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I

The discovery of the Scrolls from the Judaean Desert has added a new dimension to Biblical text criticism. It goes without saying that these MSS which precede the oldest extant MSS of the MT by more than a millennium, in view of their antiquity, are of unsurpassed importance for an investigation into the early history of the text of the OT. Much already has been learned from research carried out so far. More is to be expected from the edition of yet unpublished MSS, and from an ensuing evaluation of their contribution to a better understanding of the processes by which the Bible text was transmitted.¹

The new material often helps in elucidating the genesis, and the history of individual variants in which one or more of the ancient VSS differ from the MT. They also open up new possibilities for the recovery or the reconstruction of the factors which underlie textual variation. The sifting of these cases, their classification, and a statistical assessment of the frequency of their appearance may make possible the systematic presentation of the processes which can be proved empirically to have been conducive to the emergence of variæ lectiones. The pertinent information gained from these first-hand sources, because of their scope and their primacy, should enable scholars to improve on previous attempts along these lines, such as F. Delitzsch’s Lese- und Schreibfehler im Alten Testament (Berlin–Leipzig 1920).

Prior to the discovery of the Qumran Scrolls, observations on the skill and the peculiarities of the ancient copyists of the Biblical text could be inferred only from the analysis of variants which are extant in mediaeval Heb. MSS,

or had to be abstracted from deviating translations in the ancient VSS. With the pre-Christian Hebrew Scrolls from Qumran at our disposal, we now are in a position to verify principles established by inference, and to put them to a practical test. The Scrolls afford us a completely new insight into ancient scribal craft and give us an unexampled visual impression of the physical appearance of the manuscripts in which arose the Biblical variae lectiones. We now can observe at close range, so to say in situ, scribal techniques of the Second Commonwealth period which left their impression on the Bible text in subsequent stages of its history. We can perceive the manuscriptal realities which were the breeding ground of the variants that crop up in the extant witnesses to the text of the Bible.

That the Qumran Scrolls indeed exhibit scribal conventions and techniques which were generally prevalent in Jewry of the Second Commonwealth is easily proved from the fact that the sectarian scribes in many details followed rules which tally with those laid down by the Rabbis for Torah-scribes of the "normative" community.2 There is obviously nothing specifically sectarian in the external appearance of the Qumran Scrolls, nor in the scribal customs to which their copyists adhered.3 The same holds true for the majority of the deviating readings found in them. The impression of dissent that goes with the Biblical Scrolls from Qumran derives from the secession of their scribes from normative Judaism, and has no roots in the MSS as such. That is to say, it must be attributed to socio-historical processes which engulfed these scrolls, but in no way to their textual or manuscriptal character. Genetically the Biblical texts from Qumran are "Jewish". They became "sectarian" in their subsequent history.

What makes the evidence of the Scrolls especially valuable is the fact that they present not just one horizontal cross-section view of a stabilized version, such as is the Massoretic textus receptus. Because of their textual diversity, the kaleidoscope of the textual traditions exhibited in them: their concurrence here with one, here with another of the known Versions, or again in other cases their textual exclusive individuality, the Biblical MSS found at Qumran, in their totality present, in a nutshell as it were, the intricate and variegated problems of the OT Hebrew text and Versions. The concentration of processes

2 This was pointed out by the late E.L. Sukenik already in 1947 in his first report on the Scrolls: א.ל. סוקניק, מאמרים שונים... ב.ד. יום (ירושלים 1947) א–אכ.

3 A notable exception are the enigmatic scribal marks or symbols found in the margins of Is-a for which, as yet, no adequate explanation was offered. See: The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery 1, ed. M. Burrows (New-Haven 1950) p. XVI. It appears that these signs are peculiar to Is-a. Only some of the simpler ones turn up also in other Qumran MSS.
which obtain in the history of the Bible text, in a comparatively small corpus of MSS, small in comparison with the bulk of Hebrew — Massoretic and Samaritan —, Greek, Aramaic, Syriac, Latin etc. MSS which have to be sifted, collated and compared in the course of the critical work on the Bible text, a corpus which moreover is relatively homogeneous with respect to time and place of provenance, make the Qumran Scrolls an ideal subject for a pilot-study on these processes. Although the results gained from an analysis of the Qumran material cannot be applied without qualification to the wider field of comparative research into the MT and the VSS, we may derive from them certain working hypotheses which then have to be verified by application to the wider problem.

Thus the situation at Qumran reflects on a basic issue in OT textual research, namely the most pressing problem of the establishment of a Hebrew textus receptus. The coexistence of diverse text-types in the numerically, geographically and temporally restricted Covenanters-community; the fact that (some or most of) the conflicting MSS, very probably, had been copied in the Qumran scriptorium; and that no obvious attempts at the suppression of divergent MSS or of individual variants can be discovered in that voluminous literature, proves beyond doubt that the very notion of a Biblical textus receptus had not yet taken root at Qumran. The superscribed corrections in 1QIsa (henceforth Is-a) which in the majority of cases, though by no means in all, bring the deviant basic text in line with MT, or with a proto-Massoretic textual tradition (1QIsb = Is-b) cannot be adduced in evidence for a supposed tendency to revise Is-a towards an established Qumran recension. This evidence is set off, in fact is neutralized by a Deuteronomy MS from Cave 5, roughly contemporary with Is-a. Here the corrections in practically every instance run counter to the proto-Massoretic tradition, and align themselves with a Septuagintal text-type.

We have no reason to doubt that this "liberal" attitude towards divergent textual traditions of the Bible was prevalent also in "normative" Jewish circles of that period, i.e. in the second and first centuries B.C.E. It actually can be shown that according to Rabbinic testimony, even the model codices that were kept in the Temple precincts not only exhibited divergent readings, but represented conflicting text-types. Phenomenologically speaking the situation that prevailed in the 'azarah may be compared, though with quali-

4 Cp. J. Hempel, "Bebachtungen an der 'syrischen' Jesajarolle vom Toten Meer (DSla)", ZDMG 101 (1951) 149.
fications, with the one that obtained in the *Scriptorium* at Qumran. The difference consists in the fact that in the end the Temple codices were collated, probably in the first century C.E., and what is more important, that Rabbinic Judaism ultimately established a model text and strove to banish deviant MSS from circulation. However at this stage the comparability of “normative” with Qumran practice breaks down. The active life span of the Covenanters-community ends sometime in the first century B.C.E., although sporadic attempts at restoration vibrate into the first or possibly into the second century C.E. However also the latest manuscripts from Qumran which give evidence to the local history of the Bible text in the crucial period, the last decades before the destruction of the Temple, do not present the slightest indication that even an incipient *textus receptus* did emerge there, or that the very notion of a model recension ever was conceived by the Covenanters.\(^7\)

The presentation of the sum total of the Biblical documents from Qumran as a small-scale replica of the “MT and VSS” issue, derives further support from one more characteristic of that material. The Qumran finds exhibit, as stated, a basic homogeneity with regard to the time and the place of their provenance. There are no grounds to doubt that these MSS were written in Palestine, and that a great majority of them, if not all, were copied at Qumran. It also may be considered as established that, some odd items excepted, the bulk of the MSS in the Qumran library was copied within a span of not more than three hundred years, approximately from the middle of the third century B.C.E. to the middle of the first century C.E.\(^8\) In view of these circumstances the marked diversity of textual traditions which can be observed in these MSS presumably derives from the temporal and/or geographical heterogeneity of the *Vorlagen* from which the Qumran MSS, or some of them, were copied. Thus, in addition to the horizontal cross-section view of the Bible text at Qumran during the last phases of the Second Commonwealth period, the Qumran material also affords a vertical cross-section view of the transmission


\(^9\) The case for an existence of local recensions of the Bible text in view of the Qumran evidence, recently was argued by W.F. Albright, “New Light on Early Recensions of the Hebrew Bible”, BASOR 140 (1955) 27–33; F.M. Cross, Jr., *The Ancient Library of Qumran*, 188–194; see also the latter’s forthcoming paper in HTfR in which unpublished material from Qumran Cave 4 was utilized. The present author is indebted to Prof. Cross for permission to read this paper in typescript.
of the Bible text, in which are reflected various chronological layers, and geographical or social-strata traditions. These circumstances further enhance the similarity of the problems relating to the Bible text at Qumran with those adhering to the wider issue of the relations of the MT and the VSS.

The situation which obtains at Qumran holds out one more possibility of comparison with another phase in the history of the Bible text. In conformity with a basic characteristic of Second Commonwealth Judaism — normative and dissenting alike — the Covenanters' religious concepts were Bible-centred. Their original literary creations, such as the War-Scroll, the Hodayot, the Sectarian Manual, and the Zadokite Documents swarm with verbatim Bible quotations, paraphrases and allusions. Their most fundamental beliefs and practices reflect the attempt to recapture, and to typologically re-live Biblical Judaism. It is this Scripture-piety which produced the pesher technique, so indicative of the Covenanters' system of Bible hermeneutics, by the aid of which Biblical history was actualized, and made existentially meaningful. In this unceasing process of quotation, interpretation and adaptation, the Bible text at Qumran was exposed to a fate which is comparable to that which the hebraica veritas experienced on a wider scale in Rabbinic Judaism, and in the orbit of Jewish and Christian communities that had recourse to translations of the Hebrew original. The deliberate insertion of textual alterations into Scripture for various reasons of dogma, style etc., the uncontrolled infiltration of haphazard changes due to linguistic peculiarities of copyists, or to their characteristic concepts and ideas, which may be observed in the transmission of the Bible text at large, have their counterparts in the "Qumran Bible". The study of these phenomena at Qumran again is facilitated by the comparative compactness of the material, and by the decidedly more pronounced manner in which they become manifest. We thus encounter in the Qumran writings developments of Biblical text-transmission which may be considered prototypes of phenomena that emerge concurrently and subsequently in the text-history of the Bible in Jewish and Christian tradition, albeit in less concentrated form, and at different grades of variation.

10 For a discussion of these issues cp. E.Y. Kutscher, תלת הספרים המפתחי של מגילת י possibilità, esp. pp. 45–70.

11 Basic information on the utilization of the Bible in these works is provided in the scholarly editions of the texts. A detailed discussion of the Biblical quotations and allusions in the Hodayot pl. I–III is offered by P. Wernberg-Moller in his article in the present volume.

12 This aspect of Qumran Sectarianism was often referred to in the voluminous literature on the Covenanters. See also my forthcoming discussion of "The 'Desert Ideal' in the Bible and at Qumran", in: Studies and Texts 3, ed. A. Altmann (Philip W. Lown Institute of Advanced Judaic Studies, Brandeis University).
II

The foregoing general remarks will be illustrated in this paper by an analysis of the manuscriptal conditions which, in the first stage, fathered the development of “double-readings”, and ultimately were conducive to the Massoretic techniques of variant-preservation in the Kethib-Qerê system, and in the Midrashic 'al iqtê technique.

Two main types of conflation must be clearly distinguished. On the one hand, a double reading may result from the routine insertion into the main text of marginal or intralinear corrective notes and annotations together with the readings which they were meant to supersede. On the other hand, conflation will result from the premeditated intentional effort on part of a scribe to preserve variant readings which he considered equal in value and worthy of preservation. This type of conflation is a well-attested trick-in-hand of the transmitters of the Bible text. It was widely practiced by scribes and copyists, Jews and Christians, throughout centuries, in the Heb. original and in translations.

Lacking a universally recognized device of variants-notation, not to be confused with correction, the parallel readings either were recorded in the margins and between lines, or else were incorporated prima manu (p.m.) into the text-base, whenever this could be done without serious disruption of syntax or distortion of sense. But also when the variant initially had been noted p.m. outside the normal text-base, it easily could be transferred into the text by a subsequent copyist who used the annotated MS as his Vorlage. Although the practical results of variants-conflation will coincide with those of the routine conflation of a mistake with its correction, the two phenomena must be kept apart. Routine conflation always is due to a copyist's default and runs counter to the original corrector's intentions. Variants-conflation secunda manu indeed also results from scribal lapse, but it always puts into effect the purport of the first-hand collator, namely the intentional preservation of variant readings.

Methodologically, therefore, the two types of conflation outlined above are different. But in practice we have no safe means to decide in each case whether the marginal or intralinear notation from the outset was intended to replace a reading in the main text, whether it was meant to be added to the text base,

13 See the present writer's “Double Readings in the Massorethic Text", Textus 1 (1960) 144–184 (henceforth DRMT); and the notes on Ex. 15:2 and 1 Sam. 15:32a in VT 4 (1954) 206–207, respectively VT 11 (1961) 456–457.

14 On these, see the present author's “Synonymous Readings in the Textual Traditions of the Old Testament”, Scripta Hierosolymitana 8 (1961) 335–383 (henceforth SROT).
or whether it was considered a mere note, to be kept apart from the text proper also at subsequent抄写ings. The external similarity of emendation, restitution and annotation, all of which were entered in the margins or between lines, could be conducive to conflation by mistaken interpretation of the collators’ notations.

