Assessing Emanuel Tov's "Qumran Scribal Practice"

Eibert Tigchelaar

Correlations might be enough for us,
but it's not evidence, you know—
not enough to do anything with.
China Miéville, *The City & the City*

1. Introduction

Emanuel Tov's assumption of a so-called "Qumran scribal practice" is largely inductive. Tov has collected many thousands, perhaps even tens of thousands, of small technical details pertaining to how the Dead Sea Scrolls and other texts from Antiquity were written. In his book *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert*, he explains the reason of collecting all these data:

These details are important in their own right for improving our understanding of these scribes and the compositions they copied. They should be added to the storehouse of knowledge relating to the biblical and nonbiblical compositions found in the Judean Desert.¹

The collection of all those data also enables the scholar to analyze possible correlations of different sets of data. Indeed, Tov's work is full of observations, queries, and analyses of correlations. Sometimes these are simple observations, such as "that all the texts from Qumran written in the palaeo-Hebrew script are inscribed on leather rather than papyrus."² More often, one first needs to collect and analyze large sets of data before one can describe differences between scrolls, such as the varying size of the writing blocks of scrolls. With respect to this example, there are multiple correlations. There is a general correspondence between size of the composition and the height of a column. But some scrolls with a shorter column may have been used liturgically, which suggests that liturgical scrolls had a smaller format than other

-
1. Emanuel Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert* (STDJ 54; Leiden: Brill, 2004), xix.
 2. *Ibid.*, 33, where this simple correlation is connected to other features. For a fuller discussion of writing in the paleo-Hebrew script, cf. *ibid.*, 238–48. See also Steve Delamarter, "Sociological Models for Understanding the Scribal Practices in the Biblical Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Methods and Theories in the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. Maxine Grossman; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, forthcoming).

ones.³ Or one may correlate many different sets of data. For example, Tov studied in detail the character of the very large scrolls or *de luxe* editions, and analyzed relations between textual character, date, and number of corrections in the text. Tov's work is full of analyses of such correlations, which shed light on the character of types of scrolls, but also on the practices of the scribes who wrote them. Some of those practices are related to the kinds of scrolls they wrote, for example biblical texts or *tefillin*. Other scribal practices may have been conventions of specific groups of scribes.

This paper addresses Tov's construction and analysis of one such scribal practice, the one that he connects to the scribes at Qumran, who would have had a set of scribal conventions that was clearly distinct from that of other, nonsectarian, scribes. Tov refers to this scribal practice as the "Qumran scribal practice," which is in part a statistical construction, based on analysis and reconstruction of correlations between many different sets of data, and in part an hypothesis or theory, inasmuch as it proposes an explanation of this construction. In fact, one can observe that even the statistical reconstruction itself is based on specific suppositions. I therefore call Tov's "Qumran scribal practice" a scholarly construct, and, when we assess it, we could look both at the building blocks, and at the way the building has been raised.

Tov's "Qumran scribal practice" has been for many years a work in progress, gradually developing from its first tentative description in the 1980s⁴ to the more comprehensive formulation in his 2004 *Scribal Practices and Approaches*.⁵ This development was due to three factors. First, in the 1980s many scrolls, which during the 1990s and early 2000s were published, were not yet known. Second, the original formulation of the hypothesis was mainly based on the analysis of orthographic and morphological data, but later Tov included in his analysis other kinds of scribal features. Third, scholarly criticisms forced Tov to deal with many issues in detail. For the sake of convenience, I will mainly refer to Tov's construct as it appears in his 2004 *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, even though he has continued working on parts of his construct. Because Tov's work has been a work in progress, some older criticisms of Tov's work may not be relevant anymore, often because Tov himself has addressed those criticisms extensively.

3. Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 82–99.

4. Note especially, Emanuel Tov, "The Orthography and Language of the Hebrew Scrolls Found at Qumran and the Origin of These Scrolls," *Textus* 13 (1986): 31–57; idem, "Hebrew Bible Manuscripts from the Judaean Desert: Their Contribution to Textual Criticism," *JJS* 39 (1988): 5–37.

5. This 2004 volume integrates more than thirty earlier published contributions, which have been edited to varying degrees. Cf. *ibid.*, xx–xxi. Cf. also my review of Tov's volume in *DSD* 14 (2007): 368–72.

2. A Close Reading of Tov's Formulation of the "Qumran Scribal Practice"

Tov's most recent summary of the "Qumran scribal practice" runs as follows

Within the Qumran corpus, a group of some 160 nonbiblical and biblical texts has been isolated as reflecting an idiosyncratic practice, the characteristics of which are visible in peculiarities in orthography, morphology, and scribal features. This group of texts is closely connected with the Qumran community since it includes virtually all commonly agreed upon sectarian writings (with the exception of seven or eight sectarian texts which do not display these characteristics). The texts found at Qumran can thus be subdivided into texts presumably copied by a sectarian group of scribes, and other texts which were presumably taken there from elsewhere. The combined evidence shows that the great majority of the distinctive scribal features is more or less limited to texts that also display the Qumran orthography and morphology. The texts written in the Qumran scribal practice could have been penned anywhere in ancient Israel, but they were probably written mainly at Qumran.⁶

Tov is generally very careful in his writing, and this summary is very much alike ones he wrote earlier. We may therefore closely analyze this summary. In the first sentence, "Within the Qumran corpus, a group of some 160 nonbiblical and biblical texts has been isolated as reflecting an idiosyncratic practice, the characteristics of which are visible in peculiarities in orthography, morphology, and scribal features," Tov does *not* state that there are some 160 manuscripts that display a number of specific orthographic, morphological and scribal features. Instead, he claims that on the basis of these features one can construct a specific scribal practice, and that about 160 manuscripts display one or more features that reflect this practice. This distinction is theoretically important because it argues that these features are correlated; it is methodologically important because in some cases one or two features would be enough to reflect the practice. Here the term "idiosyncratic" as in "idiosyncratic practice" should probably be taken in its etymological sense, and not in the usual meaning of "unconventional," "eccentric." A similar ambiguity appears in the word "peculiarities," which should probably be understood as "characteristics," and not as "abnormalities" or "irregularities." The exact meaning and intent of those words here is important, since in his discussion of the orthography and morphology Tov uses binary oppositions, which in some cases present the form of the

6. Emanuel Tov, "Scribal Features of Two Qumran Scrolls" (Orion conference 2008), but cf. almost similar wording already in his *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 261–62. The main difference in wording is the change from "a group of 167 nonbiblical and biblical texts," to "a group of some 160 nonbiblical and biblical texts."

“Qumran scribal practice” as different from the “regular” form we know from the Masoretic text of the Hebrew Bible, and most other forms of Hebrew. Most of the orthographic and morphological features of Tov’s “Qumran scribal practice” are indeed irregular vis-à-vis the wording of the Masoretic text, but several critics have questioned what they saw as the implicit suggestion that all these forms were linguistically irregular in Hebrew of that period.

Tov continues with “This group of texts is closely connected with the Qumran community since it includes virtually all commonly agreed upon sectarian writings (with the exception of seven or eight sectarian texts which do not display these characteristics).” This description assumes the position that was commonly held amongst textual scholars, namely that the scrolls belonged to a sectarian community residing at or related to Qumran, and that we can confidently isolate some compositions that are specifically sectarian, even though there is a dispute about other writings.⁷ In this respect, Tov’s distinction between sectarian writings (i.e., compositions) and sectarian texts (i.e., manuscripts) is important, but also confusing. There are several suppositions involved, namely (a) that sectarian compositions must have originated and have been copied in the sectarian community of Qumran;⁸ (b) that hence the scribal practice reflected in those texts must have been that of scribes at Qumran; (c) the fact that virtually all sectarian compositions were copied in this practice indicates that it was not just one of several scribal practices at Qumran, but specifically one connected to sectarian manuscripts. Tov acknowledges that there are a few manuscripts of sectarian compositions that are not copied according to this practice, but he ventures no explanation.⁹

“The texts found at Qumran can thus be subdivided into texts presumably copied by a sectarian group of scribes, and other texts which were presumably taken there from elsewhere.” Many scholars nowadays might allow for the fact that some texts were written by a sectarian group of scribes, and other texts taken there from elsewhere—something that was still disputed when Tov first launched his hypothesis. However, Tov suggests that this differentiation more or less corresponds to that between one group of texts written according to the “Qumran scribal practice,” and another group of texts that do not reflect this practice. The ba-

7. We now have to write “was commonly held,” since in the past decade most elements of this position have been questioned. Cf. most recently Sarianna Metso and Hindy Najman, eds., *The Community of the Dead Sea Scrolls* = DSD 16.3 (2009), which an extremely helpful collection of essays representing the present views on the Community. See also John J. Collins, *Beyond the Qumran Community: The Sectarian Movement of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2010).

8. This is not specifically Tov’s supposition, but one that was assumed by most scholars up to recently.

9. Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 262, again acknowledges there are some exceptions, but does not discuss this phenomenon.

sis supposition is that scribal practices are conventions of groups of scribes, and that it is unlikely to find two quite different conventions within one sectarian community. In his very first construction, Tov added another socio-religious argument which we do not find anymore in his later work, namely that the different scribal practices reflected in the biblical manuscripts, actually show two opposite, incompatible approaches to the biblical text, that cannot be imagined in one community.¹⁰ Nonetheless, the idea of mutual exclusiveness still remains at the basis of his construct.

“The combined evidence shows that the great majority of the distinctive scribal features is more or less limited to texts that also display the Qumran orthography and morphology.” This is a crucial element of Tov’s construct, because his research shows that the orthographic and morphological peculiarities are not random, but are correlated to other features, and hence reflect a actual scribal practice. Of course, Tov’s restrictive qualification “more or less” invites one to carefully study those correlations. One should also note the use here of the term “Qumran orthography and morphology” which was originally the main element of Tov’s hypothesis.

“The texts written in the Qumran scribal practice could have been penned anywhere in ancient Israel, but they were probably written mainly at Qumran.” From the beginning Tov has emphasized that the features of the Qumran orthography and morphology need not have been exclusively limited to Qumran, but could have been more broadly Palestinian, which is also suggested by a few texts in his group that are dated palaeographically before, or at the beginning of the settlement of Qumran. However, in view of the fact that the group comprises many sectarian texts, he assumes that most of them were copied at Qumran (or at other places where the sectarians stayed).

3. Critical Reception

From the late eighties on, scholars have commented on earlier stages on Tov’s hypothesis or construct. Even though Tov’s present construct has refuted or integrated some of those criticisms, I will briefly categorize and summarize them.

A series of scholars has argued that from a linguistic point of view the peculiarities in orthography and morphology cannot be attributed uniquely to one sectarian group at Qumran, since some are attested, albeit scarcely, in the Hebrew Bible and other Hebrew traditions. Variations of this argument have been expressed by, for example, Cross, Freedman, Ulrich, Lübke,

10. Thus, apodictically, in “Orthography and Language,” 40–41, but he dismissed this position de facto already in “Hebrew Biblical Manuscripts,” 33–34.

