Dittography and Copying Lines in the Dead Sea Scrolls
Considering George Brooke's Proposal About 1QpHab 7:1-2

Eibert Tigchelaar

1. Introduction: Interpreting 1QpHab 7:1-2

In a 2015 seminar on physical features of the Cave 1 Habakkuk Pesher,¹ George Brooke both discussed those characteristics which he had earlier published in an article on physicality and paratextuality,² and proposed some explanations which he had not included in the article. Thus, he discussed the dittography of על across the line break in 1QpHab 7:1-2.

1 וידבר אל אל חבוק לכתוב הבאות על

2 על הדור האחרון ואת גמר הקץ לוא הודעו

One may note first that two strokes (rather than dots) above the *ayin* and *lamed* of על in line 2 apparently serve as deletion markers, indicating that the letters should not be read.³ Secondly, line 1 has a supralinear insertion of the second אל.⁴ In the seminar, Brooke proposed an explanation which was missing in his article: these two copying errors, namely the haplography of אל, and the dittography of על, could be related if the copyist was copying from a manuscript Vorlage with the same layout. That is, because of the scribe's initial omission of the second אל earlier on in line 1, there was enough space at the end of this line for the word על which (one must conclude) apparently was already in the scribe's mind, but in the Vorlage was the first word of the following line. Brooke did not spell out all the details, but seemed to suggest that when starting to write the next line, the scribe looked at the Vorlage, and automatically adopted the line of the Vorlage, which

¹Yale University, March 4, 2015, as a special session in the course "Editing Dead Sea Scrolls: Identification, Reconstruction, Interpretation."

²George J. Brooke, "Physicality, Paratextuality and Pesher Habakkuk," in *On the Fringe of Commentary: Metatextuality in Ancient Near Eastern and Ancient Mediterranean Cultures*, ed. S. H. Aufrère, P. S. Alexander, and Z. Pleše, OLA 232 (Leuven: Peeters, 2014), 175-94. The paper was presented at a 2008 conference.

³See the discussion in Brooke, "Physicality," 181-82. See also p. 182 for the dots to the right and left of לוא in the same line.

⁴See the discussion in Brooke, "Physicality," 182.

started with לע , resulting in the dittography which subsequently was corrected by means of the strokes.

This proposal is characteristic of Brooke's signature intimate exploration of manuscripts and texts, devoted to discover every detail, from scribal to cultural, and to draw out connections. His proposal is focused primarily on this specific instance of dittography, and makes a claim for the process of copying of 1QpHab only. Yet, I welcome his suggestion as an invitation to survey and explore more broadly the ways of copying and the causes of scribal errors in the Dead Sea Scrolls. More specifically, this contribution focuses on the hypothesis of line-by-line copying, on the different kinds of dittography, and the causes of some of the dittographic errors.

2. Starting with 1QpHab and Its Scribe

It is generally acknowledged that 1QpHab is (at least in part) a copy of an earlier scroll. This is argued on the basis of scribal errors such as the original haplography of לס in 7:1 and the sometimes strange distribution of blanks in the lines, and on literary analysis which proposes that the present text contains multiple literary layers.⁵ In addition, some scholars have proposed that the X-shaped signs were either directly copied from the Vorlage, or referenced columns of one or more Vorlages.⁶ It is not clear, however, to what extent the scribe of 1QpHab simply copied a scroll which already had a text with these multiple layers, or contributed to the ongoing reworking and expansion of

⁵See H. Eshel, "The Two Historical Layers of Peshar Habakkuk," in *Northern Lights on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Nordic Qumran Network 2003-2006*, ed. A. K. Petersen et al., STDJ 80 (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 107-17; P. B. Hartog, "'The Final Priests of Jerusalem' and 'The Mouth of the Priest': Eschatological Expectation and Literary History in Peshar Habakkuk," forthcoming in *Dead Sea Discoveries*.

⁶See, most recently, S. Llewelyn, S. Ng, G. Wearne, and A. Wrathall, "A Case for Two *Vorlagen* Behind the Habakkuk Commentary (1QpHab)," in *Keter Shem Tov: Essays on the Dead Sea Scrolls in Memory of Alan Crown*, ed. S. Tzoref and I. Young, Perspectives on Hebrew Scriptures and its Contexts 20 (Piscataway: Gorgias, 2013), 123-50. Cf. criticism of this position in Hartog, "Final Priests."

the text. Since neither the date of the assumed later literary layers,⁷ nor the paleographic date of the manuscripts⁸ are clear, these cannot support hypotheses about the copying process.⁹

