4QProv AND TEXTUAL CRITICISM

Jan de Waard

Introduction

In the Dead Sea Scrolls on Microfiche, edited by E. Tov, the 4Q fragments of Proverbs have been classified as 4Q102 (4QProv^a), containing Prov 1:28-2:1,\(^1\) and as 4Q103 (4QProv^b), containing Prov 9:16; 13:6-9; 14:7-10; 14:12-13; 14:31-15:8 and 15:19-31.\(^2\) The photographs clearly show the rather fragmentary state of these texts.

As can easily be seen from the photographs, 4Q102 and 4Q103 have been written by different hands. In the first there is hardly any distinction between \(\text{waw}\) and \(\text{yodh}\),

\(^1\)Emanuel Tov, The Dead Sea Scrolls on Microfiche (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1993). For 4Q102 Prov a (1:28-2:1) the reader is invited to consult photographs 40988 and 43016. On photograph 40988 the upper right part of the fragment is lacking. It figures on photograph 41913, where the following text can be deciphered:

\begin{align*}
\text{יִשְׁחַרְנִי} \\
\text{יִירָאָתִי} \\
\text{נַצָּרָת} \\
\text{כָּמוֹם[ֹ]}\end{align*}

The two parts of the fragment have apparently been put together for photograph 43016.

\(^2\)As to 4Q103 Prov b, photographs 43016 and 43563 have to be compared. Prov 9:16 figures on both photographs in the upper-left part, Prov. 13:6-9 in the lower-left part of photograph 43016 and the upper-central part of 43563. Prov. 14:7-10 figures on photograph 43016 (lower-right) and 43563 (upper-left), Prov. 14:12-13 on photograph 43016 (lower-right) and 43563 (upper-left). Prov 14:31-15:8 appears on photograph 43016 (lower-middle part) and 43563 (lower-right part), Prov 15:11-12 occurs on photograph 43563 (lower-middle) and Prov. 15:19-31 on the same in the lower-left part. Most of the last fragment is also represented on the lower-left part of photograph 43016, but a small fragment at the upper-right angle is lacking.

For a simple negative in the edition, two different exposures were chosen, enabling an optimal readability of both the light and dark fragments on the negatives. In addition, readability has been the criterion for the selection of the photographs joint to this article. It should, however, be noted, that for an optimal decipherment the use of the microfiches and of a good microfiche reader with a magnification of 42x remains obligatory.

[Textus 19 (1998) 87-96]
whereas in the second they are distinguished, the yodh being shorter than the waw and its head being broader. Skehan in his report on Proverbs speaks in both instances of a “relatively late hand.”\(^3\) A careful comparison with the different scripts presented by Cross (138-139),\(^4\) and even better, with the same as shown on photographs 43127 and 43127A of the Tov edition, makes it possible to speak more precisely of a Herodian hand.

**Transcription and apparatus**

In another brief report, Skehan, to whom the publication of the Proverbs material from Qumran had been entrusted, referring to these two 4Q manuscripts of Proverbs, makes the following remark: “because of the United Bible Societies’ O.T. project, Prof. J. A. Sanders has had a complete transcription from me for some time.”\(^5\) Unfortunately, it has been impossible to consult this transcription since after having been handed on to the late Prof. Rüger it was lost. The following transcription, therefore, is entirely my own. Prof. Eugene C. Ulrich (University of Notre Dame) has now been charged with the final publication of these fragments.\(^6\)

\[Prov 1:28 - 2:1\]

\[
\text{ישחרני [רל]במצאנהו}
\]

\[
\text{חורות נון [י]חכים}
\]

\[
\text{בכין נון [י]חכים}
\]

\[
\text{רפסות נון [י]חכים}
\]

\[
\text{הFTAינון קסילים חכמים}
\]

\[
\text{רשוף של יסכים בתכ [י]חכמים}
\]

\[
\text{בכין אוכק יסכים בתכ [י]חכמים}
\]


