphic Confusion)	1
Col 1:28 (Isa 1:24)	ואנקם מ^ה^איבו	אנקמה מאזבי	Substitution of Tense and Pronominal Suffix	2
Col 1:28 (Isa 1:25)	והשיב	ואשיבה	Substitution of Tense/Person	1
Col 2:4 (Isa 1:30)	אשר אין מים	אשר מים אין	Transposition	1
Col 2:5 (Isa 1:31)	ופעלכם	ופעלו	Substitution of Pronominal Suffix	1
Col 2:28 (Isa 2:20)	אצ[בעותיו	לו	Substitution of Syntax: Harmonization Immediate Context (Isa 2:8 [DJD, 121])	1
Col 3:16 (Isa 3:11)	ישוב	יעשה	Substitution of Lexeme and Voice	1
Col 3:23 (Isa 3:16)	וטופף	וטפף	Substitution of Tense	1
Col 3:24 (Isa 3:17)	{{אדוני}} ^יהוה^	אדני	Substitution of Divine Name: Correction against the MT	1
Col 4:9 (Isa 4:4)	סער	בער	Substitution: Graphic similarity	1
Col 4:13 (Isa 5:2)	ויברא	ויבן	Substitution of Lexeme	1
Col 4:15 (Isa 5:4)	בכרמי	לכרמי	Substitution of Preposition	1
Col 4:16 (Isa 5:5)	אודיע	אודיעה	Substitution: Tense	1
Col 4:17 (Isa 5:5)	אסיר	הסר	Substitution: Tense	1
Col 4:22 (Isa 5:8)	וישתם	והושבתם	Substitution: Verbal Stem	1
Col 4:26 (Isa 5:11)	מאחזי	מאחרי	Substitution: Graphic Similarity	1
Col 5:10 (Isa 5:24)	ואש	ונחש	Substitution: Graphic/Phonetic Similarity	1
Col 5:24 (Isa 6:3)	וקראים	וקרא	Substitution: Tense	1
Col 5:25 (Isa 6:4)	נמלא	ימלא	Substitution: Tense	1
Col 6:3 (Isa 6:10)	השמ	השמן	Substitution: Graphic Similarity/Similar Lexeme	1
Col 6:6 (Isa 6:11)	יהוה	אדני	Substitution: Divine Name	1
Col 6:9 (isa 6:13)	משלכת	בשלכת	Substitution: Graphic/Phonetic similarity	1
Col 6:28 (Isa 7:14)	יהוה	אדני	Substitution: Divine Name	1
Col 7:19 (Isa 8:2)	והעד	ואעדה	Substitution: Tense	1
Col 7:21 (Isa 8:3)	הנביא	הנביאה	Substitution: Gender	1
Col 7:23 (Isa 8:4)	אביו ואמו	אבי ואמי	Substitution: Pronominal Suffixes	1
Col 8:25 (Isa 9:6)	אותו ולסעדר	אתה ולסעדה	Substitution: Pronominal Suffixes	1

Table A31 continued

Col 8:27 (Isa 9:7)	יהוה	אֱדֹנָי	Substitution: Divine Name	1
Col 8:27 (Isa 9:8)	וירעו	וַיִּדְעוּ	Substitution: Graphic Similarity	1
Col 9:1 (Isa 9:11)	על	עַד	Substitution: Preposition	1
Col 9:5 (Isa 9:16)	לוא יחמ'וּל	לֹא יִשְׁמַח	Substitution: Similar Lexeme	1
Col 9:9 (Isa 9:18)	מעברת	בְּעֵבֶרֶת	Substitution: Graphic Similarity	1
Col 9:27 (Isa 10:13)	יואמר	אָמַר	Substitution: Tense	1
Col 10:11 (Isa 10:24)	משבט	בַּשִּׁבְטִים	Substitution: Graphic and Phonological Similarity	1
Col 10:12 (Isa 10:26)	ויעיר	וַעֲוָרָר	Substitution: Verbal Stem	1
Col 10:17 (Isa 10:32)	ינופ	יִנְפֹף	Substitution: Verbal Stem	1
Col 10:24 (Isa 11:6)	ימרו	וַיִּמְרִיאוּ	Substitution: Parts of Speech (Graphic Similarity)	1
Col 10:27 (Isa 11:9)	תמלאה	מִלְאָהּ	Substitution: Tense	1
Col 12:4 (Isa 14:2)	ורדים	וַיִּרְדּוּ	Substitution: Tense	1
Col 12:20-21 (Isa 14:19-20)	תחת	תַּחַד	Substitution: Lexeme	1
Col 12:14 (Isa 14:23)	קפז	קִפְדוּ	Substitution: Phonetic Similarity	1
Col 12:27 (Isa 14:25)	מעליכמה	מִעֲלֵיהֶם	Substitution: Person	1
Col 12:27 (Isa 14:25)	שכמכמ	שִׁכְמוֹ	Substitution: Person	1
Col 13:2-3 (Isa 14:30)	אהרוג	יִהְיֶה	Substitution: Person	1
Col 13:4 (Isa 14:31)	ואין מודד במודעיו	וְאֵין בּוֹדֵד בְּמוֹדְעָיו	Substitution: Graphic/Phonetic Similarity	1
Col 13:6 (Isa 15:1)	עיר	עָרָה	Substitution: Proper Name for Noun	1
Col 13:6 (Isa 15:1)	עיר	קִיר	Substitution: Proper Name for Noun	1
Col 13:12 (Isa 15:5)	יערו	יִעְצְרוּ	Substitution: Verbal Stem	1
Col 13:14 (Isa 15:7)	תישאום	יִשְׂאוּם	Substitution: Person	1
Col 13:24 (Isa 16:6-7)	לכן...ולכן לוא	לֹא יִכֹּן... לָכֵן	Substitution: Adverbs	2
Col 13:26 (Isa 16:9)	ארזיך	אֲרִיזָה	Substitution: Graphic Similarity	1
Col 13:30 (Isa 16:12)	בא	נִלְאָה	Substitution: Lexeme (figurative/concrete)	1
Col 14:2 (Isa 16:14)	כבוד	כְּבִיר	Substitution: Graphic Similarity	1
Col 14:20 (Isa 17:12)	כבדים	כְּבִירִים	Substitution: Graphic Similarity	1
Col 14:26 (Isa 18:2)	בזאי	בְּזָאוֹ	Substitution: Part of Speech (Graphic Similarity)	1

Table A31 continued

Col 15:2 (Isa 18:7)	בזאי	בָּזָאוּ	Substitution: Part of Speech (Graphic Similarity)	1
Col 15:11 (Isa 19:8)	הדגים	הַדְּגִיִּים	Substitution: Defective?	1
Col 15:28 (Isa 19:20)	וירד	וַרְבַּ	Substitution: Graphic/Phonetic Similarity/Lexeme	1
Col 15:30 (Isa 19:22)	ונרפו	וַנְּרֹפֵא	Substitution: Tense	1
Col 16:6 (Isa 20:2)	תחליץ	תַּחֲלִיץ	Substitution: Verbal Stem	1
Col 16:10 (Isa 20:5)	מבטחם	מִבְּטָחָם	Substitution: Phonetic Similarity/Similar Lexeme	1
Col 16:12 (Isa 20:6)	נסמך	נִסְנוּ	Substitution: Similar Lexeme	1
Col 16:14 (Isa 21:1)	דבר	מִדְּבַר	Substitution: Graphic similarity	1
Col 16:15 (Isa 21:2)	היגד	הִגֵּד	Substitution: Voice	1
Col 16:18 (Isa 21:4)	תועה	תַּעֲוֶה	Substitution: Tense	1
Col 16:21 (Isa 21:8)	הראה	אַרְיֵה	Substitution: Graphic Similarity/Interpretive	1
Col 16:25-26 (Isa 21:10)	גדרי	גְּרָנִי	Substitution: Graphic Similarity	1
Col 17:1 (Isa 21:16)	שלוש שנים	שָׁנָה	Substitution of Years	1
Col 17:6 (Isa 22:3)	אסורה	אַסְרוּ	Substitution: Tense	1
Col 17:9 (Isa 22:5)	מקרקר קדשו על ההר	מִקְרַקֵּר קֶר וְשׁוֹעַ אֶל־הַהָר	Substitution: Faulty Word Division/Graphic Similarity	1
Col 17:27 (Isa 22:19)	הרסך	יִהְרָסֶךָ	Substitution: Tense	1
Col 18:6 (Isa 23:2)	עברו	עָבְרוּ	Substitution: Tense	1
Col 18:6 (Isa 23:2)	מלאכך	מְלֹאכְךָ	Substitution: Graphic Similarity	1
Col 18:14 (Isa 23:9)	כול גאון צבי	גֹּאוֹן כָּל־צְבִי	Substitution: Transposition	1
Col 18:14 (Isa 23:9)	עבדי	עֲבָדִי	Substitution: Graphic Similarity	1
Col 20:7 (Isa 25:9)	ואמרת	וְאָמַרְתְּ	Substitution: Person	1
Col 18:17 (Isa 23:11)	מעוזיה	מְעֻזָּיָה	Substitution: Graphic Similarity	1
Col 20:12 (Isa 25:12)	יגיע	הִגִּיעַ	Substitution: Tense	1
Col 20:18 (Isa 26:7)	תפלט	תִּפְלֹט	Substitution: Graphic/Phonetic Similarity	1
Col 20:19 (Isa 26:8)	ולתורתך	וּלְתוֹרַתְךָ	Substitution: Interpretive	1
Col 20:21 (Isa 26:10)	יחון	יֶחֱוֶן	Substitution: Verbal Stem	1
Col 20:24 (Isa 26:12)	תשפוט	תִּשְׁפֹּט	Substitution: Graphic/Phonetic Similarity	1
Col 20:17 (Isa 26:14)	ותאסר	וּתְאַבֵּד	Substitution: Graphic Similarity	1
Col 21:1 (Isa 26:19)	יקיצו וירננו	יִקְצוּ וַיִּרְנְנוּ	Substitution: Tense	1
Col 21:16 (Isa 27:7)	הורגיו	הַרְגָיו	Substitution: Voice	1

Table A31 continued

Col 21:31 (Isa 28:2)	ליהוה	לאדני	Substiution: Divine Name	1
Col 21:20 (Isa 28:16)	מיסד	יסד	Substitution: Tense	1
Col 22:26 (Isa 28:20)	משתיים	מהשתרע	Substiution: Graphic/Phonetic Similarity	1
Col 22:26-27 (Isa 28:20)	והמסכסה בהתכנס	והמסכה צרה כהתכנס	Substiution: Graphic Similarity/Faulty Word Division	1
Col 22:27 (Isa 28:21)	בהר...בעמק	כהר...בעמק	Substiution: Graphic Similarity	2
Col 23:4 (Isa 28:27)	יסוב	יוסב	Substiution: Verbal Stem	1
Col 23:11 (Isa 29:5)	זדיך	זריד	Substiution: Grpahic Similarity	1
Col 23:14 (Isa 29:7)	ומצרתה	ומצדתה	Substiution: Graphic Similarity	1
Col 23:23 (Isa 29:13)	רחוק	רסוק	Substiution: Parts of Speech	1
Col 24:9 (Isa 30:3)	לכמה	לקלמה	Substitution: Transposition	1
Col 24:10 (Isa 30:5)	כלה באש	כל הבאיש [הביש]	Substitution: Faulty Word division	2
Col 24:10 (Isa 30:5)	תועיל	להועיל	Substitution: Parts of Speech	1
Col 24:12 (Isa 30:6)	ואין מים	מקם	Substiution: Grpahic Confusion/Interpretation	1
Col 24:18 (Isa 30:11)	תסירו	סורו	Substitution: Tense and Stem	1
Col 24:21 (Isa 30:12)	ותעלוז	ונלוז	Substitution: Graphic Similarity	1
Col 26:2 (Isa 31:5)	והפליט	והמליט	Substitution: Graphic/Phonetic Similarity	1
Col 26:6 (Isa 31:8)	ולוא	לו	Substitution: Phonetic Confusion	1
Col 26:7 (Isa 31:9)	מנוס	מנס	Substitution: Lexeme	1
Col 26:10 (Isa 32:2)	בצל	כצל	Substitution: Graphic Confusion	1
Col 26:13-14 (Isa 32:5)	יואמר	יאמר	Substitution: Stem	1
Col 26:14 (Isa 32:6)	חושב	יעשה	Substitution: Parts of Speech/Lexeme	1
Col 26:30 (Isa 32:19)	היער	העיר	Substitution: Lexeme/Transposition of Letters (cf. earlier in the verse)	1
Col 27:3 (Isa 33:2)	הושעתנו	ישועתנו	Substitution: Parts of Speech	1
Col 27:3 (Isa 33:3)	מדמתך	מך וממתך	Substitution: Graphic Similarity	1
Col 27:8 (Isa 33:8)	עדים	ערים	Substitution: Graphic Similarity	1

Table A31 continued

Col 27:9 (Isa 33:9)	חפור	הַחֲפִיר	Substitution: Parts of Speech	1
Col 27:21 (Isa 33:19)	תִּי־רָאוּ	תִּרְאֶה	Substitution: Lexeme	1
Col 27:28 (Isa 33:23)	כִּי	כֹּן	Substitution: Graphic Similarity	1
Col 28:3 (Isa 34:4)	יפולו	וְנִמְקוּ	Substitution: Interpretative	1
Col 28:5 (Isa 34:5)	תראה	רִוְתָהּ	Substitution: Graphic Similarity	1
Col 28:14-15 (Isa 34:14)	ירגיעו	הִרְגִיעָהּ	Substitution: Tense	1
Col 28:15 (Isa 34:15)	קופד	קפוז	Substitution: Graphic Similarity	1
Col 28:17 (Isa 34:16)	פיהו	פִּי	Substitution: Person	1
Col 29:4 (Isa 36:5)	אמרתה	אֲמַרְתִּי	Substitution: Person (Harmonization to Context)	1
Col 30:28 (Isa 37:21)	אליו	אֵלַי	Substitution: Person	1
Col 31:3 (Isa 37:25)	קראתי	קָרַתִּי	Substitution: Graphic/Phonologic Similarity	1
Col 31:5 (Isa 37:26)	נצורים	נְצִיִּים	Substitution: Graphic Similarity	1
Col 31:6 (Isa 37:27)	הנשדפ לפני קד־מ	וּשְׂדָמָה לִפְנֵי קָמָה	Substitution: Graphic Similarity and Interpretive	2
Col 31:7 (Isa 37:28)	הרגזכה	הַתְרַגְזָהּ	Substitution: Verbal Stem	1
Col 32:1 (Isa 38:10)	פקודתי	פְּקֻדָּתִי	Substitutions: Parts of Speech (Graphic Similarity)	1
Col 32:1 (Isa 38:10)	ומר	יִמַּר	Substitutions: Graphic Similarity	1
Col 32:4 (Isa 38:12)	יכלה	וְנִגְלָהּ	Substitution: Graphic Confusion	1
Col 32:4 (Isa 38:12)	ספרתי	קִפְדָּתִי	Substitution: Graphic Similarity	1
Col 32:5 (Isa 38:13)	שפותי	שְׁוִיתִי	Substitution: Graphic Similarity	1
Col 32:5 (Isa 38:13)	ישבור	יִשְׁבַּר	Substitution: Stem	1
Col 32:8 (Isa 38:16)	חיו רוחו	חַיֵּי רוּחִי	Substitution: Less Direct	2
Col 32:9 (Isa 38:17)	מאודה	מֵר	Substitution: Interpretative	1
Col 32:16 (Isa 39:1)	והיה	וַיִּחְזַק	Substitution: Interpretive	1
Col 32:26 (Isa 39:7)	ממעיקה	מִמְקָהּ	Substitution: Interpretative	1
Col 33:12 (Isa 40:12)	מי ים	מִיִּים	Substitution: Graphic Similarity	1
Col 33:17 (Isa 40:17)	וכאפס	מֵאֶפֶס	Substitution: Graphic Similarity	1
Col 33:18 (Isa 40:19)	מסך	מָסַךְ	substitution: Phonological Similarity	1

Table A31 continued

Col 34:6 (Isa 41:2)	נודף	נָדַף	substitution: Verbal Stem	1
Col 34:6 (Isa 41:3)	לוא יבינו	לא יבוא	Substitution: Verbal Stem (Graphic Similarity)	1
Col 34:8 (Isa 41:5)	יחדו	יַחַדְדוּ	Substitution: Parts of Speech (Graphic Similarity)	1
Col 34:9 (Isa 41:7)	יואמר	אמר	Substitution: Tense	1
Col 35:2 (Isa 41:23)	ונשמעה	וְנִשְׁמָעָה	Substitution: Lexeme (Graphic Similarity)	1
Col 35:3 (Isa 41:25)	העירות	הַעִירוּתִי	Substitution of Person: (Shift in Agency)	1
Col 35:3 (Isa 41:25)	בשמו	בְּשִׁמִּי	Substitution: Person (Harmonization)	1
Col 35:13 (Isa 42:4)	ינהילו	יְנַחֲלוּ	Substitution: Lexeme (Graphic Similarity)	1
Col 35:14 (Isa 42:5)	האלוהים	יְהוָה	Substitution: Divine Name	1
Col 35:17 (Isa 42:7)	אסור	אָסִיר	Substitution: Verbal Stem (Graphic Similarity)	1
Col 35:22 (Isa 42:11)	יצריחו	יִצְרְחוּ	Substitution: Harmonization (cf. 42:13 [DJD, 163]))	1
Col 35:23 (Isa 42:13)	יודיע	יָרִיעַ	Substitution: Lexeme (Graphic Similarity)	1
Col 36:2 (Isa 42:20)	פתחו	פָּקְחוּם	Substitution: Lexeme (Grammatical Update)	1
Col 36:18 (Isa 43:9)	ישמיעו	וְיִשְׁמָעוּ	Substitution: Stem (Interpretative)	1
Col 36:20 (Isa 43:10)	היה	יְהִיָּה	Substitution: Tense (Style)	1
Col 36:29 (Isa 43:19)	נתיבות	נְקָרוֹת	Substitution: Graphic Similarity/Harmonization to Immediate Context	1
Col 37:1 (Isa 43:20)	אתן	נָתַתִּי	Substitution: Tense (Style)	1
Col 37:3 (Isa 43:23)	ולוא עשיתה ליא מנחה	לא תַעֲבֹדְתִיךָ בְּמִנְחָה	Substitution: Lexeme (Interpretative)	1
Col 37:9-10 (Isa 44:4)	כבין	כָּבִין	Substitution: Preposition (Graphic Similarity)	1
Col 37:18 (Isa 44:12)	לוא שותה מים	לא־שָׁתָה מִיָּם	Substitution: Part of Speech	1
Col 37:18 (Isa 44:12)	ויועף	וַיִּעָף	Substitution: Part of Speech (Graphic Similarity)	1
Col 37:20 (Isa 44:15)	והגה	וְהִגָּה	Substitution: Graphic similarity (Scribal error)	1
Col 37:21 (Isa 44:15)	או	אָף	Substitution: Particle (Graphic Similarity)	1
Col 37:22 (Isa 44:16)	ויאכל ועל גחליו ישב ויחם	יאֲכַל יִצְלָה צְלִי וְיִשְׁבַּע אֶף־יָחֵם	Substitution: Graphic Confusion	4
Col 37:22 (Isa 44:16)	נגד	רָאִיתִי	Substitution: Parts of Speech (Interpretive)	1
Col 37:22 (Isa 44:17)	יעשה	עָשָׂה	Substitution: Tense (Style)	1

Table A31 continued

Col 37:22 (Isa 44:17)	לבליו עז	לפסלו	Substitution: Explanatory Note or Harmonization (cf. Isa 44:19 [DJD, 166])	1
Col 37:26 (Isa 44:20)	יוכיל	יציל	Substitution: Lexeme (Graphic Similarity)	1
Col 37:27 (Isa 44:21)	תשאני	תנשני	Substitution: Lexeme Verbal Stem/Aramaic Influence	1
Col 38:2 (Isa 44:24)	מיא אתי	מי אתי [מ] [אתי]	Substitution: Interpretative	1
Col 38:8 (Isa 45:2)	יאושר	אושר [אישר]	Substitution: Person (Direct)	1
Col 38:8 (Isa 45:2)	אשבור	אשבר	Substitution: Verbal Stem (Intensity)	1
Col 38:13 (Isa 45:7)	טוב	שלום	Substitution: Lexeme	1
Col 38:17 (Isa 45:10)	תחולין	תחילין	Substitution: Lexeme (Graphic Similarity)	1
Col 38:24 (Isa 45:16)	צורים	צירים	Substitution: Lexeme (Graphic Similarity)	1
Col 38:29 (Isa 45:20)	ואתיו	נתדו	Substitution: Parts of Speech (Phonetic Similarity)	1
Col 39:2 (Isa 45:22)	והושיעו	והנשעו	Substitution: Verbal Stem (Voice)	1
Col 39:4 (Isa 45:24)	ליא יאמר	לי אמר	Substitution: Tense (Aspect)	1
Col 39:6 (Isa 46:1)	משמועיהמה	משא לעינה	Substitution: Lexemes (Graphic Similarity and Different Word Division)	2
Col 39:7 (Isa 46:2)	יוכלו	יכלו	Substitution: Tense (Aspect)	1
Col 39:8 (Isa 46:3)	ממני בטן ונושאים	מני בטן הנושאים	Substitution: Voice and Preposition (Updating)	1
Col 39:11 (Isa 46:6)	בכיס	מכיס	Substitution: Prepositions (Graphic Similarity)	1
Col 39:15 (Isa 46:10)	יעשה	אעשה	Substitution: Person (Direct)	1
Col 39:18 (Isa 46:13)	קרובה	קרבתתי	Substitution: Part of Speech (Agency)	1
Col 38:22 (Isa 47:2)	שולך	שקל	Substitution: Graphic Similarity	1
Col 38:26 (Isa 47:7)	עוד	עד	Substitution: Parts of Speech (Graphic Similarity)	1
Col 39:27 (Isa 47:7)	אחרונה	אחריתה	Substitution: Graphic Similarity	1
Col 39:27 (Isa 47:8)	עודנה	עדינה	Substitution: Graphic Similarity	1
Col 39:27 (Isa 47:8)	אראה	אדע	Substitution: Verbal Stem (Graphic Similarity)	1

Table A31 continued

Col 39:29 (Isa 47:9)	אלמנה	אַלְמָן	Substitution: Harmonization	1
Col 39:40 (Isa 47:10)	בדעתך	בְּרַעְיוֹנְךָ	Substitution: Lexeme (Graphic Similarity)	1
Col 40:3 (Isa 47:13)	יבוא עליהמה	יָבֹאוּ עָלֶיךָ	Substitution: Person (Direct)	1
Col 40:3 (Isa 47:14)	הצילו	יִצִּילוּ	Substitution: Tense (Style)	1
Col 40:12 (Isa 48:7)	שמעתים	שְׁמַעְתֶּם	Substitution of Person: Harmonization to Immediate Context	1
Col 40:13 (Isa 48:8)	שמעתי	שְׁמַעְתָּ	Substitution: Person Harmonization to Immediate Context	1
Col 40:13 (Isa 48:8)	לוא פתחת אוזנכה	לֹא-פִתַּחְתָּ אָזְנוֹךָ	Substitution: Person (Agency)	1
Col 40:14 (Isa 48:8)	יקראו	קִרְאוּ	Substitution: Part of Speech (Description)	1
Col 40:15 (Isa 48:10)	בחנתיכה	בְּחַנְתִּיךָ	Substitution: Lexeme (Graphic Similarity)	1
Col 40:16 (Isa 48:11)	איכה איחל	אֵיךְ יִחַל	Substitution: Person (Direct)	1
Col 40:17 (Isa 48:12)	אלה	אַלֵּי	Substitution: Part of Speech (Graphic Similarity)	1
Col 40:18 (Isa 48:14)	יקבצו כולם וישמעו	הִקְבְּצוּ כֻלְכֶם וְשָׁמְעוּ	Substitution: Tense/Person (Direct)	3
Col 40:19 (Isa 48:14)	אהבי	אַהְבּוּ	Substitution: Part of Speech and Person (Direct: Graphic Similarity)	2
Col 40:19 (Isa 48:14)	חפצי	חִפְצוֹ	Substitution: Person (Direct)	1
Col 40:23 (Isa 48:17)	הדריכה	מְדַרְיָךָ	Substitution: Part of Speech (Description)	1
Col 40:24 (Isa 48:19)	וצאצאיכה	וְצִאצְאֵי מַעְיָדְךָ	Substitution: Abbreviated Idiom	1
Col 41:1 (Isa 49:5)	יוצרך	יֹצְרִי	Substitution: Person (Direct)	1
Col 41:2 (Isa 49:5)	עזרי	עֲזִי	Substitution: Similar Lexeme (Graphic Similarity)	1
Col 41:6 (Isa 49:7)	ראו	יִרְאוּ	Substitution: Tense	1
Col 41:6 (Isa 49:7)	יבחרכה	וַיִּבְחַרְךָ	Substitution: Tense	1
Col 41:7 (Isa 49:8)	אענכה	עֲנִיתִיךָ	Substitution: Tense	1
Col 41:7 (Isa 49:8)	אעזרכה	עֲזַרְתִּיךָ	Substitution: Tense	1
Col 41:9 (Isa 49:9)	על כול הרים	עַל-יַדְרָכִים	Substitution: Lexemes (Graphic Similarity)	2
Col 41:12 (Isa 49:13)	מנחם	נַחֵם	Substitution: Part of Speech	1

Table A31 continued

Col 41:16 (Isa 49:17)	בונִיד	בְּנִיד	Substitution: Part of Speech (cf. Isa 54:13)	1
Col 41:23 (Isa 49:23)	והוי	והיו	Substitution: Graphic Similarity	1
Col 41:25 (Isa 49:24)	עריץ	צדיק	Substitution: Lexeme (Harmonization cf. 49:25 [DJD, 172])	1
Col 41:26 (Isa 49:25)	מלקוח... ושׂוֹבֵי	שְׁבִי... ומִלְקוּחַ	Transposition: Harmonization	1
Col 42:3 (Isa 50:2)	תיבש	תִּבְאֵשׁ	Substitution: Lexeme Graphic Similarity	1
Col 42:7 (Isa 50:6)	הסירותי	הִסַּרְתִּי	Substitution: Lexeme (Graphic Similarity (Similar Concept))	1
Col 42:15 (Isa 51:2)	ואפרהו	וּבְאֶבְרָהוּ	Substitution: Similar Lexemes/Harmonization to common phrase	1
Col 42:19 (Isa 51:5)	וזרועו... וזרועו	וְזַרְעִי... זָרְעִי	Substitution: Person (Agency/Graphic Confusion)	1
Col 42:19 (Isa 51:5)	אליו	אֵלַי	Substitution: Person (Agency/Graphic and Phonetic Confusion)	1
Col 42:26 (Col 51:10-11)	ופזורי	וּפְדוּיִי	Substitution: Graphic Similarity	1
Col 42:28 (Isa 51:12)	נתן	יָנַתַּן	Substitution: Tense	1
Col 43:1 (Isa 51:14)	צרה	צָעָה	Substitution: Lexeme (Lexical Updating/Graphic Similarity)	1
Col 43:6 (Isa 51:18)	לך	לָהּ	Substitution: Person (Direct)	1
Col 43:8 (Isa 51:19)	ינחמך	אֲנַחֲמֶךָ	Substitution: Person (Interpretative)	1
Col 43:21 (Isa 52:7)	מבשר מבשר... משמיע	מְבַשֵּׁר... מְשַׁמֵּעַ... מְבַשֵּׁר	Transposition	1
Col 43:23 (Isa 52:9)	רונה	רָנְנוּ	Substitution: Part of Speech (Interpretative)	1
Col 44:7 (Isa 53:3)	ויודע	וְיָדוּעַ	Substitution: Part of Speech/Stem (Metathesis)	1
Col 44:13 (Isa 53:7)	פתח	יִפְתַּח	Substitution: Tense	1
Col 44:17 (Isa 53:10)	ויחללהו	הִחְלִלּוּ	Substitution: Graphic Confusion Attempt to clarify (Rosenbloom 61)	1
Col 44:20 (Isa 53:11)	עבדו	עֲבָדֵי	Substitution: Person (Graphic Similarity)	1
Col 45:8 (Isa 54:10)	תתמוטינה	תְּמוּטְיִנָּה	Substitution: Verbal Stem (Voice/Haplography)	1

Table A31 continued

Col 38:15 (Isa 45:9)	הוי האומר	היאמר חמר	Substitution: Immediate Context (Graphic Similarity)	1
Col 45:10 (Isa 54:11)	ויסודותיך	ויסדתיך	Substitution: Part of Speech (Graphic Similarity)	1
Col 45:12 (Isa 54:13)	ב^ו^ניכי	בניך	Substitution: Graphic Similarity	1
Col 45:14 (Isa 54:15)	יגר	גר	Substitution: Tense	1
Col 46:1 (Isa 55:9)	כגובה	גבהו	Substitution: Part of Speech (Graphic Similarity)	1
Col 46:4 (Isa 55:10)	לאכול	לאכל	Substitution: Part of Speech	1
Col 46:7 (Isa 55:12)	תלכו	תבולו	Substitution: Verbal Stem/Similar Lexeme (Voice)	1
Col 46:9 (Isa 55:13)	לאות ולשם	לשם לאות	Transposition	1
Col 46:26 (Isa 56:12)	ונקה	אקה	Substitution: Person (Harmonization)	1
Col 47:1 (Isa 57:2)	הלוך	הלך	Substitution: Part of Speech	1
Col 47:4-5 (Isa 57:6)	שמה המה	הם הם	Substitution: Part of Speech (Interpretative)	1
Col 47:12 (Isa 57:13)	קובציך	קבוציך	Substitution: Interpretive/metathesis	1
Col 47:15 (Isa 57:15)	ישכון	אשכון	Substitution: Person (Direct)	1
Col 47:17 (Isa 57:17)	ואהסתר	הסתר	Substitution Tense: Harmonization to Immediate Context	1
Col 47:17 (Isa 57:17)	לבי	לבו	Substitution: Direct (Graphic Similarity)	1
Col 47:18 (Isa 57:18)	תנחומים	גחמים	Substitution: Lexeme (Graphic Similarity)	1
Col 47:20 (Isa 57:20)	לאשקוט	השקט	Substitution: Tense	1
Col 47:20 (Isa 57:20)	נגרשו	נגרש	Substitution: Part of Speech	1
Col 47:20 (Isa 57:20)	יתגרשו	ויגרשו	Substitution: Verbal Stem (Voice)	1
Col 48:2 (Isa 58:7)	תתעל	תתעלם	Substitution: Phonetic (Qimron, §200.143)	1
Col 48:11 (Isa 58:14)	והרפבתיך	והרכיבכה	Substitution: Person (Direct)	1
Col 48:11 (Isa 58:14)	והאכילכה	והאכלתיך	Substitution: Person (Direct)	1
Col 48:15 (Isa 59:4)	בטחו... והולידו	בטוח... והוליד	Substitution of Tense	1
Col 48:16 (Isa 59:5)	יבקעו	בקעו	Substitution of Tense	1
Col 48:17 (Isa 59:6)	יכסו	תכסו	Substitution: Verbal Stem (Voice)	1

