

Improving the Edition of 4Q14 (4QExod^c)

Eibert Tigchelaar

KU Leuven, Leuven, Belgium

eibert.tigchelaar@kuleuven.be

Abstract

The article identifies the text and location of two unidentified 4Q14 fragments (frags. 37 and 41) in the 4Q14 manuscript. It adds to 4Q14 two fragments from PAM 43.677 which had not yet been identified as 4Q14 fragments and calls attention to three lost parts of 4Q14 fragments that can be found on the earliest photographs. The new photographs also enable to read a few variants which were not recognized by the editor.

Keywords

Dead Sea Scrolls – Exodus – 4Q14 – Variants

1 The Edition of 4Q14 (4QExod^c)

The official edition of 4Q14 (4QExod^c) presents thirty-six identified fragments which “represent the remains of seven out of eight successive columns in the middle of the book of Exodus” (cols. I–VI, VIII).¹ In addition, it includes nine unidentified fragments (frags. 37–45) which had been assigned to 4Q14 on the basis of their material and palaeographic appearance, but which the editor could not

¹Judith E. Sanderson, “14. 4QExod^c,” in *Qumran Cave 4.VII: Genesis to Numbers*, DJD 12 (Oxford: Clarendon, 1994), 97–125 at 97.

connect to a specific textual section of the book of Exodus.² The present article furthers the edition in four respects. It identifies the text and location of two unidentified 4Q14 fragments (frags. 37 and 41) in the 4Q14 scroll; it adds to 4Q14 two fragments from PAM 43.677 which had not yet been identified as 4Q14 fragments; it calls attention to three lost parts of 4Q14 fragments that can be found on the earliest photographs;³ it corrects two readings on the basis of the new photographs. These contributions add a few words to the textual remains of 4Q14 and attest to several variants.

2 4Q14 I 40–45 (Exod 8:16–20) Incorporating PAM 43.667 Frags. 14 and 26

The Qumran Cave 4 unidentified fragments PAM 43.677 frags. 14 and 26 can be identified as remnants of 4Q14 (4QExod^c).⁴ PAM 43.677 frag. 26 joins physically to the right of 4Q14 frag. 8, the two fragments together preserving all of *tav* of תס in 4Q14 col. I line 42 (Exod 8:17). For PAM 43.677 frag. 14 one should compare the photograph PAM 43.166 where it has two more letters in line 3 which later have broken off, and where the two pieces of the fragment are aligned slightly differently

²Drew Longacre, “A Contextualized Approach to the Hebrew Dead Sea Scrolls Containing Exodus” (PhD, University of Birmingham, 2014), 111 n. 3 proposed incorrect identifications for frags. 37 (see below) and 43 (the reading of the edition פתם is incorrect; rather read the letters שכם).

³The following 4Q14 fragments were found during the Qumran Cave 4 archaeological expedition by Harding, de Vaux, and Milik, and photographed in the so-called Excavation series (PAM 40.978–40.985): frags. 2, 4, 5, 7, 9, 14, 15, 24, 25, 26 (top part), 27, 29, 37, and 41. All of these are from cols. I–IV.

⁴Dana M. Pike and Andrew C. Skinner, *Qumran Cave 4.XXIII: Unidentified Fragments*, DJD 33 (Oxford: Clarendon, 2001), 107, 111, Pl. XVIII. The photograph PAM 43.677 can be found online, <https://www.deadseascrolls.org.il/explore-the-archive/image/B-285456>. Fragment 14 is the second left fragment in the second row; fragment 26 is in the fourth row, third from left.

than on PAM 43.677.⁵ The fragment can be placed in 4Q14 col. I lines 43–45, most easily at the very right of the column.⁶ Recent images of that fragment are accessible online on The Leon Levy Dead Sea Scrolls Digital Library.⁷

PAM 43.677 frag. 26 had not been identified due to the limited number of preserved letters. The editors failed to identify PAM 43.677 frag. 14 because some traces in line 2 are difficult to identify, and because the fragment has in lines 1 and 3 variants compared to the Masoretic Text of Exod 8:18–20.⁸ With these two newly identified fragments, there are now four fragments which can be placed in col. I lines 41–45, namely 4Q14 frags. 8 and 9, PAM 43.677 frag. 26 in lines 41–42, and PAM 43.677 frag. 14 in lines 43–45.⁹