Since we do not have the Vorlage(n) which the scribe of 1QpHab used, it is only by paying close attention to various details that we can try to reconstruct how the scribe copied the Vorlage. In his article and seminar, Brooke hinted at the possibility that the copyist actually used the Vorlage as an exemplar, that is, that the scribe did not only copy the text of the Vorlage, but also adopted or imitated its layout. Thus, the frequent spilling-over of words into the left margin might suggest that the copyist copied line by line from a Vorlage which had slightly wider writings blocks than 1QpHab.¹⁰ Secondly, the unusually large number of seven columns per sheet with narrow columns could have a special reason. In the seminar Brooke proposed that the scribe may have initially tried to imitate an exemplar, which would have started the commentary on the five woes (Hab 2:6-20) on a second sheet. However, by inserting the text which is now in 1QpHab 2:5-10 the scribe unintentionally disturbed this layout, so that the quotation of Hab 2:5-6 now starts in line 3 of the second sheet.¹¹ Thirdly, the explanation of the dittography in 1QpHab 7:1-2 would be compat-

⁷Eshel, "Two Historical Layers," sees the second literary layer as a reaction to the Roman conquest; Hartog, "Final Priests," as a reaction to the demise of the Hasmonaean priesthood.

⁸F. M. Cross, "Introduction," in *Scrolls from Qumrân Cave 1 from Photographs by John C. Trever* (Jerusalem: The Albright Institute of Archaeological Research and The Shrine of the Book, 1972), 1-5 at 4 characterizes 1QpHab as written in an "Early Herodian hand (ca. 30-1 B.C.)." See also E. Puech in DJD 25, 86, who refers to the second part of the first century B.C.E. However, other scholars date this hand, and that of 11Q20, almost certainly written by the same scribe, to the first century C.E. See, e.g., Strugnell as quoted in DJD 25, 85 (on 11Q20) or A. Steudel, "Dating Exegetical Texts from Qumran," in *The Dynamics of Language and Exegesis at Qumran*, ed. D. Dimant and R. G. Kratz, FAT 35 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009), 39-53, at 47: "1-50 CE." The latest date was given in DJD 23, 364, by the editors of 11Q20, who refer to a "developed Herodian formal script (c. 20-50 CE)," a characterisation which I now would modify.

⁹Eshel, "Two Historical Layers" and Hartog, "Final Priests" suggest that 1QpHab is a copy of a Vorlage which already contained the second layer or youngest additions, whereas Brooke, Yale Seminar, seems to assign the latest additions to the scribe of 1QpHab.

¹⁰Brooke, "Physicality," 179, n. 24, giving credit to Ariel Feldman for this suggestion. Here, however, one might counter that quite frequently the copyist leaves a generous space between the last word and the left margin which, along the same line of argument, could indicate the exact opposite.

¹¹One might counter that the length of the assumed insertion in col. 2 is longer than the text of 1QpHab 8:1-3. However, if in the Vorlage a new content unit really began on a new sheet, then the last line(s) of the previous sheet might have been unwritten which would account for the discrepancy. Note, however, that we have very little evidence in the scrolls for the intentional beginning of a new content unit at the beginning of a new column or sheet. This is the case for the main part of the Rule of the Community, which in all our manuscripts begins at the start of a new column (1QS 5:1; 4Q256 9:1; 4Q258 1:1). In 4Q258 it is the beginning of the scroll, in 4Q256 at the beginning of a new sheet, and in 1QS

ible with this hypothesis. Cumulatively, these arguments are suggestive of the possibility that the scribe copied line by line. However, there is some degree of circular arguing, and none of the individual pieces of evidence is persuasive, which explains why Brooke did not press the point in this article.

For the study of scribal features in 1QpHab one should also pay attention to the scribal features of 11Q20, a scroll which appears to have been copied by the scribe of 1QpHab.¹² Because of the fragmentary preservation of this scroll, there are no completely preserved lines, or even phrases that cross over line breaks. Nonetheless, some of the mentioned features of 1QpHab can be recognized. Here, too, we have irregular left margins, some words spilling over into the left margin, and other lines stopping at some distance before the left margin, though overall the irregularity in 11Q20 is less extreme than in 1QpHab. In 11Q20 we also have twice the same X-shaped signs (indicating, by the way, that these signs should be assigned to the scribe, and not to later readers) at the left margin (11Q19 4:9 and 5:9), but in 4:9 it hardly could have been intended as a line filler.¹³ At any rate, there are no clear indications that in 11Q20 the same scribe was involved in line-by-line copying.

