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ABSTRACT

Certain ancient Near Eastern texts develop over time towards a reasonably stable state of transmission. However, the development towards a single ‘stabilised’ transmitted form that marks the biblical manuscripts between the second century B.C.E. and second century C.E. is often considered to permit the Hebrew bible a unique position in the ancient Near Eastern textual corpus. The degree to which the wider body of ancient Near Eastern texts actually support or undermine this position is the topic of this dissertation. The study begins by formulating a methodology for comparing the accuracy with which ancient texts of varying genres and languages were transmitted. Exemplars from the first millennium B.C.E. cuneiform evidence are selected for analysis on the basis of genre. Texts that are preserved in more than one ancient copy are compared to determine how much variation occurs between manuscripts of the same text. The study begins with representative texts from the Neo-Assyrian, Neo-Babylonian and Late Babylonian periods that range in date from the late eighth century B.C.E. to the third century B.C.E. The study then turns to the Torah scrolls from the Dead Sea area that range in date from the third century B.C.E. to the second century C.E. The accuracy with which the cuneiform texts were transmitted is then compared with the biblical evidence. The study finds that the most stable texts surveyed are those containing ritual instructions. The mechanisms that may have led to the exact transmission of the Torah in the late Second Temple period are discussed in the conclusion.
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CHAPTER 1 – INTRODUCTION

The Hebrew Scriptures and other ancient Near Eastern Traditions

It has been said that the textual history of the Hebrew Bible represents a unique development in the ancient Near Eastern textual corpus.¹ No other ancient Near Eastern text appears to have undergone quite the same recensional activity.² Whether we view the background of biblical texts as conforming to the regional delineation of textual traditions,³ or as stemming from more diverse localised sources,⁴ we must still reckon with the problem that the biblical text seems to have undergone a degree of recensional activity that has not yet been recognised in other ancient Near Eastern textual traditions.⁵

How might we understand the development of the Hebrew scriptures in respect of other textual traditions in the ancient Near East? Is the reduction of several biblical textual traditions towards the ‘standard text’ that emerged by the second century C.E. a unique phenomenon in ancient Near Eastern textual history? Do any other ancient Near Eastern texts show tendencies toward a level of standardisation that is comparable with the almost letter-perfect editions of the Hebrew scriptures in all of our evidence from at least the second century C.E. onward? By what method can we make legitimate comparisons between the way the biblical text developed and the way other ancient Near Eastern texts developed?

Answers to such questions require the establishment of a method for analysing various ancient texts, in multiple copies, over a wide geographical and temporal distribution. Any method for analysing texts from various localities, periods, genres, and languages would need to be flexible and broad in its categorisation of variant readings, and unbiased in the way it delimited quanta within the different texts. Variant categories would need to be weighed for significance so that some idea could be obtained about what type of variations were common in a given tradition, and what kind were not.

In fact, several models exist for comparative analyses of ancient texts. A selection of those that pertain to texts written in Semitic languages will be considered here. Although the majority of these operate in a single linguistic setting, some synthesis of these sys-

recensions is more than likely to be largely incorrect. Such an analysis cautions scholars who reconstruct earlier unattested forms of the biblical text based on source- and text-critical arguments.
tems will be attempted to frame an analysis that works across different languages, scripts and media.

**Textual Criticism, Its Objectives and Presuppositions**

A characteristic of textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible has been the concern of scholars to reconstruct the ‘original’ form of each individual text. This is “the text or edition (or a number of consecutive editions) that contained the finished literary product and which stood at the beginning of the process of textual transmission.”⁶ Indeed, according to Tov it is this “final authoritative copy which it is the object of textual criticism to reconstruct, even if only in isolated details.”⁷ The text critic of the Hebrew Bible, then, aims to reconstruct one text that he or she believes to be historical.⁸

This approach must proceed from two obvious assumptions. The first is that a single text did in fact stand at the beginning of the transmission process, before it was corrupted by mechanical and recensional processes.⁹ This must necessarily be true, otherwise the objective of this approach to textual criticism must be redefined. The second assumption is that the end result of the process was the standardised form of the Hebrew scriptures that

---

⁷ E. Tov, *Textual Criticism*, 177.
⁹ See E. Tov, *Textual Criticism*, where this ‘original text’ is more specifically defined as “... a text which was considered authoritative (and hence also finished at the literary level), even if only by a limited group of people, and which at the same time stood at the beginning of a process of copying and textual transmission.”
in effect became the ‘copy-text’ of the Hebrew Bible as it is reflected in all of the medieval manuscript evidence. In the words of Eugene Ulrich “... the term ‘standard text’ implies or even denotes a single text which is not only fixed, but is acknowledged to be ‘the text,’ as opposed to other forms of the text.”

Some care is needed here, for it is not the view of the writer that either of these assumptions is necessarily incorrect, but it is important to highlight the position from which this approach to textual criticism advances, for it significantly affects the way the evidence is analysed.

There is, it may be said, a general preference when reconstructing ancient texts to present them in a standardised form, even though in history many of these texts existed in different forms. One need only look at Pritchard’s “Ancient Near Eastern Texts”, Charlesworth’s “Pseudepigrapha”, or Foster’s “Before the Muses” to see that varying

---

10 That all variant readings in medieval manuscripts are genetic, and result from the corruption of a single copy-text is illustrated clearly in M.H. Goshen-Gottstein, "Hebrew Biblical Manuscripts: Their History and Their Place in the HUBP Edition," *Biblica* 48 (1967). See also S. Talmon, "Old Testament Text," 170-175. The term ‘copy-text’ usually refers to an authoritative manuscript that is to be set in type, however its use in this context seems justified, assuming, with the majority of scholars, that the faithful reproduction of this specific text was the intention of copyists by the first century C.E. See primarily R.B. McKerrow, *Prolegomena for the Oxford Shakespeare: A Study in Editorial Method* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1939) 8, for the use of the term in reference to the textual criticism of the plays of Shakespeare. Its use was properly explored and defined in a lecture prepared for the British Institute by W.W. Greg that was actually delivered by J. M. Osbourne, in 1949 and published in 1950 (see W.W. Greg, "The Rationale of Copy-Text," *Studies in Bibliography* 3 [1950] 19-36). Most recently see the discussion in R. Hendel, "The Oxford Hebrew Bible: Prologue to a New Critical Edition," *VT* 58, 3 (2008) 343-46.

copies of ancient texts are frequently presented in translation as single composite versions. The case is similar with the bulk of critical editions, as a cursory glance at the text of BHS will confirm. The copy-text, in this case the Leningrad Codex, is accompanied by a critical apparatus that is purposefully positioned to leave the text, to as great an extent as possible, free from distracting notation and comment. The elected text of the critic is the unmistakeable focus, with other evidence from less authoritative manuscripts relegated to the apparatus.\textsuperscript{12}

That is not to say that our translations and critical editions lack any significant information. The focus on a normative text obviously makes the texts themselves far more readily understood, and the critical apparatus, should we care to consult it, serves to inform us of variant readings. However, the presentation of an ancient text in a normative ‘standardised’ form often draws attention away from the fact that this standardised form is something imposed on the evidence by the text-critical method itself, and does not reflect a text that was extant at any time in antiquity.

\textsuperscript{12} See the comments, including a thorough discussion of the development of the ‘score’ presentation of multiple textual editions, in J. Black, Reading Sumerian Poetry: A Study of the Oldest Literature (New York: Cornell University Press, 1998) 33-38. A recent vision of this same text-critical goal is stated by R. Hendel, "Prologue," 329-330 with n. 15: “The practical goal for the OHB [Oxford Hebrew Bible] is to approximate in its critical text the textual ‘archetype,’ by which I mean the ‘earliest inferable textual state.’ In the case of multiple editions, the practical goal is to approximate the archetype of each edition and, where one edition is not plausibly the ancestor of the other(s), also the archetype of the multiple editions ... In this [latter] case, the archetypal readings will be included in the critical text and the variants from the subsequent editions will be included in the apparatus.”
The implications of thinking in terms of ‘original’ forms of the biblical texts, and ‘copy-texts’ of the scriptures, were the topic of a paper by Eugene Ulrich. Ulrich framed a question about the state of the Hebrew scriptures in the period between 200 B.C.E. and 70 C.E. which, after careful consideration, was phrased thus: “What were the texts of the Scriptures like near the end of the Second Temple period?” In phrasing this question, Ulrich decided to do away with such anachronistic and subjective terminology as ‘standard text’ and ‘Hebrew Bible.’ In doing so he asserted that the concern for a standard text is a modern one, and that there is no evidence to suggest that the standardisation of the text was a concern in the period in question.

There has been general recognition by scholars that textual criticism does not necessarily require one text in particular to be judged as superior to all others. Certainly most modern text-critics will not insist that alternative readings in the MT must always be preferred over variant readings in other textual witnesses. Studies by scholars such as Clines, Cogan, Polak and Young emphasise the necessity to examine texts not in terms of ‘original’

---

14 E. Ulrich, ”The Qumran Biblical Scrolls,” 84.
15 This view does not take into account the arguments put forward in Young “The Stabilization of the Biblical Text In the Light of Qumran and Masada: A Challenge for Conventional Qumran Chronology?” DSD 9, 3 (2002) 365 n. 6, concerning the interpretation of the evidence from Masada. Rather, Ulrich’s comments pertain to the biblical texts from Qumran, and do not extend to the evidence at Masada and other (non-Qumran) sites in the Judean Desert. In ”The Canonical Process, Textual Criticism, and Later Stages in the Composition of the Bible,” ”Sha’arei Talmon”: Studies in the Bible, Qumran and the Ancient Near East Presented to Shemaryahu Talmon (eds M. Fishbane and E. Tov; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1992) 275 n. 26, Ulrich argued that “the Masada and Murabba’at manuscripts positively document a proto-Masoretic text tradition, but the assumption of an official, definitive rejection of other textual forms is an argumentum e silentio.” In light of Young’s argument, we might revise the period under consideration in Ulrich’s paper to cover from 200 B.C.E. to before 70 CE, i.e. the first half of the first century C.E.
editions or ‘standardised’ copy-texts, but rather to approach the question of textual stabi-

lisation from a more broadly comparative perspective. These studies call for the aban-
donment of the practice whereby the ‘original’ text is reconstructed by working back-

wards from the final ‘copy-text.’ Instead, each extant ancient manuscript is treated a pri-

ori as a potential ‘pristine’ text. In doing so, information concerning how the texts were
treated in transmission is adduced, while the introduction of subjective presuppositions,
so required by a hypothetical reconstruction of an ‘original text,’ are avoided.

Talmon argued this very point when he proposed that, in the absence of any evidence in
the manuscripts from the second to first centuries B.C.E. that identified a single pristine
text (or three pristine texts, as Cross’s local text theory posits), all variant readings should
be treated as alternative readings unless their genetic relationship to other texts could be
demonstrated. Similarly, Goshen-Gottstein argued that no single recension can be

16 See the studies by D.J.A. Clines, "What Remains of the Hebrew Bible? Its Text and Language in a Post-
Bible from an Assyriological Perspective," Textus 22 (2005) 1-20; F.H. Polak, "Statistics and Text Filia-
tion: The Case of 4QSam²/LXX," Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings (eds G.J. Brooke and B. Lin-
dars; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992) 215-276; I. Young, "The Biblical Scrolls from Qumran and the
Stability in Gilgamesh and the Dead Sea Scrolls," Gilgamesh and the World of Assyrian: Proceedings of
the Conference Held at the Mandelbaum House, the University of Sydney, 21-23 July, 2004 (Ancient Near

17 S. Talmon, "Aspects of the Textual Transmission," 96. See also the comments on textual emendation
according to external parallels in S. Talmon, "The ‘Comparative Method’ in Biblical Interpretation – Prin-
ciples and Problems," Congress Volume: Göttingen 1977 (VTSup 29; ed. J.A. Emerton; Leiden: Brill,
1978) 343-47.
proved to exist before the first half of the second century C.E., based on the variants in the early manuscript evidence. Rather, the non-linear nature of interaction between recensions made it no longer possible to say that “the ‘one-recension’ central current did not allow the occasional drop to trickle in from the side”. As Talmon puts it, “... the very notion of a Biblical textus receptus had not yet taken root at Qumran ... [there is not] the slightest indication that even an incipit textus receptus did emerge [in the last decades before the destruction of the Second Temple].”

This is not to say that there is no identifiable trend in the evidence from Qumran. In fact, scholars have found tendencies away from particular recensions, as well as towards others. For example, Cross shows evidence in the 4QSam manuscripts of a proto-Lucianic recension which, in his terms, is a revision away from the Egyptian textual family towards the Palestinian. Trebolle Barrera has suggested that at least some sacred texts at Qumran progress towards the proto-MT recension. This is despite the view put forward

---

18 That is, at the end of his second period in the history of the biblical text (see M.H. Goshen-Gottstein, "Hebrew Biblical Manuscripts," 244-48). In light of the Masada evidence, as argued by Young, this date can be pushed back to before 70 C.E. See also the comments on Goshen-Gottstein’s position in E. Tov, Textual Criticism, 38-39.
23 J. Trebolle Barrera, "Qumran Evidence for a Biblical Standard Text and for Non-Standard and Parabiblical Texts," The Dead Sea Scrolls in Their Historical Context (ed. T.H. Lim; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2000) 91-92. It is the books most well known at Qumran, i.e. the Pentateuch, Isaiah, the XII Prophets and Psalms, that seem to approach proto-MT over time “with exceptions” (see J. Trebolle Barrera, 98-99). This is supported by the comments in G.J. Brooke, "E Pluribus Unum: Textual Variety and Definitive Interpretation in
by Cross that the bulk of the Qumran biblical scrolls that display full orthography and expansionistic tendencies, including the paleo-Hebrew manuscripts, are related to the Palestinian textual family, written in what he calls the “new-baroque style.”

Tools Available for Building a Methodology

The tools that biblical text criticism offers for the comparison of ancient texts divide basically into two groups: those that facilitate the aim of reconstructing an original text, and others that assist a comparative analysis of textual forms. We will label these approaches ‘reconstructive’ and ‘comparative’ respectively. To be sure, this is not a distinction that textual critics would necessarily make, but rather the two sets of tools work together to produce critical editions and comprehensive apparatuses. The distinction is important to make in this study, though, because it is the second set of tools, those that aid a ‘comparative’ approach, that are most important to us. Comparing the accuracy of the transmission process reflected in ancient texts, across media, genres, cultures, and centuries, requires a method that allows for the broad comparison of materials that make up textual traditions, and is not concerned as much with the reconstruction of one particular form of a given tradition. While some speculation as to what may be an original reading can be justified

---

in determining the existence of errors, the classification of variants as genetic, and typically corruptions, has been avoided wherever possible.\textsuperscript{25}

Conceptual Frameworks for Viewing the Texts

Textual critics have used various terms and expressions, often not exclusively, to describe theories and phenomena in their field. The present study has neither the scope nor the space to review the whole range of terminologies that are available to us to describe ancient texts in transmission. We will, however, be aided by a broad outline of the various theories that impact on our study.

Texts are generally divided into two types: ‘substantive’ and ‘derived’ texts.\textsuperscript{26} A substantive text has distinguishing features that show it cannot have derived from any other extant text, but must be a copy of an unknown manuscript. A derived text, on the other hand, contains variants that indicate it was derived from another known text. In this way, we can talk about derived texts containing specific ‘genetic’ readings, \textit{i.e.} variants that are directly related to readings in other manuscripts, and substantive texts containing ‘alternative’ readings, \textit{i.e.} variants that are not related to other manuscript evidence and are not clearly errors.\textsuperscript{27} Substantive texts are not precluded from containing genetic variants, but derived texts by definition do not contain a significant number of alternative readings.

\textsuperscript{25} See the discussion below on Errors.


\textsuperscript{27} Unlike McKerrow, Tov asserts that genetic variants “developed – by change, omission, addition, or inversion – from another reading which may, or may not, be known today” (E. Tov, \textit{Textual Criticism}, italics added). McKerrow thought instead that derived manuscripts had to have a known predecessor to prove
In order to reconstruct the formative period of the scriptures, most scholars are required to hypothesise various stages of progress towards a fixed text. Talmon, for example, sees four phases in the development of the biblical texts from their inception to Origen’s *Hexapla*. These range from an oral phase, through an oral to written transition period, to purely written transmission, and finally to a fixed form of the text selected by, among other things, historical accident and sectarian prejudice.²⁸ Importantly, Talmon asserts that the processes behind many of the variants that appear through transmission are similar throughout the entire period that the text is transmitted in an unfixed form. That is, during the first three phases of the development of the biblical text, scribes used the same combined methods of textual and stylistic variation and expansion to invert, reiterate, and draw parallels in the texts they transmitted.²⁹
In line with Talmon’s description of the biblical text in transmission, Tigay charts four stages in the development towards an authoritative text of the Gilgamesh Epic.\textsuperscript{30} Like Talmon, Tigay’s first two stages allow for widespread collation, conflation and re-editing of the source texts, eventually resulting in the formation of certain standardised (but not fixed) versions of the text, that stood at the beginning of the third stage. By this time, “though the editors ... made their own contributions to the epic ... they were clearly transmitting in revised form a text that was essentially the work of an earlier author.”\textsuperscript{31} Tigay’s final stage is broadly identifiable as the fixation of the text into a standardised form, where there is little reformulation of the text, and minimal lexical interchanges. Tigay describes the version of the Gilgamesh Epic that stood at the end of the four staged process as “nearly a textus receptus or ‘authorised version’ in wording or content, and different copies or editions differed from each other almost exclusively in matters of orthography, grammar, and format.”\textsuperscript{32}

In contrast, Cross envisions a development of the biblical text according to a presupposition of local access to specific archetypes which in turn undergo defined stages of development. In his theory of local texts, Cross outlines the development of biblical texts into

\textsuperscript{30} See J.H. Tigay, "Evolution of the Pentateuchal Narratives.” A major difference should be underlined here between Tigay’s and Talmon’s theories. Tigay’s earliest stage is represented by the Sumerian written evidence, rather than an unattested oral phase that is the first phase in the development of the biblical text according to Talmon.


\textsuperscript{32} J.H. Tigay, "Evolution of the Pentateuchal Narratives," 43. See esp. n. 91 where it is emphasised that the final form of Gilgamesh represents a text close to a ‘received’ text, but ultimately less stable in comparison to the final form of the biblical text.
three families, identified with the localities of Palestine, Egypt and Babylon. The process of stabilisation developed only after a long period of recensional activity, which saw the three textual families further developed into various traditional forms. Likewise, the recensional activity that led to the production of the Versions only occurred after a significant period of non-recensional, ‘localising’ activity. That is, texts evidenced at Qumran show signs of updating towards various ‘localised’ versions, but give no indication of recensional activity. For Cross, different biblical texts broke away from particular family archetypes at different times, with the process starting as early as the 6th-5th centuries B.C.E., and continuing down to the third century B.C.E. The resulting recensions of localised archetypes are represented by the confused collection of traditions at Qumran. Later, in the period between the Jewish Revolts, a consciously selective process was undertaken to select texts of particular recensional backgrounds to form the *textus receptus*, the copy-text of MT.

---

33 See the collection of previously published papers in F.M. Cross and S. Talmon, *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text* (Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1975). Articles republished in that volume are cited in this study in their original place of publication.

34 Cross gives as an example the Lucianic revision of an Egyptian-type text, revised in transmission towards a Palestinian text-type, the *Vorlage* of which is reflected in the Samuel manuscripts from Qumran cave 4. See F.M. Cross, "The Contribution of the Qumran Discoveries," 88.

35 See F.M. Cross, "The History of the Biblical Text," 290, and esp. n. 30, where he acknowledges that the date of a document from Qumran "tells us nothing of its textual character," in stark contrast to the later texts from Masada, Murabba‘at, Wadi Sdeir and Nahal Hever.


Tov agrees that the emergence of a relatively fixed text was beginning to emerge by the middle of the Second Temple period in Palestine. Texts that were deposited in the temple became authoritative, though it is likely that there was a gradual change in the shape of that text over time. For example, a text deposited in the temple that looked like an ancestor of the Vorlage to the LXX may have over time become a text that looked more like an ancestor of the MT. Tov posits that perhaps by the third century B.C.E. a text significantly like the MT had come to be deposited in the temple archives. This was not the only text-type that was in circulation in Jewish Palestine in the late centuries B.C.E. and early first century C.E., but rather was the text-type affiliated with the centre of the religious institution in Jerusalem. The temple affiliated texts are characterised by those which were uncovered at sites along the southwest coast of the Dead Sea in the first century C.E. (Masada) and the second century C.E. (Murabba‘at, Wadi Sdeir and Naḥal


39 That the text that was kept in the temple archives underwent some process of textual evolution is suggested by the report of the three differing scrolls found in the temple court in the Talmud. See E. Tov, "The Biblical Text in Ancient Synagogues in Light of the Judean Desert Finds," *Meghillot* 1 (2003) 195-97 [Hebrew], and the detailed discussion in chapter 9 pages 290-94.

40 E. Tov, private conversation. It should be noted that the use of the term ‘MT’ here indicates a text that is the theorised close ancestor to the medieval MT, and not a copy-text that was exactly like the medieval MT in every detail. Indeed, it is inevitable that some variations creep into the text through multiple cycles of transmission no matter what level of attempted exactitude accompanies the copying process. Here it is important to note the cautious tone that Tov employs when discussing the proto-MT and the MT in real terms: "Only from the early medieval period, when the apparatuses of vocalization, accentuation, and Masoretic notes were added to the consonants, can one speak of a real Masoretic Text. Nevertheless, the main constituent of [the MT], its consonantal framework, already existed many centuries beforehand, as it is attested in various texts from the Judean Desert, which date from the third pre-Christian century until the second century CE" (E. Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001) 27).
These scrolls are identified not only by their particular textual character, but also by their large format, high number of lines per column, layout, and limited instances of scribal interventions. In other areas texts that diverged from the temple affiliated text predominated, though texts that were aligned with the temple text were not unknown. These diverse text-types are characterised by those uncovered at Qumran.

The main point of difference for Tov’s conceptualisation of the formation of fixed textual traditions is that, for Tov, the difference between textual traditions is not connected with geographical or chronological distinctions, but rather stems from sociological distinctions. Texts like those uncovered at Masada had a social context that was aligned with the text affiliated with the temple in Jerusalem, whereas texts like those uncovered at Qumran had a different social context that was not as closely connected to the temple – though a small number of the Qumran scrolls certainly may be of that type. The point is that texts from Qumran do not necessarily reflect the temple social context but texts from Masada necessarily do.

---

According to E. Ulrich, there is no evidence that suggests that there was a concern for the standardisation of the text in the middle of the Second Temple period.\textsuperscript{44} Rather, the collection that is known as the (proto-) MT

"was a haphazard collection of disparate texts and text-types, gathered only near the close of the Second Temple period. It was not a unit or a unity but rather resulted from the presumably chance (as opposed to critically selected) collection of one text per book. The category of the (proto-) MT makes sense only from afterward – after the collection has been gathered and used exclusively, in contrast to other text forms, over a period of time."\textsuperscript{45}

Ulrich views the variant forms of the Pentateuchal texts exemplified in the finds from the western shore of the Dead Sea in terms of different literary traditions, of which there were "at least two, and possibly three, editions ... circulating in general Judaism at the end of the Second Temple period."\textsuperscript{46} As can be seen from the collection of texts uncovered at Qumran, concepts such as ‘canon’ and ‘scripture’ were not defined in the period


that these texts represent.\textsuperscript{47} Instead, competing literary editions, comprised of a literary unit, whether a book, story, narrative, pericope, etc., were transmitted by authors or redactors, and which “a subsequent redactor or editor intentionally changed to a sufficient extent that the resultant form should be called a revised edition of that text.”\textsuperscript{48} According to this view the scriptures in general did not become fixed in their final (proto-)MT form as a result of predictable internal or external processes, but rather were abruptly frozen due to the dual threats presented by the Roman conquest on the one hand, and the rise of gentile Christianity which undermined the Jewish character of the scriptures on the other.\textsuperscript{49}

\textit{The Categorisation of Variant Readings}

Critical to this analysis is the ability to delineate between errors and genuine variants. Here, again, certain tools developed by biblical text critics should be reviewed and employed where appropriate. We will also survey the various text critical systems available for weighing variants once they have been classed as such.

\textit{Errors}

All variant readings are, on the face of it, to be treated as ‘alternative’ readings. Essentially, we must do our best to ensure the equal standing of all attested text-types, without

\textsuperscript{48} E. Ulrich, "The Canonical Process," 278.
\textsuperscript{49} E. Ulrich, "The Qumran Biblical Scrolls," 87.
preference for one copy of a text over another. This is the only way that we can ensure our investigation begins free of the anachronisms and subjectivity described by Ulrich.\(^{50}\)

Many of the terms associated with describing genetic readings will not be prevalent in a strictly comparative analysis. Accordingly, we will make only relatively infrequent reference to phenomena such as dittography, haplography, parablepsis (homoioteleuton and homoioarchton), and any other slips of the pen, in keeping with our intention to treat each variant as properly alternative unless error is certain. Such terms will only be used when noting the views of the scholarly authorities on how particular variants may have arisen, but will not colour the categorisation of the variants themselves. In this way we are mindful of Tov’s observation that “at the level of content, that is, at the descriptive level, all readings are equal, and no one reading is from the outset superior to another one.”\(^{51}\)

In many cases it cannot be determined without conjecture which differences are truly genetic readings and which are alternative readings. It then becomes impossible to decide which variants should be considered genuine, and which should be considered corruptions. Clearly, each variant reading will need to be considered as ostensibly genuine to avoid discarding potentially significant data. This appears to have motivated McKerrow’s view that the only certain errors are those that involve metathesis, or some combination of letters that make no sense – all other variants are only errors in the critic’s judge-

---

\(^{50}\) As well as E. Ulrich, "The Qumran Biblical Scrolls," see also E. Ulrich, "The Bible in the Making," 79-80.

\(^{51}\) E. Tov, *Textual Criticism*, 234.
ment. While this approach is certainly careful, it may on occasion be overcautious. In the present analysis we will prefer the approach of P. Pulikott: “unless a deviant reading does not fit in the grammatical or linguistic context of the passage, or disrupt the logical flow of the passage, it cannot be considered to be an error.”

Variants in Reconstructive Approaches

Even a brief survey of the literature will inform the scholar that there are a variety of models available for classifying variant readings in ancient Near Eastern texts. Those models termed ‘reconstructive’ typically divide variants into categories that reflect a judgement on the overall quality of the manuscript in which they are found. As such, these models only provide certain tools that can be applied in the present context. That said, it will be beneficial to permit a brief review of some of the theories proposed by those scholars, if only to form an appreciation of the scope of methodologies available to the text critic in this instance.

An example already referred to above is supplied by Tov, who groups variants into ‘genetic’ and ‘alternative’ readings, based on the relationship of a given reading to readings in different biblical manuscripts. Genetic readings, the majority of which are corruptions, are further divided into four subcategories that reflect the different effects of scribal transmission: minuses, pluses, changes in orthography, and differences in word se-

---


quences. Alternative readings, on the other hand, are divided into five subcategories: linguistic-stylistic changes, lexical interchanges, harmonisations, exegetical changes, and additions (glosses, interlinear and marginal corrections, remarks, etc.)

Alternatively, Talmon employs a synthesis of textual and literary criticism to describe a process of transmission that allows for creativity on the part of authors and copyists alike. Expansionistic or clarifying changes, such as conflation and lexical interchange, as well as complex literary devices, such as inversion, reiteration and parallelism, are used by writers and copyists regularly. Talmon maintains that “an undetermined percentage of the variae lectiones derive from the impact of ongoing literary processes of an intra-biblical nature.”

In her analysis of the differences between the synoptic passages of Samuel-Kings and Chronicles, S. Japhet outlines the process whereby the text was updated from Biblical Hebrew to Late Biblical Hebrew, which in her analysis reflects a diachronic development. While it pertains only to verbal forms, Japhet’s analysis can still be informative for our present purposes. Common differences between the sources are described as: substitution of rare or poetic roots for more common forms; changes or deviation in the mean-

54 See E. Tov, Textual Criticism, 236-58.
55 See E. Tov, Textual Criticism, 258-85.
ing of a root; roots and phrases common to the language of the scribe; interchanges of synonymous readings; changes in content and style; errors; and other changes.58

These models provide an insight into how to weigh the significance of variant readings. Talmon shows us that variant readings in ancient copies cannot all be neatly classed into ‘genetic’ and ‘alternative’ readings, without the critic making a subjective judgement. This effectively levels the playing field for all of the readings in the early manuscripts. Japhet’s model indicates that differences in expression and language can be driven by shifts in the textual milieu, an observation that can apply regardless of whether the differences are explained as diachronic or synchronic developments. Tov’s model shows us that variants regarded as alternative readings are essentially expansionistic, updating, or revisionist. Expansionistic changes, such as harmonisations and additions, add to but do not change the sense of the text. Updating changes, such as lexical interchanges and linguistic-stylistic changes, also leave the sense of the text intact while bringing its use of lexical or grammatical expression into line with what the scribe felt was suitable. Revised exegetical changes, though, seem to be different in that they affect the meaning of the text according to a personalised view of what seems appropriate. Such changes can alter the meaning of the text, something that expansionistic and updating changes are not aimed towards.

58 See primarily the description of variant types in S. Japhet, "Interchanges of Verbal Roots in Parallel Texts in Chronicles," Hebrew Studies 28 (1987) 10-48. ‘Errors’ are characterised as the corruption of letters, phonetic confusion, metathesis, and corruption leading to omission of superfluous material. ‘Other changes’ include the correction of awkward or problematic phrasing by changing word sequence, and the substitution of verbs as a means of avoiding confused phrasing.
Both Clines and Young have conducted recent studies on the transmission of biblical texts in various periods.\(^\text{59}\) Clines analyses texts that are transmitted in parallel in the received biblical text, in particular the doubly transmitted poem recorded in Psalm 18 and II Samuel 22. Clines differentiates between pluses, the interchange of synonyms, variant word or phrase order, changes in syntax, as well as grammatical and orthographic variants.\(^\text{60}\)

Young examines the biblical evidence from Qumran against the evidence from elsewhere in the Judean Desert, delineating between orthographic and non-orthographic variants.\(^\text{61}\) We could say that Young’s category of content variants encapsulates all of those defined by Clines, with the exception of orthographic variants.

While there may be differences in the way variants are categorised, the similarities between the methodologies of Clines and Young lie in their straightforward statistical approach to the data. After collating the variant readings, both scholars represent their data in easily readable tables that indicate the frequency of variants by way of simple ratios.


\(^{61}\) See I. Young, "The Biblical Scrolls from Qumran," 128-29, and Goshen-Gottstein’s classification of ‘real variants’ (M.H. Goshen-Gottstein, "Hebrew Biblical Manuscripts," 247-48, and 274-75). This is taken up in I. Young, "Textual Stability," 2, n. 3, and 6, where the distinction is made between orthographic variants, linguistic variants, and content variants.
The advantages of this method are that the statistical evidence is easy for the scholar to represent and for the reader to interpret. Representing variance as a ratio against non-variance renders often confusing data readily understandable.

Polak published an important study in 1992 that employed adroit methods of differentiating between variants and statistically analysing the data. His method was to classify variants according to their quality, in terms of impact on the sense of the text, and in terms of their quantity. Polak made the distinction between variants that occupy single syntactic slots and variants that encompass whole clauses or sentences. He also recognised changes in word order as being distinct from other variants, whereas minor changes in sequence appear to be considered as genetic by Tov, and not intentionally created by scribes.

In Polak’s system, variants are categorised as mechanical variants (i.e. genetic corruptions), exchange of synonyms, expansion or condensation of syntactic slots, omission or addition of syntactic slots or whole phrases, complicated redactional processes, and changes in word order. His system agrees with the distinctions made by Tov, in that it identifies expansive, clarifying, and extraneous forms of variation.

---

62 See F.H. Polak, "Statistics and Textual Filiation," 215-76. The Chi-squared mathematical function that features heavily in Polak’s treatment of the data is essentially used for determining genetic relationships between the sources, and so is not employed in the present study.

63 E. Tov, Textual Criticism, 258.

An important aspect of Polak’s analysis is that he delineates between variants that are similar in nature but different in length. Two categories exist for the omission or addition of material: those that involve single syntactic slots, and those that involve whole phrases or sentences. This is an important delineation, and one that will be recalled when we formulate our own methodology.

Variants in Comparative Approaches to Non-Biblical Texts

Cogan’s examination of the annals of Ashurbanipal identifies two separate figures behind ancient scribal activity: authors and copyists. However, as no holographs are discernable amongst the evidence, the treatment of all sources as copies is demanded. This is something akin to the argument that a level playing field must be established between all alternative readings. Further to this, variants are divided into orthographic level variants and word level variants. This is comparable to Young’s designation of orthographic and non-orthographic variants.

Other aspects of Cogan’s system are more finely tuned than many other models. He distinguishes between scribal errors, variants that occur within copies of a single edition of the text, and variants that occur within parallel texts in different editions. Variants from each of the latter two groups are then described as linguistic (changes in verb conjugation), expanding, condensing, and parallelisms (changes in sequence or rephrasing). An

65 See M. Cogan, "Some Text-Critical Issues".
67 Scribal errors are divided into five categories: dittography, omission, interchange of graphically similar symbols, spelling error, and difference in sequence. See M. Cogan, "Some Text-Critical Issues," 6-7.
additional category representing lexical interchange is subdivided into interchanges of verbs, and other words (nouns, adjectives, adverbs and pronouns). 69 Perhaps most importantly for our present purposes, Cogan defines a category for changes in details. Though limited to a small number of examples, 70 he points to a need to define some variants as introducing conflicting or different information that does not agree with the parallel data. This could be likened to the category for revised exegetical readings defined by Tov.

Another study relevant to our investigation is the examination of copying practices among Northwest Semitic scribes by Dobrusin. 71 She utilises inner-biblical parallel texts as well as Phoenician and Ugaritic material, and compares variants from each body of evidence. The texts that were examined by Dobrusin included parallel material in Isaiah and Kings, parallel material from the Phoenician inscriptions at Karatepe, and the hippiatric texts from Ugarit. She discriminated between three different types of variants in her analysis, namely ‘stylistic,’ ‘substantive’ and ‘error’ variants. Variants considered as ‘stylistic’ were found “to do little to change the content of the text but affect the presentation and form of the text ... [while] substantive variants represent a level of creativity that makes a significant impact on the text.” 72 The important difference between these classifications is that, while one class of variant allows for reworking the text without impacting on its meaning, another class of variant allows for changes that do in fact alter the sense of the text. This distinction, while not elaborated beyond this in Dobrusin’s study,

70 See the examples given in M. Cogan, "Some Text-Critical Issues," 10.
agrees with other features of systems we have already reviewed above, specifically the delineation between expansive or clarifying variants, and variants that bring a different meaning to the text.

One feature of Dobrusin’s work that makes it unique among the models being assessed here is that it attempts to contrast different texts from varying localities and periods, by exposing all of the evidence to the same method of analysis. This is perhaps the reason that Dobrusin’s system of categorisation is so much less complicated than, say, Cogan’s or Polak’s. To make the methodology flexible enough to be used in differing contexts, Dobrusin has kept her classification of variants broad and uncomplicated. This is something we will have to keep in mind when forming our own methodology, given that we will face the same challenge of making our method adaptable to as many text forms as possible.

In his critical edition of the Epic of Gilgamesh, George attempts to define the exact nature of recensional variations between the first millennium manuscripts, coming to the conclusion that “a methodology seeking to view variant readings as necessarily indicative of recensional differences is exposed as naïve.”

George’s system of categorising variant types delineates between words or phrases that are modified grammatically or completely replaced, words that are added or omitted, and phrases and lines that are reworked. More infrequently whole lines can be omitted en-

---

tirely, or two or more lines are transposed or reordered.\textsuperscript{74} In particular instances some regional variations can be grouped and analysed, such as in the sources recovered from royal complex at Kuyunjik in Nineveh. Here George lists differences in anaptyctic vowels, the transposition of nouns and adjectives according to stylistic or poetic conditioning, the intrusion of syntactic elements that affect poetic style, or the intrusion of Assyrian dialect forms.\textsuperscript{75} There is also particular consideration given to the various nuances of orthography and underlying pronunciation among the texts from this site.\textsuperscript{76}

Also of particular interest for our present examination is George’s in depth discussion of the provenience and physical properties of the sources he examines. The find-sites of the tablets are discussed in as much detail as excavation and museum records allow, and where available in-text indications, such as colophons, are also brought into the analysis.\textsuperscript{77} Special attention is also given to the physical properties of the tablets so that commonalities or differences in format and production serve to further delineate types of manuscripts, aiding the process of textual affiliation and categorisation beyond the treatment of common or peculiar textual variants.

\textsuperscript{74} See the summary in A.R. George, \textit{Gilgamesh}, 429. Specifically George cites examples of ‘substantive’ differences as: expansion or contraction of the text; transposed lines, words or phrases; variant lines, words or phrases; omitted words or phrases; interchanges of words or phrases; differences in gender or number; differences in tense, stem or mood; the addition or omission of suffixes or enclitics; different genitive constructions; differences in dialect or pronunciation; and minor differences in words or expressions (see A.R. George, \textit{Gilgamesh}, 419-29).

\textsuperscript{75} See A.R. George, \textit{Gilgamesh}, 431-37.

\textsuperscript{76} See the discussion of forms in A.R. George, \textit{Gilgamesh}, 437-42. The particular examples listed there will be discussed in the following chapters as they become relevant to the analyses of the cuneiform sources.

\textsuperscript{77} See the thorough treatment of all known manuscripts for the Standard Babylonian Epic of Gilgamesh in A.R. George, \textit{Gilgamesh}, 379-417.
Tigay's proposed method for examining the transmission process behind the Gilgamesh Epic is also important to our present investigation.\textsuperscript{78} He groups variants into those that reflect less extensive and more extensive differences in the text. Among the less extensive changes that occur between copies of the Gilgamesh Epic, Tigay lists corruptions, changes in grammatical forms, interchange of synonyms, addition or omission of words or phrases, expansions and contractions, altered formulaic constructions, and minor changes in word sequence. Listed as more extensive changes are the restructuring of whole sections, assimilation of similar passages, and changes in characterisation.\textsuperscript{79}

Finally, we turn to the examination of Tablet XI of the Gilgamesh Epic by Young.\textsuperscript{80} In this study, Young classifies three types of variation between his sources: orthographic, linguistic and content variants. This marks a development from the earlier distinction between orthographic and non-orthographic variants in Young's examination of the Judean Desert texts.\textsuperscript{81} By including 'linguistic' variants as a separate category, Young distinguishes a difference between variants that affect, for example, the conjugation of verbs, and variants that significantly alter meaning in the text.\textsuperscript{82} This is an important distinction, and is reflected, for example, in the classification of 'grammatical' type variants in the

\textsuperscript{80} See I. Young, "Textual Stability," 174-183.
\textsuperscript{81} For example, see the method employed in I. Young, "The Stabilization of the Biblical Text," 370-378, and I. Young, "The Biblical Scrolls from Qumran," 81-83.
\textsuperscript{82} See in particular the methodology outlined in I. Young, "Textual Stability," 6-7.
methodologies of Tigay and Cogan. Young weighs linguistic variants as more significant than orthographic variants, but less significant than content variants.
CHAPTER 2: METHOD

Creating a Methodology

In formulating our own approach to the comparative analysis of ancient texts we will adopt those features shared in common from the systems surveyed above in chapter one, as well as some features specific to certain models that are deemed to suit our purposes. Most prominent in our system will be the treatment of all variant readings as, prima facie, alternative readings, unless they are shown to be obviously genetic. Hence we will refer not to changes, but differences between copies. We may also refer to additions or omission in a source, or may state that an element is lacking in one source, without this denoting a judgement as to which source preserves the more original reading.