One can transcribe these fragments and reconstruct the gaps as follows (the text of the two PAM 43.677 fragments is underlined):

Exod 8:16-20

40 [וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אֶל מֹשֶׁה הִשְׁכֵּם בִּבְקֹר וְהִתְיַצַּב לִפְנֵי פָרְעָה הִנֵּה יוֹצֵא [הַמִּימָה וְאָמַרְתָּ]
41 [אֵלָיו כֹּה אָמַר יְהוָה שְׁלַח עַמְּךָ [וְיַעֲבֹדֶנִּי] ¹⁷כִּי אֲנִי אֵינְךָ [מְשַׁלַּח אֶת עַמִּי הַנִּנִּי מִשְׁלַח בְּךָ וּבְ[עַבְדֶּיךָ]
42 [וּבְעַמְּךָ וּבְבִתֶּיךָ אֶת הָעֶרֶב וּמָלְאוּ בְתֵּי מִצְרָיִם אֶת הָעֶרֶב וְגַם [הָאֲדָמָה אֲשֶׁר הִמָּה] [עַל]יָהּ]
43 ¹⁸וְהַפְּלִיתִי בְ[יּוֹם הַהוּא אֶת אֶרֶץ גִּשְׁן אֶת עַמִּי עַמְּךָ [עַל]יָהּ [לְבָב]לִי הִיוֹת שֵׁם עֶרֶב לְמַעַן תִּדְעַ
44 [כִּי אֵין כֶּמֶךָ] וְנִי בִקְרַב הָאָרֶץ ¹⁹וְשִׁמְתִי פֶדֶת בֵּין עַמִּי וּבֵין עַמְּךָ לְמַחֵר יִהְיֶה הָאֵת הַזֶּה ²⁰וְיָעֵשׂ

⁵<https://www.deadseascrolls.org.il/explore-the-archive/image/B-284613>, bottom row, middle fragment.

⁶Sanderson, “14. 4QExod^c,” 104 and Pl. XVI.

⁷<https://www.deadseascrolls.org.il/explore-the-archive/image/B-358198> (colour);

<https://www.deadseascrolls.org.il/explore-the-archive/image/B-358199> (infrared).

⁸For the reading of line 2, compare the image of PAM 43.166 and the recent colour image on the Leon Levy website.

⁹The edition posits 43 lines per column, which would mean that the fragments in this column should be placed two or three lines higher in the column.

The precise horizontal placement of the fragments in these lines is uncertain. Given the practice of sense-divisions in this manuscript, one would expect Exod 8:16 **וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אֶל מֹשֶׁה** to begin at the beginning of line 40, corresponding to the paragraph division of the Masoretic Text.¹⁰ The textual reconstruction in the transcription above is based on the Masoretic Text, but there may have been more content variants on top of the one actually preserved in PAM 43.677 frag. 14. Line 40 (Exod 8:16) may have had an additional **הוּא**, just as the Samaritan Pentateuch which reads **הִנֵּה הוּא יֵצֵא**, which would better fit the available space. In line 41 the gap between **אִם** (PAM 43.677 frag. 26) and **מִשְׁלַח** (frag. 8) is tight, but still can accommodate **אֵינֶךָ**.

PAM 43.677 frag. 14 reads **וְהִפְלֵיתִי** (line 43) where MT Exod 8:18 reads **וְהִפְלֵיתִי**. The form is a hapax, from the rare verb **פָּלַה**, “to treat specially.” The orthographic variant with or without *yod* is known from other first person singular perfect forms of ל”ה verbs, such as between **וְהִפְרֵיתִי** (Gen 17:6) and **וְהִפְרִיתִי** (Gen 17:20).