3. Line by line copying in the Dead Sea Scrolls

Among the Dead Sea Scrolls, there are many works that have been copied in multiple manuscripts, even though in most cases only fragments remain. In spite of the paucity of remains, there are

the width of the columns has been adjusted in order that the text of 1QS 5 could begin at the top of a column. Also 4Q216 organizes the text physically according to content, by having blank lines at the bottom of col. 6, and beginning in col. 7 with the sixth day of creation (Jub. 2:13). For more details on the layout of 4Q216, see my "The Qumran Jubilees Manuscripts as Evidence for the Literary Growth of the Book," *RevQ* 26/104 (2014): 579-94.

¹²J. van der Ploeg, "Une halakha inédite de Qumrân," in *Qumrân, sa piété, sa théologie et son milieu*, ed. M. Delcor, BETL 46 (Paris-Gembloux: Duculot, 1978), 107-13, at 107, seems to have been the first to mention that both manuscripts were copied by the same scribe. For a brief comparison of the shared palaeographic and scribal features of 1QpHab and 11Q20, cf. DJD 23, p. 364. Other shared features are easily discernible. For example, in both manuscripts the scribe generally starts to write the downstroke of line-initial lamed on or very close to the margin ruling line, so that the body of lamed is written to the right of the right marginal ruling. The two exceptions in 1QpHab are at the top of a column, in 5:1 and 10:1. Cf. on the writing of these lameds, Brooke, "Physicality," 179.

¹³For other speculations on the function of the X's, cf. E. Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches as Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert*, STDJ 54 (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 209-10.

enough examples of textual overlaps between different manuscripts to examine whether in some cases they would correspond line after line, which could be an indication of occasional line by line copying, or even of manuscript exemplars. Hitherto, I have found no clear evidence of scribes who were concerned with line-by-line copying. Generally, the size of writing blocks would depend on the size of skins, and these, like the size of letters, vary considerably. But even in copies with writing blocks of comparable size, it is rare for more than two successive lines to have been copied down identically. In part, this may be due to the accidents or preservation. For example, the lines in 4Q400 2 i 1-2 and 4Q401 14 i 7-8 are identical, but the earlier lines of 4Q400 and the following ones of 4Q401 are lacking. Similarly, 4Q434 1 i 1-2 is identical to 4Q437 1 i 1-2, but once again no more material for comparison is available. Where there is evidence available for comparison, it shows that occasionally two lines may be identical, while the preceding and following lines are different. This holds, e.g., for 4Q405 20 ii 22 4-5 and 11Q17 7:6-8 (in both cases partially reconstructed). A longer stretch of text layed out in exactly the same way can be found in 1QH^a 7:14-17 and 4Q427 8 i 6-9, but after these lines the exact correspondence disappears, and the lack of other layout correspondence between 1QH^a and 4Q427 rules out any systematic line-by-line copying. A remarkable correspondence is found between 4Q30 5 lines 3-5 and 7, and DSS.F133 (APU 3) lines 2-4 and 6, with only the different placement of פ (at the beginning of a line in 4Q30 and at the end of the previous line in DSS.F133) disturbing an identical layout over five lines.¹⁴ While there is no evidence of consistent line-by-line copying, the examples given above may indicate that scribes might be following intentionally or automatically the exact layout of the lines over a number of lines. One may also suspect that occasional correspondence between the lines of the Vorlage and that of the copyist, could affect the copying process of the copyist.

4. Dittographic Errors

¹⁴Note that the similar shape of the fragments and the identical textual variants strongly suggest a direct dependency between the fragments. I surmise that DSS.F133 (APU 3) is a modern forgery, imitating 4Q30 5, even up to a similarity of the shapes of some letters.

The term dittography is commonly used as an umbrella term for the error of repeating one or more letters, syllables, words, or even phrases by scribes or copyists. But those forms of repetition actually have different causes and require other kinds of explanations. Thus, dittographies of letters and syllables at the sublexical level are from a model of linguistic processing often similar to common speech errors.¹⁵ Dittography of longer phrases or passages, however, should generally be attributed primarily to visual error (whether *saut du même au même* or *aberratio oculi*) when the scribe (or the one who dictates!) looks again at the exemplar. Dittography of single or multiple words in copying can be explained as visual errors in the case of so-called “vertical dittography,” the scribe accidentally copying a word from an adjacent line in the Vorlage.¹⁶ For most cases of dittography of single words, however, several other possibilities should be considered. From a cognitive psychological perspective, repetitions in spontaneous speech are the result of disfluency in speech.¹⁷ From the study of repetitions in speech two features may be applicable to repetitions in writing, including copying.¹⁸ First, repetitions of words in speech are generally caused if speakers cannot formulate an entire utterance at once, and therefore suspend their speech by introducing for example a pause or a filler (such as *uh*). When they continue they may simply proceed, or restart with one of the earlier constituents of the speech. Second, the vast majority of the repeated words are function words, not content words.¹⁹ This may be due to the overall frequency of function words, but specifically because some function words introduce those content words or clauses which the speaker had not yet fully anticipated when starting the clause. The reason for suspending speech (a speaker began an utterance before knowing how to fulfill it) is different from a