Table A31 continued

Col 48:24 (Isa 59:13)	פִּשְׁאוֹ עוֹ	פִּשְׁעֵע	Substitution: Tense	1
Col 48:25 (Isa 59:14)	וּאִסִּיג	וְהִסִּיג	Substitution: Verbal Stem (Voice)	1
Col 49:7 (Isa 60:3)	לִנְגַד	לִנְגָה	Substitution: Part of Speech (Graphic Similarity)	2
Col 50:4 (Isa 61:7)	מִשְׁנֵה בְּאֵרְצֵם תִּירָשׁוּ	בְּאֵרְצֵם מִשְׁנֵה יִירָשׁוּ	Transposition and Substitution: (Emphasis) and Person (Direct)	1
Col 50:4 (Isa 61:7)	לִכְמָה	לְקָהִם	Substitution: Person (Direct)	2
Col 50:5 (Isa 61:8)	פְּעוֹלַתְכֶם... לִכְמָה	פְּעֻלָּתְכֶם... לְקָהִם	Substitution: Person (Direct)	2
Col 50:5 (Isa 61:8)	רַעֲמָה וְצִאֲצִימָה	זֶרְעָם וְצִאֲצִימָה	Substitution: Person (Direct)	1
Col 50:9 (Isa 61:10)	כְּכוֹהֵן	זִכְהֵן	Substitution: Part of Speech	1
Col 50:10 (Isa 61:11)	יְהוָה אֱלוֹהִים	אֱדֹנֵי יְהוָה	Substitution of Divine Name	1
Col 50:15 (Isa 62:5)	כְּבִעוֹל	יִבְעֵל	Substitution: Part of Speech	1
Col 50:19 (Isa 62:8)	עוֹד דֹּגַגְךָ מֵאֵכֶל	אֶת־דֹּגְגֶךָ עוֹד מֵאֵכֶל	Transposition	1
Col 50:23 (Isa 62:10)	סְקוּלוֹ	סְקוּלוֹ	Substitution of Stem (Graphic Similarity)	1
Col 50:23-24 (Isa 62:10)	אִמְרוּ בְּעַמִּים	הִרְיִמוּ נֶס עֲלֵי־הָעַמִּים	Substitution: Interpretative	1
Col 50:28 (Isa 63:2)	בִּגְד	בְּגָת	Substitution: Lexeme (Graphic/Phonetic Similarity)	1
Col 51:10 (Isa 63:14)	כִּי־אֵ	כִּן	Substitution: Part of Speech (Graphic Similarity)	1
Col 51:12 (Isa 63:16)	הִכִּירְנוּ	יִכְיִרְנוּ	Substitution: Tense	1
Col 51:13 (Isa 63:17)	יְהוָה תִּתְעַנּוּ	תִּתְעַנּוּ יְהוָה	Transposition (Emphasis)	1
Col 51:23 (Isa 64:8 [Eng., 9])	לַעֲת	לְעַד	Substitution: Lexeme Graphic Similarity	1
Col 52:1 (Isa 65:4)	וּבְנִצִּירִים	וּבְנִצְוִרִים	Substitution: Lexeme (Graphic Similarity)	1
Col 52:2 (Isa 65:5)	תִּגַּע	תִּגַּשׁ	Substitution: Lexeme (Graphic Similarity)	1
Col 52:14 (Isa 65:11)	מִסְכָּה	מִמְסָדָה	Substitution: Lexeme (Graphic Similarity)	1
Col 52:20 (Isa 65:14)	יִרְנְנוּ בְּטוֹב	יִרְנְנוּ מִטוֹב	Substitution: Graphic and Phonetic Similarity	1
Col 53:6 (Isa 65:23)	בְּרִיךְ	בְּרוּכִי	Substitution : Voice (Syntax)	1
Col 53:18 (Isa 66:5)	יִרְאֵה	וְנִרְאֵה	Substitution: Tense/Person (Graphic Similarity/Interpretive)	1

Table A31 continued

Col 53:19 (Isa 66:5)	בעיר	מעיר	Substitution: Preposition (Graphic and Phonetic Similarity)	1
Col 53:20 (Isa 66:8)	יראה	רצה	Substitution: Tense	1
Col 53:21 (Isa 66:8)	התחיל	היחל	Substitution: Voice/Syntax (Graphic Similarity)	1
Col 53:12 (Isa 66:28)	תשתעשעו	תשעשעו	Substitution: Voice	1
Col 53:29 (Isa 66:13)	תתנחמו	תנחמו	Substitution: Stem (Voice)	1
Col 54:2 (Isa 66:15)	ובסופה	וכסופה	Substitution: Graphic Similarity	1
Col 54:3 (Isa 66:16)	יבוא לשפוט	נשפט	Substitution: Interpretative	1
Col 54:4 (Isa 66:16)	חלליו	חללי יהנה	Substitution: Pronoun with Noun (Implicit)	1
Col 54:6 (Isa 66:18)	באו	באה	Substitution: Part of Speech	1
Col 54:7 (Isa 66:19)	אותות	אות	Substitution: Number (Interpretative/Synonym)	1

Table A32. 1QIsa^a: Description of variants, variants likely deriving from a damaged exemplar (category 2)

Column, Line, and Verse	1QIsa ^a	Mt	Details	Statistical Weight
Col 28:18-19a (Isa 34:17-35:2)	ירשוה לדור ודור ישכנו בה יששום מדבר וציה ותגל ערבה ותפרח כחבצלת פרח תפרח ותגל אף גילת ורנן כבוד לבנון [[ב]] נתן לה הדר הכרמל והשרון המה יראו כבוד יהוה הדר אלהינו	יִרְשׁוּהָ לְדוֹר וָדוֹר יִשְׁכְּנוּ בָהּ: ס יִשְׁשׂוּם מִדְבָר וְצִיָּה וְתִגְלַ עֲרֵבָה וְתִפְרַח כְּחִבְצַלְתַּת: פֶּרֶחַ תִּפְרַח וְתִגְלַ אֲפֵי גִילַת וְרִנָּן כְּבוֹד לְבִנְיָן נָתַן לָהּ הַדָּר הַכְרֵמֶל וְהַשְּׂרֹן הַמָּה יִרְאוּ כְבוֹד־יְהוָה הַדָּר אֱלֹהֵינוּ: ס	Corrected to MT by later hand with minor deviations	49
Col 29:15-18 (Isa 36:11-12)	אליו	אֶל־רַב־שָׁקָה	Scribe may have made contextual guesses to supply text	4
	את הדברים האלה	אֶל־יְהוָה יְהוּדִית		
	האנשים היושבים	הָעַם אֲשֶׁר		
	האליכמה ועל אדוניכמה	הָאֵל אֲדֹנָיָךְ וְאֵלֶיךָ		
Col 30:10-11b (Isa 37:5-7)	ם בעיר הזואת ויבואו עבדי המל ^א ־ד ^א יחזקיה אל ישעיה [[א]] ויואמר להמה ישעיה כוה תואמרו אל אדוניכמה כוה אמר יהוה אל תירא מפני הדברי ^א ־מ ^א [[ב]] אשר שמעתה אשר גדפו נערי מלכ אשר אותי הנני נותן רוח בוא ושמע שמועה ושב לארצו והפלתיו בחרב בארצו	וַיָּבֹאוּ עֲבָדֵי הַמֶּלֶךְ חִזְקִיָּהוּ אֶל־יִשְׁעִיָּהוּ: וַיֹּאמֶר אֵלֵיהֶם יִשְׁעִיָּהוּ כֹּה תֹאמְרוּן אֶל־אֲדֹנֵיכֶם כֹּה אָמַר יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל מִפְּנֵי הַדְּבָרִים אֲשֶׁר שָׁמַעְתָּ אֲשֶׁר גָּדְפוּ נְעָרֵי מֶלֶךְ־אֲשׁוּר אוֹתִי: הֲנִנִי נֹתֵן בּוֹ רוּחַ וְשָׁמַעְתָּ שְׂמוּעָה וְשָׁב אֶל־אֲרָצוֹ וְהִפְלַתִּיו בְּחָרֶב בְּאֲרָצוֹ:	Corrected to the MT possibly by the original scribe with minor deviations	5
Col 31:10-13 (Isa 37:31-33)	ואספה	וַיִּסְפָּה	Scribe likely copying from memory due to damaged exemplar	5
	מציון...מירושלים	מִירוּשָׁלַם...מֵהַר צִיּוֹן		
	והנמצא	הַנִּשְׁאָרָה		
	מציון...מירושלים	מִירוּשָׁלַם...מֵהַר צִיּוֹן		
	ולוא ישפוך עליה סוללה ולוא ירא שמ חץ ולוא יקדמנה מגן	לֹא־יִזְרָה שָׁם חֵץ וְלֹא־יִקְדַּמְנָהּ מִגֵּן וְלֹא־יִשְׁפֹךְ עָלֶיהָ סִלְלָה		

Table A32 continued

	<p>חי חי יודך כמוני היום אב לבנים יהודיע אלוה אמתך יהוה להושיעני</p>		<p>Addition: Dittography</p>	<p>19</p>
<p>Col 32:12-14(15a?) Isa 38:19-22(23a?)</p>	<p>ונגנתי ננגן כול ימי חיינו על בית יהוה ויאמר ישעיהו דבלת תאנים וימרחו על השחין ויחי ויאמר חזק^א מה אעלה בית יהוה בעת ההיא</p>	<p>ונגנתי ננגן כל ימי חיינו על בית יהוה: ויאמר ישעיהו וישאו דבלת תאנים וימרחו על השחין ויחי: ויאמר חזקנהו מה אעלה בית יהוה: ס בעת ההיא</p>	<p>Correction to the MT with minor differences likely made by multiple hands</p>	<p>36</p>
<p>Col 33:14-16 (Isa 40:14-16)</p>	<p>וילמדהו דעת ודרך תבונות יודי הן גואים כמר מדלי וכשחק מזנים נחשבו הן איים כדק ויטול ולבנון אין די בער וחיתו אין די עולה</p>	<p>וילמדהו דעת ודרך תבונות יודיענו: הן גוים כמר מדלי וכשחק מאזנים נחשבו הן איים כדק ויטול: ולבנון אין די בער וחיתו אין די עולה: ס</p>	<p>Corrector corrects text to the MT</p>	<p>29</p>
<p>Col 34:14-17 (Isa 41:11-12)</p>	<p>יובדו כול אנשי ריבכה.] ואנשי מצתכה</p>	<p>יהיו כאין ויאבדו אנשי ריבכה: תבקשם ולא תמצאם אנשי מצתכה</p>	<p>Differences may derive from copying from memory</p>	<p>11</p>
<p>Col 36:11-12 (Isa 43:3)</p>	<p>אני יהוה אלוהיכה קדוש ישראל גואלך ונתתי מצרים כופרך כוש וסבאים תחתיכה</p>	<p>כי אני יהוה אלוהיך קדוש ישראל מושיעה נתתי כפרך מצרים כוש וסבא תחתיך:</p>	<p>Differences may derive from copying text with damaged exemplar</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>Col 38:13-15 (Isa 45:8)</p>	<p>הריעו</p>	<p>הרעיפו</p>	<p>Differences may derive from copying text with damaged exemplar with spacing irregularities</p>	<p>8</p>
	<p>האמר לארץ</p>	<p>תפתח ארץ</p>		
<p>Col 42:20 (Isa 51:6)</p>	<p>וראו מי ברא את אלה</p>	<p>כי שמים כעשן נמלחו והארץ כבגד תכלה</p>	<p>Differences may derive from copying text with damaged exemplar with spacing irregularities</p>	<p>11</p>
<p>Col 44:15-16 (Isa 53:8)</p>	<p>מפשע עמו נוגע למו</p>	<p>מפשע עמי נגע למו</p>	<p>Correction to MT with minor differences</p>	<p>7</p>

Table A32 continued

Col 45:16-18 (Isa 54:17)		וְכָל־לְשׁוֹן תְּקוּיִם־אֶתְּךָ לְמִשְׁפָּט תְּרַשְׁיָעִי	Scribe omitted phrase that was not later corrected	9
Col 46:16-19 (Isa 56:6)		לְשִׁרְתּוֹ וּלְאַהֲבָה אֶת־שֵׁם יְהוָה	Differences may be caused by scribe copying from memory	16
	וּלְבָרֵךְ אֶת שֵׁם יְהוָה וּשׁוֹמְרִים אֶת הַשַּׁבָּת	כָּל־שֹׁמֵר שַׁבָּת		
Col 50:29 (Isa 63:3)?		וְאֲדַרְכֶם בְּאִפִּי וְאֲרַמְסֶם בְּחִמְתִּי וְיִזְנוּ נַצְחָם עַל־בְּגְדֵי	Could be omission due to homoioteleuton or damaged exemplar	19
Col 51:29 (Isa 65:3)?	הִמָּה		Difficult to determine, but location and textual issues may indicate damaged exemplar	2
	וַיִּנְקוּ יָדַיִם	מִקְטָרִים		
Col 52:23 (Isa 65:15-16)	תְּמִיד... וְהָיָה הַנִּשְׁבַּע	וְלִעֲבָדָיו יִקְרָא שֵׁם אֲחֵר: אֲשֶׁר הִמְתַּבְּרָה בְּאָרְץ יִתְבַּרְךָ	Differences likely occasioned by contextual guesses and a damaged exemplar	13

Table A33. 1QIsa^a: Category 3 variants

Column, Line, and Verse	1QIsa ^a	Mt	Details	Statistical Weight
Col 2:18 (Isa 2:9-10)		וְאֶל־תִּשְׂא לְהֵם: בְּזֹא בְצוּר וְהִטְמִן בְּעֵפֶר מִפְּנֵי פֶסֶד יְהוָה וּמִהֲדַר גְּאֹנֹ:	Omission: possible parablepsis	20
Col 40:2 (Isa 47:12-13)	וְעַד הַיּוֹם כְּרוּב עֲצַתְךָ	אוּלֵי תוֹכְלֵי הוֹשִׁיל אוּלֵי תַעֲרוּצֵי: גִּלְאִית בְּרֵב עֲצַתְךָ	Omission/ Addition/ Substitution	11

Table A34. 1QIsa^a: Did no count

Column, Line, and Verse	1QIsa ^a	MT	Details	Statistical Weight
Col 54:10-11 (Isa 66:20)	[] וּבְּ		Insufficient Manuscript Evidence	

Table A35. 4Q57: Description of variant (categories 1, 2, 3)

Category	Description of Variant	Fragment, Line, and Verse	4Q57	MT	Detailed Description of Variant	Statistical Weight
1	Addition	F2:L6 (Frags. 1-2: L10 [Isa 9:11])	ובכול	בְּכָל	Addition of Conjunctive vav	1
		F9ii:L26 (Frags. 9ii, 11, 12, 52i:L38 [Isa 24:12])	ונשאר	נִשְׁאָר	Addition of Conjunctive vav	1
		F13:6 (F13:L12 [Isa 25:1])	את		Addition: Marker of Accusative	1
		F27:L7 (F27:L40 [Isa 46:13])	ולישראל	לְיִשְׂרָאֵל	Addition of Conjunctive vav	1
		F29:L2 (Isa 48:13)	וינעמודו	נְעֻמְדוּ	Addition of Conjunctive vav	1
		F31:L2 (Isa 48:18)	ולוא	לוא	Addition of Conjunctive vav	1
		F33:L2 (F33:L5 [Isa 51:11])	ת[היה		Addition of Elided Verb	1
		F34:L2 (F34:L6 [Isa 51:11])	ונס	נְסוּ	Addition of Conjunctive vav	1

Table 35 continued

1 continued	Substitution	F6:L3 (Isa 11:6)	ירבצו	יִרְבְּצוּ	Substitution: Collective v. Plural	1
		F6:L6 (Isa 11:9)	לדעה	לְדַעָה	Prepositional Phrase v. Accusative	1
		F9ii:L5 (Frgs. 9ii, 11, 12, 52i:L17 [Isa 23:12])	שמה	שָׁם	Different ways to depict Adverbial idea	1
		F9ii:L10 (Frgs. 9ii, 11, 12, 52i:L22 [Isa 23:15])	והיה	יִהְיֶה	Substitution of Tense	1
		F9ii:L14 (Frgs. 9ii, 11, 12, 52i:L26 [Isa 23:18])	והיה	יִהְיֶה	Substitution of Tense	1
		F9ii:L19 (Frgs. 9ii, 11, 12, 52i:L31 [Isa 24:4])	אמלל	אֶמְלִלוּ	Substitution: Collective v. Plural	1
		F9ii:L20 (9ii, 11, 12, 52i:L32] Isa 24:5)	תורה	תּוֹרָה	Substitution: Collective v. Plural	1
		F9ii:L21 (Frgs. 9ii, 11, 12, 52i:L33 [Isa 24:6])	ה[ארץ]	אֶרֶץ	Substitution: Marking Definiteness	1
		F9ii:L26 (Frgs. 9ii, 11, 12, 52i:L38 [Isa 24:12])	ושואה	וּשְׂאֵיָהּ	Substitution: Related Lexeme	1
		F9ii:L28 (Frgs. 9ii, 11, 12, 52i:L40 [Isa 24:14])	ורננו	יִרְנְנוּ	Substitution of Tense	1
		F9ii:L28 (Frgs. 9ii, 11, 12, 52i:L40 [Isa 24:15])	בוארים בארם כבול] .	בְּאָרִים כְּבֻדוֹ יִהְיֶה	Substitution: Verbal Stem	1
		F13:4 (F13:L9 [Isa 24:22])	ואסף אסוף	וְאָסְפוּ אֶסְפֶּה	Substitution of Number, Voice, and Way of representing the Absolute Object	1
		F12ii:L5 (F12ii:L25 [Isa 25:11])	יפרוש]	יִפְרֹשׂ	Substitution of Verbal Stem	1
		F27:L3 (F27:L36 [Isa 46:10])	אח[רונות	אַחֲרֵית	Substitution of Similar Lexemes	1
		F27:L6 (F27:L39 [Isa 46:13])	הקרבת	קִרְבָּתִי	Substitution of Similar Verbal Stem	1
		F30:L2 (Isa 48:15)	וא[צליה	וְהִצְלִי חַ	Substitution of tense	1
		F48:L7 (Isa 66:23)	ב[שבתה	בְּשַׁבַּת יְ	Substitution of Gender	1

Table 35 continued

2	Addition	F6:L6 (Isa 11:9)	את כבוד יהוה	אֶת־ יְהוָה	Harmonization (cf. Hab 2:14 [DJD, 52])	1
		F9ii:L22 (Frgs. 9ii, 11, 12, 52i:34 [Isa 24:7])	גפן יצהר	גֶפֶן	Addition: Compound Subject or addition of Genitive	1
		F9ii:L26 (Frgs. 9ii, 11, 12, 52i:38 [Isa 24:12])	שערה	שָׁעַר	Addition: Pronominal Suffix	1
		F9ii:L28 (Frgs. 9ii, 11, 12, 52i:40 [Isa 24:15])	בוארים בארם כבוד [.]	בְּאָרִים כְּבֹדוֹ יְהוָה	Interpretative	1
		F14:L6 (F14:L28] Isa 26:1)	חומותיה וחילה	חֻמּוֹת וְחִלָּה	Addition of Pronominal Suffixes	2
		F14:L11 (Frgs. 12ii, 14-15, 53:L33 [Isa 26:7])	יש[רו]	יֵשֶׁר	Addition: Pronominal Suffix	1
		F42:L2 (Isa 54:8)	ובחסדי	וּבְחֶסֶד	Addition of Pronominal Suffixes	1
	Omission	F18:L1 (Frgs. 18-20:L2 [Isa 30:8])	כתוב	כְּתִיבָה	Omission of Pronominal Suffix	1
		F47:L4 (Frgs. 44-47:L18 [Isa 55:6])	בהמ[צא]	בְּהִמְצָאֵי	Omission of Pronominal Suffix	1

Table 35 continued

2 continued	Substitution	F1:L1 (Isa 9:3)	הח[תוּתִי	החַתָּתָּ	Substitution: Person	1
		F6:L5 (Isa 11:8)	יהדה	הָדָה	Substitution: Tense	1
		F9ii:L3 (Frgs. 9ii, 11, 12, 52i:L15 [Isa 23:11])	להרגיז	הַרְגִּיז	Substitution: Tense (Interpretation)	1
		F9ii:L4 (Frgs. 9ii, 11, 12, 52i:L16 [Isa 23:12])	עוז	עוּד	Substitution: Interpretation or Confusion of dentals	1
		F9ii:L28 (Frgs. 9ii, 11, 12, 52i:40 [Isa 24:14])	וצהלו	צָהֲלוּ	Substitution of Tense (Interpretation)	1
		F9ii:L28 (Frgs. 9ii, 11, 12, 52i:40:40 [Isa 24:14])	מיום	מַיִם	substitution: <i>vav/yod</i> confusion	1
		F14:L11 (F12ii, 14-15, 53:L33] Isa 26:7)	צדק	צָדִיק	Substitution of Part of speech (4Q57 is more Abstract)	1
		F28:L2 (Isa 48:11)	איחל	יְהִל	Substitution of Person and Agency	1
		F30:L2 (Isa 48:15)	וא[צליה	וְהַצְלִי חַ	Substitution of Person	1
		F56:L2 (Frgs. 33-25, 55-57:L3 [Isa 51:9])	המוח[צת	הַמְחַצָּ בָּת	Substitution of Lexeme: Possibly also Verbal Stem, but unsure (cf. 1QIsaa Col 42:24 [DJD, 68])	1
3	No Variants					

Table A36 continued

Synonymous Spellings continued	F13:11 (Isa 24:23)	ובירושלים	ובִּירוּשָׁלַם	Alternative Spelling
	F14:L11 (Frgs. 12ii, 14-15, 53:L33 [Isa 26:7])	מישׁ־יָרְיָם	מִיִּשְׁרַיִם	Alternative Spelling
	F22:L1 (Frgs. 21-22:L3 [Isa 33:4])	ה[חסל]	הַחֶסֶל	Alternative Spelling
	F27:L2 (F27:L35 [Isa 46:9])	אני	אָנֹכִי	Alternative Spelling
	F30:L2 (Isa 48:15)	הביאות[יהו]	הִבִּיאֹתִיו	Contracted or Non-Contracted form of Suffix
	F36:L2 (Frgs. 36-38:L2 [Isa 52:10])	אֲזָרְעֶ	זָרְעֶ	Prosthetic aleph
	F45:L11 (Frgs. 44-47:L11 [Isa 55:2])	תשקולו	תִּשְׁקֹלוּ	Alternative Spelling
	F45:L13 (Frgs. 44-47:L13 [Isa 55:3])	ואכרותה	וְאֶכְרְתָהּ	<i>Plene</i>
	F45:L14 (Frgs. 44-47:L14 [Isa 55:4])	נתתיהו	נָתַתִּיו	Contracted or Non-Contracted form of Suffix
	F45:6 (Isa 54:15)	אפס מאתי	אָפֶס מְאוֹתִי	Perhaps defective?
Kethiv/Qere	F4:L6 (Frgs. 3-5, 50:L9] Isa 10:32)	בת	בֵּית	Agrees with <i>Kethiv</i>
	F9ii:L15 (Frgs. 9ii, 11, 12, 52i:L27 [Isa 24:1])	אדוני	יְהוָה	Substitution of Divine Name (Agrees with <i>Qere</i>)

Table A37. 4Q64: Description of variants

Category	Description of Variant	Fragment, Line, and Verse	4Q64	MT	Detailed Description of Variant	Statistical Weight
Category 1	Substitution	F2:L1 (Frgs. 1-5:L1 [Isa 28:27])	ידוש	יודש	Substitution of Verbal Stem	1
		F3:L1 (Frgs. 1-5:L3 [Isa 28:29])	י[צא	יָצָאָה	Substitution of Gender	1
		F3:L2 (Frgs. 1-5:L2 [Isa 29:1])	סופי	סָפוּ	Substitution of Gender	1
		F4:L1 (Frgs. 1-5:L5 [Isa 29:2])	ו[תהיה	וְהִיְתָה	Substitution of Tense	1
Category 2	Substitution	F3:L1 (Frgs. 1-5:L3 [Isa 28:29])	הפיל	הִפְלִיא	Substitution of Lexeme	1
Not Counted	Insufficient Manuscript Evidence	F1:L2 (Frgs. 1-5:L2 [Isa 28:28])	ז^לחם	לָחֵם	Unclear Evidence	
	Synonymous Spelling	F3:L2 (Frgs. 1-5:L2 [Isa 29:1])	סופי	סָפוּ	Orthographic	

Table A38. 2Q13: Description of variants

Category	Description of Variant	Fragment, Line, and Verse	2Q13	MT	Detailed Description of Variant	Statistical Weight
1	Addition	F6:L3 (Jer 44:13)	ובר]עב	בָּרַעַב	Addition of Conjunctive <i>vav</i>	1
		F9ii:L9 (Frgs. 9ii-12:L9 [Jer 48:32])	ועל	על	Addition of Conjunctive <i>vav</i>	1
	Substitution	F1:L4 (Frgs. 1-2:L4 [Jer 42:9])	תחננו]תיכ מה	תַּחֲנַנְתֶּם	Substitution of Number	1
		F8:L8 (Frgs. 7-8:L8 [Jer 47:4])	והכרתי	לְהַכְרִית	Overlapping Syntax: Different formation of purpose/result clause	1
		F8:L9 (Frgs. 7-8:L9 [Jer 47:4])	איי	אי	Substitution of Number:	1
		F8:L14 (Frgs. 7-8:L14 [Jer 47:4])	שמה	שָׁם	Overlapping Syntax: Adverbial Idea	1
		F9ii:L4 (Frgs. 9ii-12:L4 [Jer 48:27])	תתנוודדי	תַּתְּנוּדְדוּ	Substitution of Gender: Moab is masculine in MT, but Feminine in 2QJer	1
		F9ii:L4 (Frgs. 9ii-12:L4 [Jer 48:28])	ושכוני	וְשָׁכְנוּ	Substitution of Gender: Moab is masculine in MT, but Feminine in 2QJer	1
		F9ii:L4 (Frgs. 9ii-12:L4 [Jer 48:28])	ישבת	יִשְׁבּוּ	Substitution of Gender and Number: Moab is masculine plural in MT, but Feminine singular in 2QJer	1
		F9ii:L4 (Frgs. 9ii-12:L4 [Jer 48:28])	והיי	וְהָיָו	Substitution of Gender and Number: Moab is masculine plural in MT, but Feminine singular in 2QJer	1

Table A38 continued

1 continued	Substitution continued	F9ii:L7 (Frgs. 9ii- 12:L7 [Jer 48:30])	עשתה	עָשׂוּ	Substitution of Gender and Number: Moab is masculine plural in MT, but Feminine singular in 2QJer	1
		F9ii:L7-8 (Frgs. 9ii- 12:L7-8 [Jer 48:31])	[קיר חרשת	קִיר־ חָרֶשׁ	Substitution of Gender	1
		F10:L5 (Frgs. 9ii-12:L18 [Jer 48:38])	[הפנוּ	הִפְנָה	Substitution of Number	1
2	Addition	F9ii:L3 (Frgs. 9ii- 12:L3 [Jer 48:27])	היאה		Addition: Demonstrative Pronoun	1
		F9ii:L3 (Frgs. 9ii- 12:L3 [Jer 48:27])	בְּגַנְבְּכֵה	בְּגַנְבִים	Addition of Pronominal Suffix	1
		F9ii:L4 (Frgs. 9ii- 12:L4 [Jer 48:28])	ער[יד	עָרִים	Addition of Pronominal Suffix	1
	Substitution	F8:L10 (Frgs. 7-8:10 [Jer 47:5])	תתגורר	תַּתְגֹּדְדִי	Substitution of word: Nouns (Graphic Confusion)	1
		F9ii:L5 (Frgs. 9ii- 12:L5 [Jer 48:29])	שמעו נא	שְׁמַעְנוּ	Substitution of Tense	1
		F12:L2 (Frgs. 9ii-12:L15 [Jer 48:37])	תגר[ע]	גָּרַעַה	Substitution: Verb for Participle	1
	Unclear Variant	F5:L4 (Jer 44:2)	ה[יום הזה מ	הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה וְאִין בְּהֵם יּוֹשֵׁב: מִפְּנֵי	Omission of 5 words, Addition of 4 words, or Transposition	1
		F9ii:L6 (Frgs. 9ii- 12:L6 [Jer 48:29])	גאווו ואיננו]	גָּבוּהוּ וּגְאוּוּ	Substitution: Graphic Similarity	2
		F13i:L4 (Jer 48:45)	מקריית		Addition of Noun, but the <i>mem</i> is not clear	1
3	No Variants					

Table A38 continued

Not Counted	Insufficient Manuscript Evidence	F9ii:L2 (Frgs. 9ii- 12:L2 [Jer 48:26])	הגדילה	הגדיל	Possible Substitution of Gender	
		F9ii:L4 (Frgs. 9ii- 12:L4 [Jer 48:28])	והיי	והיו	Possible Substitution of Gender and Number: Moab is masculine plural in MT, but Feminine singular in 2QJer	
		F9ii:L4 (Frgs. 9ii- 12:L4 [Jer 48:28])	תקוננ[י]	תקונן	Possible Substitution of Gender	
		F9ii:L8 (Frgs. 9ii- 12:L8 [Jer 48:31])	ג[פן]	הגפן		
	Synonymous Spellings	F3:L2 (Frgs. 3-4:L2 [Jer 43:9])	יהודי ^א י ^ב ם	יהודים	Alternative Spelling	
		F3:L3 (Frgs. 3-4:L3 [Jer 43:10])	נבו[כדנא [צר]	נבוכדנא צר	Alternative Spelling	
		F8:L8 (Frgs. 7-8:L8 [Jer 47:4])	פלשתיים	פלשתים	Alternative Spelling	
		F9i:L1 (Jer 48:1)	אתה	את	Alternative Spelling	
		F9ii:L6 (Frgs. 9ii- 12:L6 [Jer 48:29])	לבבו	לבו	Alternative Spelling	
	Kethiv/Qere	F9ii:L3 (Frgs. 9ii- 12:L3 [Jer 48:27])	נמצא	נמצאה [נמצא]	Agrees with Qere	
	Scribal Error	F1:L3 (Frgs. 1-2:L3 [Jer 42:9])	אלוהימה	אליהם		

Table A39. 4Q73: Description of variants

Category	Description of Variant	Fragment, Line, and Verse	4Q73	MT	Detailed Description of Variant	Statistical Weight
1	Substitution	F1:L6 (Ezek 10:8)	ידי	נד	Substitution of Number	1
		F2:L6 (Ezek 10:21)	וארבעה	וארבע	Substitution of Gender	1
		F3ii:L1 (Ezek 23:44)	ויבאו	ויבוא	Substitution of Number	1
2	No Variants					
3	No Variants					
Not Counted	Insufficient Manuscript evidence	F3i:L4 (Ezek 23:15, 17)			Proposed parablepsis of v. 16: Based entirely on Reconstruction	
	Synonymous Spelling	F3ii:L2 (Ezek 23:45)	אתהם	אותהם	Possibly defective	
	Scribal Error	F3ii:L2 (Ezek 23:45)	ישפטו	ישפטו	Possible Phonetic Error (DJD, 214)	
	Fragment Placement	F5:L1 (Ezek 41:5-6)	סביב ל[בית וה		Can fit other loci	

