The reading of 1QIs<sup>8</sup> 37: 31 differs from MT not only in wording, but also in the structure of the verse and in concept. Instead of MT דִּבְּרָא יְהוָה מִתְפָּרֵס נַפְלַת בֵּית יִהוּדָה — “and the surviving remnant of the house of Judah shall again take root downward and bear fruit upward” (RSV), we read in 1QIs<sup>8</sup>:

וְאִמָּס אֲדֻמָּא לִמְכַה לִמְכַה פֶּרֶי מַעַלֶּה

The phrase פֶּרֶי מַעַלֶּה, which had been left out, was superscribed, leaving a little blank spot in between. We shall disregard at the moment the spelling of אֲדֻמָּא versus MT יְהוָה, and the omission of prepositional י in the word לִמְכַה. The main difference affecting the text lies in the substitution of the word והמַכָּא — here an adjectival modifier — by a substantive which by virtue of the connective והמַכָּא becomes coordinated with the previous subject of the sentence.

But before we inquire into the meaning of והמַכָּא, we should mention that at the beginning of this same chapter, we find another variant which also involves the very same word. In 37: 4 (corresponding to the synoptic portion of 2 Ki. 19: 4) MT reads: בֵּית מַכָּא (בֵּית מַכָּא), as against 1QIs<sup>8</sup> הבֵּית מַכָּא. A plural modifier of מַכָּא is not uncommon in Biblical Hebrew, and since the three primary Versions G, S, V also happen to render this phrase in the plural, it might appear that the two additional words in that Qumran reading — בֵּית מַכָּא — represent just another expansion based on familiar expressions elsewhere, such as: והמַכָּא in Jer. 21: 6–7 and 38: 4. On the other hand, it seems very unlikely that the previously mentioned והמַכָּא (v. 4) would have influenced to any extent the Qumran reading והמַכָּא in v. 37, where MT has והמַכָּא. Note that this variant did not assume the form of an adjective in the fem. to replace another, redundant adjective, but instead appears as a substantive in the masc. sing. with a conjunctive והמַכָּא. This suggests that the word והמַכָּא here is intended to convey a meaning different from that implied by the analogy to v. 4 in the same chapter.

1  Cp. Jer. 8: 3; Zeph. 2: 9; 3: 13; Neh. 7: 72.
Furthermore, if it is not merely redundant, it must refer to something other than the phrase מתלת ביהו וגו with which it is now coordinated to form a compound subject. Considering the grammatical form in which it appears, the change it caused in the structure of the passage, and the presence of the superscribed words, the phrase מָצָא looks more like an intelligent gloss than a mere alteration brought about by remote analogy.

An examination of the etymology of the root מָצָא will show that מָצָא was at that time a technical term denoting the status of an oppressed, destitute or displaced person, whether captive or émigré. It will appear that it was in vogue with certain Biblical writers, but was lost completely as a technical term before the time of the earliest translators, and levelled through by all subsequent commentators. This Qumran variant may not only possess a historical significance, but will help to place this textual variant of Isaiah more closely in the general textual tradition of its time.

II

It should be noted at the outset, that the prevalent connotation of מָצָא — “that which is found”, “is present” or “existing”\(^2\) represents in effect the cumulative semantic development of the Semitic root מָצָא which basically meant “to reach”, “to come upon”, “to overtake”, “to catch”. The Aramaic cognate מָצָא — “reach out”, Syriac part. pass. מָצָא — “be able”, “have the power”, “prevail upon”, seldom carries the Hebrew meaning “to find”, which normally is rendered by מָצָא.\(^3\) In Ethiopian maṣ’a means “to come”, “arrive”.\(^4\)

Nöldeke in his time might have been right in warning against phonetically linking מָצָא with Aramaic מָצָא and מָצָא.\(^5\) But new evidence from Ugaritic (yamṭ’a,

---

2 In itself a mediaeval term, meant to be a philosophical substitute for the Arabic, and not akin to Biblical semantics. Think of מָצָא הָבָר or מָצֶאת הָבָר כְּלֵי הַמַּצָּא (חָּבָר עַל כָּלָּא הָבָר) “could not prevail upon him” or מָצָא (חָּבָר עַל כָּלָּא הָבָר) “they could not capture the city”. (R. Payne Smith, A Compendious Syriac Dictionary [Oxford 1903] 293).

3 In Syriac (figuratively) מָצָא (חָּבָר עַל כָּלָא) “could not prevail upon him” or מָצָא (חָּבָר עַל כָּלָא הָבָר) “they could not capture the city”.