¹⁵T. Proto, “Speech and Scribal Errors As a Window Into the Mind: Evidence for Mechanisms of Speech (Re)production and Systems of Mental Representations,” *Cognitive Philology* 3 (2010)

¹⁶For this paper I have not attempted to systematically collect instances of “vertical dittography.” Some are mentioned in Tov, *Scribal Practices*, esp. 226-27. A clear example is found in 4Q266 11:15 והמשתלח.

¹⁷A much fuller discussion of a cognitive approach to copying errors is found in J. Vroom, “A Cognitive Approach to Copying Errors: Haplography and Textual Transmission of the Hebrew Bible,” *JSOT* 40 (2016): 259-79, which only appeared after the submission of this paper.

¹⁸I have used H. H. Clark and T. Wasow, “Repeating Words in Spontaneous Speech,” *Cognitive Psychology* 37 (1998): 201-42.

¹⁹See Clark and Wasow, “Repeating Words,” who do not only present statistics, but specifically examine the place of these function words in the enunciation.

scribe's interrupting the process of copying, which may be due either to a disruption in the recall of the text to be copied, or to physical interruptions of writing, such as the re-inking of the pen,²⁰ or perhaps the movement of the hand to the beginning of a new line. Also, unlike speakers who are "pressed by a temporal imperative,"²¹ writers and scribes are not under the immediate pressure to continue their writing, which may explain the small numbers of repetitions. Nonetheless, just as in English the word *the* is the most repeated word in writing, in the Dead Sea Scrolls almost half of the repeated words are short function words that precede a content word (cf. below 4.2.).

4.1. Dittography of long word-strings by visual error

Within the Dead Sea Scrolls there are a few cases of partial or full dittography of long word-strings.

1QS 6:4-6 the entire string of words או התירוש לשתות הכוהן ידו לרשונה להברך בראשית הלחם is repeated and not corrected. The error was apparently triggered by the occurrence of או התירוש and והתירוש in subsequent lines.

4Q128 1 26-27 uncorrected dittography, partially preserved, of Deut 10:22 בשבעים נפש ירדו אבותיכה Not corrected. Probably due to homoiarcton of לרוב.

4Q129 1 recto 11-12 uncorrected dittography, partially preserved, of at least the following words from Deut 5:23: ותקרבוני אלי כול ראשי שבטיכמה וזקניכמה ותמרו מתוך of Deut 5:24 to מתוך in Deut 5:23.

4Q143 1 recto 1-5 dittography of entire Deut 10:22-11:1. The first instance of these verses was apparently encircled as a correction marker, though only the line below line 3 remains.

4Q221 1 5-7 corrected dittography, apparently by encircling, in lines 6-7 of the words ומכול תועבתם ושומר משמרת אל עליון ועשה רצונו ותצלח בכול; there may be more cases of extensive dittography in 4Q221, but those are badly preserved.

²⁰See P. M. Head and M. Warren, "Re-inking the Pen: Evidence from P. Oxy. 657 (P13) Concerning Unintentional Scribal Errors," *NTS* 43 (1997): 466-73.

²¹Clark and Wasow, "Repeating Words," 208.

4Q418 9 8-10; the entire line 10 is a dittography of the last word of line 8 and entire line 9. The dittography is marked in the text.

The first three cases seem to be due to *saut du même au même*. In the last two cases there is another kind of *aberratio oculi*. Since in both cases the dittography could correspond to one line in the Vorlage, the scribe might have simply repeated an entire line of the Vorlage.

4.2. Dittography of one, or several short words, in the same line²²

4Q48 2-3 3 מאד <מאד> סאדם²³

4Q60 3-6 13 ושביה וש[ב]יה

4Q86 1:6-7 נאווה [י]ה[א]ל / [א]ל[ה]ינו נא[וה זמרה]. But the reading and reconstruction are not certain, and since the text also displays other variants vis-à-vis the MT, one may assume another text.