It is one of the great advantages of the Biblical MSS from Qumran that in them we yet can perceive conflation in the different stages of its execution. The Qumran Scrolls furnish us with the means to trace step by step the intentional preservation of alternative readings on the one hand, and the perpetuation by default of scribal mistakes together with their corrections on the other hand.

III

Let us first consider the category of routine conflations which resulted from the mistaken insertion of superscribed or adscribed corrections into the text base.

Superscription or marginal adscription as a means of correction was as familiar to the sectarian scribes as it is to the modern writer or copyist. It is unfortunate that in most cases, especially in 1 Sa, it cannot be decided whether the first hand is at work correcting a recognized and admitted mistake, or whether a second hand thought fit to emend a text with which the initial scribe had found no fault. On the whole the corrections are towards the MT. Accordingly they are ascribed to a second hand who used a proto-Massoretic MS as his Vorlage. However there are significant exceptions to this rule.

These two different types of correction make themselves manifest in the very first line of 1 Sa in which we find three cases of superscribed single letters: מִלָּה, יִרְאוֹשׁ לֵץ. The first two seemingly are instances of corrected lapses which, at the same time, bring the text of 1 Sa in line with the (proto-) Massoretic readings. In the third the opposite is the case: a normal MT-type reading (барו) is (mis)corrected towards the Aramaic determined morphology of the sectarian copyist. The first two may be ascribed to the initial scribe with much probability, the third with absolute certainty.

On pl. iv, 3 (Is. 3:25b) the insertion amounts to two letters. A typical variant reading — מְרֹדב (2nd pers. plur. fem. of מְרֹדב), supported by all VSS,15 which is a better parallel to מְרֹדב of the first stichos than is the Massoretic מְרֹדב (2nd pers. sing. fem. of מְרֹדב) was corrected towards the reading exhibited in the MT by the superscription of מְרֹדב (2. pers. plur. fem. of

15 T: G; of ἱσχύοντος θρόνων; Aqu.: oλ δευτερο αὐτου; V: fortest tui. See also: A. Rubenstein, VT 4 (1954) 320.
However no full identity with the MT reading was achieved. Here we seem to be dealing not with a corrected mistake p.m., but rather with a (subjective) emendation s.m. based on a MT-type Vorlage.

Similarly, complete words were added to the basic text of Is-a by superscription. Again we can differentiate between omissions by default which were filled in p.m. or possibly s.m., and between emendations of what a second hand interpreted as a textual mistake perpetrated by the initial copyist. Thus the superlinear יִשְׂרָאֵל in Is. 23:8 certainly is a correction p.m. of an obvious omission in the basic text. That by this correction Is-a is brought in line with the MT is an accidental corollary, and is immaterial for the issue on hand.

In Is. 8:17 the acc. part. הָיוּ was inserted by superscription before יִשְׂרָאֵל, in accordance with the prevalent usage of Is-a. Here the superlinear correction goes against the MT, and most certainly stems from the original copyist.

Much less clear is the situation with regard to the word יִשְׂרָאֵל which is added over יָשָׁרִי הָיָה in Is. 19:12. The basic text of Is-a, as it stands, causes no difficulties. Th correction makes it identical with the MT (= T, G) which reads יָשָּׁרוּ in this verse, in v. 16, 18, 25, and especially in v. 17 where imagery is employed which is virtually identical with the imagery of v. 12. But, on the other hand, also the single tetragrammaton is well represented in this chapter (vv. 19, 20, 21, 22). Accordingly it seems preferable to ascribe the insertion of יָשָּׁרוּ in v. 12 to the emendatory activities of the MT-oriented corrector, and not to the first hand. The same goes for the superlinear addition of יָשָּׁרוּ in Is. 14:19 to the basic reading of Is-a which indeed may, but need not be a simplified reading of the somewhat obscure Massoretic: יָשָּׁרוּ (= G, V). Whatever the case may be, the restitution of יָשָּׁרוּ adjusts Is-a to the MT.

The random examples adduced so far clearly show that superscription was a technique recognized by the scribe and the corrector of Is-a as a means for restituting letters or words which had been omitted by default from the text base. These interlinear and marginal notations contained a tacit, but nevertheless explicit directive for future copyists to restore the superscribed or adscribed textual items into the text base of their own copies for which the annotated MS served as Vorlage. This restoration would be a mere mechanical re-transfer from the margin or from between the lines into the line proper,

16 In the main tradition of T הָיָה is not rendered: מאת הכורא באוכנו MSS. f, e insert לפני בבלי whereas in the First and Second Bomberg Bible (b, g) the word follows upon בבלי. Qimh's commentary (ed. L. Finkelstein), as quoted in A. Schaper's edition of the Targum, has the interesting variant: לדיסיס באוכנו. Could be a miswritten יָשָּׁרוּ which thus would tally with יָשָּׁרוּ that seems to underlie V: ad fundamenta laci. Cp. Kedar's discussion of this reading on p. 187 of this volume.
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and would not require any re-adjustment in the text-base of the Vorlage. Since such corrections p.m., or s.m. of omissions and mistakes perpetrated p.m. most probably constituted the majority of marginal notations, they created a psychological readiness in copyists to restore superscriptions or adscriptions which they found in their Vorlage into the main text of their own copy. Herein may be found the roots of routine conflation.

It is here that the Qumran Scrolls lend the support of manuscript facts to theoretical considerations. Let us first discuss some cases of hypothetical doublets which could have arisen, but in fact did not arise from such an Is-a reading. An intriguing instance of correction by superlinear insertion is found in Is. 43:3. Here the basic text of Is-a has no equivalent for מישנין of the MT. Its shorter reading אֵין הַאָלֶלֶךְ קַדְשָׁהּ יָשָׁרָאָה is syntactically without fault, although metrically it lacks somewhat in length in comparison with the second half-verse. A second hand whose ductus is clearly distinguishable from that of the first, and who uses defective as against the latter’s plene spelling ( האלהים), added between the lines. This is a good synonomous reading of the Massoretic דְּרִישָׁה. Thus the difference between Is-a and the MT which in the first stage consisted of the lack of one word, in the second stage developed into a varia lectio. A subsequent collator, not a mere copyist, of Is-a and the (proto-) MT easily could have combined the two readings into a non-extant doublet:

(MT=Is-a): אֵין הַאָלֶלֶךְ קַדְשָׁהּ יָשָׁרָאָה מֵסְכֵּנִין (= G, T).

The probability of routine-conflation increases when we consider not restorative but corrective superscriptions which are meant to “replace” a component of the text-base. As a rule the tendency towards conflation will be checked by appropriate marks which prescribe the excision from the text18 of the component that is to be replaced by the marginal notation. There are two instances of this kind, which hypothetically could have resulted in conflatio.

1. Is. 21:1

Is-a: ממבדר ונאמר החמדים
MT: ממבדר ונאמר רואית

The basic reading of Is-a which is reflected in S: מַמְבֶּדֶר וְנָאָרָה, perhaps inadvertently substituted יָשָׁרָאָה, which is found nine times in the OT19 including one mention in Is. 39:3, for the hap. leg. מַמְבֶּדֶר וְנָאָרָה20 of MT which underlies G: φοβερόν, and T (?) מַשִּׁיטֵן. The superscription וְנָאָרָה with the

19 Seven times connected with the verb אָמַר: Deut. 29:21; Josh. 9:6, 9; 1 Ki. 8:41 = 2 Chr. 6:32; 2 Ki. 20:14, and esp. Is. 39:3. Cp. Kutscher, op. cit., 478.
20 However twice וְנָאָרָה ... מַמְבֶּדֶר is found: Deut. 1:19; 8:15.
concomitant deletion of וַיַּשְׁבֵּא may confidently be attributed to a second hand by reason of the different ductus. Thus we deal here with the subjective emendation s.m. of a possibly bona fide reading p.m.

2. Is. 12:6

Is-a: יַשְׁבֵּא
MT: יָשַׁבֶּא

The basic reading of Is-a: יָשַׁבֶּא presents a to all means and purposes synonymous variant of MT's יָשַׁבֶּא. Whereas S: יָשַׁבֶּא clearly sides with the MT, T's נָשַׁבֶּא appears to go with Is-a p.m., although the evidence is not altogether decisive. Again it would appear that a bona fide variant reading of the first hand, was subsequently (s.m.? corrected towards the MT by the superscription of נָשַׁבֶּא. However it seems that the concomitant deletion here affects only the second letter of the word יָשַׁבֶּא, thus creating the basis for a reading which indeed comes nearer to MT than Is-a p.m., but is not identical with it. This reading is mirrored in G: of כְּֽמָּשַׁבֶּא in סִּיוֹן.

It does not require much imagination to reconstruct the reasoning of a copyist of Is-a who, in spite of the deletion mark in Is. 21:1, and because of the only partial deletion in 12:6 would have interpreted the superscriptions not as substitutions for components found in the text-base, but rather as faultily omitted intrinsic parts of it, which he therefore restored to their proper place without altering the text-base. In both cases this could easily be done. In Is. 21:1 it would have resulted in the doublet מַעַרְשׂ בֶּן מָרֶשֶׂ for which cp. Deut. 1:19 — הַמַּעַרְשׂ בֶּנֶר וַתִּדְגָּל הַגָּדוֹל הָעָנָא. In 12:6 the outcome would have been נַחֲלַת בֵּית צִיוֹן for which cp. e.g. בֵּית צִיוֹן (Is. 37:22 = 2 Ki. 19:21).

Such a hypothetical development is even more imminent in the following instance of hypercorrection:

1QIs* 41:20

In Is. 41:20 a series of four synonymous verbs is used to describe the future

21 Cp. Is. 10:24 MT: יָשַׁבֶּא, שָׁבֵא, יִשָּׁבֶא, T: יָשַׁבֶּא, S: יָשַׁבֶּא, Jer. 51:35 MT: יָשַׁבֶּא, T: יָשַׁבֶּא, S: יָשַׁבֶּא (possibly resulting from an intentional or unintentional confusion of יָשַׁבֶּא with יָשַׁבֶּא).
23 Kutscher (op. cit., 474) maintains that בֵּית was struck out altogether.
recognition by the poor and the destitute of God's mighty deeds: לַחֹ֣מֵן יָרַא... The MT here is supported by the *verbatim* rendition of the first two and the fourth verb in T (דִּבָּ֔ר וַרְשַׁמְּוָ֖ו וַיִּשְׁמַ֣ע וַיִּתְּנ֣וּ פֶּן...), and by the latter's interpretative rendering of the crucial third: רֶאֶֽמֶת רְשַׁמְּוָֽו וַיִּתְּנ֣וּ פֶּן... However Is-a reads here רֶאֶֽת יָרַֽע, and has רֶאֶֽמֶת as a superscription, most probably introduced *s.m.* The basic רְשַׁמְּוָֽו clearly is a variant reading. Whether it is due to a mere interpretation of the apocopated וַיִּשְׁמַ֣ע or whether it is a true *varia lectio*, may be left undecided at present. The G translation יָרַֽע, רְשַׁמְּוָֽו, which may reflect יָרַֽע, רְשַׁמְּוָֽו, possibly strengthens the latter proposition. But, since this specific verb is a *hap. leg.* in the Greek translation of Isaiah the evidence is not conclusive. Also the fact that the combination יָרַֽע יָשָׁמ (לְ) recurs in v. 22 in inverted order, both in the MT and in Is-a: יָרַֽע יָשָׁמ elaborates יָרַֽע יָשָׁמ in the MT, results from faithful adherence to a *Vorlage* which is yet mirrored in S: יָרַֽע יָשָׁמ elaborates יָרַֽע יָשָׁמ, and not from slovenly word substitution.

Of more importance for the issue on hand is the fact that the superscribed emendation subsequently was disqualified by its enclosure within deletion-dots. Thus the basic non-MT רְשַׁמְּוָֽו was restored to its original validity. 24 This two-stage correction might have led an imaginary copyist to consider the interlinear רֶאֶֽמֶת as a restituted omission and not as an emendation. As a result he would have conjoined this verb with רְשַׁמְּוָֽו, thus creating the hypothetical doublet: לַחֹ֣מֵן יָרַֽא וַרְשַׁמְּוָֽו וַיִּתְּנ֣וּ פֶּן... It is obvious that the chances of an actual conflation will considerably increase in cases in which a variant reading is superscribed or ascribed without any accompanying critical symbols.

IQIs* 36:11

Is. 36:11  
Is-a: דָּבֵרָה רָאָֽה  
MT: דָּבֵר וַיִּתְּנ֖וּ פֶּן... 

The redundant לַחֹ֣מֵן of Is-a, which has no equivalent in the VSS, was entered in the right hand margin exactly in line with the following word לַחֹ֣מֵן. לַחֹ֣מֵן is a parallel reading of לַחֹ֣מֵן with which the preceding line ends. Thus we

24 Cp. e.g. Is. 49:14 where the non-Massoretic superscribed emendation is deleted by "pointing" in favour of the basic אָלַּי יָרַֽע (= MT).