4 Concerning Aramaic מָצָא this verb, too, appears to have also the connotation of “be able” as evidenced from the text of the Genesis Apocryphon, ed. A. Avigad and Y. Yadin, (Jerusalem 1956), Col. 21, 3: דַּלֶּא שֵׁעָה כָּל בָּר אָמַש (ַלְּאָּבָר) “no man will be able to number it”. More details on similar occurrences were presented in a paper by Joseph A. Fitzmyer, CBQ 22 (1960) 283.

5 Just as in Egyptian the word “to fall upon” later came to mean “to find”. We may also cite as an illustration the Accadian kalādu(m) which meant in a number of contexts “overpower”, “reach”, “arrive”, “catch”, “capture”, and “find”; see W. von Soden, Akkadisches Handwörterbuch (Wiesbaden 1963) 459.

mg marrying “to arrive”, and also ymsl’) and South Arabic מנה prove that Biblical מנה is, at least in part, the etymological equivalent of Aramaic מנה. It is also possible that we have here a conflation of stems with different phonemes which, for lack of a separate sign, merged in Hebrew.6

The following Biblical examples will suffice to uncover the diversity of the meanings still contained in the root מנה.

Lev. 25: 28: וְגוֹאָל לַמִּיתָמָא דְּיָדָיו וּשְׁבַי לָלְתִי — if he lacks sufficient means
Num. 20: 14: אֲלֵיוֹ תַּלְתִּי הַמִּיתָמָא אֲשֶׁר הָעָבָרָה — that has befallen us
Jud. 6: 13: הַמִּיתָמָא לָאָל חַיָּבָה — why all this has befallen us
Jud. 5: 30: הַלֹּא יָבָרָה תַּלְתִּי שֵׁלָה — capturing and dividing spoil
1 Sam. 23: 17: כְּלֵי אֶלֶן מֵתוֹתֵי דָּוִיד שָׁאוּל אָבִי — will not reach you
Is. 10: 10, 14: לִבְּשֵׁם מֵתוֹתֵי דָּוִיד מֵתוֹתֵי דָּוִיד, תוֹלְטֵי הַמִּיתָמָא בַּקָּרָא — (with ב) as I have reached, overpowered, captured

עָלַי הַמִּיתָמָא — overpower, get hold of

Ps. 21: 9: יִמְרָךְ מֵתָמָא שְׁפֵּאָה — “The snares of death encompassed me; the pangs of Shē-‘ol laid hold on me; I suffered distress and anguish” (RSV)

Ps. 116: 3: אֲפֹרִים הַבָּלָה מִתָּמָא שֵׁפִּי הַמִּיתָמָא פָּרָדָה יְרֵגֵו מֵתוֹתֵי —

While the VSS in general equate מנה with “find”, the nif‘al form מנה occasionally has in G a much more variegated meaning than the standard סִבְרַשְׁבוּ. Some of these connotations (or variations thereof) such as ἀλίσκωμαι “be caught”, “held” approximate rather closely the meaning of מנה which we propose in this paper. But it is not clear whether this reflects an actual knowledge on the part of the translator that מנה was used in this sense in Hebrew, or whether he merely adapted his translation to the context.

Here we may pause to say, rather tentatively, that Biblical מנה usually means “found” following the verb בָּשָׁב — “to search”, or, when followed by a genuine prepositional phrase serving as adverbial modifier. Otherwise, when standing alone, as participial noun or adjective, it very often represents an older, different meaning which needs to be investigated.

III

There is now ample proof to establish a meaning “come upon”, “meet”, or “reach” for Biblical מנה in the qal, and “overpowered”, “caught” or “captured”

in the nif’al. Indeed some Hebrew lexicographers list a separate entry where the meaning would come closest to the one attested in S. Arabic, Ethiopic (and Syriac) “strong”, “able”.

In the Hebrew Bible we find this connotation first in poetry, embedded in a context which cites old sayings, and in parallelism with other verbs which also mean “to be captured, apprehended”, such as: יָֽצֶא וּלְכִּֽדָּשׁ, מַשֵּׁא which leave no doubt that נַכְּבַת was used in the sense of “apprehended” or “caught”.

Thus, Jeremiah exhorts Babylonia saying: כֹּֽעַ֖בַּר וְמִשְׁכַּבָּה אֱלֹהֵי אֲדֹוָֽדָהָר וַעֲשַׁת נַכְּבַת — “I have laid a snare for thee, and thou are taken, O Babylon, ....... thou are caught and also seized” (50: 24).