Regarding the textual differences in the Dead Sea Torah scrolls relative to the MT, the discussion will frequently begin from the point of view of the MT as Haupttext, even though in reality it is fully realised that the relationship between textual variants is often complex and difficult to ascertain. In practice maintaining a neutral tone throughout the entire presentation and discussion of the variants in this regard results in unnecessary verbosity and clumsily egalitarian phraseology. It is the decision of the writer that it is better to concede at this early stage that any apparent bias in the language here employed is purely a means to facilitate ease and efficiency of expression.

Based on the methodologies reviewed above we can begin our present analysis by asserting a series of rules that will apply to each situation in which a difference between two or
more sources is considered. Every variant that is encountered in the following analysis will be analysed according to the following criteria.

Rule 1: *All variants are prima facie alternative readings.* This rule stipulates that every variant must be considered *a priori* as a possible alternative reading unless the reading fails to meet the criteria as discussed in chapter 1, namely those conditions outlined by Pulikottil.  

83 “‘... unless a deviant reading does not fit in the grammatical or linguistic context of the passage, or disrupt the logical flow of the passage, it cannot be considered to be an error,” (P. Pulikottil, *Transmission of Biblical Texts in Qumran*, 24).

Rule 2: *Reconstructed variants are not counted.* That is, all variants must be graphically present in the sources to be considered. No variations that are the result of scholarly restoration of the manuscripts based on considerations of space will be treated in the following analysis.

Rule 3: *Only one variant can be counted for each semogenic unit.* That is, if a single semogenic unit 84 contains two variants, such as an orthographic and a linguistic difference, only one of these differences may be counted in the analysis. 85 In such instances the variant that is counted is dependent upon Rule 4.

84 For a use of the term ‘semogenic unit’ in this study see the discussion below, pages 38-45.

85 This follows the methodology set out in I. Young, "Textual Stability," 6.
meaning of the text is taken as the default reading. In general this will mean that a choice between the reading of an orthographic or linguistic variant will result in an orthographic variant being read, while a choice between an expansive plus and a difference in hermeneutic will result in the reading of an expansive plus, and so on. This rule ensures that the least amount of conscious alteration to the meaning of the text is assumed on the part of the scribe in any instance of variation between the sources.86

Another important element in our methodology is the delineation of different types of ‘content’ or ‘substantive’ variants into categories that reflect common observations in the systems surveyed above. That is, we will categorise variants with an emphasis on delineating between updating, expanding and extraneous differences. As was noted in relation to Dobrusin’s study, every effort should be made to keep categories of variation relatively uncomplicated, to allow for their adaptation to as many textual environments as necessary. In this way some of the mechanisms defined in the models surveyed above, for example the delineation between expansive verbs and other grammatical forms, will be abandoned in the interests of keeping the analysis as broad and adaptable as possible.

Variations are thus described as textual, stylistic or hermeneutic. Textual variants denote those that are manifested in the texts at a graphical level only, such as spelling or dialect differences. Such variations exist at the letter-level of the text, and typically represent updates towards what the scribe perceives as ‘correct’ forms. On a more substantial level we will define stylistic and hermeneutic variations in the sources. These variations exist

86 See the rationale described in I. Young, "The Stabilization of the Biblical Text," 372 n. 28.
at the word-level of the text and in Polak’s language occupy whole or multiple syntactic slots. Stylistic variants “do little to change the content of the text but affect the presentation and form of the text,” while hermeneutic variants “alter the text for the purpose of presenting a different characteristic, perspective or message.”87 A more detailed description of each category follows.

Textual Variants – Orthographic

Orthographic variations between the sources can be considered to be of relatively minor significance. Such variants rather narrowly relate to the graphical representation of individual phonemes and generally make no difference to the sense of the text. This seems to be the case for all texts examined here, whether the script is logographic, syllabic or alphabetical, and whether the language is East or West Semitic. As a result matters of spelling are frequently relegated to the most sundry category available as they have the least impact on the text’s meaning. And, as orthography is that grammatical property most readily updated throughout a text’s history of transmission, there is every reason for it to be treated similarly here.88

These variations are therefore labelled Orthographic Variants, which is abbreviated to OV in the lists. In alphabetical texts this typically denotes a difference in the representa-

87 See D. Dobrusin, The Nature of Ancient Northwest Semitic Copying Practices as Reflected Through Variants (Columbia University Ph.D. Dissertation: New York, 1987) 24. Dobrusin uses the term ‘substantive’ rather than ‘hermeneutic,’ but the sense is the same. For the terminology used in the present analysis I am indebted to Professor Avi Hurvitz, private conversation.

88 This much was already noted in W.F. Albright, From the Stone Age to Christianity: Monotheism and the Historical Process (Baltimore: The John Hopkins Press, 1940) 43-47.
tion of vowels, elision of stem markers in verbs (such as the representation of the digraph ܢ, or affixed ܐ of the 힘 stem. In cuneiform documents this denotes differences in the signs chosen by a scribe. This includes the exchange of two signs with one sign (such as CV-VC with CVC), the use of different signs with the same phonetic value, and the exchange of logographic forms with phonetically written forms. In addition, we include under Orthographic Variants differences in the use of phonetic complements, which generally provide information as to case or number in nouns.

Textual Variants – Orthographic (linguistic)

Also listed as orthographic variants are grammatical phenomena that may be more properly identified as linguistic. These variants are introduced either intentionally or unconsciously, and typically change the language towards a dialect or grammatical practice better known to the copyist, or perceived to be more ‘correct.’ These types of ‘language variation’ represent differences in the phonetic perspective of the copyist that may be related to dialect or pronunciation. As such, it is similar to orthographic variation in that it is almost explicitly concerned with the graphical representation of particular phones. The important difference, though, is that linguistic variations actually have an effect on morphology. These grammatical changes, although often appearing very much like variations in spelling, emerge in response to the actual use of the language in a living environment.

However, the lines between what one can fairly call an orthographic or a linguistic variation become somewhat blurred in certain circumstances. For example, we often find the spelling ܢ in a Qumran biblical text against ܢ in the parallel section of the MT. Now,
we are surely correct to see this as a minor orthographic variation that simply reflects the
tendency of some scribes to represent the vowel ‘ō’ graphically, while others do not.89

An ostensibly similar phenomenon occurs with the second person masculine suffix con-
jugation in Hebrew, written as הָתִּ- in many Qumran texts, as opposed to the more famil-
 iar תִּ- that occurs in the vast majority in the MT. However, it is likely that in the second
instance the addition of the letter ה to the suffixed form of the verb marks a change in the
linguistic profile of the copyist, reflecting a living dialectal difference, and not an ortho-
graphic convention.90

The point of difference between the spelling of the word הָתִּ with or without mater lec-
tionis, and masculine verbs ending in afformative הָתִּ or תִּ-, is between orthographic
convention on one hand, and the representation of the spoken language on the other. The
difficulty lies in determining whether the scribe is recording what a particular ortho-
graphic convention dictates, or graphically representing the audible form of the spoken
language. In truth we can never be absolute in our determination one way or the other.

89 According to E.Y. Kutscher, The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1959) 20, the spelling הָתִּ did in fact represent a linguistic difference, serving as an indication to avoid the pronunciation of the negative particle as in Aramaic. For a variation on this theory see W.M. Schniedewind, "Qumran Hebrew as an Antilanguage," Journal of Biblical Literature 118, 2 (1999) 248.

90 See note below.
Some of the orthographic phenomena we encounter stem from archaic forms which elsewhere have fallen out of use.\textsuperscript{91} It is certainly permissible, then, that linguistic differences underlie some variations in orthography. However, the issue is clouded by evidence that certain copyists used orthographic conventions to demarcate texts linguistically, as has been suggested for some of the Qumran Scrolls.\textsuperscript{92}

In the cuneiform documents we are presented with a different set of linguistic phenomena that raise essentially the same methodological issue. We have already mentioned the occurrences of phonetic complements that may be seen as more linguistic than orthographic phenomena. In general, case endings in the cuneiform sources are often irregularly employed, and in some instances vary when the sense of the text clearly remains the same.\textsuperscript{93}

\textsuperscript{91} E.Y. Kutscher, \textit{Language and Linguistic Background}, 438, suggests that the long form of the third person masculine singular independent pronoun $\pi\nu\nu\nu$ retained the Proto-Semitic ending, softened to $-\textit{ah}$. In contrast this ending has disappeared from Biblical Hebrew. Against this we find a mixture of long and short forms of this pronoun in different sectarian documents. The long form is used exclusively in 1QS (fifteen times), while the short form is used exclusively in 1QH (six times) and 11QT (36 times, although there is one instance of the long form in 11QT\textsuperscript{b} [11Q20] v 21). The few occurrences in 1QM are mixed (two instances of the short form against four of the long form).


\textsuperscript{93} In MUL.APIN tablet I ii 9, BM86278 reads “MUŠEN aribu MUL $\,\text{Adad},$” while the parallel document BM32311 reads “MUŠEN aribi MUL $\,\text{Adad}.$” In the next line “$\text{Subulu}$” appears in the former text against “$\text{Subula}$” in the latter. In both cases the taxonomic style of the text suggests no difference in declination is.
In other instances we find possible Sumerian case endings preserved that are lacking in parallel copies. Any of these types of variation could be due to either orthographic convention or linguistic representation. The fact is that in many instances we cannot know which phenomenon we are dealing with. In light of this it seems the best option before us is to relegate all of the potentially orthographic variations to the same category, even if dialectal influences may be at work in particular cases, to avoid introducing a high degree of subjectivity into our analysis. In the hope that variations that might point to possible linguistic differences are not entirely lost in our examination, those cases will be marked as Orthographic Variants (linguistic) abbreviated to OV(l). However, during the course of the analysis, OV and OV(l) will be dealt with largely as a unit.

Stylistic Variants

The category of stylistic variants covers the broadest range of differences between the source texts. While OV and OV(l) variants affect the text below the level of whole syntactic slots, stylistic variants represent those variations between the sources that affect the text at the level of whole or multiple syntactic slots.

We can define three different types of stylistic variation. The first relates to a difference between forms that retain the same meaning between the parallel sources. Shorter forms intended by the difference. There are numerous other examples of the same phenomena in the other cuneiform texts examined. See, for example, the prologue to LH, or Gilgamesh XI passim. 94 In tablet number 63 of the series Enûma Anu Enlil (the so-called Venus Tablet of Ammizaduga) we find four copies in which the tenth omen includes the form KÙ.GI.GA.KAM, while in one text (BM36395) we find the form KÙ.GI.GA.KE4. The genitive marker in Sumerian (-AK > -K) is either spelled differently in the latter document, or the latter document preserves an ergative post-position marker (-E). See the full discussion in the listed variants.
include: an extra conjunction, object marker, interrogative and locative  SetValue, or definite article; the exchange of prefixed prepositions; independent prepositions in the cases of הָש / הָס; the use of resumptive particles such as וּוּ and וּוּ in various clauses; differences in grammatical person, gender or number between the sources; and the exchange of lexemes that are contextually synonymous – a class of variation noted in almost all of the models examined above. Given that an exchange of synonyms, by definition, only affects the meaning of the text on a minor level (or the words would not be synonymous) this type of variant has been collated with conjunctions or other particles that are also of minor significance. Thus all of the variants in this first sub-category are listed as Stylistic Variants (Type 1), abbreviated to SV(1).

The second type of stylistic variation relates to forms that expand on the meaning of a parallel manuscript, usually for means of clarification. Such variants include any lexemes that can be considered as adding to the text without specifically contradicting any content in a parallel source. This reflects the description of alternative readings that are ‘pluses,’ ‘expansionistic’ or ‘additional’ in the models of Clines, Cogan, Polak, George, Tigay and Tov, or those defined as ‘stylistic reiteration’ by Talmon. These variations do not alter the overall meaning of the text, but rather act to clarify or extend meaning typically by the insertion of explicating or expansive pluses. Variants in this sub-category are listed as Stylistic Variants (Type 2), abbreviated to SV(2).

95 This includes readings where additional material of uncertain content exists in one source against other parallel sources. In this situation, where the nature of the additional material cannot be determined beyond the knowledge that it is extraneous to the parallel sources, the material is assumed to be expansionary rather than contradictory, and is counted as SV(2).
The final sub-category of stylistic variation relates to differences in the word order of parallel manuscripts. It reflects the category of changes in sequence, or changes in word order, represented in the models of Tov, Cogan, George and Tigay. It also reflects the category of ‘stylistic metathesis and textual inversion’ described by Talmon.96 Variants in this final sub-category are listed as Stylistic Variants (Type 3), abbreviated to SV(3).

Hermeneutic Variants

The final category of variation relates to forms that alter the meaning of the parallel manuscript. These are the most significant differences between parallel texts. Shorter forms of this category are typically changes in definitive information, such as cardinal or ordinal numbers. In the biblical text hermeneutic variation generally involves exegetical changes, whereas in non-biblical texts this category can involve opposing and contradictory observational information such as weather or planetary movements, as well as changes to chronological information. Variations of this type are listed as Hermeneutic Variants, abbreviated to HV.

The Quantification of Texts

In order to render our texts adaptable to a statistical analysis, it is necessary to reduce each of our sources into data streams that can be counted and registered statistically. To this end we must decide on a system of quantifying our texts into units that can be easily defined and counted. These units should be adjustable to the characteristics of any of the

languages we are likely to encounter in our examination, which means that the quanta we decide upon should be capable of defining individual units within texts that are composed in alphabetical, syllabic or logographic scripts. The unit of calculation that we employ in the following study should thus be capable of quantifying texts written in any of these scripts, without bias towards one system of writing or another. In defining such a versatile unit of quantification we will ultimately produce a more detailed and finely tuned analysis.

The studies reviewed above typically use a ‘word’ as their main unit of calculation. A word is generally counted as a group of letters or signs situated between word dividers, which are commonly represented by dots or spaces. It should be pointed out, though, that the tendency in Semitic languages is to package multiple semogenic units into singular groups of letters, without separating these letter-groups with word dividers.97 Thus, a typical Hebrew form like קסנשֶׁל may be counted in any one of the reviewed models as one word, given that it is a single series of uninterrupted letters, separated from other letter-groups by word dividers at either end of the series. However, if we consider the semogenic parts of this letter-group, we find that multiple morphemes are collated to construct semogenic units that each have an identifiable meaning. In the form קסנשֶׁל an initial preposition indicates a beneficiary, and this is followed by a plural noun, “horses.” The final element in the series is a second person masculine possessive pronominal suffix. The whole package constitutes three definable semogenic units that are collated into one series of uninterrupted letters.

Quantifying the texts that we are to examine into units that are defined as semogenic thus allows us to be more specific as to how much meaning is contained within a given passage of text. Units of calculation that are based on such a rationale could in turn serve to give a greater degree of accuracy when attempting to indicate exactly how much difference in meaning there is between two parallel documents that vary in relation to each other in small textual details.

An example can be constructed as follows. Let us assume that the form יִנָּהַבְּבָּא exists in one manuscript, and is paralleled in another manuscript of the same text by the form לְהַיָּבֲחַל. If we count the forms in parallel attestation using a ‘word’ as our unit of calculation, we would have two word units (one in each manuscript) that showed one type of variation. Alternatively, were we to quantify our texts using a system of semogenic delimitation, we would count six units (three in each manuscript) that showed three types of variation: a prepositional interchange between ב and ל that counts as SV(1), one OV(1) variation between qal and hiph'il conjugations of the verb ינָהַבְּבָּא, and the variation of a 3ms and a 3mpl pronominal suffix that would be counted as SV(1). Such an understanding of this textual variant gives us a more nuanced perspective of exactly how much difference in meaning there is between these two hypothetical manuscripts.

It may be suggested that it would be preferable to quantify our texts by delineating units based on morphology, rather than to deal with terminology that includes abstract units of

---

98 This would be in consideration of Rule 3 as set out above.
calculation based on semantic content. It is certainly true that a terminology which is based on semantic quantification does lend itself to subjective definitions and delineations. After all, quanta defined in linguistic terminology as ‘semes,’ ‘sememes,’ ‘archisemes’ and ‘semantic units’ are all units of qualification, rather than quantification. These operate above the lexico-grammatical level of the text to bring about the signification of meaning. Thus, a terminology of semantics is generally employed to communicate something about a lexeme’s meaning on an abstract level, and as such multiple ‘semantic features,’ or ‘content figures,’ can be attributed to a lexeme while not actually finding graphical representation in the form of the lexeme itself. The ‘lexicogrammar,’ to borrow a term from Halliday, forms a continuum between morphology and lexical units (vocabulary) that is used to facilitate semogenesis, but semogenesis is not explicitly represented quantitatively in the lexicogrammar. Semogenesis is accomplished on a level

99 See D. Geeraerts, "Componential Analysis," The Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics (ed. R.E. Asher; vol. 2; Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1994) 648-50, for a convenient definition and history of the first three terms. Regarding ‘semantic units’ T.C. Potts, Structures and Categories for the Representation of Meaning (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994) 251, has said that their “implicit criterion … is that an expression A is a semantic unit in an expression B just in case a further expression C, being the same meaning as A, may be substituted for A … salva veritate.” None of these terms defines a quantifiable unit that is always graphically expressed in the text. The term ‘sememe’ is a possible exception, the earliest usage for which was “einfach für die Lexikalische Bedeutung eines Morphems” according to W. Abraham, Terminologie zur neueren Linguistik (vol. 2; Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1988) 747. However, the subsequent development of this term towards a more narrow meaning negates its usefulness in the present study.

100 The terminology employed here is as broad and inclusive as possible. Both of the terms ‘semantic features’ and ‘content figures’ are used by linguists to refer to a lexeme’s particular set of semantic values. See O. Durcot and T. Todorov, Encyclopedic Dictionary of the Sciences of Language (Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 1979) 265.

101 See S.A. Groom, Linguistic Analysis of Biblical Hebrew (Cumbria: Paternoster Press, 2003) 111. Semantic features are “not considered as signifieds themselves, since there is no signifier that corresponds to them” (O. Durcot and T. Todorov, Encyclopedic Dictionary, 265).

that is abstracted from the lexicogrammar, by the interaction of the lexicogrammar and
the interpreter.

So, given the implicit problems that occur when we employ semantic terminology, surely
we would be better served by the use of the morpheme as our main unit of quantification.
Such units would be much more adaptable to a statistical analysis, given that they are
quantitatively represented in the lexicogrammar and do not require any subjective inter-
pretation to delineate them in a text. Individual morphemes have a formal unity, in that
each allomorph is represented consistently in the lexicogrammar. They possess functional
unity, as each morpheme fulfills a definable function in the syntax of a language. Every
morpheme also has its own semantic unity, possessing a fundamental meaning which ex-
ists in all occurrences.103

However, a system of quantification based on morphological delimitation raises problems
for our study due to the various writing systems we encounter. That is, not all of our texts
permit themselves to a consistent morphological breakdown while maintaining an equal
representation in the statistical analysis. For example, documents written in cuneiform
script can represent entire words with either a single logogram, or through a more elon-
gated string of syllabic signs. Now, suppose we were to encounter, as we do, a cuneiform
text that is represented by multiple parallel copies. Suppose also that some copies of this
text represent particular words with logograms, while the same words are represented in

103 See D.G. Lockwood, "The Problem of Inflected Morphemes," Readings in Stratificational Linguistics
(eds A. Makkai and D.G. Lockwood; Alabama: The University of Alabama Press, 1973) 190, for this de-
scription of the qualities of morphemes.
parallel copies using strings of syllabic signs. Were we to quantify this parallel text using morphological units, we would find that some copies (using syllabic forms) would produce greater statistical values than other copies (using logographic forms). This would present us with the problem that, while all copies essentially held the same amount of meaning and differed only in terms of their orthography, our statistical results would be skewed to represent the copies with more written morphemes (spelled out syllabically) as showing a higher ratio of calculated units to variants than the copies with less written morphemes (compressed within logograms).

Such a distorted statistical result might be permissible if the phenomenon just described only occurred in a small number of cases, however it would appear that certain texts regularly represent particular words with single logograms while parallel copies represent the same words with multiple morphemes fully expressed with syllabic signs. It therefore seems obvious to us that a system of quantification needs to be devised that can treat a single logographic form as equal to a longer syllabic form, given that each form is ident-

---

104 For example, in the parallel copies of MUL.APIN we find that BM 86378 iii 9 represents the plural verb *innammāru* with the compound logogram IGI.LÁ, while AO7540 ii 9 has IGI²ME, and K 6558 + Sm 1907 ii 6’ has IGI. Each text clearly means to write a plural verb, as the multiple subjects to which the verb refers attest in each copy. If we are to base the quantification of our texts on morphology, we would count two morphemes for the first two forms, and one morpheme for the third form. In so doing we create the mistaken impression in our statistical analysis that there is less information being communicated in the third text, when in fact all texts communicate the same plural verb form and differ only in their orthography. Another example occurs in the parallel copies of the 63rd tablet of *Enûma Anu Enlil*. BM 36395 regularly represents the lexeme *u”aram* with the logogram ZAL, whereas the parallel texts K2321+K3032 and W1924.802 consistently use the syllabic spelling *u”a-ram*. Another parallel text, K160, uses a mixture of the two forms. There are, as would be expected in cuneiform writing, many other instances of the same phenomenon to be found in our texts.
tical, excepting their respective orthography. Such a system must necessarily quantify a text based on quantified semantic value, rather than morphological value, for, as we have just shown, morphology is not necessarily consistently represented between two parallel copies.

There is another alternative open to us that still allows for the use of morphemes as a quantifying unit of calculation. That method would be to reconstruct a cuneiform text’s morphology based on what the logograms imply, thus equating logographic forms to syllabic forms in the statistical analysis. However, this solution creates a greater methodological problem than it resolves: it generates statistical evidence based on conjectural readings that find no graphical representation in the texts themselves. By employing such a methodology we would have to concede that some of the data included in our analysis would come from morphological material that was essentially invented by the process of examination itself. Such an analysis could not claim to accurately represent the texts under examination.

These considerations raise the question as to which morphemes should be ignored to avoid conjectural values leaking into the statistical results. Such cases as unwritten definite forms (definite articles assimilated to prepositions, or in construct chains), and so-called ‘zero’ morphemes (the 3ms suffix conjugation verb) should be ignored because they are not represented graphically. In addition to these non-graphic morphemes we should exclude morphemes that are semantically bound to other morphemes. We are thinking here in particular of plural markers and markers of gender, which are semanti-
cally ‘packaged’ with nouns to comprise one semogenic ‘packet.’ For example, the plural noun מְסִיסָה would be read as containing one semogenic part: ‘horses,’ rather than two semogenic parts: ‘horse’ + ‘plurality.’ Likewise, the feminine noun בָּסָה would be read as one semogenic unit comprising ‘horse’ + ‘feminine gender.’

We conclude, then, that using basic morphology to quantify our texts is inadequate. It would also seem from the previous discussion that semantic quantification is problematic. We will therefore try to seek some middle ground between morphological and semantic content in order to define our main unit of calculation in the present analysis. Our system will be based primarily on morphological quantification as these units are represented unambiguously in the written lexicogrammar. However, we will exclude the counting of some morphemes where statistical inconsistencies would result and where particular morphemes are considered to be semantically bound to others.

It remains only to decide upon some terminology that will sufficiently describe the unit of calculation that fits our requirements in the present context. In the absence of an appropriate extant term, at least as far as I can determine, we will use the term ‘semogenic unit,’ abbreviated to SU, when referring to the quanta.105

105 That an appropriate label is lacking from current scholarship is typified in B.K. Waltke and M. O’Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1990) 63, where grammatical units are given in ascending order as the phoneme, morpheme, word, clause and sentence. In this taxonomy semogenic units would stand between morphemes and words.
CHAPTER 3: INTRODUCTION TO THE CUNEIFORM TEXTS

Defining Parallel Texts

It can be considered a maxim of the present study that scribes in antiquity who copied texts without necessarily maintaining exact letter or word sequences did not transmit their texts in a precise way, and the texts thus reproduced will therefore not show themselves through statistical analysis to be stable in transmission. On the other hand, copyists who reproduced texts with the intention of representing as accurately as possible the sequence of letters or words that existed in the copyist’s exemplar will by definition qualify as texts that are transmitted in a stable way.

The problem remains of how the text-critic is to determine which texts are to be analysed for signs of stability in transmission and which are to be left aside. For one, it is a surety that the textual corpus of the ancient near east is too extensive to be subjected in its entirety to a rigorous analysis in the space available here. It is unavoidable that some compromise must be made between the constraints of space in the present paper on one hand, and the sheer volume of texts in the ancient near eastern corpus on the other.
The Historical Setting

We have restricted this investigation to cuneiform tablets from the first millennium B.C.E. Texts will primarily be in Akkadian though some intermittent encounters with Sumerian will be inevitable. Texts written exclusively in Sumerian will not be considered.

The first millennium B.C.E. cuneiform evidence examined here is primarily available from the Neo-Assyrian, Neo-Babylonian and Late Babylonian periods, although occasional Seleucid period copies do exist. This means that our potential data covers the period from the middle of the eighth century B.C.E. to at least the late fourth century B.C.E.

The Assyrian king Ashurbanipal (669-627 B.C.E.) is attributed with instigating the large-scale collection and reproduction of cuneiform documents. The discovery of large-scale collection and reproduction of cuneiform documents. The discovery of large-

106 The most well known evidence for attributing the collation of texts at Nineveh to Ashurbanipal are the tablets BM25676 and BM25678, published as CT XXII 1. These tablets are two copies of a letter in which “[a]n Assyrian king, who most probably is Ashurbanipal, gives ... a written order to his agents in Babylonia to search for tablets that might be useful for his royal library” (J.C. Fincke, "The Babylonian Texts of Nineveh: Report on the British Museum's Ashurbanipal Library Project," AfO 50 (2004) 122). While the sender is not so named, the letter is commonly attributed to Ashurbanipal. For example, see A.K. Grayson, "Assyrian Civilization," The Cambridge Ancient History Volume III, Part 2: The Assyrian and Babylonian Empires and Other States of the Near East, from the Eighth Century to the Sixth Century (eds J. Boardman, I.E.S. Edwards, N.G.L. Hammond, and E. Sollberger; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996) 227. However, note the objections in S.J. Lieberman, "Canonical and Official Cuneiform Texts: Towards an Understanding of Assurbanipal's Personal Tablet Collection," Linger Over Words: Studies in Ancient Near Eastern Literature in Honor of William L. Moran (eds T. Abusch, J. Heuhnergard, and P. Steinkeller; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990) 310, against these tablets being genuine official correspondence: “It is, rather, a student’s copy of a (practice) letter, or rather two students’ copies of the same letter.” This may be the case, but the reputation of Ashurbanipal as a collector and reader of diverse texts remains strong by way
amounts of tablets at Kuyunjik, the main mound at Nineveh, were made during excavations by A.H. Layard, H.C. Rawlinson and H. Rassam. The excavations were undertaken from the middle to the end of the 19th century, and the recovered artefacts included many literary texts. These probably came from libraries which were situated in the Southwest Palace, North Palace, and in the Ištar and Nabû temples. The texts include what is referred to as Ashurbanipal’s royal library, although it seems evident that more than one location was used to house texts at Nineveh. Many of the ca. 5000 literary texts unearthed bear colophons that contain Ashurbanipal’s name. Texts with colophons containing the names of other kings are likewise thought to have been collected by Ashurbanipal, though their original locations may have been in libraries in other cities.

A collection that ostensibly comes from the accumulated library of an Assyrian monarch presents a special opportunity for our analysis. The existence of multiple copies of literary texts contained within one area may allow us to identify copying practices that are

\[\text{of the references in many of his inscriptions, colophons, and correspondence. See the primary references in} \]
\[\text{J.C. Fincke, "Babylonian Texts of Nineveh," 120-122.}\]

\[\text{A.R. George, } \textit{Gilgamesh}, 389, \text{ has provisionally suggested that it is possible that the tablets written during} \]
\[\text{Ashurbanipal’s reign were stored in the North Palace, while those from an earlier period were kept in} \]
\[\text{the Southwest Palace.}\]

\[\text{See J. Reade, "Archaeology and the Kuyunjik Archives," } \textit{Cuneiform Archives and Libraries: Papers Read at the 30\textdegree Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale} \text{ (ed. K.R. Veenhof; Istanbul: Nederlands Historich-Archaeologich Instituut te Istanbul, 1986) 217-22. Perhaps one is more correct to talk of Ashurbanipal’s libraries in the plural, which is the language used by S. Parpola, "Assyrian Library Records," } \textit{JNES} \]
\[\text{42, 1 (1983). See also J. Reade, "Archaeology and the Kuyunjik Archives," 218 on the problems of separating} \]
\[\text{which texts were in the textual collections from the North Palace and the Southwest Palace in antiquity.}\]

\[\text{See O. Pedersén, } \textit{Archives and Libraries in the Ancient Near East 1500-300 B.C.} \text{ (Maryland: CDL Press, 1998) 158-65. Pedersén determines that the approximate number of 30,000 tablets or fragments of} \]
\[\text{tablets can be reduced by about one third if joins are taken into account. S. Parpola, "Assyrian Library Records," 6-8 notes that of the 30,000 tablets or fragments around 6,000 are non-literary texts.}\]
based on solid statistical evidence. The potential for comparative material to be present in
this collection is illustrated by the historical events that underlie its formation.

“During the first 20 years of Ashurbanipal’s reign, his brother Šamaš-šum-ukin was
appointed king of Babylonia, but later revolted against his brother. In 648 BC, Ashur-
banipal was victorious in the civil war and took over the kingship of Babylonia. The
situation gave him direct access to all the Babylonian temple archives. When Ashur-
banipal created his extensive royal library in the citadel of his Assyrian capital city
Nineveh he incorporated Assyrian and Babylonian tablets into the collection. The tab-
lets written in Babylonian characters may have been imported from Babylonian librar-
ies, whereas others could have been written by Babylonian scribes in the service of the
Assyrian king.”\textsuperscript{110}

Ashurbanipal apparently engaged the services of Babylonian scribes to copy some of the
texts that contributed to his library, most likely a practice established by his father
Esarhaddon.\textsuperscript{111} Also, library records recovered from excavations at Nineveh show that a
large number of texts were acquired from Babylonia immediately following the fall of
Babylon and the death of Šamaš-šum-ukin midway through the seventh century B.C.E.\textsuperscript{112}
These texts came not only from official collections but also from the private collections

\textsuperscript{110} J.C. Fincke, "Babylonian Texts of Nineveh," 112.
\textsuperscript{112} S. Parpola, "Assyrian Library Records," 11 notes that preceding the fall of Babylon in 648 B.C.E. “the
Assyrian government had no right to interfere with the internal affairs of Babylonia, least of all to lay claim
to the private property of her citizens; here, however, we all of a sudden find large quantities of Babylonian
literary tablets being channelled into Assyria a few months after the conquest of the country. It seems likely
that the Assyrian monarch, well known for his literary interests, was utilizing the situation to add to the
collections of his libraries.”
of professionals. Subsequently a number of the tablets recovered from Kuyunjik are written in Babylonian script. Thus during the reign of Ashurbanipal there appears to have been a tendency towards the centralisation of the literary corpus and a mixing of scribal cultures. These are conditions that provide a solid platform from which to launch an analysis of textual transmission. The texts from Kuyunjik will therefore be critical to our investigation, and other material will generally be incorporated to add contrast to the picture that emerges from this particular collection.

In addition to the texts from Kuyunjik we can also include texts from other areas in Assyria and Babylonia. Libraries existed in official and private contexts in many other locations in Mesopotamia during the first millennium B.C.E., and tablets are included in the present study from Assur, Babylon, Borsippa, Nimrud, Sippar and Sultantepe. We also include many tablets whose origins are uncertain and can only be conjectured based on palaeography and museum catalogue numbers. Notes will be made on the issues sur-

---

113 This includes several copies that will be examined here, including copies of MUL.APIN (K3020; K3852; K8598; K13254; K15929), and copies of the Venus Tablet (K2321+3032; K3105). S. Parpola, "Assyrian Library Records," 5-6, found that the number of texts imported from Babylonia, as reflected in the library records, was somewhere in the vicinity of 2,000 tablets. Considering the number of tablets uncovered at Nineveh this represents “a major acquisition to the library.”

114 Assyrian scribes would presumably have copied texts that were also copied by Babylonian scribes, as the mixture of Assyrian script and Babylonian script among the copies would seem to suggest. That the scribal culture of Babylonia was essentially more developed and fruitful than its Assyrian counterpart has been suggested by A.K. Grayson, "Assyrian Civilization," 227, and this would explain why texts from the south were specifically sought out for inclusion in Ashurbanipal’s library.

115 U. Jeyes, "Assurbanipal's Bârûtu," Assyrien im Wandel der Zeiten: XXXIX`e Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale, Heidelberg 6-10 Juli, 1992 (eds H. Waetzoldt and H. Hauptmann; Heidelberger Studien zum Alten Orient 6; Heidelberg: Heidelberger Orientverlag, 1997) 62, has observed that the material reproduced in the libraries at Nineveh reflects a relatively accurate copying processes, especially when compared to the transmission of the same texts in the Late Babylonian period.
rounding the provenance of individual tablets as they are examined. Even with our rather incomplete knowledge about the origins of many tablets, we can at least reconstruct very basic chronological and geographical frameworks for describing the texts.

The History of the Collections

Texts from official libraries, such as those that are located in palaces or temples, make up the bulk of our information, though their exact provenience is frequently uncertain. Such was the state of the art in the middle to late nineteenth century that the actions of some excavators were at times indistinguishable from those of looters. In addition to excavated finds, many tablets were purchased by representatives of the European museums from entrepreneurial locals. These local businessmen had the foresight to keep the locations of large finds to themselves, selling off tablets in limited quantities while refusing to disclose their origins to protect their own commercial interests. Scholars still occasionally discover fakes among the tablets purchased at this time, as the author has had occasion to witness at the British Museum. Happily, we are not concerned here with the counterfeits that were sold to the nineteenth century European archaeologists as authentic antiquities. These are decidedly in the minority, and relatively easy to spot.\textsuperscript{116} Rather, our concern is for the accuracy of the records kept by those early archaeologists as to the find-spots of

\textsuperscript{116} Professor Marcel Sigrist has pointed out to me that in general the perpetrator of the hoax lacked sufficient knowledge of the cuneiform script even to ensure all signs were facing the right way. On top of this, fakes are often made of irregular clay types and can appear unusual in their coloration. As museums often purchased tablets by the basket-full from antiquities dealers in Baghdad during the middle and late nineteenth century, it was not always possible for the counterfeit tablets to be discovered before they were packaged and shipped.
authentic tablets, and information as to the conditions under which many of the unprovenanced tablets were acquired.

As controlled excavations with sufficient notation are so rare, it is usually possible to talk only in very general terms about the archaeological context of tablets from either Assyrian or Babylonian localities. The most reliable information is that contained in the texts themselves, typically in the colophons or date formulae. Where information in the text is lacking, we can get some indication of where a tablet was found based on the museum numbers that were assigned to them. On this evidence we can make some comments about tablets in the British Museum from the Kuyunjik collection (K), those from the Rassam collections (Rm 1, 2), and those from Smith’s excavations (DT, Sm). Only very limited information is available for the BM collection. As for the other museums, the few tablets we will consider from the Vorderasiatische collection of the Staatliche Museen in Berlin (VAT) can be elucidated by the detailed reconstruction of the libraries and archives of the city of Assur by O. Pedersén.117 For the tablets with Nimrud (ND), Sul-tantepe (SU), University Museum in Philadelphia (CBS), and Musée de Louvre (AO) museum numbers, we will rely principally on the notes in the primary publications or catalogue entries, with some recourse to the surrounding scholarly literature.

Selecting the Texts for Analysis

The process of selecting textual material must of necessity be both methodologically sound and expedient in its application, so as a manageable body of textual material can be

---

amassed that will give a reasonable indication of what one can expect to find in the broader corpus of Ancient Near Eastern literature. A precondition of our comparative analysis is that it can only be executed upon texts that have been preserved in more than one ancient copy. Obviously for the most reliable statistical results it is preferable to have texts that exist in as many ancient copies as possible, but essentially only two copies from antiquity need remain. Needless to say a preference will be given in the main analysis to texts with the highest number of exemplars.

Texts can to some extent be selected based on the nature of their content as the rigidity and endurance of a given textual edition can often depend on the subject matter which the text itself addresses. It is perhaps an anachronism perpetrated by those unfamiliar with the textual character of Assyrian royal annals to expect there to be any intention towards exact accuracy in transmission in the minds of those ancient scribes that copied such texts. Any familiarity with the textual style of the various copies of these texts must inform the modern reader that the Assyrian scribe felt free to change the order of certain events, to omit certain material considered superfluous, and to re-order or exchange with contextually synonymous equivalents various lexemes and phrases in the exemplar before him. Expediency of language could certainly be a reason for such changes, as too could matters of personal preference and style. What is important is that there is no textual evidence that tells us that a scribe copying a tablet from Ashurbanipal’s royal annals, perhaps even less than a single generation removed from when the autograph was inscribed, felt it necessary to exactly preserve the text of his exemplar by creating a highly accurate
copy. Rather, a transmitted text of this type was something that owed some of its form to
the style and preference of the scribe that copied it.\footnote{Much of the wording in the preceding summary stems from discussions with M. Cogan between February and June 2007.}

Other texts, such as astronomical diaries and mathematical treatises, are by their nature unsuitable for the present analysis. These were more likely to be one-off works that, if reproduced at all, usually contributed to subsequent refined texts.\footnote{W. Horowitz, private conversation.} The same is true for the official and private correspondence, as well as the enormous number of legal and trade related documents so common to most archives in antiquity. These kinds of texts lack the prerequisite quality for our present purpose, namely to reflect “textual stability and fixed tablet sequence within a series.”\footnote{The phrase is appropriated from S.J. Lieberman, "Canonical and Official Cuneiform Texts," 305, who thus describes Rochberg-Halton’s use of the word ‘canonicity.’ Still, the expression captures the nature of the texts that are ideal for consideration in the present context. Some series may not have entirely fixed tablet sequences. See, for example, the colophon of W1924.802 compared with that of K2321+3032. The former, excavated from Kish in 1924 and written during the reign of Sargon II (721-705 B.C.E.), is labelled as tablet 62 in the series \textit{Enûma Anu Enlil}. The latter, presumably excavated from the libraries at Nineveh, but originally of Babylonian origin, states that the tablet is the 63\textsuperscript{rd} in the same series. Interestingly, both W1924.802 and K2321+3032 are apparently of Babylonian origin – the former based on the statement in the colophon “copy from Babylon, written according to its original and collated,” and the latter based on its palaeography. See H. Hunger, \textit{Babylonische und Assyrische Kolophone} (Kevelaer: Butson & Bercker, 1968) 58, 132, nos. 150 and 469 respectively.}

Oppenheim made essentially this binary distinction between types of texts when he grouped the cuneiform literature into two broad categories. The first “can loosely be termed the corpus of literary texts maintained, controlled, and carefully kept alive by a
tradition served by successive generations of learned and well-trained scribes.”121 He referred to these texts as the ‘stream of tradition.’ The second and far more numerous body of documents was the “impressive bulk of cuneiform tablets that contain the records of the day-to-day activities of the inhabitants of Mesopotamia, from kings down to shepherds.”122 The former group of texts is much more likely to provide multiple copies in diverse areas and across larger time-spans than are texts of the second type.

As a result our access to multiple copies of texts is generally limited to what may be cautiously termed the ‘canonical’ cuneiform texts, or the ‘stream of tradition.’ In these texts a relatively fixed form of content and structure is achieved through the collection of “various different forms of a text, and reconciling their differences.”123 The prime candidates, so to speak, in an analysis of textual transmission are those texts that have “attained a kind of literary stabilization in the sense that old material was no longer being incorporated.”124 Such textual entities are certainly well developed by the end of the

122 A.L. Oppenhein, Portrait of a Dead Civilization, 23.
eighth century B.C.E. The focus of the present analysis must therefore be on the texts that were authoritative in this sense.

Representative texts from five broad categories will be analysed: omens, phenomenological observations, laws, epics and rituals. The texts that exist in sufficient copies from each of these categories are: tablet 63 of the series *Enûma Anu Enlil*; the ritual for inducting the cult image known as *mīṣ pî*; the astronomical work *MUL.APIN*; the Laws of Hammurabi; and the Epic of Gilgamesh. This selection is intended to include as broad a range of ancient Near Eastern textual genres as possible to determine what kinds of texts, if any, were likely to be copied with particular care and exactitude. We can thus set some informed limits on the amount of material eligible for analysis.