Campbell, and van Peursen, in most cases briefly, and mainly pertaining to orthographic features.¹¹ Tov's reply is succinctly addressed in his summary quoted above. First: not the individual peculiarities themselves, but the set of features that makes up the scribal practice is related to the sectarian community. Second: given the evidence we have now, this orthography and morphology is most clearly reflected in those texts that are connected to the Qumran community. In sum: Tov appeals to statistical data, rather than to linguistic reconstructions.¹²

Cross did, however, criticize one of the basic assumptions of Tov, namely the dichotomy between regular forms as found in the Masoretic text versus irregular forms as found in the Qumran scrolls, and he disagreed with Tov's statement of the 1980s that the scribes of the biblical scrolls with a Qumran orthography changed the original orthography as opposed to other scribes who had a conservative and careful approach. Cross thus questions the default value of the MT-like orthography, but unfortunately his own concrete examples are rare and problematic, such as his claim that in literary pre-Exilic Hebrew, the second person masculine singular suffix was spelled with *kaf-he*, an argument based on his own idiosyncratic reading of the Bêt Layy inscription, which has been adopted by no one else.¹³

A second kind of objection that has been raised repeatedly, is that there is no specific and consistent orthographic and morphological practice. Critics refer to inconsistent orthography within scrolls, that is, that the features are encountered only erratically within the scrolls,¹⁴ or that Tov's Qumran orthography "form[s] a spectrum of diverse elements, unpre-

11. Frank Moore Cross, "Some Notes on a Generation of Qumran Studies," in *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid 18-21 March 1991* (ed. Julio Trebolle Barrera and Luis Vegas Montaner; 2 vols.; STDJ 11; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 1:1-14, esp. 3-6; David Noel Freedman, "The Evolution of Hebrew Orthography," in *Studies in Hebrew and Aramaic Orthography* (ed. David Noel Freedman, A. Dean Forbes, and Francis I. Andersen; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1992), 3-15, esp. 14; Eugene Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible* (Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1999), 88 n. 22; John Lübbe, "Certain Implications of the Scribal Process of 4QSam^c," *RevQ* 14/54 (1989): 255-65, esp. 257-58; Jonathan Campbell, "Hebrew and its Study at Qumran," in *Hebrew Study from Ezra to Ben-Yehuda* (ed. William Horbury; London: T&T Clark, 1999), 38-52, esp. 41; Wido Th. van Peursen, "The Verbal System in the Hebrew Text of Ben Sira" (Ph.D. diss, Leiden 1999), 28.

12. Tov, *Scribal Practice and Approaches*, 269, remarks that the rare presence of a few forms of the Qumran-type in MT or the oral tradition of the Samaritan Pentateuch "does not render our statistics for the Qumran texts less meaningful."

13. For different readings of the Bêt Layy inscription, cf. Johannes Renz and Wolfgang Röllig, *Die althebräischen Inschriften. Teil 1 Text und Kommentar* (Handbuch der althebräischen Epigraphik 1; Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1995), 245-46.

14. Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible*, 111-12.

dictable combinations of which may or may not appear in a particular document.”¹⁵ Tov has addressed most of these issues extensively. For example, in one of his forthcoming articles he demonstrates that even though some scrolls and scribes reflect inconsistency, the direction of scribal corrections is not inconsistent, but always towards the “Qumran scribal practice.”¹⁶ Other scholars do acknowledge, like Tov, specific orthographic practices, but they question his dichotomy. Thus, Vermes and Alexander posit a trichotomy of what they call, perhaps infelicitously, defective, full, and super-full orthographies.¹⁷ Abegg does not categorize the texts at all in groups, but merely claims that most texts are somewhere on the spectrum between *plene* and defective.¹⁸

A third, and different kind of objection is that even though there may be a special scribal practice, this cannot be connected exclusively to a Qumran community, in view of important exceptions.¹⁹ Thus, there are some commonly acknowledged sectarian texts, like 4Q258 (4QS^d), 4Q162 (4QpIsa^b) and 4Q169 (4QpNah), that are not penned according to the “Qumran scribal practice.” Or, some texts related to the “Qumran scribal practice,” like 4QQoh^a (4Q109)—one of Tov’s group of 160—which has been dated palaeographically from 175–150 B.C.E., precede the founding of the settlement of Qumran, and therefore must have been brought from outside to Qumran.²⁰ The latter example is not a problem for Tov, since he never claimed that the Com-

-
15. Campbell, “Hebrew and its Study at Qumran,” 41. See also Devorah Dimant, “The Qumran Manuscripts: Contents and Significance,” in *Time to Prepare the Way in the Wilderness* (ed. Devorah Dimant and Lawrence H. Schiffman; STDJ 16; Leiden: Brill, 1995), 23–58, at 28 n. 15
 16. Emanuel Tov, “Some Reflections on Consistency in the Activity of Scribes and Translators” (forthcoming in FS Fabry, 2010).
 17. Philip S. Alexander and Geza Vermes, *Qumran Cave 4 XIX: Serekh Ha-Yahad and Two Related Texts* (DJD 26; Oxford: Clarendon, 1998), 8.
 18. Martin G. Abegg, Jr., “The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment* (ed. Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam; 2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1998–1999), 1: 325–58, esp. 328.
 19. For example, Dimant, “The Qumran Manuscripts,” 28–29 n. 15; Armin Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination. Weisheitliche Urordnung und Prädestination in den Textfunden von Qumran* (STDJ 18; Leiden: Brill, 1995), 11; idem, “Kriterien essenischer Texte,” in *Qumran kontrovers. Beiträge zu den Textfunden vom Toten Meer* (ed. Jörg Frey and Hartmut Stegemann; Einblicke 6; Paderborn: Bonifatius, 2003), 59–69, at 68–69; Dong-Hyuk Kim, “Free Orthography in a Strict Society: Reconsidering Tov’s ‘Qumran Orthography,’” *DSD* 11 (2004): 72–81, who only considered Tov’s very first paper, “Orthography and Language”—see the response, in Emanuel Tov, “Reply to Dong-Hyuk Kim’s paper on ‘Tov’s Qumran Orthography,’” *DSD* 11 (2004): 359–60.
 20. Lange, “Kriterien essenischer Texte,” 68; cf. also Eugene Ulrich, “4QQoh^a,” in DJD 16:221–26, at 222 “this may well indicate that such forms were in use in wider Palestine, not simply characteristic of Qumran scribes.” Note that Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 339, does not record that 4QQoh^a has the form ה[א]יזה, rather

munity invented the “Qumran scribal practice,” or was the only group that used its characteristics. Also, those few exceptions like 4Q258 may be troublesome, but statistically (if they would be only seven or eight) do not seriously invalidate the overall connection between so-called sectarian texts and the “Qumran scribal practice.” However, those exceptions do shake Tov’s division of the corpus into two clearly distinct groups, one written presumably at Qumran, the other brought presumably from outside. If some texts written in the “Qumran scribal practice” must have been taken to Qumran from elsewhere, how many more also could have come from elsewhere? And how many more texts written in defective script, and without special scribal features, except the seven or eight clear exceptions, might have been penned at Qumran?

A final issue concerns Tov’s use of the term “sectarian.” Thoughts about the sectarian character of writings and the community have gradually changed between 1986, when Tov first presented his construct, and now. Tov refers to commonly accepted views, expressed mainly by Dimant, and refined by Newsom, Lange, and Hempel.²¹ However, for example, Dimant is gradually changing her views now, allowing for a third group standing somewhere in between sectarian and nonsectarian texts.²² The overall question is whether Tov’s construct can support a traditional distinction between sectarian and nonsectarian texts, or whether he will have to adjust his construct to changing views on the corpus and the community.²³

than הוֹיָא. See for similar examples, Esther G. Chazon, “Is *Divrei ha-me’orot* a Sectarian Prayer?” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research* (ed. Devorah Dimant and Uriel Rappaport; STDJ 10; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 3–17, at 6.

21. Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 278 n. 339, referring to Dimant, “The Qumran Manuscripts”; Carol A. Newsom, “‘Sectually Explicit’ Literature from Qumran,” in *The Hebrew Bible and its Interpreters* (ed. William Henry Propp, Baruch Halpern, and David Noel Freedman; Biblical and Judaic Studies 1; Winona Lake, Ind.; Eisenbrauns, 1990), 167–87; Lange, “Kriterien essenischer Texte”; Charlotte Hempel, “Kriterien zur Bestimmung ‘essenischer Verfasserschaft’ von Qumrantexten,” in Frey and Stegemann, *Qumran kontrovers*, 71–85.
22. Devorah Dimant, “Between Sectarian and Non-Sectarian: The Case of the *Apocryphon of Joshua*,” in *Reworking the Bible: Apocryphal and Related Texts at Qumran* (ed. Esther G. Chazon, Devorah Dimant, and Ruth A. Clements; STDJ 58; Leiden: Brill, 2005), 105–34. See also Florentino García Martínez, “¿Sectario, no-sectario, o qué? Problemas de una taxonomía correcta de los textos qumránicos,” *RevQ* 23/91 (2008): 383–94.
23. A good example of such changing views is the new model developed by Alison Schofield, *From Qumran to the Yahad: A New Paradigm of Textual Development for The Community Rule* (STDJ 77; Leiden: Brill, 2009), who attributes the corpus found in the caves to “broader scribal activity, not limited to Qumran,” and at the same time agrees that “consistent [orthographic] variance underpins the idea that some development took place within different scribal circles” (129).

A present, the situation seems to me to be the following. Tov has collected thousands of details, analyzed the work of the scribes in their production of texts more carefully than anyone else in the field, drawn attention to statistical correlations, and has proposed general explanations for those correlations. Other scholars in the field have commented on his analysis and statistical correlation, but most of all they have questioned his explanations. In my opinion, a fair assessment of Tov's work needs to look at both his construct and his explanations. If his construct is problematic, namely the existence of an idiosyncratic scribal practice, then one should also question his explanations. On the other hand, it is conceivable that his construct makes sense, but that his explanations need to be modified or rejected.

In my own assessment, I will comment first on the core of his "Qumran scribal practice," namely his statistical analysis and interpretation of the orthographic and morphological peculiarities. Second, I will discuss a few of the correlations he observed between specific scribal features and the orthographic and morphological peculiarities. Third, I will discuss the correlations between the scribal practice and sectarian texts, including the issue of the exceptions. Fourthly, I want to use the same data as Tov has collected, and suggest a possible explanation for one subset of the corpus.