Table A40. 4Q76: Description of variants

Category	Description of Variant	Fragment, Line, and Verse	4Q76	MT	Detailed Description of Variant	Statistical Weight
1	Addition	F2i:L7 (Col 1:18 [Mal 2:13])	ובכי	בְּכִי	Addition of Conjunctive <i>vav</i>	1
		F3:L4 (Col 2:4 [Mal 2:16])	כי אם	כִּי	Substitution of Syntax	1
		F4ii:L5 (Col 3:13 [Mal 3:10])	את הברכה	בְּרָכָה	Addition of Article and Marker of Accusative	2
		F8:L2 (Col 4:2 [Mal 3:15])	וגם	גַּם	Addition of Conjunctive <i>vav</i>	1
		F19:L2 (Col 6:2 [Jon 1:9])	אל[הי השמים וא]ני	אֱלֹהֵי הַשָּׁמַיִם אֲנִי	Addition of Conjunctive <i>vav</i>	1
	Omission	F4ii:L2 (Col 3:10 [Mal 3:10])	מעשר	הַמְעַשֵּׂר	Omission of Article	1
		F13:L2 (Col 5:6 [Jon 1:3])	[תרשי]ש	תְּרִישָׁה	Omission of Accusative <i>he</i>	1
	Substitution	F3:L5 (Col 2:5 [Mal 2:16])	אל	אֱלֹהֵי	Synonymous Words	1
		F3:L5 (Col 2:5 [Mal 2:16])	יכסו	וְכָסוּהָ	Substitution of Tense and Number	1
		F3:L9 (Col 2:9 [Mal 2:17])	עשי	עֲשֵׂהָ	Substitution of Number	1
		F2ii:L2 (Col 2:12 [Mal 3:1])	יבאו	יָבֹאוּ	Substitution of Number	1
		F5:L5/F6:L1 (Col 3:7 [Mal 3:7])	ואמרת	וְאָמַרְתֶּם	Substitution of Number	1
		F8:L3 (Col 4:L3 [Mal 3:15])	איש [על רעה]ו	אִישׁ אֶת־רַעְהוּ	Substitution of preposition for Marker of Accusative	1
		F8:L4 (Col 4:L4 [Mal 3:17])	ויהיו	וְהָיוּ	Substitution of Tense	1
		F91:L5 (Col 4:L12 [Mal 3:17])	כעגל	כְּעִגְלִי	Substitution of Number	1
		F17:L2 (Col 5:L18 [Jon 1:8])	בשלמי	בְּאִשְׁרִי לְמִי	Substitution of Synonymous Relative Pronouns	1

Table A40 continued

2	Addition	F2ii:L4 (Col 2:14 [Mal 3:1])	הנו	הנה	Addition of Pronominal suffix (Explicit)	1
		F22:L1 (Jon 3:2)	כזות		Addition of Prepositional Phrase	2
	Omission	F2i:L7 (Col 1:20 [Mal 2:14])		אֲשֶׁר אָתָּה בְּגִדְתָּהּ בָּהּ	Omission of Relative Clause	5
	Substitution	F2i:L4 (Col 1:15 [Mal 2:11])	בית אל נכר	בֵּת־אֵל נֶכֶר	Substitution of Noun	1
		F3:L4 (Col 2:4 [Mal 2:16])	שנתה	שנא	Substitution of Syntax	1
		F2ii:L5 (Col 2:15) [Mal 3:2])	אותם	אֶת־יוֹם	Substitution of Objects (Graphic Similarity)	1
		F9i:L5 (Col 4:12) [Mal 3:21])	ועוצותם	וְעֹפוֹתָם	Substitution of Verbal Form (Phonetic Similarity)	1
Category 3	No Variants					
Potential Category 3	Sequence Malachi - Jonah					
Not Counted	Insufficient Manuscript evidence	F2i:L5 (Col 1:16 [Mal 2:12])	עד וענה	עַד וְעָנָה		
		F3:L7 (Col 2:7 [Mal 2:17])	והגעתם	הוֹגֵעְתֶּם		
		F3:L8 (Col 2:L8 [Mal 2:17])	[אלהי]ם	יְהוָה		
		F2ii:L1 (Col 2:11) [Mal 3:1])	לִכְן הִנְנִי	הִנְנִי		
		F6:L3/F4ii:L1 (Col 3:9 [Mal 3:7])	וּמְרֵאִים אתם רֵאִים	בְּמֵאֲרָה אֶתְּם גְּאֲרִים		
		F17:L2 (Col 5:18 [Jon 1:8])	הגד נא	הַגִּידֵה־נָא		
	Unclear Paleography	F2i:L7 (Col 1:18 [Mal 2:13])	מֵאוֹן אֲעוֹדֶה פְּנוֹת	מֵאִין עוֹד פְּנוֹת		
	Synonymous Spelling	F2i:L2 (Col 1:13 [Mal 2:10])	באחי]הו	בְּאָחִיו	Contracted v. Non-contracted form of Pronominal Suffix	
		F4ii:L3 (Col 3:11 [Mal 3:10])	בבתי	בְּבֵיתִי	Defective?	
		F10:L3 (Col 4:16 [Mal 3:23])	אליהו	אֵלִיָּה	Proper Name	
		F17:L2 (Col 5:18 [Jon 1:8])	אלו	אֵלָיו	Defective?	
		F3:L4 (Col 2:4 [Mal 2:16])	שנתה	שנא	Third <i>aleph</i> treated like third <i>he</i>	

Table A41. 4Q78: Description of variants

Category	Description of Variant	Fragment, Line, and Verse	4Q78	MT	Detailed Description of Variant	Statistical Weight
1	Addition	F12:L2 (Frgs. 10-12:L5 [Joel 1:14])	וקראו	קראו	Addition of Conjunctive <i>vav</i>	1
		F18:L10 (Frgs. 18-20:L10 [Joel 4:17])	השכון	שכון	Addition of Article	1
		F21:L2 (F21-23:L2 [Amos 2:13])	והנה	הנה	Addition of Conjunctive <i>vav</i>	1
	Omission	F7:L1 (Frgs. 4-7:L11 [Hos 4:15])	אל	ואל	Omission of Conjunctive <i>vav</i>	1
		F9:L7 (Hos 14:6)	יכ	יך	Omission of Conjunctive <i>vav</i>	1
	Substitution	F4:L2 (Frgs. 4-7:L2 [Hos 4:3])	יוש[בי	יושב	Substitution of Number	1
		F14:L2 (Frgs. 14-17:L2 [Joel 2:11])	יכ^ל^כלנו	יכלנו	Substitution of Verbal Stem	1
		F18:L5 (Frgs. 18-20:L5 [Joel 4:12])	[וירעשו	[רעשו	Substitution of Tense	1
		F19:L1 (Frgs. 18-20:L12 [Joel 4:18])	[יטיפו	יטפו	Substitution of Verbal Stem	1
		F29:L2 (Frgs. 24-29, 48:L9 [Amos 4:1])	הביאו	הביאה	Substitution: Emphatic Imperative	1

Table A41 continued

2	Addition	F8:L2-3 (Hos 13:4)	אנוכי יהוה אלוהיכם] ה בצר שמים] וקונה ארץ אשר ידיו ברא כול צבא השמים ולוא הראיתם לכה ללכת אחריהמה ו]אנוכי העלותיכה		Addition	5
		F14:L10 (Frgs. 14-17:L10 [Joel 2:19])]ואכלתמה^]ושבעתמ]ה		Addition	1
		F20:L2 (Frgs. 18-20:L13 [Joel 4:18])	^כול^		Addition of Particle	1
		F19:L3 (Frgs. 18-20:L14 [Joel 4:19])	^למדבר^		Addition	2
		F18:L1-2 (Frgs. 18-20:L1-2 [Joel 4:6b-8])	^צב]אות דבר^	דְבַר	Addition	1
	Substitution	F12:L4 (Frgs. 10-12:L7 [Joel 1:17])	עפ^ש^ו	עָבְשׁוּ	Substitution: Graphic Similarity or Interpretation	1
		F12:L4 (Frgs. 10-12:L7 [Joel 1:17])	פורות	פְּרֻדוֹת	Substitution: Graphic confusion or Interpretation	1
		F14:L3 (Frgs. 14-17:L3 [Joel 2:13])	גדיכ]מה	בגְדִיכֶם	Substitution	1
		F21:L4 (Frgs. 21-23:L4 [Amos 2:16])	ומוצא	וְאֲמִיץ	Substitution	1
		F31:L2 (Frgs. 30-33:L9 [Amos 7:8])]שְׁמֹתִי	שֵׁם	Substitution: Part of Speech	1
3	No Variants					

Table A41 continued

Not Counted	Insufficient manuscript Evidence	F9:L1 (Hos 13:15)	וִיבֹשׁ	וְיִבּוֹשׁ	Substitution: Interpretative	
	Synonymous Spelling	F14:L2 (Frags. 14-17:L2 [Joel 2:11])	מוֹאֵדָה	מָאֵד	Synonymous Spelling	
		F14:L6 (Frags. 14-17:L6 [Joel 2:16])	אֶסְפּוּ	אֶסְפוּ	Synonymous Spelling	
		F18:L1 (Frags. 18-20:L1 [Joel 4:6])	יְרוּשָׁלַיִם	יְרוּשָׁלַם	Synonymous Spelling	
		F24:L3 (Frags. 24-29, 48:L3 [Amos 3:10])	בְּאֵרְמוֹנוֹתֵיהֶמָּה	בְּאֵרְמָנוֹ תִּיקָם	Synonymous Spelling	
		F18:L5 (Frags. 18-20:L5 [Joel 4:12])	יֹשֶׁפֶט	יְהוֹשָׁפֶט	Synonymous Spelling	
	Corrections	F12:L5 (Frags. 10-12:L8 [Joel 1:18])	הַבִּקֵּר	בְּקֵר	Article is likely Erased	
		F12:L6 (Frags. 10-12:L9 [Joel 1:19])	הַמְדַבֵּר	מְדַבֵּר	Article is likely Erased	
	Correction and insufficient Manuscript Evidence	F18:L1-2 (Frags. 18-20:L1-2 [Joel 4:6b-8])			Omission by haplography, but corrected in part or full: Insufficient Manuscript Evidence obscures the extent of the Correction	
	Scribal Error	F29:L3 (Frags. 24-29, 48:L10 [Amos 4:2])	בְּסוֹפּוֹד	בְּסִירוֹת	Scribal Error? 4Q78's reading is not a word	

Table A42. 4Q79: Description of variants

Category	Description of Variant	Fragment, Line, and Verse	4Q78	MT	Detailed Description of Variant	Statistical Weight
2	Substitution	F2:L2 (Frgs. 1-2:L7 [Hos 2:1])	יומֹר	יָאָמַר	Substitution of Voice	1
	Unclear Variant	F2:L7 (Frgs. 1-2:L12 [Hos 2:4])	מבין פניה ונאפופיה	מִפְּנֵיהַּ וְנֶאֱפֹפִיָּה מִבֵּין	Substitution or Omission	1
Not Counted	Synonymous Spelling (See Abegg - <i>hiphil</i> does not occur)	F1:L6 (Frgs. 1-2:L6 [Hos 2:1])	וְלוֹ יִסְפִּיר	וְלֹא יִסְפֵּר	Insufficient Manuscript and <i>Plene</i> ?	
	Synonymous Spelling	F2:L4 (Frgs. 1-2:L9 [Hos 2:2])	הֵרֵץ	הָאֵרֵץ	Omission of Guttural	
	Synonymous Spelling	F2:L6 (Frgs. 1-2:L11 [Hos 2:4])	לוֹ	לֹא	Omission of Guttural	

Table A43. 4Q80: Description of variants

Category	Description of Variant	Fragment, Line, and Verse	4Q80	MT	Detailed Description of Variant	Statistical Weight
1	Addition	F17:L1 (Zech 8:6)	הגם	גַּם	Addition of Interrogative Particle	1
	Substitution	F15:L1 (Frgs. 14-15:L8 [Zech 6:1])	נחון[ש	נְחֻשָׁת	Substitution of Gender	1
		F15:L3 (Frgs. 14-15:L10 [Zech 6:3])	אמיצ[ים	אֲמִיצִים	Synonymous Lexical Root	1
2	Omission	F3:L5 (Zech 1:6)		לְנוֹ	Omission of Prepositional Phrase	2
Not Counted	Insufficient Manuscript Evidence	F14:L2 (Frgs. 14-15:L2 [Zech 5:9])	{ואש}אה {עיני} ^ואר[אה] והנה	וְאִשָּׁא עֵינַי וְאָרָא וְהִנֵּה		
		F15:L5 (Frgs. 14-15:L12 [Zech 6:5])	אדון	עַל־אֲדוֹן		
	Synonymous Spelling	F10:L9 (Frgs. 8-13:L13 [Zech 3:9])	ומשיתי	וּמִשְׁתִּי	<i>Plene</i>	
		F17:L1 (Zech 8:6)	ההמ[ה	הֵהֶם	Alternative Form of Pronoun	
		F18:L2 (Zech 12:8)	והיא	הִיא	Substitution of Gutturals	
F18:L3 (Zech 12:9)	ו[היא	וְהִיא	Substitution of Gutturals			

Table A44. 4Q82: Description of variants

Category	Description of Variant	Fragment, Line, and Verse	4Q82	MT	Detailed Description of Variant	Statistical Weight
1	Addition	Frgs. 19β· 27-30α, 31 verso-32:L10 (Hos 12:3)	וכמע[לליו	כמעלליו	Addition of Conjunctive <i>vav</i>	1
		Frgs. 30β, 31α recto, 36-37:L8 (Joel 2:8 [Eng., 7])	ואה[י]ן	אָהיו	Addition of Conjunctive <i>vav</i>	1
		Frgs. 88-91i:L5 (Jonah 4:7)	למהר[ת] ה[י]ןֹם	לְמַהֲרָת	Addition: Interpretative	1
		Frgs. 30γ, 40β-43β, 44:L6 (Amos 1:14)	ה^ה^מלחמה	מִלְחָמָה	Addition of Article	1
		Frgs. 91ii, 93-94i:L2 (Mic 1:13)	ללכ[יש	לְכִישׁ	Addition of Preposition	1
	Omission	Frgs. 76-78i, 79-81 (Jonah 1:3)	תרשיש	תְּרַשִּׁישָׁה	Omission of Accusative <i>he</i>	1
	Substitution	Frgs. 15-16α, 17-19α, 20 recto-26:L:22 (Hos 10:12)	וירו	וְיָרָה	Substitution of Number	1
		Frgs. 19β· 27-30α, 31 verso-32:L6 (Hos 11:11)	כְּצַפְרִים	כְּצַפּוֹר	Substitution of Number	1
		Frgs. 31β recto, 38-40α:L2 (Joel 4:4)	מ[הֶר	מִהֲרָה	Substitution: Part of Speech	1
		Frgs. 70-75:L24 (Obad 15)	שובו	יָשׁוּב	Substitution of Aspect/ Number	1
		Frgs. 88-91i:L5 (Jonah 4:7)	כעלות	בְּעֵלוֹת	Substitution of Similar Preposition	1
		Frgs. 91ii, 93-94i:L10 (Mic 2:4)	ונ[ה]ו נהי	וְנָהָה נְהִי	Substitution of Number	1

Table A44 continued

2	Addition	Frgs. 52β, 53β, 54β, 56β, 59-60 verso, 61 verso-64:L1 (Amos 7:8)	אד[וני יה[וה]	יהוה	Addition: Divine Title	1
		Frgs. 52β, 53β, 54β, 56β, 59-60 verso, 61 verso-64:L14 (Amos 7:17)	אדני יהוה	יהוה	Addition: Divine Title	1
		Frgs. 78ii, 82-87:L6 (Jonah 2:7 [Eng., 6])	חיי נפשי	חיי	Addition	2
	Substitution	Frgs. 52β, 53β, 54β, 56β, 59-60 verso, 61 verso-64:L2 (Amos 7:8)	יהוה	אלני	Substitution of Divine Name	1
		Frgs. 70-75:L10 (Obad 4)	תשים	שים	Substitution: Change of Speech/Voice	1
		Frgs. 72ii, 82-87 (Jonah 2:10 [Eng., 9])	אשלם	אשלמה	Substitution: Imperfect for Cohortative	1
		Frgs. 88-91i:L2 (Jonah 4:6)	אדוני יהוה	יהוה אלהים	Substitution of Divine Name (Second Occurrence)	1
		Frgs. 91ii, 93-94i:L9 (Mic 2:3)	צוא[רותי הם	צוארתים	Substitution of Pronominal Suffix	1
		F104:L2 (Zech 10:12)	יתהל[לו	יתהלכו	Substitution of Lexical Root	1
	Unclear Variant	Frgs. 52β, 53β, 54β, 56β, 59-60 verso, 61 verso-64:L12 (Amos 7:15)	ויאמר יה[וה]	ויאמר אלי יהוה	Omission or Transposition	1
		Frgs. 19β· 27-30α, 31 verso-32:L:16 (Hos 12:10)	כימי [מעלכה מעד]	כימי מועד	Addition or Substitution	2
		Frgs. 97 recto-99i:L1 (Nah 2:9)	מימיה	מימי היא	Possible Addition of Pronominal Suffix	1
	Complex Variant	Frgs. 47α ii, 50:L14-15 (Amos 5:15)	שנאנו רע... יהננו	שנאו רע... יחנו	Substitution/Addition	2
1 and 2	Complex Variants	Frgs. 19β· 27-30α, 31 verso-32:L5 (Hos 11:10)	א[הריו]^[יהוה] ילך וכאר[יה	אחרי יהוה ילכו פאריה	Addition/Substitution	3 (1 variant belongs to category 1 while 2 others belong to category 2)

Table A44 continued

Not Counted	Insufficient Evidence	Frgs. 1-2 verso, 3i, 4i:L6 (Hos 2:4)	רַיבּוּ	ריבו		
		Frgs. 3ii, 4ii, 5-7:L1 (Hos 2:14)	חַיַּת	חית		
		F13:L3 (Hos 7:14)	בְּלִבָּהֶם	בלבם		
		F13:L4 (Hos 7:16)	הִרְוִיחָהּ	רמיה		
		Frgs. 19β· 27-30α, 31 verso-32:L3 (Hos 11:8)	עָל	עלי		
		Frgs. 30β, 31α recto, 36-37:L6 (Joel 2:5)	מִלְחָמָה	מלחמה		
		Frgs. 76-78i, 79, 81:L15 (Jonah 1:8)	וְמָה	מה		
		Frgs. 78ii, 82-87:L11 (Jonah 3:2)	לְכָה	לך		
	Synonymous Spelling	F13:L3 (Hos 7:14)	יִלְלוּ	יִלְלוּ	Quiescence <i>yod</i>	
		F13:L3 (Hos 7:15)	אֲזָרוּעוֹתֵם	זָרוּעֵתֵם	Prosthetic <i>aleph</i> and <i>plene</i>	
		Frgs. 31β recto, 38-40α:L1 (Joel 4:4)	גְּלִילֹת	גְּלִילוֹת	Defective?	
		Frgs. 47אי-48:L15 (Amos 4:6)	אֲנוּכִי	אָנִי	Alternative Form of Pronoun	
		Frgs. 52β, 53β, 54β, 56β, 59-60 verso, 61 verso-64:L12 (Amos 7:15)	הַנְּבִיא	הַנְּבִיא	<i>Plene</i> and Substitution of Gutturals	<i>Yod</i> for a sere
		Frgs. 78ii, 82-87:L4 (Jonah 2:6 [Eng., 5])	אֲפֹנִי	אֲפֹנִי	Defective?	
		Frgs. 88-91i:L10 (Jonah 4:10)	לִילִי	לִילָהּ	Synonymous Spelling	
		Scribal Error	Frgs. 52β, 53β, 54β, 56β, 59-60 verso, 61 verso-64:L22 (Amos 8:5)	וְנֹשְׁבֵי	וְנֹשְׁבֵי	Scribal Error?
	Kethiv/Qere	F69:L2 (Amos 9:6)	מִעַלּוֹתָיו	מִעַלּוֹתָיו	Agrees with <i>Qere</i>	
Frgs. 88-91i:L2 (Jonah 4:6)		אֲדוּנֵי יְהוָה	אֲדוּנֵי יְהוָה	Agrees with <i>Qere</i>		

APPENDIX 3

TABLES OF THE TEXTS OF THE WRITINGS

Table A45. 4Q83: Description of variants (category 1)

Description of Variant	Fragment, Line, and Verse	4Q83	MT	Detailed Description of Variant	Statistical Weight
Addition	F9ii:L12 (Ps 71:13)	ויכלן	יכלו	Addition of Conjunctive <i>vav</i>	1
	F16:L1 (Col 2:28 [Ps 66:16])	ושמעו	שמעו	Addition of Conjunctive <i>vav</i>	1
	F18:L3 (Col 2:34 [Ps 67:6])	וידוכה	ידודך	Addition of Conjunctive <i>vav</i>	1
Omission	F9ii:L4 (Ps 38:21)	משלימי	ומשלמי	Omission of conjunctive <i>vav</i>	1
	F9ii:L6 (Ps 71:2)	תפלטני	ותפלטני	Omission of conjunctive <i>vav</i>	1
	F9ii:11 (Ps 71:11)	תפ[שוהו]	ותפשוהו	Omission of conjunctive <i>vav</i>	1
	F20:L2 (Col 3:25 [Ps 69:3])	אין	ואין	Omission of Conjunctive <i>vav</i>	1
	F19ii:L3 (Col 3:26 [Ps 69:3])	שבלת	ושבלת	Omission of Conjunctive <i>vav</i>	1
	F20:L7 (Col 3:30 [Ps 69:9])	נכרי	ונכרי	Omission of Conjunctive <i>vav</i>	1
	F19ii:L10 (Col 3:33 [Ps 69:15])	מעמקי	וממעמקי	Omission of Conjunctive <i>vav</i> and Preposition	1
	F19ii:L12 (Col 3:35 [Ps 69:18])	אל	ואל	Omission of Conjunctive <i>vav</i>	1

Table 45 continued

Substitution	F1:L2 (Ps 5:11)	הָאֲשִׁימוּ	הָאֲשִׁימָם	Substitution of Number	1
	F1:L4 (Ps 5:13)	בְּצַנָּה	כְּצַנָּה	Substitution of Preposition: Graphic Similarity	1
	F6:L3 (Ps 35:16)	חֲרָקוּ	חָרָק	Substitution of Tense	1
	F4ii:L2 (Ps 35:27)	חֲפָצִי	חֲחָפֵץ	Substitution of Number	1
	F6:L3 (Ps 35:16)	שָׁנִים	שָׁנִימוּ	Substitution of Number	1
	F9ii:L3 (Ps 38:19)	כֹּה	כִּי	Substitution of Similar Particles	1
	F9ii:L3 (Ps 38:19)	עֹונָתִי	עֹונִי	Substitution of Gender	1
	F9ii:L4 (Ps 38:20)	מִשְׁלִימִי	וּמִשְׁלָמִי	Substitution of Stem	1
	F9ii:L6 (Ps 71:2)	הִצִּילָנִי	תִּצִּילָנִי	Substitution of Tense	1
	F9ii:L6 (Ps 71:2)	הִצִּילָנִי	וְהוֹשִׁיעֵנִי	Substitution of Similar Lexeme	1
	F12:L1 (Frags. 11-12:L3 [Ps 53:5])	קָרָא	קָרְאוּ	Substitution of Number: collective v. plural	1
	F14ii:L3 (Col 2:30 [Ps 66:20])	מֵאוֹתִי	מֵאֹתִי	Substitution of similar Particle	1
	F19ii:L4 (Col 3:27 [Ps 69:5])	מִשְׁעָרֵי	מִשְׁעָרוֹת	Substitution of Gender	1
Unclear Variants	F6:L2 (Ps 35:15)	וְנֹאסְפוּ׃	וְנֹאסְפוּ וְנֹאסְפוּ	Omission of Conjunctive <i>vav</i> or first <i>vav</i> +perfect	1

Table A46. 4Q83: Description of variants (category 2)

Description of Variant	Fragment, Line, and Verse	4Q83	MT	Detailed Description of Variant	Statistical Weight
Addition	F4ii:L7 (Ps 36:7)	בה		Addition of Prepositional Phrase	2
	F9ii:L4 (Ps 38:20)	שקרי	שָׁקֵר	Addition of Pronominal Suffix	1
	F9ii:L5 (Ps 38:23)	לי		Addition of Prepositional Phrase	2
	F19ii:L10 (Col 3:33 [Ps 69:15])	וְאֵל אֲטַבְעָה וְיִקְחֵנִי גִזְלִי	וְאֵל- אֲטַבְעָה	Addition of Phrase	5
Omission	F11:L2 (Frgs. 11-12:L2 [Ps 53:4])	[כול	כָּלוּ	Omission of Pronominal Suffix	1
	F20:L11 (Col 3:34 [Ps 69:17])		יְהוָה	Omission of Vocative	1
Substitution	F4ii:L5 (Ps 36:5)	יִתְעַז כּוֹל דָּרָךְ	יִתְעַזב על- דָּרָךְ	Substitution: Lexeme and particle - graphic similarity	2
	F4ii:L6 (Ps 36:6)	מהשמים	בְּהַשְׁמַיִם	Substitution of Prepositions: graphic/phonological similarity	1
	F9ii:L6 (Ps 71:3)	לְבִי עֹדֵמִי	לְבוֹא תְּמִיד	Substitution: Graphic Similarity	1
	F9ii:L8 (Ps 71:6)	עוֹזִי	גוֹזִי	Substitutions of Lexeme	1
	F18:L4 (Col 2:35 [Ps 67:8])	יִבְרַכּוּכָה אֱלֹהִים]	יִבְרַכּוּ אֱלֹהִים	Substitution of subject and object	1
	F20:L2 (Col 3:25 [Ps 69:3])	בֵּין	בֵּינוֹן	Substitution: Graphic Similarity	1
	F19ii:L5 (Col 3:28 [Ps 69:6])	אַתָּה יָדַעְתָּ לוֹא לוֹיְתִי וְאַשְׁלַמְנִי	אַתָּה יָדַעְתָּ לְאַנְלִיתִי וְאַשְׁמוֹתִי	Substitution: Likely graphic confusion	2
	F20:L6 (Col 3:29 [Ps 69:9])	מִי זֶר הֵייתִי	מִזֶּר הֵייתִי	Substitution: Graphic Similarity	1
	F20:L7 (Col 3:30 [Ps 69:11])	וְאֵךְ בְּצוֹם נַפְשִׁי	וְאַבְרָכָה בְּצוֹם נַפְשִׁי	Substitution of Lexeme	1
	F19ii:L8 (Col 3:31 [Ps 69:12])	וְתָהִי	וְאַהִי	Change of Subject	1
	F19ii:L8 (Col 3:31 [Ps 69:13])	יְשִׁיחוּ יֹשְׁבֵי שַׁעַר בֵּי	יְשִׁיחוּ בֵּי יְשִׁבֵי שַׁעַר	Transposition of Prepositional Phrase	1

Table A46 continued

Substitution continued	F20:L8 (Col 3:31 [Ps 69:13])	ינגנון]	ונגינונות	Substitution: graphic similarity or interpretation	1
	F19ii:L9 (Col 3:32 [Ps 69:14])	ואני תפלתי למה [יהוה] עתה רצון	ואני תפלתתי לך יהוה עת רצון	Substitution: Graphic Similarity	2
	F19ii:L10 (Col 3:33 [Ps 69:15])	הצילני	אנצלה	Substitution of Verbal Stem	1
	F19ii:L11 (Col 3:34 [Ps 69:16])	פי	פיה	Substitution of Pronominal Suffix	1
	F19ii:L12 (Col 3:35 [Ps 69:18])	מה[רה	מהר	Substitution: Imperative forms	1
	F19ii:L12 (Col 3:35 [Ps 69:19])	קרב	קרבה	Substitution: Imperative forms	1
Unclear Variants	F7:L6 (Frgs. 7-8:L6 [Ps 38:12])	מןגד רעי ומיוד[עי	אקבי ורעי מנגד נגעי יעמדו	Substitution and Transposition?	2
	F19ii:L5 (Col 3:28 [Ps 69:7])		בי	Omission or transposition of prepositional phrase	2
	F20:L6 (Col 3:29 [Ps 69:7])		בי	Substitution or Transposition	1
Complex Variants	F9ii:L2 (Ps 38:16)	אדני אתה תענני כי אלהי	אתה תענה אלני אלהי	Transposition and Additions	3
	F9ii:L4 (Ps 38:21)	יישסני תחת דבר טוב	ישטנוני תחת רדופי [רדפי] טוב	Substitutions	3
	F12:L2 (Frgs. 11-12:L4 [Ps 53:7])	ביום ציון	מציון	Substitution and Addition	2
	F20:L3 (Col 3:26 [Ps 69:4])	כליו שני בחיל לאלהי יש[ראל]	כלו עיני מיחל לאלהי	Substitutions and Addition	3

Table A47. 4Q83: Description of variants (category 3)

No Variants

Table A48. 4Q83: Description of variants, not counted in statistics

Description of Variant	Fragment, Line, and Verse	4Q83	MT	Detailed Description of Variant	Statistical Weight
Differences likely caused by Excerpted Nature	F4i:L4 (F4i:L6 [Ps 31, 33])		Rearranged Sequence	Different Sequence of Psalms	
	F4ii:L5		Different Division of Psalms	Psalm 36 divided into 2 Psalms	
	F9ii:L5			Ps 38 and 71 Portrayed as One Psalm	
Insufficient Manuscript Evidence	F1:L1 (Ps 5:9-10)]ֹֹֹא	כִּי אֵין	Line spacing and remains of aleph suggest longer reader	
	F4i:L2 (F4i:L4 [Ps 31:24])	אָמוֹנִים	אמנם		
	F5:L1 (Ps 34:21)	נשב[ר	נשברה		
	F6:L5 (Ps 35:20)	וְאֵל	וְעַל		
	F8:L2 (Frags. 7-8:L3 [Ps 38:6])	וְנִמְקוּ	נְמָקוּ		
	F9ii:L2 (Ps 38:17)	יִגְדִּילוּ	הִגְדִּילוּ		
	F9ii:L3 (Ps 38:20)	הָנֵם	חַיִּים		
	F9ii:L7 (Ps 71:4)	וְחִמּוֹץ	וְחֹמֶץ		
F13:L1 (Ps 56:4)	יֹֹֹם]	יֹֹֹם			
Synonymous Spelling	F9ii:L3 (Ps 38:19)	מִן הַטְּאוֹתִי	מִטְּאוֹתִי	Spelling and word division	
	F9ii:L5 (Ps 38:23)	חִישָׁה	חֹשָׁה	Alternative Spelling (See Ps 70:6 and 71:12 [DJD, 16])	
	F20:L2 (Col 3:25 [Ps 69:3])	כִּלְיוֹ	כָּלוּ	4Q83 represents the original third <i>yod</i>	
	F20:L11 (Col 3:34 [Ps 69:17])	כָּטוֹב	כִּי־טוֹב	Substitution of Particle	
	F19ii:L12 (Col 3:35 [Ps 69:19])	עַל	אֶל	Confusion of Gutturals	
Scribal Error	F8:L4 (Frags. 7-8:L4 [Ps 38:9])	נִפְגְּאוֹתִי]	נִפְגּוֹתִי	4Q83's root does not exist?	
	F8:L5 (F7-8:L5] Ps 38:10)	נִסְתַּר	נִסְתַּרָּה	Clear 3fs subject	
<i>Kethiv/Qere</i>	F9ii:L12 (Ps 71:12)	חִישָׁה	חִישָׁה [חֹשָׁה]	Agrees with <i>Kethiv</i>	