The partially reconstructed reading **לְמַעַן תֵּדַע כִּי אֵין כֹּחַ בְּקִרְבִּי הָאָרֶץ** (lines 43–44) does not correspond to MT Exod 8:18 **לְמַעַן תֵּדַע כִּי אֲנִי יְהוָה בְּקִרְבִּי הָאָרֶץ**. However, the **כִּי אֵין כֹּחַ** expression is found in the plagues narrative in Exod 8:6 **לְמַעַן תֵּדַע כִּי־אֵין בְּיָהוּהָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ** and 9:14 **בְּעֵבֹר 9:14 לְמַעַן תֵּדַע כִּי אֵין כֹּחַ בְּקִרְבִּי הָאָרֶץ**. The reading of 4Q14 could be an assimilation to the wording of Exod 9:14, or a unique variant, just as also the LXX has here a unique variant **ὁ κύριος, ὁ εἰς τὸ εἶναι ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ κύριου, ὁ κύριος πάσης τῆς γῆς**.¹¹ Both the text of 4Q14 and that of the LXX might reflect attempts to interpret the somewhat strange wording transmitted in MT and SP, “then you shall know that I, YHWH, am in the midst of the land.”

¹⁰Cf. discussion of the intervals in 4Q14 in Sanderson, “14. 4QExod^c,” 99–100.

¹¹See Bénédicte Lemmelijn, *A Plague of Texts? A Text-Critical Study of the So-Called ‘Plagues Narrative’ in Exodus 7:14–11:10* (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 162.

3 4Q14 II 27–28 Including an Additional Piece of Frag. 15 on PAM 40.975 (Exod 9:18–20)

On PAM 40.975 (second row, most left fragment), 4Q14 frag. 15 still has a piece at its left which is absent from subsequent photographs. The small piece adds the short words לך and את. Assuming, with the edition, that frag. 15 comes from the very left of the column, one may transcribe col. II lines 27–28 (based on frags. 13–15) as follows, with לך at the end of line 27 rather than the beginning of line 28:

Exod 9:18–20

[מח]ר ברד כבד]	27
[ע]תה ¹⁹ ועתה שלח העז את[מ] [מ] קנך וכל אשר לך	
[בשדה כ]ל]	28
ה[ביתה ויך]ד ע[ל]י[הם ה[ברד ומ]תו ²⁰ הירא את	

4 4Q14 III 1–4 (Frag. 20, 21, 37 i; Exod 10:1–5)

The editor failed to identify frag. 37, not recognizing that most of the text is written in the margin between two columns. This marginal insertion is the continuation of the supralinear insertion (see frag. 20) above col. III line 2. However, it is not written vertically alongside the text, as in several other long marginal additions, but horizontally in three additional lines.¹² This addition is written as follows:

וא[ת אתתי] אשר שמתי במ וידעתם כי אני יה[וה וי]בא]	2a
משה	
ואהרן אל	
פרעה	

¹²For a discussion of marginal insertions, see Emanuel Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert* (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 226–28.

The few other letters on the fragment, on the right and left of the intermarginal addition, belong to the very left of col. III and the very right of col. IV.

One may therefore reconstruct col. III lines 1–4 as follows:

Exod 10:1-5

- 1 ¹ויאמר יהוה אל משה בא על פרעה כי אני הכבתי את לבו ואת לב עבדיו למען שתי אתתי אלה בקרבו
[ולמען]²
- 2a ואת אתתי אשר שמתי בם וידעתם כי אני יהוה ³ויבא
- 2 [תספר באזני בנך ובן בנך את אשר התעללת] במצרים / ויאמר מרו אליו כה אמר יהוה אלהי העבריים משה ואהרן אל
- 3 [עד מתי מאנת לענות מפני שלח עמי ויעבדני] ⁴כי אם מאן אתה לשלח את עמי הנני מביא מחר ארבה פרעה
- 4 [בגבולך] ⁵וכסה את עין הארץ ולא יוכל לראות את הארץ ואכל את יתר הפלטה הנשארת לך

This alignment of the three fragments and the reconstruction of the text fits with the traditional text of Exodus. The new placement of frag. 37 proposed here solves the textual problems discussed in the edition. There is no apparent reason such as homoioarchton or homoioteleuton which could explain why exactly this sequence of words from Exod 10:2-3 was omitted. If the scribe's Vorlage contained lines of ca. 65 letter/spaces, then the scribe could have skipped an entire line of the Vorlage.