4Q111 2:1 לוא לוא מצא

4Q162 1:4 {אשר} ואשר. It has been proposed that this a copying error from a Vorlage which read (in Hasmonean script) ואשר אמר. The supralinear waw was then added secondarily, giving the impression of a dittography.²⁴

4Q179 2 8 וכל בנותיה כאבלות על על בע[ליה]ן

4Q196 2 4 ומלך ומלך

4Q216 6:4 עשה עשה ביום השלישי

4Q216 6:12 ואת [כל ואת כ]

²²Many examples are mentioned in Tov, *Scribal Practices*, when discussing correction procedures, esp. 226-27. I have also searched the DJD volumes for terms like dittography, the Accordance modules for the repetition of specific words and for erasures of entire words, and Qimron's first and second volume for the use of פּעמּיּים. I wish to thank David Van Acker for providing a complete list of repetition of words in the Accordance module Qumran Nonbiblical Texts. I have checked all examples in the editions and on the photographs, and in some cases I propose other readings.

²³The editor, E. Tov, discusses the reading of the dittography in DJD 14:155 and 157. One might add that the confusion might have arisen more easily with a Vorlage written in Paleohebrew script.

²⁴J. H. Charlesworth, "Revelation and Perspicacity in Qumran Hermeneutics," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Contemporary Culture*, ed. A. D. Roitman, L. H. Schiffman, and S. Tzoref, STDJ 93 (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 161-80, at 168. I must confess, however, that I do not see how a Hasmonean medial mem could be confused with shin. (The suggestion of a Hasmonean Vorlage is perhaps based on the אשר in 1:1, which would be a misreading of the first three letters of אשיתהו).

4Q266 3 iii 20 [הבא אל] דמשק {כאשר} [כאש] ר כתוב

4Q266 9 iii 6 [למגרש] וכן יבן. Thus the editor. However, the remains make it virtually impossible to decide between bet and kaf,²⁵ and the second word has also, more likely, been read as וכן or יבן.²⁶

4Q271 4 ii 4 [וקדק] מד הכול כי ביה מושה {כי}

4Q365 12b iii 7 ויעשו את ה' ויעשו את החשן

4Q365 12b iii 7 the supralinear insertion מעשי חושב כמעשה אפוד erroneously adds too many words and creates a dittography with the words כמעשה אפוד written in line 7.²⁸

4Q417 2 i 5 יצדק כמוכה הואה כיא הואה {כיא הואה} שר

4Q503 11 4 {בממ} במעמד (if the reading of the last erased letter is correct, then this was a dittography in the making and then aborted)

4Q509 97-98 i 3 {לעשות} לעשות

4Q542 1 i 2 {ותנדעונה} ותנדעונה

11Q1 3:6 {את} את

11Q1 6:9 {את} את

11Q19 58:5 {העם} מעשר העם

²⁵J. M. Baumgarten, DJD 18, 71 simply states “bet as the second letter of the second word appears preferable,” but does not adduce any arguments.

²⁶J. T. Milik's transcription in the Preliminary Concordance (see *A Preliminary Edition of the Unpublished Dead Sea Scrolls: The Hebrew and Aramaic Texts from Cave Four*, Fascicle One, reconstr. and ed. B. Z. Wacholder and M. G. Abegg (Washington: Biblical Archaeological Society, 1991), 19 (D^b frag. 18 col. ii line 5) ran [למגרש] וכן, while Baumgarten, DJD 18, 71 reports that Milik read וכן יבן למגרש (if this is a correct reproduction of Milik's notes, then Milik would have joined another tiny fragment to the conglomerate of 9 iii). E. Qimron, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: The Hebrew Writings: Volume One* (Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi, 2010), 49 transcribes וכן וכן למגרש. The interpretation of the words as a dittography could be based on the Genizah text which only reads וכן למגרש (CD 13:17). However, the CD text might be erroneous, and Baumgarten's reading would give a parallel with יסר in the next line. Yet, syntactically, ב"ן hiphil generally does not take ל, but את, with direct object. (The only example is 1QH^a 25:12 where הבינוותה is—probably incorrectly—reconstructed).

²⁷The editor, E. Tov, comments in DJD 13, 282, that “the ink of the first occurrence of this phrase is more faint, and it may have been erased.” In fact, the ink of the words ויעשו את ה' ויעשו is more faint, which would then indicate that one word too many (ויעשו) has been erased. However, many sections and words on this fragment (and other fragments of 4Q365) have faded, some probably due to material circumstances after the deposit in the cave, others perhaps because of delayed re-inking of the pen.

²⁸Cf. below 4.3.2. for other inadvertent secondary dittographies by adding (or retracing) more words than only the missing ones.

The following are instances that have been called dittographies, but should be read differently.

4Q51 2:7 {○○○○} ולחם. The editors comment that “perhaps the scribe wrote ולחם, a dittograph, and proceeded to erase.” In my opinion, the erased text cannot be read ולחם, but perhaps אחד (even though LXX reads plural ἄρτοις).