25 Kutscher (op. cit., 430) assumes that לַחֹ֣מֵן in the first part of Is. 36:11 echoes לַחֹ֣מֵן in the
have here a true variant-notation, a Qerɛ-type entry which was registered alongside the Kethib-type reading סינְו, and was never meant to be integrated into the text proper. However the probability of its integration is much furthered by the favorable manuscriptal conditions which could easily induce a copyist of Is-a to take בְּאֶפֶן as an integral part of the original text-base.

We can now proceed from hypothetical to actual routine conflation. While in the preceding instances Is-a was presented as a possible basis for an ensuing doublet in an imaginary MS for which it might have served as the Vorlage, in the examples to follow the faulty doublet actually occurs in Is-a.

We presume that a reading cum superscribed emendation lies at the basis of the following doublet in Is-a 51:11 which, however, was emended post facto, by the erasure of one of its components.

The extant text of Is-a reads here ספָדֵד יִשְׂבַּה מַהֲרוֹרִים which, as against ספָדֵד יִשְׂבַּה מַהֲרוֹרִים of MT which is supported by the VSS. In the parallel, Is. 35:10, both MT and Is-a read ספָדֵד יִשְׂבַּה מַהֲרוֹרִים. Moreover, whereas the root מַהֲרוֹרִים is represented twice more in the Book of Isaiah (1:27; 29:22), מַהֲרוֹרִים is not found in it at all. Even if one assumes that the sectarian scribe substituted מַהֲרוֹרִים for מַהֲרוֹרִים under the influence of scriptures which use מַהֲרוֹרִים in reference to Israel's dispersion (Jer. 50:17; Joel 4:2; Esth. 3:8), his reading still must be considered the lectio difficilior, with a fair claim at originality. Accordingly, מַהֲרוֹרִים may be deemed a synonymous reading of מַהֲרוֹרִים, and its textual equivalent. This equivalence is further indicated by the fact that מַהֲרוֹרִים actually had been written also in the text-base of Is-a where it preceded מַהֲרוֹרִים, but was subsequently erased, possibly by a second hand. If indeed this was the case, the scroll initially contained the doublet מַהֲרוֹרִים מַהֲרוֹרִים which, as we assume, resulted from a conflation of the main reading with a supralinear or marginal variant which the scribe of Is-a had found in his Vorlage.

second part of the parallel verse 2 Ki. 18:26 — יְשַׁבֵּית. This supposition is highly improbable in view of the fact that in Is. 36:11b Is-a altogether deviates from MT, and from the parallel reading in 2 Kings.

26 G: καὶ ἔλευσεν τὸν ἥρων; T: ספָדֵד יִשְׂבַּה מַהֲרוֹרִים; S: מַהֲרוֹרִים דְּמַהֲרוֹרִים. 27 Cp. Kutscher, op. cit., 207.
28 Cp. Kutscher, op. cit., 433. A similar situation may underlie the present text form of Is-a in Is. 2:4:

The crossing out of מַהֲרוֹרִים and the superscribed lamed bring Is-a into conformity with MT, whereas in the preceding instance the erasure fortified the deviance of Is-a from MT. The reading of Is-a indeed may be explained as a conscious, or unconscious harmonization with the first stichs of the verse (Kutscher, op. cit., 489), but in itself it is the lectio difficilior. מַהֲרוֹרִים with the dat. pron. lamed is found in the parallel passage Mic. 4:3, and prevails in the OT (Job 32:12; Prov. 9:7, 8; 15:12; 19:25, and esp. Is. 11:4), whereas מַהֲרוֹרִים is found only twice (Gen. 31:37; Job 9:33).
IV

Now we can turn to the premeditated retention of parallel readings by conscious conflation, as reflected in Qumran Biblical MSS.

We find in the Scrolls, just as in the MT and the VSS, fully-fledged doublets which have been already incorporated in the basic text. These may be arranged under the following two headings:

1. Doublets which are reflected also in extra-Qumran Bible texts, and therefore obviously are rooted in an all-Jewish (not specific-sectarian) textual tradition.
2. Doublets which are found only in Qumran MSS. These cases, which may be assumed with much probability to have arisen at Qumran, illustrate the collation activities of the sectarian scribes. At the same time Qumran MSS, and especially Is-a, present instances of interlinear or marginal critical notations which in MT or in one of the VSS have become part and parcel of the main text. Here the Qumran material fulfills two functions:

3. (a) It illustrates the manuscriptal conditions which are the basis of double-readings, and enlightens us on the technical aspects of conflation. (b) It assists in the discovery of presumed doublets in other extant text-traditions of the Bible.

Not in all cases are we in a position to determine the sources from which the constituent variants of a doublet were culled, due to the paucity of non-standardised textual traditions which survived the normalising attention of scribes and revisers. Yet often one of the components of a doublet (e.g. in Is-a) turns up as a single reading in the MT or in one of the extant VSS. This can cause no surprise in view of the disparity of the textual traditions of the Biblical books which may be observed at Qumran. In the same fashion as the harmonization of variant readings by conflation was practised by Greek or Aramaic translators and copyists, and by scribes of the MT, it was employed by the Covenanters. Also in this respect the atmosphere of scribal activities at sectarian Qumran resembles that which prevailed in normative circles.

At the present, our interest lies with the particular Qumran text-traditions, and not with the text of a given Biblical book as such. Accordingly all the illustrations to be adduced quite naturally will be cases of textual deviations of a Qumran MS from the MT and/or from one or more of the ancient VSS.

1. Double-readings in Qumran MSS which presumably derived from a Vorlage.

a) In Is. 37:9 the reading of Is-a: 

\[ \text{ירשמ מירשל מלאכומ} \]

undoubtedly combines the MT wording in Is.

\[ \text{ירשמ מירשל מלאכומ} \]

with that of the MT parallel in 2 Ki. 19:9

\[ \text{ירשמ מירשל מלאכומ} \]

29 Cp. DRMT, 133. The sectarian scribe's awareness of the MT readings in 2 Ki. chs.
Since the doublet is reflected also in G: καὶ ἄκοος ἄπαστρεψεν⁵⁰ καὶ ἀπ-έστειλεν ἀγγέλου, it may be considered as being derived from a text-type which was utilized both by the sectarian scribe and the Greek translator.

b) Isa. 51:23 Is-a: שַׁמָּחֵת בַּעֲבוֹדֵי מְנָנֵךְ אַשְׁרָא אֲרוֹרִים לּוֹסֵכְסִי וְצַחְרַיִךְ<br>MT: שִׁמְחַת בַּעֲבוֹדֵי מְנָנֵךְ < אַשְׁרָא אֲרוֹרִים לּוֹסֵכְסִי וְצַחְרַיִךְ<br>G: καὶ ἀπεστάλη ἀγέλος αἱ ἡ τῶν χειρῶν τῶν ἄδικησάντων σε καὶ τῶν τετευλισόμενων σε<br>T: אָמַרְרֶה בַּעֲבוֹדֵי מְנָנֵךְ לָתָּתָּתָּתָו<br>S: בִּכְי מִכְּבָּבִי<br>

Here, as in many other cases, it cannot be decided by any objective means whether the MT, probably supported by T (ep. Isa. 49:26), and S (?), has a defective text, or whether Is-a indeed presents a conflation. If, by rule of thumb, the shorter MT reading is taken to be original, the redundant מְנָנֵךְ of Is-a may be explained as an interpretative gloss of the hap. leg. מֵסְכָּנֵךְ or else simply as a parallel reading. The two roots נָבָא and נָבָא are employed in parallelismus membrorum in Lam. 3:33. Whatever the case, the doublet is proved to antedate the text of Is-a by its appearance in the translation of G.⁵¹ It is possible that the common Vorlage was influenced by the similarity of ideas and expressions in Isa. 60:14: מְלֵא הָאָדָם אַלֹ נֶשֶׁת (וכל) בְּעָדָתָם מְנָנֵךְ אַשְׁרָא אֲרוֹרִים לָתָּתָו מְסָכְסִי וְצַחְרַיִךְ וַּתִּשְׁחַתָּו עַד פָּהַר רוֹדֵל (וכל) מְסָכְסִי עַד פָּהַר רוֹדֵל מְסָכְסִי יִשְׁחַתָּו בְּעָדָתָם מְסָכְסִי עַד פָּהַר רוֹדֵל מְסָכְסִי יִשְׁחַתָּו בְּעָדָתָם מְסָכְסִי עַד פָּהַר רוֹדֵל.<br>

c) 1 Sam. 2:24-25 Q Sam:<br>אֲלֵי בָּוָא שָׁמִיר אֲנָכָּא וְאַרְכֵּךְ שָׁלוֹם<br>MT: אל בה אל כל שָׁמִיר אֲנָכָּא וְאַרְכֵּךְ שָׁלוֹם<br>G: μὴ τέκνα διὶ οὐκ ἁγαθῇ ἤ ἁκούῃ ἤν ἔγω ἁκούῳ μὴ πουεῖτε σὺν οὗτοι διὶ οὐκ ἁγαθαὶ αἱ ἁκοις αἱ ἔγω αἱ ἁκοῖς.<br>

The Qumran text is very fragmentary. However, the restoration, as proposed by its editor F.M. Cross, Jr.,⁵³ may be considered almost certain, in view of the fact that it differs from those found in the parallel account of Is. chs. 36–39, and his utilization of both text-traditions, significantly illuminate the early textual history of the Book of Isaiah. This issue will be discussed in a separate publication. ⁵⁰ In the Origencian tradition the word is shown to be an addition to the Hebrew text by means of an obelus. ⁵¹ This fact has fathered the suggestion (BH) to insert בַּעֲבוֹדֵי מְנָנֵךְ (ep. Is. 49:26) after בַּעֲבוֹדֵי מְנָנֵךְ. G renders מְנָנֵךְ — θεσσαλον. Accordingly, we may assume that the, with regard to MT, redundant καὶ τῶν ταυταπώσαντων σε in Is. 51:23 indeed stands for Is-a καὶ τῶν ταυταπώσαντων σε in Is. 51:23 indeed stands for Is-a. ⁵² The Greek words in question are absent from Aq., Sym., and Orig. ⁵³ The second line is omitted in the Luc. tradition, and in some late witnesses. ⁵⁴ F.M. Cross, Jr., “A New Qumran Biblical Fragment Related to the Original Hebrew Underlying the Septuagint,” BASOR 131 (1953) 15–26.
of its virtual identity with the Greek rendition. Again it can be stipulated that the doublet was found in a textual precursor of 4Q Sam which both the Qumran copyist and the Greek translator used as their Vorlage.

2. Doublets which arose in the basic textual tradition of Is-a.

In the examples to follow only one of the components of a presumed doublet in Is-a is yet extant singly in other textual traditions. Accordingly we assume that here conflation arose in the Qumran Scroll. In some cases this assumption can be supported, though not proved, by circumstantial evidence. The decision to classify these double-readings as intra-Is-a confluences can be maintained only as long as the doublets are not found also in extra-Is-a traditions.

a) A clear case of an extended variants-combination may be found in Is. 38:19–20. The two verses actually are mere reiterations with only slight variations in spelling, and one possible sense-variant. At the same time it is obvious that Is-a adhered to a sentence division which differs from that of the MT, and probably underlies also G. 34

19 (a): יִדְּרֵשׁ אֲדֻמָּה הַמֶּרֶצֶר אֶל אֲמַכֶּךָ הֶלֶשֶׁפִּינְי
20 (b): יִדְּרֵשׁ מֵמוֹנָה הַמֶּרֶצֶר אֶל אֲמַכֶּךָ הַלוֹשֹׁפִּינְי

None of the extant witnesses to the Book of Isaiah exhibits this doublet which thus is shown to be of particular Qumran vintage. It is obvious that the doubling could not have resulted from a scribal mistake, as is suggested by Kutscher, and this for two reasons:

Accidental dittography of complete syntactical units may be assumed only when evident manuscript reasons can be adduced to back up this assumption, mainly homoioteleuton or homoiarkton. Neither of these can account for the present doublet in spite of the phrase סדר אֲמַכֶּךָ which in MT recurs at the end of both v.18 and v.19. According to the proposed syntactical analysis, in Is-a the phrase does not close v.19, but is followed by לְשׁוֹפִּינְי which with which the verse ends.

Against the assumption of accidental doubling militates the even weightier fact that the textual peculiarities of the (b) reading which exhibits a defective spelling (אֲמַכֶּךָ, יִדְּרֵשׁ) are against the plene spelling of the (a) text (אֲמַכֶּךָ, יִדְּרֵשׁ) were faithfully preserved.

On ground of the spelling alone we can confidently state that the (b) variant stems from a text-type which differed from that of the Is-a text-base, where,

34 Some further concurrences of sentence-division between Is-a and G against MT, were discussed by the present author in “DSⅠa as a Witness to Ancient Exegesis of the Book of Isaiah”, Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute (= ASTI) 1 (1962) 62–72.
plene spelling prevails. On the other hand, the interlinear and marginal corrections in Is-a often are distinguished from the basic text by their defective spelling. Compare e.g. the superscribed הָאָדָם in 43:3 with the lower-case האדמ. Thus we may surmise that variant (b) in 38:20 and some of the marginal or interlinear corrections were derived from the same extra-Is-a text, or text-types.