Then, there is a proverbial saying (Prov. 6: 30−31): לא יִכְתָּב לָאָבּוֹ לְהוֹיִם; נַכְּבַת נַמָּשָׁה עָשָׁתָה יָֽצֶא וּלְכִּֽדָּשׁ — “Men do not despise a thief, if he steal to satisfy his soul when hungry, but if he be caught (RSV, based on G: αὐν ἰδε ἢλα) he shall restore sevenfold”. Besides, we find the same expression in Jer. 2: 26: נַכְּבַת גֹּבֶנֶת רָכְשָׁה (RSV: As a thief is shamed when caught). Or, Jer. 48: 27: אַמָּל אִשָּׁה וַתְּשַׁחֵת אֶלָּֽת וַעֲשַׁת נַכְּבַת — “For was not Israel a derision unto thee? Was he caught with thieves, that whenever you spoke of him you wagged your head?”

A propos of thieves, we were led to examine the classical passage in Ex. 22:1−2: אֲנָבָא שֶׁנְּשָׁחָה נַפְּלָֽתָה בָּֽךְ אֵלָֽת וְעָשָׁת נַכְּבַת — “If a thief be found breaking in and he was smitten and died... If the sun has risen upon him” (RSV). Quite a few of these casuistic laws can be duplicated almost verbatim in the Mesopotamian legal codes. And we find in fact the word “be caught” in the original of the Laws of Eshnunna (§ 13) which in Goetz’s translation reads: “(If) a man who is caught in the house of a mushkenum — if at day... if at night.” We have here therefore the same distinction between day and night with reference to blood guilt as in the Covenant Code, with the Hebrew אָֽמֶת מַצָּא reflecting Accadian ṣṣabbatu (cp. § 12 which deals with a man caught in the field). Also the laws against adultery, seduction and rape, for which parallel injunctions can be found in the Code of Hammurabi, confirm our supposition. E.g., § 129: “If a seignior’s wife be caught with another man ...”, cp. Deut. 22: 22: אָֽמְתָא עָשָׁת אֲשֶׁר חָסַב נַפְּלָֽתָה בָּֽךְ אֵלָֽת. Again, Eshnunna §28: “A girl if she is caught with another man” — as against the same in Deut. 22: 28: אָֽמְתָא. Accordingly, Ex. 22: 1 should be translated: “If a thief be caught breaking in ...”

7 Indeed, the new JPS translation correctly renders: “If a thief is seized while tunneling”. Cp. further Ex. 21: 16: וְעָשָׁת אַשָּׁר לְךָ וְעָשָׁת אֲדֹוָֽדָהָר בָּֽךְ רַעֶשׁ נַכְּבַת. This passage, characterized by want of consistency, has given rise to many questions. If the captor has sold his victim, how could the latter be ‘found’ in his possession; or, if the kidnapped man is
Describing the imminent fall of Babylon in a forceful apocalyptic fashion, Isaiah likens the panic-stricken mass of people to a “hunted gazelle and to sheep that nobody would shelter”, (the foreigners) “everyone turning to his own people, every man fleeing to his own country” (13:14). And then, in v. 15 he says: כל הנמשא ידך وكل הנמשא ילב תורֵך. The translation “and one that is found shall be thrust through” is flat and meaningless. It does not follow the spirit of the oracle, which further predicts that the disaster will be brought about by the Medes, “who do not regard silver and do not care for gold, have not pity for children” and (apparently) no use for prisoners. While the KJV only in the second half of the verse follows the rendering of G, which must have read נמשא, the whole passage in G reads: “For, everyone that is taken (prisoner) (δς γυρ ου αυλος) shall be thrust through and every one that is joined unto them shall fall by the sword.” Whether the Greek translators knew this meaning of נמשא, or correctly sensed it from the context, to them as to us it meant that neither captive, refugee, nor defector to the enemy would have any chance to survive.

