THE CONTRIBUTION OF THE HODAYOT TO BIBLICAL TEXTUAL CRITICISM

P. WERNBERG-MOLLER

I

When the Hodayot were published under the editorship of E.L. Sukenik\(^1\) scholars lost no time in acclaiming them as being of the utmost importance, both from the theological, historical, literary, and text-critical point of view. Much attention has been devoted to the possible light shed by these compositions upon the theology of the Qumran community, the particular type of piety reflected in them, and their possible references to incidents in the personal life of the founder of the community. But no one has as yet examined in detail the very numerous Biblical allusions with particular reference to their recensional background.\(^2\) Indeed, in some quarters there seems to be a certain amount of scepticism as to the possibility of using the Hodayot for the purpose of textual criticism. It is admittedly true that the physical appearance of the manuscript (1QH), as well as the nature of most of the Biblical allusions in it, pose some grave methodological problems; but it would no doubt be unjustified, on those grounds, to write off a priori the relevance of a comparative examination of the Biblical allusions in 1QH. The textual significance of our manuscript lies in the light which it sheds on the text of the Hebrew Bible which is reflected in its Scriptural allusions. The question whether the author(s) merely paraphrased Scripture or quoted it loosely cannot be answered by vague considerations of a general nature, but only by establishing in every single instance, if possible, the precise passage to which the author(s) alluded — and by examining in detail the relationship of these quotations and allusions to MT and the VSS.

A study of 1QH along such lines shows on the one hand that the Hymns were composed at a time when the Biblical text was not yet finally fixed and

1 *The Dead Sea Scrolls of the Hebrew University* (1955), plates 35–58. The main points of the following article were already set out in a short paper read before members of the 25th International Congress of Orientalists in Moscow, on 11th August 1960. See the brief résumé in the *Proceedings* 1, 386 f.

2 Some general remarks on this issue may be found in M. Mansoor, *The Thanksgiving Hymns* (Leiden 1961).
authorized, and on the other hand that in their use of classical Hebrew phraseology and idioms the author(s) depended directly on the OT, and drew their inspiration from it. It has recently been said that "it is true in a number of cases that one cannot count on there being any question of an actual use of Scripture, even when there is a complete agreement of words and phrases. It may simply be a matter of the use of certain permanent phrases, stereotyped expressions, customary terminology, which may well have originated somewhere or other in the Old Testament, but which existed in the everyday language of the time. This would be the case, of course, particularly where it is not a matter of the ordinary language of the people, but of a special terminology, in this instance within the religious sphere". This point of view seems to me unjustified. One must not forget that the Hebrew Bible, with which the Scripture-studying covenanters were exceedingly familiar, was to the (Aramaic speaking) author(s) the prime, if not the only literary source for composing devotional hymns in classical Hebrew. In view of the evidence available it appears that in a large number of cases the author(s) of the Hymns depended directly on the Hebrew of the Bible, either in its Massoretic form, or in some other slightly different form. In this respect 1QH is similar to all the other non-Biblical MSS from Qumran, such as, e.g., 1QS and 1QM.

This direct dependence on the Hebrew Bible may be detected in 1QH in many instances in which the author(s) adopted, not merely characteristic Biblical words and idioms, but definite phrases or sentences which occur in closely definable Biblical contexts. It is reasonable to assume a direct dependence on a Biblical text wherever 1QH employs a seemingly unique expression or a reading which cannot be documented in the extant witnesses of the Bible text. It is well known that practically all the Biblical texts from Qumran (pre-eminently 1QI") exhibit readings and spellings which differ from MT, and that some of these readings are supported by one or more of the VSS. It should therefore cause no surprise if the Biblical allusions in 1QH should be found to reflect a similar state of variability and fluidity of the Biblical text. In fact, if the textual examination of 1QH were to show that the author(s) depended in every detail on the textus receptus, to the consistent exclusion of variant readings attested in the VSS, 1QH would hold a unique position among the Qumran ensemble because, as P.W. Skehan expresses it, "there is not now any good evidence... that the sect committed itself to consistently transmitting a standardized form of text for any Biblical book." There is evidence that

4 Cp. C. Rabin's general remarks on similar lines, in JTS NS 6 (1955) 174.
the Qumran community knew a proto-Massoretic text,\textsuperscript{6} at least of some of the Biblical books, but not as an exclusively authoritative text. The Bible was known in several Hebrew text forms during the time when the community flourished at Qumran, no one being absolutely identical with any other.

It should be kept in mind, however, that the differences between these various recensions were not great. Even IQIs\textsuperscript{a} which displays many minor, and some major deviations from MT exhibits very many points of essential agreement with the latter, both in wording and orthography. Again, the Massoretic tradition itself is not completely uniform. There are, within its framework, many textual and orthographical variants which have been carefully preserved through many centuries, from the earliest times.\textsuperscript{7}

Our investigation by its very nature requires meticulous attention to detail. It is only through an examination of this kind that we can form a precise idea of the relationship between the phraseology of the Hymns and the Hebrew Bible — and also an idea of the state of the Biblical text at Qumran at the time of the composition of the Hymns, and of the attitude of their author(s) towards it. The relevance of the ensuing investigation will lie mainly where a difference in IQH from MT finds some support in one or more of the VSS. In such instances we stand on firm ground and are provided with irrefutable proof that a variation from the received text in IQH may not be due simply to faulty memory or loose quotation or requirements of the context and so on, but must often be regarded as dependent on a Hebrew \textit{Vorlage} which differed slightly from MT. A Scriptural passage may be alluded to in more than one of the Qumran extra-Biblical MSS, displaying the same differences from MT without any support in the VSS. In such cases there is the possibility that the variant reading is a mere paraphrase or elaboration which originated with one Qumran author and was reproduced by another. This possibility applies, in my opinion, to the two cases quoted by C. Rabin.\textsuperscript{8} But where supporting evidence is available in the VSS such a possibility is eliminated.

Even where such external, confirming material is extant we may occasionally be forced to tread warily, because of the special nature of the Scriptural allusions in IQH. IQH is in a very poor state of preservation. Also the fact that we often have at our disposal a mere fraction of a sentence naturally interferes

\textsuperscript{7} I have dealt in some detail with this aspect of Massoretic tradition in "An Inquiry into the Validity of the Text-critical Argument for an Early Dating of the Recently Discovered Palestinian Targum", in VT 12 (1962) 312 ff.
\textsuperscript{8} \textit{Op. cit.}, 175 f. The passages concerned are IQH ii, 32, paralleled by CD i,18 (in their allusion to Is. 30:10), and IQS viii,9, paralleled by CD iii,19 (in their allusion to 1 Sam. 2:35).
with the exact text-critical evaluation of many instances in which some particular Biblical passage is clearly alluded to. There are in IQH very few cases of a Biblical quotation extending beyond four words. The hymn writer(s) more often than not would quote a mere two, or possibly three words of a passage. In the case of such a fragmentary quotation the recensional relationship, if indeed there is one, may be very difficult to determine. There are quite a number of cases in the plates I have so far examined where the agreement of IQH with one or several of the VSS against MT may be accidental. The author(s), in alluding to the Bible, for a variety of reasons may have changed — probably unconsciously — the exact Hebrew text of the Vorlage. In this process, quite accidentally and unwittingly, a text form could have been produced which in one or more of the VSS is attested as a real variant reading — or at least may be reasonably taken as such. One is up against precisely this difficulty in some cases involving the use or disuse of the copular waw, the definite article, certain prepositions, conjunctions, pronouns and suffixes. Similarly, there are some cases where it is impossible to draw a safe conclusion as to the existence of a real variant reading in IQH on the basis of the interchange of the plural and the singular in verbs, nouns and suffixes. Caution is called for again and again, and allowance must be made for accident, inexact quotation, loose paraphrase, requirements of the context, theological considerations, and sectarian exegesis. However, in a great many cases the recensional background can be established, and interesting observations may be made in the individual instances.

Before going on to a detailed examination, which will enable the reader to make up his own mind as to the validity of the thesis argued in these pages, I should like to present a general survey of the results which I have gained on the basis of my researches so far. I am confident that the conclusions I have reached will be confirmed — possibly with slight modifications here and there — by further study.

We can say with certainty that the text of the Bible quoted by the author(s) was, generally speaking, substantially that of the textus receptus. This, of course, is not really surprising: it is what we might expect. Nevertheless, it is of supreme importance when it comes to evaluating the precise extent to which we should speak of the author’s or authors’ dependence on a non-Massoretic text form. The differences from MT which we may glean from IQH, are not impressive if looked at one by one. And there are very many cases of a quotation agreeing in every detail with MT, as confirmed by G,T, and S; and also instances of agreement with MT against one or more of the VSS, both where the former is straightforward, and where it is difficult, or perhaps even corrupt. It is interesting to notice that where we can speak of
differences within the Masoretic tradition, 1QH generally agrees with the reading commonly attested. There are cases where the author(s) may be paraphrasing a certain passage, but fortunately in such a way that we can decide whether he (they) depended on the Masoretic or on some different recension. And in some of these cases one will find that it is the Masoretic tradition which lies behind the paraphrase concerned. I find occasion in this connection to mention that the number of concurrences of 1QH with MT against emendations which have been proposed by modern scholars (without support in the VSS) are legion.

Proportionately speaking, there certainly is a great deal of evidence for the fixation and recognition of the text, which later came to be called the Masoretic Text, by the time the Hymns were composed. But it cannot be concluded on this basis that by that time the whole of MT was definitively fixed, and was universally acknowledged as authoritative to the exclusion of any other Version. We have in 1QH an apparently bewildering number of cases where the form in which a Biblical tag is quoted agrees now with this, and now with that Version, against MT. It is difficult to imagine that the author(s) composed these Hymns with a variety of recensions of the Biblical texts before them, dipping now into this, and now into that recension. The position in 1QH is rather similar to the position in 1QIṣa. 1QH, in the same way as 1QIṣa, largely confirms MT, but differs from it in numerous points of detail; and in the case of 1QH, as well as in the case of 1QIṣa, these minor details can often be confirmed as variant readings by references to one of the VSS. It is therefore reasonable to assume that the Biblical text from which the author(s) of the Hymns culled their Scriptural quotations and allusions exhibited these variants. In order to define, as closely as possible, the text type — or rather types — reflected in 1QH, it is necessary to deal with every Biblical book individually, and not to draw general conclusions about the text of the entire Hebrew Bible used by the author(s), on the basis of a few variant readings in any one particular Biblical book which we may be able to observe in 1QH. In the case of some books the recension reflected in 1QH may be closer to MT than in the case of other books. It may be, therefore, that the author(s) derived his (their) knowledge of the Bible from proto-Masoretic texts which differed from the textus receptus to a greater or smaller extent in the different books.

On the other hand one should not exclude the possibility that differences in 1QH from MT in the identifiable Biblical allusions may be of either a dialectal or an orthographical nature, without necessarily being of a recensional nature. The Biblical references in 1QH, do not necessarily reflect a "sectarian"

---

9 This point was raised by H.M. Orlinsky after the reading of my paper at the International Congress in Moscow.
text form. It may often be more correct to speak of a secondary remoulding of Biblical material, due to the author's mother tongue being Aramaic, and to the author's or the copyist's employment of the orthography common in their day, rather than their intentional reproduction of the spelling actually found in the Biblical texts before them. E.g. the plene spelling is certainly not used less in, than out of quotations of Biblical passages. Indeed, the spelling employed in 1QH does not appear at all to be consistent and may be due to the simultaneous application of several orthographical systems.\textsuperscript{10} That 1QH contains far less evidence of Aramaic influence than 1QIs\textsuperscript{a} is no doubt due to the fact that the style of the Hymns is consciously neo-classical, leaning heavily on the idiom of Biblical Hebrew, and exhibiting only a sprinkling of Aramaic, non-Biblical loan-words. It cannot be doubted, however, that in matters of orthography, where Scriptures are quoted, we must allow for considerable freedom, as far as the employment of vowel letters is concerned. We are rarely in a position to ascertain whether the copyists depended on the orthography of any particular MS. Their use of plene spelling is certainly different from the one in MT. But it should be said, on the one hand, that the copyists of 1QH employed fewer vowel letters than the copyists of e.g. 1QIs\textsuperscript{a}, and on the other hand, that both MT and 1QH do not exhibit strict adherence to any rules, as far as the application of vowel letters is concerned.

The author(s) of the Hymns knew a text which was substantially the same as the Massoretic, but it was not identical with it in every detail. Sometimes e.g. 1QH agrees with the Qerê and sometimes with the Kethîb of the present MT. It is reasonable to infer from this that there was no Qerê-Kethîb at that early stage.\textsuperscript{11} Sometimes 1QH reflects a reading of the consonantal text of the textus receptus which is different from the one implied by the vocalization; and in some of these cases it is not a question of mere dialectal differences. Sometimes, in quoting Isaiah, the author(s) would agree either with 1QIs\textsuperscript{a} or with 1QIs\textsuperscript{b} against MT, and sometimes with the latter against both 1QIs\textsuperscript{a} and 1QIs\textsuperscript{b}. This illustrates the variability of the Biblical texts before the author(s). It might also suggest different dates of composition for these hymns. That the Qumran community did not favour one particular recension of Scripture to the exclusion of any other, may be amply illustrated by examples from 1QH.

\textsuperscript{10} Cp. M. Martin, The Scribal Character of the Dead Sea Scrolls 1 (Louvain 1958) 393 ff. who argues on these lines.