Can this Vorlage of the (b) reading be further defined? The variant of (b) סֵפִירְיָה, as against סֵפִירְיָה of (a), is of no help. But the remaining varia lectio אָבָל might point the way. It is evident that (b) here reads the divine epithet אָלָה (אָלָה) instead of the proposition אָלָה in MT.36 The (b) reading is not supported by any other witness, whereas the MT variant is possibly, although only poorly, attested in S’s rendition of אַלִּי אֲמַרְתִּי by the direct object הָוָשֶׁם, reflected also in the redundant paraphrase אָלָה בְּרֹכֶהְתָּךְ of T.37 Sym.’s ἐπὶ τής ὀλίγειας σου seems to mirror הָוָשֶׁם / אַלִּי אֲמַרְתִּי. The other VSS have preserved a medial stage between אַלִּי of MT and אַלִּי of (b). T’s main reading: אַלִּי קְשֵׁית, and possibly also G’s: אָלָה אָלָה, which is clarified by the marginal καὶ τοῦτο ἀναγγείλατι in MS. Q and Syr. Hex., reflect the consonantal base of MT and (a) vocalised אָלַי, which is the apocopated form of the demonstr. pron. הָוָשֶׁם. For the Targum this was already recognized by Qimḥi ad loc. who comments: “It appears that Jonathan translated this אַלִּי as if (it were pointed) with sere, like אָלָה בְּרֹכֶהְתָּךְ (Gen. 26:3, 4).” He then goes on and quotes with disapproval Ibn Ezra who, following T, interpreted אַלִּי אֲמַרְתִּי to mean אָלִי אֲמַרְתִּי — “these are the creeds/tenets”. It seems, in fact, that Qimḥi suspected Ibn Ezra of implying that he had based his comment on an actual variant vocalization אָלִי, since he emphatically professes: “In no book have I seen אָלַי pointed otherwise than with segol, and in the construct-state with אֲמַרְתִּי.”38

The vocalization of אָלַי as the plur. demonstr. pron., as it tranpires from the Aramaic and Greek renditions, and from Ibn Ezra’s commentary, is now supported by the consonantal variant אָלָה found in the incomplete Isaiah Scroll (Is-b). However, we cannot be certain whether the scribe of Is-b, like T and G, took אָלָה to represent the plur. demonstr. pron., or whether he

36 Here we differ from Kutscher (op. cit., 432) who maintains that אָלַי simply was omitted in the (a) reading, as is the case in MS. Ken. 96.
37 I.L. Seeligmann, The Septuagint Version of Isaiah (Leiden,1948) 69, considers אָלִי אֲמַרְתִּי of MT the probable original reading.
38 For סֵפִירְיָה see S. Loewinger, VT 4 (1954) 157, n. 3.
considered it a defective spelling of הָֽלַכָּה, siding with (b). But it may be
considered as certain that the copyist of Is-a thus interpreted the consonantal
group הָלַכָּה in his (a)-type Vorlage, and transferred it to his own MS with the
waw filled in, as a variant reading.

If the textual development indeed followed the above reconstructed pattern,
the doublet in Is-a 38:19–20 would give witness that the scribe of Is-a collated
a proto-Massoretic with a (proto-) Is-b text with the resulting conflation of
the present (a) and (b) variants.

From here follow some further considerations which will be discussed at
a later stage.

b) Is. 14:2

לָֽלַכָּה נָפָֽשׁ עָמָֽשׁ רָבִּים הָֽבְּרוֹמָֽי אֶל אָרְמָֽתָּהּ וְלָֽכָּה
MT: < < מְקֻמַּת
T(P): לָֽלַכָּה נָפָֽשׁ רָבִּים הָֽבְּרוֹמָֽי אֶל אָרְמָֽתָּהּ
T(R): יְרָבָֽוָמָֽי לָֽלַכָּה
G: σικ τὸν τόπον αὕτον

The conflation of לא אָרְמָֽתָּהּ with לא מְקֻמַּת is found in Is-a only. In this case both the conflated
readings are preserved singly in extant textual witnesses: לא מְקֻמַּת is the
reading of MT, G, S, and is reflected in one branch of the T tradition (Cod.
Reuchlinianus, ed. de Lagarde), whereas another MS of T (Bibl. Nationale
MS. 1325) mirrors the parallel reading לא אָרְמָֽתָּהּ. This circumstance de-
cisively weakens Kutscher’s implied suggestion that Is-a merely harmonized
of v. 2a with (ב) לא אָרְמָֽתָּהּ.

c) Is. 35:9

מִֽכַּוֲךָ שָֽׁיָּהָ יִוְּלָדָֽו
MT: < < יִוְּלָדָֽו

The double negation לא לא מִֽכַּוֲךָ, which has no equivalent in MT or the VSS,
suggests that the scribe of Is-a conflated two readings. In view of the fact
that Is-a faithfully retains the twenty odd occurrences of מִֽכַּוֲךָ יִוְּלָדָֽו in the Book of
Isaiah, and by virtue of the plene spelling of לא לא which is characteristic
for the Is-a base, this latter variant should be deemed primary in the present

39 Not mentioned by Kutscher op. cit., 429.
40 If one accepts Gottstein’s supposition, for which no manuscriptal evidence can be
adduced, that T originally had the compound reading לָֽלַכָּה נָפָֽשׁ רָבִּים הָֽבְּרוֹמָֽי (Biblica 35
[1954] 35), the doublet in Is-a would have to be classified as derivative from a Vorlage.
41 See also Kutscher, op. cit., 430. In Is. 33:21 the two words are employed synonymously
in parallelismus membrorum.
42 Among these are found three cases of triple בֵּל in one verse (33:20; 40:24; 44:9), and
three of double בֵּל (26:10; 14; 33:23).
43 One MS Ken. — בֵּל.
setting. Thus must be considered a synonymous reading which was collated into the MS from a (proto-) Massoretic-type text, such as e.g. Is-b.

d) Is. 62:7

Is-a:数控 너בר יכונן דוע ישיאقطع ויהי באה ביצים

Is-b:数控 너בר יכונן דוע ישיא القطע ויהי באה ביצים

MT:数控 너בר ישיא القطע ויהי באה ביצים

T:数码 너בר ישיא القطع ויהי באה ביצים

S:数码 너בר ישיא القطع ויהי באה ביצים

G: δώσα διορθώσαν και πονηθήσαν

The synopsis of all the extant witnesses to this verse reveals a typical case of textual expansion if the Is-b reading is considered original, or of contraction in Is-b if MT or one of the VSS is chosen as departure point for the textual comparison. Either way, Is-a exhibits a conflated reading.

The shortest reading, with only one verb in the sentence, is found in Is-b. Its preserved text is very fragmentary indeed, but may be reconstructed as follows: 45 האל הנחתור דרמך 44数控 ישיא القطע ויהי באה ביצים. The reading לול in MT and Is-a (=T) which is supported by G’s עון, proves that Is-b presents here a deviant text tradition, to which also the absence of המיד in the preceding verse (found in all other VSS) gives evidence. Viewed against this background, the omission in Is-b of MT’s and Is-a’s עון cannot be considered a lapsus calami resulting from homoioloarkton.

MT and all the VSS have two verbs, the first of which is obviously doubled in Is-a:数控 너בר יכונן דוע. Since this duplication has no parallel in any other witness, it may be ascribed, with much probability, to the scribe of Is-a. What it boils down to is a combination of two forms of the causative of the hif’il formation שיבך and the polel formation שיבך. Both formations are found in the Book of Is., in MT as well as in Is-a: the hif’il in 9:6; 14:21; 40:20 (MT: התה), Is-a: התה); the polel in 45:18; 51:13; 54:14 (MT: התה), Is-a: התה). Stilistically one cannot be preferred over the other, and they must be considered

44 The reading of Is-b in 62:6-7: האל הנחתור דרמך, lets one suspect that in MT and Is-a this obvious doublet was camouflaged by variation to read: האל הנחתור דרמך, G has preserved only the first component of the suspected doublet:数控 너בר יכונן דועם עון. The main tradition of T exhibits the first variant in an apocopated form (K: לול; b: לול; K: לול; b: לול). 45 Cp. Zeph. 3:19: שמותה לההליך לול עון, Nowhere in the Bible does ו秾 carry a double object. May we assume two possible basic readings for Is. 62:7, namely数控 너בר יכונן דועם עון and数控 너בר יכונן דועם עון. !

46 In the lacuna between the preserved ר of רוע and the final ב of the following word, there is room for four to five letters at most.
synonymous. One is inclined to postulate that the scribe of Is-a called them from two MSS that were at his disposal, and conflated them in his copy.

e) Is. 40:19 Is-a:

MT:...

T:...

G:

Aq.:

The redundant reading of Is-a which is reflected in T’s ֶתַּבָּר, S’s ֶתַּבָּר, and G’s ֶתַּבָּר probably is a variant of MT: ֶתַּבָּר (miswritten in Is-a as ֶתַּבָּר), which was correctly rendered ֶתַּבָּר by Aq. More confident than Kutscher, and in spite of the garbled syntax of Is-a, we tend to propose that its scribe conflated a MT-type and an extra-Massoretic reading in his copy.

f) Is. 30:6 Is-a:

MT:...

All the VSS concur here with MT in recording only two appositions to ָבָרָא as against three in Is-a. The word-pair ָבָרָא ָבָרָא is found again, though divided, in Is. 8:22, and once more, with a slight variation, in Zeph. 1:15: ָבָרָא ָבָרָא also in Deut. 28:53, 55, 57. Jer. 19:9; Ps. 119:143. Never is the redundant reading ָבָרָא combined with either. This makes the Is-a reading a lectio difficilior which can hardly be explained by Kutscher’s contention that ָבָר — “parished land” — arose in the text under the influence of ָבָר (MT: ָבָר) in the continuation of the verse. Accordingly we are led to assume that ָבָר is a variant reading for either ָבָר or ָבָר (possibly due to graphic confusion) which was incorporated by the scribe into his text.

g) Is. 40:18 Is-a:

MT:...

MT here has the support of all the VSS. The variant reading of Is-a, which in fact constitutes a doublet, accordingly must be considered an inner-Is-a

47 A somewhat similar situation obtains in MT to Is. 35:5. Cp. DRMT, 177.
49 Kutscher (op. cit., 429) compares Ps. 63:2. As a contrasting image also Is. 41:18 = Ps. 107:35 can be adduced.
development. It appears that the scribe combined two wordings of an idea which is found twice in ch. 40, in v. 18 and again in v. 25, and which are kept distinct in MT and the VSS. The basic difference between them is in that one refers to God, the direct object, by the noun הים and the 3rd. pers. pron. יִהְיֶה; while in the other He, being the speaker, refers to himself by the 1st pers. pron. יִהְיֶה and the pronominal suffix יִהְיֶה:

v. 18: יִהְיֶה אָלָמָה הָיָה דַּמֶּחֶת הָעֲרָבָּה
v. 25: יִהְיֶה עָמַּדְתָּ תְדֹרִים

h) A fairly obvious case of conflation of two interrogative particles may be found in

Is. 36:19 Is-a: וְכִי תַחְנוּ הָעָצִים
MT: וְכִי

The VSS support MT in that only one interrogative word is mirrored in them, but it is not possible to decide which of the two: יִהְיֶה or יִהְיֶה was in their respective Vorlage.

The non-MT variant חֲזָה יַחַלֵּי עַמֶּה constitutes the retention of a form which had been already employed in the preceding verse (36:18, MT = Is-a), whereas יִהְיֶה is a variational form of interrogation.

A class by themselves are the doublets which result from a combination of parallel readings that present the same word-stock, but differ in the word order.51

i) Is. 22:14 Is-a: אֶמֶר לְךָ לְשׁוֹנָה הָהּ לֵךְ וְיָלָם
MT: אֶמֶר לְךָ לֵךְ וְיָלָם
T: אֶמֶר לְךָ לְשׁוֹנָה
S: לֵךָ לְשׁוֹנָה אֶמֶר לֵךְ
G: יִתְחָלֵל אָמַּר לָּךְ לָבֵן עַמֶּה ַךָּמָרְפָּא

One of the readings conflated in Is-a had the pers. pron. לֵךָ precede the subject לֵךָ. This order — אֶמֶר לְךָ לְשׁוֹנָה — which also is reflected in G and S, is well represented in a Yemenite textual tradition, as evidenced by the quotation of the verse in one Yem. MS of the Bab. Tal. Ta’anit 11a, and in some MSS of the (Yem.) Midrash ha-Gadol to Gen. 37:29 (MSS. מְדִרשְׁ הִגְדוֹל; ed. M. Margulies 637, 18), and to Ex. 32:6 (MSS. מְדִרשְׁ הִגְדוֹל; ed. M. Margulies 447).