4. *Tov's Qumran Orthography and Morphology*

In his 2004 volume Tov states "The main argument in favor of the existence of a Qumran scribal practice is orthographic and morphological, however inconsistent, allowing a distinction between a group of texts displaying a distinctive system and texts which do not display these features."²⁴ The question that concerns us is to what extent we can really discern a distinctive system, and whether inconsistencies are compatible or not with the system. I propose to tackle this question by analyzing the different elements in Tov's system, and by repeating his statistical research from a different perspective, in order to see whether different approaches lead to different or to similar results.

Tov discusses the orthographic and morphological features that he considers distinctive for the system of the "Qumran scribal practice" at different places in *Scribal Practices and Approaches*.²⁵ These are the same features he already described in 1986, except for one feature which he dropped as being too complex.²⁶ In 2004 he lists eighteen categories which virtually

24. Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 262.

25. Ibid., 266–70, 337–39.

26. Tov, ibid., 337, explains that "lengthened forms of the types *'eqtelah* and *'eqtolah* instead of *'eqtol* have not been recorded because of the complex conditions of their occurrences, but they probably also serve as a good

all consist of binary oppositions: a regular form or spelling which is the common one in the Masoretic manuscripts of the Hebrew bible, versus a distinctive²⁷ one which is generally rare, or non-existent, in those Masoretic manuscripts, but on the contrary rather common in the Dead Sea Scrolls, especially in many of the so-called sectarian nonbiblical manuscripts.²⁸ Statistically these categories seem related: some texts attest to very few if any of the distinctive categories, whereas other texts have distinctive forms and spellings from many of those categories. There are virtually no texts where the choice between regular or distinctive forms appears to have been absolutely random, and the realization of the different forms of those orthographic and morphological categories more or less seems to follow a system. However, whereas ideal-typically one might contrast two kinds of orthographic and morphological practice according to Tov's categories, the reality is more complex. The question is how those categories relate to one another, in what respects one can really speak about a special scribal practice with respect to orthography and morphology, how we can categorize texts if we have little or mixed evidence.

Tov subdivides his eighteen categories in ten categories pertaining to morphology and eight relating to orthography. The first five orthographic categories all relate to the use of *vav* as a vowel letter or mater lectionis for *o* or *u* in different circumstances. Tov singles out five common words, *זאת*, *בה*, *משה*, *לא*, and *כל*, for three reasons: (1) Because the words are very common, and the distinctive writing is often attested in the scrolls; (2) because they represent different categories of *plene* writing; (3) and because in the Masoretic text they are virtually always spelled defectively, without the *waw*.²⁹ The form *זאת* is chosen as representative of cases like *ראש* or *צאן*, or the *qal* imperfect of *אמר* and *אכל*, where an additional *vav* is added to, or re-

criterion for the Qumran scribal practice." The *ואקטלה* forms which have ה both in *w'yiqtol* and *wayyiqtol* 1st person forms. This phenomenon is the rule in nonbiblical texts, both QSP and non-QSP, with only few exceptions in texts that imitate language of biblical texts. Tov, "Orthography and Language," did not yet distinguish whether those first person imperfect forms were preceded or not preceded by *waw*.

27. I choose to use the word "distinctive," as a neutral term opposite to "regular," rather than "idiosyncratic" or "peculiar."

28. Actually, whereas in most cases the "Qumran scribal practice" form or spelling is either rare or non-existent in the Masoretic manuscripts, this is not the case with *הם* versus *המה*. Also, the spelling of the verbal form *קטלתה*, as opposed to *קטלת*, is not very rare in MT. See below.

29. The word *לא* seems to be an exception, since in the Codex Leningradensis it is spelled with *vav* 188 times, that is 3.5% of all cases of *לא*, but the vast majority of the cases is in *הלוא* (148x), and twenty of the other forty cases of *לוא* are in Jeremiah. Generally, where this article refers to Masoretic Text, it refers to the text of the Codex Leningradensis as electronically available through the Accordance BHS-W4 module.

places, quiescent *alef* that serves as mater lectionis.³⁰ The sixth orthographic category concerns the word **כי**, which is never written with additional *alef* in the Masoretic text, but often as **כיא** in the scrolls.³¹ The seventh and eighth category concern the spelling of the second masculine singular perfect and the second masculine singular suffix with a *he* as mater lectionis for the final $\bar{a}$ (i.e., **קטלתה/קטלת**, respectively **כה-/ך**). Forms with *he* are in fact sporadically attested in the Masoretic manuscripts, but much more often in the scrolls. All of the abovementioned spellings have sometimes been subsumed under the category of *plene* writing or full spelling, but they should be mentioned separately because they represent different cases, and because they do not occur in the same frequency. Note that Tov has not included rare cases of *plene* spelling such as *yod* as mater lectionis for $\bar{e}$, or *alef* for final $\bar{a}$.

All of Tov's morphological categories seem to represent two general phenomena, namely (1) the lengthening of specific forms (the independent pronouns **הם**, **אתם**, **היא**, **הוא** being lengthened to resp. **המה**, **אתמה**, **היאה**, **הואה**; the second and third plural suffixes; the affix of the second masculine plural perfect **תם-**; the adverb **מאד**) with *he* representing final $\bar{a}$,³² and (2) differences in some *qal o* imperfect forms.³³

Many scrolls are a witness to a general tendency towards lengthening of forms, also other forms than those mentioned by Tov.³⁴ Several of those forms, such as **אתמה** or **הואה** are only attested in writing in the Dead Sea Scrolls, but a form as **המה** alongside **הם** is common in the Masoretic Text, where roughly speaking the Pentateuch prefers **הם** above **המה**, but the prophets **המה** above **הם**. Likewise, lengthened masculine plural suffixes are attested only twice in the Masoretic Text against almost 10.000 short masculine plural suffixes, but the statistics are somewhat different with the feminine plural suffixes, where in the Masoretic Text 8% (21 out of 254 cases) are lengthened.³⁵ While specific lengthened forms and the general tendency

30. Other example is **תאר**, spelled as **תור**, **תואר**, **תאר**, and even as **תר** defective! This may suggest that **רש** also could be hypercorrective **ראש**. Orthographic loss of quiescent *alef* also occurs in words such as **רשית**, **רשת**, **רישית**, all for **ראשית**. Compare also **שאר** ("flesh") spelled as **שיר**, and even as **שר**.

31. Similar forms like **מיא** or **פיא**, or even **בוא**, all with final *alef*, and perhaps spelled thus by analogy with **כיא**, are only found in very few scrolls.

32. Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 338 and table on 339–43, categories resp. cols. 1–6 and 9–10; *ibid.*, 268, categories 1–2 and 5–6.

33. *Ibid.*, 338 and table on 339–43, categories resp. cols. 7–8; *ibid.*, 268, categories 3–4.

34. Steven E. Fassberg, "The Preference for Lengthened Forms in Qumran Hebrew," *Meghillot* 1 (2003): 227–40. For example, statistically **שמה** is on the rise against **שם**. Also the **ואקט(ו)לה** form, with its own rules, may belong to this category.

35. Note that the only case of 2d plur fem suffix in Mishna Kaufmann (but also Eshkol ed.) is *m. Soṭa* 1:6 **זימתכנה**. But *MS Kaufmann* has no other lengthened plural suffixes.

towards lengthening might be assigned to Tov's "Qumran scribal practice," isolated occurrences of the independent pronoun *המה* have virtually no weight since they are not uncommon in the Masoretic Text.³⁶

Second, in some cases the distinction between morphological and orthographic features is not a priori clear, since the assessment of the character of some variants is based on linguistic analysis and hypotheses. For example, for Cross and Freedman, the difference between the two writings of the second masculine singular suffix with merely *kaf* or with *kaf-he* is not merely orthographic, as in the vocalized Masoretic Text, but morphological, representing a double tradition. For them, forms such as *קטלתה* and *כה-* are not cases of full orthography, but examples of morphologically lengthened endings, vis-à-vis the short morphological form suggested by the consonantal writing of the Masoretic text.³⁷ Another problem are the *yiqṭólu* and *tiqṭólu* forms, both in free and final position, corresponding with the Masoretic pausal forms, but being morphologically different from the Masoretic *yiqṭ^llú* and *tiqṭ^llú* in free position. But we cannot a priori assume the Masoretic pronunciation *yiqṭ^llú* for all cases where we have a defective spelling, and the Masoretic pausal form *yiqṭólu* when we see a *plene* spelling.³⁸

There are very few manuscripts that have examples of all eighteen categories,³⁹ and it rarely occurs that manuscripts only have examples of the distinctive forms of the different morphological categories whenever they appear. But if a manuscript has some regular spellings or forms and some distinctive ones, how does Tov decide whether it is written in the "Qumran scribal practice" or not? Or, if we have a very fragmentary manuscript, what would

36. Hence, the data in Tov's fourth column are largely supportive of other features, and have little or no importance on their own.

37. Frank Moore Cross and David Noel Freedman, *Early Hebrew Orthography: A Study of the Epigraphic Evidence* (AOS 36; New Haven, Conn.: American Oriental Society, 1952), 65–68, esp. 67. Cross, "Some Notes on a Generation of Qumran Studies," 3–5 complicates the matter by arguing that the lengthened forms in the Dead Sea Scrolls are part of a baroque orthography imitating forms in older manuscripts where they marked the literary long form. Unfortunately, the pre-Qumran evidence for Cross's hypothesis is very meagre.

38. Cf. also Eugene Ulrich, DJD 15:46, who interprets such imperfect verbal forms as orthographic.

39. 1QIsa^a does, and 1QIsa^a B uses them all, though not consistently. Emanuel Tov, "Scribal Features of Two Qumran Scrolls" (paper given at the Orion Conference 2008; forthcoming Leiden: Brill, 2010), follows the distinction made in earlier scholarship of two scribes, scribe A writing from the beginning of 1QIsa^a to the end of col. 27, and scribe B starting at the beginning of the next sheet at col. 28. Though the two parts of the scroll are orthographically clearly distinct, it is mooted whether the handwriting warrants a distinction between two scribes. See Eugene Ulrich in the forthcoming DJD edition of 1QIsa^a. Therefore, I here simply refer to 1QIsa^a A and B to refer to two orthographically and morphologically clearly distinct sections in 1QIsa^a.

be the necessary evidence to assign that manuscript to Tov's group? Tov does not explicitly explain those criteria, but a study of his tables and comments reveals some of his criteria. In the last column of the table in Appendix 9 of *Scribal Practices*,⁴⁰ many texts have a question mark,⁴¹ indicating that Tov regards the evidence as indicative but not enough to be convincing. One possible reason is that the manuscripts are very fragmentary and there is very little evidence, as with 2QExod^b, 2QNum^b, or 4QPs^o;⁴² another possibility is that a manuscript has distinctive or Qumran spellings in some orthographic categories, but regular forms in the morphological categories. This holds true, e.g., for 4QDeut^j (cols I-IV), 4QXII^g, or 1QDM.⁴³ It is clear that for Tov a few attestations of specific distinctive forms, such as **הואה**, **אתמה**, or lengthened pronominal plural suffixes, weigh heavier than multiple cases of simple *plene* spellings of **כול**, **לוא**, or **זואת**. His argument is that certain forms are not found in texts that reflect an orthography and morphology similar to that of the Masoretic Text,⁴⁴ or not found in texts not written according to the "Qumran scribal practice."⁴⁵ On the whole, Tov seems to be right, but there is some degree of circular reasoning involved, and there are exceptions. For example, 4Q185 is entirely written in a defective MT-like orthography, but with the one exception of **אתסה**.⁴⁶ It seems therefore that Tov takes both the quantity of distinctive forms and the idiosyncrasy of particu-

40. Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 339–43. The column has mistakenly the heading "Sect. nature" where Tov clearly intends "QSP". The error probably has been made by copying the headings of the comparable tables that are used in Appendix 1 where the last column, "Sect. nature," refers to content.