For tablet 63 of *Enûma Anu Enlil*, also known as the Venus Tablet of Ammizaduga, all available first millennium sources will be analysed and the most recent joins taken into account.

---

125 The primary evidence for this view is constituted in the fragments published by W.G. Lambert, "A Catalogue of Texts and Authors," *JCS* 16, 3 (1962) 59-77. These fragments provide a list of what were viewed as closed bodies of work compiled by ancient authors. An important discussion of this catalogue and its implications appears in K. van der Toorn, *Scribal Culture and the Making of the Hebrew Bible* (Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2007) 42-44, 207-21. According to W.G. Lambert, "Catalogue," 63, at least three copies of the catalogue are represented by the fragments from Nineveh.

126 It has not been possible to analyse texts of a more rigorously scientific nature, such as astronomical diaries or mathematical documents. Likewise, historical texts such as campaign annals have not been analysed as these also cannot be properly categorised as parallel copies of one text. M. Cogan, "Some Text-Critical Issues in the Hebrew Bible from an Assyriological Perspective," *Textus* 22 (2005) has shown that the variations between copies of the campaign annals of Ashurbanipal indicate that the transmission of such texts was undertaken in the interests of communicating core information, with much less concern for the absolute reproduction of the exact sequence of signs than in the other genres considered here. It can be said that certain genres promote attempts by scribes for a relatively high level of exactitude, while in other genres scribes seem to take a more free approach when copying a text.
account. For the text known as MUL.APIN, ‘the plough star,’ all available sources will be considered, including copies from personal libraries in Assur during the reigns of Esarhaddon and Ashurbanipal. This affords us the special opportunity to examine the copies of one text both at the royal library in Nineveh, and in contemporary personal libraries in Assur, to see how the official copies and the personal copies from the same period compare. This could provide a valuable tool for comparison with the biblical material found in various locations in the Judean Desert. For the Laws of Hammurabi all available texts will be examined, with the exception of two minor texts. Due to the length of the Epic of Gilgamesh only tablet XI of the twelve tablet series will be analysed here. The text called mīṣ pî, ‘washing of the mouth,’ is attested by copies from both Assyria and Babylonia, but only the Assyrian copies will be treated below. This is because the variation between the northern and southern editions is such that it is not possible to consider their particular exemplars as truly parallel texts.

It has been possible to consult a critical edition of the text presented in a score arrangement in most cases. The critical editions provide each text with its sources in parallel,

127 The following texts have been omitted from the analysis on account of the availability of cuneiform copies: a text from Sippar (Nr. 3/2166) excavated in 1986 which contains part of the prologue, and K6516 which contains part of the epilogue.

and so are especially convenient for the present purposes. In addition previous publications of the tablets have been used to augment the scores in the critical editions, especially where difficult readings are concerned. Drawings, photographs and, where possible, the original cuneiform tablets have been consulted, with notes included on difficult or damaged signs and the physical qualities of the tablets.

the analysis proceeds from a score composed from copies of the cuneiform fragments compiled by the author rather than from a pre-existing critical edition.
CHAPTER 4 – ENŪMA ANU ENLIL TABLET 63

The Text

The 63rd tablet of the series Enūma Anu Enlil is also known as the ‘Venus Tablet of Ammizaduga’ because of the reference in the text to the “year of the golden throne,” a known eponym for the eighth year of the Old Babylonian ruler Ammizaduga. Ammizaduga was the fourth ruler after Hammurabi, and as such the origins of this text should probably be dated to around the mid-seventeenth century B.C.E. Nevertheless, the largest number of copies exist from the first millennium B.C.E. In relation to the rest of the series Enūma Anu Enlil, the 63rd tablet is unique in its specificity when referring to the conjunctions of Venus, in contrast to the tablets concerning other astral phenomena.

Reiner divides the text of the Venus Tablet into four sections, I-IV. The first section treats observations of the conjunctions between Venus and the sun in a chronological progression for the 21 year reign of Ammizaduga with the exception of his eighteenth year. In the second section 12 omens, apparently unconnected with Ammizaduga, are arranged in the order of the months. The very regular movements of Venus described in section II are obviously not based on real observations, but are more likely given as approximate dates to facilitate actual observations. Section III contains four omens that are also probably not related to those made during Ammizaduga’s reign. Section IV repeats most of the omens from the first and third sections reorganised in the order of the months in which the heliacal setting of Venus was observed.

---

130 The text divisions, sigla and apparatus in E. Reiner, BPO I, has been utilised throughout the present study.
131 See E. Reiner, BPO I, 7-25.
While the first three sections are represented in all of the exemplars remaining to us, the fourth section is less regularly represented. This prompted Reiner to identify two manuscript traditions for this text. These differ in terms of the layout of the four sections, the inclusion of an additional final omen in some sources, and the varying placement of certain subscripts. The first manuscript tradition has only sections I-III on one tablet with a second tablet possibly containing the fourth section. The second manuscript tradition has sections I-IV on the same tablet. Not surprisingly it is the material from the first three sections that is best represented by our sources, and this will be the focus of the present analysis.

The Tablets

While an examination of the previous publications does afford some insight into certain peculiarities of the texts not necessarily reflected in Reiner’s transliteration, the edition by Reiner was found to serve the purposes of this analysis more than sufficiently and so only passing references will be made below to the cuneiform editions of some of the tablets. Occasionally some inspection of the tablets themselves has been possible, and remarks will be made where appropriate.

Several joins have been proposed for the fragments that are given individual sigla in Reiner’s apparatus. Reiner herself has suggested joins between A and M, and between F and H. She also suggested joining L with some other fragments of section IV, K7072 and Sm 174. More recently Walker has suggested that J can be added to F and H along

---

134 The author has been able to inspect the following tablets: A, C, D, L and M. For the other tablets the drawings in the previous publications have been consulted.
with some other fragments of section IV, BM37121+37432. Walker proposes that L and the other associated fragments can be joined to K7090. The following table therefore gives the sigla used in Reiner’s edition, while the fragments presented in the discussion of the sources reflects Reiner’s sigla with the later joins taken into account.

Table - EAE 63: Tablets Under Examination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Siglum</th>
<th>Museum Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>K2321+3032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>W1924.802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>K160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>K7225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>BM37010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>BM36758+37496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>BM36395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>K12344+12758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>K3105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>BM41688</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description of the Sources

A, K2321+3032; M, K3105

The museum catalogue prefix ‘K’ suggests this tablet was probably from Nineveh, and as such it will be considered here as originally housed in the royal collections. The original unbroken tablet seems to have contained all of the sections I-IV. The colophon states that

this is the sixty-third tablet in the series *Enûma Anu Enlil*, and also contains the personal name Nergal-uballit.137

The script is Neo-Babylonian, as is indicated by Reiner, in agreement with Langdon & Fotheringham and also Weir.138 The cuneiform is carefully written, and the layout follows the convention for this type of text, with fixed left and right margins, and ruled sections that generally separate each omen.139 Smoothed areas of clay which have been overwritten indicate corrections were made in line 5 on the obverse, and similarly in line 17 of the reverse.

The size of the tablet appears to have been roughly identical to C, the most complete tablet examined here, being *ca.* 10 cm wide and 20 cm high. The preserved portions allow the observation that the original tablet was about 2 centimetres thick at the edges, widening to approximately 3-4 cm thick at the centre. There is noticeable vertical convection on the reverse while the obverse is relatively flat. These seem to be the standard dimensions for a tablet of this text-type and quality.

The clay appears to be of reasonable quality with no noticeable impurities, such as stones or other foreign material, visible in the cross section. The coloration is pale grey-brown, with some small sections of burnt orange in the middle-left part of A, and at the lower

---

137 See H. Hunger, *Babylonische und Assyrische Kolophone* (Kevelaer: Butson & Bercker, 1968) 132, no. 469. Hunger lists this tablet among those that are “unbekannter Herkunft,” that is, of unknown origin. The colophon appears on the reverse at line 28 with the incipit of the following tablet in the series, after which is written “DUB 1 UŠ 3 KAM DIŠ UD An ˁEn-lil.”


139 Exceptions for K2321+3032 are: on the obverse, the single ruled section that contains lines 1-3, and the single lines followed by rulings in lines 20 and 21. On the reverse, ruled sections that contain only one line occur in lines 14, 15, 18 and 29. The left margin is straight on both sides of the tablet, and the right margin is only exceeded in ruled sections that contain a single line (an exception is line 23 on the obverse). On the other hand, K3105 has some lines that exceed the right edge, *e.g.* lines 3, 4, 7 and 8 of the obverse, and lines 2, 3 and 9 of the reverse.
edge of M. This suggests an uneven heating process, in which more heat was applied to the upper right part of the tablet. It is possible therefore that this tablet was unfired in antiquity, and was subsequently burnt in a fire, possibly in the conflagration at Nineveh in 612 B.C.E. However, the difference in coloration could also be the result of a controlled firing process in which heat was accidentally applied unevenly.

B, W1924.802
In all probability the most ancient of any of the examined Venus tablets, this document was excavated at Kish in 1924 by Langdon, and now forms part of the Herbert Weld Collection in the Ashmolean Museum at Oxford University. It is dated by its colophon to the reign of Sargon II (721-705 B.C.E.). The script is Neo-Babylonian, and the reference to both Babylon and Sargon in the colophon suggests that it was written after the Assyrian king regained control of Babylon from Merodach-baladan II in 710 B.C.E. This would demand the view that this tablet was written between 710-705 B.C.E. From the preserved text B appears to have contained sections I-III.

C, K160
This tablet is the most fully preserved copy of the Venus tablet examined here and, in the sections that concern this study, contains more than five times as much text as the next

---

140 According to W.G. Lambert (private conversation) the coloration of fired clay changes depending on the temperature applied, ranging from terracotta, through red, pale brown and grey-white. A pale green colour immediately precedes vitrification, at which point the clay becomes blackened and can exhibit bubbling in areas of extreme heat. To some degree the coloration of fired clay depends on the presence of iron oxides in the raw material, however the changes in colour between various tablets is typically a sign of the firing temperature. To add confusion to the issue, it is also true that some unbaked tablets were fired by the excavators in the 19th century to prevent them from further damage during shipping.

most preserved copy. The British Museum catalogue number suggests that this tablet was part of the library that stood in the Southwest Palace at Nineveh, and was probably excavated by Layard between 1849-51. Line 33 of the reverse of this tablet carries a subscript that reads “12 kiṣru tāmurātu ša Ninsianna gabarī Bābili.” Hence its textual heritage can be traced to a copy from Babylon.

The script is clearly Neo-Assyrian, and the signs are the same size or slightly smaller than A. The layout of the text follows the standard convention of using ruled lines to separate each omen. The margins of the tablet are carefully observed: the writing on both the obverse and reverse does not exceed the left and right margins of the faces. There is no writing on the bottom edge of the obverse, such as might continue over to the reverse, and although the top edge is damaged the little of it that remains is also uninscribed. The final line of the reverse contains the colophon. The tablet is of standard size, ca. 10 cm wide and 20 cm high.

The clay appears to be quite free of small stones or other impurities that are occasionally visible in the cross sections of broken tablets. Its colour is terracotta throughout with only

---

142 D. Brown, *Mesopotamian Planetary Astronomy-Astrology*, 18, informs that the British Museum catalogue numbers K1-278 almost certainly come from Layard’s excavations in the Southwest Palace.

143 See E. Reiner, *BPO I*, 47. An inspection of the tablet reveals that line r33 of K160 does indeed contain the words “gabarī Bābili,” even though the drawing made by Langdon does not represent these last six signs. The reasons for this omission are not immediately clear, as the transcription in the same volume clearly sees the text intact. Compare S. Langdon, J.K. Fotheringham, and C. Schoch, *Venus Tablets*, 13 with the drawing in Plate II.

144 There are two exceptions: lines 7 and 8 on the obverse together make up omen 10, but are separated by a ruling. This part of the text is unusual in other copies as well. For example, A has the same separation of individual lines in the same section of the text on line 20 and 21 of the obverse (see note above). Line 33 on the reverse is sectioned off with individual rulings, but this line actually contains a superscript rather than an omen.

some areas showing a more red hue that suggests slightly uneven firing temperatures.\textsuperscript{146} Firing holes have been pressed into most blank spaces on the writing surfaces to a depth of about 1 cm. This tablet would seem to have been written in Nineveh by an Assyrian scribe, and was carefully baked in antiquity. Its discovery in the Southwest Palace encourages the view that this tablet was once part of the royal libraries at Nineveh.

\textbf{D, K7225}

This is a fragment of a tablet that is likely to have come from Nineveh, based on the museum catalogue number. Reiner assigns no date to the script.\textsuperscript{147} Bezold’s catalogue describes this as a small fragment from the middle of the tablet, 3.5 cm wide and 4.1 cm high, but no thickness is recorded.\textsuperscript{148} This document will be treated as an Assyrian copy coming from the libraries at Nineveh, with some reservations due to our incomplete knowledge of its qualities.

\textbf{F, BM37010; H, BM 36758; J, BM36395}

It has been suggested by C.B.F. Walker that these fragments, plus the joined fragments BM37121+BM37432, were from one original tablet of Late Babylonian origin that was written around the sixth century B.C.E.\textsuperscript{149} Reiner classifies the tablet as Neo-Babylonian. In accord with J. E. Reade, we will consider these tablets to have been part of Rassam’s collection, either excavated in Babylonia or purchased from antiquities dealers in that area between 1879-83.\textsuperscript{150}

\begin{footnotes}
\textsuperscript{146} For example, see the left edge of the obverse at lines 34-37. The coloration could alternatively be due to pigmentation from iron oxides – see note .
\textsuperscript{147} A transliteration of this tablet was published for the first time in E. Reiner, \textit{BPO I}.
\end{footnotes}
One fragment, J, preserves a colophon, but unfortunately this is broken and provides rather inconclusive evidence. Importantly, though, it preserves a statement that the tablet was incomplete. The tablet series name and tablet number are not preserved in the colophon, so it is in fact impossible to ascertain whether or not this was a copy of the entire Venus tablet or an excerpted section. It will be considered here as a sixth century copy from central Babylonia, with reservations.

G, Rm 2, 531; L, K12344+12758

According to C.B.F. Walker these fragments should be joined to K7072, K7090 and Sm 174 to form a Late Assyrian text. The tablet is written in Neo-Assyrian script, usually in evenly sized and spaced cuneiform, but with some exceptions. The layout of the text follows the convention of one omen per ruled section.

It seems reasonable to assume that these fragments were originally uncovered in Nineveh, though it is difficult to be any more specific. Fragments K12344+12758, K7072 and K7090 show vitrification that suggests that the unbaked tablet was burnt in a fire. The absence of firing holes in any of the fragments lends weight to this hypothesis. To become vitrified the tablet must have been exposed to very high temperatures (ca. 1000°

---

151 Line 13 of the reverse ends with the Sumerian “NU AL.TIL” – “not complete.” The following lines have only broken parts of the incipit of the omens relating to the New Year (akīnā) festival, not the omens concerning Jupiter as is the case with the colophons of fragments A and B. The broken colophon in fragment J also preserves an incomplete personal name.


153 For example, some of the signs are crowded and difficult to read in line 5 of K7090, and in lines 5 and 7 of K7072.

154 This is based on the catalogue numbers. K, as noted above, typically refers to tablets found at Kuyunjik in general, while the Rm, 2 and Sm collections are mostly from the North and Southwest Palaces at Nineveh respectively. On this see D. Brown, Mesopotamian Planetary Astronomy-Astrology, 18-19. The tablet was either broken in antiquity and its parts distributed to both locations, or the apparent trends in the catalogue numbers do not hold for these entries. In support of the latter, the vitrification of the fragments appears to have occurred towards what would have been the centre of the complete tablet – a very unlikely coincidence if the fragments were separated before vitrification occurred.
C), such as would obtain in a fierce conflagration. It is possible to imagine, then, that this tablet was broken and burnt during the fall of Nineveh in 612 B.C.E.

N, BM41688

Very little can be said about this small fragment. The museum catalogue number suggests that it was purchased or extracted from unrecorded excavations in central Babylonia. The script, labelled Neo-Babylonian by Reiner and Late Babylonian by Walker, would fit this assumption. We will therefore consider this as a fragment from a tablet that was copied in the sixth century in central Babylonia.

**Table - Number of SU preserved in the Sources for EAE 63**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fragment</th>
<th>Total SU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A+M</td>
<td>462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>1206.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>54.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F+H+J</td>
<td>309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G+L</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

155 J.E. Reade, "Rassam's Babylonian Collection," xxviii-xxxii has indicated that tablets with ascension numbers in the range BM33328 – BM77218 are from Rassam’s excavations in Babylonia between 1879-83. Further, items in number ranges BM40462-BM41389 and BM42259-45607 are reportedly from Babylon, Borsippa and Sippar, with the latter range also including material from Kutha. We must therefore assume that BM41688 was most likely from the same central Babylonian region.


157 The tablet represents the number of SU preserved in the fragments with the joins proposed by E. Reiner and C.B.F. Walker taken into account.
The following table gives the total number of SU and the total count of variant forms for each set of two parallel tablets preserving at least 20 SU in common. Following this table is an exhaustive list of all variant readings between any two sources for EAE 63 that overlap in content, regardless of the amount of overlapping text preserved. Although every variant is given in the list, the discussion of the variants will refer in the main only to those texts preserving approximately 50 SU in parallel listed in the table. Variants in less well preserved texts will be periodically referred to, but will not be made to carry any weight in the statistical analysis.
Table - Variants in the Parallel Sources for EAE 63

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparison: Text vs Text</th>
<th>TOTAL PLL</th>
<th>Orthographic Variants</th>
<th>Proportion: SU per Orth. Variant</th>
<th>Orthographic (linguistic) Variants</th>
<th>Proportion: SU per Orth. (l) Variant</th>
<th>Stylistic (Type 2) Variants</th>
<th>Proportion: SU per St. (2) Variant</th>
<th>Stylistic (Type 3) Variants</th>
<th>Proportion: SU per St. (3) Variant</th>
<th>Hermeneutic Variants</th>
<th>Proportion: SU per Her. Variant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A vs. B</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>59.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>179.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>57.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C vs. M</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C vs. H</td>
<td>291.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C vs. G</td>
<td>196.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A vs. C</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>83.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>83.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C vs. L</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C vs. J</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A vs. J</td>
<td>141.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>94.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>94.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>35.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B vs. J</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>54.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C vs. D</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>44.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C vs. N</td>
<td>83.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C vs. F</td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A vs. D</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B vs. D</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B vs. C</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D vs. J</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H vs. L</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B vs. M</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M vs. N</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Tablets</th>
<th>Variant Text</th>
<th>Categorisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V1</td>
<td>A:4</td>
<td>UD.8.KAM</td>
<td>HV – Difference in cardinal number. 158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B:4</td>
<td>UD.7.KAM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2</td>
<td>A:7</td>
<td>NAM.KÚR.MEŠ</td>
<td>OV(l) – Difference in grammatical form. 159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B:7</td>
<td>SAL.KÚR.MEŠ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V3</td>
<td>A:10</td>
<td>UD.15.KAM</td>
<td>HV – Difference in cardinal number. 160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B:10</td>
<td>UD.18.KAM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

158 A has the period of superior conjunction as two months and eight days, recorded as two months and seven days in B. The cuneiform system for writing numerals is such that discrepancies of one or ten occur particularly frequently. Hence variation in numbers is common between the sources. In addition to poorly written signs, the susceptibility of clay tablets to effacement means that numbers are often transmitted incorrectly due to damaged texts. On this see J.D. Weir, Venus Tablets, 27-28, as well as S. Langdon, J.K. Fotheringham, and C. Schoch, Venus Tablets, 7 n. 6. Regarding the astronomical terms used and the concepts discussed here see R.R. Newton, "Introduction to Some Basic Astronomical Concepts," The Place of Astronomy in the Ancient World (ed. F.R. Hodson; London: Oxford University Press, 1974). On Babylonian astronomy A. Sachs, "Babylonian Observational Astronomy," The Place of Astronomy in the Ancient World (ed. F.R. Hodson; London: Oxford University Press, 1974) can be consulted for a general introduction, and see O. Neugebauer, The Exact Sciences in Antiquity (New York: Dover Publications, 1969) 122-32 for a complete description of the astronomical phenomena at issue here.

159 A has the rare spelling of nukurṭu with the Sumerian abstract prefix NAM plus KÚR.MEŠ, nakāru. B has the more common “SAL.KÚR.MEŠ,” nukurṭu.

160 A has the period of inferior conjunction as 15 days, recorded as 18 days in B.
V4 A:10  u₃-h₄-ram-ma  OV – A and B have syllabic spelling, against the logogram in J.¹⁶¹  
B:10  u₃-h₄-ram-ma  
J:9  ZAL-ma  

V5 A:11  GÁL.ME  OV - A has the plural marker ME, against MEŠ in B and J.  
B:11  GÁL.MEŠ  
J:10  }EŠ  

V6 A:12  UD.’12’[  HV – Difference in ordinal number.¹⁶²  
B:12  UD.25.KAM  

V7 A:13  UD.16.KAM  HV – Difference in ordinal number.¹⁶³  
B:13  UD.29.KAM  
J:11  UD.28.KAM  

¹⁶¹ This variant could be counted as a lexical interchange. This would treat the logogram ZAL as having the value nasalu, ‘to take away, remove’. However, given the close semantic relationship between harāmum and nasalu it is difficult to suppose that any change in the text was intended at this point by the copyist of J. In the light of Rule 4 it will be assumed that the logogram in J in place of the full spelling in A and B represents an orthographic variant.  
¹⁶² A records the eastern setting of Venus (Σ) on the 12th day of Kislimi, while B has the 25th day.  
¹⁶³ There is a 13 day discrepancy between the western rising of Venus (Ξ) in A and B, probably a result of the previous variant. J does not have the first date preserved, but the date for Ξ varies from B by one day, so J may be a misreading of a text like B.
V8  A:14  UD.20 ḫi-pi eš-šú  HV – Difference in ordinal number.

B:14  UD.18.KAM

V9  A:14  uh-ḫa-ram-ma  OV – A and B syllabic spelling, against the logogram in J.

B:14  uh-ḫa-ram-ma

J:13  ZAL[

V10  A:15  IN.NU  OV – A and B have composite logogram =

B:15  IN.NU

D:1  ]ŠU

A has the western setting of Venus (Ω) occurring on 20th day of Araḫsamna, B has the 18th day. E. Reiner, *BPO* 1, 32, reads A as “20 [+8]”, and therefore sees the reading “18” in B as an error for the correct number “28.” S. Langdon, J.K. Fotheringham, and C. Schoch, *Venus Tablets*, 15, n. 2 prefers the reading “20” in A without restoring an extra number. Reiner’s reading, being the most recent review of the tablets, is preferred throughout this study. S. Langdon, J.K. Fotheringham, and C. Schoch, *Venus Tablets*, 15, n. 2 interprets “ḫi-pi eš-šú” as “‘a recent defacement of the text’”. R. Borger, *Mesopotamisches Zeichenlexikon* (Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2004) 387, notes “ḫe-pu-ú, sind angebrochen. Auch + eš-šù, neu, rezent.” *CAD* Ḫ 196 defines the term as meaning “new break.” The form is therefore not counted as a textual variant.

In understanding ŠU as a pronominal suffix, the reading in D would constitute a stylistic variant. However, as this is uncertain, Rule 4 requires reading D as an orthographic variant which has the same meaning as both A and B. In an Old Babylonian text from Nippur we find “in-nu-uš” as a variant spelling of “IN.NU” in *The Instructions of Šuruppag*, line 27 (see R. Borger, *Mesopotamisches Zeichenlexikon*, 411). The form in D could therefore be “in-nu-u-šu”, or something similar, but this is unlikely. Alternatively, the text could be restored to read IN.NU.ŠU, *maštakal*, which is a type of plant. This form would then have to be counted as a lexical interchange. However, as it is impossible to determine what may have preceded the sign ŠU in this context, the most conservative variant category must be assumed in the light of Rule 4.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Tablet</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Tablet</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V11</td>
<td>A:15</td>
<td>GÁL ub-bu-tu</td>
<td>B:15</td>
<td>GÁL KI.MIN ub-bu-tu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J:14</td>
<td>GÁL ub-bu-tu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V12</td>
<td>A:16</td>
<td>uḥ-ḥa-ram-ma</td>
<td>B:16</td>
<td>uḥ-ḥa-ram-ma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C:2</td>
<td>]ram-ma</td>
<td>D:2</td>
<td>uḥ-ḥa-ram[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J:15</td>
<td>ZAL-ma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The addition in B of the signs KI.MIN are taken as an expansion on the apodosis of A and J. KI.MIN signifies Wiederholungszeichen, a repetition of previous text. S. Langdon, J.K. Fotheringham, and C. Schoch, *Venus Tablets*, 15, n. 4, and E. Reiner, *BPO 1*, 32, suggest that KI.MIN “probably refers to line 13, *ebur mātī iššir.*” It can therefore be categorised as an expansive plus to the apodosis that predicts “a shortage of grain and straw in the land, the harvest of the land will prosper, famine will occur.” At this point B predicts a shortage of grain and straw at the same time as it claims that the harvest will be successful. The nature of the plus in B is therefore uncertain, and, according to Rule 4, is classed conservatively as a stylistic rather than a hermeneutic variation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Tablet</th>
<th>Lexeme</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| V13  | B:17   | ŠÈG.MEŠ | OV – D has the plural marker ME, against MEŠ in B and C.  
|      | C:3    | ŠÈG.MEŠ | |
|      | D:3    | ŠÈG.ME  | |
| V14  | A:17   | GAR.MEŠ | OV – A and J have the plural marker MEŠ, against ME in B and C. D has a phonetic complement ‘an’ for iššakkān.  
|      | B:17   | GAR.ME  | |
|      | C:3    | GAR.ME  | |
|      | D:3    | GAR-an  | |
|      | J:16   | GAR.MEŠ | |
| V15  | A:18   | uḫ-ḫa-ram-ma | OV – A-D have syllabic spelling, against the logogram in J.  
|      | B:18   | uḫ-ḫa-ram-ma | |
|      | C:5    | uḫ-ḫa-ram-ma | |
|      | D:4    | uḫ-ḫa-ram-ma | |
|      | J:17   | ZAL-ma  | |
| V16  | C:6    | IGI.DU₈ ŠÈG.MEŠ | SV(2) – D has an abbreviated apodosis.  
|      | D:5    | IGI.DU₈ KI.MIN | |

167 It is worth noting that in the copy made by Langdon C appears to have abbreviated ŠÈG.MEŠ to A.MEŠ (ŠÈG being made up of the signs A+AN). While this is an attested abbreviation, B appears to have the full writing of ŠÈG. Additionally, C actually reads “ŠÈG.MEŠ [abbreviated to A.MEŠ] ina KUR.MEŠ,” against the reading in B, “ŠÈG.MEŠ ina KUR GÁL.MEŠ,” even though Reiner reads C as exactly the same as B. Alternatively the sign A can be read as mû, “water,” which represents a lexical exchange with zanu, “rain.” However, an orthographic variant is most likely the safest option here. Unfortunately there is no readily available cuneiform copy of D to compare.
V17  A:19  GÁL.ME  OV – A has the plural marker ME, against MEŠ in B and C.\(^{168}\)
      B:19  GÁL.MEŠ
      C:6   GÁL.MEŠ

V18  A:21  [K]Ù.GI.GA.KAM  OV(l) – Difference in grammatical form, or possible difference in pronunciation.\(^{169}\)
      B:21  G]A.KAM
      C:8   KÙ.GI.GA.KAM
      D:6   KÙ.GI.GA.KAM
      J:19  KÙ.GI.GA.KE₄

\(^{168}\) Compare the opposite situation at V14 where A preserves the plural marker MEŠ, against MEŠ in B and C in the word GAR.ME(Š).

\(^{169}\) KE₄ is read as the genitive case marker “-k” plus the ergative post-position “-e,” and is a commonly occurring writing of this grammatical form (see J.L. Hayes, \textit{A Manual of Sumerian Grammar and Texts} [ARTANES 5; Malibu: Undena Publications, 2000] 42-43). An alternative reading is to read the last sign KAM as KA₁₃, as is indicated in M. Thomsen, \textit{The Sumerian Language: An Introduction to Its History and Grammatical Structure} (Copenhagen: Akademisk Forlag, 1984) 90. This way the last sign in this word could be read as the Sumerian genitive case marker, where the suffix “-ak” > “-k” (M. Thomsen, \textit{The Sumerian Language}, 94). The final /a/ in the other sources might be read as a nominalising particle, though its grammatical function in this context is unclear. In fact, the entire construction is rather unusual grammatically, as was noted already when this line was first interpreted (see F.X. Kugler, \textit{Sternkunde und sterndeinst in Babel: assyriologische, astronomische und astralmythologische Untersuchungen} [2 vols.; Münster in Westfalen: Aschedorffsche Verlagsbuchh, 1910] 2.257-311). On the unusual spelling of ‘gold’ here, see J.D. Weir, \textit{Venus Tablets}, 28. The ability of first millennium scribes to transmit this obscure Sumerian phrase accurately is perhaps doubtful given the difference in forms this variant reflects.
| V19 | C:9   | UD.4.KAM | HV – Difference in cardinal number.¹⁷⁰ |
|     | D:7   | UD.4.KAM |
|     | J:20  | ]5.KAM   |

| V20 | A:22  | uḫ-ḫa-ram-ma | OV – A, B and C have syllabic spelling, against the logogram in J. |
|     | B:22  | uḫ-ḫa-ram-ma |
|     | C:9   | uḫ-ḫa-ram-ma |
|     | J:20  | ZAL-ma     |

| V21 | A:23  | UD.15.KAM | HV – Difference in ordinal number.¹⁷¹ |
|     | C:10  | UD.15.KAM |
|     | J:20  | UD.16.KAM |

¹⁷⁰ C and D record the period of invisibility during inferior conjunction as nine months and four days, while J records [break] five days. See J.D. Weir, *Venus Tablets*, 28, for a discussion of the problems with the period of invisibility recorded in C and D. An acceptable period of invisibility for Venus during inferior conjunction at this time, year nine of Ammizaduga, would be around four days. According to Weir the error could have arisen in one of the texts when a抄写员“misread the previous month of rising as the setting month; and thus wrote the wrong month down” (S. Langdon, J.K. Fotheringham, and C. Schoch, *Venus Tablets*, 7; see also K. Oberhuber, *Innsbruck Sumerisches Lexikon* [1; Innsbruck: Instituts für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck, 1990] 418, n. 5, and the references there). It is possible that C and D share a genetic variation as this error appears in both texts. A break in the text of J preceding the number of days precludes any comparative information from this source, although it seems clear that the number of days recorded in J is not the same as C and D.

¹⁷¹ A and C record the eastern rising of Venus (Γ) as occurring on the 15th day of Addari, while J has the 16th day of Addari.
V22  A:23  (UD.15.KAM)  dNin-si₄-an-na  ina  
   SV(2) – A has an expansive plus.\textsuperscript{172}
C:10  (UD.15.KAM)  ina

V23  A:23  LÚ.NE  
   HV – A, D and J have LÚ.NE, šalta, while C preserves the variant SILIM.MA, salīma.\textsuperscript{173}
   C:10  SILIM.MA
   D:8  LÚ.NE
   J:21  LÚ.NE

V24  C:11  UD.6.KAM  
   Not Counted – The variant apparently visible in F is damaged, so ultimately uncertain.
   D:9  'UD.6.' KAM
   F:1  'UD.16.KAM'

V25  A:24  uḫ-ḫa-ram-ma  
   OV – A has syllabic spelling, against the logogram in C.
   C:11  ZAL-ma

\textsuperscript{172} A preserves the proper noun dNinsianna, lacking in C.

\textsuperscript{173} The difference in meaning here is significant: šarri šalta išappar, “the king will send messengers of war,” verses šarri salīma išappar, “the king will send messengers of peace.” Also, the composite logogram LÚ.NE, which has no phonetic complement, stands in contrast to the logogram SILIM plus either the emphatic particle or a phonetic complement. For SILIM as denoting “heil sein, wohlbekommen sein” without the emphatic particle attached, see BGP 237.
V26 A:26 ]ŋa-ram-ma
C:13 ZAL-ma
F:2 ZAL-ma

OV – A has syllabic spelling, against the logogram in C and F.

V27 C:14 IGI.DU₈
J:23 IGI

OV – J has an abbreviated form of the full composite logogram preserved in C.

V28 A:28 rjam-ma
C:15 [ZAL-ma]

Not Counted – Although Reiner restores two signs in C based on the length of the lacuna, the text is damaged so ultimately uncertain.

V29 C:16 IGI.DU₈
J:24 IGI

OV – J has an abbreviated form of the full composite logogram preserved in C.

V30 C:17 7 UD-mi
F:4 UD.7.KAM
G:1 UD.7.KAM

SV(3) – C breaks from the standard formula for expressing the number of days, preserved in F and G.¹⁷⁴

V31 C:18 IGI.DU₈
J:25 IGI

OV – The compound logogram in C is abbreviated in J.

¹⁷⁴ This occurs here and in line 7 of the reverse of C. For lines 17-19 of C I have relied on C.B.F. Walker, "Notes on the Venus Tablet," 64-65, as well as my own inspection of the tablet. Reiner’s transliteration of these lines is not accurate.
V32  C:18-19  UD.20.KAM  HV – Difference in ordinal number.\(^{175}\)
G:3  UD.21.KAM
J:26  2]1.KAM

V33  C:18-19  ina \textsuperscript{4}UTU.È [ ]\(^{19}\) ina \textsuperscript{4}UTU.È it-bal  Not Counted – This is clearly a case of scribal error, where C has acquired a ditography not present in J.\(^{176}\)
J:26  ina \textsuperscript{4}UTU.È it-bal

V34  C:19  UD.’21’.KAM  HV – Difference in ordinal number.\(^{177}\)
G:4  UD.11.KAM

V35  C:22  UD.20.KAM  HV – Difference in ordinal number.\(^{178}\)
G:7  UD.21.KAM

\(^{175}\) C records Σ on the 20\(^{th}\) day of Tebēti, while G and J have the 21\(^{st}\) day.

\(^{176}\) E. Reiner, \textit{BPO 1}, 36, reads the last signs on C 18 as “\textsuperscript{4}Nin-si[ ]”, rather than “ina \textsuperscript{4}UTU.È [ ]” which appears in both Rawlinson’s and Langdon’s drawings. C.B.F. Walker, "Notes on the Venus Tablet," 65, reads in agreement with the latter, and after an inspection of the tablet that is also the reading adopted in this study. Although this understanding of the signs creates a break in the formulaic style of the protases, which is retained by Reiner’s reading, we can point to a similar departure from the expected format in line 8 of G. Following the methodology stated in Rule 1, the departure here from logical sequence discounts this variation from the statistical analysis.

\(^{177}\) C records Ξ on the 21\(^{st}\) day of Šabāti, while G has the 11\(^{th}\) day. The period of invisibility during superior conjunction in this omen is given as 15 days, which is impossibly brief. A period of more than two months is usually to be expected. It should also be noted that the rulings on C that normally delineate individual omens here enclose two omens, the second beginning half way through line 18. This anomaly may have some connection with the possible corruption of the astronomical data at this point. J.D. Weir, \textit{Venus Tablets}, 29, suggests that the month in which Venus again became visible was incorrectly copied, perhaps due to a damaged exemplar, with the signs ĀŠ and BĀR being confused.

\(^{178}\) C records Σ on the 20\(^{th}\) day of Abi, recorded as the 21\(^{st}\) day in G.
V36  C:23  ITI.ʾAPINʾ  HV – Difference in cardinal number. 179
    G:8  ITI.GAN

V37  C:23  dNin-si₄-an-na ina  SV(2) – C has an expansive plus. 180
    dUTU.ŠÚ.A
    G:8  ina dUTU.ŠÚ]

V38  C:24  ITI.ʾNEʾ  HV – C records Ω as occurring in the month of Abi, while G has Arahsamnu. 181
    G:10  ITI.APIN

V39  C:25  ITI.ʾNEʾ  HV – C records Γ as occurring in the month of Abi, while G has Duʿūzi.
    G:11  ITI.ŠU

V40  C:25  ina UTU.ŠU.A  OV – C lacks the divine determinative for šīṭ šamši, present in G.
    G:11  ina dUTU.È

179 C has the period of superior conjunction as two months 15 days, while G seems to necessitate 3 months and 14 days.
180 C has the pronoun denoting the subject, which is only implied in G.
181 According to E. Reiner, BPO I, 21-23 the confusion of month names began at an early stage in the text when both months and days were recorded as simple numerals. In such a text the figures representing months could suffer the same corruption as has been noticed in the present documents (see note ). Here a misreading between five and eight would have occurred, which is not difficult to imagine if the source text was damaged or poorly written. The next variant requires a misreading between four and five, which is similarly imaginable. Another type of textual corruption for month names written as logograms has been noted above (see note ).
V41 C:25 ina UTU.ŠU.A 
G:11 ina ₄UTU.È
HV – C gives a date for Ξ instead of Γ. G has the expected text.¹⁸²

V42 C:25 ŠEG.ME ina AN-e 
A.KAL.ME ina IDIM
G:11 ŠEG.ME u A.KAL[ 
SV(2) – C has an expansive plus.¹⁸³

V43 C:25 A.KAL.ME
H:3 A.KAL.MEŠ
OV – C has the plural marker ME, against MEŠ in H.

V44 C:26 3 ITI UD.9.KAM 
H:4 2 ITI UD.7.KAM
HV – Difference in cardinal number.¹⁸⁴

¹⁸² The apparent error in C is corrected towards G by almost all scholars, but for an alternative interpretation that is no less entertaining than it is wildly speculative see L.E. Rose, “Babylonian Observations of Venus,” Velikovsky Reconsidered (ed S.L. Talbott; New York: Doubleday, 1976) 73-86.
¹⁸³ C has the full text: “rains in the sky, floods in the subterranean water;” G has abbreviated: “rains and floods[ ].”
¹⁸⁴ C has the period of superior conjunction as three months and nine days, against H which has two months and seven days. This two-fold error is understandable. In the case of the months a single vertical line has been lost and in the case of the days the lower three strokes of 𒌷 have been confused for the lower stroke of 𒉊.
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H appears to have the word išappar before EBUR (eḫûr) in the apodosis. C lacks any such reference to sending messengers at this point.

C records that the final day of the western visibility of Venus was the 6th day of Tebêti, while H has the 7th day.

C records the period of western visibility as eight months and nine days, while H records [break] eight days.

C records Γ on the 18th of Addari, while H has the 17th of Addari.
V51 C:r1 GÁL.MEŠ OV – H has the plural marker ME, against MEŠ in C.
H:17 GÁL.ME

V52 C:r1 GÁL OV – C lacks the phonetic complement.
H:17 GÁL-ši

V53 C:r7 7 UD-mi SV(3) – C breaks from the standard formula for expressing the number of days.
L:8 UD.7.KAM

V54 C:r7 SAL.KÚR.MEŠ OV – M has the plural marker ME, against MEŠ in C.
M:3 SAL.KÚR.ME

V55 C:r7 GÁL.MEŠ OV – M has the plural marker ME, against MEŠ in C.
M:3 GÁL.ME

V56 C:r9 GÁL.ME OV – C has the plural marker ME, against MEŠ in H.
H:21 GÁL.MEŠ

V57 C:r10 DU-az OV – M lacks the phonetic complement.
L:11 ]-az
M:4 DU
V58  C:r24  KUR-ma  OV – The signs used in both texts symbolise the same word, *napāḫum*.\(^{189}\)

M:r2  SAR-ma

V59  C:r26  DU-az  OV – M lacks the phonetic complement.

M:r3  DU

V60  C:r26  UD.17.KAM  HV – Difference in ordinal number.\(^{190}\)

M:r3  UD.16.KAM

V61  C:r30  DU-az  OV – M lacks the phonetic complement.