4Q70 12:11 {על עונם} אל [תכפר ע'ל עונם]. According to DJD 15. However, the proposed reading is very doubtful.²⁹

4Q328 1 4 [יה יכין] {פתחיה} [פתחיה] [מ'מ'ז]. According to DJD 21. However, in the reading of the erased word, the letter before yod has a basestroke, and the name was either שכניה or perhaps אביה.

The causes of these dittographies will differ. A few may have been set off by the repetition of similar words in the text (e.g. 4Q48 where the probable sequence מאד מאדם created problems; or 4Q417 where הוואה כיא הוואה was mistakenly expanded to הוואה כיא הוואה). Close to half of the instances (including the just mentioned 4Q417) involve function words, which also in other languages occur more often as dittographies. A special case which seems to be merely the repetition of a letter, but which also can be interpreted as the repetition of a function word is 1QM 4:6 וב{ב}לכתם.

4.3. Dittographic Errors across Line Breaks in the Dead Sea Scrolls

Dittographic errors across line breaks occur in many manuscript cultures, either in the form of letters or syllables being repeated across the line break, or in the form of entire words (usually short ones) being written twice across the line break. Among the Hebrew Dead Sea Scrolls words are divided between the lines occasionally in some manuscripts written in palaeo-Hebrew or in scripta

²⁹The editor, E. Tov, provides a long explanation in DJD 15:166, suggesting that “the second phrase was possibly added by way of correction.” In my opinion, several traces of the erased reading do not conform to על עונם, so that we do not have a dittography here,

continua (as in the phylacteries) but no examples of dittography of one or more letters across line breaks are preserved in those manuscripts.

4.3.1. The following list provides all the examples I could find where the last word of the line seems to have been accidentally repeated as the first word of the next line.

#1 1QIsa^a 54:10-11 ובפרדים \ ובפרדים (Isa 66:20)

The first word is faded and the reading, suggested by Eugene Ulrich and Peter Flint, is not certain.³⁰

If the manuscript read another word, it would be a plus variant vis-à-vis the other textual witnesses of Isaiah. One should note that the later hand which retraced part of col. 54, did not retrace this word, which suggests that the retracer recognized the words as a dittography.

#2 1QpHab 7:1-2 וידבר אל^א חבקוק לכתוב הבאות על \ {על} הדור האחרון

#3 1QS 7:19-20 ברשונה לוא יגע בטהרת רבים \ {רבים} blank ובשנית

If this is a dittography, it is a strange one, since the scribe indented the line that begins with the second רבים. The dittography is found in the section of 1QS (roughly 1QS 7:8-8:12) that is, unlike the rest of the manuscript, ridden with unexplained blanks, additions and erasures, one possibility being that the scribe was here dependent on an incomplete *Vorlage*. The second רבים therefore also could have been intended as the last word of a second clause which the scribe intended to complete later. None of the other Rule of the Community manuscripts preserve exactly this part of the Rule.

#4 1QH^a 9:19-20 ופקודת שלומם עם \ עם כול נגיעהם

The dittography has not been marked for deletion in the manuscript. Apart from this case and the following, there seem to be no other cases of dittography of a word in this manuscript. One might add a quasi-dittography, if the hardly legible traces at the end of 1QH^a 13:9, in the intercolumnar margin, read במגור, just like the first word of 1QH^a 13:10. Schuller suggests that “after ותשמני, the scribe wrote something, but erased it because it extended too far into the margin.”

³⁰See their comments in DJD 32.2, 118. D. W. Parry and E. Qimron, *the Great Isaiah Scroll (1QIsa^a): A New Edition*, STDJ 32 (Leiden: Brill, 1999), propose וּבְ[צ]וֹבִים, which would be a dittography of the preceding word.

#5 1QH^a 15:14-15 כי תאלמנה שפתי / שפתי שקר

The dittography has not been marked for deletion in the manuscript.

#6 4Q24 9 i, 10-17 31-32 [ש]רוע / {שר[ו]א} (Lev 22:23); transcription according to DJD 12.

Both words are badly legible, but it is clear that where the Masoretic text reads וְשׂוּר וְשָׂה שְׂרוּעַ, this manuscript had not one but two words in between ושה and וקלוט. The editor proposes that “the scribe made an erroneous attempt at writing שרוע, then lined it through and wrote the correct form at the beginning of the next line.”³¹ However, the more or less vertical stroke at the end of line 32 is not typical of the left leg of *’alep*, and might perhaps be interpreted as the arm of *’ayin*, in which case the word was lined through in order to correct a dittography.