41. Fifty-one out of 170 texts (thirty percent), but elsewhere (ibid., 266) he states that some forty percent of 167 Qumran texts present a somewhat less convincing case.

42. Examples taken from Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 339. Therefore, I do not understand why some manuscripts with much more "positive" evidence are not included in Tov's list. For example, 4Q375 (see ibid., 287) has exclusively positive evidence in five categories, but this is there regarded as insufficient.

43. Examples taken from ibid., 339–40. 1QDM has the form **המה**, but above I argued that **המה** is not really distinctive. But if a lack of distinctive forms is grounds for adding a question mark, one should also question 4Q227, 4Q271, 4Q277, 4Q292, 4Q377, 4Q393 (there is a mistake in column 6), 4Q403, 4Q460, 4Q471, 4Q506, 4Q509, 4Q512, 6Q18, all of which now have a "y" without question mark in the last column.

But then, shouldn't one also question 4Q227? Or we may ask why 4Q437 is distinctive.

44. Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 337: "The distinction between texts written in the Qumran scribal practice and other texts is based on the assumption that texts which otherwise reflect an orthography and morphology similar to that of MT do not contain a single occurrence of **ביא**, **הואה**, or **מלכמה**, etc."

45. Ibid., 338 n. 385.

46. The one occurrence of **לוא** in 4Q185 which Tov records (ibid., 286) is actually in **הלוא**, which form should be excluded from the statistics. I also mentioned this example in my review of Tov's *Scribal Practices and Approaches* in *DSD* 14 (2007): 368–72.

lar forms into account. Here we may relate to his own comments about the consistency and frequency of distinctive spellings and forms:

The shared spellings which are used most consistently in all scrolls in this group are the *plene* writings זאות/זואת/זות(ה), מושה, לוא, בול, and the long spelling of the second person singular suffix כה- in nouns and prepositions; the most frequently used forms are the lengthened forms of the verb of the type (w)qtqlw and (w)ytqlw and of מאד.⁴⁷

If one peruses Tov's tables, then one gets the impression that Tov is less easily convinced if a manuscript has only those spellings and forms, and not any of the other less frequent spellings or forms. In other words, the more idiosyncratic categories weigh much heavier than the less distinctive ones.⁴⁸ One single case of הווא serves as a red flag, whereas multiple cases of לוא or בול are relatively common. At the same time it means that it is difficult to say with certainty that a fragmentary text does not reflect the "Qumran scribal practice," when it only has the stock set of full spellings. Put differently: whereas the distinctive spelling הווא is a strong positive indicator of the "Qumran scribal practice,"⁴⁹ the regular form הוא is not negative evidence, but neutral. This holds for virtually each of the morphological categories.

Of course, many of the uncertainties arise from the fragmentariness of the material: one hundred words more might have solved our problems. Yet, Tov's exercise in trying to determine which texts should be isolated also reveals a basic problem, namely that the exact drawing of the boundaries, determining whether a text is "in" or "out," is subjective.⁵⁰

5. Starting with "Not"

In order to freshly approach the issue, I decided to redo some parts of Tov's statistical analysis, to see to which extent I would reach the same or other conclusions. Initially, I started looking

47. Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 268. This statement may not be entirely correct, perhaps because "consistent" and "frequent" are ambiguous. For example, the *qtqlh* forms versus *qtqlt* occur less frequently in absolute terms, but in relative terms more than *-kh* versus *-k*.

48. This reminds us of Emanuel Tov, "Some Notes on a Generation of Qumran Studies (by Frank M. Cross): Reply," in Trebelle Barrera and Vegas Montaner, *The Madrid Qumran Congress*, 15–21, at 16, where he replies to Cross that "to some extent, morphological differences are more far-reaching than orthographic ones." However, Tov does not repeat this view in his later work.

49. Nonetheless, Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 286–87 shows that in spite of הוואה/היאה, Tov regards the evidence pertaining to 4Q172 (which actually is not a manuscript, but a collection of heterogeneous fragments), 4Q321, and 6Q12 as insufficient.

50. Tov is aware of this, and therefore states that the "scribal features ... provide more objective criteria for analysis than the analysis of orthography and morphology" (*Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 162).

at the most idiosyncratic forms like הוּאָה, but ran into the problem of paucity of data. I then turned to the opposite approach, and decided to start with the most common category in Tov's list: לֹא/לֹא. My question is simple: what kind of correlations does the defective or *plene* spelling of לֹא have with other spellings and forms.⁵¹

I initially limited my research to a small corpus of texts, those included in Accordance's *Qumran Biblical Texts*.⁵² The choice for this particular group of texts has the methodological advantage that one can compare both individual readings and general orthographic and morphological patterns to the Masoretic Text. Also, those manuscripts provide more usable data, because one can generally reconstruct partially preserved words on the basis of the Masoretic text.⁵³

My first search was to see how the spellings לֹא/לֹא were distributed among these texts, with disregard for all the לוּ, הלוּא, בלוּא, כלוּא and ללוּא spellings. This results in four groups of texts: (1) those that only have instances of the defective spelling לֹא; (2) those that have instances of both defective לֹא and full לוּא spellings; (3) those that only have examples of the full spelling לוּא; and (4) a large group of small manuscripts that have no clear case of לֹא.⁵⁴

51. In many respects this approach touches upon the same phenomena which Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 268–69, discusses under the heading “Consistency and statistical analysis.” Note, however, that my discussion is initially restricted to “biblical” manuscripts, and does not depart from the idea of a specific scribal practice.

52. *Qumran Biblical Texts* (Manuscript order). Version 1.1. Grammatical tagging by Dr. Martin Abegg, James E. Bowley, and Edward M. Cook with Casey Toews, Trinity Western University, BC, CANADA. Copyright © 2008 by OakTree Software, Inc. This module contains all the texts that have been classified as “biblical” in the series *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert*, as well as the *tefillin* and *mezuzot*, but not the manuscripts entitled 4QReworked Pentateuch^{a-e} (4Q158; 4Q364–4Q367). It contains the biblical Psalms but not the other hymnic materials included in 4Q88 and 11Q5–11Q6. It also contains the biblical material from other locations in the Judaean Desert. The Accordance program allows one to restrict one's searches to specified parts of a module.

53. For example, if ה[or אה[are preserved where the Masoretic text reads הוּאָה, is it relatively certain that the manuscript read הוּאָה.

54. Of course I ruled out all cases where only the *lamed* or only the *alef* was preserved, and where the editor had reconstructed either a full or defective spelling. I also disregarded cases of transcriptions that presented the material as לֹא or לֹא, because otherwise I would have had to check each single case as to whether the remaining traces of were compatible or incompatible with the other reading. Tov has taken similar decisions when recording the data in his tables. In a few cases, where a transcribed spelling or form was very unexpected, or inconsistent with all other data, I checked the reading against the photographs.

Many fragmentary manuscripts do not have any case of לִי or לוֹי (group 4).⁵⁵ A slightly smaller number of manuscripts only has cases of defective לִי (group 1).⁵⁶ The group with only full spelling is considerably smaller (group 3),⁵⁷ and the group with both spellings is smallest (group 2).⁵⁸ Of course, all statistical comparisons are marred by the fragmentariness of the material. For example, groups 1 and 3 include many manuscripts that have only one single occurrence of לוֹי/לִי,⁵⁹ whereas manuscripts in group 2 need at least two occurrences of לוֹי/לִי.⁶⁰ Also, one would expect that the chance that a manuscript has samples of both spellings increases with the quantity of the preserved text. This, however, is hardly the case. If one looks at, for example,⁶¹ the forty best preserved biblical manuscripts from Qumran,⁶² the statistics