M:r5  DU

V62  C:r35  UD.15.KAM  HV – Difference in cardinal number.\(^{191}\)

M:r9  J16.KAM

---

\(^{189}\) See *CAD* N 1 263, where both KUR and SAR are listed as logograms representing *napāḫum*. Both signs for *napaḫum* are additionally cited in R. Labat, *Manuel d’Epigraphie Akkadienne* (Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner, 1988) 105, as well as E. Reiner, *BPO* 1, 13 and 169.

\(^{190}\) C records Σ on the 17th of *Tašrīti*, M has the 18th of *Tašrīti*.

\(^{191}\) C records the period of inferior conjunction as 15 days, while M has 16 days.
V63  B:r2  ḫa-ram-ma  OV – B and M have syllabic spelling, against the logogram in C and N.
    C:r35  ZAL-ma
    M:r9  uḫ-ḫa-ram-ma
    N:4  ZAL-ma

V64  C:r35  UD.17.KAM  HV – Difference in ordinal number.¹⁹²
    M:r9  UD ḫi-pi eš-šú
    N:4  UD.14.KAM

V65  B:r3  ḫGÁN.ZI  ‘S.L.SÁ’  HV – C, M and N preserve a different apodosis to B.¹⁹³
    C:r36  IGI MU SAL ina KUR
           SUD-ti GÁL ina É.GÁL
           GU[  
    M:r10  SU]D-ti GÁL ina É.GAL
           GU.LA
    N:5  ]ina KUR SUD- ́ti``

¹⁹² C records Γ on the 17th of Ulâli arki, while N has the 14th of Ulâli arki. The source text for M was apparently damaged at this point, see note above.
¹⁹³ B, C, M and N presumably all retained the end of the protasis IGI, but the apodosis that follows appears to be different in B than the other sources. C has “MU SAL ina māti rāqṭi ibašši u ina É.GAL GU ́LA,’’ which may translate to “MU SAL will be in a distant land, and in the great palace.” The reading “MU SAL” in E. Reiner, BPO 1, 13, is unclear. It is interesting to note that S. Langdon, J.K. Fotheringham, and C. Schoch, Venus Tablets, 13, n.2, reads “MU-ši” but also decline to suggest a meaning. In the drawing the reading IGI instead of SAL seems clear, but the tablet itself is more ambiguous. M and N would appear to follow C, though the text of each is damaged. B reads: mērešu iššir, “the cultivated land will prosper” – see J.D. Weir, Venus Tablets, 27. Clearly the apodoses vary, with C focusing on events in a distant land, and B implying that the arable land will be productive. Given these differences the classification of this variation as HV seems justified.
V66  C:r38   UD.6.KAM  HV – Difference in cardinal number.\textsuperscript{194}  
M:r11   UD.16.KAM

V67  B:r4   uh-ha[  OV – B and M have syllabic spelling,  
C:r38   ZAL-ma  against the logogram in C and N.  
M:r11   uh-ha-ram-ma  
N:7   ZAL-ma

V68  C:r38   UD.24.KAM  HV – Difference in ordinal number.\textsuperscript{195}  
N:7   UD.14.KAM

V69  C:r38   dNin-si₄-an-na  SV(2) – N appears to supply alternative  
N:7   UD[ ]KAM `UD´  dates for Ξ, lacking in C.

V70  C:r40   UD.27.KAM dNin-si₄-an-na  SV(2) – N appears to supply alternative  
N:8   `UD´.27.KAM  dates for Ω, lacking in C.  
UD.28.KA[M

\textsuperscript{194} C records the period of superior conjunction as two months and six days, M has two months and 16 days.

\textsuperscript{195} C records Ξ on the 24\textsuperscript{th} day of Ulāti, N has the 14\textsuperscript{th} day.
Discussion of the Variants

Orthographic Variants

There are some common orthographic phenomena that persist across the different sources, and also a few nuances that appear to be more narrowly represented. Common variations include the use of logographic forms that are spelled syllabically in parallel documents, and variation between signs used to represent commonly occurring morphemes such as plural markers. We may also mention the presence or absence of phonetic complements. While some variations appear to cluster in sources of a given provenience, other variants occur relatively frequently in any two parallel sources, indeed even within the one document. This might be said to be a natural result of the flexibility inherent in the cuneiform writing system. A brief survey of the orthographic variants will illustrate this point.

A common term appearing in two forms is the word ḫaramu, literally meaning “to cover up,” which in the present context describes the heliacal setting and subsequent disappearance of a planet that has entered either inferior or superior conjunction with the sun. The term is written syllabically as “uḫ-ḫa-ram” but it also appears often as the logogram “ZAL.”196 It is written syllabically 50 times and logographically 18 times.

A preference for one form or the other in different sources is identifiable, but some sources use both terms. A+M always writes this word syllabically, 15 times in the sections of text examined here. The source F+H+J shows almost completely the opposite practice with five out of six occurrences of this term employing the logogram ZAL.

196 In every instance the emphatic particle is added to the syllabic form and the logographic form, so that in the text the term appears as “uḫ-ḫa-ram-ma” and “ZAL-ma” respectively.
Source C has a mixture of forms, using syllabic spelling 13 times against five occurrences of the logogram ZAL.

The mixed spelling for this particular word seems to some degree to be distributed according to textual provenience. That is, the later Neo-Babylonian texts from southern Mesopotamia have a proclivity to use the logographic spelling more often than the syllabic spelling. The two sources that have been identified as Neo-Babylonian documents from Babylonia, F+H+J and N, show an almost exclusive use of the logogram ZAL. Further, in all cases where either of these sources preserve the logographic spelling, a parallel source of northern provenance preserves the syllabic spelling. The tendency in the tablets from the Neo-Assyrian period seems to be towards the longer syllabic form, as is predominantly the case in the Nineveh and Kish texts. Similarly the composite logogram IGI.DU₈, read as innamir, “is seen,” appears in F+H+J frequently abbreviated to IGI.

---

197 Tablet B, copied at Kish during the reign of Sargon II, preserves the syllabic spelling in all eight occurrences. This is always in disagreement with the Neo-Babylonian sources F+H+J and N. Of the Nineveh texts written in Neo-Assyrian script, C has 13 syllabic spellings against five logographic spellings, and D has syllabic spellings in both preserved instances. L does not preserve any instance of this word. The variation in C between long and short spellings does not seem to reflect issues of writing space on the tablet. In fact the short spelling appears in places where the longer syllabic spelling would have certainly been acceptable, such as line 17 of the obverse. The opposite is also true in line 9 of the obverse, where the short form would have been better suited to the available writing space, but the long form is used instead and runs well over the right margin. Note the use of the short form in the same context two lines below.

198 A+M has the spelling IGI.DU₈ on the obverse, but has IGI-ir consistently on the reverse. The scribe who wrote tablet C seems to have tired of writing the full composite logogram half way through his work, managing only two full spellings on the reverse of the tablet against nine abbreviated spellings. The mixed evidence in these more fully preserved tablets shows quite clearly that a text’s orthography can change from line to line. This is also evident in the use of the plural marker, which differs significantly across the sources. For example, A+M and B differ in two out of five parallel occurrences of the plural marker, even though they are consistent in other areas. Both of these sources show their own internal inconsistencies. A+M marks the plural with MEŠ ten times and seven times with ME, while B has ME four times against nine instances of MEŠ. Care should therefore be taken not to overstate the significance of the orthographic peculiarities in the sources.
Other orthographic variants are less common. It is possible that D preserves a variant spelling of *tibnu* in the first line. This is far from certain, but even so, reading an orthographic variant here seems to be the most conservative way to deal with the problem.

**Orthographic (linguistic) Variants**

Two variants in the sources may perhaps be considered linguistic variants, although in both cases simple orthographic variation is also a possible explanation of the forms. V2 reflects the possible use of the Sumerian abstract prefix. V18 reflects a possible addition of a post-position genitive marker. In the latter case we would expect eponymous material to resist variation above the orthographic level.

**Stylistic Variants (Type 2)**

All of the instances of this variant type in the sources are expansive. In two cases a resumptive pronoun is present in one source and absent in another (V22 and V37). In a further two cases a source features *Wiederholungszeichen* where the full text is given in a parallel source (V11 and V16).

---

199 See also M210 and P20.

200 For the term and references to the literature for this type of variation see note above. At V11 B has KI.MIN, lacking in A and J. At V16 D has KI.MIN standing for the repetition of the complete apodosis in the line above, written out fully in C. In the second instance the text abbreviated by *Wiederholungszeichen* is clear but this is not so for the first instance. According to Langdon, the *Wiederholungszeichen* refer to part of the apodosis of the preceding omen on line 13 of B. If this is correct, then the apodosis in B would read *ḫušaḫḫi še′i u tibni ina māti ibašši, ebūr māti iššir, ubbuta iššakkan*, “there will be a shortage of grain and straw in the land, the harvest of the land will prosper, famine will be present.” If indeed KI.MIN in B was intended to stand for the phrase *ebūr māti iššir*, such an addition would appear to contradict the primary sense of the apodosis, which seems to be to forecast a lack of food throughout the region. By adding a phrase that speaks of the prosperity of the harvest, B undermines the prediction of calamity in the parallel sources A and J. Such a variation may arguably be categorised as a hermeneutic variant, in that it ostensibly changes the meaning of the text. However, given that the apodosis in B continues with the same words as the parallel sources after this variant, *ubbuta iššakkan*, it should be considered to be an expansion on the text rather than a change in meaning. This consideration is also in keeping with the opinion of Langdon, apparent in his treatment of the text.
Two more variants of this type involve possible extra dates given in N for the period of western visibility of Venus (V 69 and V70). The recorded dates in N 7-8 for Ξ and Ω each have two occurrences of the sign UTU, meaning ămu, “day.” In N 8 two numbers are recorded, showing that the dual dates offered in N were for successive days, perhaps reflecting some uncertainty on the part of the copyist as to which number was contained in his exemplar. This is possibly connected with the phenomenon observed where dates between the sources differ by one day. It is conceivable that the scribe who copied N supplied two dates for the one astronomical event because he was confronted with a similar discrepancy in his sources, or possibly possessed a damaged source that left some uncertainty as to the exact figure recorded.

Another example of expansion is found at V42. In C we read zunnu ina šamê mîlû ina nagbî ibaṣṣû, while the text of G is more compact: zunnu u mîl[û ibbaṣṣû]. This variation alters the style of the text but has no impact on meaning. It is significant that two copies of this text stored in the royal libraries at Nineveh display stylistically divergent versions of this apodosis.

One further example of varying apodoses is found at V45. The apodosis in C consists of the compound statement “EBUR KI.A SI.SÃ ŠÂ KUR iṭ-ṯab,” ebûr rutibi ıṣṣir libbi māti iṭâb, “the harvest of the wet-land will succeed, the heart of the land will be well.” In contrast H retains the signs “KI]N-ár E[BUR.” The last sign preserved in H seems to be the first sign of the apodosis in C, but the first partial sign and the fully preserved phonetic complement that attaches to it seems to require that in H we find the word iṣappar before the expected apodosis. Judging by other apodoses that also feature this term, we can assume that the apodosis in H originally had a reference to a messenger sent by a king before the statement concerning the harvest of the irrigated land.

Hermeneutic Variants

There is a high number of hermeneutic variants in our sources. The majority of these relate to differences in numerals which may be explained as mechanical errors in transmis-
sion or accidents of preservation. In three of these cases the variation between sources affects the month name in which a given phenomena is said to have occurred (V36, V38 and V39). These are most likely variants that emerged at a stage of textual development in which the month and day information were recorded as lists of figures, and thus these variants should be identified with the misreading of cuneiform numerals discussed above. The only possible exception is the confusion between the signs BÁR and ÅŠ, concerning which see note above.

Seven instances of hermeneutic variation do not reflect a change in number. In V23 the apodosis in A, D and J reads: “LUGAL ana LUGAL LÚ.NE KIN-ár,” šarru ana šarri šalta išappar”. The corresponding apodosis in C reads: “LUGAL ana LUGAL SILIM.MA KIN-ár,” šarru ana šarri šulma išappar”. The variation between the signs in A, D and J, compared with in C hardly suggest misreading by the copyist. The opposing semantic ranges of the words šalta and šulma might suggest that this variation is intentional and not the result of scribal error. Perhaps the apodosis was altered in C to reflect some historical situation, the truth of which the copyist was directly aware. Otherwise this variant could reflect the presence of two traditions of interpreting the astral phenomenon in question. A third possibility is to suppose a copyist’s error through homoioteleuton, given that the variant apodosis that appears in C is found in a later omen in other sources. However this last is unlikely given the placement of the text in the two formats discussed above.

201 See the comments in note above.
202 See note above.
203 Tablet A preserves the apodosis šarru ana šarri salma išappar rātibtu iššir libbi māti itab in omen 59, which appears at the very end of section IV. In the text-type that C represents, this omen would have appeared on a different tablet to the one where the supposed haplography is thought to have occurred. Alternatively, if C was copied from a source that included sections I-IV on the same tablet, then omen 59 would have appeared on the reverse side of the tablet at the lower edge, while omen 11 would have been on the obverse towards the middle of the tablet. The placement of the two apodoses that would need to have been confused in C, if this explanation is true, would have required an impossible situation from the copyist, who, midway through copying omen 11 on his tablet, would had to have turned over his source tablet, or
Another example of this type of variation is found at V65. Here we see that B varies from all of the other parallel sources in its apodosis, apparently giving a prediction that concerns matters unrelated to those mentioned in tablets C, M and N. The text of B is damaged, and it is difficult to tell from Langdon’s copy whether enough remains to confirm the reading by Reiner of mērešu iššir. However, it seems clear from what is visible in the copy made by Langdon that a reading of B that follows C, M and N is impossible. C, M and N all seem to agree, although the exact meaning of the apodosis is uncertain, and M and N are badly damaged. What seems clear is that the focus of the apodosis in B, being the arable land, is significantly different to the focus in C, M and N. The latter refer instead to events in a far away land.

B is our oldest source, dating to the late eighth century B.C.E. It was presumably kept in the Babylonian city of Kish, where it was uncovered during Langdon’s excavations in 1924. The other variant sources date from the late seventh to middle of the sixth century B.C.E., and come from Babylonia as well as Nineveh. The congruence of the later sources here indicates that B, although the oldest text, is not necessarily the most accurate text in terms of quality of scribal transmission. It may be that B preserves a more original apodosis, but the agreement of the other sources suggests that B is perhaps at variance here with the popular text. Regardless of which source preserves the more ‘correct’ apodosis, this variant does show that the earlier source does not automatically possess the most integrity.

---

replaced it with the tablet containing section IV, before copying only the first part of the incorrect apodosis from omen 59. Such a situation seems, at best, unlikely.

204 See note above.
CHAPTER 5 – MUL.APIN

The Text

The following analysis relies primarily on the critical edition of the sources published by Hunger and Pingree.205 The composition known as MUL.APIN is a compendium of 60 stars or constellations and their heliacal rising and setting times. Added to this are another 11 astronomical objects, namely five planets and six circumpolar stars, considered to be later interpolations to the original list of 60 bodies.206 Based on the recorded observations that comprise the text, MUL.APIN has been dated to approximately the end of the 12th century B.C.E.207 The text is contained in a series of two tablets of four columns each, the first tablet of which will be examined here.

206 See AfO 24, 137.
The Tablets

All of the preserved tablets date to the first millennium B.C.E. and appear to be from both Babylonian and Assyrian sources.\textsuperscript{208} The same sigla given to the tablets by Hunger and Pingree has been used in the following list.

\textit{Table - MUL.APIN: Tablets Under Examination}

\begin{tabular}{ll}
\textit{Siglum} & \textit{Museum Number} \\
A & BM86278 \\
B & K13254 \\
C & BM34814+35708 \\
E & AO7540 \\
F & K3852 \\
G & K15929 \\
H & BM76505 \\
J & Rm319 \\
K & BM32311 \\
L & BM45922 \\
M & N1463 \\
N & BM33779 \\
O & K3020 \\
Q & Rm322 \\
R & BM35207 \\
T & BM41218 \\
V & BM33791 \\
W & BM33728 \\
X & BM32626 \\
\end{tabular}

\textsuperscript{208} The following tablets have been inspected: C, H, J, L, R, W and GG. For all of the other tablets the photographs and drawings in the publications have been consulted where possible, or, failing that, the transliteration in the score edition in \textit{AfO 24} has been utilised.
Siglum | Museum Number
---|---
Y | K8598
AA | VAT9429
BB | VAT9435
CC | K11251
DD | ND4405/30
EE | ND5497/22
FF | Rm2,174+313
GG | K6558+Sm1907
JJ | VAT9527

Description of the Sources

A, BM86278

The script is Neo-Babylonian. The colophon states that this is “DUB.1.KAM MUL.APIN [... kūma] labũrišu šatirma bari, “tablet one of MUL.APIN [... according to] its original, written and checked.” The museum registration number suggests that this tablet was excavated from Babylonia in uncontrolled excavations late in the second half of the 19th century. A drawing of the tablet was published in 1912 by L.W. King. Weidner considered this tablet to have been produced in around the third century B.C.E. Little else can be said regarding the provenience of this tablet.

---

For a full description of the sources for MUL.APIN, with information on the various editions and selected bibliography, see *AfO* 24, 4-8. The following description of the sources supplements that in *AfO* 24 with information on script and the possible provenience of the tablets. Where possible a description of the physical properties of the tablets has been supplied.

The colophon is found on the second tablet, col. iv 40-41.


See note below.
B, K13254

This tablet was originally described as a Babylonian fragment of a religious text,213 however the drawing in AfO 24, 165, indicates that the script is Neo-Assyrian. The museum catalogue number suggests that this fragment was excavated at Kuyunjik, though its exact location at that site remains uncertain.

C, BM34814+35708

These two fragments are from a four column tablet, which presumably contained the text of the first tablet of the series. The script is Neo-Babylonian. The writing is crowded and of varying size, with signs ranging from 3mm to 6mm in height. There are no rulings on the tablet, and many of the lines of text do not maintain a consistent horizontal direction. The tablet itself is quite thick, approaching 4cms at its centre. The clay is light red, and terracotta in places, with some signs of impurities. The fragment numbered BM35708 is of a slightly lighter colour than BM34814, which may be an indication that the tablet was fired by Rassam’s team before being shipped from Iraq, or it was otherwise broken in antiquity and each piece burned separately. Against the latter conclusion one may note the relatively even colouring of the individual fragments which is not typical of fragments baked by conflagration.214 The museum catalogue number indicates that this tablet was

213 See the entry in C. Bezold, L.W. King, and E.A.W. Budge, Catalogue, 3.1298.
214 According to S.J. Lieberman, "Canonical and Official Cuneiform Texts," 330, most of the tablets from the archives and libraries at Kuyunjik were unbaked in antiquity other than those that were effectively fired in the conflagration of 612 B.C.E. This does not take into account, however, tablets that have firing holes pressed into their surface so as to avoid cracking during firing (see, for example, the copies of the Venus Tablet K160 and K2321+3032, and a copy of the second tablet of MUL.APIN not examined here,
excavated in what is now southern Iraq by H. Rassam.\textsuperscript{215} This tablet was published by T.G. Pinches.\textsuperscript{216}

E, AO7540+

This tablet, now at the Louvre, originally contained six columns and probably held the entire text of MUL.APIN on the same tablet. Weidner considered this tablet to have been written in the third century B.C.E., judging it to be of a similar period to BM86378 (tablet A).\textsuperscript{217} The script is Neo-Babylonian and quite similar to tablet A in appearance. Another fragment that was originally published in connection with AO7540 (W3376) is now lost.\textsuperscript{218}

\textsuperscript{215} Rassam’s expeditions between 1879 and 1882 were primarily focused in southern Iraq. A significant number of tablets that were acquired by the British Museum at this time came from uncontrolled excavations via local antiquities dealers, for which see J.E. Reade, "Hormuzd Rassam and His Excavations," \textit{Iraq} 55 (1993) 51, and J.E. Reade, "Rassam's Babylonian Collection," xv. According to J.E. Reade, "Rassam's Babylonian Collection," xxvii, British Museum catalogue numbers BM30001-84999 were catalogued before November 1894, and, more specifically, the majority of tablets catalogued as BM33328-77218 are from Rassam’s excavations in Babylonia between 1879 and 1882.


\textsuperscript{217} See E.F. Weidner, "Ein Babylonisches Kompendium Der Himmelskunde," \textit{American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures} 40, 3 (1924) 188.

\textsuperscript{218} See the description in \textit{AfO} 24, 4-5. A photograph of the obverse of W3376 appears in \textit{AfO} 24, pl. XV, but most of the script is illegible due to salt incrustations.
F, K3852

This fragment was originally described as a Babylonian astronomical forecast.\textsuperscript{219} The tablet is more properly considered Neo-Assyrian based on its palaeography. The writing is regular and linear, and some horizontal rulings are visible on the reverse. The museum catalogue designation ‘K’ allows some confidence in assigning the tablet to the excavations at Nineveh, though exactly where at this site it was discovered is not known. The tablet probably contained four columns originally, being a copy of the first tablet in the series.

G, K15929

The tablet is part of the Kuyunjik collection, although the high ascension number does suggest that this tablet may not have been uncovered during Rassam’s excavations.\textsuperscript{220} The script is Neo-Babylonian, as can be seen from the writing of LUGAL in line 3, so if the tablet was discovered at Kuyunjik it may well have been authored by a Babylonian scribe.\textsuperscript{221}

\textsuperscript{219} The description is from C. Bezold, L.W. King, and E.A.W. Budge, \textit{Catalogue}, 2.571.

\textsuperscript{220} As noted in D. Brown, \textit{Mesopotamian Planetary Astronomy-Astrology}, 18, collections were often mixed during the complex process of shipping and cataloguing the tablets in the late 19\textsuperscript{th} and early 20\textsuperscript{th} century, “so that even a ‘K’ number does not guarantee a Kuyunjik origin.”

\textsuperscript{221} Tablets in Neo-Babylonian script at Nineveh may have been the product of Babylonian scribes in the employ of the royal library at Nineveh, or alternatively were acquisitioned by Ashurbanipal from Babylonia in the interests of expanding his collection, taken either consensually or by force (see S. Parpola, "Assyrian Library Records," \textit{JNES} 42, 1 [1983] 4-9).
The tablet originally contained four columns, most likely holding the text of the first tablet of MUL.APIN. The script is Neo-Babylonian, and is written in a small but neat style with signs ranging from 2.5mm to 3.5mm in height. The lines of text are roughly linear, but the horizontal direction of the text tends upwards to the right of the tablet. A horizontal ruling closes the section of the tablet that list the stars of Ea. Other horizontal rulings, only visible in otherwise blank spaces on the tablet, were perhaps guide lines for writing. The bottom edge of the obverse has a ruled margin, and there appears to be at least one ruled line separating the columns on the obverse and on the reverse. The tablet is relatively flat on the obverse and slightly convex on the reverse side. It is of standard thickness, approximately 1.7cm to 2cm thick at the left edge, and approaching 3cm thick at the centre. The clay shows some impurities in the form of dark stones, and there are some fractures in the cross section. The clay appears to have been fired in antiquity, and is typically terracotta tending towards bone coloured throughout, with some greenish tinges in certain areas indicating higher firing temperatures. The tablet was acquired by the British Museum before 1894, as can be judged by its catalogue number, though any other information on its provenience is unknown.

222 The same tendency is noted for K6558+Sm1907 (tablet GG) and K160 (tablet C of the sources for EAE 63). See also the comments in note below.

223 Tablets that display greenish-white colouration were probably baked in antiquity as these colours indicate very hot temperatures. See the comments in (EAE63 note 13).
The division of the text seems to be different in this tablet. The tablet is probably of Ku-
yunjik origin but this is ultimately uncertain. The text is separated into sections by sin-
gle horizontal ruled lines, and columns are separated by a single vertical line on the re-
verse and by a double vertical line in the obverse. The tablet is flat on the obverse and
slightly convex on the reverse, approximately 2cm thick at the edge tending towards 4cm
thick at the centre. The clay is quite free of impurities in the cross-section and the colour
is light terracotta throughout, so the tablet was possibly unfired in antiquity.

The script is Neo-Babylonian. This tablet probably contained four columns, most likely
consisting of the first tablet of MUL.APIN. The left edge has a colophon that proves its
Late Babylonian origin where, after the name and patronymic of the scribe, the text states
“šé-ê-ku šàr,” “Seleucus (is) king.”

The tablet is written in Neo-Babylonian script, and probably comes from Rassam’s exca-
vations in southern Iraq between 1879 and 1882. The signs are approximately 3mm to
4mm in height but the sizing is quite irregular. The tablet originally contained four col-

---

224 Most of the signs on the tablet appear to be Neo-Assyrian, though some signs could be Neo-Babylonian
in style (e.g. KU₆, obv. ii 5; ŠA, passim, appears in both Neo-Assyrian and Neo-Babylonian forms). While
the Rm collection is mostly Assyrian material, there are occasional pieces of Babylonian origin that were
purchased in Baghdad (J.E. Reade, "Rassam's Babylonian Collection," xxviii-xxix). The bulk of the Rm
material is thought to have been extracted from the North and the Southwest Palaces at Nineveh during
Rassam’s excavations between January and May 1878, for which see A.R. George, Gilgamesh, 387.
umns, most likely consisting of the first tablet of MUL.APIN. The preserved fragment is a flake of five lines with part of the top edge preserved. There are no rulings, vertical or horizontal, apparent on the tablet. There may be some impurities in the clay (a hole in the bottom edge may have been created when a stone was displaced). The clay is a light bone colour throughout, so that tablet may have been fired in antiquity.

M, N1463

The museum catalogue number designates this tablet came from excavations at Nimrud. The unusual layout and spacing of the text, and the fact that it is a single column text from a displaced section of MUL.APIN suggests that this could be a school text. The reverse contains a text that is not part of the series.

N, BM33779

The script is Neo-Babylonian. This tablet originally contained four columns, most likely comprising the first tablet of MUL.APIN. The catalogue number suggests that it was excavated at Babylon.225

O, K3020

The tablet was originally catalogued as a Babylonian fragment of astronomical forecasts.226 The script is more properly described as Neo-Assyrian (cf. the form of MUL

225 Tablets with catalogue numbers BM33447 to 33904 arrived at the British Museum on 24th December 1879, having been shipped from Baghdad on 15th October that same year. The only site being excavated at that time was Babylon (see J.E. Reade, "Rassam's Babylonian Collection," xxix).

226 See C. Bezold, L.W. King, and E.A.W. Budge, Catalogue, 2.497.
passim, and GU on obv. ii 11). The tablet is likely to have contained parts of both tablets of MUL.APIN in its four columns.\textsuperscript{227} The catalogue designation ‘K’ indicates that this fragment was excavated from Kuyunjik, though its exact location at that site is unknown.

Q, Rm322

The script is Neo-Babylonian (cf. the form of KA and ITI on obv. iii 11). The catalogue designation Rm indicates that the tablet was part of Rassam’s excavations and acquisitions in 1877-78. While most of the material in the Rm collection is Assyrian in origin there is some material from Babylonia.\textsuperscript{228}

R, BM35207

The script of this tablet is Neo-Babylonian, and the signs are regularly between 4mm to 5mm in height. There is some crowding of the signs between lines 5 and 7. No rulings are visible on the tablet, but the horizontal direction of the text is even. No edges are preserved so nothing can be said regarding margins. Only the obverse of the tablet remains and this indicates that the tablet was over 2.5cm thick at its centre. The clay has only minor impurities and there is some cracking in the surface. The colour is a light terracotta so this tablet appears to have been baked after excavation to enable safe shipping.

T, BM41218

The tablet originally contained four columns of the first tablet of MUL.APIN written in Neo-Babylonian script. Some horizontal rulings separating sections are visible on the ob-

\textsuperscript{227} See the comments in \textit{AfO} 24, 6.

\textsuperscript{228} See note above.
verse and reverse. From the catalogue number it may be assumed that this tablet was excavated from Babylon or Borsippa in late 1880 or early 1881.\textsuperscript{229} If the former, the tablet may have been uncovered at the Ninmah Temple near Babylon’s Ishtar gate. If the latter, the tablet may have come from the Nabu Temple at Borsippa where excavations were conducted in late 1880.\textsuperscript{230}

V, BM33791

This fragment from the obverse of a four column tablet is written in Neo-Babylonian script. Like tablet N above, this tablet was probably from Babylon as this was the only site being worked at the time the tablet was acquired.

W, BM33728

This was most likely originally a four column tablet. The flake from the right edge of the obverse is written in Neo-Babylonian script, as is indicated by the signs DUḪ (line 6), GU₄ and NA (line 12). The signs are typically 4mm to 6mm in height and not always neatly written. There are no ruled margins or horizontal lines visible, and in some places the writing appears to extend beyond the right margin (see line 12 and possibly line 14). The tablet is approximately 1.5cm to 1.8cm thick at its right edge. The clay that remains is quite free of impurities and is a light terracotta colour throughout. From the museum

\textsuperscript{229} Catalogue numbers BM40462 to 41389 were received at the British Museum on the 28\textsuperscript{th} April 1881, and the time that it generally took a shipment to reach the museum after leaving Baghdad was around two months (see J.E. Reade, "Rassam's Babylonian Collection," xxv-xxvi).

\textsuperscript{230} See J.E. Reade, "Rassam's Babylonian Collection," xxi-xxii.
catalogue number it may be assumed that this tablet is from Babylon, for the same reasons as have been stated above in relation to tablet N and tablet V.

X, BM32626

The script appears to be Neo-Babylonian, and in its original state the tablet probably contained four columns of the first tablet of MUL.APIN. Little else can be said regarding the provenience of this fragment. It was presumably acquired by the British Museum before 1894.

Y, K8598

This tablet originally contained only two columns of text. The script appears to be Neo-Babylonian (cf. the form of ITI on obv. 15), and the demarcation ‘K’ suggests that this tablet was excavated at Nineveh (but see note above).

AA, VAT9429

This tablet, now at the Staatliche Museen in Berlin, is written in Neo-Assyrian script.231 AfO 24 does not provide a photograph or drawing of the tablet but some parts were quoted by Weidner.232 The tablet was discovered in Ashur and was originally part of a

---

231 See the comments in AfO 24, 126.

private library that belonged to a family of scribes. The tablet dates to the seventh century B.C.E. 233

BB, VAT9435

Like tablet AA, this tablet is written in Neo-Assyrian script. Some parts of this tablet were previously published by Weidner. 234 Little can be said in regard to its provenience.

CC, K11251

The script is Neo-Assyrian, and the catalogue number indicates this tablet was excavated at Nineveh. The reverse of the tablet, following the name of the scribe, reads: gabari uru TIN.[TIR\\textsuperscript{ki}], “original from Babylon.” 235 This is quite possibly a copy made for Ashurbanipal’s library by an Assyrian scribe who copied an original tablet from the city of Babylon.

233 According to O. Pedersén, Archive and Libraries in the Ancient Near East 1500-300 B.C. (Maryland: CDL Press, 1998) 134, the library was kept in a private house situated close to the main zikkurat in Ashur. Most of the texts from the library date from the seventh century B.C.E. The location of the house in the north-east of the city, close to the Temple of Ashur, makes some connection with the temple library possible according to O. Pedersén, Archives and Libraries in Assur, 2.30-31, or alternatively with another library connected with the prince’s palace built by Sennacherib for Ashur-muballissu (O. Pedersén, Archives and Libraries in Assur, 2.81).

234 E.F. Weidner, Handbuch, 141-42, and KAO 4, 24-25.

235 The colophon is not given in AfO 24. See the drawing in L.W. King, Cuneiform Texts From Babylonian Tablets in the British Museum: Part XXVI (CT 26; London: The British Museum, 1909) pl. 47.
DD, ND4405/30
The fragment is from Nimrud (ancient Kalḫu) and is written in Neo-Assyrian script.236 The tablet originally had four columns containing the first tablet of MUL.APIN. This tablet and tablet EE, also from Nimrud, were probably written between the end of the ninth century B.C.E. and the end of the seventh century B.C.E.237

EE, ND5497/22
This fragment is from Nimrud and is written in Neo-Assyrian script. It is possible that this was a copy of the first tablet in the series which perhaps also included abbreviated portions of the second tablet.238 Like tablet DD it probably pertains to the Temple of Nabû at ancient Kalḫu, being written between the end of the ninth and the late seventh century B.C.E. (see note).

236 The tablet was published in D.J. Wiseman and J. Black, *Cuneiform Texts from Nimrud IV: Literary Texts From the Temple of Nabû* (CTN IV; London: British School of Archaeology in Iraq, 1996) pl. 20.
237 The two tablets from Nimrud, DD and EE, were discovered in a storeroom located across the main courtyard of the Temple of Nabû, E-zida, and so were probably part of a collection related to that temple. The majority of texts from this excavation are written in Assyrian script, and presumably stem from the period of the temple library’s continuous use between 800 B.C.E. and 616 B.C.E. Some movement of texts between Kalḫu and Nineveh is probable (see *CTN IV*, 4-5, and D. Brown, *Mesopotamian Planetary Astronomy-Astrology*, 21). For the colophons of these texts see *CTN IV*, 6 n. 73, and H. Hunger, *Babylonische und Assyrische Kolophone* (Kevelaer: Butson & Bercker, 1968) 293-311.
238 *AfO* 24, 7. For the publication of the text see *CTN IV*, pl. 21.
FF, Rm2,174+313

The tablet is presumably of Assyrian origin as the museum catalogue designation ‘Rm2’ indicates.239 There is a strong possibility that this tablet was discovered in the North Palace at Nineveh, and so was probably written at around the middle of the seventh century B.C.E.240 The fragment Rm2,174 was published by Virolleaud.241

GG K6558+Sm1907

The script is Neo-Assyrian, and although the signs are somewhat crowded along each line there are clear delineations between successive lines of text. The tablet is from Nineveh and was most likely excavated from the Southwestern Palace.242 In its original form the tablet contained six columns that comprised a substantial amount, if not all, of both tablets in the series. Each line tends upward to the right in its horizontal trajectory, so that the beginning of a line is at roughly the same height as the end of the line that follows

---

239 The tablets marked ‘Rm2’ were shipped to the British Museum between 1879 and 1883. The tablets are mostly “Assyrian, apart from strays” (J.E. Reade, "Rassam's Babylonian Collection," xxix). The tablets in this collection were mostly excavated during Rassam’s second expedition to Nineveh in 1878 (see A.R. George, Gilgamesh, 387).

240 D. Brown, Mesopotamian Planetary Astronomy-Astrology, 18-19, notes that around 90% of the tablets in the Rm2 collection were excavated from the North Palace. The construction of the palace was completed in 645 B.C.E., which may serve as an approximate guide for when the tablet was written. There is, of course, no firm evidence for the suggestion that the completion of the palace should inform us as to when a tablet housed there was written. The date does, however, allow for a general approximation of when the tablet was in circulation.


242 According to D. Brown, Mesopotamian Planetary Astronomy-Astrology, 18, the Smith collection in the British Museum, designated ‘Sm’ in the catalogue, is almost entirely from the Southwestern palace at Nineveh. George Smith excavated tablets from this collection during his second expedition to Nineveh in 1874 (see A.R. George, Gilgamesh, 386-87).
it.\textsuperscript{243} No inter-columnar rulings are preserved but there are parts of a top ruled margin and lower right ruled margin. The clay has visible impurities in the cross section and, from the brittle and crumbling nature of the tablet, appears to be unbaked.\textsuperscript{244}

JJ, VAT9527

The script is Neo-Assyrian, and the tablet was apparently found in a private house in Ashur. The tablet probably dates to the seventh century B.C.E. and was part of the private collection of a family of scribes. This family may have had some connected with the Ashur temple or the palace at Ashur.\textsuperscript{245} The tablet originally held six columns and comprised the entire text of MUL.APIN.

Table - Number of SU Preserved in the MUL.APIN Tablets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fragment</th>
<th>Total SU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>73.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>49.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>229.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>30.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>117.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>135.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>190.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{243} This is certainly not a sign of imperfection in scribal execution. The same effect can be seen in such skilfully executed texts as the Taylor prism.

\textsuperscript{244} I owe this observation to M. Sigrist, private conversation.

\textsuperscript{245} H. Hunger, "Zwei Tafeln des Astronomischen Textes MUL.APIN im Vorderasiatischen Museum zu Berlin," Forschungen und Berichte 22 (1982) 127, connects this tablet with the same find-site as discussed for tablet AA (see note above).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fragment</th>
<th>Total SU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>58.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>133.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>69.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB</td>
<td>141.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DD</td>
<td>102.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FF</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GG</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following table gives the total number of SU and the total count of variant forms for each set of two parallel tablets preserving at least 50 SU in common. Following this table is an exhaustive list of all variant readings between any two known sources for the first tablet in the series MUL.APIN that overlap in content, regardless of the amount of overlapping text preserved. Although every variant is given in the list, the discussion of the variants will refer in the main only to those texts preserving at least 50 SU in parallel listed in the table. This is done so that only those texts that are preserved in sufficient proportions to be statistically reliable are brought into the main discussion. Variant readings in the parallel sources that are less fully preserved may be referred to periodically, but will not be made to bear any of the statistical argument put forward regarding types and frequencies of variants.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text vs Text</th>
<th>TOTAL PLL</th>
<th>Orth. Variant</th>
<th>Proportion: SU per Orth. Variant</th>
<th>Orth. Variant (linguistic)</th>
<th>Proportion: SU per Orth. (l) Variant</th>
<th>Proportion: SU per St. (1) Variant</th>
<th>Stylistic (Type 1) Variants</th>
<th>Proportion: SU per St. (2) Variant</th>
<th>Stylistic (Type 2) Variants</th>
<th>Proportion: SU per St. (3) Variant</th>
<th>Stylistic (Type 3) Variants</th>
<th>Hermeneutic Variants</th>
<th>Proportion: SU per Her. Variant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A:AA</td>
<td>489.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A:BB</td>
<td>226.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA:BB</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A:FF</td>
<td>191.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA:DD</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A:EE</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A:K</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A:T</td>
<td>145.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A:H</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A:C</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A:Y</td>
<td>133</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A:DD</td>
<td>116.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T:EE</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB:DD</td>
<td>105.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C:AA</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A:X</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A:J</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A:N</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X:AA</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y:AA</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J:K</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A:F</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A:GG</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C:X</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A:M</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M:N</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
List of Variants Between the Parallel Sources for MUL.APIN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Tablets</th>
<th>Variant Text</th>
<th>Categorisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M1</td>
<td>AA i 1</td>
<td>DIŠ mul APIN</td>
<td>SV(1) – The preposition determinative DIŠ, preceding clauses or proper nouns, is lacking in CC.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CC 1</td>
<td>mul [</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2</td>
<td>B 1</td>
<td>mul Giš APIN</td>
<td>OV – The preposition determinative GIŠ, preceding wooden objects, is lacking in AA and DD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AA i 1</td>
<td>mul APIN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DD 1</td>
<td>mul APIN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M3</td>
<td>A i 1</td>
<td>pa-ni</td>
<td>OV – The phonetic spelling in A appears as a logogram in the parallel sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B 1</td>
<td>IGI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AA i 1</td>
<td>IGI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BB 1</td>
<td>IGI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DD 1</td>
<td>IGI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M4</td>
<td>AA i 2</td>
<td>DIŠ mul UR.BAR.RA</td>
<td>SV(1) – The preposition determinative DIŠ is lacking in BB and CC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BB 2</td>
<td>mul UR.BAR.RA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CC 2</td>
<td>mul UR.BAR[</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M5</td>
<td>A i 2</td>
<td>giš NINDA</td>
<td>OV – The preposition determinative GIŠ is lacking in BB.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B 2</td>
<td>giš NINDA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AA i 2</td>
<td>giš NINDA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BB 2</td>
<td>NINDA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M6</td>
<td>A i 2</td>
<td>ša mul APIN</td>
<td>SV(1) – The relative pronoun ša is lacking in BB.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AA i 2</td>
<td>ša mul APIN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BB 2</td>
<td>mul APIN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M7</td>
<td>AA i 3</td>
<td>DIŠ mul ŠU.IGI</td>
<td>SV(1) – The preposition determinative DIŠ is lacking in BB and CC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BB 3</td>
<td>mul ŠU.IGI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CC 3</td>
<td>mul ŠU[</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DD 3</td>
<td>DIŠ mul ŠU.IGI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M8</td>
<td>AA i 3</td>
<td>GÂM</td>
<td>Not Counted – The sign is uncertain</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

246 The general rule followed in this study is that if a determinative is lacking in one document and present in another it is counted as an orthographic variant. See, for example, the spelling with or without the preposition determinative DINGIR at V40 et passim. There the parallel sources refer to the same noun, so the difference is clearly orthographic. In the present case, though, whether or not a scribe wrote the sign DIŠ at the beginning of consecutive lines on the tablet is rather a matter of stylistic convention.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Seite 113</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| BB 4 | "giš" GÀM |
| CC 4 | G[ÀM |
| DD 3 | GÀM |

**M9**

| AA i 4 | d GAM.LUM |
| BB 4 | ]Ga [ |

OV – The proper name Gamlum is written differently in BB.