50 Kutscher (op. cit., 56, 250, 447) assumes a mere contamination of v. 18 by v. 25, but this seems unlikely.

51 Examples of inverted word-order in Is-a in comparison with MT, were assembled by Kutscher, op. cit., 450–451.
681, 9). In the other reading the pers. pron. followed upon the noun. This is the arrangement of MT, supported by T, and one MS of G.\textsuperscript{52}

The difference in spelling גלעמה against גלעמה may point to the derivation of the two readings from different text-types.\textsuperscript{53}

j) Is. 57:18 Is-a: אַשֶּׁר ἐλέος ἔχεις שָׁם לְאָבָנִים
MT: וַחֲמָם בְּנֵי אָבָנִים
T: וַאֲשֶׁר חֲמָם בָּנֹי אָבָנִים
S: וַחֲמָם בְּנֵי אָבָנִים
G: καὶ ἐδοξάσει αὐτῷ παράκλησιν ἀληθινήν

The reading of MT (= T, S), in which the dat. pron. וַחֲמָם follows upon the direct object, was conflated in Is-a with the reading presented by G in which it precedes it. The force of the G evidence is somewhat weakened by the omission in its translation of the second dat. object בְּנֵי אָבָנִים. This may have caused the transfer of the dat. pron וַחֲמָם. However the same word-order is maintained also in MSS of G, in Aq., Sym., Theod. and Orig., where the missing clause is restored.

k) Is. 64:1 Is-a: הִבְשָׂמָה אַשֶּׁר לְעֶרְיָה לְחִירָדְנִים שֶׁמֶם לְוָרָכַר
MT: הִבְשָׂמָה אַשֶּׁר לְחִירָדְנִים שֶׁמֶם לְוָרָכַר
G: καὶ κατακαύσει πῦρ τοῦ υἱοῦ ὑπεναντίου καὶ φανερῶν ἔσται τὸ δύναμις κυρίου ἐν τοῖς ὑπεναντίοις
T: הִבְשָׂמָה שֶׁמֶם לְוָרָכַר

In view of the exegetical difficulties inherent in this verse it cannot be decided for definite whether the first לְעֶרְיָה simply was omitted in MT (followed by T, Sym., Theod,) or whether it accrued in Is-a (followed by G). In the first case, לְעֶרְיָה would be the dat. object of both the verbs שֶׁמֶם and לְחִירָדְנִים. In the second a conflation of the following two readings must be assumed:

לְעֶרְיָה לְחִירָדְנִים שֶׁמֶם לְוָרָכַר

Also the most closely amalgamated type of conflation found in MT, the crossing of two variants in one word which results in hybrid readings, is not absent from Is-a.

1) Is. 1:31 Is-a: לְאָבָנִים לְעָרֹרֵי שָׁם לְרוּחִי
MT: לְאָבָנִים לְעָרֹרֵי שָׁם לְרוּחִי

Here the Is-a reading results from the combination of a noun defined by

\textsuperscript{52} Cp. J. Ziegler (ed.), \textit{Isaias} (Göttingen 1939) \textit{ad loc}.

the def. art. נַחֲתָה (MT) with its parallel definition by the 2nd pers. plur. poss. suffix נַחֲתָהּ which is reflected in the 3rd pers. plur. poss. suffix found in the main VSS — G: ή λαχάνις υβριν

T: נַחַתְךָ אֲחֹלֶת

S: שְׁמוּרְךָוֹן

m) The enigmatic נַחֲתָה (MT) against נַחָתָה (Isa) of Isa 34:14 can possibly be explained as a hybrid reading. We propose tentatively that the scribe combined the otherwise attested נַחֲתָה, some sort of desert - being (Is. 13:22, Isa: אוֹדֶנָה; Jer. 50:39), with the hap. leg. נַחָתָהוּ (Gen. 36:24) which carries a similar connotation. The VSS are of no help here, since the Heb. synonyms would be similarly translated.

n) An uncompleted case of hybrid reading of the same type may be found in Is. 30:23 where the present text of Isa-a אֶדֶם אֶדֶם has been superimposed upon the variant אֶדֶם אֶדֶם אֶדֶם אֶדֶם. The hē at the end of the word אֶדֶם clearly is a correction of an underlying taw. The initially intended definition by the 2nd pers. sing. poss. suffix עָדֵם אֶדֶם אֶדֶם אֶדֶם (G: τῆς γῆς σου) was superseded by the definition with the aid of the def. art. אֶדֶם אֶדֶם אֶדֶם אֶדֶם (MT; T: אֶדֶם אֶדֶם אֶדֶם אֶדֶם). Conflation possibly may explain the following reading of Isa-a.

o) Is. 61:6 Isa-a: 56 הַנָּחַת הַנָּחַת הַנָּחַת הַנָּחַת MT: בִּלְתִי הִנָּחַת הַנָּחַת הַנָּחַת

The phrase הַנָּחַת הַנָּחַת תַּחְתָּוִי is a crux interpretum. No satisfactory derivation for הַנָּחַת תַּחְתָּוִי has been proposed. T: נַחַתְךָ אֲחֹלֶת, S: נחַתְךָ אֲחֹלֶת, and G: קִשְׁרֶה אֲחֹלֶת are of no help. But the Isa-a reading in conjunction with Aq.'s rendition may point the way.

We assume for Isa-a a combination of the MT spelling (possibly

54 Cp. Josh. 7:21), תַּחְתָּוִי (ib. 8:33), תַּחְתָּוִי תַּחְתָּוִי תַּחְתָּוִי תַּחְתָּוִי (2 Ki. 15:16), and see DRMT, 178-179. After considering the possibility of conflation, Kutscher seems to prefer the doubtful explanation that the scribe of Isa-a (inadvertently?) transferred from one determination to the other in the process of writing (op. cit., 445).

55 The possibility was suggested by Kutscher, op. cit., 238 (אַרְעָי) who tentatively explains the form as a combination of אַרְעָי אַרְעָי אַרְעָי אַרְעָי (ib., 165). Mr. A. Hurvitz has drawn my attention to a comparable case of proper nouns conflation in the Genesis Apocryphon XXI, 29, ed. N. Avigad and Y. Yadin (Jerusalem 1956). Here a seeming combination of אַרְעָי אַרְעָי (Gen. 14:5) with אֶדֶם אֶדֶם (Deut. 2:20) resulted in אֶדֶם אֶדֶם אֶדֶם אֶדֶם.

56 At first sight this could be explained as a plene spelling of הַנָּחַת תַּחְתָּוִי with the alef serving as mater lect. for patah. Cp. Is. 30:31 MT: אֶדֶם אֶדֶם אֶדֶם אֶדֶם.

57 Cp. E. Nötcher, VT 1 (1951) 300: מֶרֶד אִשָּׁר מֶרֶד אִשָּׁר מֶרֶד אִשָּׁר מֶרֶד אִשָּׁר מֶרֶד אִשָּׁר.

58 J. Ziegler (op. cit., 168) following Fischer and Wutz, supposes that influence of Aram. מֶרֶד אִשָּׁר, and of the in content similar passage Is. 60:5 may explain the use of תַּחְתָּוִי in the instance under review.
reflected in Sym.’s στηρύνωσετε with a spelling which is mirrored in the renderings of Theod. and Aq.

Theod.’s ὑψωθησότα is clearly derived from אָמֵר אַמְרֵי (אַמְרֵי) = “branch”, “tree-top” (?). In a different connotation רַמֵּה appears to be reflected in Aq.’s rendition: πορφυροθησότα, (faultily quoted by Hier., in his commentary as: πορφυρα ἐνέκουσετε).

We propose that the translator here had in mind the Rabbinic “hem of a garment”, which sometimes was made of purple, cp. Mishnah Nega'im 11, 10: הלוק שעראה ודג מפלי אפי אחלקיו נבח בפל ירומק. In translating כֵּי דַּבְּרֵה הַיָּדוֹן πορφυροθησότα, Aq. probably took הבכּרָדִים תַּנָּאָר to mean: “Ye will put on their splendour (like) purple”, thus exhibiting his familiarity with Rabbinic language. We may assume that this same concept underlies the conflated reading of Is-a.

p) Is. 57:17 Is-a: יָשֵׁרְכָּה מַעֲלָה מָזוֹן
MT: יָשֵׁרְכָּה מַעֲלָה מָזוֹן
G: καὶ ἀπέστρεψα τὸ προσωπὸν μου ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐλιπῆθεν
T: עליך תִּעֲבֹר וָרְאֹת אֶזְאַבִּית תַּנָּאָר do not bear on the issue.

Kutscher explains the redundant ἡδ of Is-a as aram. influence. Thus both verbs would be (inverted?) imperfects. However, a case can be made for the supposition that Is-a contains a fully developed doublet which may be observed in statu nascendi in MT. The underlying alternative variants then would be יָשֵׁרְכָּה מַעֲלָה מָזוֹן — יָשֵׁרְכָּה מַעֲלָה מָזוֹן.

The assumption that in one variant כְּפָנִים was read as an absolute inf. is borne out by the vocalization of the way with shewa in MT, and by G’s rendering it as a 3rd. pers. sing. which points to a consonantal stock קפן without the prefixed aleph of the 1st pers. sing. imperf.

q) Is. 11:9 Is-a: יְדַע הֶדֶע הֶדֶע
MT: יְדַע הֶדֶע הֶדֶע

Here, as in similar cases in the MT, we postulate that in Is-a the 3rd pers. sing. fem. perf. דָּעַה (MT) was conflated with the parallel imperf. form דָּעַה which possibly is reflected in T’s: דָּעַה, and S’s: דָּעַה.
3. (A) Is-a readings and corrections which constitute the basis of double-readings found in MT.

a) On pl. iii, 20–25 (Is. 3:15–18) Is-a three times records the tetragrammaton accompanied by what in the MT is considered its Qerê perpetuum — רָאִיָּה. In v. 18 the Tetragrammaton is written in the line, with אַלֹהִים inserted on top of it. In v. 17 the situation is reversed. In both cases the superscribed reading is presented as a correction by the “pointing” of the lower-case reading. Here the corrector quite clearly indicated the superiority of, or his preference for the superlinear variant. Obviously this is a matter of choice which is not rooted in the intrinsic primacy of one or the other reading since the correction alternately goes both ways, but rather derives from the idio graph of the Vorlage used by the corrector, which was not identical with the MT. MT reads in both verses הרָאִיָּה. In both these instances the substitution character of the superscription is made manifest by the pointing of the variant to be deleted. This is sufficient safeguard against the mistaken combination of the two by a later copyist. We encounter a different situation in the remaining instance, the first in the row of three, which has a direct bearing on the issue on hand, the emergence of double-readings. In v. 15 the superlinear רָאִיָּה is added without the deletion of the lower-case Tetragrammaton (cp. also 28:16; 30:15; 65:13). It is impossible to decide whether the omission of the deletion-points is due just to a lapsus calami on part of the corrector, p.m. or s.m., or whether the express purpose of the correction was the restoration of what the corrector considered to be an accidentally missing רָאִיָּה. Thus the superscribed word would constitute not a variant of the one in the line, but rather an addition to it. The latter assumption derives support, though not proof, from the MT which in fact reads the double-name יהוה רָאִיָּה. The doublet, and such it appears to be, accordingly did not arise in Is-a, but rather stems from a proto-Massoretic text-type which possibly preceded Is-a, but certainly is external to its textual tradition. Thus Is-a p.m. represents the earliest text-form of this specific case, Is-a s.m. the transitional stage, and MT the ultimate double-phase, also present in Aq.: κυρίος κυρίος (παπα παπα).

b) Is. 24:4 MT: אָמָלִל וּמִרְּחַם שְׁלֹאָרִים
          Is-a: אָמָלִל וּמִרְּחַם שְׁלֹאָרִים

As Kutscher correctly observed, the reading of the verb in the sing. (אמָלָל) proves that the lack of שְׁלֹאָרִים in the text-base of Is-a is not just a case of faulty omission, subsequently corrected. The shorter text of Is-a underlies also the renditions of G (of ὅσηλοι τῆς γῆς) and S (רָאִיָּה דָּרִים) which have no equivalent for שְׁלֹאָרִים. This is moreover missing also in one MS Ken. T follows MT: שְׁלֹאָרִים. Accordingly the reading (דָּרִים שְׁלֹאָרִים may be conceived of as a
parallel of (תמרות) which in Is-a was collated between the lines from a not anymore extant text-type. At a subsequent copying for which a MS of the Is-a type served as Vorlage, the superscribed variant was misconstrued as a corrected omission, and was reinstated in the text proper. This resulted in a doublet, as exhibited by the present MT.