-
55. I include in this group also manuscripts that have incomplete לִי, not enabling one to determine whether the text read לוֹי or לִי. The groups consists of: 1Q1, 1Q6, 1Q10, 1Q11, 1Q12, 2Q1, 2Q3, 2Q4, 2Q5, 2Q6, 2Q7, 2Q8, 2Q9, 2Q10, 2Q11, 2Q12, 2Q14, 2Q15, 2Q17, 3Q1, 3Q2, 3Q3, 4Q3, 4Q4, 4Q7, 4Q8a, 4Q8b, 4Q8c, 4Q8d, 4Q10, 4Q12a, 4Q15, 4Q18, 4Q19, 4Q20, 4Q21, 4Q38c, 4Q39, 4Q44, 4Q46, 4Q49, 4Q50, 4Q62a, 4Q66, 4Q67, 4Q68, 4Q69, 4Q69a, 4Q69b, 4Q71, 4Q72b, 4Q74, 4Q75, 4Q77, 4Q86, 4Q89, 4Q90, 4Q91, 4Q92, 4Q93, 4Q94, 4Q95, 4Q97, 4Q98, 4Q98a, 4Q98b, 4Q98c, 4Q98d, 4Q98e, 4Q98f, 4Q98g, 4Q100, 4Q103a, 4Q104, 4Q105, 4Q106, 4Q108, 4Q116, 4Q117, 4Q118, 4Q131, 4Q132, 4Q133, 4Q143, 4Q146, 4Q149, 4Q151, 4Q152, 4Q153, 4Q154, 4Q576, 5Q2, 5Q3, 5Q5, 5Q7, 6Q1, 6Q2, 6Q3, 6Q5, 6Q7, 8Q1, 8Q2, 11Q2, 11Q3, 11Q7, 11Q9, XJosh, Murx. Most are very fragmentary: the above mentioned manuscripts have an average of forty words (including partially preserved words) per manuscript. Here I understand a word to be any letter or sequence of letters that has been tagged as “adjective,” “noun,” “particle,” “pronoun,” or “verb,” in the Accordance module. A sequence like וּבְכַל therefore counts as three words, even though it consists of only three letters.
56. 1Q2, 1Q3, 1Q5, 1Q7, 1Q8, 1Q13, 2Q16, 4Q1, 4Q2, 4Q5, 4Q6, 4Q9, 4Q11, 4Q13, 4Q14, 4Q16, 4Q17, 4Q22, 4Q23, 4Q24, 4Q25, 4Q28, 4Q29, 4Q30, 4Q31, 4Q32, 4Q33, 4Q34, 4Q35, 4Q36, 4Q38b, 4Q38d, 4Q42, 4Q43, 4Q45, 4Q47, 4Q48, 4Q52, 4Q54, 4Q55, 4Q56, 4Q58, 4Q59, 4Q60, 4Q62, 4Q63, 4Q64, 4Q72, 4Q72a, 4Q73, 4Q76, 4Q79, 4Q81, 4Q84, 4Q85, 4Q101, 4Q102, 4Q103, 4Q107, 4Q112, 4Q114, 4Q130, 4Q141, 4Q145, 4Q150, 4Q155, 5Q1, 6Q4, 6Q6, 8Q3, 8Q4, 11Q1, 11Q4, XQ1, XQ2, XQ3, Mur1, Mur2, Mur3, Mur4, Mur88, Sdeir1, 5/6Hev1b, XHev/Se2, XHev/Se5, 34Se1, Mas1b-Mas1e, X4, XJudges.
57. 1Q4, 1QIsa^a, 2Q13, 4Q12, 4Q27, 4Q38, 4Q38a, 4Q40, 4Q53, 4Q57, 4Q65, 4Q78, 4Q80, 4Q83, 4Q87, 4Q88, 4Q96, 4Q109, 4Q110, 4Q111, 4Q113 16-18 i+19-20, 4Q128, 4Q129, 4Q135, 4Q137, 4Q138, 4Q139, 4Q140, 4Q142, 4Q144, 5Q4, 11Q5, 11Q6.
58. 2Q2, 4Q26, 4Q37, 4Q41, 4Q51, 4Q61, 4Q70, 4Q82, 4Q99, 4Q134, 4Q136, 5Q6, 11Q8.
59. This goes for twenty-five manuscripts in group 1 (1Q2, 1Q3, 4Q16, 4Q17, 4Q25, 4Q38b, 4Q38d, 4Q43, 4Q62, 4Q63, 4Q64, 4Q73, 4Q78, 4Q101, 4Q103, 4Q107, 4Q150, 4Q155, 6Q6, 11Q4, XQ2, Mur2, Sdeir1, Mas1c, X4), and five from group 2 (1Q4, 4Q12, 4Q40, 4Q88, 4Q96).
60. In fact, 2Q2 and 11Q8 both have once לוֹי and once לִי.
61. One needs to take a sizable amount of texts. If one would look only at the six best preserved biblical manuscripts, the relations would be different. 1QIsa^a, 11Q5, and 4Q27 consistently use the spelling לוֹי; 1Q8 and 4Q22 consistently לִי; and 4Q51 uses both spellings.
62. Based on the number of hits for “adjective,” “noun,” “particle,” “pronoun,” “suffix,” or “verb,” ignoring

are that twenty-seven only have לֹא (group 1), nine only have לוֹא (group 3), and only four have both לֹא and לוֹא (group 2).⁶³ The first conclusions can be relatively straightforward. The majority of the “biblical” manuscripts uses לֹא and not לוֹא. None of the non-Qumran “biblical” manuscripts ever uses לוֹא.⁶⁴ The vast majority of the manuscripts is consistent with regard to the spelling of either לֹא or לוֹא.

5.1.

Do those groups of manuscripts correlate consistently with Tov’s other categories? The group of manuscripts that always have defective לֹא (and never full לוֹא) overall have regular MT-like forms and spellings, and very few distinctive ones. None of those manuscripts has the distinctive lengthened forms הוֹאָה, הִיאָה, אַתְמָה, קַטְלְתָּמָה, none has the *y^equtlenu* forms, none the full spelling of the particle כֹּה. In some other categories there are very few exceptions: one uncertain case of כִּי with *alef*;⁶⁵ five cases where those manuscripts read the independent pronoun הֵמָּה against MT הֵם;⁶⁶ one possible case of a full spelling of a *yiqṭōlu* form;⁶⁷ three cases of lengthened מֵאֵד;⁶⁸ one phylactery (4Q141) which has lengthened plural suffixes;⁶⁹ one text (4Q13) that consistently (five times) spells מוֹשֶׁה full; a few texts that have distinctive spellings of זֶאת⁷⁰ or בָּל,⁷¹ the latter consistently in 4Q130. However, besides those rare exceptions, there are, in comparison, a larger number of cases where the second masculine singular suffix and the second masculine singular perfect form were spelled with *he* against MT. Thus, *qtlth* spellings with *he* are found fifteen times where MT does not have *he*,⁷² and the suffix *kh* five

words inside brackets, in the earlier mentioned Accordance module.

63. In order of size: Group 1 1Q8, 4Q22, 11Q1, 4Q23, 4Q56, 4Q1, 8Q3, 4Q11, 4Q14, 4Q112, 4Q24, 4Q72, 4Q30, 4Q84, 4Q58, 4Q33, 4Q13, 4Q35, XQ3, 4Q45, 4Q55, XQ1, 4Q2, 4Q130, XQ2, 4Q76, 4Q128, 4Q85; Group 2 1QIsa^a, 11Q5, 4Q27, 4Q57, 4Q83, 4Q137, 4Q78, 4Q138, 4Q128; Group 3 4Q51, 4Q82, 4Q70, 4Q41. If one takes more manuscripts, these proportions change only slightly.

64. Except for הִלּוֹא and כִּלּוֹא in Mur88.

65. Mas1e 2:15 בִּיאָ.

66. 1Q7 2 2; 1Q8 28:7; 4Q14 1:42; 4Q22 3:33; 4Q63 1 4. On the other hand, 1Q8 24:29; 28:7 has הֵם versus MT הֵמָּה.

67. 4Q22 19:3 יִשְׁפֹּן־טוֹ.

68. 4Q13 3 i-4 16; 4Q22 10:31; 4Q23 60-61 1.

69. And possibly also 4Q23 85 1 (small unidentified fragment) and 4Q107 2 i 5.

70. 4Q76 spells twice זֹאת and twice זֹאת. 8Q3 1-11 i 8 spells once זֹאת against twice זֹאת.

71. 4Q14 6:43 (uncertain reading); 4Q114 2:16; 4Q130 1 9-10, 12-14, 16, 20; 4Q145 1V 10; 8Q4 1 23. See also 4Q54 8 2 (uncertain reading) and 4Q58 16 3, but those fragments probably stem from other manuscripts.

72. 1Q8 8:25; 4Q13 3 ii + 5-6 i 6 (2x); 4Q16 1 8; 4Q22 28:5; 32:10; 4Q76 2:4; 4Q114 1:15; 4Q130 1 4; 4Q141 1 i 5-6; 5Q1 1 1; XQ2 1:21 (2x); XQ3 1:20. In eight cases the קַטְלְתָּה spelling is also found in MT. This should be compared to

times.⁷³ One should note that in view of the large sample, the number of distinctive spellings and forms remains very small, and that many can be attributed to the same manuscripts.⁷⁴

5.2.

If one looks at the smaller group of biblical manuscripts that always spell *plene* לוא and never defectively, then the spelling is in many respects consistent within this group, with the important exception of 1QIsa^a whose scribes or parts, especially the first one (A) are exceptionally internally inconsistent. How does *plene* לוא correlate to the other categories selected by Tov?

These manuscripts that only have *plene* לוא, and never defective לא, always have full spelling of מושה and of זאת with waw. More than 95% cases of בול are full—almost all exceptions are in 1QIsa^a.⁷⁵ They always have full בוה, except again for 1QIsa^a A, which consistently has בה, and 4Q83 9 ii בה. With the exception of 1QIsa^a A and 4Q135, they always write קטלתה and not קטלת. And, if one ignores 1QIsa^a, which has 120 of the 134 cases of ך, then more than 97% of the second masculine singular suffix are written בה rather than ך.⁷⁶ Unlike these orthographic examples, where, with the exception of 1QIsa^a, the distinctive spellings are the rule, ביא with *alef* is not the rule in these manuscripts. The spelling differs per manuscript, but all in all, regular בי is more common than distinctive ביא, which is attested mostly in 1QIsa^a.⁷⁷

With regard to forms, these manuscripts mostly have מאודה/מואדה/מאדה (24x) and there are only three instances without lengthening.⁷⁸ In this group of manuscripts, we always

about 240 regular קטלת spellings.

73. In total the suffix *kh* is found eleven times in this group of manuscripts. However, five times these are in Exod 13:16 where MT has ידכה, and once Deut 28:35 where MT has יככה. There are five cases of כה against MT ך, namely 4Q22 25:5 (עמכה); 4Q24 9 i-10-17 28 (לכה); 4Q59 where the reading of ה is not necessary; 4Q141 1 i 13, and Mas 1e 1:20.

74. See especially 4Q13, 4Q22, 4Q130, and 4Q141. Actually, 4Q141 is orthographically and morphologically like the manuscripts of group 3; the defective spelling is לא is an exception within the manuscript.

75. Fourteen cases of defective MT-like כל in 1QIsa^a, thirteen in 1QIsa^a A, and one by a corrector above the text of 1QIsa^a B. The few other cases in this group are: 2Q13 9 ii-12 7; 4Q88 3:18; 4Q111 3:2; 4 1

76. If one disregards 1QIsa^a, then there are fourteen cases of ך as opposed to ca. 500 cases of בה. See 4Q12 1 4; 4Q37 41 1; 4Q78 48 1; 4Q135 1 11, 20; 11Q5 3:14; 12:15; 20:9, 12; 21:5.

77. In absolute terms (occurrences), outside 1QIsa^a the ratio is ca. 75% בי against 25% ביא, but those proportions are distorted by the many cases of בי in 11Q5. Virtually all those biblical manuscripts consistently use either בי (4Q78 [once ביא], 4Q83, 4Q87, 4Q88, 4Q128, 4Q129, 4Q135, 4Q137, 4Q138, 4Q139, 4Q140, 11Q5) or ביא (1Q4, 2Q13, 4Q27, 4Q38a, 4Q57, 4Q111). 4Q57 23 7 has ביא, but the spelling בי instead of ביא is probably influenced by אב. Cf. 1QS which consistently has ביא, except for 1QS 5:15 ביא.