\textsuperscript{11} On the question of the age of the Qerê-Kethîb system, see H.M. Orlinsky, in Congress Volume Oxford 1959. Supplements to VT 7 (1960) 186 ff. Whether, against the background of the evidence provided by the Judean MSS (1QIs\textsuperscript{a} in particular, of course), it is correct to say, as Orlinsky does (ib., 188) that “virtually all Kethib-Qere readings... are textual variants of the kind that scribes bring into being unintentionally”, is in my opinion a moot point.
As already pointed out, we cannot assume that the author(s) picked, now a reading from this, and now from that recension in some haphazard fashion; neither can we suppose that the author(s) merely took an academic interest in the variant readings. The Hymns are not academic but devotional compositions, written not as learned exercises in Biblical idiom for the author(s) own sake, but as expressions of piety with a view to the edification of the members of the community. The fact that, in the case of quotations from Isaiah, three recensions (MT or proto-MT, 1QIsa, and 1QIsb) are reflected in 1QH, might therefore point to different dates of composition for these hymns. It is not impossible that the result of an examination of the recensional background as a whole could, with caution, be used to throw some light on their relative dates. There is no definite proof that all the variant readings, which may be gleaned from 1QH belong to one stage only in the history of the text of the Bible, such as e.g. the stage which C. Rabin has described as “limited variability”. Rabin suggests that the Judaean non-Biblical MSS reflect “a text with recognized equivalent variants”, and he finds a parallel to this in the case of the Quran with its seven slightly different, but recognized, recensions. The difference between this view and the one outlined above is obviously that Rabin regards all variants in Biblical and non-Biblical MSS as reflecting a text type with simultaneously recognized variants, whereas in my view the variants concerned were not officially recognized, and were not — or at least need not be — all simultaneous. A recognized text presupposes an authorized, canonical text form of all the Biblical books. But the text-critical evidence, as this may be gleaned from either the Biblical or the non-Biblical MSS, does

---

12 As far as I am aware this point has never been raised against the widely accepted assumption that the Hymns were all written by the same author. At least it seems to me that there is an argument here which could be used to refute that theory. Especially when seen against the Biblical background, and when taken as a kind of continuation or further development of Biblical psalmography, it appears a feasible proposition to regard these poems as composed at various stages of, and for different purposes in, the communal life at Qumran. They are not wholly autobiographical. They were written for the purpose of communal edification, and were very probably recited, either communally, or perhaps individually, at the devotional meetings or divine services of the society. This practice may have lasted throughout the stay of the community at Qumran. It should also be remembered that 1QH may only form a minor part of the original, possibly much larger, collection of hymns. The fact that 1QS ends with a long hymnal section appears to suggest that there were more than one such collection. (Incidentally, the great similarity between 1QS x-xi and 1QH, in my view, suggests that we are dealing with religious poetry which should not be regarded as having sprung up suddenly and spontaneously on the initiation of one poetically gifted man).


14 Ib., 180.
not suggest that this was the case at any time during the Scripture-studying activities of the Qumran community. A MS like 1QI³, although in substance confirming MT, contains so many deviations from any text form hitherto known that I find it impossible to believe that this is a recension with “recognized equivalent variants”. 1QI³ belongs to the time before we can speak of an authoritative text with a thin fringe of recognized variants. It can only date back to a time when no one took exception to copying the Biblical texts freely, employing vowel letters whenever it was thought to be convenient, and amplifying the text occasionally by inserting passages or parts of passages from elsewhere, and when even the subject matter was, to some extent (but not to a very great extent), in a state of fluidity.

Returning now to our examination of 1QH, (which in this article covers plates i–iii only), a clearer picture naturally emerges of the Biblical texts behind that manuscript by a comparison with the VSS, than by a collation merely with Hebrew Biblical MSS. A comparison of the Biblical material in 1QH with the Biblical MSS from Qumran, with MT and its variants in MSS as collected, say, by de Rossi in his Variæ Lectiones Veteris Testamenti, is not greatly illuminating. Such an investigation indicates only in a very general way, either that the copyists of 1QH relied on Hebrew MSS which reflected a certain amount of fluidity in the transmission of the text,¹⁵ or that they complied with certain rules of orthography which were in common use at the time when our copy was written. An examination along such lines, being confined mainly to matters of orthography, would naturally be of rather limited scope, because it would not take into account the possibility that the Biblical texts were in an even greater state of fluidity at the time the Hymns were written — that, in some cases at least, where the author appears to paraphrase or to quote according to memory, he in fact depended on a reading which is no longer preserved in any Hebrew MS, but is reflected in one or several of the VSS. That this has important consequences for our attitude to the VSS generally, is obvious: where they differ from MT, we must reckon to a far larger extent than has been done hitherto, with the possibility of literal translation from a Hebrew text which contained these variants. Perhaps it would be useful already at this point to make it clear that I do not propose to discuss the exegetical value of variants in 1QH. My primary concern is that of establishing, through the VSS, that 1QH does reflect a recension — or rather recensions — of the Biblical books which were different from MT. The question of the intrinsic value of the variants, or whether in any given case MT is more original than

¹⁵ H.M. Orlinsky, op. cit., 187, suggests that the MSS (three in number), on the basis of which the early scribes worked, may have differed quite considerably as far as the employment of vowel letters were concerned.
the one reflected in 1QH, is of secondary importance in this connection.\(^{16}\) There are quite a number of cases in the columns I have so far examined, where our author is certainly not quoting freely, but is in fact relying on a Hebrew original different from MT. There are cases where a sentence represents a conflation of two quite separate Biblical passages, both of which are quoted in forms different from MT; or it may be that one part follows MT, and the other not. It is particularly here that 1QH has something to offer because it contains here and there the original Hebrew phrasing of passages which, through the VSS, can be shown to represent genuine variant readings, and not mere idiosyncrasies on the part of the author or the copyst. And the fact that, for parallels, one must go now to this, and now to that Version, need not lead to confusion. If, instead of MT, one took as a starting point for a text-critical examination, say, the Targums, one would find a very similar state of affairs, with readings now agreeing and now disagreeing with MT and/or any of the VSS. I have suggested above\(^ {17}\) that acquaintance on the part of the author(s) of the Hymns with three different versions of the Book of Isaiah (MT, IQIs\(^ a\), and IQIs\(^ b\)) might be an indication of different dates of composition of the respective hymns reflecting these recensions. The alternative to such a theory would be to assume that the whole of 1QH reflects one recension of the Book of Isaiah which contained some readings identical with what we find in MT, IQIs\(^ a\) and IQIs\(^ b\), without being identical with any one of those three. This is in itself a reasonable theory which, however, we are not in a position either to prove or disprove. Or perhaps it would be more correct to say that it is a theory which by future finds may be proved right, but which can never be proved wrong, because the conclusion in that case would invariably be reached by an argument from silence. Whether 1QH, in its Biblical material, of each Biblical book taken individually, reflects one recension only, we simply do not know. There is nothing in available Hebrew MSS which can prove anything either way. As far as the VSS are concerned, the evidence is quite clear: the differences in 1QH from MT cannot be shown to be affiliated with any one of the VSS in particular, as e.g. is the case with some of the Biblical MSS from Cave 4 whose decidedly Septuagintal affiliations have already been realized.\(^ {18}\) In 1QH it is impossible to discover any kind of consistent, or indeed exclusive, dependence on variant readings which underlie one version in particular. Here again the text-critical position of 1QH resembles that of IQIs\(^ a\) which has been proved to contain the original readings of, not one, but several of the ancient VSS.

\(^{16}\) As far as IQIs\(^ a\) is concerned this point has been emphasized by M.H. Gottstein, in *Biblica*, 35 (1954) 52 ff.

\(^{17}\) See p. 139.

\(^{18}\) See F.J. Cross, *op. cit.*, 133 ff. where further literature is indicated.
In most cases of this kind — and this applies to 1QIs\textsuperscript{a}, 1QH, or any other manuscript where similar, genuine variant readings may be found — it is not a matter of establishing a reading superior to MT by invoking the support of the VSS, although I have found a couple of instances where the reading in 1QH does appear to be better and more original than the Massoretic reading.\textsuperscript{19} I have also found some cases where 1QH, corroborated by evidence in the VSS, offers some material of lexicographical importance. But one cannot, on the basis of the material offered in 1QH, decide on the question whether, e.g., the Vorlage of G was superior to MT, or vice versa. No one would maintain that all the variants in 1QIs\textsuperscript{a}, although supported by evidence from outside, are necessarily better than the Massoretic readings simply because 1QIs\textsuperscript{a} is presumably the oldest Isaiah MS we can hope for, and contains quite a number of Septuagintal readings.\textsuperscript{20} 1QIs\textsuperscript{a} certainly exhibits numerous readings inferior to those of Biblical MSS of a much later date. In the present study of the Biblical quotations in 1QH I am less concerned with the intrinsic value of any reading different from MT which 1QH may contain, than with the variant readings as such. Whether a reading is considered superior or inferior to others is often a matter of personal choice. The purpose of textual criticism cannot always be to establish the original text, because that is in many cases impossible. The textual critic must often confine himself to ascertaining the differences without committing himself on the question of priority. But the basic fact should be emphasized that when a Scriptural passage, or part of one, is quoted in a manner slightly different from MT, and the same difference or differences may be traced in one or several of the VSS, then it is often impossible to escape the conclusion that the Hebrew text of 1QH in such instances preserves the actual reading reflected in the VSS, and that therefore 1QH testifies to variant readings which were known and acknowledged by the authors, the religious circles for which they wrote, and very likely by others as well. There is no need to assume that we are here dealing with readings which owe their origin to a narrow sectarian milieu. Indeed, the fact that these readings may be traced in the VSS decidedly speaks against such an assumption. Particularly sectarian material may possibly be found where the author uses his own phraseology, not where he is dependent on a reading which is reflected in the VSS. A division of the material along such lines might perhaps prove useful when examining 1QH from the religio-historical point of view, but that does not concern me at the moment.

A particular text-critical problem is posed by the fact that the authors

\textsuperscript{19} For a case of MT representing "Inferior" readings, see F.M. Cross, \textit{op. cit.}, 135.

\textsuperscript{20} On Septuagintal material in 1QIs\textsuperscript{a} see my article in \textit{JSS} 3 (1958) 244 ff., especially 254 ff. The most notable contribution to this field of study has been made by J. Ziegler, in \textit{JBL} 78 (1959) 34 ff.
of the Hymns were certainly acquainted with the peculiar kind of paraphrastic, often homiletic exegesis which we find in the Targums. This opens up the question as to whether they depended on oral or written Targumic material; and however this question is to be answered, we must suppose that Targumic exegesis was fixed by the time the Hymns were composed, and that it was shared by the authors.\textsuperscript{21} This is a point of considerable interest in fields other than that of textual criticism, because it affects the view one takes of Targumic material in general. Some years ago it was argued that the presence of Targumic material in the Judaean MSS suggests a late dating of the latter. However, there is nowadays a noticeable swing in the opposite direction: since on other grounds the Qumran MSS can be proved to be early — and very likely all of them pre-Christian — the fact that they show occasional signs of influence from the Targums suggests that the latter are much earlier than was thought hitherto.\textsuperscript{22} Efforts are now made to prove the pre-Christian origin of at least the bulk of Palestinian Targumic material.\textsuperscript{23}

In the following ca. 100 Biblical passages will be dealt with, and special attention will be devoted to an examination of the recensional background of these passages, as quoted or otherwise used by the hymnologist(s).\textsuperscript{24} The necessary initial research has been done entirely on the basis of Mandelkern's Concordance, without reference to the Biblical material already detected by other students of the Hymns. Such independent ground-work seemed to me imperative in the circumstances because the subject has not received any detailed, systematic treatment before. My hope is to publish in due course two further articles on the subject in which the remainder of the material

\textsuperscript{21} Some Targum fragments, as is well known, have been found at Qumran.
\textsuperscript{22} For some literature on this, see A. Diez Macho, in \textit{Congress Volume Oxford} (1959) 227.
\textsuperscript{23} See especially the study by A. Diez Macho, in his article referred to in n. 22 above; cp. also, in this connection, my article referred to in n. 7 above where I have attempted to show that Macho's text-critical argument is invalid.
\textsuperscript{24} MT is quoted according to the third edition of Kittel's \textit{Biblia Hebraica}. For the Septuagint I have, whenever possible, made use of the available volumes of the Göttingen Septuagint, and otherwise relied on Sweete's edition; the later Greek translations are quoted according to Field's \textit{Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt}. As for the Peshitta I have had access to Walton's edition only — an obvious shortcoming which is, however, offset by the fact that no exclusive connection between 1QH and S may be ascertained, except in a couple of isolated instances. Vetus Latina is referred to according to the edition by Sabatier, and the same applies to the Vulgate, except where the latter is available in the new, but incomplete Benedictine edition. For the Targums the editions by Sperber and Walton have been consulted, and variant readings in Hebrew MSS are given according to de Rossi's collection. The abbreviations are either the usual ones, or too obvious to be in need of any explanation. Syriac quotations are transcribed in Hebrew characters.
(covering plates iv, 5–x, 12) will be presented (the rest of the scroll being badly mutilated and unsuitable for the kind of inquiry I have undertaken). The task of detecting the Biblical allusions in the Hymns is an arduous and unenviable one, to which the following study, at least on the surface, bears witness only imperfectly; and I hope I may be forgiven for not referring, except where necessary, to the work of other scholars in this field.\footnote{In the various editions of, and studies on 1QH reference is, of course, constantly made to Biblical passages. See especially those by J. Licht, S. Holm-Nielsen, M. Mansoor.} That in some instances (most of them fairly obvious ones) my researches should lead me to Biblical passages to which also others have referred, is inevitable. I trust, however, that most of the material presented below will be found to break new ground, and to throw some light on a hitherto largely neglected branch of study. Naturally, parts of the ensuing discussion can result in no more than tentative conclusions, and the reader is asked to bear in mind throughout the article its experimental nature.

The material is classed in four main groups. This arrangement, from the point of view of convenience, is preferable to dealing with the individual instances in the order in which they occur in the MS. A division of the Biblical allusions according to their relationship to the VSS proved impracticable. I therefore propose first to analyse the recensional background of passages in which the original Hebrew is reproduced \textit{verbatim}. The next step would then be to examine the instances in which the original Hebrew is reproduced, not exactly but with minor variations, and to inquire whether such small and apparently insignificant deviations are in fact variant readings as testified in the VSS, or whether they are simply due to the requirements of the hymnal context or are to be explained in some other way. In the third and fourth groups will be assembled cases of more extensive differences from MT and of paraphrases, respectively. They too will be subjected to the recensional test. This classification is not wholly satisfactory, mainly because it is sometimes difficult to distinguish clearly between a minor and a major divergence from MT; and it is often impossible to draw the line between an instance of major divergence and a paraphrase. Furthermore, a few words, agreeing in every detail with MT may occasionally be only part of a longer sentence which amounts to a paraphrase of the Biblical verse in which the literally produced words occur. This last mentioned circumstance explains why there are so few examples (twelve) in the first group. The majority of cases, where two or more words are verbally reproduced from the Biblical text, are dealt with in one of the other subdivisions (especially in the third and fourth groups dealing with more extensive differences from the Hebrew original) for reasons which, it is hoped, will become clear in due course. All the instances
will be numbered according to the order in which they are here treated; and cross references to passages dealt with in this study will be given in that way.

II

1. i, 5: דַּיֵּר תַּנְשָׁה. Cp. Jer. 32:19. No Biblical MS has *plene* spelling here, although the construct case of דַּיֵּר is spelt *plene* occasionally elsewhere in *MT* (e.g. in Ez. 17:3). The paraphrasing rendering of this and the following expression in T of Jer. 32:19 was adopted in S and need not to be taken as reflecting a different reading; nor can we argue with certainty from μεγάλης βουλής of G that the *Vorlage* of the latter read the phrase anarthrously. The rendering in Sym.: μέγας τι βουλή follows MT slavishly and reflects the general tendency to revise the Greek version in strict accordance with the Hebrew original.