**M10**

| AA i 5 | DIŠ mul |
| BB 7 | mul |
| CC 6 | |

SV(1) – The preposition determinative DIŠ is lacking in BB and CC.

**M11**

| AA i 5 | MAŠ.TAB.BA.GAL.GAL |
| BB 5 | ]BA.GAL.GAL.LA |
| AA i 4 | MAŠ.TAB.BA.GAL.GAL |
| BB 5 | MAŠ.TAB.BA.GAL.GAL |
| DD 4 | MAŠ.TAB.BA.GAL.GAL.LA |

OV – A, AA and BB have the short spelling for Tū’amū rabûtu, “the Great Twins,” against the longer spelling in B and DD.

**M12**

| AA i 5 | d Lugal-gir-ra u dMes-lam-ta-è-a |
| BB 6 | d Lugal[ ] u dMes-lam-ta-è[a |
| DD 4 | d Lugal-gir-ra u d |

OV – A has the conjunction between the proper nouns Lugalgirra and Me-slantecae written with Ù, against Ù in B, BB and DD.

**M13**

| AA i 5 | d Lugal-gir-ra u dMes-lam-ta-è-a |
| BB 6 | d Lugal[ ] u dMes-lam-ta-è[a |
| DD 4 | d Lugal-gir-ra u d |

SV(1) – The conjunction between the proper nouns Lugalgirra and Me-slantecae is lacking in AA.

**M14**

| AA i 5 | DIŠ mul |
| BB 7 | mul |
| CC 6 | mul |

SV(1) – AA has the preposition determinative DIŠ, lacking in BB and CC.

---

247 *AFO* 24 19 has “̄gš” GÀM.”

248 The form GAL.GAL.LA is a variant spelling of GAL.GAL, rabûtu, “great,” see *CAD* R 16. The variant form “MAŠ.TAB.BA.GAL.GAL.LA” appears in a Neo-Babylonian list of divine and astronomical names from Birs Nimroud (Borsippa) published in *RawlCu* 5 46 I 4a.
The spelling of the star name Alummuš varies in AA compared to the other sources.\textsuperscript{249}

A spells the conjunction with the sign U, whereas this is written with the sign Ú in B, BB and DD.

Not Counted – The text appears to vary between the three preserved sources, but is only certain in A.\textsuperscript{250}

SV(1) – The preposition determinative DIŠ is lacking in BB and CC.

SV(1) – The preposition determinative DIŠ is lacking in BB, CC and DD.

OV – AA and BB have the spelling CVC, against CV-VC in A.

SV(1) – The preposition determinative DIŠ is lacking in BB and CC.

OV – The relative pronoun ša is written with the sign ŠA in AA, against ŠA in BB.

\textsuperscript{249} The rare spelling for the divine name Alummuš in AA, “dMÙŠ.LÀL,” is also found in RawlCu 5 46 I 6b, and H. Zimmern, Beitraege zur Kenntnis der babylonischen Religion: Die Beschwoerungstafeln Šurpu, Ritualtafeln fuer der Wahrsager, Beschwoerer und Saenger (Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1901), VIII 25.

\textsuperscript{250} See AfO 24 125. RawlCu 5 46 I 6 has the same spelling as A.
M23  A i 9  mul LUGAL  
    C i 2  mú LUGAL  
    AA i 8  mul LUGAL  
    BB 12  mú LUGAL  
    DD 7  múl

OV – The preposition determinative for kakkabu, “star,” is written with the sign MÚL in C, against MUL in the other sources.

M24  AA i 9  DIŠ MUL  
      BB 13  MUL  
      CC 10  MJUL

SV(1) – The preposition determinative DIŠ is lacking in BB and CC.

M25  AA i 9  MUL  
      BB 13  MUL meš

OV – AA has an unmarked plural, kakkabû, “star,” marked as plural with MEŠ in BB.

M26  A i 10  lu-tum  
    AA i 9  um-mu-lu-tum  
    BB 13  um-mu-lu-tu  
    DD 8  mú-lu-tú

OV – A and AA preserve mimation, lacking in BB and DD.

M27  E i 1  GUB-zu  
    AA i 9  GUB-zu  
    BB 14  GUB meš  
    DD 8  GUB-zu

OV – BB marks the plural verb izzazzû with the sign MEŠ, lacking in the other sources.

251 AA has the plural adjective “um-mu-lu-tum,” “faint, dusky” attached to the noun MUL so there can be little doubt that the noun is also plural. The singular noun would require the singular adjective ummulum – see J. Huehnergard, *A Grammar of Akkadian* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2005) 24.

252 BB and DD also differ from each other in the spelling of the final syllable. On the loss of mimation see J. Huehnergard, *Grammar*, 258-59, and 596.

253 The verb is marked as plural in BB and with a phonetic complement in the other sources. The phonetic complement “-zu” in E, AA, and DD evidently marks the long final vowel of the plural verb izzazzû because, at least in AA and DD, the adjective describing the subject is clearly plural (see also M63 and compare M66). The form “GUB-zu” is singular in A i 35 (M68), but compare the singular forms “GUB” in BB (M68) and “GUB-iz” in EE (M72). Also has a phonetic complement for the plural form “GUB meš-zu” in A i 33 (M66) and A ii 25 (M109). E and DD preserve the verb but not the adjective, and both are in agreement with AA. On the reading of the root as *zwa*, “to stand,” see J. Huehnergard, “izzazzum and itišum,” *Riches Hidden in Secret Places: Ancient Near Eastern Studies in Memory of Thorkild Jacobsen* (ed. A. Abusch; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2002) 162.
M28  AA  i  9-  
   10  GUB-zu (10) sis-sin-nu  
   BB  14  GUB meš si-si-nu sis-si-nu  

SV(2) – BB has a gloss following the proper noun Sissinu.  

254 According to CAD S 325-26 the proper noun Sissinu, the constellation Coma Berenices, is frequently accompanied by the gloss sisinu meaning “date frond, spadix.” Only BB supplies glosses for this name and for the name of the city deity Eru (see M29).

M29  A  i  11  
   C  i  3  dE₄-ru₆  
   AA  i  10  dE₄-ru₆  
   BB  15  dE₄-ru₆ e-ru  

SV(2) – BB has a gloss following the proper noun Eru.  

255 The close association of both names that are glossed in BB is indicated by the astronomical text published in LBAT 1510 11, which reads “E₄-ru₆... sis-sin-nu ina qaṭ,” “Eru ... date frond in hand.”

M30  AA  i  11  
   BB  16  DIŠ mul 

SV(1) – The preposition determinative DIŠ is lacking in BB.

M31  A  i  12  
   AA  i  11  dEn-lil 
   BB  16  dBE  
   DD  9  dEn-lil  

OV – A, AA and DD preserve the usual spelling for Enlil, while BB has the abbreviated form.


M32  A  i  12  
   C  i  5  i-ši[m]-me  
   E  i  3  šim-me  
   AA  i  11  i-šim-ma  
   BB  16  i-šim-mu  

OV(1) – Different inflected verbal ending.

257 A and BB share the same spelling of the present future verb išemme, “to fix, decree.” AA has a spelling with final /a/, unattested in the parallel sources, while C and E reflect the expected ‘i’ theme vowel. For the verbal root šāmu, “to fix, decree,” see CAD Š 1 362.

M33  AA  i  12  
   BB  17  DIŠ mul 

SV(1) - The preposition determinative DIŠ is lacking in BB.

M34  AA  i  12  
   BB  17  IGI-šu  
   DD  10  IGI-šu  

OV – The pronominal object suffix is written with the sign ŠÚ in AA and DD.
M35  A i 13  mul Hé-gal-a-a
    C i 6  mul Hé-gal-a-a-
    E i 4  ]-a
    AA i 12  mul Hé-gal-a-a-ú
    BB 17  ]-gal-a-a
    DD 10  mul Hé-gal-a-a

O V(1) – Possible difference in pronunciation.\(^{258}\)

M36  AA i 13  DIŠ mul
    BB 19  mul

S V(1) - The preposition determinative DIŠ is lacking in BB.

M37  AA i 13  šá
    BB 19  ša

O V – The relative pronoun ša is written with the sign ŠÁ in AA against ŠA in BB.

M38  AA i 13  šá EGIR-šú
    BB 19  ša ina [ 
    DD 11  ] EGIR-šú

S V(1) – BB has an extra preposition ina which is lacking in AA. DD is broken and so uncertain.

M39  AA i 14  DIŠ mul
    BB 21  mul

S V(1) - The preposition determinative DIŠ is lacking in BB.

M40  A i 15  DIŠ mul
    BB 22  mul

S V(1) – The preposition determinative DIŠ is lacking in BB.

M41  A i 16  za-ri-i
    AA i 15  za-ri-i
    DD 13  za-ri-e

O V(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.\(^{259}\)

M42  A i 16  MAR.GÍ.D.DA
    AA i 15  mul MAR.GÍ.D.DA

O V – The preposition determinative MUL is lacking in A.

M43  C i 9  mul
    AA i 16  DIŠ mul
    BB 23  mul

S V(1) - The preposition determinative DIŠ is lacking in C and BB.

\(^{258}\) AA has a different spelling for the final vowel of the proper noun Hégala, “the Abundant One.” A, C, E and BB all have final /a/ while DD is uncertain. The final /a/ vowel in A, C, E, and BB could represent a difference in case however the only meaningful reading of the text is to treat the proper noun as nominative.

\(^{259}\) A and AA have zarî, “cart pole,” with final /i/ against the spelling with final /e/ in DD.
M44 A i 18  
C i 11  
AA i 17  
\textsuperscript{d} A-a

OV – The preposition determinative DINGIR is lacking in C.

M45 A i 19  
AA i 18  
DD 15  
\textsuperscript{d} A-num

OV – AA has a longer spelling for the proper noun Anum.

M46 A i 19  
AA i 18  
\textsuperscript{d} GAL-ú

OV – The phonetic complement for rabû, “great,” is written differently in A and AA.

M47 A i 20  
F 2  
AA i 19  
BB 26  
\textsuperscript{d} DIŠ mul

SV(1) – The preposition determinative DIŠ is lacking in BB.

M48 A i 21  
F 3  
AA i 20  
BB 27  
\textsuperscript{d} DIŠ mul

SV(1) – The preposition determinative DIŠ is lacking in BB.

M49 A i 21  
AA i 20  
BB 28  
DD 17  
\textsuperscript{mul} IBILA.É.MAH

OV – The preposition determinative MUL is lacking in DD.\textsuperscript{260}

M50 A i 22  
F 4  
AA i 21  
\textsuperscript{d} DUMU reš-tu-ú

SV(2) – AA has the preposition determinative MUL, lacking in A and F.\textsuperscript{261}

M51 A i 22  
AA i 21  
\textsuperscript{d} A-nu-um

OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.

M52 A i 23  
F 5  
BB 30  
\textsuperscript{d} DIŠ mul

SV(1) – The preposition determinative DIŠ is lacking in BB.

\textsuperscript{260} The apparent metathesis of the signs MAḪ and Ė in DD is broken and therefore uncertain. The signs are reads as follows: IBILA (=DUMU), apla, “heir, (eldest) son;” Ė, bitu, “house, temple;” and MAḪ, širu, “eminent, sublime” (see CAD § 210) thus rendering the name “Heir of the Sublime Temple.”

\textsuperscript{261} This is read as a gloss that defines the phrase māru reštu as a proper noun referring to an astronomical body. For examples of similar glosses lacking in the parallel sources see M132 and M299.
| M53 | A i 23 | mul. | DIŠ | SV(1) – The preposition determinative DIŠ is lacking in A, AA and BB. This is probably because only F begins a new line at this point. |
| M54 | A i 23 | mul | DINGIR.TUŠ.A | OV – The preposition determinative MUL is lacking in AA. |
| M55 | A i 23 | mul | DINGIR.TUŠ.A | SV(1) – Difference in number. |
| M56 | A i 24 | mul | DINGIR.TUŠ.A | SV(1) – The preposition determinative DIŠ is lacking in BB. |
| M57 | A i 24 | d | Gu-la | SV(1) – A and AA have different names for the same deity. |
| M58 | A i 25 | mul | DINGIR.TUŠ.A | SV(1) – The preposition determinative DIŠ is lacking in BB. |
| M59 | A i 26 | mul | DINGIR.TUŠ.A | SV(1) – The preposition determinative DIŠ is lacking in BB. |

---

262 AA has the singular dingirtušu, “the sitting god,” written as a plural in the other sources. A difference in number here is suggested by the fact that AA has the title dingirgubbû, “the standing gods,” spelled with the plural marker MEŠ in the same line.

263 According to J. Black and A. Green, Gods, Demons, and Symbols of Ancient Mesopotamia: An Illustrated Dictionary (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2003) 101, Ninkarrak and Gula are both to be identified with the cognomen Nirisina, “The Lady of Isin.” See also G. Leick, A Dictionary of Ancient Near Eastern Mythology (London: Routledge, 1997) 132–33. Another appellation, Bau, appears alongside the name Gula in RawlCu 5 46 I 17. Different divine names may reflect different understandings as to which deity was associated with a given astral body. We may presume here that the body being referred to remains the same although the associated deity may vary. For an analogous terrestrial situation concerning the relationship between Bau and Ningirsu see W. Heimpel, "The Lady of Girsu," Riches Hidden in Secret Places: Ancient Near Eastern Studies in Memory of Thorkild Jacobsen (ed. A. Abusch; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2002) 158-60.
| M60  | A i 26  | né-bu-ù  | OV – AA has the sign U for the final vowel, written as Ú in A and BB.  
|      | AA i 25 | né-bu-u  | 
|      | BB 34   | né-bu-ù  |
| M61  | A i 27  | DIŠ 2    | SV(1) – The preposition determinative DIŠ is lacking in BB. 
| F 10 | DIŠ 2   | 2        |
|      | BB 36   | 2        |
| M62  | A i 27  | šá       | OV – The relative particle ša is written with the sign ŠA in BB, against ŠÁ in A and AA. 
| AA i 26 | šá     |          |
| BB 36 | ša      |          |
| M63  | A i 27  | GUB meš-zu | OV – The plural marker in AA and EE is lacking although the beginning of the line clearly requires a plural noun in all sources.  
| AA i 26 | GUB-z[u] |          |
| EE i 3 | GU]B-zu |          |
| M64  | A i 32  | DIŠ mul  | SV(1) – The preposition determinative DIŠ is lacking in BB.  
|      | BB 44   | mul      |
| M65  | A i 32  | um-mu-lu-tu₄ | OV – A and T spell the final syllable with the sign TU₄, written as TU in EE. BB is broken and therefore uncertain.  
| T i 6 | m]u-lu-tu₄ |          |
|      | BB 44   | um-mu-lu-[u] |          |
|      | EE i 10 | ]mu-lu-tu |          |
| M66  | A i 33  | GUB meš-zu | SV(1) – A and BB have the plural marker MEŠ for izzazzū, “they are positioned,” referring to multiple jects, while T lacks the plural marker. The context seems to require that T refers to the constellation in the singular.  
|      | T i 6   | GUB-zu    |          |
|      | BB 45   | GUB meš   |          |

---

264 Most of the line is preserved in A, F, and BB, which read: “(DIŠ) 2 MUL (meš) šá EGIR-šú GUB (meš)-zu ...,” 2 kakkabu ša arkiša izzazzū ..., “Two stars that are positioned after it ...” The reading of the form “GUB-zu” as the plural verb izzazzū is therefore certain. On the function of the phonetic complement “-zu” to mark the plural verb izzazzū see note above.

265 T may refer to multiple subjects with a defective plural as was read in M27. However, the broken context of T makes it impossible to determine if there are in reality several subjects mentioned in this source. The possibility remains that T refers to the constellation Manzūt, “the Rainbow,” in the singular even though it is likely that the reference is to the three stars Andromedae 18, 32 and δ (31).
M67  A i 33  GUB \textsuperscript{meš} zu  
BB 45  GUB \textsuperscript{meš}  
OV – A has the phonetic complement “-zu,” lacking in BB.  \cite{note1}

A i 34  DIŠ \textsuperscript{mul}  
BB 46  mul  
SV(1) – The preposition determinative DIŠ is lacking in BB.

M68  A i 35  GUB-zu  
T i 8  GUB-zu  
BB 47  GUB  
EE i 13  z\textupsilon  
OV – A, T and EE have the phonetic complement “-zu” for izzazzu, lacking in BB.

M69  A i 36  MUL \textsuperscript{meš} šu-ut \textsuperscript{d} En-líl  
T i 9  \textsuperscript{meš} šu-ut \textsuperscript{d} En-líl  
EE i 14  MUL \textsuperscript{meš} šu-ut 50  
SV(2) – A and T have an expansive plus.  \cite{note2}

M70  A i 36  ug-dam-mi-ru-ni  
T i 9  ug-dam-mi-ru[  
EE i 14  ug-da-me-ru-ni  
OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.

M71  A i 37  MUL GAL UD.DA-su  
EE i 15  MU\textsc{L} GAL ú UD.DA-su  
SV(1) – The conjunction between the words \textit{kakkabu rabû}, “a great star,” and \textit{še\textsc{s}su}, “its light,” is lacking in A.

M72  A i 37  GUB-zu  
T i 10  GUB-ma  
EE i 16  GUB-iz  
FF i 1  GU\textsc{B}-m[a  
OV – A, T and EE use different signs to write the phonetic complement, while FF lacks the phonetic complement entirely.

M73  A i 37  GUB-zu  
T i 10  GUB-ma  
EE i 16  GUB-iz  
FF i 1  GU\textsc{B}-m[a  
SV(1) – T and FF preserve the emphatic particle “-ma,” lacking in A and EE.

M74  A i 37  né-bi-ri  
EE i 17  \textsuperscript{d} né-be-ru  
OV – A lacks the preposition determinative DINGIR in the divine title for the star of Marduk, \textit{Nēberu}, “the Ford.”

\textsuperscript{266} In light of Rule 3 this variant is only counted between A and BB. A minor stylistic variation, SV(1), is counted for the same semogenic unit between T and BB (M66).

\textsuperscript{267} A and T have “the stars of Enlil,” where EE has “the fifty stars.” Each source records fifty stars up to this point, so the reference to “stars of Enlil” is taken as a plus. This description is essentially arbitrary, and it remains equally possible that the reading in A and T may be original.
M75 A i 37 né-bi-ri
   EE i 17 d né-be-ru

OV(I) – A and EE have different spellings for the title Nēberu.268

M76 A i 38 KÚR.KÚR-ir
   T i 11 KÚR.KÚR-ma
   EE i 18 KÚR.KÚR-ir

OV – T lacks the phonetic complement “-ir” present in A and EE.

M77 A i 38 KÚR.KÚR-ir
   T i 11 KÚR.KÚR-ma
   EE i 18 KÚR.KÚR-ir

SV(1) – T has the emphatic particle “-ma,” lacking in A and EE.

M78 A i 40 IGI
   T i 13 IGI
   EE i 22 pa-an

OV – The logogram in A and T is written fully in EE.

M79 A i 40 MUL meš
   T i 13 MUL
   EE i 22 MUL meš

SV(1) – Difference in number.269

M80 A i 43 ḫū ḤUN.GÁ
   T i 16 ḤUN.GÁ
   FF i 7 ḫū ḤUN.GÁ

OV – The preposition determinative LÚ, denoting a professional office, is lacking in T.

M81 A ii 1 d is l[e
   FF i 9 is le-e

OV – The title is lé appears without the preposition determinative

268 The difference in final vowels could represent a grammatical variation, although the more likely explanation is that this is a simple orthographic variant. The full title in A is “MUL d AMAR.UD ḫū né-bi-ri/u,” kakkab Marduk Nēberi, “the star Marduk of the Ford.” EE has the preposition determinative DINGIR preceding the second noun, probably indicating a separate title that is not bound to the first noun Marduk. Thus in EE the two titles are both independent and nominative. Indeed, the name Nēberu appears independently as “nē-bi-rū” in two other astronomical lists, CT 26 41 v 1, and CT 26 44 ii 12. For a similar variation in the case vowel on a proper noun see M91 below.

269 The plural marker MEŠ is lacking in T, denoting a singular noun, while A and EE have the plural noun marked with MEŠ. The plural noun in A and EE refers to the kakkab šat Anu, “the stars of Anu.” The reading of the singular in T is similar to the singular noun that refers to multiple stars in the constellation Manzāt (see V66 and note ).
M82  G 1  \([^d] A\text{-nim} \ u[^d] I[NNIN]\)  
FF i 10  \(^d\) A-nim INNIN  
DINGIR in FF.  
SV(1) – The conjunction “u” is lacking between the divine names Anu and Ištar in FF.

M83  G 1  \[^d\] I[NNIN]\)  
FF i 10  INNIN  
OV – The preposition determinative DINGIR is lacking before the divine name Ištar in FF.

M84  A ii 4  \(GUB^\text{meš}_{-zu}\)  
FF i 11  GUB-zu  
OV – A has the plural marker MEŠ following the logogram GUB, zazzū. This is written without the plural marker MEŠ in FF.

M85  A ii 4  \(^d\) LÛ.LÂL \ u[^d] L[a\)  
FF i 12  \(^d\) LÛ.LÂL \(^d\) La-ta-rak  
SV(1) – A has a conjunction between the proper nouns Lulal and Latarak, lacking in FF.

M86  G 2  \(^d\) La-ta-ra-ak  
FF i 12  \(^d\) La-ta-rak  
OV – The proper noun Latarak is written differently in G and FF.

M87  G 3  \(^m\) DAR.LUGAL  
FF i 13  \(^m\) DAR.LUGAL  
SV(1) – The prepositionative attached to the proper noun Tar-lugalla is MUL in FF against DINGIR in G.

M88  G 4  \(^d\) MAŠ  
OV – The proper noun Ninurta ap-

---

270 According to CAD I/J 188 the name “\(^d\) is le-e” refers to the constellation Haydes, the “Jaw of the Bull” (the “Bull” being the constellation Taurus). Other possible readings are “\(^d\) LI,” burāšu, meaning “juniper;” and \(^d\) lē’u, “writing board,” which appears as “\(^d\) le9-e” in E. Ebeling, *Literarische Keilschrifttexte aus Assur* (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1953) 113 r.3 (cf. CAD L 156). However it is most likely that the lack of the preposition determinative DINGIR is simply an orthographic variation.

271 The spelling in FF is probably a defective plural, but this is problematic given that the subject is unclear. The subject in A is “Lulal u Latarak,” clearly two proper nouns requiring a plural in the predicate. FF has Lulal Latarak without the conjunction, leaving the number of subjects ambiguous. However, the occurrence of the preposition determinative DINGIR preceding each of the proper nouns in FF suggests that two individual names are intended, and so the agreement of FF with A seems most probable.

272 See also M132 for the interchange of the determinatives DINGIR and MUL preceding proper nouns. It is otherwise possible that the proper noun in G had both the determinatives MUL and DINGIR attached (cf. M150 and M167) but based on the space immediately preceding the sign DINGIR in G the former possibility seems more likely.
Hi 1 uırta
FF i 14 d Nin-urta

M89 A ii 7 d Iš-tar NIM.MA-tu4 OV – The divine title Ištar Elamatu appears as a logogram in G.
K ii 1 ]el-la-ma-tu
FF i 15 d Iš-tar NIM.MA-tu4

M90 A ii 8 EN er-še-tu4 OV – The divine title bēl erṣet, appears as a logogram in G, K and FF.
G 6 EN KI-ti
H i 3 ]tu4
K ii 2 EN KI[
FF i 16 EN KI-ti

M91 A ii 9 a-ri-bu MUL d Adad OV(l) – The title Aribu kakkab Adad appears as Aribi kakkab Adad in K.273
K ii 3 a-ri-bi MUL d Adad

M92 A ii 10 d Ša-la šu-bu-ul-tu4 OV – The preposition determinative DINGIR is lacking in A.
K ii 4 d Ša-la d Šu-bu-lá

M93 A ii 10 šu-bu-ul-tu4 OV(l) – The proper noun Šala šubultu appears with the accusative case ending in K, Šala Šubula.274
G 8 ]šu-bu-lu-tu4
J i 1 ]tu4
K ii 4 d Šu-bu-lá

M94 A ii 12 mul TI8 mušen OV – The preposition determinative MUL appears as MUL in K.
K ii 5 múl TI8 mušen

M95 A ii 13 KÚR. KÚR-ir
K ii 6 KÚR. KÚR-ir-ma SV(1) – The emphatic particle “ma’ is lacking in A.

M96 A ii 14 KÚR. KÚR-ir
J i 5 ]ir-ma
K ii 7 KÚR. KÚR-ir-ma SV(1) – The emphatic particle “ma” is lacking in A.

M97 A ii 15 KÚR. KÚR-ir

---

273 Of the five sources for this line only A and K preserve the nomen regens. According to H. Hunger and D. Pingree, AfO 24, 127, it is possible that this form is a gloss to mul UGA mušen.

274 Šubultu is a cognomen for Šala, meaning “the ear of corn.” The deity Šala is associated with the constellation Virgo. According to RLA 3 77 in the Seleucid period Virgo was, under Greek influence, depicted as a young woman holding an ear of corn. It might be suggested that the feminine appellation šubultu in A may have some relation to this, even though that tablet is from the Neo-Babylonian period. K, which bears a colophon attributing it to the Seleucid period, has the variant form Šubula that apparently lacks the feminine reference.
M98  A ii 16  MU.NI  
K ii 9  MU-šû  
OV – A writes the possessive pro-
nominal suffix as the logogram NI,
written phonetically with the sign ŠÚ
in K.

M99  A ii 16  lu  
J i 7  lu  
K ii 9  lu-ú  
OV – A and J have the short spelling
for the precative particle lū, while K
has the full spelling.

M100  A ii 16  d ŠTE  
J i 7  d ŠTE  
K ii 9  d ŠTE A  
OV – The full composite logogram
for šīt Šamši, “east,” is apocopated in
A and J.

M101  A ii 17  lu  
K ii 9  lu-ú  
OV – A has the short spelling for the
precative particle lū, while K has the
full spelling.

M102  A ii 17  IGLÁ-ma  
J i 8  m[a]  
K ii 9  IGLÁ  
SV(1) – The emphatic particle “-ma”
is lacking in K.

M103  A ii 19  MUL  
J i 10  meš  
K ii 11  MJUL  
OV – The plural kakkabû is written
without the plural marker MEŠ in
K.275

M104  A ii 19  d É-a  
J i 10  d BE  
K ii 11  d É-a  
AA ii 4  d É-a  
OV – A, K and AA have the syllabic
spelling for the proper noun Ea.276

M105  A ii 20  MUL  
X ii 3  DIŠ MUL  
AA ii 5  [MJUL]  
SV(1) – The preposition DIŠ is lack-
ing in A and AA.

M106  A ii 23  d A.É  
OV – The preposition determinative

---

275 It is possible that the form in K is singular and therefore represents a difference in grammatical number. However, the more likely reading is that K has a defective plural form. This reading understands the form šūt that follows in each source as a masculine plural demonstrative pronoun “… Ea, who goes before those stars,” rather than as a singular masculine pronoun “… Ea, who goes before his star.” In the context the second reading is difficult, and subsequently the reading of an orthographic variant is preferred.

276 J has the syllabic spelling for Ea in the next line.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Textual Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AA ii 8</td>
<td>DUMU[ DINGIR is lacking from the proper noun Mār-biti in AA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M107 A ii 24</td>
<td>lib-bi-šû</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K ii 14</td>
<td>lib-šu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA ii 9</td>
<td>lib-šu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M108 A ii 25</td>
<td>DIŠ 2 MUL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C ii 6</td>
<td>DIŠ 2 MUL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X ii 7</td>
<td>DIŠ 2 MUL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y 6</td>
<td>2 MUL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA ii 10</td>
<td>DIŠ 2 MUL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M109 A ii 25</td>
<td>GUB me-zu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X ii 7</td>
<td>GUB-zu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA ii 10</td>
<td>GUB-zu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M110 A ii 25</td>
<td>Šullat u Ḫaniš</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J i 16</td>
<td>Šullat u Ḫaniš</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA ii 10</td>
<td>Šullat Ḫaniš</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M111 A ii 27</td>
<td>ŠÚ meš</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J i 17</td>
<td>ŠÚ-û</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA ii 12</td>
<td>ŠÚ-bi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M112 A ii 31</td>
<td>GUB meš-zu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H ii 1</td>
<td>GUB meš-zu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA ii 16</td>
<td>GUB-zu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

277 It is clear that the subject “DIŠ 2 MUL,” “two stars,” is plural in all of the sources, and so the verb izzazzû, “to stand,” should be read as a defective plural in X. See also note above.

278 H. Hunger and D. Pingree, *AfO* 24, 127, reads the variation in A as a scribal error. Hunger also points to the alternative possibility that A could preserve a durative Gtn verbal form where “ŠÚ meš” is read as irtanabbî, “it repeatedly sets.” One can also read the same grammatical form as ingressive “it will come to set.” AA might agree with this reading as indicated by the phonetic complement “-bi,” but J seems to require a final “u” vowel instead. Despite the difficulties in determining the correct form of the verb the evidence suggests there is a grammatical difference between the sources.

279 The verb “GUB-zu” in AA clearly refers to a plural subject eventhough it lacks the plural marker MEŠ: “2 kakkabû (DIŠ 2 MUL) ša ina ziqit Zuqaqîpi izzazzû (GUB-zu),” “two stars that are positioned in the tail of the Scorpion.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M113</td>
<td>A ii 32 MUL</td>
<td>SV(1) – Difference in number.\textsuperscript{280}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y 12</td>
<td>MUL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA ii 17 MUL meš</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M114</td>
<td>A ii 33 EGIS-šu-nu</td>
<td>Not Counted – The sign MEŠ is uncertain in AA.\textsuperscript{281}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA ii 17 EGIS meš (?)-šu-nu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M115</td>
<td>A ii 34 mul MÁ.GUR₈ u mul SUḪUR.MÁŠ ku₆</td>
<td>SV(1) – The conjunction between the proper nouns Makurru and Suḫurmāšu is lacking in AA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA ii 18 mul MÁ.GUR₈ mul SUḪUR.MÁŠ ku₆</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M116</td>
<td>A ii 40 u mul MAŠ.TAB.BA.GAL.GAL</td>
<td>SV(1) – The conjunction is lacking between the proper nouns Šidallu and Tūʾamū rabûtu in GG.\textsuperscript{282}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H ii 9 u mul MAŠ.TAB.BA.GAL.GAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GG ii 2 mul MAŠ.TAB.BA.GAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M117</td>
<td>A ii 41 mul MAŠ.TAB.BA.TUR.TUR u mul AL.LUL</td>
<td>SV(1) – The conjunction between the proper names Tūʾamū seḫrîtū and Alluttu is lacking in GG.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H ii 10 mul MAŠ.TAB.BA.TUR.TUR u mul AL.LUL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GG ii 3 mul MAŠ.TAB.BA.TUR.TUR mul AL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M118</td>
<td>A ii 42 MUŠ u mu₆</td>
<td>Not Counted – The apparently lacking conjunction in GG is possibly obscured by damage.\textsuperscript{283}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H ii 11 MUŠ u mu₆</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 2 MUŠ mu₆</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GG ii 4 MUŠ mu₆</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{280} AA refers to Pabilsag (the constellation Sagittarius) in the plural against the singular form in A. In addition to the subject “MUL meš,” kakkabū, the adjective describing the subject is probably also plural in AA against the singular in A (see note below). The spelling of the plural verb without MEŠ in AA is already attested in M109, and see also note above.

\textsuperscript{281} The plural marker in AA “... šá EGIR meš-šū-nu,” ša arkīšunu, “which are after them,” fits well with the reading of the subject as plural in this line (see note above). Against this A reflects the singular subject: “Šá EGIR-šū-nu,” ša arkīšunu, “which is after them.” However, the sign MEŠ in AA is recorded as uncertain in H. Hunger and D. Pingree, \textit{AfO} 24, 39, so is not counted here.

\textsuperscript{282} On the presence or absence of a conjunction between the listed names in A ii 36-iii 12 and the parallel sources see note below.

\textsuperscript{283} Upon inspection the tablet reveals some traces of what could be the conjunction just before the break in GG ii 4, or this could be the final Winkelhaken of the sign MUŠ. The damaged sign is visible in the photograph in H. Hunger and D. Pingree, \textit{AfO} 24, pl. XXI.
| M119  | A ii 43 | u₄-me | OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.  
|       | H ii 12 | u₄-mi | ²⁸⁴  
| M120  | A ii 44 | UD.5.KAM | HV – A has the “Bow and the King” becoming visible on the ⁵ᵗʰ day of Abu, recorded as the ¹⁵ᵗʰ day in M and N.  
| M     | 4      | UD.15.KAM |  
| N     | 3      | UD.15.KAM |  
| M121  | A ii 44 | IGI me | OV – The plural marker appears as the sign ME in A.  
| H     | ii 13  | IGI meš² |  
| M122  | A ii 45 | IGI me | OV - The plural marker appears as the sign ME in A.  
| H     | ii 14  | IGI meš² |  
| M123  | A ii 47 | UD.25 | SV(1) – The postposition determinative for ordinal numbers KAM is lacking in A.  
| E     | ii 1   | UD.25.KAM |  
| H     | ii 16  | UD.25.KAM |  
| N     | ii 7   | UD.25.KAM |  
| M124  | E ii 2  | UD.15.KAM | HV – H has the ⁵ᵗʰ day of Tašrītī, recorded as the ¹⁵ᵗʰ day in E, M and N.  
| H     | ii 17  | UD.5.KAM |  
| M     | 9      | UD.15[ |  
| N     | ii 8   | UD.15.KAM |  
| M125  | E ii 3  | u₄-mul UR.KU | OV – H spells the conjunction with the sign Ú.  
| H     | ii 18  | ù₄-mul UR.KU |  
| M     | 10     | u₄-mul UR.KU |  
| N     | ii 9   | u₄-mul UR.KU |  
| M126  | E ii 3  | IGI meš-ma | OV – E and M have the plural marker written with the sign MEŠ in H. N has the full composite logogram IGI.LÁ, ṣamaru, here probably inammarû, “they are²⁸⁴  
| H     | ii 18  | IGI meš-m[a] |  
| M     | 10     | IGI meš-ma |  
| N     | ii 9   | IGI.LÁ-ma |  

²⁸⁴ See also M145 and M234, and also G48 and G64 for the same variation in the spelling of the genitive case vowel. This represents a possible dialect variation where [i] > [e] in analogous forms in Assyrian texts. In particular see the notes to G48.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Line 1</th>
<th>Line 2</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M127</td>
<td>E ii 3</td>
<td>3 MA.NA</td>
<td>Not Counted – E.NA in N is taken as a misreading for MA.NA.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H ii 19</td>
<td>3 MA.NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M 10</td>
<td>3 MA.NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N ii 9</td>
<td>3 E.NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M128</td>
<td>E ii 3</td>
<td>u₄-mi</td>
<td>OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H ii 19</td>
<td>u₄-mi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N ii 9</td>
<td>u₄-m[u</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V 2</td>
<td>m[u</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M129</td>
<td>E ii 4</td>
<td>UD.5.KAM</td>
<td>HV – E, H and GG record the first visibility of Zuqaqīpu, Scorpius, on the 5th day of Araḫsamnu, recorded as the 15th day in M and N.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H ii 20</td>
<td>UD.5.KAM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M 11</td>
<td>UD.15.KAM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N ii 10</td>
<td>UD.15.KAM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GG ii 2'</td>
<td>UD.5.KAM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

285 The form IGI.LÁ-ma, *innammarūma*, “they can be seen,” in N is treated as an unmarked plural, on account of the fact that the verb refers to a list of four constellations. The scribe of N seems to have Avoided the use of the plural marker where the parallel sources all attest it. Other examples of this phenomenon in N are the term īmū, “days,” on four occasions spelled without MEŠ (see N iii 5-8), and inappāḫūnimma, “they will arise,” of which only one occurrence remains (see N iii 4 and note below). The tendency for the scribe of N to write multiple plural forms without the relevant determinative sign encourages the view that N has an orthographic variant here.

286 According to Hunger’s transliteration (see H. Hunger and D. Pingree, *AfO* 24, 43) N has E.NA against MA.NA (mina, a unit of measurement) in the parallel sources. For the text of N Hunger relies on the copy made by F.X. Kugler, *Sternkunde und sterndeinst in Babel: assyriologische, astronomische und astro-mythologische Untersuchungen* (2 vols.; Münster in Westfalen: Aschedorfsche Verlagsbuchh, 1910) 230 and pl. 23 (see H. Hunger and D. Pingree, *AfO* 24, 5-6). However, Kugler’s reading “E.MA” was revised by O. Neugebauer, "Studies in Ancient Astronomy VIII: The Water Clock in Babylonian Astronomy," *Isis* 37, 1/2 (1947) 41, “Kugler ... gives e-na, which is certainly a misreading of ma-na.” The text of N is therefore treated as in agreement with the other sources.

287 E and H have genitive īmū, “day,” against nominative īmu in N and V. The genitive noun is required by the context: *māṣartī umī*, “a daytime watch.” See J. Huehnergard, *Grammar*, 597-98 on the diminishing function of case vowels in Akkadian.
M130 A iii 4 UD.15.KAM  
E ii 5 UD.15.KAM  
H ii 21 UD.15.KAM  
L iii 1 UD.25.KAM  
M 12 UD.15.KAM  
GG ii 3' UD.15.KAM  

HV – L records the first visibility of  
Enzu, “the She-Goat,” on the 25th day  
of Aras amnu, recorded as the 15th  
day in the other sources.

M131 A iii 4 mul ÙZ u mul[  
E ii 5 mul ÙZ u mulGABA.GÍR.TAB  
H ii 21 mul ÙZ u mulGABA.GÍR.TAB  
M 12 mul ÙZ u mul[  
V 4 ÙJZ u mulGABA.GÍR.TAB  
GG ii 3' mul ÙZ mul GABA.GÍR.TAB  

SV(1) – The conjunction is lacking  
between the proper nouns in GG.

M132 A iii 5 mul UD.KA.DUḪ.A  
E ii 6 mul UD.KA.DUḪ.A  
H ii 22 mul UD.KA.DUḪ.A  
L iii 2 d UD.K[A  
M 13 mul UD.KA.DUḪ.A  
GG ii 4' mul UD.KA.DUḪ.A  

SV(1) – L has the preposition  
minative DINGIR preceding the con- 
stellation name Nimru, “the Panther.”  
The other sources use the preposition  
determinative MUL, kakkabu.  

M133 A iii 6 u mul Pabilsag  
E ii 7 u mul Pabilsag  
H ii 22 u mul Pabilsag  
M 14 u mul Pabilsag  
GG ii 4' mul Pabilsag  

SV(1) – The conjunction preceding  
the proper noun is lacking in GG.

M134 A iii 6 IGI meš  
E ii 7 IGI me  

OV – The plural marker is written  
with MEŠ in A, against ME in E.