Table A49. 4Q84: Description of variants

Category	Description of Variant	Fragment, Line, and Verse	4Q84	MT	Detailed Description of Variant	Statistical Weight
1	Addition	F1iii:L7 (Col 3:14 [Ps 92:7])	ולא	לא	Addition of Conjunctive <i>vav</i>	1
		F10:L1 (Col 7:9 [Ps 94:14])	את עמו[עמו	Addition of Marker of Accusative	1
	Omission	F18i:L4: (Col 20:8 [Ps 102:16])	ייראו	וְיִירְאוּ	Omission of Conjunctive <i>vav</i>	1
		F21i:L7 (Col 22:16 [Ps 103:3])	ורפא	הָרַפָּא	Omission of Article	1
		F28ii:L4 (Col 34:13 [Ps 118:7])	אני	וְאָנִי	Omission of Conjunctive <i>vav</i>	1
	Substitution	F1iii:L4 (Col 3:11 [Ps 92:5])	ירנן	אֲרִנָּן	Substitution of Subject	1
		F5ii:L4 (Col 4:15 [Ps 92:15])	והיו	וְהָיוּ	Substitution: Graphic Similarity	1
		F14:2 (Col 19:8 [Ps 102:5])	להמי מאכל מאכל ל	מֵאֲכָל לְהִמִּי	Transposition	1
		F15ii:L6 (Col 21:6 [Ps 102:20])	לארץ	אֶל-אֶרֶץ	Substitution of Similar Preposition	1
		F25ii:L2 (Col 25:2 [Ps 103:20])	דבריו	דְּבָרוֹ	Substitution of Number: Collective for Plural	1
		F25ii:L3 (Col 25:3 [Ps 103:20])	דבריו	דְּבָרוֹ	Substitution of Number: Collective for Plural	1
		F28ii:L4 (Col 34:14 [Ps 118:8])	לבטה	לְהִסּוֹת	Substitution of Roots	1
		F34:L5 (Col 35:17 [Ps 118:26])	[ב]לְכֹנּוּ אתכם	בְּרַכְּנוּכֶם	Substitution of Object	1

Table A49 continued

2	Addition	F5ii:L4 (Col 4:L15) Ps 92:15)	בשיבה טובה	בְּשִׁיבָה	Harmonization: Addition of modifier	1
	Omission	F18i:L7 (Col 20:16 [Ps 102:17])	בכבוד	בְּכָבוֹדוֹ	Omission of Pronominal Suffix	1
		F28ii:L6–7 (Col 34:14 [Ps 118:11– 12])		גַּם־סָבְבוּנִי בְּשֵׁם יְהוָה כִּי אָמַלְמָ: סָבְבוּנִי	Omission: Haplography	11
	Substitution	F18i:L5:Col 20:14 [Ps 102:16])	כבודו	כְּבוֹדָהּ	Substitution of Pronominal Suffix: Change in perspective	1
		F15ii:L5 (Col 21:5 [Ps 102:20])	ממעון	מְמָרוֹם	Harmonization: Deuteronomy 26:16 (DJD, 39)	1
3	No Variants					
Not Counted	Differences likely caused by Excerpted Nature	F25ii-iii (Ps 103 - 112)			Psalm 103 to Psalm 112	
	Insufficient Manuscript Evidence	F26:L1 (Col 29:9 [Ps 115:2])	איה	אֵיה־נָא	Lacuna could obscure reading	
		F32i:L2 (Col 35:8 [Ps 118:19])	אבואם	אָבֵא כָם	The bet could be in the lacuna	
	Synonymous Spelling	F1iii:L4 (Col 3:11 [Ps 92:5])	[במ[עשה]	בְּמַעֲשֵׂי	Orthographic representatio n of third he	
		F5ii:L3 (Col 4:14 [Ps 92:14])	יפרהו	יִפְרִיחוּ	Defective?	
		F6:L2 (Col 5:14 [Ps 93:5])	נוה	נֹאָה	Omission of Guttural	
		F25iv:L1 (Col 27:1 [Ps 113:1])	הללויה	הִלְלוּ יְהוָה	Different division of words	
	Corrected to MT	F21i:L7 (Col 22:16 [Ps 103:3])	תחלוֹאֵיךְ	תִּחְלֹאֲנִי	Corrected by Original Scribe to MT	
	<i>Kethiv/Qe re</i>	F18ii:L4 (Col 21:13 [Ps 102:24])	[כחי	[פחי]	Follows <i>Qere</i>	

Table A50. 4Q86: Description of variants

Category	Description of Variant	Fragment, Line, and Verse	4Q86	MT	Detailed Description of Variant	Statistical Weight
1	Addition	F1iii:L7 (Col 3:14 [Ps 92:7])	ולא	לא	Addition of Conjunctive <i>vav</i>	1
		F5ii:L4 (Col 3:4 [Ps 104:10])	ההרים	הרים	Addition of article	1
		F5ii:L5 (Col 3:5 [Ps 104:11])	ישקו חיות את {{ֹׁ}}ה {{ֹׁ}}א	ישקו כל-חיותו שני	Addition of marker of accusative and article	2
		F11:L1 (Col 4:10 [Ps 104:22])	ויאספו	יאספון	Addition of Conjunctive <i>vav</i>	1
		F12:L4 (Col 5:18 [Ps 104:35])	כי יתמו	יתמו	Addition of particle	1
	Omission	F6:L6 (Col 2:13 [Ps 104:3])	מקרה	המקרה	Omission of article	1
		F6:L7 (Col 2:14 [Ps 104:3])	מהלך]	המהלך	Omission of article	1
		F5ii:L4 (Col 3:4 [Ps 104:10])	משלח	המשלח	Omission of article	1
	Substitution	F6:L4 (Col 2:12 [Ps 104:1])	תלבש	לבש	Substitution of Tense	1
	2	Omission	F5ii:L5 (Col 3:5 [Ps 104:11])	חיות	כל-חיותו	Omission of Pronominal Suffix and <i>kōl</i> particle
F14:L1 (Col 5:17 [Ps 104:34])				אנכי אשמח ביהנה	Omission due to Parablepsis (Haplography)	5
Substitution		F6:L8 (Col 2:16 [Ps 104:5])	יוסד	יסד	Substitution of Part of Speech	1
		F5ii:L6 (Col 3:6 [Ps 104:11])	ישכירו	ישברו	Substitution of Lexeme: Interpretation	1
		F10ii:L6 (Col 4:15 [Ps 104:24])	נעשו	עשית	Substitution of verbal stem and person	1
3		No Variants				

Table A50 continued

Not Counted	Differences likely caused by Excerpted Nature	F6:L2 (Col 2:11 [Ps 147, 104])	Ps 147, 104	Ps 147, 148	Different Sequence		
	Insufficient Manuscript Evidence	F1:L1-2 (Col 1:6-7 [Ps 147:1])	נא]וה [זמרה]				
		F1:L1 (Col 1:6 [Ps 147:1])	אמ]ו [ה]ללויה	וְדַר הַלְלוּ יְהוָה			
		F3:L1 (Col 2:2 [Ps 147:14])	זחלב	חֶלֶב			
		F6:L3 (Col 2:11 [Ps 104:1])	יהוה יהוה] אלהי]ם				
	Synonymous Spelling	F7i:L4 (Col 2:13 [Ps 104:3])	על]יו]תו	עֲלֵיוֹתָיו			
		F5ii:L5 (Col 3:5 [Ps 104:10])	יהלכו	יְהַלְכוּ			
		F11:L1 (Col 4:10 [Ps 104:22])	ויאספו	יֶאֱסְפוּ			
		F11:L2 (Col 4:11 [Ps 104:22])	ירבצו	יִרְבְּצוּ			

Table A51. 4Q87: Description of variants

Category	Description of Variant	Fragment, Line, and Verse	4Q87	MT	Detailed Description of Variant	Statistical Weight
1	Addition	F26ii:L7 (Ps 130:6)	כש]ומרים	שְׁמֵרִים	Addition of Preposition	1
	Omission	F2ii:L1 (Ps 78:31)	משמנ]יהם	בְּמִשְׁמֵנֵיהֶם	Omission of Preposition	1
		F13:L2 (Ps 115:17)	מתים	הַמֵּתִים	Omission of Article	1
	Substitution	F21:L2 (Frgs. 18ii, 20-24:L2 [Ps 105:38])	שמהו	שְׁמָה	Substitution of Number: Collective v. Plural	1
		F26i:L2 (Ps 125:2)	לע]מו סביב	סָבִיב לְעַמּוֹ	Transposition	1
		F26i:L5 (Ps 125:4)	בלב	בְּלִבּוֹתָם	Substitution of Number: Collective v. Plural (Parablepsis)	1
		F26i:L6 (Ps 126:1)	שבות	שְׁיִבַת	Substitution of Similar Lexeme	1

Table 51 continued

2	Omission	F26i:L4 (Ps 125:3)	יִדְּיָם	יְדִיָּם	Omission of Pronominal suffix	1
		F26i:L5 (Ps 125:4)	בלב	בְּלִבָּתָם	Omission of Pronominal suffix (Parablepsis)	1
	Substitution	F20:L1 (F18ii, 20-24:L1 [Ps 105:37])	וּיּוֹצֵא עִמָּו	וּיּוֹצִיאָם	Pronoun for noun	1
	Complex Variant	F25:L1 (Ps 120:6)	לִנְפִישִׁי	לָהּ נִפְשִׁי	Omission of Pronominal Suffix	1
3	No Variants					
Not Counted	Differences likely caused by Excerpted Nature	F14			Ps 118 to Ps 104	
	Insufficient Manuscript Evidence	F6:L1 (Frgs. 6-7:L1 [Ps 89:44])	לְמַלְחָמָה	בְּמַלְחָמָה	Substitution of Preposition	
		F9:Le1-2			Ps 103 to 109	
		Frgs. 15,16, 17, 18i			Ps 104 not followed by Ps 105	
		F19:L1 (Ps 105:23)	יֵעֲקֹב	וַיֵּעֲקֹב		
		F18ii:L5 (Frgs. 18ii, 20-24:L5 [Ps 105, 146])	הַלְלוּיָהּ	הַלְלוּיָהּ	Ps 105 to Ps 146	
	Correction to the MT	F26i:L5 (Ps 125:5)	וְהַמְטִים	וְהַמְטִים		
		F26i:L5 (Ps 125:5)	עַקְלֹקֹלֹתֵי	עַקְלֹקֹלֹתָם		
		F26i:L6 (Ps 126:1)	שִׁירֵי הַמַּעֲלוֹת	שִׁירֵי הַמַּעֲלוֹת		
		F26i:L8 (Ps 126:2)	הַגְּדִיל הַיְהוּדָה	הַגְּדִיל יְהוּדָה		
		F26ii:L3 (Ps 130:1)	עוֹלָתֵינוּ	שִׁירֵי הַמַּעֲלוֹת		

Table A52. 4Q88: Description of variants

Category	Description of Variant	Fragment, Line, and Verse	4Q88	MT	Detailed Description of Variant	Statistical Weight
1	Addition	F3ii:L4 (Col 2:17 [Ps 107:13])	וישיעם	יושיעם	Addition of Conjunctive <i>vav</i>	1
		F3ii:L4 (Col 2:17 [Ps 107:14])	ויוציאם	ווציאם	Addition of Conjunctive <i>vav</i>	1
		F8iL4 (Col 4:16 [Ps 107:26])	ונפשם	נפשם	Addition of Conjunctive <i>vav</i>	1
		F8i:L5 (Col 3:17 [Ps 107:27])	ויהו^ו^גו	יְהוּגוּ	Addition of Conjunctive <i>vav</i>	1
	Omission	F8ii:L1 (Col 4:13 [Ps 107:35])	ארץ	וארץ	Omission of Conjunctive <i>vav</i>	1
		F10:L6 (Col 7:8 [Ps 109:28])	עבדכָּה	ועבדךָ	Omission of Conjunctive <i>vav</i>	1
	Substitution	F3ii:L8 (Col 2:21 [Ps 107:16])	נחש]ה	נחשת	Substitution of Similar Lexeme	1
		F8i:L7 (Col 3:19 [Ps 107:28])	ויוזעקו	ויצצקו	Substitution of Similar Lexeme	1
		F8i:L1 (Col 3:13 [Ps 107:35])	למבועי	למצאי	Substitution of Similar Lexeme	1
		F8ii:L3 (Col 4:15 [Ps 107:36])	ערי	עיר	Substitution of Number	1
		F8ii:L7 (Col 4:19 [Ps 107:39])	ימ[עטו	וימעטו	Substitution of Tense	1
		F9:L3 (Col 6:3 [Ps 109:6])	שוט]ן	ושטן	Substitution of Noun for Participle	1
	2	Omission	F9:L1 (Col 6:1 [Ps 109:4])	[יסטמוני יסי]מו	ישטמוני ואני תפלה וישמו	Omission: Possibly Parablepsis
Substitution		F1:L6 (Frags. 1-2:L23 [Ps 22:16])	שופט]	תשפתני	Substitution: Verb for Participle	1
		F5:L2-3 (Col 2:7-8 [Ps 107:9])	[כי השביע נפש [רעבה ונפש ש]לקה [מ]לא	פיה שביע נפש שקקה ונפש רעבה מקא-טוב:	Transposition	1
		F3ii:L6 (Col 2:19 [Ps 107:15])	ה[ודו	יודו	Substitution of Volitive	1
		F3ii:L6 (Col 2:19 [Ps 107:15])	חסידו	חסדו	Substitution of Syntax	1
		F3iii:L2 (Col 4:17 [Ps 107:26])	בה[ם]	ברעה	Substitution of pronoun for noun	1
		F8i:L9 (Col 3:21 [Ps 107:28])	וישיעם	יוציאם	Substitution of Lexemes	1
		F8i:L9 (Col 3:21 [Ps 107:29])	ויופך	יקם	Substitution of Lexemes	1
		F8i:L10 (Col 3:22 [Ps 107:29])	גלי ים	גליהם	Substitution of pronoun for noun	1
		F8ii:L2 (Col 4:14 [Ps 107:36])	עם רב	רעבים	Substitution of Accusatives	1
		F8ii:L10 (Col 4:22 [Ps 107:41])	בעני	מעוני	Substitution of Prepositions	1
		F9:L1 (Col 6:1 [Ps 109:4])	[יסטמוני	ישטמוני	Similar Lexeme	1

Table A52 continued

2 continued	Unclear Variant	F8i:L10-11 (Col 4:22-23 [Ps 107:41])	עלוֹם [] כצאֵן	וַיִּשָׂם כְּצֵאֵן מִשְׁפָּחֹת	Addition or Substitution	1
		F5:L6 (Col 2:11 [Ps 107:11])]הֵם הַ[מרוֹן]	קִי־הַמְרוֹן		1
3	No Variants					
Not Counted	Differences likely caused by Liturgical Nature	Inclusion of Non- Masoretic Psalms	Col 7:14-8		Apostrophe to Zion	
			Col 9		Eschatological Hymn	
			Col 10		Apostrophe to Judah	
	Insufficient Evidence	F1:L6 (Frags. 1-2:L23 [Ps 22:16])	ואל [עפר	וְלַעֲפָר		
		F1:L8 (F1-2:L25) Ps 22:17)	כָּרֹן	כְּאָרִי		
		F3ii:L3 (Col 2:16 [Ps 107:13])	ממציק[ותי]הֵם	ממציקותיהם		
		F8i:L1 (Col 3:13[Ps 107:24])	יודו	יְהוָה		
		F8i:L8 (Col 3:20 [Ps 107:28])	ממציקותיהם	וּממציקותיהם		
		F8i:L11 (Col 3:23 [Ps 107:30])	[וינחם א]ל מחוז הפצם.	וַיִּשְׁמְחוּ קִי־ יִשְׁתְּקוּ לְיִנְחָם אֶל־ מְחֹז הַפְּצָם:		
		F10:L3-4 (Col 7:5-6 [Ps 109:26])	עוררני [יה]וה אלוהי [וידעו	עֲזָרְנִי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי הוֹשִׁיעֵנִי כְחֹסֶדְךָ: וַיִּדְעוּ		Possible Omission but Depends on Spatial Consider ations
	F10:L4-5 (Col 7:6-7 [Ps 109:28])	[וידעו כי ידכה] זאת [יק]ללו המה	וַיִּדְעוּ קִי־ יָדְךָ זֹאת אֲמָתָה יְהוָה עֲשִׂיתָהּ: יִקְלַל לוֹיֵהֶמה		Possible Omission but Depends on Spatial Consider ations	
	Synonymous Spelling	F1:L4 (Frags. 1-2:L21 [Ps 22:15])	נ[מ]ש	נָמַס	Sibilant Confusion	
		F8i:L9 (Col 3:21 [Ps 107:29])	שערה	סְעָרָה	Sibilant Confusion	
		F9:L1 (Col 6:1 [Ps 109:4])	יסי]מו	וַיִּשְׁיִמוּ	Sibilant Confusion	
		F10:L3 (Col 7:5 [Ps 109:25])	רושם	רֵאשָׁם	Synonymous Spelling	
Scribal Error	F1:L5 (Frags. 1-2:L22 [Ps 22:16])	מדבש	מִדְבָּק	Substitution of Lexeme		
	F8ii:L13 (Col 4:25 [Ps 107:42])	קפץ	קִפְצָה	Clear feminine subject		

Table A53. 4Q92: Description of variants

Category	Description of Variant	Fragment, Line, and Verse	4Q92	MT	Detailed Description of Variant	Statistical Weight
2	Omission	Col 1:3 (Ps 135:10)		וְהָרַג	Omission of verb	2
	Substitution	Col 1:3 (Ps 135:11)	את סיהון	לְסִיחֹן	Substitution of Particle	1
3	No Variants					
Not Counted	Insufficient Manuscript Evidence	Col 1:1 (Ps 135:6)	לעשות יעשה אין כי אין כיהוה ואיין שיעשה כמלך אלהים		Insufficient Mss. Evidence	
		Col 2:3 (Ps 99:1)	לדון ד		Addition of Superscription	
		Col 1-2			Proposed Squence Ps 135 then Ps 99	
	Synonymous Spelling	Col 1:5 (Ps 135:15)	מעשי	מעשה	Orthography?	

Table A54. 4Q93: Description of variants

Category	Description of Variant	Fragment, Line, and Verse	4Q93	MT	Detailed Description of Variant	Statistical Weight
1	Addition	F1:L7 (Col 1:12 [Ps 104:5])	לעלם	עולם	Addition of Preposition	1
2	No Variants					
3	No Variants					
Not Counted	Orthography	F1:L4 (Col 1:9 [Ps 104:4])	עשי	עשה	<i>Yod</i> representing final <i>e</i> ?	
		F1:L4 (Col 1:9 [Ps 104:4])	מלאכו	מלאכיו	Contraction of diphthong <i>aw</i>	
		F1:L5 (Col 1:10 [Ps 104:4])	משירתו	משירתיו	Contraction of diphthong <i>aw</i>	
		F1:L6 (Col 1:11] Ps 104:5)	ישד	יסד	Interchange of sibilants	

Table A55. 4Q95: Description of variants if fragments 2-3 preserve portions of Psalm 136:19-24

Category	Description of Variant	Fragment, Line, and Verse	4Q95	MT	Detailed Description of Variant	Statistical Weight
1	No Variants					
2	Addition	F1:L1-2 (Ps 135:6)	לעשות יעשה		Addition: Longer Reading	3
	Substitution	F3:L2 (F2-3:L3 [Ps 136:22 or 135:12])	עמו	עבדו	Substitution: Similar Title	1
3	No Variants					
Not Counted	Insufficient manuscript Evidence	F2:L2 (Frgs. 2-3:L2 [Ps 136:21 or 135:12])	[ל]נו		The lamed may correspond to lamed later in verse	
		F2:L2 (Frgs. 2-3:L2 [Ps 136:21 or 135:12])	נחלה	לנחלה	Line is not preserved	

Table A56. 4Q95: Description of variants if fragments 2-3 preserve Psalm 135:11-12 + Psalm 136:23-24

Category	Description of Variant	Fragment, Line, and Verse	4Q95	MT	Detailed Description of Variant	Statistical Weight
1	No Variants					
2	Addition	F1:L1-2 (Ps 135:6)	לעשות יעשה		Addition: Longer Reading	3
		F2:L2 (Frgs. 2-3:L2 [Ps 136:21 or 135:12])	[ל]נו		The lamed may correspond to lamed later in verse	2
3	No Variants					
Not Counted	Insufficient Manuscript Evidence	F2:L2 (Frgs. 2-3:L2 [Ps 136:21 or 135:12])	[כי לעולם] [חסדו]		Addition of Refrain	
		F3:L2 (Frgs. 2-3:L3 [Ps 136:21 or 135:12])	כני לעולם [חסדו]		Addition of Refrain	

Table A57. 4Q98: Description of variants

Category	Description of Variant	Fragment, Line, and Verse	4Q98	MT	Detailed Description of Variant	Statistical Weight
1	Substitution	Col 1:7 (Ps 33:9)	והיה	וְהִי	Substitution of Tense	1
		Col 1:10 (Ps 33:12)	תב[ל	תְּבַרְךָ	Substitution of Similar Lexeme	1
2	Addition	Col 1:2 (Ps 33:1)	לדויד שיר מזמור		Addition of Superscription	4
		Col 1:6 (Ps 33:7)	[שם המים] נצבו כמו [גוד		Addition of colon	2
3	No Variants					
Not Counted	Differences likely caused by Excerpted Nature	Col 1:1-2	Ps 31, 33	Ps 31, 32, 33	Omission or Transmission of Ps 32	
		Col 1:8-10	Interval between Ps 31:1-12 and 31:13-22	No Interval	Division of one Psalm into two?	
	Insufficient Manuscript Evidence	Col 2:3 (Ps 35:8)	ש[ואה	בְּשׂוֹאָה		
	Unclear Paleography	Col 1:8 (Ps 33:11)	והיה	וְהִי		
	Synonymous Spelling	Col 1:8 (Ps 33:11)	אלוהו	אֱלֹהָיו		
		Col 2:7 (Ps 35:15)	נספו	נֶאֱסְפוּ		
	Scribal Error	Col 2:7 (Ps 35:15)	תכים	גְּכִים		

Table A58. 4Q98a: Description of variants

Category	Description of Variant	Fragment, Line, and Verse	4Q98a	MT	Detailed Description of Variant	Statistical Weight
1	Substitution	F2ii:L1 (Col 2:L1 [Ps 30:10])	לשחת	אֶל-שָׁחַת	Substitution of Similar Preposition	1
2	Substitution	F2ii:L1 (Col 2:L1 [Ps 30:9])	י'הוה	אֱלֹהֵי	Substitution of Divine Title	1
3	No Variants					
Not Counted	Insufficient Manuscript Evidence	F3:L3 (Col 1:L5 [Ps 26:11])	[ה'היני	וְהִנֵּנִי	Possible <i>plene</i> Spelling	
		F2ii:L3 (Col 2:L3 [Ps 30:10])	וי[הנני	וְהִנֵּנִי	May Transcribe Different Word	

Table A59. 4Q98g: Description of variants

Category	Description of Variant	Fragment, Line, and Verse	4Q98g	MT	Detailed Description of Variant	Statistical Weight
1	Omission	L5 (Ps 89:26)	בנהרת	ובנהרות	Omission of Conjunctive <i>vav</i> (defective?)	1
	Substitution	L6 (Ps 89:23)	על	עולה	Substitution of Similar Lexeme	1
2	Omission	L5 (Ps 89:26)	יד	ידו	Omission of Pronominal Suffix	1
		L7 (Ps 89:28)		אף	Omission of Particle	1
	Substitution	L1 (Ps 89:20)	ל[בְּהַרִּיכ	לְהַסִּידִיד	Substitution of Lexeme	1
		L3 (Ps 89:21)	מִן שֶׁמֶן	בְּשֶׁמֶן	Substitution of Preposition	1
		L4 (Ps 89:22)	תכנכם	תכונ עמו	Substitution: Graphic Similarity	1
	Unclear Variants	L6 (Ps 89:23)	[אוֹאֵב וְבִן עַל לַעֲנוֹת־וֹ [^]	אוֹיֵב בּוֹ וְיָדוּ עוֹלָה לֹא לְעַנְּבוֹ	Omission or Transposition and Substitutions	3
3	No Variants					
Not Counted	Differences likely caused by Excerpted Nature	Col 1:1-8	20-22, 26, 23, 27-28, and 31	20-31	Different Sequence of Verses	
	Insufficient Manuscript Evidence	L1 (Ps 89:20)	תֹּאמֶר	וְתֹאמֶר		
		L1 (Ps 89:20)	עוֹזֵר	עוֹר	See Gleanings, 440	
		L6 (Ps 89:23)	לַעֲנוֹת־וֹ [^]	לֹא יַעֲנְבוּ		
		L7 (Ps 89:28)	אֶתְנִי־[וֹ [^]]	אֶתְנֶהוּ		
	Unclear Paleography	L4 (Ps 89:22)	ידו	יְדִי		
	Synonymous Spelling	L1 (Ps 89:20)	שֶׁת	שְׁוִיתִי	Aramaic Influence (Gleanings, 442)	
		L2 (Ps 89:20)	מִן עַם	מִעַם	Aramaic Influence (Gleanings, 441)	
L7 (Ps 89:27)		אֵת	אֶתְהּ	Synonymous Spellings		

Table A60. 11Q5: Description of variants, category 1

Description of Variant	Fragment, Line, and Verse	11Q5	MT	Detailed Description of Variant	Statistical Weight
Addition	FCii:L3 (Ps 102:20)	הארן־ז	אַרְז	Addition of Article	1
	FE ii:L2 (Ps104:22)	ויאספון	וַאֲסָפוֹן	Addition of Conjunctive <i>vav</i>	1
	FCii:L6 (Ps 102:24)	כי		Addition of Particle	1
	FCii:L9 (Ps 102:27)	וכלבוש	כְּלָבוֹשׁ	Addition of Conjunctive <i>vav</i>	1
	FEii:L5 (Ps 104:25)	שמה	שָׁם	Addition of Directional <i>he</i>	1
	FEii:L5 (Ps 104:25)	למספר	מִסְפָּר	Addition of Preposition	1
	FEii:L8 (Ps 104:28)	וילקטון	וַיִּלְקְטוּן	Addition of Conjunctive <i>vav</i>	1
	FEii:L8 (Ps 104:29)	ויגועו	וַיִּגְעוּן	Addition of Conjunctive <i>vav</i>	1
	FEii:L9 (Ps 104:30)	ויבראון	וַיִּבְרְאוּן	Addition of Conjunctive <i>vav</i>	1
	FEii:L10 (Ps 104:31)	ויהי	וַיְהִי	Addition of Conjunctive <i>vav</i>	1
	FEii:L13 (Ps 104:35)	כאשר		Addition of Prepositional Phrase	1
	FEiii:L13 (Ps 105:7)	כי		Addition of Particle	1
	Col 3:9 (Ps 148:4)	לשמים	הַשָּׁמַיִם	Addition of Preposition	1
	Col 3:3 (121:3)	ואל	אֶל	Addition of Conjunctive <i>vav</i>	1
	Col 3:9 (Ps 122:4)	שמה]	שָׁמָּה	Addition of directional <i>he</i>	1
	Col 3:12 (Ps 122:7)	ושלוח	שְׁלֹחַ	Addition of Conjunctive <i>vav</i>	1
	Col 3:15 (Ps 123:1)	למעלות	הַמַּעֲלוֹת	Addition of Preposition	1
	Col 4:3 (Ps 125:1)	שלוא	לֹא	Addition of Relative Particle	1
	Col 5:8 (Ps 129:8)	שלוא	וּלֹא	Addition of Relative Particle	1
	Col 6:3 (Ps 132:11)	כי		Addition of Particle	1
	Col 7:3 (Ps 119:17)	ואחיה	אָחִיָּה	Addition of Conjunctive <i>vav</i>	1
	Col 8:13 (Ps 119:49)	לדבריכה	דְּבַר	Addition of Preposition	1
	Col 11:4 (Ps 109:108)	ממשפטיכה	וּמִשְׁפָּטֶיךָ	Addition of Preposition	1
	Col 11:12 (Ps 119:116)	ממשברי	מִשְׁבְּרֵי	Addition of Preposition	1
	Col 11:9 (Ps 119:136)	כי		Addition of Particle	1
	Col 13:15 (Ps 119:163)	ותורתכה	תּוֹרַתְךָ	Addition of Conjunctive <i>vav</i>	1
	Col 14:10 (Ps 135:3)	את		Addition of Marker of Accusative	1

Table A60 continued

Addition continued	Col 14:11 (Ps 135:4)	וישראל	יִשְׂרָאֵל	Addition of Conjunctive <i>vav</i>	1
	Col 14:14 (Ps 135:6)	ובכול	וְכֹל	Addition of Preposition	1
	Col 15:1 (Ps 135:18)	וכול	כֹּל	Addition of Conjunctive <i>vav</i>	1
	Col 16:13 (Ps 145:5)	ונפלאותיכה	פְּלֹאוֹתֶיךָ	Addition of Conjunctive <i>vav</i>	1
	Col 17:7 (Ps 145:16)	אתה		Addition of Subject	1
	Col 17:16 (Ps 145:21)	את		Addition of Marker of Accusative	1
	Col 20:9 (Ps 139:17)	על		Addition of Preposition	1
	Col 20:17 (Ps 137:1)	בבבל	בְּבָבֶל	Addition of Preposition	1
	Col 21:2 (Ps 138:1)	יהוה		Addition of Vocative	1
	Col 23: 10 (Ps 133:3)	שמה	שָׁם	Addition of Directional <i>he</i>	1
	Col 23:12 (Ps 144:1)	ואצבעותי	אֶצְבָּעוֹתַי	Addition of Conjunctive <i>vav</i>	1
	Col 23:15 (Ps 144:4)	וימי	יָמָי	Addition of Conjunctive <i>vav</i>	1
	Col 25:10 (Ps 143:4)	וישתומם	יִשְׁתַּוְּמֵם	Addition of Conjunctive <i>vav</i>	1
	Col 27:14 (Ps 140:3)	היום	יוֹם	Addition of Article	1
	FEii:L13 (Ps 104:35)	מארץ	מִן־הָאָרֶץ	Omission of Article	1
Omission	FEiii:L7 (Ps 147:20)	משפטים	וּמִשְׁפָּטִים	Omission of Conjunctive <i>vav</i>	1
	FEiii:L15 (Ps 105:9)	שבועתו	וּשְׁבוּעָתוֹ	Omission of Conjunctive <i>vav</i>	1
	Col 2:6 (Ps 148:1)	הללו יהוה	הִלְלוּ אֶת־יְהוָה	Omission of Marker of Accusative	1
	Col 2:6 (Ps 148:1)	משמים	מִן־הַשָּׁמַיִם	Omission of Article	1
	Col 3:1 (Ps 121:1)	המעלות	לְמַעְלֹת	Omission of Preposition	1
	Col 3:9 (Ps 122:4)	שמה]	שָׁמָּה	Omission of Relative Particle	1
	Col 3:10 (Ps 122:4)	עדת ישראל	עֲדוֹת לְיִשְׂרָאֵל	Omission of Preposition	1
	Col 3:15 (Ps 123:1)		אֵת	Omission of Marker of Accusative	1
	Col 4:4 (Ps 125:2)	יהוה	וַיְהִי	Omission of Conjunctive <i>vav</i>	1
	Col 4:8 (Ps 125:5)	און	הָאֵוֶן	Omission of Article	1
	Col 5:8 (Ps 129:8)	שלוה	וְלֹא	Omission of Conjunctive <i>vav</i>	1
	Col 5:13 (Ps 130:5)	לדברו	וְלִדְבָרוֹ	Omission of Conjunctive <i>vav</i>	1
	Col 5:15 (Ps 130:7)	הרב עמו פדה	וַתִּרְבֶּה עִמּוֹ פְדוּת	Omission of Conjunctive <i>vav</i>	1
	Col 5:15 (Ps 130:8)	הוא	וְהוּא	Omission of Conjunctive <i>vav</i>	1