2. i, 23: אֲדֹנָי אֱלֹהִי. Cp. Is. 38:15 according to MT, 1QIs*, 1QIs*, T, V, S: the words, together with other words in the same context, are not translated in G. VL follows G. So in this case 1QH agrees with MT against G.


4. ii, 10: וַיְכַוֶּנֶּהוּ בְּרֵכֶר (לְשׁוֹנָה דְרֵךְ). The phrase occurs only in Ps. 37:14 and in Prov. 29:27 (sing.). The textual tradition in Ps. is clearly divided, both in Hebrew MSS and in the VSS. MT, apart from being confirmed by our passage, is attested by Aq., Sym., T, and S. According to de Rossi nineteen Biblical MSS read בְּרֵכֶר instead of לְשׁוֹנָה. cp. G (followed by VL) and V. Although the reading בְּרֵכֶר is thus quite strongly represented, there can be little doubt that לְשׁוֹנָה is the more original, because the expression לְשׁוֹנָה is found only twice whereas בְּרֵכֶר is a common phrase. However, the fact that G testifies to בְּרֵכֶר shows that the reading is ancient.


6. ii, 20: מִלְחָמָה אָדָם. The only exact parallel is Ps. 86:12 (cp. further Is. 12:1 חֲבָרָם, ἐπατέων). Our text differs only orthographically from MT in Ps. by the final ḫē of the suffix, and the waw in מִלְחָמָה — which in MT is always spelt defectively, when applied to God. Our text does not support the suggestion in BH that ḫē be deleted. The word is reflected in all the VSS.


8. ii, 21: וַיִּדְרַךְ הַכַּפֹּושׁ מָפָשׁ. The closest parallel in MT is Ps. 54:5: וַיֶּדֶרֶךְ הַכַּפֹּושׁ מָפָשׁ; and one might think that our author simply depended on that passage. The position may be somewhat more complex, however. We have seen that the hymnologist, in the beginning of the present composition, applied Ps. 86:12 (see 6 above), and there can be little doubt that, in developing
the theme peculiar to this hymn, he depended on the context of Ps. 86:12 ff., generally. It is therefore especially relevant for our purpose to note that Ps. 86:14 (וְהָדֹּתָהּ רִבְרִישָׁ֑יִּים קָשָׁ֖הּ בְּמַשִּׁ֑ישַׁיִּים) in G⁸ is translated according to the shorter parallel in Ps. 54:5 (with the word דָּוִיד left out; cp. also T). There can be little doubt that T and G⁸ reflect a real variant reading, for those two VSS arose independently of each other. In view of the author’s dependence on Ps. 86:12 ff, we may conclude that our passage contains the Hebrew text underlying the shorter text of Ps. 86:14. MT is followed by G⁸ Aq., Sym., VL, V, S. 9. ii, 27: מַהְמָןָּד מִי רָבָּם bleibt. Cp. Jer. 51:55; see (62) below. 10. iii, 7: אַחַּד בָּדֶרֶךְ כְּמוֹ אֶשָּׁת לֵדֵהּ מַכֶּרֶדֶּרֶד. Cp. Jer. 4:31 and 13:21, see (33) below. 11. iii, 8: התּוֹלֵל נַכּוֹר. Cp. Mic. 2:10. S agrees with MT, whereas in G (cp. also T) the waw of התּוֹלֵל was drawn to the preceding word — a reading which is preferred by some modern scholars (cp. BH). VL and V follow G in reading התּוֹלֵל instead of התּוֹלֵל. 12. iii, 25: מְדֹרָה בַּכָּל. In using this well known Biblical hap. leg. our author agrees with MT of Is. 14:4, against 1Q1is*, the latter reading מְדֹרָה. The meaning of either word is obscure. The use of נָדְתַּפָּה in our passage cannot be said to throw much light upon the meaning of the word as used in the Biblical context. It seems odd that our text should employ this word in its Massoretic form when the variant reading (attested in 1Q1is*) seems to fit our context, if one goes by the meanings which may be derived from the root נָדְתַּפָּה. However, we do not know what meaning our author attached to מְדֹרָה. However, מְדֹרָה is not a late variant. The reading of a resh instead of a daleth undoubtedly lies behind the rendering דֵּהַ יִֽבְּשָׁנָה in G, and the same applies to the translation פְּרוֹנָנָה in Sym. and Th.; cp. also T: עֵקְקֵק הָוָּרָה, where may mean “attack.” 27 All these renderings may be taken as reflecting מְדֹרָה, if the root is understood according to its usage in Is. 3:5; cp. also מַעְמָסָה of S. The present instance, as we shall see, is not the only one where the author, in alluding to the Book of Isaiah, goes against 1Q1is*. 13. i, 8: דֶּרֶךְ יְרוּם. No Biblical MS has ה instead of דֶּרֶךְ. The latter was clearly the reading in the Vorlage of G. But both T and S employ the preposition ה here. Biblical usage fluctuates both in the Hebrew and the Aramaic parts of the Bible: in connec-

III

26 Unless the lacuna before יְרוּם in 1QH ii, 21 originally contained the word דֶּרֶךְ, in which case the text of the Scroll would be identical with that of MT Ps. 86:14 [Ed.]. 27 Cp. Jastrow's Dictionary, 1690.
tion with שַׁלְמָלָה we find both ב and ד, and we cannot be sure that the agreement in 1QH here with T and S is more than accidental. On the other hand, since the phrase only occurs in Is. 45:17 the author may have been acquainted with the Targumic phrase in that passage, and may have been influenced by it in his allusion to the Biblical idiom.

14. i, 14: בֵּיתָן רַנס הַמָּרָגְרוֹת. In this case I would not hesitate to maintain that 1QH contains evidence of a real variant reading. Massoretic tradition is not divided as to whether ב should be read or not, but as to whether the preposition should be read once or twice. It is very interesting to notice, however, that Septuagintal tradition is divided on the question whether ב should be read or not. The reading of ב (= MT) is attested by T, V, S and, within Greek tradition by the Lucianic group, and by Western MSS; but the reading without ב is clearly reflected in G⁹, supported by VL. (One might perhaps add that the evidence of G⁹ is not available.) In this instance then, 1QH testifies to a genuine Septuagintal variant reading which was present in the translator’s Hebrew Vorlage. The text of the Lucianic MSS, and of Western MSS, is presumably secondary and is due to the effort to bring the translation into line with MT.

15. i, 15: לָלָל יְרוּמָת וּלָלָל. Cp. Is. 63:9, without the preposition. In MT the phrase refers to the past, but in our text to the future; this is emphasized and made clear by the addition of ב. No Biblical MS reads לָלָל, and no Version reflects that reading. The defective spelling לָלָל agrees with MT and 1QIs⁸, the corrected (plene) spelling with 1QIs⁸.

16. i, 23: בַּאֲלָה מַחְסָר. An echo of Is. 52:15 may be safely assumed here. MT reads וַאֲלֵה מִסָּר אֵל תְּרַגְּרוֹת, the verb being pointed as pu’al; the defective spelling we have also in 1QIs⁹, but not in 1QIs¹⁰ which spells the verb plene, like 1QH. According to de Rossi there is a poorly attested variant reading תְּרַגְּרוֹת, the future presumably being indicated by the imperfect. G agrees with MT in referring the pass. verb to the past; cp. also V and S. In this case 1QH agrees with the broad stream of tradition, as represented by MT and the VSS.

17. i, 26: רְאוּ הַמִּשָּׁס וְזְדֵרֹק. The article is not attested in any Hebrew MS, and Mishnayot in the sing. is confirmed by T and G, whereas S has the plur. here in accordance with Is. 58:2; Ps. 119:7, 62 etc.; also 1QS iii, 1, iv, 4.²⁸ In this case then, 1QH agrees with MT, T, and G, against S.

18. i, 26: גֵּר וֹאֶשֶּׁר מִשָּׁשׁ מַסָּרְקַה. That this is an allusion to Is. 32:17 is suggested by the ensuing use of מִשָּׁשׁ מַסָּרְקַה (מעודף) מַסָּרְקַה (מעודף) in both passages. MT reads מִשָּׁשׁ מַסָּרְקַה and no Biblical MS (1QIs¹ included) has the plur. here; the sing. is also con-

²⁸ Cp. the present writer’s The Manual of Discipline (1957) 58, n. 2.
firmed by V and S. It would perhaps be precarious to argue in this case that T read the plur. against MT: its rendering is paraphrasing, and it employs the plur. not only in v. 17 but also in the preceding and following verses. The Greek translator, however, must have read מָשָׁא הָאָרֶץ for he translates by τὰ ἑργα τῆς δικαιοσύνης, a rendering which, as we can now see, is based on a variant reading. Aq., Sym., and Th. reflect MT.

19. i, 28: רִים שֵׁמי. Cp. Hos. 14:3: רְיָם שֵׁמי. The Massoretic derivation of the first word of this phrase from רֶם “ox” is reflected in T and V. In G (followed by VL) and S, the word was taken in the meaning “fruit”, and BH on this basis suggests the reading רְיָם שֵׁמי. This emendation is, however, not entirely satisfactory because the preposition, that emerges as a result of the proposed word division, is not reflected, either in any of the VSS or in our passage. There are two possible explanations: either the mem of MT is due to a scribal error, perhaps caused by the mem of the previous word, or we have here the use of an enclitic mem which has been observed by scholars elsewhere in MT29. Our author, like the Greek translator of Hos. 14:3, perhaps realized that usage in the consonantal text of MT. If this is so we have a case of agreement with G, against the vocalization of MT, not against the consonantal stock of the latter.

20. ii, 8–9: לֶאֶל שִׁבָּר מַשָּׁא. Cp. Is. 59:20: לֶאֶל שִׁבָּר מַשָּׁא. MT is supported by 1QIsa and S. The Greek translator, however, by rendering καὶ ἀποστρέψαι ἀσβεῖας (cp. VL) may have read some other form of the verb ἀσβεῖας. Aq., Sym., and T testify to the same possibility, as well as to the reading of the preposition ἃ, which probably also the Greek translator had in his text, although it is not expressed in his rendition.

21. ii, 9: לִפְנֵי נַעַר נַעַר. Cp. Is. 35:4: לִפְנֵי נַעַר נַעַר. MT of 1QH is not attested in any of the VSS. In G נֵעַר נֵעַר at the end of v. 3 was drawn to what follows, and נֵעַר נֵעַר at the beginning of v. 4 was not translated. It is possible, although there is no supporting evidence for this, that the Greek translator relied on a text which did not read נֵעַר נֵעַר at the beginning of v. 4 — in which case 1QH follows the bulk of tradition against G. Aq., Sym., and Th. follow MT slavishly.

22. ii, 9–10: וַשֶּׁקֶל וַשֶּׁקֶל ... וַשֶּׁקֶל וַשֶּׁקֶל. Cp. Ps. 44:14: וַשֶּׁקֶל וַשֶּׁקֶל. The suggestion made in BH that, on the basis of the closely related phraseology of Ps. 79:4, the suffix in the sing. instead of the plur. of MT. There is no evidence, either in the VSS or in Hebrew MSS, for the reading of the suffix in the sing. instead of the plur. of MT. Our author in this case adapted the Biblical phrase to suit the requirements of his context.

29 See e.g. W.F. Albright in HUCA 23, part 1 (1950–51) 24.
23. ii, 12: חָלָה רַעַשׁ. Cp. Ps. 26:5: רַעַשׁ. All VSS agree with MT, and the use of חָלָה in our passage may be due to a preference for that word rather than רַעַשׁ in this context. Anyway, the hymnologist depends for his phraseology here on Is. 57:20, rather than Ps. 26:5.

24. ii, 14: כָּלַקְסָנָה מַעַרְז. Cp. Prov. 12:1: כָּלַקְסָנָה מַעַרְז. None of the VSS attests to the plural. The hymnologist clearly adapted the Biblical expression to the new context in which he wanted to use it.

25. ii, 20: שֵׁם הַמְּסַפְּרָה הָרִים. The expression נַבָּרָר הַרְיָים is, of course, from 1 Sam. 25:29 and agrees in every detail with MT. Apart from 1 Sam. 25:29, however, our passage is also dependent on Ps. 66:9, from where the verb is taken. MT reads in that passage מששר נבואר הרים. The suffix for the 1st pers. plur. is attested also in T, S, and in all Greek translations except G (followed by VL and V). It seems to me that in this instance one is justified in concluding that the hymnologist depended on a text which, against MT, but in agreement with G, VL, and V, read מששר instead of משער in Ps. 66:9. The evidence of G suggests that the form of the suffix was not merely changed by our author to fit the requirements of a new context, but was actually present in Hebrew MSS at the time of the first translation of the Psalter into Greek, and probably for quite some time after that, i.e. during the period when we may safely suppose that the Hymns were composed.

26. ii, 26: כָּלַקְסָנָה מַעַרְז. The nearest parallel is Jud. 18:16: כָּלַקְסָנָה מַעַרְז. There is no evidence in the VSS of the second word being in the plur., except that in T the reading כָּלַקְסָנָה מַעַרְז is fairly strongly represented.

27. ii, 26–27: הלֶבַח אַשְׁנֵא אָכַלְכוּ נָמוּ. Cp. Is. 30:30: הלֶבַח אַשְׁנֵא אָכַלְכֻּוְלָו נָמוּ. That our author is alluding to that particular passage is certain; some of the deviations from MT are recensionally unimportant, such as e.g. the spelling הלֶבַח of MT, the addition of הבין, the use of the preposition ב before אָכַלְכֻּוְלָו, and the expansion of אָכַלְכֻּוְלָו to אָכַלְכֻּוְלָו נָמוּ. There are two features which may be of some interest: 1QH agrees with MT, 1QIsa, T, VL, V, S in reading the word נָמוּ, whereas the broad stream of Septuagintal tradition leaves it untranslated, possibly reflecting a text that did not contain the word. But 1QH differs from MT in reading מְפַךְ רֵדָּו without the copula. The מְפַךְ is attested by 1QIsa, and T (the position in G is not quite clear). The translator of S certainly read מְפַךְ רֵדָּו without the connecting מְפַךְ and regarded, as did our author, the two words as forming a compound expression. There are not many cases in our MS where the latter agrees with S against all other evidence; but a few instances may be ascertained.


present context מ almam appears to refer to the stars; cp. מ almam in Job 38:32 which by Th. was pronounced and transcribed μουσιανος (in agreement with מ almam of our passage). The word is used in G of 2 Ki. 23:5 as a transcription of MT almam (“constellations”). אמשנ and מ almam of 1QH agree with MT against 1QIs≠ which reads מ almam and (ib. v. 4) מ almam, without the final aleph. One agreement with 1QIs≠ does occur which may be of some significance: instead of MT מ almam קך (Is. 59:5a), 1QIs≠ reads מ almam קך, and our author may possibly depend directly on that reading in writing מ almam קך instead of מ almam מ almam of MT (Is. 59:5b). On the other hand, it might be argued that this agreement between 1QH and 1QIs≠ is accidental, since the hymnologist would need a plur. form of the verb to correspond with the composite subject מ almam מ almam. It is perhaps safer to conclude that in the present instance, the hymnologist, in alluding to Is. 59:4–5, simply depended on MT and not on 1QIs≠. The fact that he wrote מ almam (= MT), and not מ almam (1QIs≠) is particularly important because this is not a matter of orthography, like מ almam in 1QIs≠ for מ almam, or of grammatical parallelism, like מ almam in 1QIs≠ for מ almam, but rather a question of interpretation, since מ almam, as we can see from MT of Is. 41:24, is not a synonym of מ almam. In this detail our text depends on MT against 1QIs≠.