\(^6\) After the completion of this article I have been able to consult Skehan’s working editions of the two manuscripts in the possession of Prof Eugene Ulrich. I would like to express my gratitude to Prof. Ulrich for making these editions available to me. No reason was found to change the transcription presented here. The conventions and symbols used in the apparatus below are those of BHQ (cf. *Biblia Hebraica Quinta — Librum Ruth* [ed. J. de Waard; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1998].
9:16
מִי פַּתֵּי יְהוָה וּמְשָׁר לָהּ [בַּעֲלָם [לֹ[ו]]

13:6-9
[אֶדְרַכְּוָה תֶּקֶר לָשׁוֹן וְרֹאשָׁה [חֲסֵכָה הַטָּמָאָה]]
[לְבָשׁ מַעֲשֶׂר וְאִם כִּלּוּ [חֲרָדָּה וְדַוָּד]]
[כָּפַר נַפְשׁוֹ אָשַׁר עָשָׂר וְרֹאשֶׁה [כֵּרָה]]
[אָוֹר תַּדּוּרָא שֶׁמֶּה וְגַר רֹאשֶׁה [לְדֹם]]

14:7-10
[לְךָ מִגְבָּדָא][לְאִשָׁא מִכָּל נִבְלָד דְּצָעָה שֶׁפּוֹתַי דִּצָעָה תְּכֻמָּה וּרְוָהָה דִּצָעָה [אָוֹלָתוֹ כָּלָּךְ מְרֹמָה אֲוֹלָיווֹ לִיָּמָּה וְגַבִּיָּהוֹ וְרֹזָן]]
[לָבֶּל וּדְעָא [מֹרָת נְפֶשׁ וּבְשַׁמְּתָהוּ לְאִתְּרֵבָּא גָּד]]

14:12-13
אָחָרְלֵיהּ [ ]
[ ]

14:31 - 15:8
[עַשֵׁה [ח] לְהַרְשָׁי [כָּכָּבְדָא וּזַנְוֵה [אֲוֹתוֹ]]
[בָּרֹעֲה וּ[יְדִיתָי] [וֹתָּה [כָּכָּבְדָא [צָרְיָא]]
[בְּלַכְבַּר [תַּנְח יְלֵם] [כָּכָּבְדָא [כָּפִילוֹ [סַפִּיר]]
[זָרִיךְ הָרַּע [תֵּרוֹמָס גֵּר [ח] לָפָס [אַפָּרָס]]
[זָרִיךְ מְדָל [לָצֵב מְסָכִיל וּתָּבָא [ר] לָה [כָּכָּבְדָא]]
[מִשָּׁה [ר] כָּר [חָזִית] [סָמָּה [וְדַוָּד עֻלָּה [אֶח]]
[לָשֹׁש [מְנָה] [חָזִית] [כְּחָזַי [כָּלָּא אָלָא [כָּכָּבְדָא]]
[בְּכַלְכַּל [עֲנַיְי הָזָא] [כָּכָּבְדָא [רְבִּי [טֵכִין]]
[מְרַמָּא [ל] [כִּלּוֹ [חָזִית [כָּכָּבְדָא [זָרִיךְ הָרַּע [זֶרַע בַּר עֹז]]
[אֲוֹלָי נַאָה [פָּסָר [וֹתָּה [חָזַי [כְּחָזַי [כָּכָּבְדָא]]
[כִּחֲזַאְא [חָזַי [חָזַא [כָּכָּבְדָא [זָרִיךְ הָרַּע [זֶרַע בַּר עֹז]]
[שַׁפְּרִי [זָכָּא [זָכָּא זָכָּא [כָּכָּבְדָא]]
[זָמַח רְשֵׁי [זָמַח רְשֵׁי [כָּכָּבְדָא [זָמַח הָזָא [לְשָׁת יְשָׁרִי [זָלָא]]]
15:11-12

יֶאֶבֶדְהָּ [11]
לֹא [12]