Table A60 continued

Omission continued	Col 11:1 (Ps 119:105)	אור	וְאֹר	Omission of Conjunctive <i>vav</i>	1
	Col 11:4 (Ps 109:108)	ממשפטיכה	וּמִשְׁפָּטֶיךָ	Omission of Conjunctive <i>vav</i>	1
	Col 11:4 (Ps 109:108)	תורתכה	וְתוֹרָתְךָ	Omission of Conjunctive <i>vav</i>	1
	Col 11:6 (Ps 119:110)	פקודיכה	וּמִפְקוּדֶיךָ	Omission of Conjunctive <i>vav</i> and Preposition	2
	Col 11:9 (Ps 119:113)	תורתכה	וְתוֹרָתְךָ	Omission of Conjunctive <i>vav</i>	1
	Col 11:13 (Ps 119:117)	חוקיכה	בְּחֻקֶיךָ	Omission of Preposition	1
	Col 12:4 (Ps 119:131)		כִּי	Omission of Particle	1
	Col 12:13 (Ps 119:140)	עבדכה	וְעַבְדְּךָ	Omission of Conjunctive <i>vav</i>	1
	Col 12:15 (Ps 119:142)	עולם	לְעוֹלָם	Omission of Preposition	1
	Col 13:4 (Ps 119:153)		כִּי	Omission of Particle (Haplography)	1
	Col 134:4 (Ps 119:174)	תורתכה	וְתוֹרָתְךָ	Omission of Conjunctive <i>vav</i>	1
	Col 14:5 (Ps 119:175)	ומ {שפטיכה	וּמִשְׁפָּטֶיךָ	Omission of Conjunctive <i>vav</i>	1
	Col 14:10 (Ps 135:3)	שמו	לְשֵׁמוֹ	Omission of Preposition	1
	Col 14:11 (Ps 135:4)		הָ	Omission of Subject	1
	Col 14:11 (Ps 135:5)		כִּי	Omission of Particle	1
	Col 14:12 (Ps 135:6)		כֹּל	Omission of <i>kōl</i> particle	1
	Col 15:11 (Ps 136:8)	יום	בְּיוֹם	Omission of Preposition	1
	Col 15:12 (Ps 136:9)	ירה	אֶת־הַיָּרֵחַ	Omission of Marker of Accusative and Article	2
	Col 15:16 (Ps 136:15)	נער	וְנֶעֱר	Omission of Conjunctive <i>vav</i>	1
	Col 16:11 (Ps 145:3)	לגדולתו	וְלִגְדוּלָתוֹ	Omission of Conjunctive <i>vav</i>	1
	Col 20:1 (Ps 139:10)		גַּם	Omission of Conjunctive	1
	Col 20:11 (Ps 139:19)	אנשי	וְאֲנָשִׁי	Omission of Conjunctive <i>vav</i>	1
	Col 23:11 (Ps 133:3)	עולם	הָעוֹלָם	Omission of Article	1
	Frgs. A, B, Ci:L2 (Ps 101:2)	לי	אֵלַי	Substitution of Prepositional Phrase	1

Table A60 continued

Substitution	FCii:L8 (Ps 102:26)	נוסד	יִסְדָּתָּ	Substitution of Part of Speech	1
	FD:L9 (Ps 109:31)	עמד	יַעֲמַד	Substitution of Tense	1
	FEi:L10 (Ps 104:4)	לוהטת	לֹהֵט	Substitution of Gender	
	FEii:L11 (Ps 104:32)	אל הארץ	לְאַרְצָא	Substitution of Similar Preposition	1
	FEii:L13 (Ps 104:35)	חוטאים	חַטָּאִים	Substitution of Noun for Participle	1
	FEiii:L13 (Ps 105:6)	עבדיו	עַבְדָּו	Substitution of Number	1
	FEiii:L13 (Ps 105:6)	בחירו	בְּחִירוֹ	Substitution of Number	1
	FEiii:L15 (Ps 105:9)	עם	אֶת	Substitution of Similar Particle	1
	FEiii:L16 (Ps 105:11)	לכם	לָכֶם	Substitution of Number	1
	Col 1:4 (Ps 109:28)	דב[רם]	דְּבָרוֹ [דְּבָרוֹ]	Substitution of Number	1
	Col 1:4 (Ps 109:29)	ש[רצה]	שָׂרַץ	Substitution of Gender	1
	Col 1:10 (Ps 109:37)	ויוצא א[ת עמו]	וַיּוֹצִיאֵם	Substitution of Object	1
	Col 3:9 (Ps 122:3)	לו	לָהּ	Substitution of Gender	1
	Col 3:11 (Ps 122:5)	כסא	כְּסֵאוֹת	Substitution of Number	1
	Col 3:14 (Ps 122:9)	טובה	טוֹב	Substitution of Gender	1
	Col 4:7 (Ps 125:4)	בלב	בְּלִבּוֹתֵם	Substitution of Number	1
	Col 4:4 (Ps 125:2)	לו	לָהּ	Substitution of Gender	1
	Col 4:13 (Ps 126:4)	שבתינו	שְׁבוֹתֵנוּ [שְׁבִיתֵנוּ]	Substitution of Number	1
	Col 4:14 (Ps 126:6)	נושאי	נֹשְׂאֵי	Substitution of Number	1
	Col 5:4 (Ps 129:2)	רבות	רַבַּת	Substitution of Number	1
	Col 5:11 (Ps 130:2)	תהי נא אוזנכה	תִּהְיֶינָה אָזְנוֹיְךָ	Substitution of Number	1
	Col 6:4 (Ps 132:11)	על כסא	לְכִסֵּא	Substitution of Preposition	1
	Col 6:12 (Ps 119:2)	ידורשוה	יִדְרְשׁוּהָ	Substitution of Gender	1
	Col 6:15 (Ps 119:5)	א[מתכה]	חִקִּיךָ	Substitution of Lexeme	1
	Col 7:2 (Ps 119:16)	בחוקיכה	בְּחֻקֵיךָ	Substitution of Gender	1
	Col 7:2 (Ps 119:16)	דבריכה	דְּבָרֶיךָ	Substitution of Number	1
	Col 7:3 (Ps 119:17)	דבריכה	דְּבָרֶיךָ	Substitution of Number	1
	Col 7:4 (Ps 119:18)	מתורותיכה	מִתּוֹרֹתֶיךָ	Substitution of Number	1

Table A60 continued

Substitution continued	Col 8:1 (Ps 119:37)	כדברכה	בְּדָרְכָךְ	Substitution of Similar Preposition and Lexeme (Harmonization)	2
	Col 8:7 (Ps 119:43)	לדבריכה	לְמִשְׁפָּטֶיךָ	Substitution of Lexeme: Harmonization and Number	2
	Col 8:8 (Ps 119:45)	ברחוביה	בְּרַחֲבֶיהָ	Substitution of Number	1
	Col 8:13 (Ps 119:49)	לדבריכה	דְּבַר	Substitution of Number	1
	Col 9:6 (Ps 119:64)	חוקכה	חֻקֶיךָ	Substitution of Number	1
	Col 10:1 (Ps 119:82)	כלתה	כָּלוּ	Substitution of Number	1
	Col 10:4 (Ps 119:85)	שחת	שִׁיחֹת	Substitution of Similar Lexeme	1
	Col 10:7 (Ps 119:88)	עדות	עֵדוּת	Substitution of Number	1
	Col 11:1 (Ps 119:105)	דבריכה	דְּבַרְךָ	Substitution of Number	1
	Col 11:1 (Ps 119:105)	לנתיבותי	לְנִתְיָבֹתַי	Substitution of Number	1
	Col 11:2 (Ps 119:106)	לעשות	לְשַׁמֵּר	Substitution of Lexeme	1
	Col 11:2 (Ps 119:106)	משפט	מִשְׁפָּטֶיךָ	Substitution of Number	1
	Col 11:3 (Ps 119:107)	כאמרתכה	כְּדְבַרְךָ	Substitution of Similar Lexeme	1
	Col 11:10 (Ps 119:114)	לדבריכה	לְדְבַרְךָ	Substitution of Number	1
	Col 11:15 (Ps 119:119)	על כן	לְכֵן	Substitution of Similar Prepositions	1
	Col 12:4 (Ps 119:131)	תאבתי	תִּאָבַתִּי	Substitution of Similar Lexeme	1
	Col 12:10 (Ps 119:137)	וישרים	וַיִּשְׁרַר	Substitution of Number	1
	Col 13:12 (Ps 119:160)	דבריכה	דְּבַרְךָ	Substitution of Number	1
	Col 14:5 (Ps 119:175)	ומן שפטיכה	וּמִשְׁפָּטֶיךָ	Substitution of Similar Lexeme and Number	1
	Col 14:6 (Ps 119:176)	עדותיכה	מִצִּוְתֶיךָ	Substitution of Similar Lexeme	1
	Col 14:11 (Ps 135:4)	לסגולה לו	לְסִגְלָתוֹ	Substitution of Adverbial Construction	1
	Col 15:1 (Ps 135:17)	ואין	אֵין אֵין	Substitution of Conjunctive	1
	Col 15:7 (Ps 136:3)	לאדון	לְאֹדֹנִי	Substitution of Number	1
	Col 15:10 (Ps 136:7)	מאורות	אוֹרִים	Substitution of Similar Lexeme	1
Col 15:11 (Ps 136:8)	לממשלות	לְמַמְשְׁלֹת	Substitution of Number	1	

Table A60 continued

Substitution continued	Col 16:12 (Ps 145:4)	ישבחו	ישבַח	Substitution of Number	1
	Col 20:4 (Ps 139:12)	כחושך כאור	כְּחֹשֶׁךְ כְּאוֹר	Substitution of Gender	2
	Col 20:5 (Ps 139:14)	נורא	נֹרְאוֹת	Substitution of Number	1
	Col 20:8 (Ps 139:16)	ספריכה	סִפְרֶךָ	Substitution of Number	1
	Col 20:11 (Ps 139:19)	סור	סוּרוּ	Substitution of Number	1
	Col 20:13 (Ps 139:21)	וממתקוממיכה	וּבְתִקוּמִיכָה	Substitution of Noun/Inf con for Participle and Preposition: Semantic overlap	2
	Col 21:8 (Ps 138:7)	בתוך	בְּקִרְבִּי	Substitution of Similar Lexeme	1
	Col 22:16 (Ps 93:1)	ויתאזר	הִתְאַזֵּר	Substitution of Tense	1
	Col 23:3 (Ps 141:7)	עצמי	עֲצָמַי	Substitution of Number	1
	Col 23:3 (Ps 141:7)	מיד	מִיָּד	Substitution of Number	1
	Col 23:9 (Ps 133:2)	מדיו	מְדוּתָיו	Substitution of Gender	1
	Col 23:10 (Ps 133:3)	הר	הַרְרֵי	Substitution of Number	1
	Col 23:14 (Ps 144:2)	עמים	עַמֵּי	Substitution of Number	1
	Col 23:15 (Ps 144:5)	ורד	וְתַרְדֵּ	Substitution of Volitive	1
	Col 24:1 (Ps 144:15)	אשר יהוה	אֲשֶׁר־יְהוָה	Substitution of Relative Particle	1
	Col 25:9 (Ps 143:3)	ירדוף	רָדַף	Substitution of Tense	1
	Col 25:12 (Ps 143:5)	אשיחה	אֲשׁוּחַח	Substitution of Verbal Stem	1
	Col 25:12 (Ps 143:6)	בארץ	בְּאֶרֶץ	Substitution of Similar Preposition	1
	Col 26:7 (Ps 150:6)	כול הנשמות	כָּל הַנְּשָׁמָה	Substitution of Number	1
	Col 28:1 (Ps 134:2)	ידיכה	יְדַכֵּם	Substitution of Number	1

Table A61. 11Q5: Description of variants, category 2

Description of Variant	Fragment, Line, and Verse	11Q5	MT	Detailed Description of Variant	Statistical Weight
Addition	FCii:L11 (Ps 102:29)	לדור		Addition of prepositional phrase	2
	FEii:L5 (Ps 104:25)	הרבה		Addition of adverb	1
	FEi:L6 (Ps 104:1)	לדויד		Addition of Superscription	2
	FEii:L7 (Ps 104:27)	להם		Addition of Prepositional phrase	2
	FEiii:L8 (Ps 105:1)	כי טוב כי] לעולם חסדו		Addition Phrase	3
	Col 3:4 (Ps 121:5)	בלילה		Addition of Prepositional Phrase	2
	Col 3:15 (Ps 123:1)	[ל]דויד		Addition to Superscription	1
	Col 4:8 (Ps 125:5)	כול		Addition of <i>kōl</i> Particle	1
	Col 5:11 (Ps 130:2)	תהי נא	תהינינה	Addition of Particle	1
	Col 5:11 (Ps 130:2)	לי		Addition of Prepositional Phrase	2
	Col 5:13 (Ps 130:6)	הוחילי		Addition of verb	1
	Col 8:8 (Ps 119:45)	ברחוביה	בְּרַחֲבֶיהָ	Addition of Pronominal Suffix	1
	Col 8:13 (Ps 119:49)	לדבריכה	דְּבַר	Addition of Pronominal Suffix	1
	Col 9:10 (Ps 119:68)	אדוני		Addition of Subject	1
	Col 11:6 (Ps 119:110)	אני		Addition of Subject	1
	Col 11:15 (Ps 119:119)	כול		Addition of <i>kol</i> Particle	1
	Col 14:1 (Ps 119:171)	לכה		Addition of Prepositional Phrase	2
	Col 14:8 (Ps 135:2)	ורוממו יה		Addition of colon	5
	Col 14:13-14 (Ps 135:6)	לעשות יעשה אין כיה אין כיהוה ואין שיעשה כמלך אלוהים		Addition	15
	Col 15:10-11 (Ps 136:8)	את השמש {{ואת}} וירח כי לעולם חסדו		Addition	10
Col 17:2-4 (Ps 145:13b)	נאמן אלוהים בדבריו וחסיד בכול מעשיו ברוך יהוה וברוך שמו לעולם ועד		Addition of Nun Line	21	
Col 22:16 (Ps 93:1)	הללויה		Addition of Superscription	1	
Col 23:11 (Ps 133:3)	שלום על ישראל		Addition: Harmonization	1	
Col 26:3 (Ps 149:9)	לבני ישראל עם קודשו		Addition	6	

Table A61 continued

Addition continued	Col 28:2 (Ps 134:2)	שם		Addition: Expansion of Divine Title	1
	FEii:L8 (Ps 104:29)		תַּסְתִּיר פְּנִיךָ יְבַהֲלוּן	Omission by Haplography	5
Omission	Col 3:6 (Ps 121:8)		יְהוָה	Omission of Initiator (Subject)	1
	Col 3:9 (Ps 122:3)		יְהוָה	Omission of word	1
	Col 3:13 (Ps 122:8)	אדברה	אֲדַבְרָה־ נָא	Omission of emphatic particle	1
	Col 4:7 (Ps 125:4)	בלב	בְּלִבּוֹתֶם	Omission of Pronominal Suffix	1
	Col 4:7 (Ps 125:5)	עקלקולות	עַקְלָקְלוֹתֶם	Omission of Pronominal Suffix	1
	Col 6:8 (Ps 132:16)		רְגוּ	Omission of Inf Abs	1
	Col 8:5 (Ps 119:41)	ויבואוני חסד	וַיְבֹאוּנִי חֶסֶדְךָ	Omission of Pronominal Suffix	1
	Col 8:8 (Ps 119:44)		לְעוֹלָם	Omission of Prepositional Phrase	1
	Col 11:4 (Ps 119:108)	רצה	רָצָה־נָא	Omission of Particle	1
	Col 12:1 (Ps 119:128)		כָּל־פְּקוּדֵי	Omission by Haplography	2
	Col 13:12 (Ps 119:160)	צדק	צְדָקָה	Omission of Pronominal Suffix	1
	Col 14:10 (Ps 135:3)		יְהוָה	Omission of Initiator (Subject)	1
	Col 15:8 (Ps 136:4)		גְּדֻלוֹת	Omission of Adjective: homoeoteleuton	1
	Col 16:15 (Ps 145:6)	אספר	אֲסַפְּרָנָה	Omission of Pronominal Suffix	1
	Col 20:10 (Ps 139:18)	ועוד	וְעוֹדִי	Omission of Pronominal Suffix	1
	Col 23:10 (Ps 133:3)		חַיִּים	Omission of Noun	1
	Col 23:13 (Ps 144:2)	ומפלט	וּמִפְּלִטִי	Omission of Pronominal Suffix	1
	Col 23:14 (Ps 144:2)	עמים	עַמִּי	Omission of Pronominal Suffix	1
	Col 26:4 (Ps 150:1)		הַלְלוּ יְהוָה	Omission: Haplography	1
	FCii:L1 (Ps 102:18)	תולעת הערער	תַּפְּלַת הָעֶרְעֵר	Substitution of Lexeme: Graphic Similarity	1

Table A61 continued

Substitution	FEi:L7 (Ps 104:1)	אלוהינו	אֱלֹהֵינוּ	Substitution of Person	1
	FEii:L8 (Ps 104:29)	רוחכם	רוּחְכֶם	Substitution of Person	1
	FEiii:L7 (Ps 147:20)	הודיעם	יְדַעֵם	Substitution of Verbal Stem	1
	FEiii:L10-11 (Ps 105:3)	רצונו	יְהִנֶה	Substitution of Lexeme	1
	Col 3:9 (Ps 148:5)	הללו	יְהַלְלוּ	Substitution of Person	1
	Col 3:8 (Ps 122:2)	רגלי	רַגְלֵינוּ	Substitution of Person	1
	Col 5:5 (Ps 129:3)	רשעים	חֲרָשִׁים	Substitution of Lexeme (Graphic Similarity)	1
	Col 5:15 (Ps 130:7)	הרב עמו פדה	וְהִרְבָּה עִמּוֹ פְדוּת	Substitution of Syntax: Graphic Similarity	2
	Col 6:5 (Ps 132:12)	יעלו	יִשְׁבּוּ	Substitution of Similar Lexeme	1
	Col 6:12 (Ps 119:2)	עת	לֵב	Substitution of Lexeme	1
	Col 7:3 (Ps 119:17)	גמור	גָּמַל	Substitution of Lexeme: confusion of liquid	1
	Col 8:1 (Ps 119:37)	חונני	חֲנִינִי	Substitution of Lexeme	1
	Col 8:4 (Ps 119:40)	חונני	חֲנִינִי	Substitution of Lexeme	1
	Col 8:8 (Ps 119:45)	ברחוביה	בְּרַחֲבֶיהָ	Substitution of Similar Lexeme	1
	Col 8:12 (Ps 119:48)	ואשישה	וְאֶשְׁיֶחֱהָ	Substitution of Lexeme	1
	Col 9:12 (Ps 119:70)	שִׁעַר[ש]ועי	שִׁעְשַׁעְתִּי	Substitution: Parts of Speech/Graphic Similarity	1
	Col 9:13 (Ps 119:71)	עניתני	עֲנִיתִי	Substitution: Voice	1
	Col 10:2 (Ps 119:83)	עשיתני	הִיִּיתִי	Substitution of Verb	1
	Col 10:2 (Ps 119:83)	חסדכה	חֲסִידְךָ	Substitution of Lexeme: Graphic Similarity	1
	Col 10:6 (Ps 119:87)	מארץ	בְּאַרְצִי	Substitution of Preposition: Graphic/Phonological confusion	1
	Col 10:7 (Ps 119:88)	חונני	חֲנִינִי	Substitution of Lexeme	1
	Col 10:11 (Ps 119:92)	בעוני	בְּעֹנִי	Substitution of Lexeme: Interpretation	1
	Col 11:3 (Ps 119:107)	נעותי	נִעַנְיִתִי	Substitution of Lexeme: interpretation	1
Col 11:3 (Ps 119:107)	חונני	חֲנִינִי	Substitution of Lexeme	1	

Table A61 continued

Substitution continued	Col 11:13 (Ps 119:117)	ואשא	ואֲשָׁעָה	Substitution of Lexeme (Phonological Confusion)	1
	Col 11:15 (Ps 119:119)	חשבתי	השִׁבַּתְתִּי	Substitution: Person, verbal stem, and lexical root	1
	Col 12:2 (Ps 119:129)	פלגי נפת	פְּלִאוֹת	Substitution of Lexeme (Graphic Similarity)	1
	Col 12:6 (Ps 119:133)	לאמרתכה	בְּאִמְרַתְךָ	Substitution of Preposition	1
	Col 13:3 (Ps 119:152)	מדעתכה	מִעֲדוֹתֶיךָ	Substitution of Part of Speech: Metathesis	1
	Col 13:3 (Ps 119:152)	יסדתיני	יִסְדָּתָם	Substitution of Person: (Graphic Similarity)	1
	Col 13:7 (Ps 119:156)	חונני	חִנֵּי	Substitution of Lexeme	1
	Col 13:11 (Ps 119:159)	כאמרתכה	כְּחִסְדְּךָ	Substitution of Lexeme	1
	Col 13:11 (Ps 119:159)	חונני	חִנֵּי	Substitution of Lexeme	1
	Col 13:14 (Ps 119:162)	ממוצא	כְּמוֹצֵא	Substitution of Preposition	1
	Col 14:7 (Ps 135:1)			Transpositions of the first and third lines	1
	Col 14:12 (Ps 135:5)	ואלוהינו	וְאֱלֹהֵינוּ	Substitution of Divine Name	1
	Col 15:4 (Ps 135:21)	יברככה יהוה	בְּרוּךְ יְהוָה	Substitution of Syntax	2
	Col 16:7 (Ps 145:1)	תפלה	תְּהִלָּה	Substitution of Lexeme (Phonological Similarity)	1
	Col 16:14 (Ps 145:15)	אשיח	אֲשִׁיחָה	Substitution of Volitive	1
	Col 17:14 (Ps 145:20)	יראיו	אֲהַבְּיוּ	Substitution of Lexeme	1
	Col 20:3 (Ps 139:11)	אז {ו} {ר}	אֹר	Substitution of part of Speech (Graphic Similarity)	1
	Col 20:5 (Ps 139:14)	אתה נפלאות	נִפְלְיֹתִי	Substitution of Part of Speech Interpretation	2
	Col 20:6 (Ps 139:15)	עצבי	עֲצָמִי	Substitution of Noun (Graphic Similarity)	1
	Col 20:8 (Ps 139:16)	ולו באח מהמה	וְלֹא [ו] [לו] אֶחָד בָּהֶם	Substitution	1
Col 23:14 (Ps 144:3)	אלוהים	יְהוָה	Substitution of Divine Name	1	

Table A61 continued

Substitution continued	Col 23:15 (Ps 144:5)	אלוהים	יהנה	Substitution of Divine Name	1
	Col 25:1 (Ps 142:5)	אביטה ימין ואראה	הביט ימין וראה	Substitution of Volitive (Person)	2
	Col 26:5 (Ps 150:3)	בתקוע	בתקוע	Substitution of noun for Inf construct	1
	Col 27:4 (Ps 140:4)	עכביש	עכשוב	Substitution: Graphic Similarity	1
	FD:L6 (Ps 109:27)	יהוה [אתה עשיתה	אתה יהנה עשיתה	Omission or Transposition	1
Unclear Variant	FEii:L3 (Ps 104:23)	הים	זה הים	Omission or Transposition	1
	Col 1:L4 (Ps 105:29)	שם		Substitution or Additions	1
	Col 4:7-8 (Ps 125:5)		והמטים	Omission or Transposition	1
	Col 5:9 (Ps 129:8)	א[לוהיכם		Addition or Substitution: Divine Title	2
	Col 5:10 (Ps 130:1)	אדוני		Transposition or addition	1

Table A62. 11Q5: Description of variants, category 3

Description of Variant	Fragment, Line, and Verse	11Q5	MT	Detailed Description of Variant	Statistical Weight
Omission	Col 23:12 (Ps 144:1)		לדוד	Omission of Superscription	2
Substitution	Col 16:9 (Ps 145:2)	ברוך	בכל	Substitution of Part of Speech	1

Table A63. 11Q5: Description of variants, not counted in statistics

Description of Variant	Fragment, Line, and Verse	11Q5	MT	Detailed Description of Variant
Insufficient manuscript evidence	Col 3:10 (Ps 122:4)		עלו שבטים שבטייה	
	Col 5:9 (Ps 129:8)	בוד[רך ברכת	ברכת	Second letter is unclear
	Col 9:14 (Ps 119:72)	מאלף]	מאלפי	Pe is unclear
	Col 22:17 (Ps 93:1)	[ת]כֹּן	תפון	Lacuna and darkened manuscript
	Col 27:14 (Ps 140:3)	יגרו	יגורו	
	Col 12:15 (Ps 119:142)	[צדק]ות [צ]דקות	צדקת צדק	
	FEi:L3 (Ps 118:27)	אסורי	אסרו	
Col 16:13 (Ps 145:5)	ידברו	ודברי	Yod/vav distinction not clear here	

Table A63 continued

Unclear Paleography	FCii:L8 (Ps 102:26)	ומעשי	ומעשה	
	FE ii:L2 (Ps 104:22)	מעונותיהם	מעונותם	
Synonymous Spellings	FE ii:L3 (Ps 104:23)	עד	עדי	
	Col 3:10 (Ps 122:4)	עדת	עדות	11Q5 is more defective
	Col 3:15 (Ps 123:1)	היושב	הישבי	Synonymous Form (GKC, §90m)
	Col 4:10 (Ps 126:1)	כחלומים	כחלמים	Substitution of Voice or Pointed like a stative
	Col 4:14 (Ps 126:6)	הלוך ילך ובכו	הלוך ילך ובכה	
	Col 5:9 (Ps 129:8)	עליכם	אליכם	
	Col 5:11 (Ps 130:2)	קשבת	קשבות	
	Col 6:4 (Ps 132:12)	זה	זו	
	Col 6:5 (Ps 132:12)	עודי	עדי	
	Col 7:6 (Ps 119:20)	גרשה	גרסה	Confusion of sibilants
	Col 7:8 (Ps 119:22)	גול	גל	Substitution of Roots (GKC §67p)
	Col 10:9 (Ps 119:90)	ותעמד	ותעמד	
	Col 10:11 (Ps 119:115)	מצות	מצות	
	Col 14:2 (Ps 119:172)	תענה	תען	Short form/long form
	Col 14:10 (Ps 135:3)	יהוה	יה	
	Col 15:2 (Ps 135:18)	בטה	בטח	
	Col 15:14 (Ps 136:12)	ובאזרוע	ובזרוע	Addition of prosthetic Aleph
	Col 20:3 (Ps 139:11)	בעדי	בעדני	Alternative Forms
	Col 20:6 (Ps 139:15)	עשיתי	עשיתי	
	Col 20:11 (Ps 139:19)	אלה	אלוה	
	Col 20:11 (Ps 139:20)	יאמרוך	יאמרה	MT is Defective
	Col 20:12 (Ps 139:20)	נשאו	נשא	MT is Defective
	Col 20:15 (Ps 139:23)	לבי	לבבי	Alternative Forms
	Col 20:15 (Ps 139:23)	סרעפי	שרעפי	Confusion of Sibilants
	Col 20:16 (Ps 139:24)	עצב	עצב	
	Col 22:17 (Ps 93:1)	טמוט	תמוט	Confusion of dentals
	Col 25:5 (Ps 142:8)	כת {{י}}רו	יכתרו	
	Col 25:10 (Ps 143:4)	לבי	לבבי	Alternative Forms
	Col 25:11 (Ps 143:5)	במעשי	במעשה	Alternative Forms
	Col 27:1 (2 Sam 23:7)	שר {{ף}}ף	שרוף	
	Col 27:13 (Ps 140:2)	תצרני	תנצרני	Alternative Forms
	Col 27:14 (Ps 140:3)	יגרו	יגורו	
	Scribal Error	Col 23:1 (Ps 141:5)	ותפלתי	ותפלתי
Col 27:1 (2 Sam 23:7)		חיצנית	חנית	Peculiar Reading
Kethiv/Qere	Col 4:13 (Ps 126:4)	שבותינו	שבותנו [שבותינו]	Partially follows <i>Kethiv</i>
	Col 5:1 (Ps 128:5)	אדוני	יהוה	Follows <i>Qere</i>
	Col 5:6 (Ps 129:4)	אדוני	יהוה	Follows <i>Qere</i>
	Col 13:13 (Ps 119:161)	ומדבריה	מדבריה [ו] [מ] [ד] בריה	Follows <i>Kethiv</i>
	Col 16:15 (Ps 145:6)	וגדול ותיכה	וגדולתי [ו] [ג] [ד] [ו] [ל] תך	Follows <i>Kethiv</i>
Col 20:8 (Ps 139:16)	ולו	ולא [ו] [ל] [ו]	Follows <i>Qere</i>	

Table A64. 11Q5: Differences likely caused by excerpted nature, compositions not in Masoretic Psalter

Col 2	Psalm 146 or Psalm based on Psalm 146?
Col 16	Catena from largely from Ps 118 Appended to Psalm 136
Col 18	Ps 154: Found in Syriac some late Manuscripts (Syriac 2)
Col 19	Plea for Deliverance
Col 21-22	Ben Sira 51
Col 22	Apostrophe to Zion
Col 24	Ps 155: Found in Syriac Some late Manuscripts (Syriac 3)
Col 26	Hymn to the Creator
Col 32	2 Sam 23:7
Col 27	David's Composition
Col 33	Psalm 151 A
Col 33-34	Psalm 151 B

Table A65. 11Q5: Differences likely caused by excerpted nature, catena of Ps 118 at Col 16

Category	Description of Variant	Fragment, Line, and Verse	4Q38a	MT
Col 16:3 (Ps 118:16)	עשתה	עשה	Substitution of Part of Speech	1
Col 16:3 (Ps 118:16)	גבורה	קיל	Substitution of Similar Lexeme	1
Col 16:3 (Ps 118:8)	לבטוח	לקסות	Substitution: Harmonization	1
Col 16:4 (Ps 118:9)	מבטוב	מבטח	Substitution of Lexeme (Graphic Similarity)	1
Col 16:5 (Ps 118:9?)	טוב לבטוב ביהוה מבטוח באלף עם		Addition	10
Col 16:6 (Ps 118:29)	הללו יה		Addition	2

Table A66. 11Q5: Differences likely caused by excerpted nature, reworked Psalm 145