30. רוֹנֵל תּוֹמָד. Cp. Ps. 26:12: רוֹנֵל תּוֹמָד. The waw before רוֹנֵל in our text is not attested in any Version, except that Septuagintal MSS (such as G8 and G4) read δ γάρ ποῦ... (cp. VL). It may be precarious to argue on this basis that the Hebrew recension underlying G read רוֹנֵל (cp. 1QH), but perhaps it deserves to be noticed that there are cases in classical Hebrew where waw — as introducing a circumstantial clause — is best translated “for.” Thus interpreted, רוֹנֵל would fit the Biblical context; in its hymnal context, however, the waw introduces a sharp contrast to what precedes. The second difference in our text from MT concerns the word מ almamם almam of 1QH is not clear; perhaps it means “away from their congregation”. However this may be, the ending מ almam, over against מ almam of MT is most naturally taken as the suff. (referring to the enemies of the author), rather than the plur. spelt defectively. In T the noun was taken to be sing., cp. also S. In no Version, however, was the noun taken as referring to the wicked which seems to be the meaning in our passage (cp. the suffixes for 3rd pers. plur. in the previous line). So no definite conclusions may be reached here, except that our text, T and S, agree that the noun is sing., not plur. as MT has it (supported by G and V). A third difference of our text

30 See W. Gesenius, Handwörterbuch (17th ed. by Buhl) 190.
from MT may be implied in שמש, over against ויהי (אברך) of MT. There is some evidence of a Hebrew text which read the suffix for 2nd pers. masc. sing. after the verb (cp. G and V), and שמש of 1QH could well be based on such a reading.

31. ii, 36: Theodore Strickland. It can hardly be doubted, in view of the occurrence of the phrase חיה רשבים in Prov. 10:3, that the reconstruction is right. 1QH, then, in this instance agrees with MT, against many Biblical MSS and early printed editions which read רשבים instead of רשבים, that is, instead of רשבים. The latter text is supported by G, T, V and S. The plene spelling חיה also agrees with the Massoretic pointing, as against G where the word was read as חיה “life (of)” This misreading is particularly understandable in view of Job 6:2 and 30:13, both of which passages testify to כה as a synonym of עיר (the latter form is the one used throughout in the Judaean documents).

32. iii, 7: Theodore N. T. Malherbe. One of the obvious difficulties in assuming that our author was dependent, not just on Biblical language generally, but on a specific passage, is of course the fact that a phrase or idiom may occur in several Scriptural passages. In such circumstances a choice may be difficult, if not indeed, impossible. Of fundamental importance is, however, the question of context. If, e.g., a Biblical idiom of fairly frequent occurrence is used in a particular way in one specific passage, and we find the same usage of that idiom in our text, then it is not unreasonable to suppose some kind of direct relationship between the two texts. Direct dependence becomes virtually certain if some small point of detail in which our text differs from MT, is reflected also in one or more of the VSS of that particular passage. Such a case we have here. Although there are several passages where the phrase ריש מהפנים occurs, the similarity between its metaphorical usage in Jer. 1:18 and our passage is such that we are justified in supposing a specific relationship between them. This assumption becomes certainty when the prepositional difference between MT and 1QH is considered: ב of MT is reflected in V which has dedi... in... as against posui... sicut... of VL, following ו of G, which presupposes the reading of ב, over against ב of MT. That we have here a case of a real variant, 1QH agreeing with G against MT, is proved by the fact that Jerome must have had a Hebrew MS before him which did not, in his view, justify the translation offered in VL. It is also significant that both T and S, by reading ב and ו respectively, clearly follow a text which had ב, not ב.

33. iii, 7: Theodore N. T. Malherbe. Cp. Jer. 4:4: ויהי בברכה כים אשת גזרה מפ Ме. and Jer. 13:21: נאם אשת גזרה. Our passage is a conflation of these two passages. The spelling מפ instead of מפ of MT, is no mistake, as there are other examples in 1QH of the fem. ending מפ. Our text follows MT of Jer. 13:21 and does not support the emendation of ב לא דבר מפ proposed in BH. Of all
the VSS, S alone seems to have read ירח instead of ירח רזרע, a reading which is not supported by our passage. In alluding to Jer. 4:31, using ירח רזרע of MT, the hymnologist may have been influenced by the use of ירח in T. That occasional Targumic influence must be counted a reality in 1QH is indisputable; if such direct influence is not recognized in the present case, the alternative would be to assume some measure of Aramaic influence generally which led our author to use ירח רזרע ( = Aram. ירח), rather than ירח רזרע. The latter word is, of course, used elsewhere in the non-Biblical Judaean MSS (in 1QH see v, 12; ix, 28; xv, 16).

34. iii, 7: נמס ו הארץ. The idiom occurs in 1 Sam. 4:19 and Dan. 10:16, the former constituting the closer parallel to our passage. We should therefore certainly reconstruct נמס ו הארץ. It is, however, worthy of note that there is no room on the line for ירח of the Biblical phrase. Although in 1 Sam. 4:19 the place of the prepositional expression is between ירח and הרמא and it would have been possible to argue that the hymnologist placed the preposition after the subject, as is the case in Dan. 10:16. This possibility, however, does not obtain: our author obviously quoted 1 Sam. 4:19 without the preposition, and he did so, possibly under the general influence of Aramaic, rather than of T of this passage ירח הרמא, where the idiomatic usage of ירח is not reproduced. The preposition is reflected in G, V, S. As far as we can see the prepositional expression was not left out for rhythmical reasons; in fact, as a parallel of the following the ו it would have fitted rather well. The orthographic differences from MT are: ירח of MT is spelt plene (ירח), ירח of MT is spelt ירח, and ירח of MT is spelt ירח.

35. iii, 8: המר ירח בבי. This passage is a conflation of 2 Ki. 19:3 (cp. Is. 37:3): המר ירח בבי, and 2 Sam. 22:5: המר ירח בבי. That the word המר in our passage means "birth-pangs" is realized by most scholars. The semantic development is often supposed to have gone from "waves" to "waves of pain". There is, however, some evidence already in the Bible that the word was taken to mean "pains", rather than "waves". That this is so, is suggested by המר in Ps. 18:5 which there takes the place of המר in 2 Sam. 22:5; the two words presumably being synonymous. Although, admittedly, the phraseology of the continuation in Ps. 18:6 (= 2 Sam. 22:6) appears to speak against this supposition, G and T lend some support to it (see further under 37 below). Silbermann31 has already drawn attention to T of Is. 37:3 (= T of 2 Ki. 19:3): המר ירח בבי, where the apfel of followed by ירח is due to influence from the phraseology of Ps. 18:5 which uses ירח and ירח; furthermore, T employs exactly the same Aramaic sentence

31 JBL 75 (1956) 101.
in its rendering of 2 Sam. 22:5 and in the parallel in Ps. 18:5. This fact indicates that the combination of 2 Ki. 19:3 (= Is. 37:3) with 2 Sam. 22:5 (= Ps. 18:5), which we find in our text, was also found in “orthodox” circles outside Qumran. But for evidence that מְמַגֶּר is taken in the meaning “pain”, or more specifically, “birth-pain”, we must, apart from MT of Ps. 18:5 and 2 Sam. 22:5, turn to G of 2 Ki 19:3 which, instead of מְמַגֶּר of MT, seems to have read מְמַתִּים giving it the connotation “pangs of birth” — וְתֵּלֵהוֹן יִתוֹזֵז δόξειν. Further confirmation comes from Is. 37:3 where MT מְמַגֶּר is rendered by G וְתֵלֵי (אָ) δόξιν τῇ τικτοῦσιν. These two translations possibly originated from different hands. The reading of the plur. (מְמַתִּים) in 2 Ki. 19:3 and Is. 37:3 is also attested by S.

36. iii, 9: מָרָך. Cp. Job 3:3: מָרָך. 1QH essentially confirms the consonantal text of MT. Although our author may have pointed the first word differently and however he pronounced it, he did not regard it as passive. In this respect our passage disagrees with the interpretation in Sym., T, V, and S which all took the verb in strict accordance with the preceding niph’al, although, as indicated in BH, the form מָרָך may possibly have been intended as an active participle fem., and not as a passive. For the clarification of the difficult Biblical verse the evidence of G is of no value as it clearly reflects a misinterpretation of the crucial word.

37. iii, 9: בְּכֹלָם. Shav. 2 Sam. 22:6 (Ps. 18:6): בְּכֹלָם. In the Biblical context, in parallelism with מְמַטַּו, this expression seems to mean “the cords of Sheol”, but in our context it is clearly used in the sense “the pains of Sheol”, cp. G (2 Sam.: δόξιν θανάτου; Ps.: δόξιν θανάτου). Shav.

38. iii, 15: מַעְמַטְתָּךְ מִימָנוֹ. Cp. Is. 17:12: מַעְמַטְתָּךְ מִימָנוֹ (= 1QIs). There is no support in the VSS for the change of preposition.

39. iii, 19: מְשַׁפָּל בֶּאֶבֶן. and Prov. 27:20 (Qere). Waw is confirmed by all the VSS. It is difficult to see the reason for the omission of waw in 1QH unless our author took בֶּאֶבֶן (in the appellative sense) as the equivalent of a descriptive genitive. The word is not frequent in the Qumran documents. Apart from our passage it occurs, clearly in the appellative sense, in 1QM, fragment 9, 1. 3 (pl. xlvii in Sukenik’s edition); in 1QH iii, 32, however, it is most naturally taken as a designation for the underworld, especially because of its parallelism with מְשַׁפָּל בֶּאֶבֶן. The treatment of the word in the VSS is of interest here: in two passages it occurs in connection with מְשַׁפָּל (Prov. 15:11, Job 26:6), in one (Ps. 88:12) in parallelism with בֶּאֶבֶן, and in one (Job 28:22) in juxtaposition to מָרָך. G translates in all these passages by ἀπόλασα, clearly regarding it as an appellative abstract noun. The position in T is somewhat different, and more akin to the dual function of the word as we have it in our passage and in 1QH iii, 32. For whereas, rather surprisingly, T renders
in Prov. 15:11 and 27:20 (Qere) by the corresponding Aramaic abstract, appellative noun, the translator(s) of Ps. 88:12, Job 26:6, 28:22 certainly took the word to indicate a place. 1QH, then, agrees with both G and T in regarding אבריו in Prov. 15:11 as an abstract noun, not as a synonym of יתברך, but disagrees with the general treatment of אבריו in G. Like the Targumic translators, thus also our hymn composers were aware that the word, without being a place name, could indicate the place of perdition.

40. iii, 20: ארמiento התנור. Several Biblical passages have phrases closely related to these words, but the nearest parallel is Prov. 23:31: יתהליך בכרום, where the text refers to the red, sparkling wine that “goes down smoothly”. The use of hithpa‘el in both passages is significant because it proves the dependence of the hymnologist on Prov. 23:31 rather than Cant. 7:10: ואתלך בטょう. Also in using the preposition ב our text agrees with the former against the latter passage. The VSS throw no light on the use of בטוח in 1QH instead of בטוח.

41. iii, 22–23: דרכו עד מכת. There is no support in the VSS for the plur. This is a typical case of a Biblical phrase being torn out of its context, and employed differently.

42. iii, 23: הליפש מכם מביתו. Cp. especially Ps. 26:7b: הליפש מכם מביתו. Apart from the very close verbal similarity between the two passages, it is perhaps worth pointing out that the preceding sentence in 1QH: ואלעالف ידדה רכין, is a paraphrase of Ps. 26:7a: ולἡשע ברוק רוכד so there can be no doubt that our author, in agreement with Massoretic tradition (cp. also Sym., T, S), but against some MSS of de Rossi, G (VL), V, read the first word of the Biblical passage as hiphil (הליפש), and not as qal (הליפש). The use made here of Ps. 26:7 is typical of many of the Scriptural allusions in 1QH: the verse was partly paraphrased freely, and partly quoted almost literally; but a longer line was created by the addition of הליגר הכלי משיח (cp. already 1QH i. 30, 33). The omission in 1QH of הכלי of the Biblical verse (before מביתו) is therefore understandable: our author simply dropped the word (which is firmly attested by all the VSS). From the metrical point of view our text is also typical of the general way in which Biblical material was used in 1QH: Ps. 26:7 consists of two short parallel cola (3+3), but the hymnologist, although preserving the parallelism, expanded the line quite considerably and paid no attention to the strict meter of the original.

43. iii, 23–24: יזרעיה. This expression, which was used already in i, 21, and which occurs again, with or without the article, in iv, 29; xi, 3; xii, 26, 32; xviii, 12, and fragment 1, 1. 8, comes from Is. 29:16 according to 1QIsa which reads יזרעיה instead of יזרעיה ארא רדרה instead of יזרעיה ארא רדרה. The frequency with which the expression occurs in 1QH on the one hand, and the fact that there is no outside
support for the reading in IQIsa on the other, suggest that we have here a textual tradition peculiar to Qumran. All the VSS reflect MT, except that in G (VL) חָרֵם אֲנָשָׁה is not translated. There is, however, a link between G, T, S of Is. 29:16, and the use made of that passage in our text, because our author appears to reflect acquaintance with the interpretation given to the beginning of the Biblical verse in those Versions. The phrase in MT: אָמַּר חָרֵם הַיְּצֵרָה יְחָדְשֵׁהוּ. of course, means: “Should the potter be reckoned as the clay”, and an answer in the negative is implied. Already in G^8, however, the words חָרֵם הַיְּצֵרָה were regarded as forming a compound expression: oῡ χρό̄ο το̊σο̊ κεραμέ̄ως λογισθήσεται, agreeing with the sing. of MT). The plur. of G^8 agrees with T: כְּלָל מַגְּרֵרֵבוּ כַּאֲרֵמֶרֶשָׁה וְהָיוֹתֵרֵבָה קְדוֹמֵי cp. also S. Have we evidence here of a variant reading instead of מַגְּרֵרֵבָה וְהָיוֹתֵרֵבָה (It appears that the sing. of G^8 is secondary and due to influence from Massoretic tradition). It surely cannot be due either to coincidence or to interdependence that both T and S use verbal forms which correspond exactly to the reading reflected in G^8. This particular question can, of course, not be solved one way or the other by the use of חָרֵם וַתְּכַנְּשֵׁה us in our passage. And yet, the use of that verb here (when considered as a loan from Is. 26:16) reflects the same interpretation as we have in G, T, and S of that passage, according to which the verb was not taken as referring to the potter (as is the meaning in MT), but to the listeners. The conception of the words חָרֵם וַתְּכַנְּשֵׁה (copied in IQIsa, presumably by mistake, חָרֵם וַתְּכַנְּשֵׁה) as a composite expression, would be in agreement with this interpretation of the verb (cp. G, T, S).