In passing we may observe that a similar conflation of (תמרות) (תמרות) (תמרות), the very opposite of (תמרות) (תמרות), occurred in the MT of 2 Ki. 24:14: אל גבעה חל רוח הירש על ותתול. Here again the word is not translated in G: of רוחי רוחי. It appears that in this case the two basic readings may still be found singly in parallel passages:

2 Ki. 25:12: ו לחלות במעה
Jer. 39:10: וฌו עמה במעה
Jer. 52:16: ו לחלות במעה
Jer. 52:15: ו하실ות במעה

65

The shorter basic reading of Is-a, without the (redundant?) כנין, underlies the main Targumic tradition: יסעור食べו and Theod.: ...םו ישעור食べו הקדש. It also is found in one MS Ken. The parallel reading כְּנֵי כּרִי, which was interpolated between the lines in Is-a, is found singly in G: ...םו ישעור食べו הקדש. MT, followed by G: ...םו ישעור食べו וlogan הקדש, S: ...םו ישעור食べו כּרִי and some witnesses of T (L[RN]): כּרִי כּרִי כּרִי, presents the double reading which resulted from the integration of the superscribed variant into the text proper.

The shorter basic reading here has the support of T: והי הום מייר הרם מואר כּרִי, and possibly of S: ...םו ישעור食べו יטר. One MS and some printed editions of T (bogf) though mirror MT: ...םו ישעור食べו יטר. G does not render the verse at all. Aq., Theod. and Sym. restored the missing passage in complete agreement with MT. The same pertains to Orig.67

In view of T's (and S's) concurrence with the base of Is-a, we are inclined to assume that the superscribed variant constitutes a variant notation which at a subsequent stage of copying was embodied in the main text, thus creating the doublet found in MT.

65 These passages will be discussed separately.
66 Cp. Kutscher, op. cit., 439 who, though, fails to mention the evidence of T and Theod. which supports the basic Is-a text.
e) Is. 61:1 MT: יָנָן מַשָּׁה ַּחֲיָֹת עָנָּרָֹים שָׁלְשִׁים לְהָבְשָׁת לְשָׁהְרִים לְלָֹֽךְ אֲלִיל הֶ־לָּֽךְ.

Is-a: יָנָן מַשָּׁה ַּחֲיָֹת עָנָּרָֹים לְהָבְשָׁת לְשָׁהְרִים לְלָֽךְ

 MT is supported by all VSS. The shorter Is-a text may well have resulted from the omission of שלשִׁים which subsequently was restored as a superscription. However the waw prefixed before בַּלְּהָבְשָׁת makes it quite clear that cannot have been an integral component of the basic Is-a reading, unless it is conjoined with לְשָׁהְרִים (שלשִׁים), against the Massoretic sentence division. It therefore may be surmised that the superscribed שלשִׁים represents a variant reading שלשִׁים לְשָׁהְרִים, not otherwise attested, which the writer or corrector of Is-a collated into his copy. If that is the case, MT would exhibit a faulty conflation of the two variants. While לְהָבְשָׁת לְשָׁהְרִים appears to be the smoother expression (cp. Ez. 34:4, 16), the reading שלשִׁים לְשָׁהְרִים can be maintained, by its comparison with 2 Sam. 10:3 – כי שלש לֹא מָחֲמָב; Ps. 111:9 – דְּהוֹדָה שלש לֹא מָחֲמָב. In the first reading the whole series of infinitive constructs, לְבַשֵּׁר לְלָֽךְ etc. would be dependent on the finite verb מַשָּׁה וְאֵּֽֽ֑י. In the second, only לְבַשֵּׁר would be dependent on מַשָּׁה, while the finite would open a new series of infinitive constructs.

3. (b) One more category of double-readings in the MT, on which the Qumran Scrolls throw light, remains to be mentioned. These are readings in which a Qumran MS will exhibit only one component in its text-base, without any superlinear or marginal variant-notation, as against a fully fledged doublet in the MT. Some such instances have been discussed by the present author in a previous publication in which the MT served as the point of departure.68 Further suggestions are made in what follows.

It goes without saying that in many cases of a supposed doublet in the MT, the single reading in the Is-a which serves as the controlling standard can be interpreted as a defective reading resulting from faulty omission. The situation is comparable to the choice between a dittography in one text or a haplography in another, where either decision would result in a satisfactory reading. A good example of such a situation may be seen in

Is. 3:22 MT: המָולִיצְתָּה הַמַּעֲשָׁתָה הַמְּתָמְשָׁתָה וְהוֹרְאוּתָה רָוָּי מַשָּׁה

Is-a: במָולִיצְתָּה הַמַּעֲשָׁתָה וְהוֹרְאוּתָה רָוָּי מַשָּׁה

Here the Greek and the Targumic evidence appears to support MT, and a haplography in Is-a is as good an assumption as a variant conflation in MT.

68 DRMT, 162 (Is. 14:12), 163 (12:2), 168 (35:8), 169 (37:18), 177 (25:5).
It is possible, though, to present the in Rabbinc Hebrew widely used מcollapse (found only once in the OT, Ruth 3:15), as an interpretative reading of the *hap. leg.* מcollapse which is extremely rare also in Rabbinc language (Tos. Kelim B. B. 5, 4; ed. Zuckerman, 595).

The scales can be tipped in favour of the doublet assumption whenever it is supported by one of the following:

Concurring evidence of an independent ancient Version.

Where no such support is forthcoming:

One component of the double-reading can be shown to be redundant on grounds of metrical, syntactical or sense considerations, or else can be explained as a harmonizing intrusion from a parallel passage.

We shall open this series with the analysis of a MT reading which already at some previous occasion was presented as arising from conflation by its comparison with a parallel MT reading, and with its rendition in G, and whose doublet-nature now can further be substantiated with the aid of Qumran evidence.

a) 2 Sam. 5:11 MT: קֶרֶשׁ נָשִׁי אֲדֹנָי קָר

4Q Sam.a: קֶרֶשׁ < קָר

We postulate that the redundant אֲדֹנָי in MT represents the reading אֲדֹנָי which is yet extant in G ד: קַיִּיַּבְרָם לֵיתָן, and for which cp. also 1 Chr. 22:15 – קָרָה נָשִׁי אֲדֹנָי (G: אוֹלֶקָדְם לֵיתָן וַקָּרָה נָשִׁי ְבֶלַעֲדוֹנָן).

The synonymous Qumran variant קָרָה N ish turns up in MT and G of the parallel passage, 1 Chr. 14:1,70 and in the Lucianic tradition (οἱ,e) ד: קַיִּיַּבְרָם לֵיתָן. The MT doublet underlies two Greek minuscules: קַיִּיַּבְרָם לֵיתָן. T paraphrases: Αὐτοῖς ὕποτασσόμενοι βοήθησαν ἔνας τελείως. It is feasible that this arose out of the Heb. אֲדֹנָי, which in MS. y possibly turns up as אֲדֹנָי after the rendition of קָרָה נָשִׁי אֲדֹנָי.

b) Is. 26:6 MT: תֶּרֶמְסָהּ רֵאִי רְבָּעָה שֶמֶם דָּליִם

Is-a: רֵאִי > תֶּרֶמְסָהּ

The redundant בֵּרָע (sing.) of MT, which is the reading of S ד: רֵאִי, has no equivalent in the Greek tradition, and is also absent from one MS Ken. It is, probably, a variant of בֵּרָע (plur.) which was inserted into the text base (= T).

69 This passage will be published by F.M. Cross, Jr., in his forthcoming paper in *HTH*,
70 In inverted order: קָרָה נָשִׁי אֲדֹנָי.
71 Cp. S: קָרָה נָשִׁי אֲדֹנָי נָשִׁי אֲדֹנָי.
c) A probable case of conflation, possibly involving a misreading, is the following:

Is 59:13 MT: דָּבֶר עָכֶס עָכֶס וַיֶּחֱרָה חָרָה מַלֶּל דָּבֲּרִיתָם
Is-a: דָּבֶר עָכֶס עָכֶס וַיֶּחֱרָה חָרָה מַלֶּל דָּבֲּרִיתָם

The VSS support the consonantal base of MT as it stands and follow also the Massoretic sentence division, which has a break after דָּבֶר וַיֶּחֱרָה חָרָה together with וַיֶּחֱרָה חָרָה as the regnant verbs of דָּבֶר. All the Greek sources, and S (סנהד) derive from נָרָה פַּרְעֹר "to conceive, to become pregnant". G and Sym. render it by κόσμησις, Theod. and Aq. by (ἐν γάστρι) λαμβάνειν. Thus understood דָּבֶר makes a poor parallel for the remaining verbs דָּבֶר and הָנָה, and at the same time clearly shows the translators’ dependence on an earlier verse in the same chapter, 59:4. There הָנָה פַּרְעֹר parallels וַיֶּחֱרָה חָרָה, and is again rendered by κόσμησις in G, these being the only two instances in which G employ this verb in the OT. It is feasible that וַיֶּחֱרָה חָרָה intruded into MT 59:13 from v. 4, possibly due to the correspondence of ideas expressed in those two verses, and the further similarity of the phrases employed in them – v. 4: דָּבֶר שַׁמֶּה; v. 13: דָּבֶר עָכֶס. If that is the case, the combination הָנָה וַיֶּחֱרָה חָרָה would not constitute a true doublet.

However, with some grammatical license, וַיֶּחֱרָה חָרָה can be, and probably should be derived from נָרָה פַּרְעֹר – "to teach, to instruct", as was done, and correctly so, by some mediaeval commentators, e.g. Qimḥi (in his father’s name), and Rashi (as a second proposition to its derivation from נָרָה פַּרְעֹר “to shoot, to throw”, for which he quotes Ex. 15:4). דָּבֶר thus would make an excellent alternative reading of מַלֶּל דָּבֲּרִיתָם ... מִתְבַּלֶּל ... דָּבֶר פַּרְעֹר 75 and could well be taken as a variant notation which was conflated with the basic reading. The restored two variants, individually make for a better metric structure than the present doublet:

דָּבֶר עָכֶס וַיֶּחֱרָה חָרָה מַלֶּל דָּבֲּרִיתָם

d) Is. 57:18 MT: מַלֶּל דָּבֲּרִיתָם נַחֲמִית לְלַאֲכָלִי
Is-a: מַלֶּל דָּבֲּרִיתָם נַחֲמִית לְלַאֲכָלִי

The renditions of G: καὶ παρεκάλέσασθαι 77 αὐτῶν, T: יראתיהם עליתון and S: יראתיהם עליתון convincingly show that MT נַחֲמִית 78 probably should be emended.
to read נָפַּה (cp. BH). In that case, נָפַּה could well be a parallel variant of נָפַּה 79 which in this combination is not found again in the OT, 80 whereas the pi'el of נָפַּה is recurrently employed in the Book of Isaiah and elsewhere to describe God’s reconciliatory intentions for Israel (49:13; 51:3, 12; 52:9; 61:2; 66:13; further 40:1; 54:1; 12:1). Thus the redundant נָפַּה would have to be considered a variant-gloss which intruded into the text-base of MT (but is missing from two MSS Ken.), and resulted in a cumbersome lengthening of the second half-verse.

e) Is. 24:22 MT: נַפְּפִלֵנָה אַטָּפָר עַל בָּרָר מִכָּנָר < אַטָּפֶּה

On ground of the lopsided parallelism and the unwieldy structure of the MT, and in view of the fact that G renders only בָּרָר ... נַפְּפִלֵנָה of the first half-verse, 81 Seeligmann raised doubts as to the original authenticity of the words מֵכָּנָר. 82 He then hesitatingly, although to my mind correctly, suggested to take מֵכָּנָר as a corrupted variant gloss of מַכָּנָר, namely מַכָּנָר. This assumption derives further support from the Origentic and Lucianic traditions which do render מַכָּנָר but again omit מֵכָּנָר: וְיֵצְאוּ בוֹא וְיֵצְאוּ בוֹא שָׁם מַכָּנָר בַּמֶּשֶׁר וַיֶּעָה בַּמֶּשֶׁר. The Hebrew original of this reading which is also reflected in T: וְיֵצְאוּ בוֹא וְיֵצְאוּ בוֹא שָׁם מַכָּנָר בַּמֶּשֶׁר, has now been recovered in Is-a, whose text, at the same time, witnesses to the originality of מַכָּנָר.

We therefore can endorse, with only a slight adjustment, Seeligmann’s conclusion that the variant notation מַכָּנָר < מַכָּנָר, 83 “must have crept into the Hebrew text during the centuries that elapsed between the composition of the Septuagint and that of the later (Greek) versions”, since Sym.’s rendition, as quoted by Eus., already reflects the word in question: וְיֵצְאוּ בוֹא שָׁם מַכָּנָר יֹאָסְרוּ דְּשֵׁמִיּוֹ וְיָזְעוּ וְיָזְעוּ דְּשֵׁמִיּוֹ. The additional phrase מַכָּנָר is obviously stems from Theod., as maintained by Seeligmann, 84

79 G translate נַפְּפִלֵנָה as פָּסַר and לְשֵׁם in 61:3 – נָפַּה. Did they read the same verb in both verses? An interchange between פָּסַר and לְשֵׁם can be observed also in 1 Sam. 2:20 MT: פָּסַר תַּחְנוּל עַל כָּלָה, 4 Q Sam*: לְשֵׁם פָּסַר (= G: יָשָׁמֵר). See: F.M. Cross, Jr., BASOR 132 (1953) 22.