Fragment, Line, and Verse	11Q5	MT	Detailed Description of Difference	Potential Statistical Weight
Col 16:8-9 (Ps 145:1)	ברוך יהוה וברוך שמו לעולם ועד		Addition of Refrain	10
Col 16:10 (Ps 145:2)	ברוך יהוה וברוך שמו לעולם ועד			10
Col 16:11 (Ps 145:3)	ברוך יהוה וברוך שמו לעולם ועד			10
Col 16:12-13 (Ps 145:4)	ברוך יהוה וברוך שמו לעולם ועד			10
Col 16:14 (Ps 145:5)	ברוך יהוה וברוך שמו לעולם ועד			10
Col 16:15-16 (Ps 145:6)	ברוך יהוה [וברוך שמו לעולם ועד			8
Col 17:1 (Ps 145:12)	וברוך שמו לעולם ועד			8
Col 17:2 (Ps 145:13)	ברוך יהוה וברוך שמו לעולם ועד			10
Col 17:5 (Ps 145:14)	ברוך יהוה וברוך שמו לעולם ועד			10
Col 17:7 (Ps 145:15)	ברוך יהוה וברוך שמו לעולם ועד			10
Col 17:8-9 (Ps 145:16)	ברוך יהוה וברוך שמו לעולם ועד			10
Col 17:10 (Ps 145:17)	ברוך יהוה וברוך שמו לעולם ועד			10
Col 17:11-12 (Ps 145:18)	ברוך יהוה וברוך שמו לעולם ועד			10
Col 17:13 (Ps 145:19)	ברוך יהוה וברוך שמו לעולם ועד			10
Col 17:15 (Ps 145:20)	ברוך יהוה וברוך שמו לעולם ועד		10	
Col 17:15 (Ps 145:21)	ברוך יהוה וברוך שמו לעולם ועד		9	
Col 17:10-11 (Ps 145:18)	קרוב יהוה ברוך שמו לעולם ועד יקראוהו באמונה	קרוב יהוה לקל־קראיו לקל־אשר יקראוהו באמת	Scribal Error caused by Refrain	16
Col 17:17 (Ps 145:21)	זאת לזכרון		Addition	3

Table A67. Order of Psalms (11Q5) and Spacing between Psalms

Psalm Sequence	Transition Preserved	Indicate Transition	Transition Location	Align with MT	Spacing at End of Psalm	Further Notes
Ps 101 to Ps 102	Partially	Unsure: Fragmentary	Frag. A, B, C i, 10-11	Yes	Unsure: too fragmentary	
Ps 102 to Ps 103	Partially	Last Line First Line?	FCii, 11-12	Yes	Lots of Space left blank	
Ps 109	Not preserved	Not preserved	Not preserved	Not preserved	Not preserved	
Ps 118 to Ps 104	Yes	Last Line First Line	FEi, 5-6	No	Not a lot of space on last line	
Ps 104 to Ps 147	Partially	Last Line First Line?	FEii, 14-15	No	Lots of Space left blank	
Ps 147 to Ps 105	Partially	Last Line? First Line	FEiii, 7-8	No	Unsure: too fragmentary	
Ps 105 to Ps 146	Not preserved	Not preserved	Not preserved	Not preserved	Not preserved	
Ps 146 to Ps 148	Yes	Last Line	Col 2:5-6	No	Lots of Space left blank	
Ps 148 likely to Ps 120	Not preserved	Not preserved	Not preserved	Not preserved	Not preserved	
PS 120 to Ps 121	Partially	Last Line? First Line	Col 3:1	Likely	Unsure: too fragmentary	
Ps 121 to Ps 122	Partially	Last Line? First Line	Col 3:6-7	Yes	Unsure: too fragmentary	
Ps 122 to Ps 123	Partially	Last Line	Col 3:14-15	Yes	Lots of Space left blank	
Ps 123-124	Not preserved	Not preserved	Not preserved	Not preserved	Not preserved	
Ps 124 to Ps 125	Partially	Last Line First Line?	Col 4:2-3	Yes	Lots of Space left blank	
Ps 125 to Ps 126	Yes	Last Line (slightly) First Line	Col 4:8-9	Yes	Not a lot of space on last line	
Ps 126 to Ps 127	Partially	Last line	Col 4:15-16	Yes	Lots of Space left blank	
Ps 127 to Ps 128	Not preserved	Not preserved	Not preserved	Not preserved	Not preserved	
Ps 128 to Ps 129	Partially	Last Line First Line?	Col 5:3-4	Yes	Lots of Space left blank	
Ps 129 to Ps 130	Yes	First Line	Col 5:9-10	Yes	No space on last line	
Ps 130 to Ps 131	Partially	Last Line First Line?	Col 5:16-17	Yes	Lots of Space left blank	
Ps 131 to Ps 132	Not preserved	Not preserved	Not preserved	Not preserved	Not preserved	
Ps 132 to Ps 119	Yes	Last Line	Col 6:10-11	No	Lots of Space left blank	
Ps 119 to Ps 135	Yes	Entire Line left blank between Psalms	Col 14:6-7	No		Unusual Division

Table A67 continued

Ps 135 to Ps 136	Yes	Last Line	Col 15:5-6	Yes	Lots of Space left blank	
Ps 136 plus additions of Ps 118 to Ps 145	Yes	Last Line Entire Line left Blank* First Line	Col 16:6-7	No	Not a lot of space on last line	Sanders says the blank Line is the scribe avoiding poor writing surface
Ps 145 to Ps 154 (non-canonical Psalm)	Not preserved	Not preserved	Not preserved	Not Applicable	Not preserved	Sanders space in lacuna to fit psalm between these (38) However, see peculiar skipping of 2 lines without any indentation midway in this psalm?
Ps 154 to Plea for Deliverance	Not preserved	Not preserved	Not preserved	Not Applicable	Not preserved	
Plea for Deliverance to Ps 139	Not preserved	Not preserved	Not preserved	Not Applicable	Not preserved	
Ps 139 to Ps 137	Yes	Last Line	Col 20:16-17	No	Lots of Space left blank	
Ps 137 to Ps 138	Yes	Closed Line with Blank Space	Col 21:1	Yes	Few Blank Spaces	Slightly Marked Division
Ps 138 to Sirach 51	Yes	Last Line	Col 21:10-11	Not Applicable	Lots of Space left blank	
Sirach 51 to Apostrophe to Zion	Yes	Closed Line with Blank Space	Col 22:1	Not Applicable	Few Blank Spaces	Slightly Marked Division
Apostrophe to Zion to Ps 93	Yes	Last Line	Col 22:15-16	Not Applicable	Lots of Space left blank	
Ps 93 to Ps 141	Not preserved	Not preserved	Not preserved	No	Not preserved	
Ps 141 to Ps 133	Yes	Last Line (Slightly) First Line	Col 23:6-7	No	Not a lot of space on last line	
Ps 133 to Ps 144	Yes	Last Line	Col 23:11-12	No	Lots of Space left blank	
Ps 144 to Ps 155	Yes	Last Line	Col 24:2-3	No	Lots of Space left blank	
Ps 155 to Ps 142	Not preserved	Not preserved	Not preserved	No	Not preserved	
Ps 142 to Ps 143	Yes	Last Line (Slightly) First Line	Col 25:5-6	Yes	Not a lot of space on last line	

Table A67 continued

Ps 143 to Ps 149	Not preserved	Not preserved	Not preserved	No	Not preserved	
Ps 149 to Ps 150	Yes	Last Line (slightly) First Line	Col 26:3-4	Yes	Not a lot of space on last line	
Ps 150 to Hymn to the Creator	Yes	Last Line	Col 26:8-9	Not Applicable	Lots of Space left blank	
Hymn to Creator to 2 Sam 23:7	Not preserved	Not preserved	Not preserved	Not Applicable	Not preserved	
2 Sam 23:7 to David's Compositions	Yes	Last Line First Line	Col 27:1-2	Not Applicable	Lots of Space left blank	Unusual Division: First Lines of Prose Section Indebted
David's Composition to Ps 140	Yes	Last Line (slightly) First Line	Col 27:11-12	Not Applicable	Not a lot of space on last line	
Ps 140 to Ps 134	Not preserved	Not preserved	Not preserved	No	Not preserved	
Ps 134 to Ps 151 A	Yes	Last Line (Slightly) Entire Blank Line	Col 28:2-3	Not Applicable	Not a lot of space on last line?	Unusual Division: Normally next Psalm begins indebted rather than having a Blank Line divide the psalms
Ps 151 A to Ps 151 B	Yes	Last Line	Col 28:12-13	Not Applicable	Lots of Space left blank	

Table A68. 11Q6: Description of variants

Category	Description of Variant	Fragment, Line, and Verse	11Q6	MT	Detailed Description of Variant	Statistical Weight
1	Substitution	F7b:L1, c4 (F7a-e:L4 [Ps133:2])	מדיו	מדותיו	Substitution of Gender: Harmonization	1
		F2:L2 (Ps 119:164)	אה[ללכה	הללתיך	Substitution of Tense	1
2	Addition	F7d:L3 (F7a-e:L5 [Ps 133:3])	עו[לם שלום על] ישראל		Addition of Phrase in agreement with 11Q6	3
3	No Variants					
Not Counted	Differences likely caused by Excerpted Nature	F3			Non-Masoretic Psalms: Catena from Ps 118	
		F4-5			Non-Masoretic Psalms: Plea for Deliverance	
		F7a-e			Sequence Ps 141, 133, 144	
	Insufficient Manuscript Evidence	F6			Apostrophe of Zion	Very fragmentary
		F7c:L2 (Frgs. 7a-e:L2 [Ps 133:2])144:1)			לְדוּד	Omission of Superscription

Table A69. 11Q7: Description of variants

Category	Description of Variant	Fragment, Line, and Verse	11Q7	MT	Detailed Description of Variant	Statistical Weight
1	Omission	F11:3 (Ps 25:5)	למִדְנִי	וְלִמְדִנִי	Omission of Conjunctive <i>vav</i>	1
	Substitution	F4:L4 (Frags. 4-7:L4 [Ps 12:8])	זֶה	זוֹ	Substitution of Similar Particle	1
		F8:1 (Ps 17:9)	זֶה	זוֹ	Substitution of Similar Particle	1
		F8:4 (Ps 17:13)	פִּלְטָה	פִּלְטָה	Substitution of Imperative form	1
		F8:9 (Ps 18:2)	רַחֲמֵי תִּיכְהֶה	אַרְחֲמֶךָ	Substitution of Tense	1
		F8:11 (Ps 18:4)	אִקְרָא	אַקְרָא	Substitution of Volitive: Imperfect for Cohortative	1
		F8:18 (Ps 18:12)	חַשְׁכוֹת	חֲשָׁכוֹת	Substitution of Number	1
Unclear Variant	Substitution	F10:4 (Ps 19:8)	תּוֹרָה	תּוֹרָת	Transposition or Substitution of number	1
2	Addition	F5:L1 (Frags. 4-7:L3 [Ps 12:6])	אֵל צְדִיקִים		Addition of Prepositional Phrase	1
	Substitution	F3:2 (Ps 9:5)	שִׁפְטָהּ	שׁוֹפֵט	Substitution of Part of Speech	1
		F6:L3 (Frags. 4-7 [Ps 14:1])	עוֹלָה	עֲלִילָה	Substitution	1
		F8:1 (Ps 17:9)	דְּרֹשׁ וְנִי	שְׁדוּנִי	Substitution of Lexical Root	1
		F8:2 (Ps 17:11)	גֵּרְשׁוֹנִי עֵתָה סִבְבִּי וְנִי	אֲשָׁרִינוּ עֵתָה סִבְבִּינוּ	Substitution of Lexical Root	1
3	No Variants					
Not Counted	Insufficient Manuscript Evidence	F7:L3 (Frags. 4-7:L14 [Ps 14:5])	שִׁמָּה	שָׁם		
		F8:L4 (Ps 17:14)	מִמּוֹתַיִם [מִיָּדָה]	מִמְּתֵי יָדָה		
		F8:L5 (Ps 17:14)	בְּחִיָּה [ם]	בְּחֵיִים		
	Unclear Paleography	F3:2 (Ps 9:5)	וּשְׁבַתָּה	יִשְׁבְּתָה	Difference between <i>yod</i> and <i>vav</i> is slight	
	Synonymous Form	F8:11 (Ps 18:4)	וּמֵאֹיִבִי	וּמִדְּאִיִּבִי	11Q7 reads with 2 Sam 22:4 of MT (DJD, 58)	
		F10:3 (Ps 19:7)	מִקְצֵי	מִקְצָה	Orthographic Variant	
	Scribal Error	F2:L2 (Frags. 1-2:L2 [Ps 2:3])	מִוֹסְדֵרוֹתַיִם	מִוֹסְדֵרוֹתַיִם	Dittography or <i>hapax</i>	1
		F5:L2 (Frags. 4-7:L4 [Ps 12:7])	עֵיל לָאֶרֶץ	בְּעֵיל לָאֶרֶץ	Haplography	

Table A70. 11Q8: Description of variants

Category	Description of Variant	Fragment, Line, and Verse	11Q8	MT	Detailed Description of Variant	Statistical Weight
1	Substitution	F13:L3 (Ps 81:6)	שפות	שָׁפֹת	Substitution of Number	1
2	Addition	F8:L1 (Ps 45:6)	אלף		Addition: too fragmentary	1
		F11:L2 (Ps 68:16)	זנה		Addition: Demonstrative Pronoun	1
Not Counted	Insufficient Manuscript Evidence	F14:L3 (Ps 86:13)	גדול ע]לי חסדכה	גָּדוֹל עָלַי חֲסִדְךָ	Suggested transposition	
	Synonymous Spelling	F13:L4 (Ps 81:7)	כפו	כַּפּוֹ	Substitution of Number	

Table A71. 4Q106: Description of variants

Category	Description of Variant	Fragment, Line, and Verse	4Q106	MT	Detailed Description of Variant	Statistical Weight
1	Omission	F2i:L6 (Col 2:6 [Song 3:11])	ביום	וּבְיוֹם	Omission of Conjunctive <i>vav</i>	1
		F2i:9 (Col 2:9 [Song 4:2])	עָלוּ	שָׁעָלוּ	Omission of relative particle	1
		F2i:L13 (Col 2:13 [Song 4:5])	רעים	הָרוּעִים	Omission of Interrogative	1
		F2i:L14 (Col 2:14 [Song 4:6])	אל	וְאֵל	Omission of Conjunctive <i>vav</i>	1
		F2ii:4 (Col 3:4 [Song 6:11])	פּרחה	הִפְרִיחָהּ	Omission of Interrogative	1
		F2ii:4 (Col 3:14 [Song 7:7])	מֵה	וּמֵה	Omission of Conjunctive <i>vav</i>	1
	Substitution	F2i:L11 (Col 2:11 [Song 4:3])	מזקנתך	רַקְמָךְ	Substitution of Similar Lexeme	1
		F2i:L12 [Col 2:12 (Song 4:4)]	בו	עָלָיו	Substitution of Similar Preposition	1
2	Addition	F2i:L10 (Col 2:10 [Song 4:2])	אינה	אֵין	Addition of Pronominal Suffix	1
	Substitution	F4:L3 (Col 2:5 [Song 3:11])	בנ[ות] ירושלם	בְּנוֹת צִיּוֹן	Substitution: Harmonization	1
		F2i:L9 (Col 2:9 [Song 4:1])	שגלש[ות]	שָׁגְלִישׁוֹ	Substitution: Harmonization	1
		F2i:L8 (Col 2:8 [Song 4:1])	לצמחך כעדר [העזים] שערך	לְצִמְחָךְ שְׁעָרֶךָ כְּעֵדֶר הָעִזִּים	Transposition	1
		F2i:L9 (Col 2:9 [Song 4:2])	כעדר הקצובות שניך	שְׁנֵיךָ כְּעֵדֶר הַקְּצוּבוֹת	Transposition	1
3	No Variants					
Not Counted	Differences likely caused by Excerpted/Liturgical Nature	F2ii:L1-3 (Col 3:1-3 (Song 4:8-6:10))			Abbreviation likely at sense units (4:8-6:10)	
	Insufficient Manuscript Evidence	F2i:L13 (Col 2:13 [Song 4:5])	צב[יה]°	צְבִיָּה	Evidence of word prior to רעים is unclear	
		F2ii:L5 (Col 3:5 [Song 7:1])		שוּבִי שׁוּבִי	Proposed Omission of verb based on Spatial Considerations	Do not include in table

Table A72. 4Q107: Description of variants

Category	Description of Variant	Fragment, Line, and Verse	4Q107	MT	Detailed Description of Variant	Statistical Weight
1	Addition	F2ii:L6 (Col 3:6 [Song 4:3])	ומבעד	מבעד	Addition of Conjunctive <i>vav</i>	1
	Substitution	F1:L8 (Col 1:8 [Song 2:14])	הראני	הראיני	Substitution of Gender	1
		F1:L9 (Col 1:9 [Song 2:14])	השמעיני [א]ת שמעך	השמיעני י את קולך	Substitution: Similar Lexemes Harmonization	1
		F1:L15 (Col 1:15 [Song 3:2])	אקום	אקומה	Substitution of Tense	1
		F2ii:L8 (Col 3:8 [Song 4:8])	מן ראשי	מראש	Substitution of Number	1
2	Addition	F1:L3 (Col 1:3 [Song 2:12])	הנה		Addition: Harmonization	1
		F1:L5 (Col 1:5 [Song 2:13])	הנה		Addition: Harmonization	1
		F1:L14 (Col 1:14 [Song 3:1])	בלי[ליות בלילות	בלילות	Addition: Prepositional Phrase	1
		F2ii:L14 (Col 3:14 [Song 4:11])	אחותי		Addition: Harmonization (cf. 9, 10, 12; 5:1 [DJD, 216])	1
	Substitution	F2ii:L7 (Col 3:7 [Song 4:8])	את	אתי	Substitution of Prepositional Phrase for Pronoun twice	2
	Complex Variants	F2ii:L8 (Col 3:8 [Song 4:8])	אבאי	תבואי	Substitution of Person and Addition of Pronominal Suffix	2
		F3:L5 (Col 4:11 [Song 4:16])	מן ג[דיו	פרי מגדיו	Substitution and Omission/ Transposition: Interpretation	2
3	No Variants					
Not Counted	Differences likely caused by Excerpted/Liturgical Nature	F2i:L7 (Col 2:7 [Song 3:6-8])			Omits Song 3:6-8	
		F2ii:L6-7 (Col 3:6-7 [Song 4:4-7])			Omits Song 4:4-7 and leaves <i>vacat</i>	
	Insufficient Manuscript	F1:L10 (Col 1:10 [Song 2:15])	ש[ועלים	שוועלים שוועלים		
		F1:L13 (Col 1:13 [Song 2:17])		או לעפר האילים		
		F1:L15 (Col 1:15 [Song 3:1])	בקשת[הו	בקשתיו		
		F3:L7-8 (Col 4:13-14 [Song 5:1])			Based on Reconstruction	
Unclear Paleography	F2ii:13 (Col 3:13 [Song 4:10])	שמנד	שמנד	Possible Substitution of Number		

Table A72 continued

Not Counted continued	Synonymous Spelling	F1:8 (Col 1:8 [Song 2:14])	המדלגה	המדרגה	Aramaic Influence	
		F1:L12 (Col 1:12 [Song 2:17])	הטללים	הצללים		
		F1:L13 (Col 1:13 [Song 2:17])	הררי	קרי		
		F2ii:L7 (Col 3:7 [Song 4:8] Twice in verse	מן לבנון	מלבנון		
		F2ii:L8 (Col 3:8 [Song 4:8])	מן ראשי	מראש		
		F2ii:L9 (Col 3:9 [Song 4:8])	מן הררי	מהררי		
		F2ii:L12 (Col 3:12 [Song 4:10])	מן יין	מיין		
		F2ii:L13 (Col 3:13 [Song 4:10])	מן כל	מכל		
		F2ii:L13 (Col 3:13 [Song 4:10])	בשמין	בשמים		
		F2ii:L8 (Col 3:8 [Song 4:8])	אומנון	אמנה		Rabbinic Spelling (DJD, 216)
	Scribal Error	F1:L5 (Col 1:5 [Song 2:13])	התנאה	התאנה	Metathesis	
		F1:L14 (Col 1:14 [Song 3:1])	בשקתי	בקשתי	Metathesis	
	Correction	F2ii:L12 (Col 3:12 [Song 4:10])	(ה ^ו)		Variant Omitted with Parenthesis	
	<i>Kethiv/Qere</i>	F1:L6 (Col 1:6 [Song 2:13])	לך	לכי [לך]	Follows the <i>Qere</i>	
		F2ii:L5 (Col 3:5 [Song 4:3])	ומדברך	ומדבריה	Follows the <i>Qere</i>	
		F2ii:L10 (Col 3:10 [Song 4:9])	באחד	באחד [אחת]	Follows the <i>Kethiv</i>	

Table A73. 6Q6: Description of variants

Category	Description of Variant	Fragment, Line, and Verse	6Q6	MT	Detailed Description of Variant	Statistical Weight
1	Unclear variant	Col 1:4-5 (Song 1:4)	נשמחה [ונגילה]	נגילה ונשמחה	Transposition or Omission	1
2	Omission	Col 1:2 (Song 1:3)	שמנים	שמןִיד	Omission of Pronominal Suffix	1
	Complex Variant	Col 1:5 (Song 1:4)	מישרים אהובים	מישרים אהוב	Substitution of Part of Speech and Omission of Pronominal Suffix	2
3	No Variants					
Not Counted	Insufficient Manuscript Evidence	Col 1:3 (Song 1:3)	מר[קחת מורקה	תורק שקד		
	Synonymous Spelling	Col 1:6 (Song 1:5)	בנתי	בנות	<i>Hireq compangins</i> or scribal error (DJD, 113; GKC §90)	

Table A74. 4Q109: Description of variants

Category	Description of Variant	Fragment, Line, and Verse	4Q109	MT	Detailed Description of Variant	Statistical Weight	
1	Addition	F6i:L8 (Col 2:19 [Ecc 7:5])	מ[ל^ש^מו ע	מאיש שמע	Addition of Preposition	1	
	Omission	F1i:L3 (Col 1:3 [Ecc 5:15])	גם	וגם	Omission of Conjunctive <i>vav</i>	1	
		F6i:L9 (Col 2:20 [Ecc 7:6])	גם	וגם	Omission of Conjunctive <i>vav</i>	1	
		Col 2:17 (Ecc 7:4)	בית	בבית	Omission of Preposition	1	
	Substitution	F1ii:L1 (Col 2:1 [Ecc 6:3])	הנפל ממנו	ממנו הנפל	Transposition	1	
		F1ii-iii:L1 ^{sup} (Col 2:1 [Ecc 6:4])	הלך	ילך	Substitution of Tense	1	
		F1ii:L3 (Col 2:3 [Ecc 6:5])	ואם לוא	ואלו	Substitution of particle	1	
		F6i:L7 (Col 2:18 [Ecc 7:5])	גערות	גערת	Substitution of Number	1	
		F6ii:L3 (Col 3:19 [Ecc 7:19])	ש[היו]	אשר היו	Substitution of Relative Particle	1	
		F6ii:L4 (Col 3:20 [Ecc 7:20])	ש[יע]שה	אשר יעשה	Substitution of Relative Particle	1	
	Unclear Variant	F1i:L1 (Col 1:1 [Ecc 5:14])	כיא	כאשר	Substitution or Addition of Particles	1	
		F4:L3 (Col 2:15 [Ecc 7:2])	כול סוף האדם]	סוף כל- האדם	Transposition of words or Omission	1	
	2	Substitution	F1ii:L2 (Col 2:2 [Ecc 6:5])	נוחת	נחת	Substitution of part of Speech	1
			F6i:L1 (Col 2:15 [Ecc 7:2])	ש[מחה]	משמה	Substitution of Noun: Metathesis or interpretation	1
F1iii:L2 (Col 3:2 [Ecc 7:7])			ויעוה]	ויאבד	Substitution of Lexeme	1	
F7:L1 (Col 3:18 [Ecc 7:19])			ה[חכמה] תעזר	החכמה תעזו	Substitution of Lexeme	1	
3	No Variants						
Not Counted	Insufficient Manuscript Evidence	F3-4:L1 (Col 2:12 [Ecc 6:12])	שם יגיד	אשר מי- יגיד			
	Synonymous Spelling	F1ii:L1 (Col 2:1 [Ecc 6:4])	בה	בא			
		F1ii:L6 (Col 2:6 [Ecc 6:8])	כמה	כי מה	Possible Substitution of Syntax		

Table A75. 4Q111: Description of variants

Category	Description of Variant	Fragment, Line, and Verse	4Q111	MT	Detailed Description of Variant	Statistical Weight
1	Addition	F3:L6 (Lam 1:14)	לקום	קום	Addition of Preposition	1
		F3:L5 (Lam 1:14)	וישתרג	ישתרגו	Addition of Conjunctive <i>vav</i>	1
	Substitution	F2:L5 (Lam 1:8)	חטוא	חטא	Substitution of Absolute Object	1
		F2:L9 (Lam 1:9)	[פ]לאות	פלאים	Substitution of Gender	1
		F3:L1 (Lam 1:11)	מחמדיה	מחמודיהם [מחמדיהם]	Substitution of Number	1
		F3:L3 (Lam 1:12)	עוללו לי	עולל לי	Substitution of Number	1
		F3:L2 (Lam 1:11)	זולל	זוללה	Substitution of Gender	1
		F3:L4 (Lam 1:13)	ויורידני	ויורדנה	Substitution of Gender and Number	1
		F3:L4 (Lam 1:13)	שומם	שממה	Substitution of Gender	1
		F3:L5 (Lam 1:13)	וד[ו]י	דנה	Substitution of Gender	1
		F3:L5 (Lam 1:14)	וישתרג	ישתרגו	Substitution of Number	1
		F3:9 (Lam 1:17)	ציון	ירושלם	Substitution of Name	1
		2	Addition	F2:L4 (Lam 1:7)	צריה	צרים
F2:L5 (Lam 1:7)	[כו]ל				Addition of <i>kôl</i> particle	1
F3:L1 (Lam 1:11)	נפשה			נפש	Addition of Pronominal Suffix	1
F3:L3 (Lam 1:12)	הוגירני י[הוה]			הוגה יהנה	Addition of Pronominal Suffix	1
F3:9 (Lam 1:16)	דמעתי			מים	Addition of Pronominal suffix	1
F3:8 (Lam 1:17 MT)	מכול אוהביה צדיק אתה יהוה				Addition	8

Table A75 continued

2 continued	Omission	F2:L3-4 (Lam 1:7)	זכורה יהוה [כו]ל מכאובנו	זכרה ירושלם ימי עניה ומרוידיה כל מתמדיה	Omission: Parablepsis	6	
		F2:L4 (Lam 1:7)	ואין עוזר צריה שחקו	ואין עוזר לה ראוה צרים	Omission: Parablepsis	4	
		F2:L6 (Lam 1:8)	הזילו	הזילוה	Omission: Pronominal Suffix	1	
		F3:L1 (Lam 1:10- 11)	לוא יבואו מחמדיה	לא יבאו בקהל לד: ס כל-עמה נאנחים מבקשים לקם נתנו מתמדיהם [מתמדיהם]	Omission: Parablepsis	11	
		F3:L9 (Lam 1:16)	עיני	עיני עיני	Omission: Haplography	2	
		F3:10 (Lam 1:16)	נפש	נפשי	Omission of Pronominal Suffix	1	
	Substitution	F2:L3 (Lam 1:7)	[כו]ל מכאובנו	כל מתמדיה	Substitution of Pronominal Suffix and Lexical Root	2	
		F2:L5 (Lam 1:7)	משבריה	משבתה	Substitution of Noun	1	
		F2:L6 (Lam 1:8)	לנוד	לנידה	Substitution of Predicates	3	
		F3:L3 (Lam 1:12)	הוגירני [יהוה]	הוגה יהנה	Substitution of Lexical Root	1	
		F3:L4 (Lam 1:13)	ויורידני	וינדנה	Substitution of Verbal Stem and Root	1	
		F3:5 (Lam 1:14)	נקשרה על פשעי	נשקד על פשעי	Substitution: Graphic confusion or Interpretation	1	
		F3:L5 (Lam 1:14)	עולו	עלו	Substitution: Different Syntax	1	
		F3:L7-10 (Lam 1:16- 17)			Transposition of Acrostic	1	
		F3:8 (Lam 1:17 MT)	צפה	צנה	Substitution of Root	1	
		F3:9 (Lam 1:17)	היתה ציון לנדוח	היתה ירושלם לנדחה	Substitution of Speech and Root: Graphic Confusion	1	
		F3:9 (Lam 1:16)	בכו עיני	אני בוכיה עיני	Substitution of Syntax	1	
		F3:9 (Lam 1:16)	דמעתי	מים	Substitution of Nominal Root	1	
		Unclear Variant	F3:L3 (Lam 1:12)	ביו]ם חרונו	ביום חרון אפו	Possible Omission	1

Table A75 continued

3	Substitution	F2:L3 (Lam 1:7)	זכורה יהוה	זְכָרָה יְרוּשָׁלַם	Substitution of Noun and Verbal Tense	2
Not Counted	Insufficient Manuscript Evidence	F3:L2 (Lam 1:12)	לוא אֶלִיכֶם	לוא אליכ[י]		
	Scribal Error	F2:L1 (Lam 1:6)	לוא לוא	לא	Double negation with two לא particles never occurs in MT	
		F1:L6 (Lam 1:6)	מצא ומרעה	מִצָּאוּ מְרַעָה	Faulty Word Division Results in Difficult Syntax	
		F3:L4 (Lam 1:13)	הַשִּׁבְנִי	חִשְׁבְּנִי	Graphic Confusion	
		F3:6 (Lam 1:15)	אבידי	אֲבִירִי	Graphic Confusion	
		F1:L11 (Lam 1:6)	מבת	מִן־בַּת־[מ][בת]	Follows <i>Qere</i>	
	<i>Kethiv/Qere</i>	F3:L6 (Lam 1:14)	יהוה	אֲדָנִי		
		F3:L7 (Lam 1:15)	יהוה	אֲדָנִי		
		F3:L10 (Lam 1:18)	א[דוני	יְהוָה	Follows <i>Qere</i>	

Table A76. 4Q112: Description of variants

Category	Description of Variant	Fragment, Line, and Verse	4Q112	MT	Detailed Description of Variant	Statistical Weight	
1	Addition	F1i:L1 (Frgs. 1-2:L1 [Dan 1:16])	ואת]	את	Addition of Conjunctive <i>vav</i>	1	
		F3i:L3 (Frgs. 3i, 17:L3 [Dan 2:22])	וידע	ידע	Addition of Conjunctive <i>vav</i>	1	
		F3i:L4 (Frgs. 3i, 17:4 [Dan 2:23])	לאלה	אלה	Addition of Preposition	1	
		F3i:L16 (Frgs. 3i, 17:L16 [Dan 2:31])	לרב	רב	Addition of Preposition	1	
		F3i:L16 (Frgs. 3i, 17:L16 [Dan 2:31])	יתירא	יתיר	Substitution of Gender	1	
		F14:L12 (F14:L16 [Dan 8:4])	וכל החיות	וקלחיות	Addition of Article	1	
		F15:L3 (F15:L17 [Dan 10:19])	החמדות	חמדות	Addition of Article	1	
	Omission	F3i:L18 (Frgs. 3i, 17:L18 [Dan 2:33])	ומנהון חסר	ומנהון חסר	וימנהון [ר] [מנהון] די חסר	Omission of <i>di</i> particle	1
		F3ii:L1 (Frgs. 3ii, 4-6:L1 [Dan 2:34])			די	Omission of <i>di</i> particle	1
		F6:L4 (F3ii, 4-6:L18 [Dan 2:46])	אדין	באדין		Omission of Preposition	1
		F9:L5 (F9:L18 [Dan 5:7])	בב[ל כל	בב[ל די כל		Omission of <i>di</i> particle	1
		F10:L1 (Frgs. r-11:L1 [Dan 5:12])	שכלתנו	ושכלתנו		Omission of Conjunctive <i>vav</i>	1
		F14:L1 (F14:L5 [Dan 7:25])	עדנין	ועדנין		Omission of Conjunctive <i>vav</i>	1
		F14:L12 (F14:16 [Dan 8:4])	צפונה	וצפונה		Omission of Conjunctive <i>vav</i>	1
		F15:L4 (F15:18 [Dan 10:19])	ואמר	ואמרה		Omission of <i>he</i>	1
	Substitution	F3i:L7 (Frgs. 3i, 17:L7 [Dan 2:24])	אה^ה^חזה	אחזא		Substitution of Verbal Stem	1
		F3i:L8 (Frgs. 3i, 17:L8 [Dan 2:25])	יהודיא	יהוד		Substitution of Noun	1
		F3ii:L3 (Frgs. 3ii, 4-6:L3 [Dan 2:35])	והוה	נהו		Substitution of Number	1
		F3ii:L3 (Frgs. 3ii, 4-6:L3 [Dan 2:35])	אדר	אדרי		Substitution of Number	1
		F5:L6 (Frgs. 3ii, 4-6:L13 [Dan 2:43])	הכא די	האכדי		Transposition	1
		F10:2 (Frgs. 10-11:L2 [Dan 5:12])	השת[כח	השתכח		Substitution of Gender	1
		F12:L3 (Dan 5:17)	ונבזבתך	ונבזביתך		Substitution of Number	1
		F14:L5 (F14:9 [Dan 7:28])	יהשנון	ישתנון		Substitution of Verbal Stem	1
		F16:L3 (F16:L17 [Dan 11:15])	ושפך	ולשפך		Substitution of Tense	1
		Unclear Difference	F14:L10 (F14:L14 [Dan 8:3])	קרנים קרנים וחקרנים	קרנים וחקרנים		Addition or Omission