78. 1QIsa^a 13:23; 46:26; 4Q83 1 7.

find **אתמה**, and never **אתם**.⁷⁹ The form **קטלתמה** seems to be about twice as common as **קטלתם** in these manuscripts.⁸⁰ In 1QIsa^a the regular short forms of **הוא** and **היא** are twice as common as the distinctive long forms, but in the other manuscripts of this group the distinctive long forms are slightly more common than the short ones.⁸¹ The lengthened suffix **המה** is more common in 1QIsa^a, but in other texts **הם** is more common.⁸² The short suffix **ם** is overall more common than **מה**, which mainly is found in 1QIsa^a and the phylacteries.⁸³ The lengthened suffix **כמה** is clearly more common than **כם**.⁸⁴ The *yiqṭolu* forms (or spellings?) are extremely common in 1QIsa^a, though there are a few *yiqṭ^elu* ones, but in other texts the cases of either form/spelling is rare, but more or less equally distributed. The same goes for the *yiqṭ^eleni/y^equt^eleni* form.

This short survey shows that with the exception of 1QIsa^a, especially the first scribe, who penned cols. 1-27,⁸⁵ and to a lesser extent also 4Q83 (4QPs^a),⁸⁶ those manuscripts that consistently write **לוא**, also quite consistently have the distinctive spellings which Tov listed, instead of the regular ones that are found in the MT. The one exception is the attestation of **כי** or **כיא**. With respect to the distinctive morphological forms, however, the correlations are more complex. The distinctive forms *mō'dah* and **אתמה** are used fairly consistently, instead of the regular forms. In the other morphological categories the occurrence of the regular or distinc-

79. The one exception is 4Q135 (twice **אתם**). Admittedly, the form does not occur very often, thirty times **אתמה** in these manuscripts.

80. Twenty-six instances of **קטלתם** versus forty-nine of **קטלתמה**. Four manuscripts have both forms (1QIsa^a, 4Q27, 4Q38, 4Q78), one only **קטלתם** (4Q135), and eleven only **קטלתמה** (2Q13, 4Q40, 4Q57, 4Q80, 4Q128, 4Q129, 4Q137, 4Q138, 4Q140, 4Q142, 4Q144, seven of which are phylacteries).

81. Disregarding 1QIsa^a, twenty-four cases of the long form **הואה** or **היאה** in nine manuscripts (4Q27, 4Q38, 4Q40, 4Q53, 4Q57, 4Q111, 4Q128, 4Q138, 4Q140), and sixteen short forms in eight manuscripts (4Q27, 4Q57, 4Q65, 4Q80, 4Q109, 4Q111, 4Q128, and 11Q5). Note that 4Q27, 4Q57, 4Q111, and 4Q128 have both forms.

82. The phylacteries 4Q128, 4Q129, 4Q137, and 4Q138 consistently use the long form. Some manuscripts like 4Q37, 4Q38, 4Q83, 4Q88, and 4Q135 attest to the short form only, while larger manuscripts like 4Q27, 4Q57, 4Q78, or 11Q5 have predominantly short forms, and sometimes the longer ones.

83. The use of **ם**- and **מה**- is complex, since the use of the long form is restricted to specific phonological environments. See Elisha Qimron, *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (HSS 29; Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1986), § 322.18; Shelomo Morag, "Qumran Hebrew: Some Typological Observations," VT 38 (1988): 148–64, at 158–59. This is probably the reason why Tov distinguishes in his categories between second and third plural suffixes in nouns and verbs, and second and third plural suffixes in prepositions.

84. Some manuscripts only have the short form (e.g., 4Q57 and 11Q5), others only the long form (4Q78 and most phylacteries), some both (4Q27).

85. For a detailed description and tables, cf. Tov, "Scribal Features of Two Qumran Scrolls."

86. Although 4Q83 always attests **לוא**, it actually displays a mixed spelling. E.g., it always spells **אלהים** defectively.

tive form is less predictable, and differs per manuscript. Thus, some manuscripts, like 1QIsa^a B and the Phylacteries 4Q128, 4Q129, 4Q137, 4Q138, 4Q140, 4Q142, 4Q144 tend to use predominantly or exclusively lengthened morphological forms. Other manuscripts, like 11Q5 or 4Q135 usually have the regular forms, with very few examples of the distinctive lengthened ones, and 4Q83 has no attestations of the distinctive forms.

5.3.

A different category is the small group of biblical manuscripts that employ both full and defective forms of לֹא. Those manuscripts are also unpredictable with regard to other spellings, some tending towards the defective and other ones to the plene, or being entirely mixed, but they have in common that they display hardly any of the lengthened forms of Tov's morphological categories.⁸⁷ The one exception is 4Q37, which, as Tov also records,⁸⁸ changes markedly with respect to spelling and morphology from col. 5 on, so that 4Q37 5–12 should actually be regarded as a לֹא only section.⁸⁹ This relatively small group of manuscripts can be said to stand in between the fairly defective MT-like spelling, and the distinctive full spelling that Tov described.⁹⁰

5.4.

On the basis of the correlations described above, many of the manuscripts of group 4 (no לֹא or לֹא attested), may be assigned to one of the other groups. For example, the words כֹּל בְּמוֹתָמָה in 2Q7 (2QNum^b), strongly indicate it sides with the manuscripts of group 3. On the other hand, 4Q3 and 4Q4 consistently have defective spellings.

5.5.

87. 11Q8 1 2 has מוֹאֲדָה, and 4Q41 6 3 has the lengthened suffix הִמָּה.

88. Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 339.

89. Initially, I also had included 4Q139 in this group of texts that use both לֹא and לֹא. According to Milik's transcription in DJD 6:70 it has three cases of לֹא (in lines 4 and 10), and one of לֹאִן, in line 2. I consider it possible that one should transcribe לֹאִן, and I have transferred the manuscript to group 2.

90. One of these inbetween manuscripts is 4Q51 or 4QSam^a, which Cross characterized as standing in between MT and what Cross calls the baroque or archaizing spelling. With respect to לֹא/לֹא or כֹּל/כֹּל the text is inconsistent, but more often full than defective; likewise it prefers *qtlth* forms above *qtl* ones. In other respects it is like MT, be it with some exceptions such as twice כִּי with *alef* against twenty-eight times regular כִּי.

At this stage, one can make the following observations, exclusively with respect to those biblical manuscripts (and I assume that most or all of those have been seen by Tov):

(1) The majority of biblical manuscripts uses consistently defective סל , and has with regard to orthography and morphology a text that stands close to MT. Also, it has virtually none of the idiosyncrasies of Tov's "Qumran scribal practice."

(2) A group of biblical manuscripts uses consistently full סל . Those manuscripts also displays a full orthography in other forms, both with regard to *vav* used for *u* or *o*, and with regard to final *he* for the second masculine singular perfect and suffix. These texts display more variation with respect to the morphological forms, ranging from having no or few distinctive forms, to having predominantly distinctive forms. A special case is 1QIsa^a A which is inconsistent with respect to both spellings and forms.

(3) In between these groups stand some manuscripts that display less consistency with respect to the spelling of סל and other orthographic issues, but generally are consistent in having the regular MT-like forms.

This brief investigation into the biblical manuscripts shows that we have to weigh and interpret the facts. We could classify the material in two, three, or even more groups, or organize the evidence on a spectrum. For example, on the basis of the biblical texts, we could classify the manuscripts broadly in (a) texts that are generally MT-like with defective spelling in the categories Tov uses and no lengthened forms; (b) texts with a mixed defective-full spelling, and only very rarely lengthened forms; (c) texts with a predominantly or exclusively full spelling, and some degree of lengthened forms; (d) texts with full spelling and a comprehensive use of lengthened forms. And then one should also refer to the small group of manuscripts that have an "archaic" spelling that is more defective than that of MT.⁹¹ Tov seems to categorize (c) and (d) as Qumran orthography and morphology, whereas Alexander and Vermes probably would call (c) full, and (d) super-full.

With respect to details, one should note that overall, also in the group of manuscripts that is very much like the MT, the *qtlth* spelling is more common than in MT. To a lesser extent this also holds for the *kh* spelling of the suffix. This supports Tov's feeling that not all eighteen categories are equally important for discerning a specific practice. But it also might support Cross and Freedman's hypothesis that the Rabbinic consonantal text reflects a revision towards the vernacular.

91. For example, 4Q52 (4QSam^b). Cf. the literature referred to in DJD 17:220.

6. Correlations between Orthography/Morphology and Scribal Features

6.1. Scribal Corrections

Throughout his work Tov describes statistical relations between certain scribal features and the Qumran orthography and morphology. In particular he considers the correlation between cancellation dots and the Qumran orthography and morphology to be very strong, since he includes references to scribal corrections in his tables in Appendix 9, and repeatedly refers to the connection between this particular correction practice and the Qumran spellings and forms. In fact, the “Qumran scribal practice” could be described as consisting largely of the orthographic and morphological features on the one hand, and a few typical scribal features, particularly the cancellation dots, on the other. His argument runs as follows:

The practice of using cancellation dots is evidenced in fifty-two biblical and nonbiblical texts written in the Qumran scribal practice, eight texts not written in that system, six texts of unclear orthographic practice, and three Aramaic texts. Since only half of the Qumran texts large enough for analysis reflect the features of the Qumran scribal practice, and the majority of the texts using the scribal dots are written in the Qumran orthography and morphology, the use of cancellation dots may be considered characteristic of that scribal practice.⁹²

The complete list of those in total sixty-nine texts, of which fifty-two in the “Qumran scribal practice” (seven biblical and forty-five nonbiblical), is presented in chapter 5,⁹³ so that we can easily compare that list to that of the other lists of texts written in the “Qumran scribal practice.”⁹⁴

Actually three of the list of fifty-two are not mentioned in Tov’s complete list of texts written in the “Qumran scribal practice,” namely 4QDeut^c (4Q30), 4QCal Doc/Mish C (4Q321a), and 4QBarkhi Nafshi^a (4Q434). In the tables of Appendix 1 they are characterized as not having the “Qumran scribal practice,” or, for 4Q321a, having no data.⁹⁵ Eleven more manuscripts of the list of fifty-two⁹⁶ are included in Tov’s list of texts written in the “Qumran scribal practice,” but with the question mark, which— as we saw—indicated that they belong to the group for

92. Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 264.

93. Idem., 196–98.

94. Idem., 339–43. Cf. also 279–87, the tables in Appendix 1

95. 4Q30 has some *plene* spellings (but always לֹא and כֹּל), and only regular, no distinctive forms. 4Q434 is slightly more *plene*, though not consistently, and again has no distinctive, only regular forms. 4Q321a lacks relevant data, though it has the strange spelling בֹּוֹא for בּוֹ.

96. 1Q22, 4Q222, 4Q223–224, 4Q274, 4Q289, 4Q396, 4Q400, 4Q410, 4Q426, 4Q438, 4Q522.

which the evidence was less convincing (unclear or probable). This still leaves a respectable number of thirty-eight out of sixty-nine for which Tov regards the evidence for the “Qumran scribal practice” convincing,⁹⁷ and eleven for which he considers it possible or probable, but the overall figures have become somewhat less overwhelming.