Another striking example is the verse in Is. 22:3 where נמשא figures as a substantive with possessive suffixes laying claim to be a terminus technicus and appearing in parallelism with another technical term, also a noun in the pln. with the 2nd pers. pronominal suffixes: כל נתניא כיון היה משל אמיו כל נתניא. The English translations [KJV]: “All thy rulers have fled together, they are bound by the archers: all that are found in thee (of thee [JPS], all of you who are found [RSV]) were bound together though they had fled from far away.” This time the translations are faulty. One cannot retain the verbal force of a participial passive in the nif’al and decline it with possessive pronoun suffixes. In Hebrew, a construction like “all that are found in thee” would amount to כל הנמשאים בך, like כל הנמשאים בך, followed by a preposition with a pronominal suffix, unless it was understood as a noun still found in the possession of his captor why the indictment for selling? To avoid contradiction, and following the traditional line, the passage is split and the rendering now reads (RSV): “Whoever steals a man whether he sells him or found in possession of him, shall be put to death”. Cp. the expanded reading of U. Cassuto who, after dealing at length with this passage in his Commentary on the Book of Exodus4 (Jerusalem 1965, Heb.), felt compelled to return to it again in an additional note at the end of his work, p. 344. There, he refers to an oral communication by I. I. Rabinowitz, to the effect that the mishma must be hinting at some evidence brought against the kidnapper by eye-witnesses.

However, if we juxtapose this passage of Ex. 21:16 with a similar statement in Deut. 24:7 we may presume that הנמשא here, too, means “overpowered”, “held captive”, or “maltreated by the kidnapper”, much the same as the words התפשר בר would suggest. Cp. Ps. 21:9; Is. 10:10.
meaning “your (captives), your refugees, who fled from far away places before the onslaught of the enemy only to be captured when the besieged city fell”. (Cp. oracles on foreign lands: Is. 47: 14, 15; Jer. 51: 49–50, 56–57). The Greek translators did not render “those who are found in thee”, as they did in the preceding examples. However, a case of vertical homoioteleuton must have taken place and, as a result, the passage was broken up into three cola: “all your chiefs, they are taken are cruelly bound, even the mighty”...
(reading מטיאת derived from מטיאת — ‘to be strong’ for מטיאת).

IV

We shall now demonstrate that some Biblical writers of exilic or post-exilic time, in recording or editing older narratives, have persistently shown a predilection for using the prase מַהֲכַה in the meaning “captured”, “seized”. The Gibeah story, which is considered an appendix to the Book of Judges (chs. 19–21), has been singled out in all critical studies for its composite nature, literary dependence on the Lot narrative of Gen. 19, and undisputed imitation of the story of the capture of Ai in Josh. 8 in matters of warfare and tactics. And so after destroying Gibeah with fire and sword, and reducing the fighting population to a mere 600, we are told at the end of ch. 20 (v. 48): "And the men of Israel turned back against the Benjaminites and smote them with the edge of the sword, men and beasts and all that they found. Moreover, all the cities which they found they set on fire" (RSV). That this rendering is wrong need not be argued any longer. One just doesn’t go around ‘finding’ towns in tiny Benjamin. Rather, what is implied in these set phrases at the conclusion of the story, is the ill-famed practice of ‘devoting to destruction,’ namely the wholesale slaughter of war captives (including civilians), and the burning of all captured settlements, typical of seminomadic peoples, and exemplified in the Amarna Letters, the Book of Joshua and the Mesha Stone. As with other details, but without using the expression מַהֲכַ in reference to this Hebrew intertribal war, the writer has modelled his concluding lines on the story of the capture of Ai, where we read: “And the Israelites turned back against the city and smote all men of Ai with the edge of the sword until there was left none that was a survivor (שעידי) or fugitive (וסלט), “Only the cattle and spoil of the city Israel took as their booty” (Josh. 8: 21–27). Thus, the phrase מַהֲכַ in the Gibeah story would mean “until the last captive”, and מַהֲכַ in the Benjaminite story “and all the captured cities” (they set on fire).}

8 Cp. C. F. Burney, *The Book of Judges* (London 1920) where all the literary and linguistic similarities have been outlined and brought into juxtaposition.

9 In this connection it is rather interesting to note that the Sodom story of Gen. 19,
Finally, we arrive at a period in the history of Israel and Judah where the Chronicler informs us (2 Chr. chs. 30 and 35) that at two instances in pre-exilic Biblical times large numbers of Israelites and ‘strangers’ from the North came to Judah to participate in large-scale Pesach Festivities. First in the times of Hezekiah, when as a result of the fall of Samaria many Israelites were left destitute and uprooted. Then, again, in the time of King Josiah, when attempts were made to gain political control over Northern territories, and to assure the religious and patriotic adherence of the stateless Israelites. On both these occasions, the newly-arrived transients were sumptuously fed by the Judaean King and given state hospitality. At one point they even went roaming through the countryside of Judah, breaking down altars and bāmōth, burning and destroying local shrines as participants in a popular religious revolution. And each time when the Chronicler mentions these people the phrases ננטשתא וירשראל appear very conspicuously.