M135 A iii 7 mul SIM.MAḪ mul ši-nu-nu-tu₄  
E ii 8 mul SIM.MAḪ mul ši-nu-nu-tu₄  
H ii 23 mul SIM.MAḪ mul ši-nu-nu-tu₄  

SV(1) – V has a conjunction between  
the proper nouns, lacking in the other  
sources.  

---

288 The variant represents a stylistic variation rather than a hermeneutic one. Although the determinatives  
DINGIR and MUL (ilu, “god,” and kakkabu, “star” respectively) have distinctly different referents, the  
meaning in L is essentially the same as in the other sources, in that they each clearly refer to the constellation  
Nimru. Indeed, the sign MUL is composed of three DINGIR signs, and the sign DINGIR originally  
represented a star (see R. Labat, Manuel, 48-49). This variant is therefore treated as a lexical interchange  
and counted as SV(1).

289 This variant occurs in what appears to be a list of three names, SIM.MAḪ, Šīmūnītu, and IM.ŠEŠ. These  
names probably all refer to the same constellation. Šīmūnītu, “the swallow,” is most likely a gloss for  
SIM.MAḪ. The verb at the end of this clause is marked as plural in some sources, but unmarked in others  
(see note below). This may indicate some confusion in antiquity as to whether this list of three names re-
ferred to three individual stars, or were three names for the same star or constellation. Such confusion might also explain the extra conjugation in H between the last two names in the list (see note below). On this see H. Hunger and D. Pingree, *AfO* 24, 128.

290 The extra conjunction in H is possibly due to the confusion surrounding this list of names (see the previous note). The scribe of H may, however, have been aware that the second term, šinunutu, was a gloss for the first term, SIM.MAḪḫ.

291 E lacks the conjunction between the listed items and so one might expect that this source assumes the three listed names all refer to the same star or constellation. However, the plural form innammarū, “they are seen,” in this sources indicates that E treats the listed items as referring to three individual stars. Further, it seems that even H and V, which each have a conjunction separating two of the three listed names, use a singular verb to describe them. In this way H and V always agree with A in the use of singular and plural forms of the verb, even where they disagree on the use of conjunctions. A, it should be said, always has the singular IGI.LÁ, innammar, when describing a single proper noun or a list of proper nouns that are not separated by a conjunction (see A ii 36-39, 46, 47; iii 8, 9, 11). A always has the plural form of the verb, IGI(LÁ) mešš, when referring to lists of multiple proper nouns that are separated by a conjunction (see A ii 40, 41, 43, 44, 45; iii 6, 10, 12). E, on the other hand, agrees with A in all occurrences of the verb except for here and later in the same line (see below, M143). So, although there are some differences in the use of conjunctions in the listed names (see M131, M133, M135, M137 and M148), it appears as though only E exhibits any real confusion as to which lists referred to singular entities and which referred to multiple entities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document ID</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Conjunction</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M139</td>
<td>A iii 8</td>
<td>u (^{mul}) KAK.SI.SÅ</td>
<td>OV – The conjunction appears as Ú in H, against U in the other sources.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E ii 9</td>
<td>u (^{mul}) KAK.SI.SÅ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H ii 24</td>
<td>ü (^{mul}) KAK.SI.SÅ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L iii 4</td>
<td>u (^{mul}) KAK.SI.SÅ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 17</td>
<td>u (^{mul}) KAK.SI.SÅ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M140</td>
<td>A iii 8</td>
<td>mul KAK.SI.SÅ</td>
<td>OV – The preposition determinative MUL is written as MÚL in L.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E ii 9</td>
<td>mul KAK.SI.SÅ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H ii 24</td>
<td>mul KAK.SI.SÅ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L iii 4</td>
<td>múl KAK.SI.SÅ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 17</td>
<td>múl KAK.SI.SÅ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M141</td>
<td>A iii 8</td>
<td>li-la-a-ti</td>
<td>OV – E has a different spelling for (\text{lîlātī} ), “evening.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E ii 9</td>
<td>li-lá-a-ti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H ii 24</td>
<td>li-la-a-ti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L iii 4</td>
<td>li-la-[a]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GG ii 6'</td>
<td>li-[l][a][ t][i]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M142</td>
<td>A iii 8</td>
<td>li-la-a-ti</td>
<td>OV(l) – M has the wrong case vowel for the genitive singular.(^{292})</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E ii 9</td>
<td>li-là-a-ti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H ii 24</td>
<td>li-la-a-ti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M 17</td>
<td>[i [t]ú</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GG ii 6'</td>
<td>[l][a][ t][i]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M143</td>
<td>A iii 9</td>
<td>IGI.LÁ-ma</td>
<td>SV(1) – The verb IGI, (\text{innammaru}), in E is marked as plural, against the singular verb in A and GG.(^{293})</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E ii 9</td>
<td>IGI [a]-ma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GG ii 6'</td>
<td>IGI-ma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M144</td>
<td>A iii 9</td>
<td>IGI.LÁ-ma</td>
<td>OV – A has the full composite logo-gram for (\text{innammaru}), against the short form in GG.(^{294})</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GG ii 6'</td>
<td>IGI-ma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M145</td>
<td>A iii 9</td>
<td>u₄-me</td>
<td>OV(1) – Possible difference in pronunciation.(^{295})</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E ii 10</td>
<td>u₄-mi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{292}\) M has nominative \(\text{lîlātu}\), against genitive \(\text{lîlātī}\) in the parallel sources. The full phrase reads: \(\text{u Šukūdu ina lîlātī innammarma}\), “and Šukūdu is seen in the evening,” so the genitive form is grammatically correct. The case vowel in M is therefore written incorrectly, most likely a result of the diminished function of case vowels in this period.

\(^{293}\) A and GG refer to the constellation Šukūdu in the singular while E uses a plural verb. The subject itself is written in the singular in all sources. On the unusual use of plural forms in E see note above.

\(^{294}\) The orthographic variant between A and E is not counted in accordance with Rule 3. Only the variant in spelling \(\text{innammar}\) between A and GG is counted in this instance.

\(^{295}\) See the comments in note above.
HV – M records the first visibility of Ikū, "the Field," and Lulīmu, "the Stag," on the 15th day of Šabaṭu, recorded as the 5th day in the other sources.

HV – M lacks the proper noun GU.LA, "the Great One," in the list of stars that become visible in Šabaṭu.

SV(1) – M lacks the conjunction between the proper nouns AŠ.IKU, Ikū, "the Field," and lu-lim, Lulīm, "the Stag."

OV - The plural marker is written with MEŠ in A and H, against ME in E and GG.

OV – The preposition determinative DINGIR precedes the proper noun, Anunītu, in O and V.
| M151 | A iii 12 | u | OV – The conjunction is written with the sign Ù in O, against U in the other sources. |
| E ii 13 | u |
| H ii 28 | u |
| O ii 5 | ú |
| V 11 | u |
| M152 | A iii 12 | IGILÁ me |
| E ii 13 | IGI me |
| H ii 28 | IGI meš |
| GG ii 9' | IGILÁ me |
| OV – A and GG spell innammarū, “it is seen,” with the full composite logogram, against the short form in E and H. |
| M153 | A iii 12 | IGILÁ me |
| E ii 13 | IGI me |
| H ii 28 | IGI meš |
| O ii 5 | IGILÁ |
| GG ii 9' | IGILÁ me |
| SV(1) – O has the singular verb form, innammaru, against the plural form, innammarū, in the other sources. |
| M154 | A iii 13 | KUR-ma |
| E ii 14 | KUR-ma |
| H iii 1 | KUR-ma |
| O ii 6 | KUR-ma |
| V 12 | KUJR-ḥa-ma |
| OV – V has a phonetic complement attached to the verb inappa”, “they (the stars) will rise,” lacking in the other sources. |

---

296 Because the plural marker is treated as part of the same semogenic unit as the form to which it is attached, the difference in the spelling of the plural marker between the sources here is not counted.

297 It is possible that O could preserve an unmarked plural form. The subject of the verb is almost certainly plural; the full clause reads: ina Addāri UD 15 Nūnu u Šību innammarū, “on the 15th day of Addāri, Nūnu and Šību are seen.” Nūnu, the constellation Piscis Austrinus, forms part of the astronomical path of Ea, while Šību, the constellation Perseus, forms part of the astronomical path of Anu. This means that the two constellations are distinct entities, existing as they do on two distinct and separate astronomical paths. Thus the verb form in O might reasonably be considered an unmarked form of the plural verb, innammarū, made necessary by the certain plurality of the subjects to which it refers. It remains, though, that the plain sense of the text as we have it is that O has the singular verb, innammar. And, given the irregular representation of listed proper nouns and their coordinating verbs already discussed above (see note ), it seems most prudent to take the text at face value here.

298 The verb in the parallel sources is inappāḥma. It is therefore difficult to explain “-ḥa” in V as a phonetic complement. It may be a ventive suffix, but one might more reasonably expect the form inappāḥaḥma rather than inappāḥḥama, as it appears in V. As well as the orthographic problem with the ventive we find the forms “KUR-ḥa” for napāḥi and “KUR-ḥa-nim-ma” for inappāḥiṣṭima in J and N (see below M190 et passim, and note ). Thus the ending “-ḥa” is an obvious phonetic complement in J and N and it would be reasonable to understand it similarly in V. Cf. A.R. George, Gilgamesh, 350 and 438, where some mixing of CV and VC signs is noted in Assyrian orthographies.
M155 A iii 13 mul GÍR.TAB OV – The preposition determinative MUL is written as MÚL in V.
E ii 14 mul GÍR.TAB
H iii 1 mul GÍR.TAB
O ii 6 mul GÍR.TAB
V 12 mül [GÍ]R.TAB

M156 A iii 14 KUR-ma OV – V has a phonetic complement attached to the verb inappa”, lacking in the other sources.
E ii 15 KUR-ma
H iii 2 KUR-ma
O ii 7 KUR-ma
V 13 a]-ma

M157 A iii 14 MUL.MUL OV – V spells kakkaḫū, “stars (Pleiades),” with the sign MÚL, against MUL in the other sources.
E ii 15 MUL.MUL
H iii 2 MUL.MUL
O ii 7 MUL.MUL
V 13 MÚL.MÚL

M158 A iii 17 mul d MUŠ OV – The proper noun Nira”, “the Snake,” is written with the preposition determinative DINGIR in A, lacking in the other sources.
E ii 18 mul MUŠ
H iii 5 mul MUŠ
O ii 10 mul MUŠ

M159 A iii 17 KUR me-ma OV – The plural marker is written with the sign ME in A, against MEŠ in E.
E ii 18 KUR meš-ma

M160 A iii 17 KUR me-ma OV(1) – Difference in grammatical form.299
E ii 18 KUR meš-ma
O ii 10 KUR-nim me-ma

M161 A iii 18 mul GU.LA u mušen TÌ8 mul TÌ8 OV – The conjunction is written with the sign Ū in O, against U in the other sources.
E ii 19 G]U.LA u TÌ8 mušen TÌ8
H iii 6 mul GU.LA u[ TÌ8
O ii 11 mul GU.LA û TÌ8]

M162 A iii 19 KUR me-ma OV – The plural marker is written with the sign ME in A, against MEŠ in E and H.
E ii 20 KUR meš-ma
H iii 7 KUR meš-ma

299 O has a ventive suffix attached to the verb inappāḫūnimma, lacking in A and E. The verb KUR me-ma, inappāḫuma, “they will rise,” is a present future masculine plural verb in the G stem with the emphatic particle “-ma” suffixed. In O the verb has an apparent ventive affixed as well, which in translation might be rendered as simply “arise,” or some equivalent with motion implied. See also M163 and M165 below.
M163 A iii 19  KUR me-ma  
E ii 20  KUR meš-ma  
H iii 7  KUR meš-ma  
O ii 12  KUR-nim me-ma  

**OV(l) – Difference in grammatical form.**

M164 A iii 20  KUR me-ma  
E ii 21  [KU]R meš-m[a]  
H iii 8  KUR meš-ma  

**OV – The plural marker is written with the sign ME in A, against MEŠ in E and H.**

M165 A iii 20  KUR me-ma  
E ii 21  [KU]R meš-m[a]  
H iii 8  KUR meš-ma  
O ii 13  KUR-nim me-ma  

**OV(l) – Difference in grammatical form.**

M166 A iii 21  KUR-ma  
H iii 9  KUR-ḥa-ma  
O ii 14  KUR-ma  

**OV – H has a phonetic complement attached to the verb, inappalma, lacking in A and O.**

M167 A iii 22  mul A-nu-ni-tu₄  
H iii 10  mul A-nu-ni-tu₄  
O ii 15  mul ṣ A-nu-ni-tu₄  

**OV – The proper noun Anunītu is written with the preposition determinative DINGIR in O, lacking in A and H.**

M168 A iii 24  KUR me-ma  
H iii 12  KUR meš-ma  

**OV – The plural marker is written as ME in A, against MEŠ in H.**

M169 A iii 25  KUR me-ma  
H iii 12  KUR meš-ma  

**OV – The plural marker is written as ME in A, against MEŠ in H.**

M170 A iii 27  u DINGINR.GUB.BA meš  
H iii 14  u mul DINGINR.GUB.BA meš  
DD r.1  DINGINR[  

**SV(1) – The conjunction is lacking before the proper noun Dingirgubbû in DD.**

M171 A iii 27  u DINGINR.GUB.BA meš  
H iii 14  u mul DINGINR.GUB.BA meš  
DD r.1  DINGINR[  

**OV – The preposition determinative MUL precedes the proper name Dingirgubbû in H, lacking in A and DD.**

M172 A iii 29  mul UD.KA.DUḤ.A  
J ii 1  mul UD.KA.DUḤ.A  
N iii 1  mūl UD.KA.DUḤ.A  
DD r.2  mūl[  

**OV – The preposition determinative is written as MÛL in N, against MUL in the other sources.**

M173 A iii 29  u mul TI₈ mušen  
H iii 16  u mul TI₈ mušen  

**OV – DD has the conjunction written as Ü, against U in the other**
N iii 1  \[ \text{mul} \] \[ \text{mušen} \]
DD r.2  \[ \text{mul} \] \[ \text{mušen} \]

M174  A iii 29  \[ \text{mul} \] \[ \text{TIš} \] \[ \text{mušen} \]
H iii 16  \[ \text{mul} \] \[ \text{TIš} \] \[ \text{mušen} \]
N iii 1  \[ \text{mul} \] \[ \text{mušen} \]
DD r.2  \[ \text{mul} \] \[ \text{mušen} \]

OV – The preposition determinative is written as MÚL in N, against MUL in the other sources.

M175  A iii 30  \[ \text{mul} \] \[ \text{MAŠ.TAB.BA.GAL.GAL} \]
H iii 17  \[ \text{mul} \] \[ \text{MAŠ.TAB.BA.GAL.GAL} \]
J ii 2  \[ \text{mul} \] \[ \text{MAŠ.TAB.BA.GAL.GAL} \]

OV – A has a shorter form of the compound logogram for Tūʾāmū, “the Great Twins.”

M176  A iii 31  \[ \text{mul} \] \[ \text{AŠ.IKU} \]
J ii 3  \[ \text{mul} \] \[ \text{AŠ.IKU} \]
N iii 2  \[ \text{mul} \] \[ \text{AŠ.IKU} \]
DD r.3  \[ \text{mul} \] \[ \text{AŠ.IKU} \]

OV – The preposition determinative is written as MÚL in N, against MUL in the other sources.

M177  A iii 31  \[ \text{mul} \] \[ \text{GU.LA} \]
J ii 3  \[ \text{mul} \] \[ \text{GU.LA} \]
N iii 2  \[ \text{mul} \] \[ \text{GU.LA} \]

OV – The preposition determinative is written as MÚL in N, against MUL in A and J.

M178  A iii 31  \[ \text{mul} \] \[ \text{GU.LA} \] \[ \text{mul} \] \[ \text{lu-lim} \]
H iii 18  \[ \text{mul} \] \[ \text{GU.LA} \] \[ \text{mul} \] \[ \text{lu-lim} \]
J ii 3  \[ \text{mul} \] \[ \text{GU.LA} \] \[ \text{mul} \] \[ \text{lu-lim} \]
N iii 2  \[ \text{mul} \] \[ \text{GU.LA} \] \[ \text{mul} \] \[ \text{lu-lim} \]
DD r.3  \[ \text{mul} \] \[ \text{GU.LA} \] \[ \text{mul} \] \[ \text{lu-lim} \]

SV(1) – The conjunction is lacking between the proper names GU.LA, “the Great One,” and Lulīmu, “the Stag” in DD.

M179  A iii 31  \[ \text{mul} \] \[ \text{lu-lim} \]
H iii 18  \[ \text{mul} \] \[ \text{lu-lim} \]
N iii 2  \[ \text{mul} \] \[ \text{lu-lim} \]
DD r.3  \[ \text{mul} \] \[ \text{lu-lim} \]

OV – The preposition determinative is written as MÚL in N, against MUL in the other sources.

M180  A iii 32  \[ \text{mul} \] \[ \text{d MUŠ} \]
H iii 19  \[ \text{mul} \] \[ \text{d MUŠ} \]
J ii 4  \[ \text{mul} \] \[ \text{d MUŠ} \]
N iii 3  \[ \text{mul} \] \[ \text{d MUŠ} \]

OV – The preposition determinative is written as MÚL in N, against MUL in the other sources.

M181  A iii 32  \[ \text{mul} \] \[ \text{d MUŠ} \]
H iii 19  \[ \text{mul} \] \[ \text{d MUŠ} \]
N iii 3  \[ \text{mul} \] \[ \text{d MUŠ} \]

OV – The preposition determinative DINGIR is lacking from the proper noun Nira” in H.

M182  A iii 32  \[ \text{mul} \] \[ \text{d MUŠ} \] \[ \text{mul} \]

SV(1) – The conjunction between the

---

300 Although the sign is broken in DD it is clearly not U. Only the vertical stroke of Ù is visible in D.J. Wiseman and J. Black, CTN IV pl. XX.
EN.TE.NA.BAR.ḪUM
mul d MUŠ u mul EN[ mul d MUŠ mul EN.TE.EN.NA.BAR.Ḫ[UM

proper nouns Nira" and Ḫabašīrānu is lacking in N.

M183 A iii 32 mul EN.TE.NA.BAR.ḪUM OV – The preposition determinative is written as MÚL in N, against MUL in A and H.
H iii 19 mul EN[ N iii 3 mul EN.TE.EN.NA.BAR.Ḫ[UM

M184 A iii 32 mul EN.TE.NA.BAR.ḪUM OV – N has an extra sign in the proper noun Ḫabašīrānu.301
N iii 3 mul EN.TE.EN.NA.BAR.Ḫ[UM

M185 A iii 33 mul KU₆ J ii 5 mul KU₆ N iii 4 mul KU₆ DD r.5 mul KU₆[ OV – The preposition determinative is written as MÚL in N, against MUL in the other sources.

M186 A iii 33 mul KU₆ u mul ŠU.GI J ii 5 mul KU₆ u mul ŠU.GI N iii 4 mul KU₆ mul ŠU.GI SV(1) – The conjunction between the proper nouns Nūnu and Šību is lacking in N.

M187 A iii 33 mul ŠU.GI J ii 5 mul ŠU.GI N iii 4 mul ŠU.GI OV – The preposition determinative is written as MÚL in N, against MUL in the other sources.

M188 J ii 5 KUR me-n[im DD r.5 KUR meš-nim[ OV – The plural marker is written as ME in J against MEŠ in DD.

301 The composite logogram denoting this constellation is usually mul EN.TE.NA.BAR.ḪUM (see CAD H 8). The extra sign in N could denote a more significant variant, even a different name. The word EN.TE.EN.NA, kuṣṣu, “cold, winter,” can also be written EN.TE.NA. See line 3 of BM106218, published in T. Gomi and S. Sato, Selected Neo-Sumerian Administrative Texts from the British Museum (Abiko: Research Institute Chuo-Gakuin, 1990) 321. This is, however, an Ur III period administrative text from Umma.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| M189   | A iii 33 | KUR $\text{meš}\text{-}\text{ma}$ | OV(l) – A and H lack the ventive suffix present in the other sources.  
|        | H iii 20 | KUR $\text{meš}\text{-}\text{ma}$ |  
|        | J ii 5   | KUR $\text{meš}\text{-n}[\text{im}]$ |  
|        | N iii 4  | KUR-ḥa-nim[ ] |  
|        | DD r.5   | KUR $\text{meš}\text{-}\text{nim}$ |  
| M190   | J ii 5   | KUR $\text{meš}\text{-n}[\text{im}]$ | OV – The verb inappaḫūnimma is written without the plural marker in N.  
|        | N iii 4  | KUR-ḥa-nim[ ] |  
|        | DD r.5   | KUR $\text{meš}\text{-}\text{nim}$ |  
| M191   | A iii 33 | mul AB.ŠÍN | OV – The preposition determinative is written as MÚL in N, against MUL in the other sources.  
|        | H iii 20 | mul[ ] |  
|        | N iii 4  | mul[ ] |  
| M192   | A iii 34 | KUR | OV – A lacks the phonetic complement.  
|        | J ii 6   | KUR-ḥa |  
|        | N iii 5  | KUR-ḥa |  
| M193   | A iii 34 | mul KAK.SI.SÁ | OV – The preposition determinative is written as MÚL in N, against MUL in the other sources.  
|        | J ii 6   | mul KAK.SI.SÁ |  
|        | N iii 5  | mul KAK.SI.SÁ |  
|        | DD r.6   | mul KAK.SI.SÁ |  
| M194   | A iii 34 | UD $\text{meš}$ | OV – N has the phonetic complement “-mu” for ʾumu, “days,” written with the plural marker MEŠ in A and H.  
|        | H iii 21 | UD $\text{meš}$ |  
|        | N iii 5  | UD-mu |  
| M195   | A iii 35 | KUR | OV – A lacks the phonetic complement.  
|        | J ii 7   | KUR-ḥa |  
|        | N iii 6  | KUR-ḥa |  
| M196   | A iii 35 | mul KAK.SI.SÁ | OV – The preposition determinative  

---

302 N is written without the plural marker but, as has been mentioned above (see note ), this form is taken as being marked with a phonetic complement. The verb “KUR-ḥa-nim-ma” might therefore be read as inappaḫūnimma, where the phonetic complement in N does not directly reflect the vowel. In fact, N always writes the verb inappaḫ with the phonetic complement attached – see N iii 5-8. J always has the singular form of the verb with the phonetic complement. However in J the only plural form of the verb preserved has no phonetic complement and the sign ME to mark the plural. It is thus difficult to decide if N represents a difference in number or if the difference is merely orthographic. Given that N never writes the plural marker on verbs or nouns, even when plurality is quite certain (see note above), this variant should be treated as orthographic. This orthographic variant is only counted for those sources that agree with the ventive in N, namely J and DD, for which see the following variant.

303 Plural forms are always written without the sign MEŠ in N. See notes and above.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Sign</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Sign</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J ii 7</td>
<td>mul</td>
<td>KAK.SI.SÁ</td>
<td>N iii 6</td>
<td>mul</td>
<td>KAK.SI.SÁ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M197 A iii 35</td>
<td>UD</td>
<td>meš</td>
<td>H iii 22</td>
<td>UD</td>
<td>meš</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N iii 6</td>
<td>UD-mu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M198 A iii 36</td>
<td>KUR</td>
<td></td>
<td>J ii 8</td>
<td>KUR-ḫa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N iii 7</td>
<td>KUR-ḫa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M199 A iii 36</td>
<td>mul</td>
<td>ŠU.PA</td>
<td>J ii 8</td>
<td>mul</td>
<td>ŠU.PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N iii 7</td>
<td>mul</td>
<td>ŠU.PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M200 A iii 36</td>
<td>UD</td>
<td>meš</td>
<td>N iii 7</td>
<td>UD-mu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M201 A iii 37</td>
<td>KUR</td>
<td></td>
<td>J ii 9</td>
<td>KUR-ḫa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N iii 8</td>
<td>KUR-ḫa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M202 A iii 37</td>
<td>mul</td>
<td>AB.SÍN</td>
<td>J ii 9</td>
<td>mul</td>
<td>AB.SÍN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N iii 8</td>
<td>mul</td>
<td>AB.SÍN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M203 A iii 37</td>
<td>UD</td>
<td>meš</td>
<td>N iii 8</td>
<td>UD-mu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M204 A iii 37</td>
<td>mul</td>
<td>zi-ba-ni-tu₄</td>
<td>W 4</td>
<td>zjį-ba-ni-tū</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M205 A iii 38</td>
<td>KUR</td>
<td></td>
<td>J ii 10</td>
<td>KUR-ḫa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FF ii 2</td>
<td>KUR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M206 A iii 38</td>
<td>mul</td>
<td>zi-ba-ni-tu₄</td>
<td>J ii 10</td>
<td>['[']</td>
<td>z[i-b]a-ni-tu₄</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N iii 9</td>
<td>mul</td>
<td>zi-ba-ni-tu₄</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M207 A iii 38</td>
<td>mul</td>
<td>ÙZ</td>
<td>W 5</td>
<td>mul</td>
<td>ÙZ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

is written as MÚL in N, against MUL in A and J.

OV – N has the phonetic complement “-mu” for Ṛmū, “days,” written with the plural marker MEŠ in A and H.

OV – A lacks the phonetic complement.

OV – The preposition determinative is written as MÚL in N, against MUL in A and J.

OV – N has the phonetic complement “-mu” for Ṛmū, “days,” written with the plural marker MEŠ in A.

OV – A lacks the phonetic complement.

OV – The preposition determinative is written as MÚL in N, against MUL in the other sources.

OV – N has the phonetic complement “-mu” for Ṛmū, “days,” written with the plural marker MEŠ in A.

OV – A has the final syllable of the proper noun Zibānītu written with the sign TU₄ against TŪ in W.

OV – A and FF lack the phonetic complement.

OV – The preposition determinative is written as MÚL in N, against MUL in A and J.

OV – The preposition determinative is written as MÚL in W, against MUL in A.
The form in W lacks the Sumerian genitive marker or nominalising particle on the proper noun Nimri. The noun follows a preposition plus infinitive: 30 īmū uṣu ana napāḫi șa Nimri, “30 days to the rising of the Panther.” See also variant M277 and note below.

The cardinal number 20 in A is written as 10 in J. See note on the variation of numeral signs in cuneiform sources.
M217  A iii 43  KUR  OV – A and FF lack the phonetic complement.
J ii 15  KUR-ḫa
FF ii 7  KUR

M218  A iii 43  muł GÂM  OV – The preposition determinative is written as MÚL in W, against MUL in A.
W 10  muł GÂM

M219  A iii 44  KUR  OV – A and FF lack the phonetic complement.
J ii 16  KUR-ḫa
FF ii 8  KUR

M220  A iii 44  MUL.MUL  OV – The plural is written as MÚL.MÚL in K and W, against MUL.MUL in A.
K iii 1  M[ÜL
W 11  MÚL.MÚL

M221  A iii 45  KUR  OV – A and FF lack the phonetic complement.
J ii 17  KUR-ḫa
FF ii 9  KUR

M222  A iii 45  muł[  OV – The preposition determinative is written as MÚL in K and W, against MUL in A.
K iii 2  muł GU₄.A[N.N]A
W 12  muł GU₄.AN.NA

M223  A iii 46  KUR  OV – A and FF lack the phonetic complement.
J ii 18  KUR-ḫa
FF ii 10  KUR

M224  A iii 46  UD meš  OV – K has a phonetic complement for ūmū, written with the plural marker MEŠ in A and FF.³⁰⁶
K iii 3  m[u
FF ii 10  UD meš

M225  A iii 46  mrul  OV – The preposition determinative is written as MÚL in K and W, against MUL in A.
K iii 3  mül SIPA.ZI.AN.NA
W 13  mül SIPA

M226  K iii 3  múl SIPA.ZI.AN.NA  SV(2) – K has an expansive plus.³⁰⁷
W 13  múl SIPA

³⁰⁶ See the comments in note above relating to the writing of ūmū without the plural marker, and notes and on the general proclivity in N to not write the plural marker on plural forms. K here seems to reflect the same practice as N.

³⁰⁷ The brief name múl SIPA, Šidalli or Šitaddaru, “the Shepherd,” is written in full form in K, múl-
SIPA.ZI.AN.NA, “the True Shepherd of Anu.”
M227 A iii 47 KUR
     J ii 19 KUR-ḫa

M228 A iii 47 UD mēš
     K iii 4 m[ū]
     FF ii 11 UD mēš

M229 A iii 48 KUR
     J ii 20 KUR-ḫa

M230 A iii 48 UD mēš
     K iii 5 m[ū]
     FF ii 12 UD mēš

M231 K iii 5 múl BAN
     JJ ii 1 m[u] BAN

M232 A iii 49 šèr-[i
     K iii 6 š]èr-tū

M233 A iii 50 li-la-a-[i
     K iii 7 li-la-a-tū

OV – A lacks the phonetic complement.

OV – K has a phonetic complement for ūmū, written with the plural marker MEŠ in A and FF.

OV – A lacks the phonetic complement.

OV – K has a phonetic complement for ūmū, written with the plural marker MEŠ in A and FF.

OV – The preposition determinative is written as MUL in K, against MUL in JJ.

OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation or grammatical form.308

OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.309

308 The form of the noun šērtu, “dawn,” is genitive in A, nominative in K. The text describes the annual motion of the earth around the sun, whereby the earth’s changing position relative to the sun brings about a changing in the backdrop of stars visible in the night sky as the year progresses. The effect is that an observer who takes regular sightings of the night sky at a fixed time and place will see the stars appear to advance across the sky from east to west along the plain of the ecliptic. The description in the text is: ūmu 1 UŠ.TA.ÀM kakkabū ina šerti ana múši ûrrubûni; ūmu 1 UŠ.TA.ÀM kakkabû ina ūlāti ana ūmi uṣṣūni, “Daily, in the morning, the stars enter towards the night 1 UŠ; daily, at evening, the stars exit towards the daytime 1 UŠ.” In this context “š]ēr-tū” might reflect an understanding of the phrase kakkabû ina šerti as the subject proper, according to which the scribe has marked the whole phrase as nominative. Even though this would technically be grammatically incorrect, as the genitive case should mark a noun following a preposition and should also mark the nomens rectum in a construct chain, this variant could indicate that the scribe of K understood the clause to state that “(by) 1 UŠ daily the stars of the morning enter towards the night.” Of course, a much simpler and likely explanation is that K has a variant case vowel that reflects no change in the meaning of the text, but rather relates to the diminished use of case vowels and a different preference for their representation on the part of the scribe.

309 The same considerations apply to this variant as to the variant immediately preceding this one. See the previous note for a discussion of the issues surrounding the categorisation OV(l) here.
M234  K iii 7  u₄-me  OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.
        JJ iii 3  m[ji

M235  A iv 1  MUL  SV(1) – The preposition determinative DIŠ is lacking in A.
        J iii 3  DIŠ MUL

M236  A iv 1  DIŠ MUL  SV(1) – The relative pronoun is lacking in J.
        J iii 3  DIŠ MUL  šá ziq-pi

M237  A iv 2  šá  Not Counted – Though clearly not ŠÁ, the sign in Q is broken and therefore ultimately uncertain.
        J iii 4  šá
        Q iii 1  š[a (?)

M238  A iv 2  GUB  SV(1) – Difference in number.³¹⁰
        K iii 8  ]az-ma
        JJ ii 5  a]z-ma

M239  J iii 4  ŠŪ-bi  OV – K lacks the phonetic complement.
        K iii 8  ŠŪ

³¹⁰ K and JJ have a singular verb izzazzuma, “it is positioned,” against the plural verb izzazzûma in A. K, and possibly JJ, could have a singular verb with a phonetic complement but the situation is far from certain. Much depends on the reading of the context, which is only fully preserved in A: klikkabû  ziqr ša ina ḫarrān šüt Enlil ina qabal šâm  meḫret iti ša  neṣir šâm izzazzûma mûša napâḥa u ṣâr ṣa klikkabû ina libbišunu immara, “The ziqr stars, which are in the path of Enlil in the middle of the sky, are positioned opposite the breast of the observer of the sky; nightly the risings and settings of the stars in their midst he (the observer) sees.” The verb izzazzûma, written with the plural marker in A but without it in K and JJ, appears to refer to the subject klikkabû  ziqr, “the ziqr stars.” The question is whether or not K and JJ treat the subject as singular or plural. While the beginning of the clause, including the noun that refers to the subject, is missing in K and JJ, the noun plus masculine plural possessive pronominal suffix libbišunu, “their midst,” is preserved. If one considers this pronominal suffix to refer to the subject, klikkabû  ziqr, then it seems clear that K refers to a plural noun. Such a reading would require that the variant in K and JJ “GUB-az-ma” is read as an unmarked form of the plural verb izzazzûma. However, if the noun plus possessive pronominal suffix libbišunu refers to something other than the ziqr stars (such as šâm, “the heavens”) then the reading of a singular verb in K and JJ is quite feasible.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Column</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M240</td>
<td>A iv 3</td>
<td>MUL</td>
<td>meš</td>
<td>SV(1) – Difference in number. 311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J iii 5</td>
<td>MUL</td>
<td>meš</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K iii 9</td>
<td>MUL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q iii 2</td>
<td>MUL</td>
<td>meš</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M241</td>
<td>A iv 3</td>
<td>im-ma-r[u</td>
<td></td>
<td>OV – A and J write the verb <em>immaru</em>, “he sees,” syllabically against the logographic form plus phonetic complement in K.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K iii 9</td>
<td>IGI</td>
<td>mar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JJ ii 6</td>
<td>m]a-ru</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M242</td>
<td>A iv 4</td>
<td>mul</td>
<td>ŠU.PA</td>
<td>SV(1) – The preposition determinative DIŠ is lacking in A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J iii 6</td>
<td>DIŠ</td>
<td>mul</td>
<td>ŠU.PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M243</td>
<td>A iv 4</td>
<td>mul</td>
<td>DINGIR.GUB.BA meš</td>
<td>OV – The preposition determinative is written as MÛL in K, against MUL in A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K iii 10</td>
<td>múl</td>
<td>DINGIR.GUB.BA meš</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M244</td>
<td>A iv 4</td>
<td>mul</td>
<td>UR.KU</td>
<td>OV – The preposition determinative is written as MÛL in K, against MUL in A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K iii 10</td>
<td>múl</td>
<td>UR.KU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q iii 3</td>
<td>UR.KU-u</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M245</td>
<td>A iv 4</td>
<td>mul</td>
<td>ŪZ</td>
<td>OV – A and Q lack the phonetic complement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K iii 10</td>
<td>múl</td>
<td>ŪZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L iv 1</td>
<td>múl</td>
<td>ŪZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q iii 4</td>
<td>múl</td>
<td>ŪZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M246</td>
<td>A iv 5</td>
<td>mul</td>
<td>Lu-lim</td>
<td>OV – The preposition determinative is written as MÛL in K against MUL in the other sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J iii 7</td>
<td>múl</td>
<td>ŪZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K iii 10</td>
<td>múl</td>
<td>ŪZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L iv 1</td>
<td>múl</td>
<td>ŪZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q iii 4</td>
<td>múl</td>
<td>ŪZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M247</td>
<td>A iv 5</td>
<td>mul</td>
<td>Lu-lim</td>
<td>OV – The preposition determinative is written as MÛL in K and X, against MUL in A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K iii 11</td>
<td>múl</td>
<td>Lu-lim</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X iii 1</td>
<td>múl</td>
<td>[</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M248</td>
<td>A iv 5</td>
<td>mul</td>
<td>ŠU.GI</td>
<td>OV – The preposition determinative is written as MÛL in K, against MUL in A and Q.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K iii 11</td>
<td>múl</td>
<td>ŠU.GI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q iii 5</td>
<td>múl</td>
<td>ŠU.GI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

311 K has the singular noun *kakkabu*, written as the plural *kakkabū* in the other sources. The singular form in K seems to reflect its general preference in this section for referring to subjects in the singular – see the previous note.
M249  A iv 5  \text{mul} \text{GÀM}  \\
K iii 11  \text{mul} \text{GÀM}  \\
Q iii 5  \text{m-il}  \\
OV – The preposition determinative is written as \text{MÚL} in K, against \text{MUL} in A and Q.

M250  A iv 6  \text{mul} \text{MAŠ.TAB.BA.GAL.GAL}  \\
J iii 8  \text{mul} \text{MAŠ.TAB.BA.GAL.GAL}  \\
K iii 11  \text{mul} \text{MAŠ.TAB.BA.GAL.GAL}  \\
OV – The preposition determinative is written as \text{MÚL} in K, against \text{MUL} in A and J.

M251  A iv 6  \text{mul} \text{E₄-ru₆}  \\
K iii 12  \text{mul} \text{E₄-ru₆}  \\
Q iii 7  \text{mul} \text{E₄-ru₆}  \\
X iii 2  \text{mul} [  \\
OV – The preposition determinative is written as \text{MÚL} in K and X, against \text{MUL} in A and Q.

M252  A iv 6  \text{u mul} \text{Ḫé-gál-a-a}  \\
K iii 11  \text{mul} \text{Ḫé-gál-la-a-a}  \\
SV(1) – The conjunction between the last two list items is lacking in K.

M253  A iv 6  \text{mul} \text{Ḫé-gál-a-a}  \\
K iii 11  \text{mul} \text{Ḫé-gál-la-a-a}  \\
OV – The preposition determinative is written as \text{MÚL} in K, against \text{MUL} in A.

M254  A iv 6  \text{mul} \text{Ḫé-gál-a-a}  \\
K iii 11  \text{mul} \text{Ḫé-gál-la-a-a}  \\
OV – A has the proper noun \text{Ḫegalayu}, “the Abundant One,” written without the sign LA against the spelling in K.\textsuperscript{312}

M255  A iv 7  \text{PAP an-nu-tu}  \\
J iii 9  \text{PAP DIŠ an-nu-tu₄}  \\
SV(1) – The preposition determinative DIŠ is lacking in A.

M256  A iv 7  \text{an-nu-tu}  \\
J iii 9  \text{an-nu-tu₄}  \\
OV – The final syllable of \text{annûtu}, “those,” is written with the sign TU in A, against TU₄ in J.

M257  A iv 7  \text{MUL meš Ša ziq-pi}  \\
J iii 9  \text{MUL meš ziq-pi}  \\
Q iii 8  \text{MUL meš Ša ziq-pi}  \\
X iii 3  \text{MUL ziq-pi}  \\
SV(1) – The noun \text{kakkabu} is written as singular in X, against the plural in the other sources.\textsuperscript{313}

\textsuperscript{312} The spelling in A agrees with the earlier occurrence of the same proper noun at A i 13.

\textsuperscript{313} As in the earlier occurrences of this type of variation (see note above) it is difficult to determine whether X has a singular noun \text{kakkabu} or an unmarked plural \text{kakkabu}. In the light of Rule 1, though, the text must stand as it is. With no contextual evidence to the contrary the form in X must be read as a singular noun and counted as a difference in number.
sv(1) – the relative particle is lacking in j and x.

j iii 9 mул ziq-pi
q iii 8 mул ša ziq-pi
x iii 3 mул ziq-pi

sv(1) – the preposition ina is lacking in q.

j iii 10 ina IGI-it
q iii 9 IGI-it

sv(2) – x has a clarifying plus, lacking in the other sources.

j iii 10 ina IGI-it GABA-ka GUB mezuma
q iii 9 IGI-it GABA-ka iz-za-zu[
x iii 4 t]i šá EN.NUN AN-e GU[B

ov – the plural marker is written as ME in A against MEŠ in J.

j iii 10 GUB meš-ma

ov – the verb izzazzū is written logographically in A and J against the syllabic spelling in q.

j iii 10 GUB mezuma
q iii 9 iz-za-zu[

sv(3) – the sequence in Q varies from the sequence in A and J.

j iii 11 SAR mул ša MUL
j iii 10 ] šá MUL
q iii 10 ]u GI6

ov – the plural marker is written with the sign MEŠ in A against ME in J.

j iii 11 MUL mez

314 A, J and Q all read ina mehret irtika izzazzūma, “they are positioned opposite your breast,” against the reading in X mehret ša nasir šamē izzazzū, “they are positioned opposite the observer of the sky.” X has the third person here but agrees with the other sources in using the second person pronoun in X iii 6 (see note below).
315 In the light of Rule 3 the phonetic complement, lacking in J, is not counted as it forms part of the same semogenic unit as the previous orthographic variant.
316 Although the text of Q is broken it seems clear that the logogram GI6, mūša, “night,” stands at the end of the clause. This is against the other sources which have this word at the beginning of the clause. A, the only fully preserved copy, reads: mūša nipḫāti u ribi ša kakkabī ..., “the nightly rising and setting of the stars.”
M265  A iv 10    zi-iq-pa
       J iii 12  ziq-pi
       X iii  6  ziq-pi
OV(l) – J and X have the wrong case vowel for the accusative singular.317

M266  A iv 10    a-ma-ri-ka
       J iii 12  IGI-k[a
       Q iii 11  a-ma-ri-ka
       X iii  6  IGI-ka
OV – The verb plus pronominal suffix amarika, literally “your seeing,”
is written syllabically in A and Q against the logographic spelling in J
and X.