15:19-31

וּרְאָה יִשְׁרֵיָם שְׁלוֹלָה [19]
נֶפֶשׁ אִדָּם בַּהוּא אַמָּר [20]
[אָרוֹרָה שְׁמַתָּה לֶאָרֶץ לְבָל וָאֵישׁ]
[עְבוֹדָה יִשְׁרֵי לֹאֶת [21]
[כַּשָּׁבָּה תְּבִיאֶת חָדֶשׁ]
[כַּמַּי] [22]
[אָרוֹרָה בֵּית התַּבָּא כַּמַּי]
[כַּמַּי] [23]
[כַּמַּי] [24]
[כַּמַּי] [25]
[כַּמַּי] [26]
[כַּמַּי] [27]
[כַּמַּי] [28]
[כַּמַּי] [29]
[כַּמַּי] [30]
[כַּמַּי] [31]

1:32 4Q102 | מַשְׁשַׁבְתָּ [comp. Kenn. 95] (לָשׁוּנִים) | מַשְׁשַׁבְתָּ
13:6 4Q103 σ'MV | τούς δὲ ἄσεβείς G | ST

14:32 4Q103 Ma's'VT | τῇ ἐκκατοντάτῃ όσιότητι GS
14:34 4Q103 Μσ'T | ἐλασσονοῦσι δὲ G(V)S
14:35 4Q103 (G) | μακρύτερήν Mθ'V | ST
15:2 4Q103 MVST | καλὰ (ἐπίσταται) G
15:7 4Q103(?)MV | δώδεκα G | φυλάσσομαι σ' | ST
15:28 4Q103 | מודיע' | הָיָה | G

Comments

1:32 The reading מַשְׁשַׁבְתָּ of M is confirmed by V, S, and T. The variant ηδικουν of G may be the result of an exegesis which considered מַשְׁשַׁבְתָּ to be a genitivus objectivus construction, together with a more generic translation of מַשְׁשַׁבְתָּ. Interestingly, 4Q102 testifies in its variant מַשְׁשַׁבְתָּ (to be preferred to a reading מַשְׁשַׁבְתָּ) to a metathesis of מַשְׁשַׁבְתָּ.

This is the transcription provided by Skehan in his brief report on the Proverbs portions (Benoit, “Editing,” 88). At first sight, this transcription is correct, but it is difficult to see how
This metathesis could simply be accidental, but it could also indicate a derivation from the root בָּשָׁיַש. If, in addition, such a derivative could have the meaning of “idleness,” 4Q102 would provide a much better parallel with תִּלָּחַת, “easetaking.” To obtain such a meaning for the form in M seems to be far more difficult.

9:16 The upper left part of the photograph shows an unidentified fragment reading וַד הָאָמָר. In fact, this reading should now be identified as a fragment of 9.16b, the preceding ד representing the final consonant of the expression דָּהֲצֵר. G has here a double translation παρακαλεῶμαι λέγων, a verb of saying preceded by a qualification. According to Pinkuss (1978) in 9:4 (= 9:16 in S) could be the translation of the 1 pers. imperf. cohortative vocalization υπάρχειν. In view of the translation of S of 9:3 this suggestion seems preferable to the opinion of Ehrlich, who opts for the participle. It is difficult to know on which of these two proposals the critical apparatus of BHS is based. Unfortunately, 4Q103 is indeterminate as a witness since it cannot resolve the problem of vocalization.

13:6 The right bottom side of the first photograph clearly shows a fragment of 13:6-9. Its first line only presents וַתַּעֲנָשׁ which should be the last three characters of the word וַתַּעֲנָשָּׁה. 4Q103 therefore confirms the reading of M which only had the support of V: impietas. It has several times been proposed (see e.g. Gemser, 62) to read וַתְּרִשֵּׁנָם with one Hebrew ms and G: τοὺς δὲ ἀσεβείς. The readings of S and T, which like G personify but with a collective singular, also have been cited in favor of such a proposal. However, the Hebrew ms 95 of Kennicott is late and it is one of the characteristics of the Greek translator to often render abstract nouns with concrete ones.

the form could be parsed. A comparison with the beth two lines below may, however, makes the transcription וַתַּעֲנָשָּׁה possible.