Tov’s other part of the argument (namely, that only half of the Qumran texts large enough for analysis reflect the “Qumran scribal practice,” whereas the majority of texts using the scribal dots is written in the Qumran orthography and morphology) requires more reflection and scrutiny. Unlike the binary options of two different kinds of possible spellings of one word or realizations of a form in orthography and morphology, the practice of cancellation dots has not been contrasted to another alternative correction practice in texts that do not reflect the “Qumran scribal practice.” One might compare the use of the cancellation dots with that of the crossing out of letters, and expect that one group of manuscripts would use one system, and another group of texts the other. However, Tov lists twenty-three manuscripts that cross out letters or words, nine of which also were recorded as using cancellation dots. In the case of crossing out words or letters with a line, thirteen are classified by Tov as written in the “Qumran scribal practice,” and ten as not in that scribal practice.⁹⁸ Another scribal correction practice, the use of parenthesis signs is found, thus Tov, in five texts written in the “Qumran scribal practice,” and in three not written in that system.⁹⁹ Two of those texts also use cancellation dots,¹⁰⁰ and four others also crossed out with lines.¹⁰¹ Tov adds three texts that indicate the elements to be omitted with a box-like shape around the letters, two of which actually also use cancellation dots.¹⁰²

We should draw some cautious preliminary conclusions and explanations. First, apparently neither the so-called “Qumran scribal practice” texts, nor the non-“Qumran scribal practice” texts use one specific procedure. In fact, in both categories of texts there are combina-

97. One of those cases contains a mistake. Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 342, lists 4Q393 as having 0/1 in col. 6 (i.e., having one example of a lengthened 2d/3d plur pronominal suffix with a preposition), but this should be 1/0 (having one regular, short, case of the plural pronominal suffix), see 4Q393 3 7 להם. Then the only evidence for the “Qumran scribal practice” would be orthographic.

98. Ibid., 199–200. But Tov again includes 4QDeut^c as a “Qumran scribal practice” manuscript. The third of the examples of a biblical manuscript penned in the “Qumran scribal practice” which crosses out words or letters with a line is 4QQoh^a, which has וִיחַ as the only distinctive form.

99. Ibid., 201–2.

100. 1QM and 1QS

101. 4QQoh^a, 4QM^a, 4QDibHam^a, 4QCant^b.

102. Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 202–3. 4QD^a, 4QOrd^b.

tions of similar correction procedures. One cannot argue, for example, that dots are typical of “Qumran scribal practice” texts, and crossing out of other texts. Second, the statistics of kinds of scribal procedures needs to be correlated to that of scribal interventions per se. Tov’s data also allow, for example, for the explanation that the larger number of cancellation dots and other correction procedures in those “Qumran scribal practice” manuscripts may be due to the fact that they were written less carefully, and therefore had to be corrected more often than other manuscripts, but that the authors used the same practices as others did. Third, one wonders to what extent the correlation between corrections and “Qumran scribal practice” texts could be indirect: most biblical texts are non-“Qumran scribal practice” texts, and most non-biblical ones “Qumran scribal practice” texts.¹⁰³ If biblical texts would generally have been written with more care, they would have less correction procedures.

The fact that many “Qumran scribal practice” texts do not have those correction dots or lines, and that some non-“Qumran scribal practice” texts do have them, indicates that we are not talking about a peculiar, characteristic “Qumran scribal practice,” but with one that for whatever reason was used more often in one group of texts than in another. One may assume that the use of cancellation dots was part of the scribal practice of the scribes of those manuscripts, but one cannot argue that this specific scribal feature supports the hypothesis of a Qumran orthography or morphology.

6.2. Divine Name in Paleo-Hebrew Characters

We can compare this with Tov’s list of manuscripts with tetragrammata or the words אלהים or אל written in palaeo-Hebrew characters.¹⁰⁴ Tov claims that virtually all nonbiblical manuscripts with tetragrammata or divine names written in palaeo-Hebrew characters are written according to the “Qumran scribal practice.”¹⁰⁵ He lists twenty nonbiblical compositions, of

103. The one hundred best preserved non-biblical manuscripts, i.e., with the most remaining “words” in Accordance’s Qumran module (11Q19, 1QH^a, 1QS, 1QM, 4Q418, 4Q266, 1QpHab, 4Q365, 4Q381, 4Q504, 4Q491, 4Q511, 4Q405, 11Q5, 4Q364, 3Q15, 4Q503, 4Q270, 4Q416, 4Q525, 4Q417, 4Q403, 4Q258, 4Q299, 11Q20, 1QSa, 4Q372, 4Q171, 4Q509, 4Q271, 4Q169, 4Q502, 4Q252, 4Q321, 4Q512, 1QSb, 4Q177, 4Q427, 4Q223-224, 4Q163, 4Q317, 4Q286, 4Q382, 4Q158, 4Q267, 4Q320, 1Q22, 4Q176, 4Q174, 4Q385a, 4Q394, 4Q216, 4Q274, 4Q434, 11Q17, 4Q379, 4Q378, 4Q319, 4Q428, 4Q259, 4Q265, 4Q251, 11Q11, 4Q423, 4Q400, 11Q13, 4Q175, 4Q256, 4Q522, 4Q185, 4Q390, 4Q200, 4Q422, 4Q387, 4Q521, 4Q184, 4Q397, 4Q385, 4Q396, 4Q365a, 4Q415, 4Q424, 4Q391, 1Q27, 4Q225, 4Q377, 4Q161, 4Q300, 4Q269, 4Q159, 4Q437, 4Q398, 4Q368, 4Q221, 4Q513, 4Q414, 4Q401, 4Q393, 4Q219, 4Q389) include sixty-one texts which in Tov’s list of “Qumran scribal practice” manuscripts are marked as “y,” and twelve more which are “y?” Only twenty-seven are not included in his list.

104. Ibid., 242–43.

105. Ibid., 241: “All nonbiblical compositions except for those specified as ‘not Q’ are written according to the

which he specifies one 4Q258 (4QS^d) as being an exception (“not Q”), and two more as uncertain (“Q?”; 4QShirShabb^s and 6QD). However, actually only thirteen of those twenty compositions are included in Tov’s list of about 160 “Qumran scribal practice” texts.¹⁰⁶ As for the seven biblical manuscripts with palaeo-Hebrew characters for the divine name, five are too fragmentary for orthographic analysis, and only two are clearly written in the “Qumran scribal practice.”¹⁰⁷

Tov also lists “Qumran scribal practice” texts that write divine names in square characters,¹⁰⁸ which shows that not all manuscripts that have the features of Tov’s “Qumran scribal practice” used the palaeo-Hebrew script for those names. It had been suggested previously that the use of palaeo-Hebrew script for divine names was a typically sectarian or Qumran phenomenon, and Tov’s list suggests that within the corpus it is also restricted (with the one exception of 4Q258) to texts using the distinctive orthography and morphology.¹⁰⁹

A comparison of the two phenomena—cancellation dots and palaeo-Hebrew characters—shows that we have here two different kinds of conventions. Both are attested in multiple “Qumran scribal practice” texts, but in the case of the cancellation dots it is a non-exclusive, noncharacteristic convention; in the case of the use of palaeo-Hebrew characters for the divine name, the feature seems to be exclusive and characteristic for texts written according to the “Qumran scribal practice” within the corpus. However, with regard to both conventions we also have multiple texts written in the “Qumran scribal practice” that do not use those conventions.

7. Correlations between the “Qumran scribal practice” and Sectarian Texts

No-one will challenge the view that most of the orthographic and morphological peculiarities are found in those texts that traditionally have most closely been connected to the Qumran

Qumran scribal practice.”

106. Namely 1QpMic, 1QpHab, 1QMyst, 1QH^a, 1QH^b [even though Tov indicates that the evidence is insufficient] 4QpIsa^a, 4QpPs^a, 4QAgnes of Creation A, 4QD^b, 4QD^c, 6QpapHymn, 11QPs^a, and 4QpIsa^a; not in Tov’s list on *ibid.*, 339–43 are the already mentioned 4QS^d, 4QShirShabb^s, and 6QD, as well as 1QpZeph, 4QpPs^b, 4QMidrEschat^e?, and 4QComposition Concerning Divine Providence. At the least, this shows a discrepancy between the various lists in the 2004 volume.

107. 4QDeut^{k2} and 4QIsa^c. One should add 11QPs^a, which had already been included under the nonbiblical texts.

108. *Ibid.*, 244. But the list is not complete. E.g., in section a. Biblical Texts, one should add 1QDeut, 4QDeut^{k1}, 4QDeut^m, 4QXII^e, 4QLam—all of which are certainly—and 2QExod^b, 2QDeut^c, 4QExod^b, 4QExod^j, 4QXII^s which are possibly written according to the “Qumran scribal practice,” according to Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 339.

109. Ignoring texts that are too fragmentary for orthographic analysis.

Community, like the Cave 1 texts 1QS, 1QH^a, 1QpHab, and 1QM, as well as most of the pesharim. Also many other texts that are commonly closely related to those compositions exhibit many of the same features. Tov, however, goes one step further and sees the spelling and morphology as characteristic of the sectarian writings, and the lack of those features as indicating that those scrolls had been brought from elsewhere, even though he acknowledges there are “seven or eight sectarian texts [that] do *not* share those features.”¹¹⁰ Above I already mentioned that this is more problematic than he suggests, but here I want to discuss the phenomenon of exceptions.

Tov mentions eight exceptions, but two of those, 4Q320 and 4Q395, have so little evidence that they should better be regarded as indecisive, not as exceptions. 4Q320 begins with full spelling and then continues with defective spelling, and 4Q395 only has one word—אֶהְרֶן—that could give an idea about fullness or defectiveness. 4Q252 which according to Tov has sporadic “Qumranic” spellings, is mixed, and actually a good example of a text with several of the distinctive orthographic details but none of the morphological ones. The remaining five manuscripts, are the four crucial exceptions, the two pesharim 4Q162 and 4Q169 (4QpIsa^b and 4QpNah) and the two Serekh manuscripts 4Q258 and 4Q264, as well as 4Q434 (4QBarkhi Nafshi^a). Those texts are characterized by the lack of distinctive forms, and a virtually defective spelling.

One should note, however, that the lack of specific morphological peculiarities does not necessarily indicate that a text is an exception to the “Qumran scribal practice,” since many texts that Tov assigns to this group have only few and sometimes no preserved distinctive forms. Therefore, only if the orthography of a text is predominantly defective, then we can assume that it does not have Tov’s features, and is an exception. By that token a few other texts should be added to Tov’s list of “exceptions,” such as, e.g., 4Q270 (4QD^e).¹¹¹ In general, however, there are very few “sectarian” texts that are so defective that we have to exclude the possibility that they could have had features of the “Qumran scribal practice.” We should combine this with our earlier observations: whereas many texts do not have enough evidence to assign

110. Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 262, where he lists 4QpIsa^b (4Q162), 4QpNah (4Q169), 4QCommGen A (4Q252), 4QS^d (4Q258), 4QS^j (4Q264), 4QCal Doc/Mish A (4Q320), 4QMMT^b (4Q395), and 4QBarkhi Nafshi^a (4Q434).