44. iii, 27: אָמַּר חָרֵם. The only parallel in Biblical Hebrew is Esth. 8:8: אָמַּר חָרֵם; but the construct infinitive was replaced by what appears to be a noun from the infinitive form of the high’l in the masculine.32

45. iii, 29–30: כִּלְכֵל שָׁנָה לֹא וַיַּכְּב. Cp. Ez. 21:3: כִּלְכֵל שָׁנָה לֹא וַיַּכְּב. Our phrase (which possibly occurs also in IQH viii, 19) represents an abbreviation of the Biblical passage. The VSS are not uniform in their renderings. T and V follow MT word by word, reflecting the doubling of both לֹא and כִּלְכֵל. Jerome’s translation represents a slight revision of VL which has: omne lignum viride et lignum aridum — a translation which agrees neither with G^A (πᾶν ξύλον χλαρόν καὶ πᾶν ξύλον ηθρόν = MT, T, V) or with G^B which reads לֹא only once, placing it before the second ξύλον. This variety attested by the VSS no doubt reflects an uncertainty in the transmission of the Hebrew original, with respect to the reading of לֹא twice or only once, and the placing of that word before the first or second כִּלְכֵל. Of the VSS hitherto mentioned, our passage agrees with VL in reading לֹא only once, and in placing the word at the beginning of the

32 G.R. Driver has noticed a number of such cases in IQIsa, see JTS, NS 2 (1951) 23.
sentence. More striking, however, is the agreement of our text with S which is the only Version offering a shorter text comparable with 1QH. Here, as in 1QH, “tree” is used only once. The uncertainty of the text form, as reflected in G, VL, and S lends some support to the conclusion that the agreement of the last mentioned Version with 1QH, rather than being accidental, is based on a variant reading. The reading of the suffix for 2nd pers. masc. sing., (cp. S) would be out of place in our present context and was omitted.

46. iii, 31–32: יתוהלכ דע והוה רוח. The plene spelling of the verb is in accordance with Qumran orthography such as we know it e.g. from 1QIṣa. In this instance, it may, or may not be based on a variant reading in some Biblical MS with which the hymnologist was acquainted. On balance it is more likely that our author quoted the Biblical phrase employing the orthography of his day. Imperf. qal of אֵלָה is spelt with the waw after the aleph in this and the preceding line, whereas the waw is placed before the aleph in viii, 30 (cp. also e.g. 1QS vi, 2). Whether this fluctuation in orthography represents a corresponding fluctuation in pronunciation is not clear.33 — No Version supports the reading of דע instead of דנא; it may be due to influence from Deut. 32:22.

IV

47. i, 15: כסף הזה אואר זירת חמש. Free quotation of Zech. 12:1 where MT is confirmed by all VSS, except that G reads אָמְרָה instead of אָמַרֵה.
48. i, 16: דָּרֶךְ עַמָּלָה. Our author probably had the whole of that verse in mind and quoted freely, or else he introduced a parallel expression, so as not to repeat דָּרֶךְ which he employed in the preceding phrase לֹא רוֹב נִשְׁלָה. MT is supported by all the VSS, except TP34 which read לֹא רוֹב instead of לֹא רוֹב נִשְׁלָה (cp. BH).
49. i, 22: בְּכַר עַדְּכָּה. That in 1QIṣa the defective spelling-bitv is employed may be significant. It could be argued that the word was not pronounced according to the Massoretic punctuation, but as בָּכַר which appears to occur in Ez. 18:17 in the meaning of “sin” or “wrong” or the like. The text of that passage is in BH emended to בָּכָר, partly on the basis of the parallel in Ez. 18:8, partly because of the rendering in G which uses וּסְנָק in both passages. However, as in G both בָּכַר and וּסְנָק may be rendered by וּסְנָק it may perhaps be argued that the translator read MT (‘זון) and

33 On this problem, see M.H. Gottstein, in JJS 4 (1953) 105 ff., and R. Meyer, in Congress Volume Oxford (1959) 311 ff., where references to further literature may be found.
34 P. Kahle, Masoretens des Westens 2, 32.
knew that פיט was the equivalent of וַעֲדֵי. MT of Ez. 18:17 is supported by T, S, and V. It is worthy of note that in VL of Ez. 18:8 injustitia is used, whereas the phrase in 18:17 is rendered by ab iniquitate, thus reflecting מַעְלָי and מְעִיל of MT in these two passages respectively. In Is. 48:10, G, T, V, and S all translate by "poverty". That the author of our hymn alluded to that passage is not to be doubted, and he possibly saw in פיט the equivalent of וַעֲדֵי. A similar connection of מַעְלָי and מְעִיל appears to be reflected in the paraphrase by Jerome35: Ecce vendidi te, non in pecunia, sed vendidi te peccatis tuis, et erui te de fornoce paupertatis.

50. ii, 5: נשונט וַאֲדֹנָי. In view of the hymnologist’s dependence on Ps. 51:3–4 in i, 31–32 (see 89 below), it can hardly be doubted that he alludes to Ps. 51:10 here (rather than to 1 Chr. 15:16), according to MT, G, Sym., T, and V. S alone possibly reflects a variant reading (תֵּשְׂבִ erb).  

51. ii, 7–8: והָּעִקְם מַעְלִים אֲדֹנָיְךָ מְעִילים מֵאֲדֹנָי. In MT the first and third words are pointed as imperatives, and both G and V reflect this interpretation. In S the first word was read as a participle, and the third as an adjective, and both were taken as referring to a person. T (very paraphrastic in this passage) reflects Massoretic punctuation. We thus have a considerable variety in the interpretations of this Biblical verse. This is a perfectly feasible situation before the final acknowledgement of the Massoretic vocalization, and it is an interesting illustration of the different meanings which, within various circles, could be elicited from an unvocalized Biblical text. Our author saw in והָּעִקְם and מַעְלִים of the Biblical phrase two abstract nouns: והָּעִקְם and מַעְלִים of the מָעְלִים type (fairly common in the Judaean MSS), inverted segholates with the characteristic vowel after the second radical.

52. ii, 9: מקדשיך בֵּית. All Versions reflect MT. The hymnologist formed the Biblical phrase according to the requirements of his composition.

53. ii, 15: לָהְוָהֶם וּלְתָהוֹרֵים נִכְהַת: The plene spelling חכָה in our passage agrees with the pointing in MT. The Greek translator does not seem to have read the word in the Hebrew text before him. Sym. and T (cp. also V) follow MT. The adjective נִכְהַת occurs four times in the Book of Isaiah (26:10; 30:10; 47:2; 59:14). In MT the word is always written defectively. In IQIs, as one would expect, plene writing is employed in Is. 26:10 and 59:14; the two remaining passages, however, differ in this respect. In Is. 30:10, the verse on which our author is dependent, the word is spelt defectively, in accordance with MT. The same was the case originally in Is.

35 Quoted by Sabatier, ad Is. 48:10.
57:2; but by a superscribed waw, which was clearly meant to stand immediately after the first radical, the text was changed to read רָמָתָה (as against ובית of MT). This testifies to a confusion of נָשָׁה and נָשָׁה for it can hardly be doubted that 1QH is the equivalent of פַּלְמֵחַ of Biblical Hebrew. It seems to me that, in view of this evidence we may conclude that the defective orthography in 1QH 30:10 reflects a pronunciation which disagrees with MT of the same passage. In this case, then, 1QH agrees with MT in a matter of pronunciation, against 1QH. The disagreement of 1QH with G is more apparent.

54. ii, 15: דָּרְשָׁה הַלְּכּוֹת. Cp. Is. 30:10. The use of the root דָּרְשָׁה instead of דָּרָשׁ of MT finds no support in the VSS. Our author was here influenced by a phrase which appears to have been one of the standard terms applied by the Qumran community to its adversaries.

55. ii, 16: מַעְטָה מַרְפֵּא וּרְשָׁא (cp. Ps. 55:24). The order of the two genitives is reversed in G (VL), S. Here two different readings seem to be attested. 1QH reflects acquaintance with MT (followed by Aq. and T), against G. S is the only Version that translates פַלְמֵחַ collectively.

56. ii, 19: לִשְׁמָה לֹא לֵבָכָה וּלְלַחְצָה: and Is. 27:11: לִשְׁמָה לֹא לֵבָכָה אֲנָה. 1QH obviously represents a conflation of these two passages. There is no evidence either in Hebrew MSS or in the VSS that a variant reading ever existed of Is. 27:11 in which the place of the negation was after לִשְׁמָה.

57. ii, 21: הָרֹשְׁר בְּעֵדָיו. The idiom occurs in Job 1:10 where the verb, as in our passage, is spelt with a sin. A few MSS, however (according to BH), have in Job 1:10 the spelling with a samekh (cp. Job 3:23). Our text agrees with MT of Job 1:10, and not with that of Job 3:23, not only in the matter of spelling, but also in the use of qal of כִּנּוֹן (as distinct from hiph'îl of כִּנּוֹן). Without a Qumran copy of a Job text, which would contain both 1:10 and 3:23, it is naturally impossible to say whether such a text would confirm the distinction which MT makes between the verbs of these two passages. The likelihood is, however, that it would be upheld, for the pilpel forms of כִּנּוֹן in Is. 9:10 and 19:2 are spelt with samekh in 1QH.


59. ii, 23: מַעֲמַחֵת מְצָרִיִּים. Cp. Ps. 37:23 (= Prov. 20:24): מַעֲמַחֵת מְצָרִיִּים. MT is attested by all VSS.

36 In this connection it is interesting to note that Klostermann and Cheyne have already suggested that נָשָׁה be read instead of נַשָּׁה; cp. W. Gesenius, Handwörterbuch, 505.
37 For references see Kuhn's Kondordanz zu den Qumranexten (Göttingen 1960) 52-53.
60. ii, 23–24: This phrase represents a conflation of Is. 54:15 with Ps. 94:21; and in both cases our author read a text different from MT. In the former passage MT has read which corresponds so closely to the Masoretic that no doubt can exist about the dependence of 1QIsa on the 1QIsh tradition rather than on MT. It is equally indisputable that the hymnologist in Ps. 94:21, instead of read which must have been the text underlying T. The translation given there did not merely arise as a result of influence from Ps. 59:4 but, as we can now see, was based on a genuine variant reading with which also our author was acquainted. MT in Ps. 94:21 is attested by G (VL).

61. ii, 24: The only passage in the Hebrew Bible where is used as an internal high'il is Ps. 12:5: where the preposition is presumably used in the meaning: “with respect to”. In G (VL) and S is taken as introducing the object, in the Aramaic fashion (unless these VSS imply the reading ). T may presuppose the reading but, however this may be, the agreement of T and our passage in the use of the preposition can hardly be accidental. Perhaps our author is influenced here, not by an actual variant reading, but by Targumic exegesis.

62. ii, 27: These words, embedded in an allusion to Is. 30:30 (see 27 above), are taken from Jer. 51:55: This verse lingers on in l. 28, cp. the word there which proves with sufficient certainty that the hymnologist had before him a text identical with MT, reading . This word is reflected neither in the bulk of Septuagintal tradition nor in S, which both offer a somewhat shorter text; but the fuller text is supported by V and also, possibly, by T whose rendering may be a skillful play on of MT.

63. ii, 28: In MT the verb is act., with the previous as subject; but our author, in regarding the verb as pass., agrees with three important text witnesses, each of them probably being independent of either of the other two: G, T, and S all took the verb to be pass., with the following as subject. And it is a striking fact that in T is used (אָתָּה, אָתָּה) in classical Hebrew (in Is. 33:10 with assimilated [but in 1QIsh: אָתָּה], and in Dan. 11:36 with preserved).

64. ii, 28: In Ps. 22:15 we find the words of which the sentence made up: but it would be justifiable to argue that the

38 Cp. BH and W. Gesenius, Handwörterbuch, 129.
two passages are not really parallel, and that therefore our author did not depend on Ps. 22:15. The main difference between the two lies in the fact that in the Biblical verse the heart of the psalmist is compared with melted wax, whereas the comparison with water is applied to the entire person of the Biblical author, not, as in our passage, only to the heart. This point is of some importance because Josh. 7:5 offers a close parallel to the simile in question, and we are therefore justified in concluding that our passage depends on the last mentioned verse rather than on Ps. 22:15. MT of Josh. 7:5 reads: יִרְבֶּה לִבַּךָ. The use of the preposition ב in our passage, instead of ב of MT, has a parallel in G (VL), T (some MSS, however, reflect MT. See Sperber’s edition, ad loc.), V, and S. In view of this evidence it appears that our passage agrees with the VSS against MT.

65. ii, 31: עִנְכָּה עַל. Although the major part of the verb is missing, we may perhaps be justified in regarding the text as an allusion to Ps. 32:8, influenced to some extent by Ps. 33:18–19. If so, the lacuna originally read נהבג, the verb being עִנְכָּה, “to fix (the eye) upon”; cp. S, Aq., Th., of Prov. 16:30; the Greek translator of Ps. 32:8 certainly took the verb there in the same meaning; and the (reconstructed) text of our passage suggests that he read נהבג in the Hebrew text before him, and not only וְיֵעָכַב as in MT. If the proposed reconstruction is right, our text agrees with G against MT. The reading נהבג in Ps. 32:8, the verb being taken in the meaning “to fix upon”, is reflected both in V (depending on G), and S, whereas T, Aq., and Sym. derived the verb from יָעַב, following MT.