9Unless, though much less likely, the fragment would represent the text of Ezra 8: 27-28, the only other instance in the Hebrew Bible in which a form מִתְאַמְּרָה is preceded by a ד, in this case the final ד of וַתִּלָּחַת. For details of the Ezra fragments from Qumran see the Companion Volume of the Facsimile Edition, 33 and the Inventory List of Photographs, 74 as well as photograph 43089, top.


11Arnold B. Ehrlich, Randglossen zur Hebräischen Bibel (Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1968) 6.46.

13:7 The reading of מָזוּן also has the support of 4Q103. It is, moreover, entirely incomprehensible why the critical apparatus of BHS wants to oblige its user to read מָזוּן. The Targum can certainly not be quoted as a witness for such an evidence. In fact, only the first and second Bomberg editions have the reading מָזוּן. Urbinates I reads מָזוּן, whereas Berlin Or and Zamora read the synonym מָזוּן. The non-suffixed reading clearly is the original one.

13:8 In 8b all versions are only an interpretation of a Vorlage such as M, the meaning of which probably is that the poor are not vulnerable to blackmail. There is therefore no issue of textual criticism in a restricted sense. However, the reading אַל מֵאָס בְּשֵׁם הַלֵוֶה (לֵוֶה מֵאָס בְּשֵׁם הַלָּוֶה), proposed by Steuernagel and taken over by Gemser and in BHS. Moreover, the surface form of 8b אַל מֵאָס בְּשֵׁם הַלָּוֶה is the same as in 1b although the underlying semantic structures are totally different.

14:12-13 The identification of the small fragment in the lower central part of photograph 43016 is certain. Of course, הֵדַנַנ could also be the residue of לוֹנַנ in Prov 17:21, but the fact that לא most probably is the remnant of הַלָּוֶה in Prov 14:12 of M makes this hypothesis impossible. However, the position of לא in the fragment, directly above הֵדַנַנ, remains puzzling. Unfortunately, the text is too fragmentary to permit any reconstruction of lines.

14:32 The reading בְּמָהְוָה of M which was already supported by α’σθ’V and T, now also receives the support of 4Q103 Prov. The rendering of G תְּיָבַת הָאָבָס עָשָׁת, supported by S, is, based upon a reading בְּמָהְוָה, as already Jäger had seen. Qumran discoveries considerably weaken the evaluation of such a rendering as more origi-

---

17So BHS, B. Gemser, Sprüche Salomos (Tübingen: J. C. B.Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1963) 67; O. Plöger, Sprüche Salomos (Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1984) 16 and, with some hesitation, McKane, Proverbs, 36 and 47. For A. Geiger, Urschrift und Übersetzungen der Bibel... (Breslau: J. Hainauer, 1857) 175, M is the result of a theological correction of Pharisaic origin. It remains, however, very doubtful whether בְּמָהְוָה could ever mean “auf die Belohnung, die ihm in der erneuten Welt werden wird.” According to the Preliminary and Interim Report on the Hebrew Old Testament Text Project (Stuttgart, 1977) 496-497, the committee was divided. One half favored M, the other half G, both with a C rating.
nal, whereas they reinforce the thesis that the reading in G is due to a kind of ‘al tiqrā treatment.

14:34 G and S read a derivation from the root ḥeser in their Vorlage. More specifically, the reading miserōs of V is based upon a vocalization ḥeser. Although one never can be entirely sure, the final character of 4Q103 shows more resemblance to a daleth than to a resh. The variant can easily be explained as being caused by orthographical error and/or ignorance of the meaning of ḥeser I.