2 Chr. 35: 7: "וַיְשָׁרֵא הַלִּשְׁתָּתִים אֶלֶף בֵּית שַׁלְשָׁת אֲלֵפִים.
2 Chr. 35: 17: "וַיְשָׁרֵא כֹּלָה יִשְׂרָאֵל נֵצֶרַת אֶלֶף שֶׁם הָדוֹרָה דְּדוֹתֵי נַפְרוֹ דְּהוֹדֵד הָדוֹרָה שֶׁםֶרְדּוֹר.
2 Chr. 35: 18: "וַיֹּאמֶר נַפְרוֹ דְּהוֹדֵד שֶׁמֶרְדּוֹר אֶלֶף שֶׁם הָדוֹרָה דְּדוֹתֵי נַפְרוֹ דְּהוֹדֵד שֶׁםֶרְדּוֹר.
Cp. also 31: 1: "וַיֹּאמֶר נַפְרוֹ דְּהוֹדֵד שֶׁמֶרְדּוֹר אֶלֶף שֶׁם הָדוֹרָה דְּדוֹתֵי נַפְרוֹ דְּהוֹדֵד שֶׁםֶרְדּוֹר.

with which the outrage of the Gibeah narrative shows such an involved literary interdependence, also contains the fem. plur. adjective ננטשתא. It occurs in v. 15, shows up as an expanded reading in G and although considered by many to be a later addition to the text, usually is translated literally: “And when the morning arose, the angels... saying: ‘take thy wife and thy two daughters that are found here! (new JPS edition: ‘and your two remaining daughters’). Our own study has shown that only when ננטשתא is followed by a prepositional phrase or adverbial modifier does it mean ‘is found’ or (by a further semantic extension) ‘is’, ‘is present’. Whereas when ננטשתא refers to a person, noun or adjective, it denotes a state or situation of one upon whom some kind of involuntary restriction had been imposed. May it not be, therefore, that all along we missed the real fate of Lot’s daughters? Perhaps the Sodomites had not rejected his offer after all? We might say that it appears very strange that besides the concubine of Jud. 19, the object of the outrage and sole cause of war, still another woman, the daughter of the host was offered. Did not the narrator of the Gibeah story understand the meaning of ננטשתא in the Lot story as the two daughters who were detained or held by the Sodomites?
These terms obviously denote the social status of these persons vis-à-vis the inhabitants of Judah who had not been exposed to the same conditions. And, except where it has become eclipsed by a prepositional phrase (even as in 30:21), מנהיגים obviously stands out in the text as a forceful reminder of a designation which was functional in the time of the Chronicler and still intelligible to his contemporaries, but has since been lost to all subsequent translators and commentators, as well as to our contemporary historians.

Further scrutiny of the wording in the post-exilic account of the capture of Jerusalem inevitably confronts us with some similar examples: 2 Ki. 25:19:

"Among the princes of Judah, the princes of the city, and the elders of the fathers of the land, went into the king's presence with the king in the military operation, the sopher-commander, the presiding officer of the 'am hā-ārēš, together with the group of sixty of the same 'am hā-ārēš, were not just 'found' in the city but rather captured in the course of a military clean-up operation, is almost self-explanatory. And, although these two words — מנהיגים and נ🔑 — are both eclipsed by a prepositional phrase, a mere redundant syntactical construction, it should not mar our discerning of a meaning which is evident from the context and had been in vogue in Hebrew among the writers of that time. So far, the historical significance.

Moreover, the Chronicler's absorbing interest in temple administration is well known, and so is his intent to induce the entrenched Jerusalem priesthood to admit to their privileges members of the inferior clergy, the so-called "displaced" Levites and priests. Therefore, he or an editor introduced into the time of Solomon an anachronistic statement to the effect that, even at the Temple dedication priests labelled מנהיגים, supposedly not permanently stationed in Jerusalem, were also sanctified “without regard to their (hierarchic) divisions”.