#7 4Q135 1 i 13-14 מְצַרִּים מְצַרִּים \ מְצַרִּים מְצַרִּים (Exod 13:14)

In his initial edition, Kuhn transcribed the first word of line 14 as מְצַרִּים [מ],³² but the straight right margin excludes the reconstruction of the first *mem*.

#8 4Q266 11 10-11 וּתְתַעַם בְּתֵהוּ וְלוֹ / וְלוֹ דֶּרֶךְ

The dittography (לו stands, as often in 4Q266, for לָא) has not been deleted in the manuscript.

#9 4Q421 1a ii-b 8-9 אֲשֶׁר / אֲשֶׁר דָּבַר.

Though the letters אֲשֶׁר at the end of line 8 could be the end of a longer word like מְאֲשֶׁר, “(called) happy,” especially in this wisdom passage, a dittography of אֲשֶׁר perhaps would be more likely.

#10 4Q434 1 i 10-11 הָגִישָׁם לְבָרָא גַם הוּא בְּדֶרֶךְ לְבָרָא / בְּדֶרֶךְ לְבָרָא (transcription according to DJD 29)

The translation in the DJD edition, “And he gave them another heart, and they walked in (his) way. In the way of his heart he also brought them near ...” sees the two occurrences of בְּדֶרֶךְ as belonging to two different consecutive clauses.³³ The space allows for reconstructing at the end of line 10 בְּדֶרֶךְ [רכו] or בְּדֶרֶךְ [לבו]. The resumption of the last word of one clause as the first one of the following one is attested in the same poem (שִׁפְטָם in 1 i 6-7), be it there, crucially, at the transposition of

³¹E. Ulrich, DJD 12, 183. Apparently, the “erroneous attempt” consisted of the spelling error with final *’alep*.

³²K. G. Kuhn, *Phylakterien aus Höhle 4 von Qumran*, Abhandlungen der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften Philosophisch-Historische Klasse 1957/1 (Heidelberg: Winter, 1957), 19.

³³M. Weinfeld and D. Seely, in DJD 29, 272, 278. Similarly other translations which I checked.

one stanza to the other (and by the way, repeating the same word across a line break).³⁴ The alternative, which seems to disregard the poetical structure, is to simply assume a dittography.³⁵

Out of those ten possible cases, only five are certain dittographic errors across the line breaks (##2, 4, 5, 7, 8). These different cases seem to have little, if anything, in common. Again, about half of the words repeated are function words. It is noteworthy that the only two cases of dittography of a word in the Cave 1 large Hodayot scroll are dittographic errors across the lines.

4.3.2. In addition to the cases above where one and the same scribe wrote the same word twice across the lines, there are three cases (##11-13) where a later correction inadvertently introduced a dittography across the lines. I include a fourth case (#14), where a correction resulted in a possibly erroneous repetition of עַם.

#11 1QIsa^a 54:2-3 אָפּוּ \ מַרְכָּבוֹתוֹ לְהִשִּׁיב בַּחֲמָה אָפּוּ (Isa 66:15)

A later hand retraced some of the words at the left side of the column because they had faded considerably. This later scribe added אָפּוּ at the end of line 2, even though the word already stood at the beginning of line 3.³⁶

#12 1QIsa^a 54:9-10 וְהִבִּיאוּ אֶת כּוֹל / כּוֹל אַחֲיִכֶּמָה (Isa 66:20)

The later scribe retraces the words וְהִבִּיאוּ אֶת, and added כּוֹל at the end of line 9, even though the word already stood at the beginning of line 10.

#13 4Q109 1 ii+3-6i 1-2 {שָׁמוֹ} \ הֵלֵךְ וּבַחֲשַׁךְ שָׁמוֹ (Qoh 6:4)

The Masoretic text reads וּבַחֲשַׁךְ יֵלֵךְ וּבַחֲשַׁךְ שָׁמוֹ. Apparently the scribe copied a similar text and jumped from the first וּבַחֲשַׁךְ to the second one. The same scribe later corrected the mistake by

³⁴See the analysis of the poem in M. S. Pajunen, "From Poetic Structure to Historical Setting: Exploring the Background of the Barkhi Nafshi Hymns," in *Prayer and Poetry in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature: Essays in Honor of Eileen Schuller on the Occasion of Her 65th Birthday*, ed. J. Penner, K. M. Penner, and C. Wassen, STDJ 98 (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 355-76.