14:35 M reads in the second half line, עָבוֹדָה, a reading confirmed by θ' and V, whereas 4Q103 Prov b presents the variant reading עָבוֹדָה. It seems most likely that this variant was the basis of the rendering τῇ δὲ καυτῷ ἐνδεχόμενα in G (followed by S) and that the translator derived the form from the root עָבָדָה “to twist.” It is improbable that G would depend upon a reading עָבָדָה, “and his cunning,” even if the complexity of a metathesis and an additional beth/mem confusion is not impossible. It is unlikely because of the unnoted fact that G also seems to know the reading of M, whose consonants are reproduced in the phonological transcription of the following verb ἀφαίρειται which has no other corresponding term in M. The question can be raised whether even the scribe of 4Q103 was not aware of such a reading in view of the otherwise incomprehensible space left between the beth and the tav of the word.

15:1 4Q103 only reads הָעֲלַי in the second part of the verse instead of הָעֲלָי in M. Although on the photographs there is sufficient space for a yod, no traces of this character can be detected. Did the scribe of 4Q103 read the verbal form as a participle according to its frequent defective writing? Such a reading would have the support

---

18 More carefully formulated, the reading could be the outcome of an interpretational procedure similar to the ‘al tiqrā’ approach. For 24 possible cases of such a treatment in Proverbs see my article “Metathesis as a Translation Technique?” Traducere Navem. (Festschrift Katharina Reiβ; ed. Justa Holz-mänttäri and Christiane Nord; Tampere: Univeristätsbibliothek, 1993) 249-260. A complete survey of such readings will be the subject of another paper.


20 In another paper (“‘Homophony’ in the Septuagint,” Biblica 62 [1981] 552) I used the terminology phonological translation,” following J. C. Catford, A Linguistic Theory of Translation. An Essay in Applied Linguistics (London: Oxford University Press, 1967) 61. In a personal communication dated February 14, 1982, Prof. Reiβ correctly disapproved of the used of the term “translation,” since translation only takes place when meaning is involved, and phonemes, although differentiating meaning, are not bearers of meaning as such. She therefore proposed to speak of “Äquivalenz auf Phonemebene.” However, such an equivalence is the goal of the translation process whereas the concern in this paper is the process itself. For this reason the expression “phonological transcription” has been coined. There are quite a number of
of S, מִסְרָה, and T, מִסְרָה. However, Nöeldeke has clearly shown that in order to denote general truths and gnomic expressions the participle has in Syriac almost entirely taken the place of the imperfect.\(^{21}\) In view of this and in view of the probable dependencies of T upon S, very little textual value can be attributed to a possible participle reading of 4Q103. The verbal form in the first semi-colon can unfortunately not be reconstructed.

15:2 The reading of מִסְרָה תְּלַרְכָּס, supported by V, S, and T, now also seems to be confirmed by 4Q103 Prov\(^b\), at least with regard to the first word of which all characters can be read except for the last. The Qumran reading does not favor the emendation תְּלַרְכָּס, proposed since Dyserinck and violently attacked by Ehrlich.\(^{22}\) Nor does it provide a key to the understanding of the isolated rendering of G καλὰ ἐπίσταται. G can only be due to another kind of 'al tiqrâ treatment, namely a twofold metathesis מִסְרָה תְּלַרְכָּס. The reason for the metathesis was no doubt the uncertainty with regard to the meaning of מִסְרָה in this context.

15:7 The verbal form יִדְרַו is usually derived from the root ידָר and given the figurative meaning “to spread.” Such is also the understanding of V and maybe of S and T. The rendering מָדוֹרֵי, “they make known” in T may simply be a different translational gloss of יִדְרַו. Another key to the understanding of T could be a variant יִדְרַו, “they teach,” with implied zayin/waw confusion.\(^{23}\) The Hebrew form which has inspired the rendering of ס’ φυλάσσωναί is no doubt יַדִּיר from the root בָּרָא whereas G δὲντα may have been inspired by some derivation from Hebrew בָּרָא or by a Hebrew form בָּרָא (Baumgartner, 144) from בָּרָא. In the last case, if M is taken to be the more original reading, G could be explained by vowel metathesis.\(^{24}\)

4Q103 Prov\(^b\) is of relative help. Only the first character is readable on the photographs and there can be no doubt that this is a yod. Further, only the bottom part of a phonological transcriptions in the Greek text of Proverbs, some of them involving metathesis as e.g. in 14:18: יִדְרַו מִסְרָה/κρατήσουσιν.