Table A76 continued

2	Addition	F3i:L1 (Frgs. 3i, 17:L1 [Dan 2:20])	רבא		Addition of Adjective	2
		F3i:L14 (Frgs. 3i, 17:L14 [Dan 2:30])	יתירא]		Addition of Adjective	2
		F5:L2 (Frgs. 3ii, 4-6:L9 [Dan 2:40])	כל ארעא			3
		F9:L4 (F9:L17 [Dan 5:7])	חרטמיא		Addition of element in list	2
		F10:3 (Frgs. 10-11:L3 [Dan 5:12])	וֹכְתָבָא יִקְרָא]		Addition of clause	3
		F14:L10 (F14:L14 [Dan 8:3])	איל אחד גד]ול	איל אַחַד	Addition of Adjective	1
		F14:L12 (F14:16 [Dan 8:4])	ומזרחה		Addition of Element in List	3
	Omission	F7:L7 (F7:L8 [Dan 3:2])	ומכד^נצר	נְבוּכַדְנֶצַּר מֶלֶכָא	Omission of Appositional Phrase	2
	Substitution	F2:L2 (Frgs. 1-2:L6 [Dan 1:20])	ח[כמ]הּ ב[ינה]	חֲכַמְתַּי בְּיָנָה	Substitution of Case	1
		F3i:L12 (Frgs. 3i, 17:L12 [Dan 2:28])	ומהודע	וְהוֹדַע	Substitution of Part of Speech: Harmonization	1
		F3i:L15 (Frgs. 3i, 17:L15 [Dan 2:30])	לי גלי	גְּלִי לִי	Transposition	1
		F3i:L16 (Frgs. 3i, 17:L16 [Dan 2:31])	חזה	וְזִינָה	Substitution: Graphic Confusion	1
		F15:L4 (F15:18 [Dan 10:19])	דבר	דְּבַר	Substitution of Volitive	1
	Unclear Variant	F3i:L12 (Frgs. 3i, 17:L12 [Dan 2:28])	באחרית יומיא מ[לכא לעלמין חיי חלמד]	בְּאַחֲרֵית יוֹמֵיָא יוֹמֵיָא חֲלָמְדָא חֲלָמְדָא רֵאשִׁדָא	Addition or Substitution	1
	3	No Variants				

Table A76 continued

Not Counted	Insufficient Manuscript Evidence	F1i:L5 (Frgs 1-2:L5 [Dan 1:19])	[לְמִי]שָׂאֵל	מִישָׂאֵל	Proposed Addition of Conjunctive <i>vav</i>	
		F2:L4 (Frgs 1-2:L8 [Dan 1:20])	°[לִי]° [מַלְכוּתוֹ]		Proposed longer reading	See DSSB, 486
		F3i:L5 (Frgs. 3i, 17:L5 [Dan 2:23])	[וְנָהִי°° --]		Proposed longer reading	See DSSB, 486
		F3i:L6 (Frgs. 3i, 17:L6 [Dan 2:23])	עַל [אַרְיוֹן]°	עַל עַל- אַרְיוֹן	Proposed Shorter Reading	
		F7:L8 (F7:L9 [Dan 3:2])	--°רַבִּי [אֵ]° [אֵ]			
	Synonymous Spelling	F3i:L2 (Frgs. 3i, 17:L2 [Dan 2:21])	מִשְׁנָא	מִשְׁשָׁנָא	Syncopation of the <i>he</i>	
		F3i:L6 (Frgs. 3i, 17:L6 [Dan 2:24])	לְהוֹבִדָּא	לְהוֹבְדָה	Substitution of <i>aleph</i> and <i>he</i>	
		F3i:L6 (Frgs. 3i, 17:L6 [Dan 2:24])	פִּשְׂרָה	וּפִשְׂרָא	Proposed addition of Pronominal Suffix but could be simple Substitution of <i>aleph</i> and <i>he</i>	
		F3i:L7 (Frgs. 3i, 17:L7 [Dan 2:25])	בִּאתָ [בְּהֵלָה]	בְּהֵתְבָהֶלָה	Substitution of <i>aleph</i> and <i>he</i>	
		F3i:L11 (Frgs. 3i, 17:L11 [Dan 2:27])	חֲרַטְמִים	חֲרַטְמִין	Hebraic Influence	
		F3i:L17 (Frgs. 3i, 17:L17 [Dan 2:32])	רִישָׁה	רִאשָׁה	Omission of Guttural	
		F3ii:L1 (Frgs. 3ii, 4-6:L1 [Dan 2:34])	הִתְגַּזְרַת	אַתְגַּזְרַת	Substitution of <i>aleph</i> and <i>he</i>	
		F5:L3 (Frgs. 3ii, 4-6:L10 [Dan 2:41])	תְּהוּא	תְּהִינָה	Substitution of <i>aleph</i> and <i>he</i>	
		F5:L5 (Frgs. 3ii, 40-6:12) [Dan 2:42])	תְּהוּ [וּא]	תְּהִינָה	Substitution of <i>aleph</i> and <i>he</i>	
		F9:L2 (F9:L15 [Dan 5:5])	יְדָא	יְדָה	Substitution of <i>aleph</i> and <i>he</i>	
		F9:L3 (F9:L16 [Dan 5:6])	חֲלִצָה	חֲרִצָה	Hebraic Influence	DSSB, 492
		F10:L1 (Frgs. 10:L1 [Dan 5:12])	[וּמַדְע]	וּמַנְדְע	Possible Hebraic Influence	
		F9:L4 (F9:L17 [Dan 5:7])	לְהַעֲלָה	לְהַנְעֵלָה	Nasalization	
		F9:L5 (F9:L18 [Dan 5:7])	א [יְקָרָה]	יְקָרָה	Substitution of <i>aleph</i> and <i>he</i>	
		F9:L5 (F9:L18 [Dan 5:7])	כְּתָבָא	כְּתָבָה	Substitution of <i>aleph</i> and <i>he</i>	
F12:L3 (Dan 5:17)	וּפִשְׂרָה	וּפִשְׂרָא	Substitution of <i>aleph</i> and <i>he</i>			
F14:L14 (F14:L18 [Dan 8:5])	אַל	עַל	Confusion of Gutturals			

Table A76 continued

Not Counted continued	Scribal Error	F3i:L9 (Frgs. 3i, 17:L9 [Dan 2:26])	בלטאשצר	בלטשצאר	Metathesis	
		F7:L7 (F7:L8 [Dan 3:2])	ומכדנצר	ונבוכדנצר	Graphic Confusion	
	Correction to MT	F14:7 (F14:11 [Dan 8:1])	בר[ד]} {גלה}}		Correction to MT	
	Kethiv/Qere	F3i:L13 (Frgs. 3i, 17:13 [Dan 2:29])	אנת	אנתה [אנת]	Agrees with <i>Qere</i>	
		F3i:L16 (Frgs. 3i, 17:L16 [Dan 2:31])	אנת	אנתה [אנת]	Agrees with <i>Qere</i>	
		F5:L3 (Frgs. 3ii, 4-6:L3 [Dan 2:41])	ומנהם	ומנהון [י][מנהון]	Agrees with <i>Kethiv</i>	
		F5:L4 (Frgs. 3ii, 4-6:L11 [Dan 2:42])	מנהם	מנהון [מנהון]	Agrees with <i>Kethiv</i>	
		F5:L5 (Frgs. 3ii, 4-6:L12 (Dan 2:43)	ודי	די [ו][די]	Agrees with <i>Qere</i>	
		F13:3 (Dan 7:6)	גביהא	גביה [גבה]	Partially follows <i>Kethiv</i>	

Table A77. 4Q113: Description of variants

Category	Description of Variant	Fragment, Line, and Verse	4Q113	MT	Detailed Description of Variant	Statistical Weight
1	Addition	F7ii:L14 (Frgs. 7ii, 8:L15 [Dan 6:19 {18}])	באדין	אָדײַן	Addition of Preposition	1
	Substitution	F7i:L8 (F7i:L19 [Dan 6:11 {10}])	מִן קוֹדֵם דְּנָה	מִן־קֹדֶמֶת דְּנָה	Substitution of Case	1
		F7i:L10 (F7i:L21 [Dan 6:13 {12}])	אסרא	אָסֶר	Substitution of Case	1
		F7i:L11 (F7i:L22 (Dan 6:13 {12}])	י[בעו	יִבְעֶה	Substitution of Number	1
		F7ii:L12 (Frgs. 7ii, 8:L13 [Dan 6:18 {17}])	בפם	עַל־פֶּם	Substitution of Preposition	1
		F9:L1 (Frgs. 9-11:L11 (Dan 6:27 [26}))	אלה חי	אֱלֹהָא חַיָּא	Substitution of Case	2
	Unclear Variant	F16:L4 (Frgs. 16-18i, 19:L6-7 [Dan 8:3])	קרנים ק[ר]נים [והקרנים]	קֶרְנִים וְהַקֶּרְנִים	Omission or Addition	2
2	Addition	F2:L2 (Frgs. 1-4:L8 [Dan 5:12])	יתקר]א וכת]בא		Addition of Clause	3
		F17:L3 (Frgs. 16-18i, 19:L6 [Dan 8:3])	גדול		Addition of Adjective	1
	Omission	F7ii:L12 (Frgs. 7ii, 8:L13 [Dan 6:18 {17}])	וחתם מלכא	וְחַתְמָה מְלָכָא	Omission of Pronominal Suffix	1
	Substitution	F7ii:L10 (Frgs. 7ii, 8:L11 (Dan 6:17 {16}])	ול]גבא די אריותא רמ]ו	וְרָמּוּ לְגַבְא דִּי אַרְיֹתָא אַרְיֹתָא	Transposition of verb	1
	Unclear Variant	F8:L2 (Frgs. 7ii, 8:L16 [Dan 6:20 {19}])	מל]כא בשפרפ]ר א בנגהא	מְלָכָא בְּשַׁפְרִפְרִי א בְּנִגְהָא	Omission or Transposition	1
3	No Variant					

Table A77 continued

Not Counted	Insufficient Manuscript Evidence	F7ii:19 (Frgs. 7ii, 8:L20 (Dan 6:22 {21}))	[אדין דניאל מ]לל[עם מלכא	אָדין דְּנִיָּאל עִם־מַלְכָּא מַלְל		
	Synonymous Spelling	F5:L2 (Frgs. 5- 6:L2 [Dan 5:19])	מהר[ים]	מְרִים		
		F7i:L6 (F7i:L17 [Dan 6:11 {10}])	[ב]ע(ל)ית א	בְּעֵלִיתָהּ		
		F7ii:L6 (Frgs. 7ii, 8:L7 [Dan 6:15 {14}])	לזב־ותה	לְשִׁיזְבוּתָהּ	Syncopation of the <i>shin</i>	
		F7ii:L14 (Frgs. 7ii, 8:L15 [Dan 6:19 {18}])	להיכלא	לְהִיכְלָהּ	Substitution of <i>he</i> and <i>aleph</i>	
		F8:L2 (Frgs. 7ii, 8:L16 [Dan 6:20 {19}])	ובאתבה[ל] [ה]	וּבָהּתְּבָהֶלְ ה	Substitution of <i>he</i> and <i>aleph</i>	
	F10:L1 (Frgs. 9- 11:L13 (Dan 6:28 {27}))	מי[ד]	מִי־ד			
Kethiv/Qere	F4:L2 (Frgs. 1- 4:L15 [Dan 5:16])	תוכל	תוכל [תיכול]	Follows <i>Kethiv</i>		

Table A78. 4Q114: Description of variants

Category	Description of Variant	Fragment, Line, and Verse	4Q114	MT	Detailed Description of Variant	Statistical Weight
1	Addition	Col 3:4 (Col 3:15 [Dan 11:17])	את		Addition of Marker of Accusative	1
	Substitution	F1i:L1 (Col 1:1 [Dan 10:5])	חגור	חַגְרִים	Substitution of Number	1
		F1i:L4 (Col 1:4 [Dan 10:6])	דברו	דְּבָרִיו	Substitution of Number	1
		F1i:L7 (Col 1:7 [Dan 10:8])	הַגְדוֹל הַזֶּה	הַגְדֹּלָה הַזֹּאת	Substitution of Gender	2
		F2i:6 (Col 1:16 [Dan 10:13])	[ו]שרי	וְשָׂר	Substitution of Number	1
		F1ii:L4 (Col 2:4 [Dan 10:15])	וּכְדָבְרוֹ	וּבְדָבְרוֹ	Substitution of Similar Preposition	1
		F3i:L2 (Col 3:13 [Dan 11:15])	וּשְׂפָךְ	וַיִּשְׂפֹךְ	Substitution of Tense	1
		F3i:L2 (Col 3:13 [Dan 11:15])	סֹלֶל	סוֹלְלָה	Substitution of Gender	1
		F3i:L5 (Col 3:16 [Dan 11:17])	אֲנָשִׁים	הַנְּשִׁים	Substitution of Noun	1
		F3i:L5 (Col 3:16 [Dan 11:17])	לְהַשְׁחִיתוֹ	לְהַשְׁחִיתָהּ	Substitution of Gender	1
2	Substitution	F2i:L6 (Col 1:16 [Dan 10:12])	בַּעַבְ[ו]רָךְ	בְּדָבְרֶיךָ	Substitution: Graphic Confusion	1
		F2ii:L2 (Col 2:14 [Dan 11:1])	עַמְדָתִי	עֶמְדִי	Substitution of Tense	1
		F3i:L4 (Col 3:15 [Dan 11:16])	בַּעֲזוֹ	בְּיָדוֹ	Substitution: Graphic Confusion	1
		F3i:L4 (Col 3:15 [Dan 11:17])	בִּינוֹ	פְּנִיו	Substitution: Graphic Confusion	1
3	No Variants					
Not Counted	Unclear Paleography	F3i:L5 (Col 3:16 [Dan 11:17])	יַעֲשֶׂה	וַעֲשֶׂה		
	Synonymous Spelling	F1i:L2 (Col 1:2 [Dan 10:6])	וּגְוִי[א]תוֹ	וּגְוִיתוֹ		
	Scribal Error	F3i:L3 (Col 3:14 [Dan 11:16])	הַמָּא	הַבָּא	Graphic Confusion	DJD, 275
		F3i:L5 (Col 3:16 [Dan 11:17])	כַּעַמִּיכ	כְּלִי-מִלְכּוֹתוֹ	Graphic Confusion	

Table A79. 4Q115: Description of variants

Category	Description of Variant	Fragment, Line, and Verse	4Q115	MT	Detailed Description of Variant	Statistical Weight
1	Substitution	F4:L2 (Frgs. 3-7:L12 [Dan 4:12 {15}])	חולקה	חלקה	Substitution of Similar Lexeme	1
		F4:L3 (Frgs. 3-7:L13 [Dan 4:13 {16}])	חיותא	חיוה	Substitution of State	1
2	Addition	F2ii:L5 (Dan 3:25)	להדברוהי		Addition of Object	3
	Substitution	F3:L2 (Frgs 3-7:L3 [Dan 4:6])	וכ[ר] ל[ר]ז לך לא אנט	וכל-רו לא- אנט לך	Transposition	1
3	No Variants					
Not Counted	Insufficient Manuscript	F2ii:L4 (Dan 3:25)	נבכדנצ[ר]		Addition of Subject	
		F7:L1 (Frgs 3-7:L17 [Dan 4:15 {18}])	כלקבל	כל-קבל	Synonymous Spelling	
		Frgs 3-7:L17 (Dan 4:15 [18])	פ[ש]רא	פ[ש]רא	<i>Kethiv/Qere</i> See DJD, 283-84	

Table A80. 6Q7: Description of variants

Category	Description of Variant	Fragment, Line, and Verse	6Q7	MT	Detailed Description of Variant	Statistical Weight
1	No Variants					
2	Substitution	F4:L1 (Frgs. 2-5:L12 [Dan 10:13])	מ[ל]כות פרס	מלכי פרס	Substitution of noun: Harmonization	1
		F4:L4 (Frgs. 2-5:L15 [Dan 10:16])	נג[ע]ה]	נגע	Substitution of Antecedent	1
3	No Variants					
Not Counted	Insufficient Manuscript Evidence	F3:L4 (Frgs. 2-5:L4 [Dan 10:10])	להניעני	והניעני		
		F3:L11 (Frgs. 2-5:L11 [Dan 10:13])	הרי[שונים]	הראשנים	Synonymous Spelling	
		F4:L3 (Frgs.2-5:L14 [Dan 10:15])	אפי	פני		
		F6:L1 (Frgs. 6-7:L1 [Dan 11:33])	ו[בשבי]	בשבי		
	Synonymous Spellings	F2:L2 (Frgs. 2-5:L8 [Dan 10:12])	דניל	דניאל	Omission of Guttural	
		F3:L8 (Frgs. 2-5:L8 [Dan 10:12])	הרישון	הראשון	Omission of Guttural	

Table A81. 4Q118: Description of variants

Category	Description of Variant	Fragment, Line, and Verse	4Q118	MT	Detailed Description of Variant	Statistical Weight
1	Addition	F1ii:L5 (2 Chron 29:3)	והוא	הוא	Addition of Conjunctive vav	1
2	Substitution	F1ii:L2 (2 Chron 28:27)	בן אהז	בנו	Substitution: Proper Name for Pronominal Suffix	1
3	No Variants					
Not Counted	Synonymous Spelling	F1ii:L4 (2 Chron 29:1)	איבה	אִבְיָה	Same Name	

APPENDIX 4

SUMMARY OF THE NON-ALIGNED TEXTS'
STATISTICAL RELATIONSHIP TO THE MT

Table A82. A summary of the non-aligned texts statistical relationship to the MT

Genre	Book	Text	Total # of Words	Categories 1, 2, and 3	Statistical Relationship	Categories 2 and 3	Statistical Relationship	Category 3	Statistical Relationship	Textual Tradition	Other Comments
Law	Genesis	4Q10	70	2	97.14%	0	100%	0	100%	MT	Interpretative
		2Q2	148	15	89.86%	12	91.89%	0	100%	MT	Interpretative
	Exodus	2Q3	32	1	96.88%	1	96.88%	0	100%	MT	Interpretative and Possibly Excerpted
		4Q15	31	0	100%	0	100%	0	100%	MT	Excerpted
		4Q16	61	11	81.97%	7	88.52%	0	100%	MT	Excerpted
	Leviticus	11Q1	1594	39	97.55%	20	98.75%	0	100%	MT	Inconsistent Differences
		11Q2	93	8	91.40%	5	94.62%	0	100%	MT	Interpretative
	Deuteronomy	4Q29	227	15	93.39%	8	96.48%	0	100%	MT	Interpretative
		4Q30	787	42	94.66%	23	97.08%	0	100%	MT	Interpretative
		4Q35	520	25	95.19%	9	98.27%	0	100%	MT	
		4Q37	373	19	94.91%	11	97.05%	0	100%	MT	Interpretative and Excerpted
		4Q38	166	14	91.57%	9	94.58%	0	100%	MT	Excerpted and Interpretative
		4Q38a	174	6	96.55%	2	98.85%	0	100%	MT	Interpretative
		4Q40	96	5	94.79%	2	97.92%	0	100%	MT	
		4Q41	793	39	95.08%	13	98.36%	0	100%	MT	Harmonized and Excerpted
		5Q1	166	3	98.19%	2	98.80%	0	100%	MT	Corrections from Second Hand move text further from MT
		Law Total Numbers	16	5331	244	95.42%	124	97.67%	0	100%	MT

Table A82 continued

Prophets	Joshua	4Q47	302	48	84.11%	41	86.42%	0	100%	Ambiguous	Possibly non-biblical?
	Judges	4Q49	59	8	86.44%	5	93.22%	0	100%	Ambiguous	Excerpted and high amount of scribal intervention (poor copying or copying from memory)
	Kings	6Q4	78	4	94.87%	4	94.87%	0	100%	MT	
	Isaiah	1QIsaa (3771)	25,374	N/A	N/A	903	96.44%	31	99.88%	MT	Copied from damaged exemplar
		4Q57	1043	45	95.69%	20	98.08%	0	100%	MT	Interpretative
		4Q64	43	5	88.37%	1	97.67%	0	100%	MT	Interpretative
	Jeremiah	2Q13	267	23	91.39%	10	96.25%	0	100%	MT	Interpretative
	Ezekiel	4Q73	214	3	98.60%	0	100%	0	100%	MT	
	Minor Prophets	4Q76	436	29	93.35%	12	97.25%	0	100%	MT	Interpretative
		4Q78	503	25	95.03%	15	97.02%	0	100%	MT	Interpretative and Conflated
		4Q79	39	2	94.87%	2	94.87%	0	100%	MT	
		4Q80	166	5	96.99%	2	98.80%	0	100%	MT	High amount of Scribal Intervention
		4Q82	982	31	96.84%	18	98.17%	0	100%	MT	Interpretative
	Total Prophet Numbers	13	29145 (but 3,771 for first category because of 1QIsa ^a)	228	93.95%	1033	96.46%	31	99.89%	MT (4Q47 and 4Q49 are ambiguous)	Several Interpretative texts. Also, they are fuller than the MT

Table A82 continued

165	Writings	Psalms	4Q83	558	73	86.92%	48	91.40%	0	100%	MT	Interpretative or Damaged Exemplar and Liturgical
			4Q84	595	28	95.29%	15	97.48%	0	100%	MT	Interpretative and Liturgical
			4Q86	171	20	88.30%	10	94.15%	0	100%	MT	Interpretative and Liturgical
			4Q87	234	11	95.30%	4	98.29%	0	100%	MT	Corrected to MT and Liturgical
			4Q88	203	29	85.71%	17	91.63%	0	100%	MT	Interpretative or Damaged Exemplar or Phonetic and Liturgical
			4Q92	26	3	88.46%	3	88.46%	0	100%	MT	Liturgical
			4Q93	27	1	96.30%	0	100%	0	100%	MT	Liturgical
			4Q95 (If fragments 2-3 only preserves Psalm 136)	28	4	85.71%	4	85.71%	0	100%	Ambiguous	Possibly Non-biblical
			4Q95 (If the text represents a New Psalm)	28	5	82.14%	5	82.14%	0	100%	Ambiguous	Possibly Non-biblical
			4Q98	127	8	93.70%	6	95.28%	0	100%	MT	Interpretative and Liturgical
4Q98a	35	2	94.29%	1	97.14%	0	100%	MT				

Table A82 continued

592	Writings continued	Psalms continued	4Q98g	36	10	72.22%	8	77.78%	0	100%	Ambiguous	High degree of Scribal Intervention; Non-biblical
			11Q5	3563	333	90.65%	174	95.12%	3	99.92%	MT	Liturgical (very similar to 11Q6)
			11Q6	67	5	92.54%	3	95.52%	0	100%	MT	Liturgical (very similar to 11Q5)
			11Q7	226	13	94.25%	5	97.79%	0	100%	MT	Interpretative and Liturgical
			11Q8	131	3	97.71%	2	98.47%	0	100%	MT	Liturgical
		Canticles	4Q106	119	12	89.92%	4	96.64%	0	100%	MT	Excerpted (Abbreviated Text)
			4Q107	228	15	93.42%	10	95.61%	0	100%	MT	Interpretative and Excerpted with high degree of Scribal Intervention
			6Q6	35	4	88.57%	3	91.43%	0	100%	MT	
		Eccles	4Q109	152	16	89.47%	4	97.37%	0	100%	MT	Interpretative or damaged exemplar with high degree of scribal intervention

Table A82 continued

Writings continued	Lamen- tations	4Q111	258	68	73.64%	56	78.29%	2	99.22%	MT	Interpretative and possible damaged exemplar
	Daniel	4Q112	752	50	93.35%	24	96.81%	0	100%	MT	Interpretative
		4Q113	330	16	95.15%	7	97.88%	0	100%	MT	
		4Q114	302	15	95.03%	4	98.68%	0	100%	MT	Paleographic Issue
		4Q115	98	6	93.88%	4	95.92%	0	100%	MT	Interpretative
		6Q7	65	2	96.92%	2	96.92%	0	100%	MT	
	Chron- icles	4Q118	25	2	92.00%	1	96.00%	0	100%	MT	
Writings Total Numbers	26	8391	754	91.01%	424	94.95%	5	99.94%	MT (4Q95 and 4Q98 are ambiguous)	Liturgical texts that appear to interpret an MT like exemplar	
OT	Total Non- aligned Numbers	55	42867 (But 17,493 total words for first category because of 1QIsa ^a)	1226	93.05%	1581	96.31%	36	99.92%	MT can reasonable be understood as standard text	The Majority of Differences either derive from Interpretation or Paleographic Problems

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abegg, Martin G. *Dead Sea Scrolls Non-Biblical Texts*. Accordance Bible Software. Langley, BC: Oak Tree Software, 1999-2009.
- _____. *Mishna (Kaufmann)* (version 3.0). Accordance Bible Software. Langley, BC: Oak Tree Software, 2009.
- Abegg, Martin G., James E. Bowley, and Edward M. Cook. *Accordance 11.2.5 Dead Sea Scroll Biblical Corpus (Manuscript Order) (DSSB-M)* (version 3.0). Langley, BC: Oak Tree Software, 2009.
- Abegg, Martin G., Peter W. Flint, and Eugene Charles Ulrich. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible: The Oldest Known Bible*. San Francisco: HarperSan Francisco, 1999.
- Albright, William. "A Biblical Fragment from the Maccabean Age: The Nash Papyrus." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 56, no. 3 (1937): 145-76.
- _____. "New Light on Early Recensions of the Hebrew Bible." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 140, no. 4 (1955): 27-33.
- Ausloos, Hans, Bénédicte Lemmelijn, and Julio Treballe Barrera, eds. *After Qumran: Old and Modern Editions of the Biblical Texts: The Historical Books*. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 246. Leuven, Belgium: Uitgeverij Peeters, 2012.
- Baillet, Maurice, J. T. Milik, and Roland de Vaux, eds. *Les "Petites Grottes" de Qumran: Exploration de la Falaise, les Grottes 2Q, 3Q, 5Q, 7Q à 10Q, le Rouleau de Cuivre*. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan 3. Oxford: Clarendon, 1962.
- Barrera, Julio Treballe. "A 'Canon within a Canon:' Two Series of Old Testament Books Differently Transmitted, Interpreted and Authorized." *Revue de Qumrân* 19, no. 3 (75) (2000): 383-99.
- _____. "Qumran Fragments of the Book of Kings." In *The Books of Kings: Sources, Composition, Historiography and Reception*, edited by André Lemaire, Halpern Baruch, and Matthew J. Adams, 19-39. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 129. Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 2010.
- _____. "Textual Variants in 4QJudg and the Textual and Editorial History of the Book of Judges." *Revue de Qumran* 14, no. 2 (December 1989): 229-45.
- Barrera, Julio Treballe, and Luis Vegas Montaner, eds. *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid, 18-21 March, 1991*. Vol. 1. 2 vols. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 11. Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 1992.

- Barthélemy, Dominique. *Studies in the Text of the Old Testament: An Introduction to the Hebrew Old Testament Text Project*. Edited by Roger L. Omanson. Textual Criticism and the Translator. Vol. 3. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2012.
- Beckwith, Roger T. "The Courses of the Levites and the Eccentric Psalms Scrolls from Qumran," *Revue de Qumran* 11, no. 4 (December 1984): 499-524.
- _____. *The Old Testament Canon of the New Testament Church and Its Background in Early Judaism*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986.
- Beegle, Dewey M. "Ligatures with Waw and Yodh in the Dead Sea Isaiah Scroll." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 129 (1953): 11-14.
- Ben-Dov, Jonathan. *Head of All Years: Astronomy and Calendars at Qumran in Their Ancient Context*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 78. Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 2008.
- Bieberstein, Klaus. *Lukian und Theodotion im Josuabuch: Mit Einem Beitrag zu den Josuarollen von Ḥirbet Qumrān*. Biblische Notizen. Beihefte. Vol. 7. Munich: M. Gorg, 1994.
- Blau, Joshua. *On Polyphony in Biblical Hebrew*. Jerusalem: Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1982.
- Blum, Erhard. "The Literary Connection between the Books of Genesis and Exodus and the End of the Book of Joshua." In *A Farewell to the Yahwist? The Composition of the Pentateuch in Recent European Interpretation*, edited by Thomas B. Dozeman and Konrad Schmid, 89-106. Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series 34. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006.
- Boling, Robert G. *Judges*. The Anchor Bible, vol. 6a. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1975.
- Boylan, Patrick. *The Psalms: A Study of the Vulgate Psalter in the Light of the Hebrew Text*. Vol. 1. 2nd ed. Dublin: Gill & Son, 1921.
- Brooke, George J. "The Bisection of Isaiah in The Scrolls from Qumran." In *Studia Semitica: The Journal of Semitic Studies*. Jubilee vol., edited by Philip S Alexander, George J. Brooke, Andreas Christmann, John F. Healey, and Philip C. Sadgrove, 73-94. Journal of Semitic Studies, Supplement 16. Oxford: Oxford University Press on behalf of the University of Manchester, 2005.
- _____. Review of *Qumran Cave 4*. Vol. 9, *Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Kings*, edited by Eugene Ulrich and Frank M. Cross. *The Journal of Theological Studies* 48, no. 2 (October 1997): 568-74.
- _____. "Torah in the Qumran Scrolls." In *Bibel in Jüdischer und Christlicher Tradition: Festschrift für Johann Maier zum 60. Geburtstag*, edited by Johann Maier, Helmut Merklein, Karlheinz Müller, and Günter Stemberger, 97-120. Athenäums Monografien Theologie 88. Frankfurt am Main: A. Hain, 1993.
- _____. "The Twelve Minor Prophets and the Dead Sea Scrolls." In *Congress Volume: Leiden 2004*, edited by André Lemaire, 190-43. Supplements to *Vetus Testamentum* 109. Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 2006.