The very "clumsy parenthetical insertion into the text" of 2 Chr. 5:11–12:

יריח בן יוסף הנגדים מנהיגים כהן קדוש כי כל הנגדים הנ関わים והקדושים אימל למטה... ק_text: "השם על בר חת"... (missing in the parallel account 1 Ki. 8:10–11), which modern editions of G and following them, some English translations of the OT have enclosed in parentheses, not only betrays the underlying attitude of the Chronicler and the state of affairs in his own time, but also sharpens the focus on the semantics of the word הנ гаранים.

To those (like C. C. Torrey and W. F. Albright) who claim a literary and stylistic relationship between the Ezra Memoirs and the Chronicler, it will

10 Compare 2 Chr. 30:21 with 35:17: מנהיגים אהת הנגדים (ברושלים) והנה הנגדים הנ関わים והקדושים אימל למטה.

11 S. Talmon, in a paper recently presented before the Society for Bible Study in Jerusalem: "A New Approach to the Identity of the Biblical 'Am hā-ārēš".
be no surprise to find that also the Book of Ezra designates the Jews who had been separated from their country and sojourned elsewhere as "עַל הַנִּמְגָּרָה. Ezra 8:25 states: "And I weighed out to them the silver and the gold and the vessels, the offering from the King, his counsellors and his lords and all Israel בְּּנִמְגָּרָה. KJV translates the term "there present" carefully giving "there" in italics, while RSV simply renders: "there present". Since we do not find here נִמְגָּרָה (with an adverb), the word cannot even be considered an adjective. It is rather a substantive in apposition, meaning: "All of Israel... the captives" (or those in exile).

It is also possible that the use of this term in Dan. 12:1, if we are correct, may bring about a reversal of the traditional exegesis of this most important passage in the book. Thanks to H. L. Ginsberg's penetrating studies, we now know that a number of prophetic allusions, notably from the Book of Isaiah, have been projected into the latter parts of Daniel. Particularly, it is pointed out, that Dan. 12:2, where the doctrine of resurrection is so boldly stated, owes its phraseology and theme of reference to Is. 66:23-24. Some of the phrases are quoted almost verbatim (Cp. Is. 66:24: דָּרַךְ). Thus, if we may read in Dan. 12:1: כֶּ֥חָרִ֥ב הַמִּשְׁלָ֖ת יִטְמֵ֣ת וְנָכַֽל הַנִּמְגָּרָ֣ה... כֶּ֥חָרִ֨ב תָּסַ֣ף... כֶּ֥חָרִ֨ב בֶּ֣שַׁם i.e. in the Book of Isaiah (66:19-24), assuming that the initial כֶּ֥חָרִ֨ב of כֶּ֥חָרִ֨יב has been lost through haplography, we might understand the passage to mean: "and at that time thy people shall be delivered (KJV), everyone that has survived as it is written in the Book".

We have outlined here the connotations of נִמְגָּרָה as "one that is left over", "a survivor", "one in captivity", "a refugee", or as we should term it today, a "displaced person". It was used in this sense by the Chronicler, by Ezra, and perhaps also by the writers of Daniel and Esther. Accordingly, we may conclude that 1QIs\(^a\) has retained it in exactly the same meaning. Therefore the appearance of נִמְגָּרָה in 37:31 implies that deliverance and regeneration will come not only to the remnant of Judah (in Jerusalem) but to any exiled survivor of Israel. This explains the already mentioned expansion in v. 4 at the beginning of the chapter. For, to everyone who understood the word נִמְגָּרָה in the late post-exilic meaning "refugee", the words נַשְׁפַּ֣ר הַנִּמְגָּרָ֔ה in v. 5 would refer to the "remnant which is in captivity". Such a reference would be incompatible with the plea made at that time by Hezekiah, King of Judah, to Isaiah. Therefore, the clause was expanded to נַשְׁפַּ֣ר הַנִּמְגָּרָ֔ה בִּטְיַּר הָדָ֥א in a prepositional phrase, which then could be interpreted to mean: "those who are found in this city".

Could these two textual variants be thought of as original or superior to the Masoretic readings? Hardly. But, perhaps, something more important now emerges. These are variants which, like the glosses which contain the
word סְעַבּוּן in 2 Chr. 5: 12 et. al. are additions or revisions in the Hebrew text. They stem from a time when they had meaning and currency in actual life, and when additions and revisions in the Hebrew text had still a good chance to survive. Some found their way into MT despite the scrutiny of the Massoretes. Others like אָנוּפָה in 1QIsa 37: 31, while found only in the popular uncensored texts, are just as important because they are contemporary. For the history of text-transmission, perhaps for MT itself, some of these readings are priceless.