M267  A iv 11    ni-iš
       Q iii 13  ni-iš
       X iii  8  IL
OV – The verb našû, “lift up (one’s face)” is written syllabically in A and
Q against the logographic spelling in X.

M268  A iv 12    IGI-ka
       Q iii 13  pa-ni-k[a
       X iii  8  IGI-ka
OV – The noun panu, “face,” is written logographically in A and X
against the syllabic spelling in Q.

M269  A iv 14    mul GÀM
       R 3      mul G[A]M
       T iv  2  mul GÀM
OV – The preposition determinative is written as MÚL in R, against MUL
in A and T.

M270  A iv 16    IGI-it GABA-ka
       R 4      ina IGI-it [
       T iv  4  IGI-it GABA-ka
SV(1) – The preposition ina is lacking in A and T.318

M271  A iv 16    MUL.MUL
       R 4      MJÚL.MUL
OV – The preposition determinative is written as MÚL in R, against MUL
in A.

317 The reading in the accusative case seems correct in the context: šumma ziqpa ana amārka, “If you are to
observe the ziqpu.” Reading this difference as a linguistic variation presumes the noun ziqpu is singular in
all the sources. On the other hand, the noun “ziq-pi” in J and X could be read as an oblique plural, and so
still be considered grammatically correct. Such a reading would suppose a difference in number between A
on the one hand and J and X on the other which, considering there is no plural marker attached to this noun
in any source, seems to be asking too much of the text. The variation is instead read as OV(l) in the light of
Rule 4.

318 The full clause reads: ina Ayyari UD 1 irtu ša Nimri ina qabal šamē (ina) meḥret irtika izzazma, “on the
first day of Ajjaru the Breast of the Panther is positioned in the middle of the sky (towards the) opposite
(of) your breast.”
| M272 | A iv 17 | ki-in-šu | OV(l) – R and T have incorrect case vowels for the nominative singular.\(^{319}\) |
| R 6  | kin-ša |
| T iv 5 | kin-ši |

| M273 | A iv 17 | mul UD.KA.DUḪ.A | OV – The preposition determinative is written as MÚL in R, against MUL in A. |
| R 6  | mûl UD.KA.DUḪ.A |
| T iv 5 | mul UD.KA | |

| M274 | A iv 18 | GUB-ma | OV – A and T lack the phonetic complement.\(^{320}\) |
| R 7  | GUB-zu-ma |
| T iv 6 | mul UD.KA.DUḪ.A |

| M275 | A iv 18 | mul is | OV – The preposition determinative is written as MÚL in R, against MUL in A and T. |
| R 7  | mûl is |
| T iv 6 | mul iš |

| M276 | A iv 19 | mul UD.KA.DUḪ.A | OV – The preposition determinative is written as MÚL in R, against MUL in A and T. |
| R 8  | mûl UD.KA.DUḪ.A |
| T iv 7 | mûl UD.KA.D[UḪ |

| M277 | A iv 19 | mul UD.KA.DUḪ.A | OV(l) – Possible difference in grammatical form.\(^{321}\) |
| O iii 3 | ]KA.DUḪ |
| R 8  | mûl UD.KA.DUḪ.A |

| M278 | A iv 20 | mul SIPA.ZI.AN.NA | OV – The preposition determinative is written as MÚL in R, against MUL in A and T. |
| R 9  | mûl SIPA.Z[ɬ |
| T iv 8 | mûl SI[PA |

\(^{319}\) The noun belongs to the phrase kinsu ša Nimri, “the Knee of the Panther.” Thus the nominative form is technically correct while the forms in R and T do not make grammatical sense. In the light of Rule 3 the variation in syllabic spelling between A and the other two sources is not counted here as it belongs to the same semogenic unit as the linguistic variant.

\(^{320}\) In contrast to M261, where the phonetic complement added to the plural form has a function that is more accurate, R has a phonetic complement that does not in fact reflect the actual pronunciation of the word. The compliment “-zu” doesn’t seem to fit the singular verb form izazma. It is possible that the phonetic complement served as a signal to the scribe as to which lexeme the logogram GUB denoted rather than as an accurate reflection of the pronunciation of the verb form itself.

\(^{321}\) The final sign ‘A’ is a possible Sumerian genitive ending. The noun is part of the construction “a-si-du ša mul UD.KA.DUḪ.(A),” asidu ša Nimri, “the Heel of the Panther,” so the genitive ending fits the context. See also variant M210 above.
M279 A iv 21 MUL né-bu-ú HV – A and AA record *kakkabu nebû,* “the bright star,” as visible on the 15th of Du’uzu, against T and R which record *kakkabû ummulâtu,* “the faint stars,” as visible on that date.322

R 10 u[m-mu-lu-tú]
T iv 9 mš um-mu-lu-tú
AA iii 3 MUL né-b[u]

M280 A iv 21 mul ŠU.GI OV – The preposition determinative is written as MÚL in R, against MUL in the other sources.

R 10 múl[ ]
T iv 9 mu

M281 A iv 21 MIN AA iii 4 IGI-it GABA-k[a]
O iii 6 GA]BA-k[a]
T iv 10 GA]BA-ka GUB-ma

SV(2) – A writes Wiederholungszeichen against the full clause in the other sources.323

M282 A iv 22 UD.15.KAM AA iii 5 UD.5.KAM
O iii 7 UD.15]
AA iii 4 IGI-it GABA-k[a]

HV – AA has the date for sighting *kakkabû ummulâtu,* “the faint stars,” as the 5th of Abu, recorded as the 15th of Abu in A and O.

M283 A iv 22 MUL mš um-mu-lu-tu4 SV(1) – A has a plural noun, *kakkabû ummulâtu,* “the faint stars,” against a singular noun in AA.324

AA iii 5 MUL um-mu[

322 A and AA read: *ina Du’ūzu UD 15 kakkabu nebû ša šībi ina qabal šamē ... ina Abi UD 15 kakkabû ummulâtu ša šībi ina qabal šamē,* “on the 15th day of the month Du’uzu the bright star of the Old Man (α Persei) is positioned in the middle of the sky ... on the 15th day of the month Abu the faint stars of the Old Man are positioned in the middle of the sky” (A iv 21-22; AA iii 3-5). This is in contrast to R and T which, though now quite damaged, can be restored to read: *ina Du’ūzu UD 15 kakkabu nebû ša šībi ina qabal šamē ... ina Abi UD 15 kakkabû ummulâtu ša šībi ina qabal šamē,* “on the 15th day of the month Du’uzu the faint stars of the Old Man are positioned in the middle of the sky ... on the 15th day of the month Abu the bright star of the Old Man is positioned in the middle of the sky” (R 10; T iv 9-11). The interchange of *ziqpu* stars for the fourth and fifth months is quite possibly an error (see note ), but its effect on the text is considered as a hermeneutic variation given that alternative stars are referred to. See also M284 below.

323 The sign “MIN” in A iv 21 indicates a repetition of the text from the line above: *mehret irtika izzazma,* “it is positioned opposite your breast.” See the discussion above on the marking of Wiederholungszeichen in cuneiform in note .

324 AA seems to refer to only one “faint star” in the constellation Perseus while A makes reference to multiple “faint stars.” This could in truth be an unmarked plural but as the text stands it should be read as a singular noun. Further, the scribe of AA marks the plural correctly as “MUL mš” in AA ii 17.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Column</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M284</td>
<td>A iv 22</td>
<td>MUL $^\text{m,e,s}$ um-mu-lu-tu₄</td>
<td>HV – A, O and AA record <em>kakkabū ummulūtu</em>, “the faint stars,” as visible on the 5th or 15th of <em>Abu</em> against T which records <em>kakkabu nebū</em>, “the bright star,” as visible on that date.³²⁵</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M285</td>
<td>A iv 23</td>
<td>MIN</td>
<td>SV(2) – A writes <em>Wiederholungszeichen</em> against the full clause in O.³²⁶</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M286</td>
<td>A iv 23</td>
<td>MIN</td>
<td>SV(2) – A writes <em>Wiederholungszeichen</em> against the full clause in O.³²⁷</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M287</td>
<td>A iv 23</td>
<td>MIN</td>
<td>OV – A writes the sign MIN to signify <em>Wiederholungszeichen</em> against KI.MIN in AA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M288</td>
<td>A iv 24</td>
<td>$\text{mul}$ MAŠ.TAB.BA.GAL.GAL</td>
<td>OV – A and O have the short spelling for <em>Tū̇'amū̇ rabūtu</em>, “the Great Twins,” against the longer spelling in T.³²⁸</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M289</td>
<td>A iv 24</td>
<td>MIN</td>
<td>SV(2) – A writes <em>Wiederholungszeichen</em> against the full clause in O.³²⁹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M290</td>
<td>A iv 24</td>
<td>MIN</td>
<td>SV(2) – A writes <em>Wiederholungszeichen</em> against the full clause in O.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M291</td>
<td>A iv 24</td>
<td>$\text{mul}$ ŠU.PA u $\text{mul}$ NUN ki</td>
<td>SV(1) – AA lacks the conjunction between the proper nouns ŠU.PA and <em>Eridu</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M292</td>
<td>A iv 24</td>
<td>KUR $^\text{m,e,s}$-ni</td>
<td>OV – The plural marker is written with the sign ME in O and T against MEŠ in A.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

³²⁴ See the comments above, note ³⁰⁷.
³²⁶ O has *ina qabal šamē*, “in the middle of the sky.”
³²⁷ O and T have *mešret irtika izzazzūma*, “they are positioned opposite your breast.” More accurately, the verb in T is *izzazzuma*, “it is positioned,” in reference to the singular subject it conveys here (see note above).
³²⁸ A retains the same orthography used in M11.
³²⁹ O has *ina qabal šamē*, “in the middle of the sky.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M293</th>
<th>A iv 25</th>
<th>MIN</th>
<th>ina MURUB₄ AN-e</th>
<th>SV(2) – A writes <em>Wiederholungszeichen</em> against the full clause in O.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O iii 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M294</td>
<td>A iv 25</td>
<td>MIN</td>
<td>GA]BA-ka GUB-ma</td>
<td>SV(2) – A writes <em>Wiederholungszeichen</em> against the full clause in O.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O iii 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M295</td>
<td>A iv 26</td>
<td>MIN</td>
<td>ina MURUB₄[</td>
<td>SV(2) – A and T write <em>Wiederholungszeichen</em> against the full clause in O.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O iii 13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T iv 17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M296</td>
<td>A iv 26</td>
<td>MIN</td>
<td>GUB-ma</td>
<td>SV(2) – A and T write <em>Wiederholungszeichen</em> against the full clause in O.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O iii 14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T iv 17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M297</td>
<td>A iv 29</td>
<td>MIN</td>
<td>IGI-it GABA [</td>
<td>SV(2) – A writes <em>Wiederholungszeichen</em> against the full clause in E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E iii 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M298</td>
<td>A iv 30</td>
<td>MIN</td>
<td>IGI-it[</td>
<td>SV(2) – A writes <em>Wiederholungszeichen</em> against the full clause in E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E iii 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M299</td>
<td>E iii 7</td>
<td>DINGIR meš</td>
<td>MUL m[es</td>
<td>SV(1) – E has <em>ilāni</em>, “the gods,” against <em>kakkabū</em>, “the stars,” in F.³³⁰</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F r.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M300</td>
<td>A iv 31</td>
<td>i-na</td>
<td>ina</td>
<td>OV – A has the preposition <em>ina</em>, “in,” written syllabically against the logographic form in E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E iii 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M301</td>
<td>E iii 14</td>
<td>an-nu-tu₄</td>
<td>an-nu-t[u</td>
<td>OV – The final syllable of <em>annūtu</em>, “those,” is written with the sign TU in F against TU₄ in E.³³¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F r.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

³³⁰ There is no apparent difference in meaning here as both sources refer to objects that *ina ḫarrān Sin iz-zazzūma*, “are positioned in the path of Sin.” That is, both sources refer to objects in the cosmos that stand in the orbital path of the moon and so are indicative of the same phenomena. The variant here is therefore treated as a lexical interchange.

³³¹ Compare the same variation in M256.
Discussion of Variants

Orthographic Variants

The most common type of variation involves orthography. In general the most common types of orthographic variation involve logographic spellings against syllabic spellings. Also relatively common are interchanges of CVC signs for CV-VC signs, the elision of phonetic complements, the writing of different signs with like value, and the use of apocopated logograms in place of full composite logograms. Occasionally some nouns lack determinative signs, which is regularly counted as a difference in orthography where the style of the document is not affected. In all there are 198 orthographic variants between all of the sources.

The tablets that contain the most amount of parallel material, A, AA and BB, also contain the highest number of variations in orthography. Some texts, such as J and N, consistently spell particular logograms with phonetic complements in contrast to other sources. However, these texts do not share a particular orthographic affinity, as they can be shown to vary with each other in other spelling practices. Rather, the rule seems to be that where some sources agree in a particular aspect of their orthography they will disagree elsewhere.

Most texts that preserve at least 50 SU in parallel display some level of orthographic differentiation. Exceptions to this trend are A:Y, C:X, and Y:AA. In most of these cases

332 See note above, and the reference there.
other variants occur between the parallel texts, but in C:X there are no variants at all between the sources. The discussion will return to these texts after surveying the other variant categories. It will suffice presently to indicate that the situation where more than one pairing of texts agrees is minimal. That is, where sources such as A:X and X:AA show a close orthographic affinity, there is no such affinity between A:AA.

**Orthographic (linguistic) Variants**

There are few linguistic variants between the sources, and those that do occur typically involve case endings which, by the first millennium, had become largely defunct. For example, M272 shows that across three sources three different case endings are used for the same noun. This example demonstrates that the use of case endings was not uniform between the sources. Other linguistic variations, namely the omission or addition of ventive affixes to nouns, may be more aptly described as grammatical variations.

Also included in this category are two possible variations in Sumerian grammatical forms, M210 and M277. The extent to which these variants should be considered as grammatical rather than orthographic is debatable, as it is unclear how familiar a typical first millennium Akkadian scribe would have been with Sumerian grammatical forms.\(^{333}\)

Unlike the sources for Gilgamesh XI or the prologue to the Laws of Hammurabi, there are few pronunciation or dialectal variants in the sources for MUL.APIN. Like EAE 63, this may be due to the relatively formulaic nature of the documents. Alternatively, this

---

\(^{333}\) This was pointed out to me by W. Horowitz, personal communication.
may instead be a characteristic of the scribes’ approach to copying astronomical texts. Against the latter view we could point to the various differences in case vowels, indicated above, which might ostensibly be put down to the personal preference of the individual scribes. If this is the case, then the individual’s preference for a particular case vowel in a particular context may in fact be coloured by an aspect of pronunciation. However, attempts to delineate between the choice of case vowels by any extraneous conditioning elements, such as individual copyist or geographical region, appear on the surface to be fruitless.

Stylistic Variants (Type 1)

The majority of minor stylistic variations involve the addition or omission of determinatives, conjunctions, prepositions, relative pronouns or enclitic particles. Of these the omission or addition of the determinative that begins a new section, DIŠ, is the most common form of variation.

Somewhat less frequent are changes in grammatical number to subjects or objects in the text. In one instance, M55, the constellation comprised of ε, π, ρ, and θ Herculis are described in the plural in most sources, but in the singular in source AA. The treatment of this constellation as a collective singular in AA is in contrast to the same source’s treatment of the adjacent constellation, ζ and η Herculis, as plural.

Other similar differences in grammatical number pertain to the description of a given constellation with either the singular noun or determinative “star” or plural “stars,” for
which see M66, M113, M240, M257 and M283. In four places the same variation is indicated by the form of the verbal predicate, singular or plural, for which see M138, M143, M153 and M238.

There are four variants that are considered lexical interchanges. M57 shows a difference in the title given to a particular constellation. The determinative used to describe a star differs in two instances, M87 and M132, where some sources have the determinative for “star,” MUL, while others have the determinative for “deity,” DINGIR. In M299 the common nouns that these determinatives represent, kakabū, “stars,” and ilāni, “gods,” are exchanged.

*Stylistic Variants (Type 2)*

The abbreviation of repeated phrases with *Wiederholungszeichen* (written MIN or KI.MIN in the sources) is the most common form of the second category of stylistic variants. There are 10 instances of this type of abbreviation, which occur mostly in tablet A, and occasionally in T and AA. Sources like O and E frequently write the entire repetitious phrase rather than abbreviating the text.

There is one instance of a possible gloss at M50, where tablet AA appears to clarify that the object referred to as the “first son” is in fact an astronomical body. There is also a single instance of an explicating plus at M69, where the phrase “these stars of Enlil” is written instead as “these 50 stars,” in reference to the preceding taxonomy of astral bod-
ies. One expansive plus is found at M226, where the title “the Shepherd” in tablet W, referring to the constellation Orion, is written as “the True Shepherd of Anu” in tablet K.

Stylistic Variants (Type 3)

There is a single instance where a different arrangement of words is detected between the sources. Tablet Q has a different word order to tablets A and J at M263, where the adverbial form GI₆, $mūša$, “nightly,” appears phrase-finally as opposed to phrase-initially. Due to the broken context of Q at this point it is impossible to tell if the rest of the phrase was the same as in the other sources or if a more significant variant underlies this change in sequence.

Hermeneutic Variants

Most of the hermeneutic variants recorded between the sources involve a difference in cardinal numbers. The difference is regularly by a factor or 10, the reason for which can be understood in terms of damage or haplography of the single wedge sign that represents the number 10 in the cuneiform writing system.³³⁴

At M147 tablet M fails to account for the visibility of Aquarius, termed $mug_{UL}$, “the Great One,” during the month of Šaḫaṭu. Given the precise nature of the taxonomy this omission is read as a difference in content rather than a change in sequence or a stylistic expansion.

³³⁴ See the comments in note 157.
Similarly M279 and M284 show that different sources could indicate that different constellations became visible at certain times. Tablets T and R stipulate that the constellation known as “the faint stars” rise in the middle of the month of Du’uzu while “the bright star” becomes visible in the month of Abu. According to tablets A, O and AA “the bright star” is instead visible from the month of Du’uzu and “the faint stars” are visible in Abu. As was established immediately above, the difference in the taxonomy is treated as a difference in content.
CHAPTER 6 – THE LAWS OF HAMMURABI

The Text

The following tablets represent copies made of a series of laws bookended by a poetic prologue and epilogue that stem from the Old Babylonian period, specifically to the rule of Hammurabi of Babylon. The composition is generally dated to the first half of the 18th century B.C.E. The prologue, epilogue and intervening laws were inscribed on a piece of diorite that stands approximately 225 centimetres tall, the upper portion of which is taken up by a depiction of the king standing before a seated deity, presumed to be Šamaš. The text descends in horizontal bands down the front side and then the back side of the stele, increasing in length as the stele increases in girth towards its base. As can be determined from the ancient fragments these Laws existed in more than one copy from an early point.335 The use of the Louvre stele (LH) as the Haupttext in the present study is due primarily to its relatively complete preservation, especially when compared to the other sources. Only seven columns of the lower portion of the front side of the stele have been effaced.

335 The primary exemplar of the Laws, used here as the Haupttext, is the black basalt stele discovered by Scheil at Susa in 1901-2, now kept at the Louvre in Paris. In addition to this monument there exist fragments, also inscribed on black basalt, that are presumed to have belonged to another stele that bore the same inscription, for which see the description in G.R. Driver and J.C. Miles, The Babylonian Laws (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955) 29-30. Based on this and other fragments J. Nougayrol, "Les Fragments en Pierre du Code Hammourabien (II)," Journal Asiatique 246, 2 (1958) 150, concluded that there were in fact three copies of the stele at Susa.
The Tablets

The first millennium copies of the Laws of Hammurabi examined here are both Neo-Assyrian and Neo-Babylonian in origin. None of the tablets preserve the law code in its entirety. Rather, certain tablets appear to be parts of a series that, when complete, may have contained all of the text of the stele.\textsuperscript{336} The sigla employed below are based on those used by Borger, though some adjustments have been made to reflect joins that have since been suggested by other scholars.\textsuperscript{337}

\textsuperscript{336} This much is evident from colophons that remain on some of the sources. An Old Babylonian copy, now in Istanbul, Ni2553+2565, has a colophon that labels it as the second tablet in the series.

\textsuperscript{337} For the original assignment of sigla to the fragments see R. Borger, \textit{Babylonisch-Assyrische Lesestücke: Heft II - Die Texte in Umschrift} (Rome: Pontifica Institutum Biblicum, 1963) 2-4. Subscript numerals have been added to some of the sigla to indicate which fragments of a rejoined tablet are being discussed in the list of variants. This practice follows that established in the apparatus by A.R. George, \textit{Gilgamesh}. It will be noted that, in the other ‘score’ editions utilised in this study, joins are usually indicated by a sign ‘+’ between the fragments, and all joined fragments are referred to by the same sigla. In the case of the Law of Hammurabi, though, the absence of a pre-existing publication that contained a ‘score’ edition of the text allowed the present writer the opportunity to create his own ‘score,’ in which the method of assigning individual siglum to each fragment, so recently utilised by A.R. George, was also employed.
Table - Laws of Hammurabi: Tablets Under Examination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Siglum</th>
<th>Museum Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>BM34914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>BE35271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>K10778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J₁</td>
<td>K4223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J₂</td>
<td>Sm1008a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>K10483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>K8905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P₁</td>
<td>K8321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P₂</td>
<td>Rm277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P₃</td>
<td>DT81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P₄</td>
<td>Rm2,388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>K10485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>VAT991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>VAT1036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Sm1642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>Sm26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e₁</td>
<td>Bu. 91-5-9, 221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e₂</td>
<td>K11571</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description of the Sources

B, BM34914

The script is Neo-Babylonian and the tablet is probably from Babylonia given the museum catalogue number. It is designated as Neo-Babylonian or Late Babylonian by

---

338 There seems to be some confusion in the editions about which tablet is identified by the siglum C. R. Borger, Babylonisch-Assyrische Lesestücke, 2, has this as BE35271, published in E. Bergmann, Codex Hammurabi: Textus Primigenius (Rome: PIB, 1953) pl. 52. G.R. Driver and J.C. Miles, Babylonian Laws, 2, on the other hand, have Bergmann’s pl. 52 as containing BE35751, and mention that the tablet BE35271 is known but unpublished, a claim seconded in D.J. Wiseman, "The Laws of Hammurabi Again," Journal of Semitic Studies 7 (1962) 162 n. 6. The designation of C as BE35271 in the present study relies on the tablet number given in E. Bergmann, Codex Hammurabi, where it is clearly marked in favour of Borger.

339 The proveniences of Late Babylonian, Neo-Babylonian and Neo-Assyrian that are assigned to the tablets follow the appraisals given in R. Borger, Babylonisch-Assyrische Lesestücke, 2-4. The reader is directed towards Borger’s list for the appropriate publications for each tablet.
Wiseman, who also considered that the tablet may have been copied from a *Vorlage* different to the Louvre stele.341

C, BE35271

The tablet is written in Late Babylonian script. It forms part of the collection from the University of Pennsylvania expedition to Babylonia in the late 19th century. The tablet was published by Bergmann and Falkenstein in 1953.342

D, K10778

This is a Neo-Assyrian fragment from Kuyunjik, first published by Lassøe in 1950 from an earlier drawing made by F. Geers.343

J1, K4223; J2, Sm1008a

These fragments belong to a Neo-Assyrian tablet from Kuyunjik first published by Meissner in 1908.344 From the catalogue designation ‘Sm’ it can be assumed that these fragments were discovered in the Southwest Palace.345

---

340 Tablets in the British Museum numbered between BM33328 and BM77218 were largely excavated by Rassam during his expeditions in Babylonia between 1879 and 1882. See the references in note .


342 E. Bergmann, *Codex Hammurabi*, pl. 52, but see note above.


L, K10483
This is a Neo-Assyrian fragment from Kuyunjik first published by Meissner.346

N, K8905
This Neo-Assyrian fragment from Kuyunjik was also published by Meissner in 1908.347
Borger has suggested that this fragment may be part of the same tablet as tablet L, K10483.348

P1, K8321; P2, Rm277; P3, DT81; P4, Rm2,388
The script is Neo-Assyrian. Lassøe first suggested that these fragments were from the same tablet. From the catalogue designation DT it can be assumed that this tablet was from the North Palace at Nineveh.349 It would seem that fragment P3 was excavated during Smith’s first expedition to Kuyunjik in 1873, while the fragments P2 and P3 were uncovered during Rassam’s later expedition in 1878.

345 George Smith’s 1874 expedition to Kuyunjik principally extracted tablets from the Southwest Palace, for which see J.E. Reade, "Archaeology and the Kuyunjik Archives," 214.
348 See R. Borger, Babylonisch-Assyrische Lesestücke, 3.
349 According to J.E. Reade, "Archaeology and the Kuyunjik Archives," 214, tablets catalogued as DT were excavated from the North Palace by George Smith in 1873.
T, K10485

This is a Neo-Assyrian fragment from Kuyunjik. It was published by Meissner in 1908.\textsuperscript{350}

W, VAT991

This tablet, now at the Staatliche Museen in Berlin, is written in Late Babylonian script. According to the colophon this tablet is DUB.7.KAM [i]-nu ṣi-ru-um, “the seventh tablet in (the series) ‘When the exalted Anum.’”\textsuperscript{351}

Z, VAT1036

The script is Late Babylonian. Unlike tablet W there is no colophon preserved. See note above for the publication details for this fragment.

b, Sm1642

The script is Neo-Assyrian. The designation ‘Sm’ indicates that this tablet is from the Southwest Palace at Kuyunjik.\textsuperscript{352}

\textsuperscript{350} B. Meissner, "Altbabylonische Gesetze," 507, and see the drawing in E. Bergmann, \textit{Codex Hammurabi}, pl. 47.

\textsuperscript{351} See the colophon in G.R. Driver and J.C. Miles, \textit{Babylonian Laws}, 114. This tablet and tablet Z were first published in A. Ungnad, \textit{Keilschrifttexte der Gesetze Hammurapis: Autographie der Stele sowie der altbabylonischen, assyrischen und neubabylonischen Fragmente} (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1909) 42. The drawing used in the present study for tablets W and Z is from E. Bergmann, \textit{Codex Hammurabi}, pl. 51.

\textsuperscript{352} See the reference in note above. Tablet b and tablet c were both published in B. Meissner, "Altbabylonische Gesetze," 509-10.
This is a fragment from a Neo-Assyrian tablet. Like tablet b, this fragment was excavated at the Southwest Palace at Kuyunjik.

e₁, Bu. 91-5-9, 221; e₂, K11571

The script is Neo-Assyrian. These fragments were published separately, however the catalogue designation ‘K’ suggests the tablet was originally from Kuyunjik, and the registration number Bu. 91-5-9 indicates that the tablet was from the Southwest Palace there, specifically from room LIV.\(^{353}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fragment</th>
<th>Total SU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>431.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J₁-₂</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P₁-₄</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e₁-₂</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following table gives the total number of SU and the total count of variant forms for each set of two parallel tablets preserving at least 20 SU in common. Following this table

\(^{353}\) The tablets registered as 91-5-9 come from E.A.W. Budge’s fourth trip to Mesopotamia, which led to excavations between 1889 and 1891 that uncovered tablets from room LIV of the Southwest Palace (A.R. George, *Gilgamesh*, 386). Room LIV is a large chamber on the south-western facing side of the structure.
is an exhaustive list of all variant readings between any two first millennium sources for the Laws of Hammurabi that overlap in content, regardless of the amount of overlapping text preserved. Although every variant is given in the list, the discussion of the variants will refer in the main only to those texts preserving at least 50 SU in parallel listed in the table. Variant readings in the parallel sources that are less fully preserved may be referred to periodically, but will not be made to bear any of the statistical argument put forward regarding types and frequencies of variants.
Table - Variants in the Parallel Sources for the Laws of Hammurabi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparison: Text vs Text</th>
<th>TOTAL PLL</th>
<th>Orthographic Variants</th>
<th>Proportion: SU per Orth. Variant</th>
<th>Orthographic (linguistic) Variants</th>
<th>Proportion: SU per Orth. (l) Variant</th>
<th>Stylistic (Type 1) Variants</th>
<th>Proportion: SU per St. (1) Variant</th>
<th>Stylistic (Type 2) Variants</th>
<th>Proportion: SU per St. (2) Variant</th>
<th>Stylistic (Type 3) Variants</th>
<th>Proportion: SU per St. (3) Variant</th>
<th>Herme-neutic Variants</th>
<th>Proportion: SU per Her. Variant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LH:B</td>
<td>878</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>146.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LH:P</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>67.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>403</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LH:e</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LH:J</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>133.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LH:W</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LH:C</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>52.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B:C</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LH:e</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LH:N</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LH:L</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LH:Z</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LH:T</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LH:D</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B:D</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LH:b</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P:T</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## List of Variants Between the Parallel Sources for the Laws of Hammurabi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Tablets</th>
<th>Variant Text</th>
<th>Categorisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
<td>LH ia 6-15</td>
<td>ša-i-im ši-ma-at KALAM a-na DINGIR AMAR.UD DUMU re-ešt-ti-im ša d EN.KI d EN.LÍL-ut KIŠ ni-ši i-ši-mu-šum in l-gi4-gi4 ú-šar-bí-ù-šu</td>
<td>SV(2) – Different phraseology between the sources.354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B i 2-11</td>
<td>[ ]ni-ši <code>x</code>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[ ]ra-pi [ ]m]u-ba-<code>li-ìt</code></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[ ]it qā-[i]šu-un[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[ ]ú-tim mi-ša-ri-um</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[ ]ši-rik-ti iš-ru-ku-šu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[ ]-ša-at-li-mu-šu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[ ]aṭ-ṭi-im ù a-gi-i</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>`ši´-ma-at ša-ru-tim</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

354 The opening lines of the stele are phrased differently in B, though only lines 3-15 are sufficiently preserved in parallel to allow meaningful comment. According to M.E.J. Richardson, *Hammurabi's Laws: Text, Translation, and Glossary* (New York: T&T Clark, 2004) 17, B can be restored: ... nišši ... Hammurabi mārim rēštīm ša Sinnubalīṭ ṭīpit qāṭīšan rē ūtim mīšarium ana širikti ĺṣrūkāšu uṣatlimūšu ṣṭṣu ṣaḡī sīmāt šarrūtim, “... people ... Hammurabi, the first son of Sinnuballit; by the touch of their hands they endowed him with the gift of the pastorship of justice; they presented him with the sword and the crown as signs of kingship.” This stands in contrast to the stele itself, which reads: ... šā`i-m šīmāt mātim ana Marduk mārim rēštīm ša Ea ellīlūṭ kīškat nišši išīmāšum in Igiigē uṣar-bīšu, “... (Enlil) who determines the fate of the nation allotted to Marduk, first born son of Ea, governance of all the peoples of the world. They exalted him among the Igiigē.” Certainly the proper noun Hammurabi does not appear on the stele until later in the prologue (line ia 50), and the plural noun nišši is also out of place by several lines. In the light of the two other variants that B preserves in the prologue (see H2 and H132) it seems that this Late Babylonian manuscript held a different tradition for the opening section of the text. The parallel text to lines ia 6-15 of the stele seems to be significantly abbreviated in B based on the available space contained in the reconstructed tablet. At the same time B appears to have additional material describing the instruments that symbolise kingship, and a reference to Hammurabi that is not paralleled in the stele. R. Borger, *Babylonisch-Assyrische Lesestücke*, 7, notes that B “hat jedoch statt Stele I 1-15, einen völlig abweichenden Abschnitt” [has a completely different section in place of Stele I 1-15]. D.J. Wiseman, "Hammurabi Again," 161, suggests that B most likely preserves a copy of the prologue that “followed a primary source, perhaps that of which the stele itself was one version.”
| H2 | LH ia 16 | KÂ.DINGIR.RA.KI | DUR.AN.KI | HV – Different proper nouns given in the sources.\(^{355}\) |
| H3 | LH ia 19 | ū-ša-te-ru-šu | ’ū-š[a-t]i-ru-šu | OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.\(^{356}\) |
| H4 | LH ia 20 | i-na | in | OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.\(^{357}\) |
| H5 | LH ia 21 | šar-ru-tam | ’šar’[ ]tim | OV(l) – B has the wrong case vowel for the accusative singular.\(^{358}\) |
| H6 | LH ia 21 | da-rí-tam | da-rí-ti | OV(l) – B has the wrong case vowel for the accusative singular. |
| H7 | LH ia 23 | ù | u | OV – The conjunction is written with the sign U in B. |

\(^{355}\) The stele reads: Bâbilam šumšu šīram ibbiū, “they gave Babylon its excellent name,” but the city mentioned in B is Nippur. This variant, when taken into account with variant H132, might suggest that B was a copy of a textual tradition that was centred in Nippur, as has already been observed by M.E.J. Richardson, *Hammurabi’s Laws*, 17. It should also be mentioned that the list of city names beginning at line 50 of the stele has Nippur preceding Eridu and Babylon. According to R. Borger, *Babylonisch-Assyrische Lesestücke*, 7, this may be an indication that B represents a tradition of the text that stems from a period in which Nippur was considered to be the centre of the empire – a situation that is known to have developed after Hammuabi’s 20th year.

\(^{356}\) The difference between the sources is the writing of the medial vowel in the 3mpl perfect III/1 of ‘ataru, “make increase, surpass.” On the apparent free variation of /i/ and /e/ see M. Luukko, *Grammatical Variation in Neo-Assyrian* (SAAS 16 Helsinki: Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project, 2004) 86-87, and the discussion in notes and . Given the non-uniform distribution of the spellings with /i/ and /e/ it is likely that the various spellings reflect the actual pronunciation, or at least the orthographic preference, of the individual scribe.

\(^{357}\) The stele has the archaic and poetical form of the preposition *in*, found in Old Akkadian, Old Babylonian royal inscriptions and Old Babylonian and Standard Babylonian literary texts (see *CAD* I 141b, and the comments in G.R. Driver and J.C. Miles, *Babylonian Laws*, 116). See also H268.

\(^{358}\) The spelling of the case vowel in B may reflect a similar phenomenon to that described in A.R. George, *Gilgamesh*, 439, “-i or -e for nominative or accusative singular.”
| H8 | LH ia 24 | iš-da-ša | SV(1) – Difference in the gender of the possessive pronominal suffix.  
B i 18 | iš-da-šu |
| H9 | LH ia 26 | ú-ki-in-nu-šum | OV(l) – B lacks mimation.  
B i 19 | ú-ki-in-nu-šu |
| H10 | LH ia 27-28 | i-nu-mi-šu ḫa-am-mu-ra-pi | SV(1) – The preposition inūmišu, “at that time,” is lacking in B.  
B i 20-21 | ḫa-am-mu-ra-pi |
| H11 | LH ia 28 | ḫa-am-mu-ra-pi | SV(2) – B has an expanded epithet.  
B i 20-21 | ḫa-am-mu-ra-pi ša-ra mi-ša-ra-am |
| H12 | LH ia 29 | ru-ba-am | OV – The long vowel (diphthong) in √rubû, “prince,” is written in B.  
B i 22 | ru-ba-a-am |
| H13 | LH ia 30 | na’-dam | OV(l) – B lacks mimation.  
B i 23 | na’-da |
| H14 | LH ia 31 | ia-ti | OV – The long initial vowel (diphthong) of the independent pronoun iāti is written in B.  
B i 25 | ia-a-ti |
| H15 | LH ia 32 | mi-ša-ra-am | OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.  
B i 25 | mi-ša-ri-am |
| H16 | LH ia 33 | ma-tim | OV(l) – B lacks mimation.  
B i 26 | ma-a-ti |

359 The form išdaša/u, is translated “its foundation.” The possessive pronominal suffix refers to šarrutam daritam, “everlasting kingship.” Nouns marked with the abstract affix “-ut” are grammatically feminine (cf. J. Huehnergard, *A Grammar of Akkadian* [Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2005] 124), so the reading in the stele is considered to be correct.


361 See also the spelling in B of the final vowel preceding the nominative case vowel in the form mīšarīum in H2 above. The diphthongal spelling of the ultimate vowel may reflect the pronunciation of this lexeme for the scribe, possibly influenced by √šešū, “to be straight,” on which the noun is based, but see also H18 below. In other instances the scribe seems to preserve diphthongal endings in final weak verbs (see note and the references there).
H17  LH ia 35  ṣe-nam  OV – B has CV-VC against CVC in LH.
    B i 28  [ṣ]e-‘na’am

H18  LH ia 36  ḫu-ul-lu-qi-im  OV(l) – B has the wrong case vowel for the genitive singular.362
    B i 29  [q]i-am

H19  LH ia 37  da-nu-um  Not Counted – The sign in B is clearly not UM as contained in LH.363
    B i 30  [ ]-‘am?”

H20  LH ia 42  wa-ṣe-e-em-ma  OV – LH writes the long vowel in √aṣu, “to come out, raise.”
    B ii 2  [ṣ]e-em

H21  LH ia 42  wa-ṣe-e-em-ma  SV(1) – The enclitic particle “-ma” is lacking in B
    B ii 2  [ṣ]e-em

H22  LH ia 44  nu-wu-ri-im  OV(l) – B lacks the archaic forms in LH.364
    B ii 2  nu-um-mu-ri

H23  LH ia 45  AN  OV – The proper noun Anum is written syllabically in B.
    B ii 3  [ ]-num

H24  LH ia 46  ùd EN.LÍL  OV – The conjunction is written with the sign U in B and C.
    B ii 3  u d EN.LÍL
    C i 1  ‘u’d [EN]’LÍL’

H25  LH ia 47  ni-ši  OV(l) – C preserves mimiation, lacking in LH and B.
    B ii 4  ni-ši
    C i 2  ni-ši-im

H26  LH ia 49  šu-mi  OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.365
    B ii 5  šu-mi-am
    C i 3  šu-mi

362 The form of the infinitive hulluqu, “to make disappear,” should take the genitive case vowel. See also the spelling of the final vowel that precedes the case vowel as described in note above.

363 Although damaged, the sign in B reflects a variant of some kind from the form in the stele. However, as this variant is not noted in R. Borger, Babylonisch-Assyrische Lesestücke, 7 or D.J. Wiseman, ”Hammurabi Again,” 168-72, it is considered too uncertain to be counted here.

364 B reflects the phonological shift of word medial /w/ > /m/ in the lexeme √namaru, “to illuminate” (cf. J. Huehnergard, Grammar, 259 and 597), and also lacks mimiation. These differences are only counted as one linguistic variation in light of Rule 3.

365 The ending “-am” in B may reflect the accusative singular case vowel (see also H15 and H18 above).
H27 LH ia 49 ib-bu-ú
  B ii 5 ib-bi-ù
  C i 3 ib-bi-ù
OV(l) – B and C preserve the diphthong in final weak ꜜnabû, “to invoke.”

H28 LH ia 51 re-yu-um
  B ii 7 [r]e-yu-ú-um
  C i 4 re-yu-um
OV – The long vowel in medial weak ꜜre’û, “shepherd,” is written in B.