- Brooke, George J., and Florentino García Martínez, eds. *New Qumran Texts and Studies: Proceedings of the First Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Paris, 1992*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 15. Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 1994.
- Brown, Francis, R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs, eds. *The Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1996.
- Brownlee, William Hugh. "The Manuscripts of Isaiah from Which DSIa Was Copied." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, no. 127 (1952): 16-21.
- _____. *The Meaning of the Qumrân Scrolls for the Bible*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1964.
- Broyles, Craig C., and Craig A. Evans, eds. *Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah: Studies of an Interpretive Tradition*. Vol. 2. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 70. Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 1997.
- Burrows, Millar, ed. *The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery*. 2 vols. New Haven, CT: American Schools of Oriental Research, 1950.
- _____. "Waw and Yodh in the Isaiah Dead Sea Scroll (DSIa)." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 124 (1951): 18-20.
- Chomsky, William. *David Kimhi's Hebrew Grammar: (Mikhlol): Systematically Presented and Critically Annotated*. New York: Bloch Publishing, 1952.
- Clem, Eldon. *Targum Onkelos and Jonathan (English)*. Version 6.2. <http://accordancebible.com>: Accordance Bible Software, Oaktree Software, 2006.
- Clines, David J. A., ed. *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew*. 8 vols. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993-2011.
- Colwell, Ernest Cadman. *Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament*. New Testament Tools and Studies 9. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1969.
- Cook, Edward M. "Rewriting the Bible: The Text and Language of the Pseudo-Jonathan Targum." Ph.D. diss., University of California Los Angeles, 1986.
- Cook, Johann. "Orthographical Peculiarities in the Dead Sea Biblical Scrolls." *Revue de Qumran* 14 (1989): 293-305.
- Crawford [White], Sidnie [Ann]. "The All Souls Deuteronomy and the Decalogue." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 109, no. 2 (1990): 193-206.
- _____. "A Critical Edition of Seven Manuscripts of Deuteronomy: 4QDT (A, C, F, G, I and N)." Ph.D. diss., Harvard University, 1988.
- _____. "The Pentateuch as Found in the Pre-Samaritan Texts and 4QRevised Pentateuch." In *Changes in Scripture: Rewriting and Interpreting Authoritative Traditions in the Second Temple Period*, edited by Hanne von Weissenberg, Juha Pakkala, and Marko Marttila, 123-36. Beihefte Zur Zeitschrift Für Die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 419. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2011.

- _____. "A Response to Elizabeth Owen's '4QDeutn: A Pre-Samaritan Text?'" *Dead Sea Discoveries* 5, no. 1 (1998): 92-94.
- _____. "Special Features of Four Biblical Manuscripts from Cave IV, Qumran: 4QDta, 4QDtc, 4QDtd, and 4QDtg." *Revue de Qumran* 15, nos. 1/2 (September 1991): 157-67.
- Crawford [White], Sidnie [Ann], and Shemaryahu Talmon. *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard, 1975.
- Cross, Frank. *The Ancient Library of Qumran*. 3rd ed. The Biblical Seminar. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.
- _____. *From Epic to Canon: History and Literature in Ancient Israel*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998.
- _____. "Problems of Method in the Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible." In *The Critical Study of Sacred Texts*, edited by Wendy Doniger, 31-54. Berkeley Religious Studies Series 2. Berkeley, CA: Graduate Theological Union, 1979.
- Dávid, Nóra, Armin Lange, Kristin de Troyer, and Shani. Tzoref, eds. *The Hebrew Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Forschungen Zur Religion Und Literatur Des Alten Und Neuen Testaments 239. Göttingen, Germany: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2012.
- Davila, James R. *Liturgical Works*, Eerdmans Commentaries on the Dead Sea Scrolls Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.
- _____. "New Qumran Readings for Genesis One." In *Of Scribes and Scrolls: Studies on the Hebrew Bible, Intertestamental Judaism, and Christian Origins, Presented to John Strugnell on the Occasion of His Sixtieth Birthday*, edited by Harold W. Attridge, John J. Collins, and Thomas H. Tobin, 3-11. Resources in Religion 5. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1990.
- _____. Review of *Qumran Cave 4 V 10 The Prophets*, edited by Eugene Ulrich, Frank M. Cross, Russell E. Fuller, James A. Sanders, Patrick W. Skehan, and Emanuel Tov. *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 62, no. 2 (April 2000): 346-47.
- _____. "Text-Type and Terminology: Genesis and Exodus as Test Cases." *Revue de Qumran* 16, no. 1 (1993): 3-37.
- De Troyer, Kristin. "Building the Altar and Reading the Law: The Journeys of Joshua 8:30-35." In *Reading the Present in the Qumran Library: The Perception of the Contemporary by Means of Scriptural Interpretations*, edited by Kristin de Troyer and Armin Lange, 141-62. Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series 30. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005.
- Dimant, Devorah. "Two Discourses from the Apocryphon of Joshua" and Their Context ('4Q378' 3i-ii)." *Revue de Qumrân* 23, no. 1 (89) (2007): 43-61.
- Dimant, Devorah, and Uriel Rapport, eds. *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 10. Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 1992.
- Doudna, Greg. "Dating the Scrolls on the Basis of Radiocarbon Analysis." In *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*, edited by Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam, 1:430-71. Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 1998.

- Driver, Samuel R. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Deuteronomy*. The International Critical Commentary, vol. 5. 2nd ed. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1896.
- Duncan, Julie A. "Excerpted Texts of Deuteronomy at Qumran." *Revue de Qumran* 18, no. 1 (April 1997): 43-62.
- _____. "New Readings for the 'Blessing of Moses' from Qumran." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 114, no. 2 (1995): 273-90.
- Eshel, Esther. "4QDeut[n]—A Text That Has Undergone Harmonistic Editing." *Hebrew Union College Annual* 62 (1991): 117-54.
- Fernández Marcos, Natalio, ed. *Biblia Hebraica: Quinta Editione Cum Apparatu Critico Novis Curis Elaborato: Judges*. 5^a ed. cum Apparatu Critico novis Curis Elaborato. Biblia Hebraica Quinta 7. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2011.
- _____. "The Genuine Text of Judges." In *Sôfer Mahîr: Essays in Honour of Adrian Schenker*, edited by Adrian Schenker, Yohanan Goldman, Arie van der Kooij, and Richard D. Weis, 33-45. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 110. Leiden, The Netherlands, Brill, 2006.
- _____. "The Hebrew and Greek Texts of Judges." In *The Earliest Text of the Hebrew Bible: The Relationship between the Masoretic Text and the Hebrew Base of the Septuagint Reconsidered*, edited by Adrian Schenker, 1-16. Septuagint and Cognate Studies Series 52. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003.
- Field, Frederick. *Origenis Hexaplorum quae Supersunt; Sive Veterum Interpretum Graecorum in Totum Vetus Testamentum Fragmenta*. Vol. 1. Hildesheim, Germany: G. Olms, 1964.
- First, Mitchell. "Using the Pe-Ayin Order of the Abecedaries of Ancient Israel to Date the Book of Psalms," *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 38, no. 4 (June 2014): 471-85.
- Freedman, David Noel. "Variant Readings in the Leviticus Scroll from Qumran Cave 11." *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 36, no. 4 (October 1974): 525-34.
- Freedman, David Noel, and Kenneth A. Mathews. *The Paleo-Hebrew Leviticus Scroll (11QpaleoLev)*. Winona Lake, IN: American Schools of Oriental Research; Distributed by Eisenbrauns, 1985.
- Fuller, Russell E. "A Critical Note on Hosea 12:10 and 13:4." *Revue Biblique* 98, no. 3 (1991): 343-57.
- _____. "The Minor Prophets Manuscripts from Qumrân, Cave IV." Ph.D. diss., Harvard University, 1988.
- _____. "The Text of the Twelve Minor Prophets." *Currents in Research: Biblical Studies* 7 (October 1999): 81.
- Fuller, Russell T., and Kyoungwon Choi. *A Biblical Aramaic Grammar (Unpublished)*, n.d.

- _____. *Invitation to Biblical Hebrew: A Beginning Grammar*. Grand Rapids: Kregel, 2006.
- _____. *Invitation to Biblical Hebrew Syntax: An Intermediate Grammar*. Grand Rapids: Kregel, 2017.
- García Martínez, Florentino. Review of the Paleo-Hebrew Leviticus Scroll (11QpaleoLev), edited by David Noel Freedman and Kenneth A. Mathews. *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic and Roman Period* 17, no. 2 (December 1986): 248-51.
- _____. "The Text of the XII Prophets at Qumran." *Old Testament Essays* 17 (2004): 103-19.
- García Martínez, Florentino, Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, and A. S. van der Woude, eds. *Qumran Cave 11. 2. 11Q2-18, 11Q20-31*. Vol. 2. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert 23. Oxford: Clarendon, 1998.
- Gentry, Peter John. "The Septuagint and the Text of the Old Testament." *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 16, no. 2 (2006): 193-218.
- _____. "The System of the Finite Verb in Classical Biblical Hebrew." *Hebrew Studies* 39 (1998): 7-39.
- _____. "The Text of the Old Testament." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 52, no. 1 (March 2009): 19-45.
- Gentry, Peter John, and John D. Meade. "The Masada Psalms Fragments and the Rewritten Psalters of Qumran." Unpublished, n.d.
- Gesenius, Wilhelm. *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*. Edited and enlarged by E. Kautzsch and A. E. Cowley. 2nd English ed. Oxford: Clarendon, 1910.
- Giese, R. L. "Further Evidence for the Bisection of 1QIsa." *Textus* 14 (1988): 61-70.
- Goldberg, P. Selvin. *Karaite Liturgy and Its Relation to Synagogue Worship*. Manchester, England: Manchester University Press, 1957.
- Gooding, D. W. "Appeal for a Stricter Terminology in the Textual Criticism of the Old Testament." *Journal of Semitic Studies* 21, nos. 1-2 (1976): 15-25.
- Greenspoon, Leonard. "The Qumran Fragments of Joshua: Which Puzzle Are They Part of and Where Do They Fit?" In *Septuagint, Scrolls, and Cognate Writings: Papers Presented to the International Symposium on the Septuagint and Its Relations to the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Writings (Manchester, 1990)*, edited by George J. Brooke and Barnabas Lindars, 159-94. *Septuagint, Scrolls, and Cognate Writings* 33. Atlanta: Scholars, 1992.
- Greenstein, Edward L. "Misquotation of Scripture in the Dead Sea Scrolls." In *The Frank Talmage Memorial Volume*, edited by Barry Walfish, 1:71-83. Jewish History 6. Haifa, Israel: Haifa University Press, 1993.
- Guillaume, Philippe. "The Unlikely Malachi-Jonah Sequence (4QXIIa)." *The Journal of Hebrew Scriptures* 7 (2007): 2-10.

- Haran, Menahem. "11QPSa and the Canonical Book of Psalms." In *Minḥah Le-Naḥum: Biblical and Other Studies Presented to Nahum M. Sarna in Honour of His 70th Birthday*, edited by Marc Zvi Brettler and Michael A. Fishbane. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 154, 193-201. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993.
- Heiser, Michael S. "Deuteronomy 32:8 and the Sons of God." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 158, no. 629 (January 2001): 52-74.
- Hendel, Ronald S. *Steps to a New Edition of the Hebrew Bible*. Text-Critical Studies 10. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2016.
- Herbert, Edward D. Review of *Qumran Cave 4 V 10 The Prophets*, edited by Eugene Ulrich, Frank M. Cross, Russell E. Fuller, James A. Sanders, Patrick W. Skehan, and Emanuel Tov. *Journal of Semitic Studies* 43, no. 2 (1998): 377-79.
- Herbert, Edward D., and Emanuel Tov, eds. *The Bible as Book: The Hebrew Bible and the Judaean Desert Discoveries*. London: British Library, 2002.
- Hess, Richard S. *Joshua*. Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries, vol. 6. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2008.
- Iwry, Samuel. "The Qumrân Isaiah and the End of the Dial of Ahaz." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 147 (1957): 27-33.
- Jastrow, Marcus. *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature*. 2 vols. New York: Pardes, 1950.
- Jellicoe, Sidney. *The Septuagint and Modern Study*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1968.
- Joüon, Paul, and T. Muraoka. *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*. Rev. ed. Subsidia Biblica, 14/1-14/2. Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico. 2003.
- Jull, Timothy A. J., Douglas J. Donahue, Magen Broshi, and Emanuel Toy. "Radiocarbon Dating of Scrolls and Linen Fragments from the Judean Desert." *Radiocarbon* 37, no. 1 (June 2006): 11-19.
- Kahle, Paul. *Die Hebräischen Handschriften aus der Höhle: Franz Delitzsch-Vorlesungen*. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1951.
- Kahle, Paul, and Mahmoud Saba. "The Cairo Geniza." Lectures presented at the Schweich Lectures, Oxford University, 1947.
- Knoppers, Gary N. Review of *Qumran Cave 4 V 9 Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Kings*, edited by Eugene Ulrich and Frank Moore Cross. *Journal of Biblical Literature* 118, no. 1 (1999): 174-75.
- Köhler, Ludwig, and Walter Baumgartner, eds. *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*. 2 vols. Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 2001.
- Krause, Joachim J. *Exodus und Eisdodus: Komposition und Theologie von Josua 1-5*. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 161. Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 2014.
- Kutscher, Edward Yechezkel. *A History of the Hebrew Language*. Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 1982.

- _____. *The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll (1 QIsa^a)*. Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 1974.
- Lange, Armin, and Emanuel Tov, eds. "4QXIIg (4Q82) as an Editorial Text." *Textus* 26 (2016): 1-33.
- _____. *Handbuch der Textfunde vom Toten Meer Bd. 1. Die Handschriften Biblischer Bücher von Qumran und den Anderen Fundorten*. Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 2009.
- _____, eds. *The Hebrew Bible*. Vol. 1A, B, C. 4 vols. Textual History of the Bible 1. Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 2016.
- _____. Review of *Qumran Cave 4 V 10 The Prophets*, edited by Eugene Ulrich, Frank M. Cross, Russell E. Fuller, James A. Sanders, Patrick W. Skehan, and Emanuel Tov. *Zeitschrift Für Die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 110, no. 3 (1998): 481-82.
- _____. "The Severus Scroll Variant List in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls." In *Tradition, Transmission, and Transformation from Second Temple Literature through Judaism and Christianity in Late Antiquity: Proceedings of the Thirteenth 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, 22-24 February 2011*, edited by Menahem Kister, Hillel Newman, Michael Segal, and Ruth Clements, 178-207. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 113. Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 2015.
- _____. "The Textual Plurality of the Jewish Scriptures in the Second Temple Period in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls." In *Qumran and the Bible: Studying the Jewish and Christian Scriptures in Light of the Dead Sea scrolls*, edited by Nóra Dávid and Armin Lange, 43-96. Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology 57. Leuven, Belgium: Peeters, 2010.
- Law, T. M. *When God Spoke Greek: The Septuagint and the Making of the Christian Bible*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2013.
- Levinson, Bernard M. "Textual Criticism, Assyriology, and the History of Interpretation: Deuteronomy 13:7a as a Test Case in Method." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 120, no. 2 (2001): 211-43.
- Lieberman, Saul. *Hellenism in Jewish Palestine; Studies in the Literary Transmission, Beliefs and Manners of Palestine in the I Century B.C.E.-IV Century C.E.* New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1950.
- Longacre, Drew. "Developmental Stage, Scribal Lapse, or Physical Defect? 1QIsaa's Damaged Exemplar for Isaiah's Chapters 34-66." *Dead Sea Discoveries* 20, no. 1 (2013): 17-50.
- Lucassen, Birgit. "Possibility and Probability of Textual Reconstruction: The Transition from 4QJoshb, Frg. 2 to Frg. 3 and the Transit of the Israelites through the Jordan." *Textus* 20 (2000): 71-81.
- Martin, Malachi. *The Scribal Character of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. 2 vols. Bibliothéque du Museon 44. Louvain, Belgium: Publications Universitaires, 1958.

- Mathews, K. A. "The Leviticus Scroll (11QpaleoLev) and the Text of the Hebrew Bible." *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 48, no. 2 (April 1986): 171-207.
- _____. "The Paleo-Hebrew Leviticus Scroll from Qumran." *The Biblical Archaeologist* 50, no. 1 (March 1987): 45-54.
- McNamara, Martin. *Targum and Testament Revisited: Aramaic Paraphrases of the Hebrew Bible: A Light on the New Testament*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2010.
- Milik, Jozef Tadeusz. "Fragment d'une Source Du Psautier (4Q Ps 89) et Fragments des Jubilés, Du Document de Damas." *Revue Biblique* 73, no. 1 (January 1966): 94-106.
- _____. "Textes de La Grotte 5Q: Deutéronome." In *Les "Petites Grottes" de Qumrân: Exploration de La Falaise, Les Grottes 2Q, 3Q, 5Q, 6Q, 7Q-10Q, Le Rouleau de Cuivre*, 3:169-70. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan, pt. 1. Oxford: Clarendon, 1962.
- Noth, Martin. "Eine Bemerkung Zur Jesajarolle Vom Toten Meer." *Vetus Testamentum* 1, no. 3 (July 1951): 224-26.
- O'Connell, Robert H. *The Rhetoric of the Book of Judges*. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 63. Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 1996.
- Orlinsky, Harry M. "Studies in the St. Mark's Isaiah Scroll." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 69, no. 2 (1950): 149-66.
- Owen, Elizabeth. "4QDeutn: A Pre-Samaritan Text?" *Dead Sea Discoveries* 4, no. 2 (1997): 162-78.
- Paul, Shalom M., Robert A. Kraft, Lawrence H. Schiffman, and Weston W. Fields, eds. *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov*. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 94. Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 2003.
- Pietersma, Albert. "The Acrostic Poems of Lamentations in Greek Translation." In *VIII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies*, edited by Leonard J Greenspoon and Olivier Munnich, 183-201. Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Series 41. Atlanta: Scholars' Press, 1995.
- _____. "David in the Greek Psalms." *Vetus Testamentum* 30 (1980): 213-26.
- Porter, Stanley E., and Craig A. Evans, eds. *The Scrolls and the Scriptures: Qumran Fifty Years After*. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha. Supplement Series 26. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic, 1997.
- Puech, Émile. "Les Copies Du Livre de Josué Dans Les Manuscrits de La Mer Morte: 4Q47, 4Q48, 4Q123 et XJosué." *Revue Biblique* 122 (2015): 481-506.
- Pulikottil, Paulson. *Transmission of Biblical Texts in Qumran: The Case of the Large Isaiah Scroll IQIsa^a*. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement Series 34. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic, 2001.
- Qimron, Elisha. *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986.

- Rebetiko, Robert. "The Qumran Scrolls of the Book of Judges: Literary Formation, Textual Criticism, and Historical Linguistics." *The Journal of Hebrew Scriptures* 13 (2013): 1-68.
- Reymond, Eric D. *Qumran Hebrew: An Overview of Orthography, Phonology, and Morphology*. Atlanta: SBL, 2014.
- Richards, Kent H. "Note on the Bisection of Isaiah." *Revue de Qumran* 5, no. 2 (April 1965): 257-58.
- Rofé, Alexander. *Deuteronomy: Issues and Interpretations*. London: T & T Clark, 2002.
- _____. "Studying the Biblical Text in the Light of Historico-Literary Criticism: The Reproach of the Prophet in Judg 6:7-10 and 4QJudg." In *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Context: Integrating the Dead Sea Scrolls in the Study of Ancient Texts, Languages, and Cultures*, edited by Armin Lange, Emanuel Tov, and Matthias Weigold, 111-23. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 140. Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 2011.
- Rosenbloom, Joseph R. *The Dead Sea Isaiah Scroll: A Literary Analysis: A Comparison with the Masoretic Text and the Biblia Hebraica*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1970.
- Rosenthal, Franz. *A Grammar of Biblical Aramaic*. 2nd ed. Porta Linguarum Orientalium Neue Serie 5. Wiesbaden, Germany: Harrassowitz, 1963.
- Sanders, James A. *Canon and Community: A Guide to Canonical Criticism*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984.
- _____. *The Psalms Scroll of Qumran Cave 11 (11QPsa)*. Vol. 4. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert. Oxford: Clarendon, 1965.
- Skehan, Patrick W. "The Biblical Scrolls from Qumran and the Text of the Old Testament." *The Biblical Archaeologist* 28, no. 3 (1965): 87-100.
- _____. "Gleanings from Psalm Texts from Qumran." In *Melanges Bibliques et Orientaux en l'Honneur de M Henri Cazelles*, edited by André Caquot and Mathias Delcor, 439-52. Alter Orient und Altes Testament 212. Kevelaer, Germany: Butzon and Bercker, 1981.
- _____. "Text of Isaias at Qumran." *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 17, no. 2 (April 1955): 158-63.
- Snyder, James S. "The Digital Dead Sea Scrolls." 2017. Accessed April 24, 2017, <http://dss.collections.imj.org.il>.
- Stegemann, Hartmut. "Weitere Stücke von 4 Q p Psalm 37, von 4 Q Patriarchal Blessings Und Hinweis Auf Eine Unedierte Handschrift Aus Höhle 4 Q." *Revue de Qumran* 6, no. 2 (September 1967): 193-227.
- Stevenson, William Barron. *Grammar of Palestinian Jewish Aramaic*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1962.
- Strawn, Brent. "Excerpted Manuscripts at Qumran: Their Significance for the Textual History of the Hebrew Bible and the Socio-Religious History of the Qumran Community and Its Literature." In *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Second*

Princeton Symposium on Judaism and Christian Origins, edited by James H Charlesworth, 2:107-68. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2006.

Talmon, Shemarayahu. "Fragments of a Psalms Scroll: MasPsa Ps 81:2b-85:6a (1039-160; Masle; Final Photo 5255)." *Dead Sea Discoveries* 3 (1996): 296-314.

Tigay, Jeffrey H. *Deuteronomy* דברים. JPS Torah Commentary. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1996.

Tigchelaar, Eibert J. C. "Minuscula Qumranica. I." *Revue de Qumran* 84 (2004): 643-48.

Tov, Emanuel. "Excerpted and Abbreviated Biblical Texts from Qumran." *Revue de Qumran* 16, no. 4 (December 1995): 581-600.

_____. "Groups of Biblical Texts Found at Qumran." In *Time to Prepare the Way in the Wilderness: Papers on the Qumran Scrolls*, edited by Devorah Dimant and Lawrence H Schiffman, 85-102. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 16. Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 1995.

_____. *Hebrew Bible, Greek Bible and Qumran: Collected Essays*. Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism 121. Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.

_____. "Hebrew Biblical Manuscripts from the Judaean Desert: Their Contribution to Textual Criticism." *Journal of Jewish Studies* 39, no. 1 (1988): 5-37.

_____. "A Modern Textual Outlook Based on the Qumran Scrolls." *Hebrew Union College Annual* 53 (1982): 11-27.

_____. "Samples." Accessed April 24, 2017. <https://www.sbl-site.org/assets/pdfs/pubs/DSS/Tov.pdf>.

_____. *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert*. Edited by Florentino García Martínez, Peter W. Flint, and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 54. Boston: Brill, 2004.

_____. "Textual Character of the Leviticus Scroll from Qumran Cave 11." *Shanton* 3 (1978): 238-44.

_____. *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*. 3rd ed. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2012.

_____. *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible, Qumran, Septuagint: Collected Essays, Volume 3*. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 167. Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 2015.

_____. "Textual Harmonizations in the Ancient Texts of Deuteronomy in Mishneh Today." In *Mishneh Todah: Studies in Deuteronomy and Its Cultural Environment in Honor of Jeffrey H. Tigay*, edited by Nili Sacher Fox, David A. Glatt-Gilad, and Michael James Williams, 15-28. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2009.

Tzoref, Shani. "Qumran Pesharim and the Pentateuch: Explicit Citation, Overt Typologies, and Implicit Interpretive Traditions." *Dead Sea Discoveries* 16 (2009): 190-220.

Ulrich, Eugene. "The Bible in the Making: The Scriptures Found at Qumran." In *The Bible at Qumran: Text, Shape, and Interpretation*, edited by Peter W. Flint and T'ae-hun Kim, 51-66. Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001.

_____. *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans; Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 1999.

_____. "Deuteronomistically Inspired Scribal Insertions into the Developing Biblical Texts: 4QJudga and 4QJera." In *Houses Full of All Good Things: Essays in Memory of Timo Veijola*, edited by Juha Pakkala and Martti Nissinen, 489-506. Helsinki: Finnish Exegetical Society; Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2008.

_____. "The Developmental Composition of the Book of Isaiah: Light from 1QIsaa on Additions in the MT." *Dead Sea Discoveries* 8, no. 3 (2001): 288-305.

_____. "Horizons of Old Testament Textual Research at the Thirtieth Anniversary of Qumran Cave 4." *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 46, no. 4 (October 1984): 613-36.

_____. "Multiple Literary Editions: Reflections toward a Theory of the History of The Biblical Text." In *Current Research and Technological Developments on the Dead Sea Scrolls*, edited by Donald W. Parry and Stephen David. Ricks, 78-105. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 20. New York: Brill, 1996.

_____. "Qumran Biblical Scrolls—The Scriptures of Late Second Temple Judaism." In *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Their Historical Context*, edited by Timothy H. Lim, Larry Hurtado, Jack Alison, and A. Auld, 67-88. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2000.

Ulrich, Eugene, and Frank Moore Cross, eds. *Qumrân Cave 4. VII, Genesis to Numbers*. Vol. 7. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert 12. Oxford: Clarendon, 1994.

_____, eds. *Qumran Cave 4. XI. Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Kings*. Vol. 9. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert 14. Oxford: Clarendon, 1995.

Ulrich, Eugene, Frank Moore Cross, Joseph A. Fitzmyer, Peter W. Flint, Sarianna Metso, Catherine M. Murphy, Curt Niccum, Patrick W. Skehan, Emanuel Tov, and Julio Trebolle Barrera, eds. *Qumran Cave 4. XI, Psalms to Chronicles*. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert 16. Oxford: Clarendon, 2000.

Ulrich, Eugene, Frank Moore Cross, Russell E. Fuller, James A. Sanders, Patrick W. Skehan, and Emanuel Tov, eds. *Qumrân Cave 4. X: The Prophets*. Vol. 10. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert 14. Oxford: Clarendon, 1997.

Ulrich, Eugene, Peter W. Flint, and Martin G. Abegg. *Qumran Cave 1. II: The Isaiah Scrolls Part 2: Introductions, Commentary, and Textual Variants*. Vol. 32. Part 2. Oxford: Clarendon, 2010.

van der Meer, Michaël N. *Formation and Reformation: The Redaction of the Book of Joshua in the Light of the Oldest Textual Witnesses*. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 102. Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 2004.

van der Ploeg, J. P. M. "Le Sens et Un Probleme Textuel Du Ps LXXXIX." In *Mélanges Bibliques el Orientaux en l'Honneur de M. Henri Cazelles*, edited by André Caquot and Mathias Delcor, 471-81. Alter Orient und Altes Testament 212. Kevelaer, Germany: Butzon & Bercker, 1981.

- Waltke, Bruce K. "Samaritan Pentateuch." In *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Edited by David Noel Freedman, Gary Herion, David Graf, John Pleins, and Astrid Beck. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- _____. "The Samaritan Pentateuch and the Text of the Old Testament." In *New Perspectives on the Old Testament*, edited by J. Barton Payne, 212-39. Symposium Series. Evangelical Theological Society 3. Waco, TX: Word, 1970.
- Weinfeld, Moshe. *Deuteronomy 1-11*. The Anchor Bible, vol. 5. New York: Doubleday, 1991.
- _____. "Grace After Meals in Qumran." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 111, no. 3 (1992): 427-40.
- Weissenberg, Hanne von. "'Aligned' or 'Non-Aligned?'" The Textual Status of the Qumran Cave 4 Manuscripts of the Minor Prophets." In *Perspectives on the Formation of the Book of the Twelve*, edited by Rainer Albertz, James Nogalski, and Jakob Wöhrle, 381-96. Beihefte Zur Zeitschrift Für Die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 433. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2012.
- Wevers, John William, ed. *Deuteronomium: Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis editum*. Vol. 3 pt. 2. Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum. Göttingen, Germany: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1977.
- _____. *Notes on the Greek Text of Deuteronomy*. Septuagint and Cognate Studies Series 39. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995.
- _____. *Notes on the Greek Text of Exodus*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990.
- _____. *Notes on the Greek Text of Genesis*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993.
- Wise, Michael Owen, Martin G. Abegg, Jr., and Edward M. Cook, eds. *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Translation*. Rev. ed. San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 2005.
- Yadin, Yigael. "The Excavations of Masada—1963/64: Preliminary Report." *Israel Exploration Journal* 15 (1965): 1-120.

ABSTRACT

A COMPARISON OF THE NON-ALIGNED TEXTS OF QUMRAN TO THE MASORETIC TEXT

Anthony Michael Ferguson, Ph.D.
The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2018
Chair: Dr. Russell T. Fuller

Contrary to Emanuel Tov's analysis that fifty-five texts from Qumran are exclusively identified as textually non-aligned, a more cautious analysis of each text demonstrates that once the few ambiguous texts are excluded from the category, the remaining texts can reasonably be explained as belonging to the Masoretic Tradition. Chapter 1 discusses two competing ways to interpret the diversity of textual readings found at Qumran. On the one hand, several scholars see the diversity of textual readings from Qumran as evidence that the text existed in a place of unlimited diversity, while others interpret the diversity of readings alongside a stable text.

Chapters 2, 3, and 4 follow the same methodology, but group the text based on canonical order. Chapter 2 covers the non-aligned texts of the Pentateuch, while chapter 3 covers the non-aligned texts of the Prophets, and chapter 4 covers the non-aligned texts of the Writings. First, for each text, basic features of the text are introduced such as orthographic and paleographic profile. Also, the history of how scholars have grouped the textual tradition of the text is surveyed.

Next, the variants between the non-aligned text and the MT are grouped into one of three categories. Category 1 variants are largely synonymous forms; category 2 variants are forms that are likely not synonymous, but the difference can easily be ascribed to the scribal process; category 3 variants are differences that are antithetical to the meaning of the MT and cannot easily be ascribed to the scribal process. Variants from

categories 2 and 3 are discussed in detail except for a few cases where the size of the non-aligned text prohibits exhaustive treatment.

After categorizing the differences between the non-aligned text and the MT, three statistical profiles are given for each text in relation to the MT. The first set of statistics compares the non-aligned text to the MT if one accounts for all of the differences from categories 1, 2, and 3. The second only accounts for categories 2 and 3. The last only accounts for category 3 variants. Finally, in light of this analysis, conclusions are made about the textual tradition of each non-aligned text.

Last, appendices are provided for each chapter. In each appendix, a table is given that lists and briefly discusses all of the difference between each non-aligned text and the MT. A few of these tables, however, are abbreviated due to the size of the non-aligned text.

VITA

Anthony Michael Ferguson

EDUCATIONAL

B.A., California Baptist University, 2009

M.Div., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2014

ACADEMIC

Garrett Fellow, The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2014- 2015

Online Teaching Assistant, The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2015-2017

Adjunct Faculty, Boyce College online and The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary online, 2014, 2016-2017

Adjunct Professor, California Baptist University, 2017-

Adjunct Professor, Gateway Seminary online, 2018-

MINISTERIAL

Associate Pastor, Audubon Baptist Church, Louisville, Kentucky, 2012-2016

Minister of Discipleship, Lakeshore City Church, Corona, California, 2017-

PUBLICATIONS

“The Elijah Forerunner Concept as an Authentic Jewish Expectation.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 137 (2018): 123-41.

ORGANIZATIONAL

Evangelical Theological Society

Society of Biblical Literature