111. But note the spelling צון, and possibly a יכתנ'ן בווהו, as well as once הכול (versus 15x כל). Note that even in texts that usually spell כל, there may be a tendency to write הכול rather than הכל. E.g. 4Q258 with 23x times כל, and twice כול, namely in הכול and מכול. But should we see a spelling like צון (or זון) as a full spelling, and does it belong to the same category as the ones with the digraphs ווא and וא? Cf. spellings like ותומר and רוש in the Murabba'at manuscripts and רוש in 3Q15.

them with confidence to Tov's group, likewise many others do not have enough evidence to rule out that they belonged to that group. But then, some nonbiblical texts with a consistently defective spelling, such as 4Q185 or 4Q273, suddenly have an unexpected lengthened independent pronoun like respectively *אתם* and *הוא*. Put differently: the lack of positive evidence for the "Qumran scribal practice" is not necessarily the same as evidence for the contrary. In other words: we have a large group of texts that cannot easily be categorized, and only a small group that with certainty can be excluded from the "Qumran scribal practice."

8. Preliminary Assessment

The question is not whether or not there was something like a "Qumran scribal practice," but whether Tov's construct is methodologically sound and able to organize and explain a maximum of data, with a minimum of exceptions. Tov has forcefully, and on the whole correctly, emphasized the close connection between a set of orthographic and morphological peculiarities, with those texts that traditionally have been considered to be sectarian. He has also observed that specific scribal features occur more often in texts that display those peculiarities than in other texts, and has attributed the combination of those orthographic, morphological and scribal features to shared scribal conventions, or a specific scribal practice.

In his recent work on two manuscripts that are notoriously inconsistent with respect to spellings and forms, namely 1QIsa^a and 1QH^a, Tov has demonstrated that in spite of the inconsistency there is a tendency to correct towards a specific orthographic and morphological practice, and not randomly also the other way round. Tov's awareness of different degrees in which texts may display those characteristics, is not entirely compatible, it seems to me, with his tendency to nonetheless dichotomize the material in two distinct groups, and to suggest that these two groups had clearly different origins. Though the suggestion that patently different scribal orthographic and morphological systems would indicate a different milieu is plausible, it is not the only possible one. Also, as we have seen, the phenomenon of exceptions makes the dichotomy even more problematic.

In my opinion, the variety between the manuscripts can better be described with the model of a spectrum, than in clear-cut categories, even though we may want to use labels for specific clusters on the spectrum. Tov's "Qumran scribal practice" is such a cluster, but it covers a very large part of the spectrum, in fact, more or less all manuscripts that prefer full spellings above defective spellings. Tov's proposal of a relationship between this cluster to the yahad community and the site of Qumran needs much more reflection, regardless of the recent

work of Ira Rabin and her Berlin colleagues who demonstrated that at least one “Qumran scribal practice” scroll, 1QH^a, was penned in the Dead Sea region.¹¹²

Another issue, which needs more attention, is the relationship between the majority of scrolls that are on the “Qumran scribal practice” side of the spectrum, and the small number that are clearly on the other side. It is interesting that within the corpus of biblical scrolls, the manuscripts with distinctive spellings and forms are a small minority, whereas in the corpus of nonbiblical scrolls the manuscripts with distinctive or full spellings, and often also distinctive forms, are in the majority. There, scrolls with defective spellings and regular MT-like forms are relatively rare.

Based on my searches this cluster would be no larger than about thirty to forty manuscripts.¹¹³ It includes the five exceptions to Tov’s “Qumran scribal practice,” namely “sectarian” texts with entirely regular spelling (4Q162, 4Q169, 4Q258, 4Q264, 4Q434, but one should also add 4Q270), as well as two of the *Reworked Pentateuch* manuscripts (4Q366 and 4Q367). However, this category also includes a relatively large number of texts that have been classified as Apocrypha. Thus, 2Q22 (formerly called *apocrDavid?* but now identified as a copy of *Narrative and Poetic Composition*) and 4Q372 (*Narrative and Poetic Composition*^b),¹¹⁴ 4Q216 and 4Q218 (4QJub^{a, c}), 4Q368 (*ApocrPent A*),¹¹⁵ 4Q374 (*Discourse on the Exodus Conquest Tradition*), 4Q379 (*Apocryphon of Joshua*^b),¹¹⁶ 4Q385, 4Q385a, 4Q386, 4Q387, 4Q387a, 4Q389, 4Q390 (all *Pseudo-Ezekiel* and *Apocryphon of Jeremiah C* manuscripts, although there still is discussion whether they represent different manuscripts and compositions). On the basis of Tov’s hypothesis, these would presumably have been brought from elsewhere, which would accord with the fact that these Apocrypha texts do not have any of the specifically sectarian terminology. As also Devorah Dimant indicates, in virtually all those manuscripts we see a language that is modelled on the biblical texts of Ezekiel and Jeremiah, while the orthography and morphology is remarkably much like that of the Masoretic tradition, and in 4Q387 and 4Q389 the orthography is even more defective. At the same time, a few slips of the pen in some of the copies demonstrate that the scribes were not completely used to this kind of spelling. This suggests that the scribes of

112. Ira Rabin, Oliver Hahn, Timo Wolff, Adimir Masic, and Gisela Weinberg, “On the Origin of the Ink of the Thanksgiving Scroll (1QHodayot^a),” *DSD* 16 (2009): 97–106.

113. The list should include 1Q34bis, 2Q22, 4Q162, 4Q169, 4Q185 (even though it has the one case of **אתסה**), 4Q216, 4Q258, 4Q264, 4Q270, 4Q366, 4Q367, 4Q368, 4Q372, 4Q374, 4Q379, 4Q385, 4Q385a, 4Q386, 4Q387, 4Q387a, 4Q389, 4Q392, 4Q393, 4Q434, 4Q514, as well as a series of badly preserved manuscripts.

114. MT-like orthography. But the other copies of this composition are *plene* or even QSP.

115. Check. This is a strange ms, mixing defective with some *plene* forms, partially in clusters.

116. The orthography is sometimes even extra defective, like **עלמי עד**.

Dimant's volume, except for the one of 4Q390, largely preserved an MT-like spelling. Here we may hypothesize, that these texts were copied in the kind of spelling that was associated with that of the biblical texts of Jeremiah and Ezekiel. One wonders, whether the scribes of 4Q387 and 4Q389, but also the one of 4Q379 (Apocryphon of Joshua^b), were overdoing it, or whether they had knowledge of older, more defective biblical manuscripts which they imitated. On the other hand, of some of these "apocrypha" compositions we also have copies with the distinctive spelling and forms.

In the cases of those regular MT spellings and forms, the manuscripts may have been penned by scribes who more or less copied the orthography and morphology of earlier copies. However, the clustering of defective spellings and regular morphological forms in this kind of apocryphal or pseudo-compositions may suggest a tendency to avoid the distinctive "Qumran" spellings and forms in special kinds of texts. Were those scribes only imitating what they thought to be the scribal practice of biblical texts, or can we go further and ask, hypothetically, whether they expressed their attitude towards those texts by writing them in "biblical" orthography. Was spelling, at least for some scribes, part of the strategies of authorization? Did defective spelling reflect that the scribes held the texts to be authoritative and of a different character than those which they copied in the more distinctive spelling and morphology which Tov related to the "Qumran scribal practice"? We should expand the discourse that Tov has started and introduce different parameters apart from the sectarian versus nonsectarian one.

Biblical manuscripts organized according to how they spell לא

	“Only לא” mss	“לא/לוא” mss	“Only לוא” mss
(1, 2) הוא vs הוואה	never have הוואה	never have הוואה	mixed
(3) אתם vs אתמה	never אתמה	--	almost always אתמה
(4) הם vs המה	15 :: 4 where MT has הם	as in MT	הם; only twice המה
(5, 6) short suffixes 2nd/3rd plural vs lengthened ones	no certain cases of lengthened suffixes ¹¹⁷	99% short forms	mixed, depending both on texts (1QIsa ^a is not representative) and on suffix. כמה clearly more common than המה.
(7) <i>yiqṭ^llu</i> vs <i>yiqṭólú</i>	<i>yiqṭ^llu</i> , with one possible exception in 4Q22	<i>no relevant forms</i>	1QIsa ^a predominantly <i>yiqṭólú</i> ; in other mss both, but with more cases of <i>yiqṭólú</i> than <i>yiqṭ^llu</i> ,
(8) <i>yiqṭ^llenu</i> vs <i>y^qquṭlenu</i> forms	no <i>y^qquṭlenu</i> forms	no <i>y^qquṭlenu</i> forms	mixed half/half
(9) קטלתם vs קטלתמה	never קטלתמה	never קטלתמה	קטלתמה about twice as common as קטלתם
(10) מאד vs מואדה	20 :: 3	4 :: 1	3 :: 24
(11) זאת versus זואת, זות, זאות ¹¹⁸	זאת as a rule (but זאות once in 8Q3, and זות twice in 4Q76)	זאת as rule (but twice other form in 4Q41)	never זואת, but always a form with waw
(12) כה versus כוה	always כה	always כה	mixed (especially in 1QIsa ^a), but outside of 1QIsa ^a 1 :: 7

117. Except for 4Q141, which has many more distinctive spellings and forms, the defective spelling of לא is the exception in this manuscript, and the manuscript actually fits better in the לוא group.

118. As opposed to MT these all are peculiar, but זות may actually belong to a different category.

(13) מושה vs משה	always משה except in 4Q13	always (6x) מושה except for 4Q41.	always מושה
(14) לוא vs לא	לא	לוא and לא	לוא
(15) כול ¹¹⁹ vs כל	more than 99% כל [if we ignore the 10 attestations of כול in 4Q130]	differing per ms, difficult to see system yet	more than 95% have כול, and only very rarely כל, and those mainly in 1QIsa ^a .
(16) ביא vs כי	always כי, with the possible exception of Mas1e	95% כי	mixed, but all in all more common than ביא
(17) קטלתה vs קטלת	ca. 95% קטלת, and 5% קטלתה where MT has קטלת	mixed, all in all 50/50	with the exception of 1QIsa ^a scribe A and 4Q137, always write קטלתה and not קטלת
(18)	99% ך only four certain כה where MT has -ך	predominantly ך, but some ms mixed.	1QIsa ^a A clearly prefers ך, but in all other mss about 95% כה

119. Note that in Mishna (ms Kaufmann) *kol* is spelled כל, but *kul(l)* (with suffix) generally (310 :: 76) as כול. In the Eshkol edition only once כול (*m. Sukk.* 3:12).