67. ii, 35: בְּכֵרָד הָא לִבַּךָ. Sukenik transcribes the text in this way, but we should undoubtedly read בְּכֵרָד הָא לִבַּךָ. with the verb derived, not from הנה but from נה; cp. Is. 51:7 which is certainly the Biblical passage on which our author is dependent. Our text uses the preposition ב, whereas MT has ה, and agrees with IQIs in the plene writing of the plur. ending. IQIs has the defective spelling, but differs from IQIs in using the (non-Massoretic) noun מְלֹאך, and IQIs was emended, by a superscript mem, to conform with this tradition. This is an interesting case of IQIs being corrected so as to bring it into line, not with MT, but with IQIs. It may be that the reading מְלֹאך was originally intended in IQIs: the copyist left a mem out by haplography which was added later above the line. If so, the text form of 1QH is nearer to MT than to either IQIs or IQIs.

68. iii, 4: בְּכֵרָד לְעָלָל. Ps. 72:19: בְּכֵרָד לְעָלָל is the nearest parallel. But there

is no reason to suppose that the hymnologist modelled his phraseology on that particular passage.

69. iii, 9: מתניאו. Cp. Is. 66:7: מַתְנִיאוּ. Our author could not, in this instance, quote MT verbally because the waw would have been out of place. 1QIsb follows MT, but 1QIsa reads המליחת which provides a very neat parallelism with הלאה of the first half of the verse. T uses the imperfect to render the two perfect forms of MT, and interprets the passage as referring to the Messianic king. It may be that knowledge of this is reflected in our text by the immediately following allusion to Is. 9:5, but it is hardly necessary to assume a connection between the imperfect form המליחת of our passage and הלאה of T.

70. iii, 10: מַלְאָךְ וַיִּשְׁחָרֵץ. Cp. Is. 9:5: מַלְאָכָּהל וַיִּשְׁחָרֵץ (= 1QIsa). The Midrashic rendering of the Biblical passage in our context finds no support in the VSS. We seem to have here a case of Biblical exegesis peculiar to the Qumran sect. The change was presumably motivated by the desire to avoid in the present context the direct reference to God in the Biblical original.

71. iii, 13: חָלֵג מַחְסָמָה בֵּית הַמִּשְׁמָרָה and Ps. 77:18: חָלֵג בֵּית חֲשָׁקָם. Our passage appears to be a conflation of these two passages. But no text-critical importance can be attached to our author’s use of either of them.

72. iii, 15: לְעַבְּדֶה הָהוֹדוֹת עַל נְבוֹכְדֶּנָּר מִי. Cp. Job 38:16: לְעַבְּדוּ הָהוֹדוֹת עַל נְבוֹכְדֶּנָּר. The word נְבוֹכְדֶּנָּר occurs only here in the Bible, and our author was clearly dependent on that passage although he treated his text freely. That he replaced בָּדֶה by מִי may be due to the fact that, in his allusion to Is. 17:12 in the immediately preceding phrase, he had already used מִי (מִי). The plur. הָהוֹדוֹת, instead of the sing. of MT, should also be ascribed to the author’s independent treatment of Biblical phraseology. The same applies to the use of the preposition בַּל, instead of לְ of MT — the latter being confirmed in every detail by G, T, S. In two respects we have what appear to be dialectal peculiarities: the use of בַּל in qal (post-Biblical) and the use of the “inverted” segholate נְבוֹכְדֶּנָּר which is the most likely form from which נְבוֹכְדֶּנָּר of Job 38:16 is derived). Allowing for this dialectal difference it is to be noted that 1QH confirms the hap. leg. in Job 38:16, and lends no support to the various emendations proposed (for which, see e.g. BH). With no Biblical Qumran fragment containing the Hebrew text of Job 38:16 available, we are in no position to decide whether the form נְבוֹכְדֶּנָּר depends on a tradition in Biblical MSS peculiar to Qumran.

73. iii, 19: קְטִיב of the second word is קְטִיב, Qere is קְטִיב, and it is difficult to avoid the conclusion

40 See Jastrow’s Dictionary, 1502.
that our author knew a Hebrew text which read רמאש. *Kethib* is followed by G, and S, whereas T and V agree with *Qere*. In our passage MT is also followed with regard to the reading of the word קבשנה (כְּבָשָׁה) instead of the rather poorly attested קבשנה (כְּבָשָׁה) (cp. BH). In spite of these points of agreement with MT it is curious to notice that BH, possibly on the basis of Job 33:18, suggests an emendation of MT to רמאש, a text which is closely similar to the one we have in 1QH, but finds no support in the VSS, except that in S מַעַרְבּ הַשָּׁה is rendered by אַלְכַּבֵּא דִּרְבָּא לַעָלָה.

74. iii, 19f. מַעַרְבּ הַשָּׁה מַעַרְבּ הַשָּׁה. MT is followed by the VSS. The use of the suffix in our passage is, of course, not based on a variant reading, but is due to the fact that our author had already used מַעַרְבּ הַשָּׁה in the immediately preceding phrase. The contracted form מַעַרְבּ הַשָּׁה is, in MT, found in Ps. 86:13; Prov. 15:24; 23:14; Job 11:8; the full form only in Ps. 30:4. This would seem to indicate that our author does not reproduce a variant reading, but simply applies the form most commonly attested in MT.

75. iii, 21: יִקֵּדַשּׁוֹת מַעַרְבּ הַשָּׁה יִקֵּדַשּׁוֹת. Our author employed the verb יִקֵּדַשׁ under the influence of passages like Jer. 33:8; Ps. 51:4, *etc*. The verb יִקֵּדַשׁ does not occur a single time in 1QH, and is, in the non-Biblical Qumran MSS, used only in CD v, 15; the root יָכֵד, however, is of very frequent occurrence. Against this background the allusion to Ps. 19:14 according to what one might call Qumran usage, is worthy of note. The precise reason for this preference of יָכֵד is not clear — unless we may see in it an indication of the importance which the members of the Qumran community attached to rites of purification. 41

76. iii, 22: יִקֵּדַשׁ יִקֵּדַשׁיִלָּה יִקֵּדַשׁ. This phrase is not Biblical. The nearest parallels are יִקֵּדַשׁ יִקֵּדַשׁיִלָּה יִקֵּדַשׁ in Ps. 89:6 and יִקֵּדַשׁ יִקֵּדַשׁיִלָּה יִקֵּדַשׁ in Ps. 89:8. Both Scriptures, as well as our passage, refer to divine, heavenly beings.

77. iii, 22: יִקֵּדַשׁ יִקֵּדַשׁיִלָּה יִקֵּדַשׁ. The best parallel is Is. 34:17: יִקֵּדַשׁ יִקֵּדַשׁיִלָּה יִקֵּדַשׁ, particularly according to 1QIs* which originally had a shorter text which neither contained the end of Is. 34:17 (from יִקֵּדַשׁ), nor the whole of the first two verses of the following chapter. The missing words were later added between the lines according to MT (except that the latter has יִקֵּדַשׁ whereas 1QIs* has יִקֵּדַשׁ); particularly worthy of note is the defective spelling יִקֵּדַשׁ in the addition at the end of Is. 35:2 which follows the spelling of MT, against the usual *plene* spelling in 1QIs* — clearly proving that the added text is secondary to the original text. There is no evidence in the VSS for the much shorter text of 1QIs*, although we may conclude from G that there

41 That the “spirit” is “cleansed” from sin by water rites is clearly presupposed in 1QS iii, 4 ff, if interpreted along the lines argued by the present writer in RQ 3 (1961) 439 f.
was a Hebrew text of Is. 35:1-2 which differed quite considerably from MT. The point which deserves notice is that IQIs and our passage agree in one important respect against MT: they both presuppose the connecting of ויהי וישלח of Is. 34:17 with what precedes. This instance, therefore, should be classified as a case of IQIs agreeing with IQIs against MT. Our passage suggests that the copyist of IQIs 34:17 did not break off at וישלח וישלח accidentally. We should rather take the physical features of IQIs to indicate that the copyist regarded Is. 34 as ending with וישלח וישלח, and, having written those words at the end of the line, he left one whole line blank in order to mark the beginning of a new section. As far as we can see, we have here a case of a specific Qumran tradition, with no support outside, with which the hymnologist was acquainted. He moulded the phraseology of his passage on it — against MT and all other witnesses.

78. iii, 25: electrónico מהמותרת ראב. In the immediate context this expression appears to have been formed deliberately so as to rhyme with the following הודות Maher leish; in spite of the chiastic structure of the two parallel phrases. There are three Biblical passages which offer closely similar phraseology: Am. 3:9; Ez. 22:5; Ps. 78:15. In the first two מהמותרת is used in the same way as in our passage (with an ethical connotation), and in Ps. 78:15, where מהמותרת is employed, we have the nearest parallel to the grammatical construction of our passage (the use of ראב, fem. sing., as qualifying a noun in the fem. plur.). IQH can hardly throw any light on the question as to whether, in the last mentioned passage, we should read מהמותרת (MT) or מהמותרת (a variant strongly attested in many Hebrew MSS and early printed editions) unless one is prepared to stress the use of ראב as the equivalent of ב. But there can be no doubt whatever that the hymnologist read ראב of MT, and not some other word as suggested e.g. in BH. The grammatical construction, although somewhat striking, is by no means impossible. IQH here certainly confirms MT, not because the author quoted the latter exactly, but because in this case we can confidently assume that, in coining the expression מהמותרת ראב, he depended on the specific phrase מהמותרת ראב in MT (which, as far as the reading ראב is concerned, is confirmed by all the VSS). But apart from Am. 3:9 and Ps. 78:15, special interest is attached to Ez. 22:5 where MT reads: מהמותרת ראב whereas the Greek translator certainly had a text before him which, instead of מהמותרת, read a word in the plur.: καὶ πολλὰ ἐν ταῖς ἀνομίαῖς. It is an important methodological point that, when attempting to reconstruct the Hebrew Vorlage on which a variant reading, as attested in one or several of the VSS, appears to be based, one should obviously search for the reading which offers the closest

42 See de Rossi, ad loc.
43 See W. Gesenius, Hebrew Grammar, ed. by Kautzsch, § 132 h.
similarity to the reading of the *textus receptus*, and yet is sufficiently different from it so as to justify the divergent translation(s). Such a word is, of course, immediately available in our present case. The reading reflected in ἐν τῶι ἀνόμησις of G and in ביאלי of S is undoubtedly the מְסַמֶּר of the Hebrew הַמָּשׁ המַּשְׁמַר. Although, according to Hatch and Redpath's *Concordance*, there are no examples of מְסַמֶּר being translated either by ἀνόμησις, ἀνόμησις, or ἀνόμησις, the two Hebrew words מַשׁ and מַשְׁמַר are so closely related in meaning that there can be little doubt that, in Ez. 22:5, the Greek translator read, if not actually מְסַמֶּר, then at least ביאלי of the מְסַמֶּר of S. This may be, the most important point for our purpose is the fact that the Greek translator read a plur. instead of the sing. of MT — and that that plur. (מַּשְׁמַר) was probably due to misreading of an original מְסַמֶּר of the plur. of מְסַמֶּר (MT). If so, we may find support for this variant reading in our passage, for the expression מְסַמֶּר appears to have arisen by a conflation of Ps. 78:15 (MT: מְסַמֶּר) and the reconstructed variant reading מְסַמֶּר in Ez. 22:5.

79. iii, 30–31: ביאלי מְסַמֶּר. The hymnologist is certainly dependent on Deut. 32:22: מְסַמֶּר אָרָבֶל יְרוֹם תְּפֹאְתָה מְסַמֶּר הַמָּשׁ. An examination of the VSS does not throw much light on the deviations of 1QH from MT. G translates literally, with the minor variations noted in BH: the translator apparently read all the verbal forms without the consecutive waw. It would, however, be precarious to argue that 1QH agrees with G here because the author freely altered the syntax of the Biblical passage and so had to omit the consecutive waw. But it should perhaps be pointed out that the Septuagintal readings without waw are supported not only by VL (whose evidence is secondary and unimportant), but by T and (partly) by S (which certainly read מְסַמֶּר instead of מְסַמֶּר). There is thus some support for מְסַמֶּר, and there is no doubt that we have here a real variant reading; we can not, however, reach any safe conclusion as to our author’s dependence on it. In his use of the word מְסַמֶּר instead of מְסַמֶּר of MT he is, of course, merely quoting loosely. Cp. 1QH xvii, 13 where Deut. 32:22 is quoted in a form closely similar to, but not quite identical with MT: מְסַמֶּר הָיִם ... מְסַמֶּר הָיִם ... מְסַמֶּר הָיִם ... מְסַמֶּר הָיִם. The Qumran authors appear to have preferred מְסַמֶּר to מְסַמֶּר.44

80. iii, 31: ביאלי מְסַמֶּר. The phraseology is taken from Job 28:9 where we have ביאלי מְסַמֶּר. That our author had this particular passage in mind may be seen also from the vocabulary of 1QH viii, 23 where מְסַמֶּר בָּא.44

Cp. Kuhn’s *Konkordanz*, 90 and 117.
THE HODAYOT AND TEXTUAL CRITICISM

is clearly modelled on Job 28:9–10: בְּחֵלֶם (iii, 31 and viii, 23, incidentally, are the only passages in 1QH in which the word בְּחֵלֶם is used). The main interest in our author's employment of Job 28:9–10 is attached to the plur. form of שִׁירָשׁ which is used both in our phrase and in viii, 23. Admittedly, in iii, 31 the plur. appears to have been forced upon him by the requirements of the context: he could hardly have used the sing. after יָדוֹרְךָ חוֹלֶם in l. 30 and יָדוֹרְךָ יִתְּנוּ in l. 31 (it is to be noted that יָדוֹרְךָ יִתְּנוּ is parallel with the preceding יָדוֹרְךָ יִתְּנוּ and not with יָדוֹרְךָ חוֹלֶם). There is, however, some evidence in the VSS for the reading of the plur. (משָׁרֵיס) instead of the sing. G translates by אָדַע (cp. ab stirpibus of VL) and Jerome by a radicibus. Also T and S testify to the plur. here. Two conclusions may be drawn from this evidence: (a) either we suppose that the ancient translators read the sing. (MT) and, independently of each other felt that in משָׁרֵיס the sing. must be rendered collectively; while our author, in sharing the same interpretation, simply employed the plur. form which he wanted in the context; or (b) there was a variant reading (well attested in antiquity, but not in Hebrew MSS) which read the plur. instead of the sing.; and, if such a reading existed, our author knew it and used it in his composition. There are difficulties in both these views. It is striking, however, that all the major VSS should go against MT here, for they must have done so at least partly independent of each other. T did not copy either G or V, nor did Jerome depend on either VL or G; (S, however, possibly copied T in view of their almost verbal similarity). It appears unlikely that G, T, and V should, independently of each other, use plur. renderings unless there was a plur. reading in their Hebrew Vorlage. We may conclude, with some reservation, that our passage testifies to the existence of such a text in Biblical MSS.