³⁵E. Qimron, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: The Hebrew Writings: Volume Two* (Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi, 2013), 37 apparatus proposes a dittography. Cf. also Qimron for the reading of the first two quoted words as וּלְבָטָהּ [הוֹרָה], and Qimron and Pajunen for the possible correction of וּלְבָ into לְבָ.

³⁶The transcription of col. 54 is a problematic amalgam of the original readings and the secondary ones. The first scribe probably wrote earlier in this line מַרְכָּבוֹתַי, but the second hand retraced only תּוֹ at the end of the word, suggesting either מַרְכָּבוֹתוֹ or מַרְכָּבוֹתוֹ.

adding in the upper margin הלך ובחושך שמו, even though שמו had already been written in line 2.³⁷ As a result, שמו in line 2 needed to be erased. The editor, in contrast, suggests that the scribe realized the mistake immediately after having written שמו in line 2, then proceeded to erase the word, and inserted the missing words above line 1. However, the ink of the marginal insertion is darker, and the strokes are slightly thicker than in the surrounding text, suggesting it was written at a different moment, i.e., later, and not immediately after have written שמו.

#14 4Q417 1 i 16 רוח עם וינחילה לאנוש עם

The repetition of עם in this famous phrase from the so-called Vision of Hagu section from 4QInstruction is almost universally seen as the correction of an erroneous haplography, although the editors regarded the first and the second reading as textual variants, and extensively discuss the meanings of both variant readings.³⁸ In a study of this section, I stated that the first hand of 4Q417 repeatedly omitted words, which were then added by a second hand. Nonetheless, I presented an interpretation of the section based on the first hand reading רוח עם וינחילה לאנוש עם.³⁹ An examination of the additions by the second hand, however, shows that none of those unambiguously correct a mistaken text, but rather propose, as indicated in the translations of DJD 34, different readings.⁴⁰ But if the second hand actually aimed at improving on the first hand, then we should at least consider the possibility that the correction itself introduced a variant reading or even a mistake, rather than corrected a mistake. If the correction interpreted the two words עם עם as *im 'am*, as interpreted by almost all scholars, then it is not a real dittography.

³⁷The textual variant הלך\ילך is immaterial for this paper.

³⁸J. Strugnell and D. J. Harrington, in DJD 34, 164-65.

³⁹E. Tigchelaar, "‘Spiritual People’, ‘Fleshly Spirit’, and ‘Vision of Meditation’: Reflections on 4QInstruction and 1 Corinthians," in *Echoes from the Caves: Qumran and the New Testament*, ed. F. García Martínez, STDJ 85 (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 103-18, with full references to earlier scholarship. Major subsequent contributions are J. Kampen, *Wisdom Literature* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011), 94-95, 98-101; B. G. Wold, "The Universality of Creation in 4QInstruction," *RevQ* 26/102 (2013): 211-26; M. J. Goff, *4QInstruction* (Atlanta: SBL, 2013), 138-99, 155-68; A. F. Bakker, "The Figure of the Sage in Musar le-Mevin and Serekh ha-Yahad" (PhD diss., KU Leuven, 2015), 195-219.

⁴⁰The other instances are 4Q417 1 i 27 where the first hand wrote אחר לביכמה ועיניכמה, which was subsequently corrected to אחר לביכמה ואחר עיניכמה and 1 ii 20, first hand בלוא נבונות בשר, corrected to בלוא צוה נבונות בשר (context broken). Another correction which may reflect variant readings is 1 i 14 where the first hand wrote חרות חוקה, but the correction as well as 4Q418 43-45 i 11 read חרות החוק. Two additions of letters in 4Q417 2 i 13, 15 are, however, valid corrections.

5. Conclusions

It is not to be expected that one single explanation would account for all dittographies, or even all dittographies across line breaks. Especially in the case of function words preceding content words, the explanation of disruption followed by a restart with the same function word is attractive in the light of cognitive psychology, but this explanation would need to be checked against dittographies of words in other manuscript collections. In the case of 1QpHab 7:1-2 the disruption could have been due to the move of the hand and the eye to the beginning of a new line, but in this very narrow column this would have been much less of a disruption than in an average or broad column. Any other disruption could have caused this dittography, but a red flag is provided by the last letter of 1QpHab 7:1. Its mast is larger and thicker than that of any other lamed in the manuscript. It is not clear what happened. The scribe may have re-inked the pen or retraced the mast of the lamed, in either case causing a temporary disruption at the end of the line, and triggering a restart of the constituent at the beginning of the next line.

=====

Addendum

In the present transcription of 1QH^a 9:28, namely ומה ישיב ע"ל על משפט, it would seem that the text originally had a dittography, but actually the first hand wrote ומה ישיב על כול משפט, which then was corrected.