\(^{22}\) Johannes Dyserinck, “Kritische Scholiën bij de vertaling van het boek der Spreuken,” *Theologisch Tijdschrift* (1883) 582; Ehrlich, *Randglossen*, 6.82.

\(^{23}\) The Zamora text of the Targum (185) reads מָדוֹרֵי, from the root יִדְרַו, “to ask for,” and this rendering seems to be based upon a misunderstanding of G, δὲν having been taken in the sense of δὲν II.

\(^{24}\) As to the reading of ס’, for an interchange of tsade and zeta see G’s phonological transcription הדִּיעָל of Hebrew הַדִּיעָל in Prov xvi 30.
down stroke of what could either be a zayin or a waw is visible. Therefore, readings such as יורי and יורי נביא have to be excluded and readings such like יורי and יורי נביא remain possible.

15:19 סְלָלָה of M is written plene in 4Q103: סְלָלָה

15:22 Occasionally a Hebrew Vorlage נַעֲצוּ has been postulated on the base of G: βουλή, S: הבנו and T: ייעץ. The complete text of 22b in 4Q103 joins, however α', σ', θ', and V in confirming M. The rare syntactical phenomenon of a plural feminine noun, considered as a collective and therefore ruling a feminine singular form of the verb, was misunderstood by the Greek translator who therefore made a different grammatical subject of תַּקְוָה explicit in his translation. This translational operation apparently influenced S directly and T indirectly.

15:27 רָשָׁא of M is written defectively in 4Q103: רָשָׁא.

15:28 In 28a 4Q103 clearly reads דָּרְרִי but it lacks the verb נַעֲצוּ of M. In addition, the deterioration of the manuscript is such that the reading of the last word cannot be determined with certainty. The tear in the manuscript has caused an upward movement and deformation of the final character which could either be a tav or a final mem. It is true that the reading of מַעֲנוּת has always presented problems. On the base of πίστεις in G (variant πίστιν) corrections such as אָמְנָות, אָמְנוֹת, אָמְנָה (BHS) have been proposed. However, the readings of G (followed by S and T) and V (obedientiam) could be considered as interpretations of נַעֲצוּ. As Delitzsch has correctly stated, the meaning of M is "recht zu antworten." If the last character of the word in 4Q103 can be identified as a final mem, a reading לֹא נַעֲצוּ or לֹא נַעֲצוּ מַעֲנוֹת could be suggested: "the heart/attention of the righteous is for the humble." As only one yod or waw figures in the manuscript, one would have to admit a contraction as well.

Could the omission of the verb have been a syntactical deletion of a verb הָיָה originally read through י/ה confusion?


28Toy, Proverbs, 319.

29Franz Delitzsch, Das Salomonische Spruchbuch (Leipzig: Dörrfling und Franke, 1873) 257.

30Skehan, “Qumran,” 163.
Conclusions

Skehan’s first reaction was that the two 4Q manuscripts of proverbs are “textually uninteresting.”30 This appears to be an understatement. If one eliminates the particular reading of 4Q102 in 1:32, the particular minus of 4Q103 in 15:28 and the uncertain reading of 15:7, one is left with four out of five instances in which 4Q103 supports M against G. In view of the idiosyncrasies of the Greek translator such a result is not surprising. On the other hand, the extremely limited material does not permit any further extrapolations and the evidence of 4Q in favor of M therefore remains limited. In the framework of this paper no full description of the interdependencies of versions nor of their implied translation techniques could be given; for this, the reader can be referred to some literature.31 The major analysis of these subjects has been done by the present writer and it is his intention to deal extensively with these subjects in his introduction to the book of Proverbs of which he is the responsible editor in the Biblia Hebraica Quinta project.