81. iii, 32: יָדוֹרְךָ יִתְּנוּ. That Biblical passage was already alluded to in 1QH ii, 12 ff. (see under 92 below), and it is used again in viii, 15. Under (92) we shall see how the author, in his use of Is. 57:20, differed from MT by using first יָדוֹרְךָ יִתְּנוּ and then יָדוֹרְךָ יִתְּנוּ (cp. 1QIsb and T), whereas MT (followed by 1QIsa) uses the same root twice. We now have occasion to point to a case of agreement with MT against 1QIsa. In all the three passages in 1QH mentioned above the verb יָדוֹרְךָ יִתְּנוּ, in agreement with MT, is used in active forms (it may be that we ought to read יָדוֹרְךָ יִתְּנוּ—qal, instead of יָדוֹרְךָ יִתְּנוּ—hiph'il in ii, 13). In 1QIsa, however, יָדוֹרְךָ יִתְּנוּ is used, not in the qal as in MT and 1QH, but in the hithpa'el. Although it makes little difference whether, with MT, one says about the waters of the sea that they "toss up mire and dirt" or, with 1QIsa, that they "are tossed up (with) mire and dirt", it is to be noted that it was the former phrase that inspired, not only the impersonal references to the roaring sea in 1QH ii, 12 ff. and iii, 32 (where the
element of mire- and dirt-tossing, as in MT, is of secondary importance and merely has a descriptive function qualifying the previous terms (כֹּלְיָם and רָצִים respectively, both these terms corresponding to מְשַׁמֵּר of MT), but also the personal reference to the “mud-slinging” of the author’s enemies referred to in viii, 15. Particularly the last mentioned passage makes it clear that the author derived his phraseology from MT and not from 1QIs. According to the latter the godless play a distinctly passive role, indicated not only by the hithpael רָצוֹן of דְּרַשְׁוֵךְ, but especially, and more importantly, by the niphal נִשְׂרָא with which readings of the author(s) of 1QH ii, 12 f, iii, 32, and viii, 15 do not seem to have been acquainted.

V

82. i, 10: רָצוֹן תַּחְתָּו. Cp. Ex. 14:21: נַחֲצָה נַחֲצָה הָעֵו (כֹּלְיָם נַחֲצָה הָעֵו). Our phrase may be modelled on that Biblical expression: if that is so, the hymnologist used it in a freely paraphrasing manner. None of the VSS appear to have read the substantive instead of the adjective.

83. i, 22: מַרְבִּיתָה נָחַשָׁה נַחֲצָה. This expression is of fairly common occurrence in 1QH, and there only. There is no exact Biblical equivalent. The nearest parallels are Prov. 12:8: נַחֲצָה נָחַשָׁה (cp. 1QH vii, 27), and Is. 19:14: רָצוֹן נָחֲצָה (cp. 1QH vi, 23 and vii, 5). In view of this evidence it seems that the phrase מַרְבִּיתָה נָחַשָׁה נַחֲצָה was coined by the author(s) of the Hymns, and one would not expect an examination of the VSS of Prov. 12:8 and Is. 19:14 to throw much light on it. In Prov. 12:8, e.g. no version has “spirit” instead of “heart”. One point, however, may be worth mentioning: the expansion of the phrase מַרְבִּיתָה נָחַשָׁה נַחֲצָה in our passage does not seem to be accidental; for the idea of “going astray” is expressed in G, T and S, in their renderings of מַרְבִּיתָה נָחַשָׁה. However, it is generally followed by the hiphil of נִשְׂרָא, the text referring to the staggering of Egypt, caused by giddiness, מַרְבִּיתָה נָחַשָׁה, to the Biblical passage being used, as is so often the case in the Hebrew Bible, without any specific sense; a “spirit of confusion” or “of giddiness” being the same as “confusion” or “giddiness” pure and simple. G has πνεύμα πλανήτης καὶ ἐπλανήτησιν; correspondingly T renders by: ῥόρῳ, and S by: πνεῦμα ἐπλανητικόν. That S should here have a text so closely akin to that of T may not be so significant, for it is possibly due to Targumic influence. The agreement between G and T, however, is rather more striking, although we should probably not suppose that these two VSS reflect a genuine variant reading (which would then be attested in our passage). The translators may well have realized that the Hebrew root

45 Cp. Kuhn, op. cit., 158.
and the noun ידוע could have the sense of “going astray”, like Arab. نْدأ, as distinct from the expression ערי “to bend”. And the expression והתשך in our passage, if derived from Is. 19:14, may be said to reflect the same tradition of interpretation.

84. i, 25: There is some influence here from Is. 40:26–27 in the use of the verbs תַּעַשֵּׁר and תַּעַשְׁר, although their sequence is reversed; a small difference in spelling between MT and IQH on the one hand, and IQIs on the other may be observed: the latter spells the negation (in v. 26) plene. But apart from Is. 40:26–27 our text is dependent especially on MT of Jer. 16:17: there is also close resemblance between the two contexts in which this phraseology is used (the same applies to some degree to Is. 40:26–27). MT of Jer. 16:17 is followed by T, V, and S. According to Sabatier, Jerome states explicitly that he translated these words from the Hebrew original, and that the words were not in G. In these circumstances it is hardly to be wondered at that Aqu. and Th. both follow MT by translating οὐκ ἐκρύβησαν ἀπὸ προσώπου μου, and as these are the very words also in G, one may perhaps conclude that the longer text got into the latter from those two other Greek Versions. That G represents the original text of G here is beyond dispute.

85. i, 25–26: מְהֵמי יֵכָּח לְעֵבְּרֵהוֹן מַה יִשֵּׁב עֵלִי מִכָּל מַשָּׁפֶּס הָבָרְכֵּן. That this context contains an allusion to Hab. 2:1 is fairly clear; but it is difficult to say with certainty whether our author in that passage read ישיב (MT) or ישיב (cp. S). It might be argued, on the strength of ישיב considered in isolation, that IQH in this instance agrees with S, or possibly reflects a Hebrew original which read thus. But the context in IQH is only loosely dependent on Hab. 2:1 and offers what amounts to an extensive paraphrase of the Biblical passage. In l.26 has been corrected to מְהֵמי by the addition of a superscript waw. The preposition is in parallelism with מִעִי of l.25, and other examples of an apparently superfluous waw (perhaps used for emphasis) in a similar syntactical position have been detected.

86. i, 29: מְכַבֶּה שֵׁפָתִים. Cp. Is. 11:4: מְכַבֶּה שֵׁפָתִים, as well as the parallelism of the expression with בָּרַי הָרָעֹב in l.28, show that our author (correctly) regarded the Biblical expression as a metaphor for “speech”. Cp. the very illuminating phrasing in Prov. 1:23 where the pouring out of “spirit” (or rather: “breath”) and the making known of “words” are two synonymous phrases — in the same way as, in our passage, “words” (l.28) and “pouring out of breath of lips” (l.29) are synonymous: they both refer to speech. That, in the Messianic passage Is. 11:4 מְכַבֶּה שֵׁפָתִים refers to

46 Ad loc.; cp. also Field, ad loc.
47 See the writer’s article in JSS, 3 (1958) 321 ff.
the breathing by which enunciation of words is naturally accompanied, and thus in fact means "speech" is, among the VSS, clearly realized only in T. The Greek translator by his rendering καὶ ἐν πνεύματι διὰ χαλεκων perhaps did not fully realize the meaning of the phrase, although it is to be noted that he rendered the Hebrew phrase מַחֲמֵל by τῷ λόγῳ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ. But T makes the reference to speech clear by translating: בֵּית מֹסֵי מַחֲמֵל. There can be little doubt that there is a connection between this Targumic interpretation of the Biblical idiom and the use of the latter in our passage.

87. i, 29: ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ ἐν θαυμάζων καὶ ὁ ψωμί. The use of ζω μι in the Biblical passage here is confirmed. Our author, like Ag. (καὶ αὐτὸν) either preferred the meaning "measuring line" (cp. the parallel expression בִּמְשָׁה immediately preceding it), or else was unaware of the meaning "voice" reflected in φθόγγος of G and ἢχος of Sym. Lexicographically this allusion is therefore of little value, but it is nevertheless interesting as a witness to MT, against the various emendations proposed by modern scholars (cp. BH).

88. i, 29 f.: ἀλλὰ διὸ μὴ ἐκεῖνος τὸ ἐλπίδα παρεσιμάσθηκαν. As this phraseology represents a conflation of Ps. 96:3 and 145:12 it is impossible to say whether, in the latter passage, our author read διὰ τοὺς γενεάς, with MT, or διὰ τὸν κόσμον with G. Furthermore MT, although using the plur. in v. 12, employs the sing. in v. 11. Our author is, however, clearly dependent on the general phraseology of Ps. 145:9–13. We may therefore perhaps conclude that הֵן in l.31 echoes and confirms ולְךָ in Ps. 145:9 the correctness of which is questioned in BH on the ground that G renders by τοῦ ἱστομένου. Septuagintal tradition is, however, not unanimous in that translation.

89. i, 31–32. מִבְּחֵיתוֹ הָגִהלָה תְמוּנָהוּ (ם) בָּרְכֵיהוּ. We may confidently assume that the reconstruction is correct. Our passage is a paraphrase of Ps. 51:3–4, and although our author does not quote these two verses literally, his allusion to them cannot be doubted. The present case is an excellent illustration, not only of the hymnologist's treatment of Biblical material, but also of the degree to which such paraphrasing material may be used for text-critical purposes. For the present the interest is linked to the following words in MT of Ps. 51:3–4: ...וַהֲמוּר ...וַהֲמוּר ...וַהֲמוּר ...וַהֲמוּר ...וַהֲמוּר ...וַהֲמוּר ...וַהֲמוּר ...וַהֲמוּר ...וַהֲמוּר ...וַהֲמוּר ...וַהֲמוּר ...וַהֲמוּר ...וַהֲמוּר ...וַהֲמוּר ...וַהֲמוּר ...וַהֲמוּר ...וַהֲמוּר ...וַהֲמוּר ...וַהֲמוּר ...וַהֲמוּר ...וַהֲמוּר ...וַהֲמוּר ...וַהֲמוּר ...וַהֲמוּר ...וַהֲמוּר ...וַהֲמ... (v.3). On closer examination it will be seen that the form in which our author alludes to these verses displays a number of significant variant readings which can all of them be shown to find support either in G or in Hebrew MSS. (a) The first variant to be noticed is the use of ב instead of ב. This cannot be accidental, for the same difference from the bulk of Massorethic tradition (the latter being strongly supported by G, cp. VL, other Greek translations, T, S) is found in two Hebrew MSS, according to de Rossi. (b) The second variant reading is reflected in our author's use of בְּרִית. This word, which is not in MT, was certainly read by
the translator of G, and by Th., but not by Aq. and Sym. (c) The plur. as against the sing. of MT, is, according to de Rossi, attested in one MS and in some early printed editions. For the reconstructed word, cp. also Jer. 33:8.

90. ii, 6: {לאוֹלָ wl} 1 מַחֲקִים מַלְוֹת לָבְרִי. Cp. Ez. 21:12: {אָלָּמִמַּוְתָה יִכְּ} בְאַא בֵּא כָּל-לָבְרִי...בֵּא בֵא כָּל-לָבְרִי... This passage must have been in the author’s mind when he wrote his line; and the phrase {לאוֹלָ wl} מַחֲקִים מַלְוֹת suggests that he read {רְכָּחָהוֹת} (MT, cp. V, T, S).

91. ii, 8: {כִּירְמֹה דָּוִיתָהוֹת מַיִּרְמָסִים מַלְוֹת לָלֵלָשׁ} בֵּמָשׁ בֵּמָשׁ...בֵּמָשׁ בֵּמָשׁ... The allusion is clear enough, and our author utilized freely a text identical with MT. G, T, V, S all read {מַיִּרְמָסִים מַלְוֹת לָלֵלָשׁ}, but the accumulation of abstract nouns in our context indirectly supports MT. Whether with MT the hymnologist read {לָלֵלָשׁ} or {לָלֵלָשׁ} — the reading which the Greek translator presumably had before him — is difficult to decide.

92. ii, 12–13: {נָאִיר בָּּם הָּרֵג הָּרְשָׁאָה וּתְּמַשְׁאֵא} (Is. 57:20): The suggestion in BH that {נָאִיר בָּּם} be emended to {נָאִיר בָּּם}, and {רְשָׁאָה} to {רְשָׁאָה}, is not supported anywhere. The evidence at our disposal indicates that the uncertainty in the textual tradition is bound up with the position of the {נָשָׁא} in these words, rather than with the possible confusion of that letter with {דַּלָּא}. 1QIsa, as far as the use of the root {רְשָׁאָה} is concerned, twice follows MT (the fact that 1QIsb employs different forms of this verb does not concern us at the moment). Cp. also Aq. which uses {אָבַרָאָסָא} and {אָבַרָאָסָא}, and Sym. which uses {אָבַרָאָסָא} only — in this repetition clearly presupposing MT. In T, however, the position is different; therefore there is obviously a translation of {נָאִיר בָּּם}. That the translator read two different roots in his copy of the Hebrew text is also suggested by the fact that {כִּירְמָסִים מַלְוֹת} is followed by {כִּירְמָסִים מַלְוֹת}. It appears therefore that T presupposes a text which, like 1QH, read first {רְשָׁאָה} and then {נָאִיר בָּּם}. This may be supported by reference to 1QIsh which, although only fragmentarily preserving Is. 57:20, makes it clear that there was such a variant reading; for 1QIsh reads {נָאִיר בָּּם} which goes against MT, but agrees with 1QH, and, presumably, T (cp. also Th., V, and S). The position of G is not entirely clear: the verse is only partially translated, and {כָּלְדֵּנִיִּיָּאָא} is used nowhere else in that Version.

93. ii, 14: {אָוָאָא אֶחָא לָּבַלְאֵר יַעַיְתָה} and Jer. 15:10: {אָוָאָא אֶחָא לָּבַלְאֵר יַעַיְתָה}...{אָוָאָא אֶחָא לָּבַלְאֵר יַעַיְתָה}. Cp. Is. 17:12–13: {מַטָּמְיָאֵר מַטָּמְיָאֵר הָמָהֵות (12) יָטְמָאֵר הָמָהֵות (13)} {יָטְמָאֵר הָמָהֵות (12) יָטְמָאֵר הָמָהֵות (13)}... This is an excellent case of dependence on a particular passage which the hymnologist paraphrased and used freely. What is particularly interesting for our purpose is the fact that our...
author may have depended on a text which, like MT, contained the beginning of v.13 which, according to de Rossi (cp. also BH), is missing in eight Hebrew MSS, due to *homoioteleuton*. The full text (with the expression יִשָּׁמֶר which our author must have read in this context) is found in 1QIs*; cp. T. G in v.13 has “much water” twice which, if based on a Hebrew original, illustrates the fluidity of the consonantal text in this case. S reflects a shorter text, in which the beginning of v.13 was absent, but it does attest to the expression “many waters” by its translation יָםָם נֵסָע מֵאֵשׁ at the end of v.12. This is, in all probability, based on a Hebrew text which was shorter than MT, and read יִשָּׁמֶר רִבְּעָם in v.12 and not in v.13. Jerome, although having a longer text than S, has sicut sonitus aquarum multarum at the end of v.12 (corresponding to “many” of S, as against “mighty” of MT), and sicut sonitus aquarum inundantium at the beginning of v.13. There is thus no certainty (although, in view of the evidence of 1QIs*, much probability) that the author of 1QH depended on the longer text.