5 4Q14 III 13-23 (Frag. 24–28, 41; Exod 10:12–21)

On PAM 40.975¹³ both frag. 24 and frag. 25 include a piece that has subsequently broken off and vanished from the photographic record, and which may be added to the transcription. In addition, the unidentified frag. 41, which is also found on PAM 40.975, should be added to the composite of

¹³<https://www.deadseascrolls.org.il/explore-the-archive/image/B-279122>.

fragments in lines 20–23.¹⁴ The new IAA photograph of the composite of frags. 24–27¹⁵ makes it much easier to read the text, and some letters which have dots or circlets in the edition, indicating that the reading was not certain, can now be read with absolute certainty. In lines 17 and 18 some readings of the edition should be corrected.

Exod 10:12-21

]	<i>vac</i>	[13
		אר[ק' מצרי]ם		12 14
		הש[אִיר הַבָּרָד ¹³ ויטה מְ]ש[ה]		15
14		[וְכָל הַלַּיְלָה הַבֹּקֶר הַזֶּה וְרוּחַ הַקַּיִץ נִשְׂא אֶת]		16
		[בְּכָל גְּבוּל מִצְרָיִם כִּבְדּוֹ מֵאֵד לִפְנֵינוּ לֹא]הִיהָ בֵּן אַחֲרָיו		17
		ה[אֲרֶץ וְתַשְׁחֹת]הָאָרֶץ וְיֵאָכְל אֶת]עֵשֶׂב כָּל הָאָרֶץ	15	18
16		[נֹתֵר כָּל יֶרֶק בַּעֵץ וּבְעֶשֶׂב]הַשָּׂדֶה בְּכָל אֲרֶץ		19
		לִי[הוּא אֱלֹהֵיכֶם וְלֹכְ]ם ¹⁷ וְעַתָּה שְׂאוּ נָא חֵטְאִי		20
		18]○[פֶּרַע וְעַתָּה אֶל]יְהוָה ¹⁹ הִפְדָּךְ		21
]○○○[אֶחָד בְּכָל]ג' בּוֹל		22
] <i>vac</i> [] <i>vac</i> [20	23

Reconstruction of the lines on the basis of the Masoretic Text or Samaritan Pentateuch results in lines of uneven length. In between lines 14 מצרים and line 15 השאיר the available space allows for a longer text than that of MT, and between line 20 חטאתי and line 21 פרעה the space is too short for the MT text.

The new IAA photograph of frags. 24–27 enables one to see that in line 17 the last preserved word is ואחריו (and not ארבה), which means that from Exod 10:14 the two words ארבה כמהו were missing. Likewise, the IAA photograph shows clearly that in line 18 the last preserved words are

¹⁴The best photo is <https://www.deadseascrolls.org.il/explore-the-archive/image/B-368016>.

¹⁵<https://www.deadseascrolls.org.il/explore-the-archive/image/B-367960>.

אֶת כָּל עֵשֶׂב הָאָרֶץ and not עֵשֶׂב הָאָרֶץ as in Exod 10:15. The available spacing and traces in the preceding gap suggest that 4Q14 read אֶת כָּל הָאָרֶץ as opposed to MT אֶת כָּל עֵשֶׂב הָאָרֶץ.

6 4Q14 IV 1–3 (Frag. 30, 37 ii; Exod 11:9–10)

The left part of frag. 37 (for the right part see above section 4) preserves a few letters from the very right of col. IV lines 2–3, confirming the editor's placement of frag. 30 at the very left of the column. One can now transcribe the text of the two fragments as follows:

Exod 11:9-10

top margin

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1 | [וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אֶל מֹשֶׁה לֹא יִשְׁמַע אֲלֵיכֶם פֶּה] עָה לְמַעַן רַבּוֹת מוֹפְתֵי בְּאֶרֶץ [עַ] מִצְרַיִם |
| 2 | וּמִן[שֶׁ] וְאֶהְרֶן עָשׂוּ אֶת כָּל הַמִּפְתִּים הָאֵלֶּה לְפָנַי פֶּרַעַה וַיִּחַזֶּק יְהוָה[וְ] אֶת לֵב פֶּרַעַה[רַעַה] |
| 3 | וְלֹא שָׁלַח אֶת בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל מֵאֶרֶצוֹ <i>vac</i> |

7 Variants and Textual Profile

The variants noted in this article and not mentioned in the edition are the following:

II 43 (Exod 8:18) *var* וְהִפְלִיתִי MT, SP

II 45 (Exod 8:18) *var* כִּי אֲנִי יְהוָה [כ] אֵין כִּמְ[וְנִי] MT, SP, LXX (ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰμι κύριος)

III 2 (Exod 10:2-3) < (and inserted secondarily) *var* כִּי־אֲנִי יְהוָה

MT; LXX (καὶ τὰ σημεῖά μου, ἃ ἐποίησα ἐν αὐτοῖς, καὶ γινώσcesθε ὅτι

ἐγὼ κύριος. εἰσῆλθεν δὲ Μωσῆς καὶ Ἀαρὼν ἐναντῖον Φαραώ; SP has here expansion

III 17 (Exod 10:14) *var* לֹא־הָיָה בֶן אֶרְבָּה כְּמֵהוּ MT, SP, LXX (οὐ γέγονεν τοιαύτη ἀκρις)

III 18 (Exod 10:15) *var* כָּל־עֵשֶׂב הָאָרֶץ MT, SP, LXX (πᾶσαν βοτάνην τῆς γῆς)

The variants in Exod 8:8 are orthographic and apparently due to assimilation. However, the initial omission of part of the text in Exod 10:2–3, the omission in Exod 10:14, and the transposal of בל in Exod 10:15 have no apparent textual reason. Moreover, all of these variants are unique, as are many others in 4Q14. What does this say about the textual profile of 4Q14?

Since the edition, the main scholarly interest for 4Q14 has been the poetic presentation of Exod 15 in col. VI,¹⁶ and its textual relationship to other versions or other manuscripts¹⁷ On the basis of his own criteria, which weigh the evidence, Emanuel Tov initially grouped the manuscript among the “proto-Masoretic” or “proto-Rabbinic” texts, and later among the “MT-like texts,” while Armin Lange, with an exclusively quantitative approach, considers it non-aligned.¹⁸ Longacre statistically compared the Qumran Exodus manuscripts in different respects, and concluded that 4Q14 belongs

¹⁶See, most recently, Shem Miller, *Dead Sea Media: Orality, Textuality, and Memory in the Scrolls from the Judean Desert* (Leiden: Brill, 2019).

¹⁷An exception is the forthcoming article of Drew Longacre, “Methods for the Reconstruction of Large Literary (Sc)rolls from Fragmentary Remains,” in *Research Approaches in Hebrew Bible Manuscript Studies*, ed. Élodie Attia-Kay and Antony Perrot, *Textual History of the Bible Supplement* (Leiden: Brill, forthcoming), which takes 4Q14 as its prime case study.

¹⁸Emanuel Tov, “The Biblical Texts from the Judaean Desert: An Overview and Analysis,” in *The Bible as Book: The Hebrew Bible and the Judaean Desert Discoveries*, ed. E. D. Herbert and E. Tov (London: The British Library and Oak Knoll Press in association with The Scriptorium: Center for Christian Antiquities, 2002), 139–66, at 154; Tov, “The Development of the Texts of the Torah in Two Major Text Blocks,” *Textus* 26 (2016): 1–27, esp. 11; Armin Lange, “1.2.2. Ancient and Late Ancient Hebrew and Aramaic Jewish Texts,” in *Textual History of the Bible: The Hebrew Bible, volume 1A: Overview Articles*, ed. Armin Lange and Emanuel Tov (Leiden: Brill, 2016), 112–65 at 124, 136. See also Ron Hendel, “Assessing the Text-Critical Theories of the Hebrew Bible after Qumran,” in *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. Timothy H. Lim and John J. Collins (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 281–302.

to the more conservative manuscripts based on singular readings, but also belongs to the group of Exodus manuscripts with higher percentages of scribal errors. He summarized: "This probably indicates that 4Q14 reflects relatively careless copying within a relatively conservative tradition."¹⁹ Hence, the variants of 4Q14 cannot simply be counted in order to characterize the text of the manuscript but have to be assessed. The many variants in the manuscript are of interest for an evaluation of scribal copying. In 4Q14 we see at work a scribe with a skilled and somewhat calligraphic hand, who regularly made textual mistakes, only some of which the scribe corrected.

¹⁹Longacre, "A Contextualized Approach," 176.