80 The noun מַכָּנָר is found twice more in the OT, Hos. 11:8 and Zech. 1:13. In Is. 66:11 מַכָּנָר is employed, for which cp. Jer. 16:7, and Job 15:11; 21:2 (יראתה). None of those is construed with לְשֵׁם.

81 The additional phrase מַכָּנָר is obviously stems from Theod., as maintained by Seeligmann, ib.


83 Possibly representing מַכָּנָר אַטָּפָר אַטָּפֶּה or some reading like it.
In the following two instances the doublets assumedly found in the MT, occur in the form of hybrid readings:

f) Is. 63:3  MT: מְלֹכֵי מַלְכוֹת יָאָמָלִים
Is-a: מְלֹכֵי מַלָּכָּה

The phrase is missing in G, and is rendered paraphrastically in T: מְלֹכֵי הֵרְוֹחֶיךָ. Sym. and the Luc. revision restore: καὶ πάντα τὰ ἑνὸματα μου ἐμὸλονα. The queer form נָאָמָלִים has been explained as a possible Aramaism, or simply as a miswritten נָאָמָלִים (BH), which latter we find now in Is-a.

We suggest to explain נָאָמָלִים as a combination of the not extant נָאָמָלִים with the alternative variant נָאָמָלִים (=Is-a, and S: מַלָּכָּה). The former would take up the 1st pers. imperf. which is mirrored in יָאָמָלִים and יָאָמָלָה of MT (cp. also ...ד). These words are omitted from Is-a whose text here is much shorter. The latter (נָאָמָלִים) would follow the 1st pers. perf., as found in the opening of the verse.

An identical conflation of a perf. with an imperf. form, is found in the Scroll reading to Is. 11:9: מַלָּכָּה, MT: מַלָּלָה.  

...g) Is. 23:11  MT: וַיִּזְכֹּר אֶל כַּנֵּסָּה מָעְנִיךְ
Is-a: וַיִּזְכֹּר אֶל כַּנֵּסָּה מָעְנִיךְ
G: ἀπολέσαται αὐτῆς τὴν ἁρχήν
t: לִשְׁמָאָתָהוֹ כְּבֹדָהּ

Kutscher offers the learned but unconvincing explanation of the unusual MT reading as possibly being an attempt on behalf of the prophet to employ a characteristically Phoenician plur. ending ב instead of the usual ב ending. He admits though that the ב ending never is found in inscriptions with an appended 3rd pers. plur. fem. poss. pron.

We suggest that מָעְנִיךְ in MT arose from a conflation of מָעְנִיךְ of Is-a, for which cp. in this context (Is. 17:9; 23:4, 13), with a parallel reading מֶעָנִיךְ, which is not extant for the passage under review. The synonymy of מֶעָנִיךְ and מָעְנִיךְ as an epithet of God can be proved

1. from their serving alternately in combination with a third synonym — מָעְנִיךְ.
Joel 4:16: וַיִּזְכֹּר אֶל כַּנֵּסָּה מָעְנִיךְ יְהוָה
Ps. 91:9: כִּי אָאָתָה ה' מֶעָנִיךְ לְעֹלָם מָעְנִיךְ

86 Cp. above, p. 117.
88 The plur. of מָעְנִיךְ is found only in Dan. 11:19, 38, 39.
89 The plur. מֶעָנִיךְ from מָעְנִיךְ is not extant in the Bible. מֶעָנִיךְ occurs in Jer. 21:13; Na. 2:13; Job 37:8; 38:40; Cant. 4:8.
2. from their being employed alternately in one and the same context,
Jer. 16:19: יד הַשָּׁבָּעַת מִמְּכֹר יִשְׂרָאֵל
Ps. 90:1: יִשָּׂרָאֵל מְכֹר הָעָנָא לֵאמֹר

3. from their being used alternately in a recurring passage,
Ps. 31:3: יִדְעֹת לִבְּךָ מַעֲשֵׂה
71:3: יִדְעֹת לִבְּךָ מַעֲשֵׂה

In both passages a noun derived from מַעֲשֵׂה is found in the continuation,
31:5 — יִדְעֹת מָכָס וּנְעָרֵי יִדְעֹת מָכָס וּנְעָרֵי

V

The coexistence at Qumran of varying text- formations of the Bible, and the absence of any noticeable attempt at establishing one universally recognized recension of binding force, must have confronted the Qumran scribes with the problem of what attitude to take towards these conflicting not yet assessed and rated textual traditions. The individual scribe could solve this problem by adhering faithfully to the MS which he had chosen, or had been assigned, as the Vorlage for his own copy. In a reasonable number of instances, such as were discussed above, he could perpetuate parallel readings which he found in other MSS that were at his disposal, by noting them in the margins or between the lines of his own copy or, sometimes, by integrating them in his text-base. Now, these devices, which were a common stock-in-trade of the ancient Bible scribes regardless of their socio-religious affiliations, are mere practical expediences that may work fairly well, up to a certain point, for the individual copyist, but cannot satisfactorily solve the problem of the community's disposition towards divergent, but equally well documented, readings. In Bible MSS which are intended for public use, critical annotations must be kept to a practical minimum. In fact even these relatively few marginal entries will tend to disappear at subsequent copyings by sheer routine omission, unless they are absorbed into the text proper. Even where authoritative guidance is absent we may find a spontaneous tendency towards the simplification and the stabilisation of the textual traditions of the Holy Writ and other hallowed books. This process cannot be expected to culminate in complete unification, but it will effectively circumscribe the scope, and reduce the number of textual

90 Cp. further Is. 25:4; Na. 1:7; Ps. 27:1; 28:8; 37:39, et al.
91 Some MSS of MT read here יִשָּׂרָאֵל. Also a graphical confusion of י-י may have caused the interchange. Cp. Josh. 15:29 where the MT reads יִשָּׂרָאֵל for the patently correct יִשָּׂרָאֵל (G ad loc. and MT Neh. 11:27).
92 Cp. DRMT, 146-150.
types which are allowed a continued existence, until, if ever, conscious official redactional activities set in.

The impending gradual disappearance of variant readings which, on objective grounds, could not be declared to be intrinsically inferior to those which happened to have taken root in the predominant textual traditions, may well have been viewed with misgivings by those concerned with the preservation of Scripture. The practical advantage of traditing a fairly standardized textbook for communal-cultic purposes was set off by an understandable apprehension for the unrecoverable loss of, to all appearances, valid and venerated textual traditions of the Biblical books, which per force would result from the above outlined process. Contradictory as it may sound, such pro and ante deliberations seem to have produced diverse techniques of non-manuscriptual variant preservation which helped balancing the tipped scale of the favoured text-tradition(s) that became increasingly predominant, to the exclusion, and the, to all intent and purposes, complete suppression of less favoured variæ lectiones.

Here again, a comparison with attitudes and techniques that were current in the normative community is in order.

The prevalence in Rabbinic circles of trends of thought, such as were outlined above, may have been responsible for the perceptible latitude in the employment of the Bible text in scholarly discussion which conspicuously contrasts the unceasing efforts to establish an exclusive textus receptus for public worship and for official text-transmission. Whereas deviant readings were banned from books which were earmarked for these latter categories, they were readily accepted and used as bases for Midrashic exposition.\(^93\) In fact, at times it appears that such an officially discarded variant was not employed merely as just a convenient peg upon which to hang a Midrash that was on hand, but rather that the Midrash in question was constructed on a variant that had been barred from the textus receptus in order to give it a non-manuscriptual lease on life. This supposition especially applies to the specific type of the ‘al tigrè Midrash,\(^94\) in which an established text is suspended, as it were, and another reading becomes the point of departure for an ensuing Midrashic comment, by means of the introductory formula: “do not read..., but rather read...”. A famous case in point is the ‘al-tigrè Midrash (Bab. Tal. Berakot 64a) which hinges on reading in Is. 54:13 – בְּנוֹּיִם – “thy builders”, instead of MT: בְּנוֹיִית – “thy sons” (cp. G: τέκνα; T: בְּנֵי), a variant which now has turned up in Is-a as an emended reading: לְבָן.\(^95\) Similarly, the Midrash:

---

\(^93\) Cp. TSL, 14–15; 386–374 (1932).

\(^94\) בְּנוֹיָאשֵׂהוֹ, אַל הָעָקָר, אֶת חָסְדֵאֹהוֹ, אָנָּא נָקְבִּים שָׁם הָאָנָּא בְּנוֹיָאשֵׂהוֹ.

\(^95\) Cp. Kutscher, op. cit., 171 who points out that the Midrash appears to echo the reading
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Aṣ-ṣalāt (Bab. Tal. Shab. 33a)\textsuperscript{96} can be anchored
in the different textual traditions of Is. 9:19. Here the MT (= Is-a) reading:
יאש ברעיוו (ו)כעל — “they shall eat every man the flesh of his own
arm” (G: τοῦ βραχίονος αὐτῶν) is abandoned, as it were, for a variant
ורו - “his offspring”, which underlies T’s paraphrastic rendering: מבר כמא כייכ
ו, and Sym.’s rendition: τοῦ πλησίου αὐτῶν. Both readings seemingly were
conflated in the main stream of G\textsuperscript{AB}: τοῦ βραχίονος τοῦ δεξαύων αὐτῶν.

We do not propose that every extant al-t. Midrash can be shown to have
arisen from a yet identifiable textual variant. This certainly is not the case.
\textit{Variae lectiones} which supposedly triggered off the emergence of many
a Midrash of this type have been lost for us, together with the (suppressed)
MSS which exhibited them. Here is a possible example. Is. 2:22 (missing in
G) warns before reliance on man “for wherein is he to be accounted of” —
בכף ח_market תבש הח לא הרל מביר זרב S: של מובakit ארבע שלבישה,
and Aq.: ביר וידא יבגיט רבדי אנד. Now this phrase,
among others, is employed in an al-t. Midrashic comment on Prov. 16:5
(Bab. Tal. Sotah 4b) as p r o o f that “everyone that is proud in heart is an
abomination to the Lord”: “Ula said (he is considered) as if he had built a
bamah”, and then goes on to quote Is. 2:22, winding up with: “אלא חנק תבש ולא
לכף”. At first glance it appears that here a mere different vocalization of
the same consonantal group is involved. But the fact that the point of departure
for the exposition in question is a Biblical proverb which castigates “the proud
in heart”, suggests another possibility: an interchange between ב and ר, with
the resulting reading רומ in Is. 2:22. This word can be construed as a (synonymous)
parallel of הבכ (Ez. 16:24, 25, 31, 39), and in fact sometimes is textually confused
with it (Jud. 4:5 MT: רומ, G\textsuperscript{B}: בםαι; 1 Sam. 22:6 MT: רומ, G\textsuperscript{BL}: הבכ; cp.
DRMT, 157–158). Or else רומ can be derived from \textit{רומ} — “to be exalted.”
In an association with הבכ (Prov. 16:5) this would bring to mind the expression
רומ - \textit{hybris} which recurrently is referred to in Is. 2:11, 12, 17, adjacent
to הבכ in 2:22. Interestingly, this latter concept emerges in the V rendition
of Is. 2:22: \textit{excepsus} reputatus est ipse, which accordingly also may be
based on a reading רומ.\textsuperscript{97}

Moreover this specific type of Midrash progressively degenerated, and ultima-
of Is-a, and stresses the fact that the first זכ ע in MT of Is. 54:13 was retained in
Is-a. Also in 49:17 Is-a reads זכ ע instead of MT: ע. But there the copyist may have
been influenced by the context. See. H.M. Orlinsky, \textit{Tarsis} 24 (1954) 4 ff. Cp. further the
Midrashic comments in Bab. Tal. Sotah 12b on 1 Chr. 2:18, and in Cant. Rab. 137
on Cant. 1:5 where זכ ע respectively is implied instead of MT: ע, respectively
זכ ע.

\textsuperscript{96} Cp. Yalqut on Isaiah \textit{ad loc.} (ed. J. Spira, 75), \textit{et al.}

\textsuperscript{97} Cp. Kedar’s remarks in the present volume, p. 183.
tely the 'al tigrê formula often was employed, even when the Midrash in question could not be related to an actually extant reading, by definition originally a sine qua non requirement, and had become a mere exegetical Špiellement.98 Vice versa the introductory formula of a genuine 'al tigrê Midrash often was dropped, so that now the same exposition sometimes is preserved in parallel versions, both with and without that formula.99

These short remarks which are intended but to sketch cursorily the genesis and some phases of development of the 'al tigrê Midrash lead one to presuppose the existence of a transition stage from manuscriptal notation to extra-manuscriptal Midrashic preservation of Biblical variant readings. It appears that also these aspects of text-transmission can yet be traced in Qumran writings.

A few comments on the textual character of the variants which assumedly underlie the 'al tigrê Midrash, and many a Midrash not so designated, are called for, before we enter into a discussion of the pertinent Qumran material.