95. ii, 22–23: וְזָהַזָּה הַמַּשָּׁפָה וְרָכֶל דְּרַכֵּיהּ וְחֵשְׁנָה בְּמַשָּׁפָה. Our author is here dependent on the phraseology of Ps. 109:26 and 31. In the former passage MT reads the preposition ב (cp. G, T, V, S). However, some Hebrew MSS read ב. In 109:31 MT reads הַלָּשֶׁנֶת מְשַׁפָּה (cp. T). Our author clearly took the last word of that passage as the object of the verb, as is the case also in G and S. There is also some evidence for a variant reading which read מַשָּׁפָה instead of מְשַׁפָּה: the former, which is certainly nearer to the phrasing in our passage than MT, is attested in G and V. It therefore appears that a direct link exists between the reading of Ps. 109:31 as reflected in G and the use made of that passage in 1QH.

96. ii, 29: וְזָהַזָּה רְשֵׁת פֶּאֶר לְחַבְּרֵי הָלֹהָרְבָּן וְזָהַזָּה מְשַׁפָּה לְמָשָׁפָה. Cp. Ps. 35: 7–8: וְזָהַזָּה רְשֵׁת פֶּאֶר לְמָשָׁפָה וְזָהַזָּה מְשַׁפָּה לְמָשָׁפָה... The similarities between the two passages are unmistakable. BH suggests that the plur. be read in v.8b. Our text, as well as G and S, lends some support to that. T and V support MT. Most interesting, however, is the rendering of these two verses in S which, on the one hand, differs considerably from MT and, on the other, offers a close parallel to the phraseology of our passage. The rendering of S is easily retroverted into Hebrew in the following way: יִשָּׁמֶר פֶּאֶר (8) רְשֵׁת פֶּאֶר מְשַׁפָּה (7). It is easily seen that the Hebrew Vorlage of the Syriac translator must have been closely parallel to our passage, except of course that the order of the sentences is changed. In addition to the agreement of 1QH and S on the plur. in v.8b two quite remarkable similarities between them may be noted: (a) the word פֶּאֶר, although not in MT, is used both in S and in 1QH; (b) MT uses רְשֵׁת + מְשַׁפָּה in both verses; whereas in S, as well as in our passage, the verb (with רְשֵׁת) is not מְשַׁפָּה but יִשָּׁמֶר.
It is difficult to imagine that such agreements between S and 1QH should be merely accidental. And the fact that the text of these two verses, as we have it reflected in the VSS, was obviously handed down in different recensions, surely lends some probability to the assumption that our author depended on this instance on the text form underlying 1QH, and that the latter was not a result of a free and paraphrasing translation of a text identical with MT. S, as is well known, is generally a good literal translation of its Hebrew original. MT reads in both places אתשה מברח, and in both cases T paraphrases: נודע רוחל וברחלא. It seems certain to me that our author, in his use of the מברח of T in a context of child-bearing, was influenced by this Targumic rendering. There is therefore no doubt that the substantive of our text should be read as the verb מברח, not as the noun נודע.

98. iii, 13: ירגוב עפר. This phrase does not occur in MT. But phrases like ירח עפר (Ps. 22:30) are near enough to our phrase to suggest that we have here an echo of Biblical phraseology. The use of ירגוב rather than of ירח or ירח is simply due to the fact that the phrase in the context of 1QH means “those who dwell on the dust” (i.e. the dry land, the earth), as opposed to “those who sail upon the seas” mentioned in the following — whereas the Biblical phrases both refer to the dead. Attention should perhaps be drawn to Is. 18:3. This is an example of our author being dependent upon Biblical phraseology generally, rather than upon any specific passage.

99. iii, 18: ירגוב עפר נודע. The dual form of 1QH appears with ק-double of MT, and with 1QI*, against Qere of MT, many MSS and printed editions (cp. de Rossi) which have the sing. here. The verbal form נודע of 1QH appears to be niphal, whereas in Is. 26:20 imperative qal with object is used. This is an interesting case of a ק-double reading being confirmed both by 1QH and 1QI*.

100. iii, 20–21: ירגוב עפר נודע. Three Scriptural passages appear to have been combined to form this sentence. The words ירגוב עפר נודע allude to Gen. 2:7, a passage which played a central role in the anthropological speculations of the Qumran theologians. Our text is an abridgement of the Biblical phrase ירגוב עפר נודע. The preposition מ was attached to מברח, thus presumably changing the meaning of the Hebrew a little. The preposition מברח of 1QH corresponds, not to מברח of Gen. ii, 7, but to מברח of that passage, the preposition indicating not the material of which something is fashioned (= simple accusative), but the element out of which, and as a part of which, the final product is formed. The preposition thus retains in our passage the
meaning it has in the Biblical verse (cp. also the phrase מַעֲמַר לְבָּשִׁית in 1QH, fragment 2, 1.4). The two other passages, on which the author depends are Ps. 78:69 and Job 4:19. The use in Ps. 78:69 of תְּפָרָה and in Job 4:19 of לָשָׁן עַדֵּית makes one wonder whether לָשָׁן עַדֵּית in 1QH should not be regarded as the equivalent of לָשָׁן עַדֵּית. If so, the passage means: “for the one whom Thou fashioned out of the dust as an eternal foundation” rather than: “...for an eternal assembly”. In other words, לָשָׁן עַדֵּית should perhaps be taken, not as indicating the purpose for which man was created, but as emphasizing his eternally earthly character — an attitude which is in complete agreement with the present context. No conclusion may be reached on the basis of our passage as to whether in Ps. 78:69 our author read וַהֲרֵף אָבוֹן or מַעֲמַר עַדֵּית, the latter reading being a well attested variant, both in Hebrew MSS, in G and S.

101. iii, 26: מִקְרָא. This phrase is not found in Biblical Hebrew, but the author is somehow dependent on Ps. 35:7, a passage which — together with the continuation in Ps. 35:8 — was utilized in ii, 29 (see under 96 above). As was the case there, thus also in our passage the word מִקְרָא is used, in agreement with S against MT. However, our passage also uses the word מִקְרָא which has come in from the same Scriptural passage according to MT. May we conclude on the basis of this evidence that we have here an example of a conflation of two different readings of the same Biblical passage? Some such theory would presuppose that a Bible text closely similar to MT, but not identical with it was known and used by the hymnologists, but that that same recension was not exclusively authoritative. The attractive feature about this hypothesis is that it would leave us with the purely analytical task of determining the recensional background in each case of a Scriptural passage being utilized, and would mean the abandonment of any attempt at fixing the relative dates of these compositions on the basis of their agreement or disagreement with MT. There is, in fact, nothing to show that those passages which disagree with MT are earlier than those which clearly reflect MT, and the particular significance of the conflation of two different recensions of the same Biblical passage, as we have it in our passage, is that it illustrates this very point.

102. iii, 26: תְּפָרָה. This phrase represents a paraphrastic expansion of Is. 19:8: תְּפָרָה מִכְּמַרְתָּא (MT and 1QIs). In the paraphrase the use of תְּפָרָה may well be an echo of תְּפָרָה of Ps. 35:7, alluded to in the immediately preceding sentence. תְּפָרָה never used in MT as object of מִכְּמַרְתָּא. But in Is. 19:8 Aramaic and Syriac equivalents (T: מִכְּמַרְתָּא, S: מִכְּמַרְתָּא) are employed to render מִכְּמַרְתָּא. What is more, the use of the plur. in those VSS as renderings of the Masoretic מִכְּמַרְתָּא in the sing. is

48 On the interchange of מִכְּמַרְתָּא in the Bible and in Qumran literature, see H. Yalon, Kirjath Sepher 28 (1952) 67.
exactly matched in our passage by the parallel position of the plur. word וְזָרָתָה (7), the sing. מַחֲרָת. It is safe to assume, therefore, that the author phrased his line by combining the wording of MT in Is. 19:8 with the Hebrew equivalent of the Aramaic rendering of T. This is an interesting example of Targumic influence in 1QH because it gives us an impression of the means which the authors of these hymns might have utilized in order to expand a Biblical idiom according to the traditional structure of Hebrew poetry: they might, as in the present case, resort to T, the Version with which they appear to have been familiar, and employ the closest Hebrew equivalent to the vocabulary used there. They might also sometimes substitute some word of the particular Biblical passage which they had in mind at the moment, with a completely different word of which they happened to be reminded by assonance.

We have already noted as an example of this kind; and the use of the obscure word רָקָס (8) which, in the sing. הֶבֶר (9) and the plur. הֶבֶרִים, occurs only in Ps. 10:8, 10, and 14, was probably suggested to our author by the use of the word וַיִּהְבֶּה in Is. 19:8. The Masoretic vocalization מְכַפֵּלָה in Is. 19:8 is not supported by 1QIsa: the pronunciation with o would certainly in that MS have required plene spelling (49), and the same could reasonably be argued to apply in our passage (cp. also the defective spelling in 1QH v.8). It appears that at Qumran only the pronunciation מְכַפֵּלָה was used.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

The distribution in the various Biblical books of the 102 Scriptural allusions dealt with above is as follows:

(a) The Pentateuch:
1. Gen.: (48), (100).
2. Ex.: (82).
3. Num.: (5).
4. Deut.: (17), (79).

In all these cases, except possibly (79), 1QH testifies to a text identical with MT — or, negatively expressed, they do not reflect a Biblical text different from MT.

(b) The Historical Books:
1. Jud.: (26), (93).
2. 1 Sam.: (25), (34).
3. 2 Sam.: (35).
4. 1 Ki.: (71).
5. 2 Ki.: (35).

Here again MT is confirmed. In two cases, (26) and (34), we seem to have some degree of general Aramaic, rather than specific Targumic influence; in (35), however, there is a firm link with Targumic language and exegesis.

49 See the present writers' remarks in JSS 3 (1958) 247.
(c) The Prophetical Books:

1. Is.: (2), (12), (13), (15), (16), (18), (20), (21), (27), (29), (38), (43), (49), (53), (54), (56), (60), (67), (69), (70), (77), (81), (83), (84), (86), (92), (94), (99), (102).

Not all of the above references are of interest for our purpose; this applies to (15), (38), (54), (56), (69), (70), and (84); in the case of (94) the evidence is inconclusive, and the position in (49) is equally uncertain. In (16) the hymnologist agrees with MT as confirmed by the VSS, and MT is also followed where the textual tradition appears to have been less uniform: in (2), (20), (21), and (27) 1QH goes with MT against G. Of particular interest are, of course, cases where 1QH follows MT against 1QIsa: examples of this may be found in (12), where 1QIsa and G go against MT, and in (29), (81). In (53) the hymnologist appears to follow MT against 1QIsa in a matter of pronunciation. In (67) 1QH agrees with MT against both 1QIsa and 1QIsb.

On the other hand, we find in this group a number of interesting examples where 1QH disagrees with MT and where, because of supporting evidence elsewhere, we may see an actual variant reading reflected. In (18) 1QH goes against MT, but agrees with G; similarly, in (27) S is followed against MT; and in (92) 1QH agrees with 1QIsb (and T), against MT and 1QIsa. In three instances — (43), (60), and (77) — the reading of 1QIsa is followed, in what appear to be variant readings peculiar to that MS, against all other evidence. In (99) 1QH agrees with Kethib of MT, and with 1QIsa.

In (13), (83), (86), and (102) varying degrees of Targumic influence may be ascertained.

2. Jer., Ez., Hos., Am., Mic., Na., Hab., Zech., Mal. (Jer.: five instances; Ez., Hos.: three each; Am., Mic., Na., Hab., Zech., Mal.: one each). (1), (3), (11), (19), (32), (33), (45), (46), (47), (51), (56), (62), (78), (84), (85), (90), (91).

MT, as confirmed by the VSS, is reflected in (1), (3), (46), (90). The evidence in (47), (51), and (56) is inconclusive. (11), (62), and (84) agree with MT, against G. (32) reflects a variant reading attested in G; and the same may, with reservations, apply also to (78). In (19) 1QH possibly agrees with G against MT in a matter of vocalization. Targumic influence may perhaps be detected in (33); in (45) — and possibly also in (85) — 1QH agrees with S, against MT.

(d) The Poetical Books

1. Ps.: (4), (6), (8), (14), (22), (23), (25), (30), (37), (42), (50), (55), (58), (59), (60), (61), (63), (64), (65), (66), (68), (71), (74), (75), (76), (78), (87), (88), (89), (95), (96), (101).

In this comparatively long list from Ps. the recensional evidence is of an
unsatisfactory or inconclusive nature in the following cases: (23), (58), (64), (66), (68), (71), (75), (76), (78), (88). MT, as confirmed by the VSS, is reflected in (6), (22), (50), (59), (74). 1QH agrees with MT against G in (55). In (87) 1QH also agrees with MT but differs from G in a matter of interpretation, the Hebrew Vorlage of 1QH and G being identical. In (4) and (42) we find 1QH following MT as printed in BH, against Hebrew MSS.

1QH goes against MT and agrees with G and T in (8) and (63). There are five (possibly six) more instances of 1QH agreeing with G against MT: (14), (25), (30?), (65), (89), (95). In two cases we have ascertained agreement with S against MT: (96), (101). In (60) 1QH depends on a variant reading attested in T, and influence from Targumic exegesis may be seen in (61). In (89) and (95) 1QH agrees with Hebrew MSS, against MT as printed in BH.

2. Job: (36), (57), (72), (73), (80).

In all the passages concerned, except for (80), MT is confirmed; in the last mentioned instance, however, 1QH follows, so it appears, a well attested variant reading. In (73) 1QH agrees with Kethib.

3. Prov. (24), (31), (39), (40), (52), (83).

Of the above instances the evidence of (24), (52), and (83) is inconclusive. In (39) the position is uncertain; in (31) 1QH confirms MT, as printed in BH, against Hebrew MSS.

The fact that the phraseology of 1QH leans fairly heavily on the Biblical psalms is, in the nature of the case, not surprising. But the comparatively large number of allusions to the book of Isaiah is certainly worthy of note. It is, indeed, fortunate that of that particular book we possess two contemporary manuscripts.