In a majority of cases the textual variations involved are of the simplest and most common types: interchange of graphically similar letters or of auricular close consonants; haplography or ditography; continuous writing of separate words or division of one word into two; plene or defective spelling; metathesis, differences of vocalization, sometimes entailing a change of verb conjugation. Some cases of more complicated textual phenomena do not affect the overall impression.

With respect to the issue on hand, we note that only under exceptionally favourable circumstances can we hope to find the very same reading recorded both as a variant-notation in a yet extant Hebrew manuscript or as a double-translation in one of the VSS, and at the same time also in its non-manuscriptal form as the basis of an 'al tigrê Midrash. Such a propitious concurrence of independent evidence characterizes the following instance, although in the Midrashic factor the 'al tigrê formula is not present.

98 This and related techniques of variation on Biblical themes in Midrash-exegesis, were discussed and illustrated by I.L. Seeligmann in his valuable study "Voraussetzungen der Midraschexegese", Suppl. to VT I (1953) 150-181, esp. 159-160.

99 The Sam. variant in Num. 11:32 – (אֲלַל תִּגְרֶ) as against MT תִּגְרֶתְו (ed. Blayney) as against MT תִּגְרֶתְו as against MT תִּגְרֶתְו. The Sam. reading is reflected in an al-t. Midrash in Sifre Num. § 98 (ed. Friedmann 26b) which is adduced in extenso without the introductory formula in Bab. Tal. Yoma 75b; Jer. Tal. Nazir 53c IV, 6, and in Yalkut Shim'on I, 635 on Num. 11:32. Another Sam. variant in Ex. 12:17 – (אֲלַל תִּגְרֶ) as against MT תִּגְרֶתְו as against MT תִּגְרֶתְו appears to underlie the al-t. Midrash (cp. Rashi ad loc.) in Mekilta d'Rabbi Ishmael, Tractate Pišta, ch. 9 (ed. Horovitz-Rabin, 32; ed. Lauterbach, 74) which again is quoted without the formula in Mekilta d'Rabbi Shim'on b. Yohai (ed. Epstein-Melamed, 22:3); cp. further Rashi to Bab. Tal. Yoma 33a; Meg. 6b.
In this case a double translation of the two letters גְּל in G (and possibly also in T) to Ps. 29:1 is involved. The crucial passage in MT: בֵּית הָלָחְנוֹן בִּנֵי אלִים is rendered by the Greek translator: ἐνέγκατε τῷ κυρίῳ ὑοίον θεῷ
ἐνέγκατε τῷ κυρίῳ ὑοίος κριθῶν,
and by T: בֵּית הָלָחְנוֹן יִשְׁתַּרְשֵׁהוּ אָנָּא מְאָבָא בְּנֵי אלִים.
Here the first line in G, and the first phrase in T, conceive of the underlying Hebrew text as of an invitation to divine beings, ὑοίον θεῷ — בְּנֵי מְאָבָא (athanas), taking God in the vocative as a plur. of the common noun גְּל = god (cp. Ex. 15:11; Ps. 89:7; Dan. 11:36, et al.). In its general meaning the passage thus may be compared e.g. with Ps. 97:7 and Job 38:7, to which latter also Ibn Ezra ad loc. alludes. This most natural explanation is further reflected in the Rabbinic tradition which identifies מְאָבָא רָתֶח — מְאָבָא שְׁרָת יִשְׁתַּרְשֵׁהוּ,100 However the second rendition of G — ὑοίος κριθῶν — clearly derives from the plene spelling בְּנֵי עַדְּלִים = “(young) rams” (for which cp. בְּנֵי רַמִּים in v. 6), construed as the syntactical object, and paralleling מְאָבָא in the second half-verse. The same possibly also applies to the redundant בְּנֵי עַדְּלִים in T, and certainly to Jerome’s translation: adhírite filíos arietum.

The above evidence indicates that the variant spelling עַדְּלִים at some time or other was extant in manuscripts, and was retained in the extra-Massoretic Greek tradition in the form of a variant notation (cp. also T). In the Massoretic manuscript tradition this variant-reading עַדְּלִים was discarded to the exception of some odd copies. But it did enjoy a Midrashic after-life. Shoheir Tov ad loc. (ed. Buber, 116) relates בְּנֵי עַדְּלִים to Israel, who are likened to helpless sheep over whom God will appoint David as shepherd; or again, and this time more in line with the Greek-Latin conception, presents Israel as “the sons of men slaughtered like sheep. Abraham said: I slaughter, Isaac said I am slaughtered”.

As already stated, this example is a rare case in which are yet preserved both ends of the transition process: the textual variant-notation in the form of a doublet in one (set of) extra-MT witness(es), side by side with the Rabbinic tradition in which the variant that was ejected from the MT was made the basis of a Midrash. However, ordinarily we shall have to content ourselves with illustrating the transition from one phase to the other by drawing on examples which individually reflect only one of them, but which, if viewed in conjunction, typologically represent the transition-process in toto.

We now can revert to the double-reading in Is-a 38:19 which was discussed on page 109, and in which we seem to discern the typical characteristics of a potential 'al tiqré Midrash. Again the pregnant consonant combination גְּל is involved.

100 Cp. Seder Eliahu Rab. ch. 2 (ed. Friedmann, 12).
As noted, Is-a here records in its text-base the variant ודריע אלוהים אבוקך alongside ודריע אל הָאָבָן אֵלָה אָיֵו אוֹפַּה which is the reading found in MT. The transition from MT אלוהים to Is-a אלוהים, or vice versa, may be considered as textually exceedingly simple, especially since a potential intermediate stage – אלוהים – is yet extant in Is-b. We thus may take as certain the manuscriptal coexistence, towards the end of the Second Temple period, of the above three readings which most probably derived from one another, either in the order יא → אלוהים → אוֹפַּה אוֹפַּה → אוֹפַּה → אלוהים → יא. The problem of the actual historical development is of no relevance to the present issue. The scribe of Is-a obviously did not feel competent to decide on the respective merits of יא and אוֹפַּה, or else deemed both worthy of preservation, and therefore, rather than choosing between them, integrated the two readings in the text of his copy.

At this juncture we are well within the phase of manuscriptal variants notation which, however, took place in one witness only, viz. Is-a, whereas in our other Hebrew sources and in the ancient VSS a decision was reached as to the retention of one reading and the rejection of the other(s). Now, it does not require much imagination to visualize the discarded variant אוֹפַּה cropping up in Midrashic literature in the formulation: אוֹפַּה אֱלָה אוֹפַּה אֱלָה אֱלָה אֱלָה אֱלָה. True, such a Midrash is not extant, to my knowledge, but it would have been in the very best tradition of the type to embark on an exposition which utilizes the simple graphic or linguistic variation אוֹפַּה — אוֹפַּה — אוֹפַּה which was found in Biblical MSS for the fashioning of an exegetical comment with theological or ideological undertones.

This pattern of development indeed can be observed in Qumran writings of the pesher-type which shares many features with the Rabbinic Midrash without being identical with it. In this setting we can perceive the simultaneous utilization of variant readings for expository purposes when only one of the given possibilities is quoted as actual Scripture. Here are three illustrations of the phenomenon in question.

a) Hab. 1:11 MT: יא אלוהים אתChelsea רוח יְבֹרֵךְ וּמָכַח. The MT reading, which derives בּוֹרֵךְ וּמָכַח from כּוֹרֵךְ וּמָכַח — “to be guilty”, is supported by G: אֵלָה and T: בּוֹרֵךְ. In the ensuing comment, which is based on the first part of the above Scripture, 1QHb clearly shows acquaintance, both with its own Biblical reading and also with that of MT (G, T), and with the Massoretic sentence-division: שָׁמַר (א) על מַעֲרָלָהנוֹת אָוֶר נֲשַׁמַּת הָאָבָן (ב) יָסַר יָסַר מַעֲרָלָהנוֹת בּוֹרֵךְ וּמָכַח (ב). The second pesher (b), in which the salient word is מַעֲרָלָהּ — “to despoil, to lay waste”, in all probability mirrors יָסַר of the Vorlage from which 1QHb quoted, the verb being understood as derived from מָכַח. The first exposition (a), in which מָכַח
“[their] house of guilt” is the pivotal expression, obviously is based on ושען as found in the MT which reading, though, is not explicitly quoted. However, it is possible that this very reading actually was adduced furtheron in IQHp (IV, 14–15)\(^{101}\) where another pesher is introduced, but was lost for us in a lacuna: ...וְזָרָה נַחֲרָם לְשֵׁרֵת אֶת ה’ וְאֶת הָאָרֶץ. If this indeed can be maintained, we would have here what amounts to a variant-notation, in quotation, together with two Midrash-like expositions which are based alternately on the one and the other of the parallel variants.

b) Hab. 2:16 MT: שָׁתַה בְּגָיוֹן מַעַרָּרָה - “drink thou, and uncover yourself”\(^{102}\) is quoted in IQHp XI, 9 as: שָׁתַה בְּגָיוֹן מַעַרָּרָה — “drink thou, and become intoxicated”, a change of concept which may have resulted from a simple metathesis. Here MT is supported by T, and IQHp by G,\(^ {103}\) Aq. and S.

The interesting feature of this example is that, notwithstanding his own reading וְאֶרֶץ, the author of IQHp sets his pesher to the tune of the MT variant וְאֶרֶץ in its obvious, but in Hab. 2:16 unsusuitable derivation from the root וָרָל — “uncircumcised”: מִכְּלָל מָלַא אֶרֶץ וָרָל — “he did not circumcise (the foreskin of) his heart”. Without employing the very formula, the pesher here exhibits the technical intricacies which characterize the Rabbinic ‘al tigré Midrash. We observe a similar suspension of an explicit Qumran reading in favour of an extra-Qumran variant which becomes the departure point for a Midrashic exposition.

The same factors seem to have been at work in the following instance, in which, though, the actual Biblical quotation was lost in a lacuna, and has to be restored by inference.

c) The first word on col. ii, 1 of IQHp מִפְּדֵם preceded by a lacuna at the lower margin of col. i, is the end of a quotation of Hab. 1:5, a verse which in the MT opens: רָאוּ נְתֵנָה נַבְרָעָה - “Behold ye among the nations, and regard...”. The pesher which is only partially preserved never mentions the word נַבְרָעָה - “nations”, but instead refers three times in a row to “the traitors” - הבנימין. It certainly can be postulated, as is done by I.L. Seelig-

\(^{101}\) Unless we assume that in this instance the sectarian author quoted only the second part of the verse starting, against the Massoretic sentence-division, with [םת], and now deriving the word from שָׁתַה.

\(^{102}\) This appears to be the required translation of the phrase, rather than RV: “and be as one uncircumcised”. וּרְאֹל here should be taken in the meaning ofירא. The metaphor is rooted in a situation like the one described in the tale of Noah’s drunkenness (Gen. 9:2) which well may have been in the back of the prophet’s mind. In addition to the above similarity, cp. Hab. 2:17 – יִצְוָא יִבְּשָׁן כֹּכָּב – יִבְּשָׁן כֹּכָּב with Gen. 9:23 – יִצְוָא יִבְּשָׁן כֹּכָּב. Cp. further Lam. 4:21.

mann,\textsuperscript{104} that the Biblical Vorlage with which the author of 1QHp was familiar, in fact contained the \textit{varia lectio} בּוֹדֵנְיָה. But one also could postulate that 1QHp here presents a case of a typical variant-Midrash. Bypassing the reading בתּוֹדֵנְיָה which he actually may have quoted, the author anchored his actualizing paraphrase in a parallel variant בתוֹדֵנְיָה which he found in a manuscript of the text-type that seems to underlie G’s of \textit{kəxtaφ̄roνηταί}\textsuperscript{105}. Thus the emerging situation would be comparable to that which we encountered in the previous example.

The foregoing analysis leads us to conclude that the category of the variant-Midrash which in Rabbinic literature is best, though not exclusively, represented by the ’al \textit{tiqrê} type, in the Qumran writings is exemplified by the variant-
\textit{pesher}. The Qumran material thus offers proof for the high antiquity of this Midrashic category. At the same time the combined evidence of Qumran and Rabbinic techniques proves the contention that variant readings in the Biblical textual traditions were viewed with relative equanimity by both groups, and even were perpetuated by diverse manuscriptal and non-manuscriptal devices.

This conclusion opens up a new avenue of approach to the problem of the genesis and the early history of the \textit{Kethib-Qerê} variants, an issue which we hope to discuss in a separate publication.

\textsuperscript{104} In his review of K. Elliger, \textit{Studien zum Habakkuk Commentar vom Toten Meer} (Tübingen 1953) in \textit{Kerjath Sepher} 30 (1954) 40.

\textsuperscript{105} It is of interest to remark that a similar pair of variants may be observed in Prov. 10:3 where the Ben Chajim edition and some MSS read instead of הבוֹדֵנְיָה which is found in other MSS and printed editions, and also underlies the VSS.