H29 LH ia 52 ni-bi-it
  B ii 8 ni-bi-it
  C i 5 ni-bi-it
OV – Different spelling of the noun ꜜnibîtu, “chosen, (one) called,” in B.

H30 LH ia 54 mu-kam-me-er
  B ii 9 mu-kam-’mi-i[r
  C i 6 mu-kam-mi-ir
OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.366

H31 LH iia 3 ki-ib-ra-at
  B ii 20 ki-ib-ra-tim
OV(l) – B has the archaic ending, lacking in LH.367

H32 LH iia 5 mu-šar-bí
  B ii 21 mu-šar-bi-u
OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.368

H33 LH iia 8 li-bi-i
  B ii 22 lib-bi
OV – B has CVC against CV-VC in LH.

H34 LH iia 10 u₄-mi-šu
  B ii 23 u₄-mi-ša-am
SV(1) – Difference in gender of the possessive pronominal suffix.369

366 The spelling in LH reflects [e] as an allophone of /i/ when occurring before /r/ (see J. Huehnergard, Grammar, 592). This spelling is not reflected in B and C, which perhaps show a later orthographic development where the phones [i] and [e] are in free variation as allophones of /i/, or where the phonemes /i/ and /e/ are in free variation (see the references to note above).

367 The full phrase is tīb kibrāt erbettim, “onslaught on the four regions (of the world).” The full genitive ending with mimation in B is an archaisms, cf. the archaic form of the idiom in the Hymn to Ištar (RA 22 91), and in an inscription from the reign of Hammurabi (CT 21 41 iib 7-8).

368 B has a possible case vowel appended to the III/1 participle form of final weak ꜜrabû, “to be large, great.” B reads: mušarbiu zikru Bābli, “(who) magnifies the name of Babylon,” against the bound form in the stele: mušarbi zikru Bābli, “magnifier of the name of Babylon” (cf. the table in J. Huehnergard, Grammar, 62). An alternative reading is that both sources have the same form of the participle, where B has a Neo-Assyrian form with uncontracted post-tonic ꜜi/, cf. J. Hämeen-Anttila, A Sketch of Neo-Assyrian Grammar (SAAS XIII Helsinki: Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project, 2000) 36. For other examples of final weak verbs written with diphthongal endings see H27, H62, H125 and H207 (but contra H122 and H127).
| H35 | LH iia 11 | iz-za-zu | OV – The final radical of √uzzūzu, “to stand,” is doubled in B.\(^{370}\)  
B ii 24 | iz-za-az-zu |
| H36 | LH iia 18 | wa-aš-ru-um | OV(l) – B has the wrong case vowel for the nominative singular.\(^{371}\)  
B ii 29 | wa-aš-ri-im  
D i 7 | [ ]-um |
| H37 | LH iia 19 | mu-uš-te-mi-qum | OV(l) – D has the wrong case vowel for the nominative singular.  
B ii 29 | mu-uš-te-mi-qû  
D i 8 | [ ]-qì |
| H38 | LH iia 19 | mu-uš-te-mi-qum | OV(l) – B lacks mimation.  
B ii 29 | mu-uš-te-mi-qû |
| H39 | LH iia 23 | še-mu | OV – The ultimate vowel of the I/1 participle of final weak √šemû, “to hear,” is written as long in B.  
B ii 33 | še-mu-ú |
| H40 | LH iia 23 | da-núm | OV – The medial weak √dânu, “to judge,” is written logographically in B.  
B ii 33 | DI.KUD |
| H41 | LH iia 30 | É-babbar | OV – Different spelling for the proper noun Ebabbar in B.\(^{372}\)  
B ii 38 | ‘É-babbar\(_2\)? |

\(^{369}\) The pronoun in B probably refers to Hammurabi which makes the apparent gender difficult.  
\(^{370}\) The root is given as *'zz in the dictionaries, but the underlying root may instead be read as *zwz, according to J. Huehnergard, "izzuzzum and itūlum," Riches Hidden in Secret Places: Ancient Near Eastern Studies in Memory of Thorkild Jacobsen (ed. A. Abusch; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2002) 162.  
\(^{371}\) LH and D both agree with the fragment from the Old Babylonian duplicate of LH, AO10237, so B does not seem to reflect an ancient variant. In H36 and H37 both B and D have /i/ for the nominative singular case vowel in one part of the construction wašrum mušteiqum, “humble supplicant,” so both sources display late orthography for the nominative singular (see the references in note above).  
\(^{372}\) The signs in B are quite damaged. D.J. Wiseman, "Hammurabi Again," 168-172, seems to read the signs in B with the stele, as no variant is noted in the apparatus. R. Borger, Babylonisch-Assyrische Lesestücke, 8, reads the signs following É as bar\(_6\)-bar\(_6\), while M.E.J. Richardson, Hammurabi's Laws, 32 n. 26, reads bar\(_6\)-ra. Judging from Wiseman’s drawing (see D.J. Wiseman, "Hammurabi Again," 164) it looks like reading “babbar\(_2\)” (also read “bar\(_{11}\)-bar\(_{11}\),” written \(^{47}\) \(^{48}\)) is acceptable, and so an orthographic variant is counted here.
| H42 | LH iia 37 | mu-ba-li-iṭ | OV – Different spellings of the II/1 participle muballit, “one who brings life (to).” |
| H43 | LH iia 39 | me-e | OV – The ultimate vowel in √mê, “water,” is written as long in LH. |
| H44 | LH iia 40 | nu-ûḫ-ši-im | Not Counted – Possible error in B. |
| H45 | LH iia 42 | mu-ul-li | OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation. |
| H46 | LH iia 44 | mu-kam-me-er | OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation. |
| H47 | LH iia 46 | AN-nim | OV – The proper noun Anum is written with the divine determinative in B. |
| H48 | LH iia 47 | ū | OV – The conjunction is written with the sign U in B. |
| H49 | LH iia 48 | AN.DÛL | OV – The noun √šulûlu, “shade,” is written syllabically in B. |

---

373 B agrees with the fragment of the Old Babylonian duplicate of LH, AO10237.

374 The explanation given by D.J. Wiseman, "Hammurabi Again," 170, is that this is most likely an erroneous writing of the noun √nuḫšu, “abundance, plenty,” through the omission of the sign ŠI. Otherwise the form in B could be read as nuḫšu, from √nâḫu, “pacify, give rest,” but the meaning is unclear. The full phrase in LH is šâkin mé nuḫšu ana niššu, “provider of abundant waters for his people.” In B we would therefore read šâkin mé nûḫim ana nîššu, “provider of relenting/abating waters for his people.” The sense of the phrase in B might perhaps be understood in light of the passage in Gilgamesh XI 131 (according to the line numbering in A.R. George, Gilgamesh, 710), where we read: inâḫ tâmtu (A.AB.BA), “the Deluge ended.” But in the present context the reference to abating flood waters would be quite awkward. “Provider of abating (flood) waters to his people” certainly interrupts the logical sequence of the phrase, so in the light of Rule 1 the reading of an error in B is preferred.

375 The stele has the expected bound form of √elû, “to raise up.” The spelling in B may reflect the influence of Neo-Assyrian pronunciation, where III weak /i/ > /a/ (cf. J. Huehnergard, Grammar, 602).

376 The writing of [e] as an allophone of /i/ could reflect a difference in pronunciation, perhaps under the influence of the following /r/. The stem vowel of √kanûru, “to heap up,” is a/u, but i/i in Neo-Assyrian (BGP 144). On the allophones of /i/ in Neo-Assyrian see note above and the references there.
H50 LH iia 48 ma-tim OV – The long vowel in √mātu, “land,” is written in B.

B iii 14 ma- [ ]

H51 LH iia 54 É-É.GAL.MAḪ OV – The proper noun Egalmah is written without the first logogram in B.377

B iii 20 É.GAL.MAḪ

C ii 5 É-É.GAL.MAḪ

H52 LH iia 55 šār-ri OV – Possible added gloss in C.378

B iii 20 šā[r ]

C ii 6 šār-šār7-ru9

H53 LH iia 59 ūru kiš ki OV – The proper noun Kiš is written without the city name determinative in B.

B iii 23 kiš ki

C ii 9 ūru kiš ki[i]

H54 LH iia 61 me-le-em-mi OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.379

B iii 25 me-lam-mu

C ii 11 me-le-em-m[i]

H55 LH iia 63 mu-uš-te-eš-bi SV(1) – Lexical interchange.380

B iii 26 mu-uš-te-ši-ir

C ii 13 mu-uš-te-eš-bi

H56 LH iia 66 bi-tim OV – The noun √bītu, “house,” is written logographically in B.

B iii 28 Ė

H57 LH iia 68 na-ki-ri OV – Different spellings of the noun nakru, “enemy.”381

B iii 29 na-ki-rī6

377 D.J. Wiseman, "Hammurabi Again," 170, notes this as a possible error.

378 The second sign in C has the more common palaeography for the sign ŠĀR against the defective palaeography of the first writing of this sign. The final sign in C (ru9) is a phonetic complement and the wrong case vowel for the genitive singular.

379 B has the unbound form of the noun √melammu, “radiance,” within the genitive construction melemmi Emeteursag, “the radiance of Emeteursag.”

380 It is likely that B exchanges a difficult term with a more familiar term. LH and C have √šutesbū, “to execute (something) according to a plan,” (see CAD § 227a), while B has √šutesuru, “to put into good order” (see CAD E 359a and D.J. Wiseman, "Hammurabi Again," 171 n. 1). On the term muštešbi in LH, see G.R. Driver and J.C. Miles, Babylonian Laws, 130.

381 D.J. Wiseman, "Hammurabi Again," 171 n. 2, and R. Borger, Babylonisch-Assyrische Lesestücke, 8, and M.E.J. Richardson, Hammurabi’s Laws, 32 n. 39, read B as “na-ki-du,” but reading the final sign as RI6 is also plausible based on Wiseman’s drawing.
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H58  LH iiia 69  Èr-ra  
B iii 30  Èr-ra-ra  
OV – The proper noun Erra is written with the divine determinative in B.\textsuperscript{382}

H59  LH iiia 70  ú-ša-ak-ši-du  
B iii 31  ú-ša-ak-ši-du-š[u]  
SV(2) – B has a redundant object suffix.\textsuperscript{383}

H60  LH iiia 1  ni-iz-ma-sú  
B iii 32  ni-iz-ma-šu  
OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.\textsuperscript{384}

H61  LH iiia 4  mu-ra-ap-pí-iš  
B iii 35  mu-ra-pi-iš  
OV – B has CV-CV against CV-VC-CV in LH.

H62  LH iiia 16  i-lu  
B iv 2  i-lí  
OV(l) – B has the wrong case vowel for the nominative singular.\textsuperscript{385}

\textsuperscript{382} The repetition of the sign RA in B is perhaps a dittography, perhaps a phonetic complement. The variation is not counted in the light of Rule 3.

\textsuperscript{383} The verb in LH appears without the cataphoric pronominal object suffix, which is redundant in the phrase ušakšida nizmassu, “he (Erra) allowed him to achieve his ambition.” See M.E.J. Richardson, \textit{Hammurabi’s Laws}, 33 for this translation. Following G.R. Driver and J.C. Miles, \textit{Babylonian Laws}, another acceptable translation of the verb and its object in B is “he (Erra) has satisfied it, (namely) his desire.”

\textsuperscript{384} The apparent variation here concerns the shift [tʃ] > [ss] in the noun ‘\textit{nizmatu}, “wish, desire,” with the 3ms pronominal suffix (J. Huehnergard, \textit{Grammar}, 87). However in Neo-Assyrian “<ʃ> and <s> have changed their places in the phoneme-field” (J. Hämeen-Anttila, \textit{Neo-Assyrian Grammar}, 9) which means that the writing of <ʃ> in B could in fact stand for the phoneme /s/ if the scribe was using a Neo-Assyrian dialect. In light of this there may in fact have been no difference in pronunciation between the sources. However, judging by the script and the museum number, one should consider B to be of Babylonian origin, and this is certainly the opinion stated in D.J. Wiseman, “Hammurabi Again,” 161 n. 1.

\textsuperscript{385} It is likely that the text of B preserves a stylistic variation here against the nominative phrase in LH \textit{ilu šarrî}, “the god of kings.” M.T. Roth, \textit{Law Collections from Mesopotamia and Asia Minor} (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997) 78 and 140 n. 1, restores the phrase as Ezida <\textit{šubat}> \textit{ilu šarrî}, “Ezida, <dwelling place of> the god of kings,” for which we would read B as containing the oblique plural <\textit{šubat}> \textit{iš šarrî}, “dwelling place of the gods of kings.” However, as this manuscript preserves only the variant case vowel, the noun \textit{iš} is read not as a plural but as a nominative singular written with the wrong case vowel (cf. A.R. George, \textit{Gilgamesh}, 439, “-\textit{i} or -\textit{e} for nominative or accusative singular”). The available parallel manuscripts, namely the fragments of the Old Babylonian duplicate stele AO10237 and the Middle Assyrian fragment VAT10079, also preserve the variant case vowel and so perhaps strengthen the case for reading
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H63</th>
<th>LH iii a 29</th>
<th>d Ma-ma</th>
<th>OV – Different spelling of the proper noun Mama in B.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B iv 13</td>
<td>d Má-[ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H64</th>
<th>LH iii a 35</th>
<th>d Nin-tu</th>
<th>SV(1) – Different appellations for the same deity between the sources.386</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B iv 19</td>
<td>d be-let [l-]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D ii 2</td>
<td>DINGIR.MAḪ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H65</th>
<th>LH iii a 38</th>
<th>ša-i-im</th>
<th>SV(1) – Lexical interchange.387</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B iv 21</td>
<td>ša'[ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D ii 4</td>
<td>ša-ki-in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H66</th>
<th>LH iii a 39</th>
<th>mi-ri-tim</th>
<th>OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.388</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B iv 21</td>
<td>me-ri-tim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D ii 4</td>
<td>me[ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H67</th>
<th>LH iii a 42</th>
<th>GĪR.SU ki</th>
<th>OV – The proper noun Girsu is written with the sign GĪR in B.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B iv 24</td>
<td>GĪR.SU[ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D ii 7</td>
<td>GĪR.SU[ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H68</th>
<th>LH iii a 44</th>
<th>nin-da-bé-e</th>
<th>OV – B has CVC against CV-VC in LH and D for the noun √nindabû, “offering, provision.”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B iv 25</td>
<td>nin-da-b[é ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D ii 9</td>
<td>ni-in-da-bé-'e</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H69</th>
<th>LH iii a 45</th>
<th>ra-bu-tim</th>
<th>OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.389</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B iv 26</td>
<td>ra-bi-ù-ti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D ii 10</td>
<td>ra-bu-tim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

An oblique plural here in B. However, there is a marked tendency in this Neo-Babylonian manuscript to frequently write grammatically incorrect case vowels.

386 B and D refer to the same deity, probably the goddess Mama mentioned previously, where D has a compound logogram for the epithet Bēlet III but lacks the feminine marker. The goddess Nintu, named in the stele, is also associated with the goddess Mama. On this see G. Leick, *A Dictionary of Ancient Near Eastern Mythology* (London: Routledge, 1997) 119-21 and 135.

387 The stele has √šâmu, “procure, allot,” against √šakānu, “provide,” in D. The lexeme in D is also found in the Old Babylonian duplicate of LH, AO10237 (see G.R. Driver and J.C. Miles, *Babylonian Laws*, 134, CAD Ş 1 153 and 360a). B is too damaged to allow a certain reading.

388 This is another example of the possible free variation of the phonemes /i/ and /e/. See note above, and also notes and below.

389 The final weak form in B has the diphthongal ending preserved in the orthography. See note above and the references there.
H70  LH iiia 47  mu-tam-me-eḫ  
B iv 27  mu-ta-mi-iḫ  
D ii 11  mu-tam-mi-iḫ  

OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.  

390 The orthography reflected in the stele for the II/1 participle of √tamāḫu, “to seize,” is expected, given that /i/ is thought to have been pronounced [e] when occurring before /ḫ/ or /r/ (see J. Huehnergard, Grammar, 45). The spelling in the later manuscripts B and D may reflect an underlying difference in pronunciation, or perhaps a simplified orthographic convention.

H71  B iv 27  mu-ta-mi-iḫ  
D ii 11  mu-tam-mi-iḫ  

OV – B has defective orthography for the II/1 participle of √tamāḫu, “to seize.”

H72  LH iiia 48  mi-gi-ir  
B iv 28  mi-gi-ir  

OV – Different spelling of the noun √migru, “favourite (person),” in B.

H73  LH iiia 54  še-tár  
B iv 32  [d]  

OV – The proper noun Ištar is written with the divine determinative in B.

H74  LH iiia 59  li-ib-bi  
B v 4  lib-bi  
C iv 5  [l]  

OV – B has CVC against CV-VC in LH and probably C.

H75  LH iiia 63  si-ma-tim  
B v 7  si-ma-[ ]  

OV – The long vowel in the plural noun √simātu, “ornaments,” is written in B.

H76  LH iiia 68  a-še-er  
B v 12  a-ši-ir  

OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.  

391 See the comments in note above concerning the writing of /i/ before /ḫ/ or /r/.

H77  LH iv 2  na-ap-ša-tam  
B v 15  ’na’-ap-ša-tim  

OV(l) – B has the wrong case vowel for the accusative singular.  

392 The noun is clearly the object of the verb iqîšu ( √qāšu, “to bestow”) and so must be accusative. B apparently has /i/ for the accusative singular case vowel (cf. A.R. George, Gilgamesh, 439).

H78  LH iva 4  mu-še-eš-qí  
B v 17  mu-še-eš-še-qí  

OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.  

393 B apparently has an anaptyctic vowel preceding the case vowel that is lacking in the stele. See M. Luukko, Neo-Assyrian, 102, and cf. A.R. George, Gilgamesh, 432.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>LH iva</th>
<th>B v</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| H79 | LH iva 6 | mes-lam | **OV** – The sign Ṣ, ṯitu, appears before the proper noun Meslam in B.  
394 The name of the temple in Cuthah has the logogram for ṯitu, “house,” preceding the proper noun in B. D.J. Wiseman, "Hammurabi Again," 171, lists this as a “true variant,” but the variant is treated here as purely orthographic. |
| H80 | LH iva 7 | em-qum | **OV** – Different spelling of the adjective emqu, “wise, skilled.”      |
| H81 | LH iva 8 | mu-tab-bi-lum | **OV(l)** – B has the wrong vowel for the nominative singular.          |
| H82 | LH iva 9 | šu | **SV(l)** – Lexical interchange.  
395 The stele has šu ikšudu, “he (who) has attained,” in contrast to B ša ikšudu, “who attained.” B agrees with the Old Babylonian duplicate of the stele, AO10237. |
| H83 | LH iva 11 | mu-uš-pa-az-zi-ir | **OV(l)** – Possible difference in pronunciation.  
396 The difference between the sources could be lexical, as suggested in D.J. Wiseman, "Hammurabi Again," 171 n. 5, where the stele has the III/3 form of ṣpazāru, “give shelter, refuge,” against ṣpašāru in B. The proposed meaning of the second lexeme in Wiseman’s solution is unclear. Perhaps a better alternative is to read a variation in the pronunciation of sibilants. Admittedly, though, the assimilation of the voiced sibilant [z] to the emphatic sibilant [s], or otherwise to the “ejective” [s’], is not well attested (see J. Hämeen-Anttila, Neo-Assyrian Grammar, 15). Even so, invoking a rare phonological change to read a difference in pronunciation is more preferable than reading an otherwise unattested lexeme whose meaning is unknown. |
| H84 | LH iva 12 | MÁ.AL.NAG.A ki | **OV** – Different spelling of the proper noun Malgûum.    |
| H85 | LH iva 13 | ka-ra-ši-im | **OV** – The long vowel in √karāšu, “annihilation,” is written in B.  
397 The feminine plural possessive pronominal suffix is “-šina” in B, apocopated to “-šin” in the stele. The shortened form in the stele is perhaps a poetic device intended to rhyme with the next line: in nuḫšin (see G.R. Driver and J.C. Miles, Babylonian Laws, 139). It is unclear why R. Borger, Babylonisch-Assyrische Lesestücke, 9, reads B as “nu-ūḫ-ši-[m],” when the reading “nu-ūḫ-ši-[n]” is equally as plausible. D.J. |
| H86 | LH iva 15 | šu-ba-ti-ši-na | **OV(l)** – Possible difference in pronunciation.  
397 The feminine plural possessive pronominal suffix is “-šina” in B, apocopated to “-šin” in the stele. The shortened form in the stele is perhaps a poetic device intended to rhyme with the next line: in nuḫšin (see G.R. Driver and J.C. Miles, Babylonian Laws, 139). It is unclear why R. Borger, Babylonisch-Assyrische Lesestücke, 9, reads B as “nu-ūḫ-ši-[m],” when the reading “nu-ūḫ-ši-[n]” is equally as plausible. D.J. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LH iva</th>
<th>B v</th>
<th>OV</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 17     | 27  | ŏ  | EN.KI | OV – Different spelling of the proper noun Enki/Ea.  
398
| 18     | 27  | û  | dam-gal-nun-na | OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.  
399
| 18     | 27  | u  | dam-ki-en-na | OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.  
400
| 21     | 29  | i-ši-mu | ia-ši-im | OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.  
400
| 22     | 30  | zi-bi | zi-i-bi | OV – The long vowel in √zību, “offering (of food),” is written in B.  
400
| 23     | 30  | a-ša-re-ed | a-šā-red | OV – B has CVC against CV-VC in LH.  
401
| 25     | 31  | da-ad-mi | da-ád-me | OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.  
402

Wiseman, "Hammurabi Again,” does not note a variant in this line so may be presumed to read “nu-ūḫ-ši-[n].”

398 The proper noun d EN.KI in Sumerian is identified with the proper noun Ea in Semitic (see RLA 2 347-49), and so this variant may in fact reflect two divergent spellings of the same name.

399 The Sumerian goddess d DAM.GAL.NUN(NA), “great wife (of) the exalted,” appears as Damkina, “the rightful wife,” in B and also in the Old Babylonian duplicate of the stele AO10237. In both sources it is clear that the wife of Ea whose cult was centred at Malgûm is indicated, and so the difference in signs used to indicate this goddess is read as a variation in the pronunciation of the same name. See G. Leick, Dictionary, 29-30, and G.R. Driver and J.C. Miles, Babylonian Laws, 139.

400 The diphthong at the beginning of the word in B is difficult. Reading a 1cs form does not fit the context (“I instituted” is an unusual form in an epithet), and the dative pronoun iaši(m) likewise makes no sense. The lack of the final vowel in B also marks the form as peculiar, indicating that a different form of the epithet may lie behind this source.

401 The sign read as ŠA in B by Wiseman is most likely ŠÅ, so noted in R. Borger, Babylonisch-Assyrische Lesestücke, 9.

402 The final oblique plural case vowel of the bound form of dadmû, “settlements, inhabited world,” is written as /i/ in the stele against /e/ in B. The later manuscript may reflect the phonemes /i/ and /e/ in free variation. See note above and the references there.
| H94 | LH iva 26 | ÌD.UD.KIB.NUN.NA | OV – The name of the river Euphrates is written differently between the sources. 403 |
|     | B v 32   | ÌD.UD.KIB.NUN.KI |
| H95 | LH iva 27 | i-tum \(^d\) da-gan | SV(2) – Exchange of lexemes in B, perhaps for the purpose of clarification. 404 |
|     | B v 33   | ÌD u \(^d\) da-gan |
| H96 | LH iva 29 | šu | SV(1) – Lexical interchange. 405 |
|     | B v 34   | šá |
| H97 | LH iva 30 | me-ra \(^{ki}\) | OV(1) – Possible difference in pronunciation. 406 |
|     | B v 34   | me-ri \(^{ki}\) |
| H98 | LH iva 31 | tu-tu-ul \(^{ki}\) | OV(1) – Different pronunciation of proper noun. 407 |
|     | B v 35   | tu-ul-tu-ul |
| H99 | LH iva 32 | ru-bu-um | OV(1) – B lacks mimiation. |
|     | B v 36   | [ _ ]-ú |
| H100| LH iva 35 | pa-ni | OV(1) – B lacks the ultimate vowel on the bound form of \(\sqrt{panû}\), “face.” |
|     | B vi 1   | pa-an |
| H101| LH iva 35 | \(^d\) SUḪ \(^d\) INANNA | Not Counted – The reading in LH is uncertain. 408 |
|     | B vi 1   | |

---

403 See G.R. Driver and J.C. Miles, *Babylonian Laws*, 140, on the various spellings of the Sumerian BURA.NUN, “the great river,” Euphrates. B has the more common form here, also found in the Old Babylonian duplicate stele AO10237.

404 The phrase *ittum* \(^d\) *Dagan*, “oracular sign of the god Dagan,” is written as \(^d\) *Idu u \(^d\)Dagan*, “the god Naru and the god Dagan,” in B (where ÍD = I7 = \(^d\)Naru). It is possible that the scribe of B misunderstood the term *ittu* in the stele as the proper noun *Id* plus a conjunction. The scribe then re-wrote the misread lexemes appropriately.

405 The variant in B is read as the exchange of an emphatic pronoun for a relative particle. See also H82 above.

406 The ancient city name Mari is spelled variously as *Ma-uru*, *Ma-e-ri*, *Ma-a-ri* and *Ma-ri*. See G.R. Driver and J.C. Miles, *Babylonian Laws*, 141, and the references there.

407 The spelling in B is identified from Assyrian sources with the city *Ît* (\(^{w}\) I-it). The Old Babylonian duplicate stele AO10237 has “TU.TU,” and both B and AO10237 lack the place post-determinative KI.

408 The sign now read as SUḪ (\(-\text{𒈹}\)) was originally read as NIN (\(-\text{𒈹}\)) by A. Ungnad, *Keilschrifttexte der Gesetze Hammurapis*. The reading SUḪ, signifying the god Tišpak, was suggested following the re-
H102 LH iva 36 ša-ki-in B vi 2 tja’-ki-in OV(l) – Possible difference in grammatical forms. 409

H103 LH iva 36 el-lu-tim B vi 2 e-el-lu-tú OV(l) – B has the wrong case vowel for the oblique plural. 410

H104 LH iva 40 mu-ki-in-nu B vi 6 mu-ki-in OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation. 411

H105 LH iva 41 iš-di-ši-in B vi 6 SUḪUŠ-ši-na OV – The initial weak √išdu, “foundation,” is written logographically in B.

H106 LH iva 41 iš-di-ši-in B vi 6 SUḪUŠ-ši-na OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation. 412

examination of the stele in G.R. Driver and J.C. Miles, Babylonian Laws, 141. The scribe of manuscript B would appear to have also erroneously read the sign as NIN, signifying the goddess Inanna, however the sign recorded on the stele is ultimately uncertain and so is not counted.

409 B follows AO10237 in restoring mušakin, which is read as a III/2 participle in B against I/1 participle in the stele. The difference in grammatical forms should perhaps be read as a lexical interchange (cf. G72), but in light of Rule 4 the damage to B only allows the classification OV(l).

410 The oblique plural ending on the adjective should match the governing noun mākalī, “feasts.” B has an erroneous nominative plural ending and lacks mimiation.

411 The short anaptyctic vowel in LH is rare and considered archaic (see G.R. Driver and J.C. Miles, Babylonian Laws, 142). The vowel has been dropped in B.

412 The stele has an apocopated form of the 3fpl possessive pronominal suffix. See H86 above, and the comments in note.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H107</th>
<th>LH iva 42</th>
<th>qer-bu-um</th>
<th>OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.(^{413})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B vi 6</td>
<td>qé-re-eb</td>
<td>qer-bu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C v 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H108</td>
<td>LH iva 43</td>
<td>KÁ.DINGIR.RA ki</td>
<td>OV – B lacks the post-position determinative KI.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B vi 7</td>
<td>KÁ.DINGIR.RA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C v 1</td>
<td>KÁ.DINGIR.RA ki</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H109</td>
<td>LH iva 45</td>
<td>ni-šī</td>
<td>OV – Different spelling of the noun (√nišū), “people.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B vi 8</td>
<td>ni-šī</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C v 3</td>
<td>ni-šī</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H110</td>
<td>LH iva 47</td>
<td>išš-tár</td>
<td>OV – The proper noun Ištar is written logographically in B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B vi 9</td>
<td>(^d) INANNA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C v 4</td>
<td>[ ]-tář</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H111</td>
<td>LH iva 48</td>
<td>mu-ki-in-ni</td>
<td>OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.(^{414})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B vi 10</td>
<td>mu-ki-in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H112</td>
<td>LH iva 48</td>
<td>išš-tár</td>
<td>OV – The proper noun Ištar is written logographically in B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B vi 10</td>
<td>(^d) INANNA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C v 5</td>
<td>[ ]-ʾtáʾ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H113</td>
<td>LH iva 50</td>
<td>qer-bu-um</td>
<td>OV – B has CV-VC against CVC in LH.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B vi 11</td>
<td>qé-er-bu-um</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{413}\) B lacks the case ending in the bound form of \(√qerbu\), “midst, middle” (see also H100 and H104 above, plus H111 and H212 below), displaying the expected later grammatical form qereb (cf. J. Huehnergard, Grammar, 59, where “nouns of the type pVrs ... have the shape pVrVs, in which a copy of the vowel that appears between R\(_1\) and R\(_2\) is also inserted between R\(_2\) and R\(_3\)”). C lacks mimation, and has the ‘-u’ vowel appended to the bound form of the noun \(√qerbu\). This is probably an archaism reflecting the retention of the case ending ‘-um’ on the nomen regens that the stele preserves. In C, though, the lack of mimation indicates that the vowel ‘-u’ is grammatically extraneous, where according to J. Huehnergard, Grammar, 57-62, we would expect qereb or perhaps qerbī, but not qerbu. See also H113 below for the archaic form with the full case ending in B, and H117 where LH has the expected short vowel /i/ appended to the bound form of \(√šapū\), “to silence, subdue.”

\(^{414}\) B lacks the short ultimate vowel that appears in the stèle appended to the noun in the construct state (cf. note above). The short vowel /i/ appears “sporadically beside the vowelless form of the construct state” according to G.R. Driver and J.C. Miles, Babylonian Laws, 142.
H114 LH iva 53 mu-še-pí
B vi 12 mu-
šar- bi
C v 8 mu-[ša]r- bi
SV(1) – Lexical interchange.415

H115 LH iva 53 ki-na-tim
B vi 12 ki-n[a-ti]m
C v 8 ki-n[a]-a-t[im]
OV – The long medial vowel in √kīnātu, “truth,” is written in C.

H116 LH iva 57 da-mi-iq-tim
B vi 14 da-mi-iq-ti
C v 11 [   ]mi-iq-t[im]
OV(l) – B lacks mimation.

H117 LH iva 59 mu-še-ep-pí
B vi 16 mu-še-ep
C v 13 [   ]ep[   ]
OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.416

H118 LH iva 59 na-bi-ḫi
B vi 16 n[a-b]i- i
C v 11 ša
OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.417

H119 LH iva 60 ša
B vi 17 šá
C v 14 ša
OV – The relative particle is written with the sign ŠA in B.

H120 LH iva 60 i-na
B vi 17 ina
C v 14 ’i’-[n]a
OV – The preposition ina is written logographically in B.

415 B and C exchange a difficult term with a more familiar one. LH has the relatively rare lexeme √wapû, “make appear, manifest,” exchanged with the more common √rabû, “to make great,” in the later manuscripts. The Old Babylonian duplicate stele AO10237 agrees with LH.

416 B lacks the short vowel /i/ appended to the bound form of the II/1 participle of √šapû, “to silence, subdue” in LH. Cf. H107 where the irregular short vowel /u/ is appended to the bound form in manuscript C, which is unfortunately too damaged to allow a certain reading here. See also the references in note above.

417 The form nābiḫi in the stele is read as a plural oblique noun from √nābiḫu (nābi’u), “rebel, insurgent” (see CAD N 1 25a). B could be read as a singular noun nābiḫi, or as a plural form of the same noun written with a glottal stop in place of the final velar fricative of the stele. The sign in B (𒀪) can be read as CV, namely /’i/, or as VCV, namely /aḫa/, according to R. Labat, Manuel, 183. Thus the variant is read as a difference in pronunciation rather than a difference in number.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LH</th>
<th>iwa</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| H121 | 60 | ni-nu-à | ni-[n ]-à | OV – B has CV-V[C-CV] against CV-CV in LH.  
418 R. Borger, Babylonisch-Assyrische Lesestücke, 9, notes “Schreibung des Statnamens Ninive in B unklar,” however an orthographic variant seems certain. |
| H122 | 62 | ú-šu-pí-ù | ú-še-pu-ù | OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.  
419 The Old Akkadian form in LH, where medial /e/ > /u/ for vowel harmony (see G.R. Driver and J.C. Miles, Babylonian Laws, 144), is dropped in B and C. B reflects the shift [i] > [e] in primae aleph roots, and might be considered a Neo-Assyrian form of III/1 √apû, “to pray, supplicate.” |
| H123 | 63 | me-e | me-e-su | SV(1) – Lexical interchange.  
420 B has √mēsū, “cultic rituals,” in place of √mû, “cultic rites” in LH (see CAD M 2 35 and 156). The term mēsū was perhaps more familiar to the later scribe. The possibility that B preserves a pronominal suffix lacking in the stele is discounted on account of the fact that the shift /s/ > /s/ is unwarranted given the lack of a preceding dental or alveolar plosive /t/, and that the gender of the pronominal suffix would be incorrect in context. C is too damaged to allow a certain reading. |
| H124 | 65 | mu-uš-te-mi-qum | mu-ušte-mi-iq | OV(l) – B lacks the nominative singular case vowel for the III/2 participle of √emqû, “to pray, supplicate.”  
422 LH also preserves the diphthong of final weak √darû, “everlasting,” lacking in the orthography of B. Cf. note above. |
| H125 | 66 | DINGIR.GAL.GAL | i-li ra-bi-ù-tim | OV – The phrase ilī rabûtim, “(the) great gods,” is written syllabically in B.  
421 D.J. Wiseman, "Hammurabi Again," 170, and R. Borger, Babylonisch-Assyrische Lesestücke, 9, mark this variant as a scribal error in B, where the sign MA has been elided. Scribal error is also assumed in the present study in the light of Rule 1. |
| H126 | 68 | šu-ma-la-il | šu-la-il | Not Counted – The proper noun Šumu-la-el is misspelled in B.  
421 D.J. Wiseman, "Hammurabi Again," 170, and R. Borger, Babylonisch-Assyrische Lesestücke, 9, mark this variant as a scribal error in B, where the sign MA has been elided. Scribal error is also assumed in the present study in the light of Rule 1. |
| H127 | 1 | da-ri-um | da-ru-ù | OV(l) – B lacks mimation.  
422 LH also preserves the diphthong of final weak √darû, “everlasting,” lacking in the orthography of B. Cf. note above. |
| H128 | 8 | šu-me-ri-im | | OV(l) – B lacks mimation.  
422 LH also preserves the diphthong of final weak √darû, “everlasting,” lacking in the orthography of B. Cf. note above. |
B vi 28 šu-me-ri

H129 LH va 9 ak-ka-di-im OV(l) – B lacks mimation.
B vi 28 ak-ka-di-i

H130 LH va 11 ki-ib-ra-at OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.423
B vi 30 rja-ti

H131 LH va 12 ar-ba-im OV(l) – B lacks mimation.424
B vi 30 ar-ba-'i

H132 LH va 15 d AMAR.UTU d EN.LIL
B vi 32 HV – Different proper nouns given in the sources.425

H133 LH va 18 šu-ḫu-zi-im OV(l) – B has the wrong case vowel for the genitive singular.426
B vi 34 [ ]-ḫu-zu

H134 LH ixa 65 in-na-ad-di OV – J has defective orthography.
J1 i 22 ‘in’-na-di

H135 LH ixa 66 lu SV(1) – J omits the conjunction lū, “or.”
J1 i 23 omits

H136 LH ixa 67 uth lu SV(1) – Lexical interchange or

---

423 B preserves the short vowel /i/ appended to the bound form of the noun škibrātu, “regions.” See note above and the references there.

424 This variant also reflects a possible difference in pronunciation, where the glottal stop is lacking in the orthography of the stele. In light of Rule 3 only the lack of mimation is counted.

425 The reference in the stele to Marduk, patron deity of Babylon, is in contrast to the reference in B to Enlil, patron deity of Nippur. This could point to B being from a manuscript tradition that finds its origins in Nippur, as against the Babylon centred tradition of the stele. See notes and above.

426 The phrase in context is ana šutešur ... šušim šuḫuzim, literally “to teach ... behaving well.” There seems to be no requirement to read the form in LH as an oblique plural against an incorrectly marked singular indirect object in B.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>J 1 i 23</th>
<th>lu</th>
<th>omission of conjunction.(^{427})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H137</td>
<td>LH xa 5</td>
<td>pu-úḫ-šu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J 1 i 28</td>
<td>pu-úḫ-šu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H138</td>
<td>LH xa 31</td>
<td>ù-lu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J 1 i 31</td>
<td>lu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H139</td>
<td>LH xa 10</td>
<td>mu-na-ag-gi-ir-šu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J 1 i 33</td>
<td>mu-na-gi-ir-š[u]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H140</td>
<td>LH xa 11</td>
<td>É-sû</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J 1 i 34</td>
<td>É-su</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H141</td>
<td>LH xa 13</td>
<td>lu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J 1 i 35</td>
<td>omits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H142</td>
<td>LH xa 14</td>
<td>ù lu-ú</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J 1 i 35</td>
<td>lu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H143</td>
<td>LH xa 15</td>
<td>dan-na-at</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J 1 i 36</td>
<td>da-na-at</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H144</td>
<td>LH xa 18</td>
<td>wa-ar-[k]i-šu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J 2 i 2</td>
<td>a-ar-[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{427}\) Several options are available for describing this variation. J can be read as (i) omitting the first conjunction in a fixed pair of coordinating conjunctions: (u) lū, “(and) either;” (ii) a lexical interchange where a compound conjunction is exchanged with a single conjunction: u+lū > lū; (iii) an elision of the first vowel of a lexeme ulū, “or.” The latter (iii) is unlikely in light of the fact that he scribe of J apparently knew both the forms u lū (J 1 i 27 and ii 17) and lū (here and J 1 i 31 and 35) and treated them as homonyms. In this instance it is conceivable that, with the elision of the first particle lū (see H135), the scribe dropped the conjunction before the next particle lū as superfluous: \(\text{šumma rē dum lū bā irum}\), “if a runner or a fisher.” Against this see J 1 i 30-31 where the particle lū is used redundantly before each element in the protasis without the conjunction preceding the second instance: lū rēdim lū bā irum, “either the runner or the fisher.” See CAD L 226-27, esp. 227b, for the use of the paired coordinating conjunctions “either ... or,” with and without the compounded conjunction u. See also H138, H142 and H168 below.  

\(^{428}\) See note above.  

\(^{429}\) See note above.  

\(^{430}\) The stele has the archaic form of \(\sqrt{(w)arka}\), “afterward”, retaining the initial /w/.
H145 LH xa 66 J1 ii 2 É-sù É-su OV – The possessive pronominal suffix is written with the sign SU in J.

H146 LH xa 68 J1 ii 3 in-na-ad-di-iš-šum in-na-ad-di-in-šum OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.431

H147 LH xia 1 J1 ii 4 īš-ša-ab-tu-ma SV(2) – Additional pronominal suffix in J.432

H148 LH xia 1 J1 ii 4 īš-ša-ab-tu-ma īš-ša-ab-tu-šu SV(1) – J lacks the enclitic particle “-ma.”

H149 LH xia 3 J1 ii 6 it-ta-al-ku it-ta-al-ka OV(l) – J has the wrong vowel for the inflected verbal ending.433

H150 LH xia 4 J1 ii 7 i-il-la-ak i-la-ak OV – J has defective orthography for the I/1 present future form of √alāku, “to go.”

H151 LH xia 6 J1 ii 9 iš-ti-a-at-ma iš-te-a-at-at OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.434

H152 LH xia 6 J1 ii 9 iš-ti-a-at-ma iš-te-a-at-at SV(1) – J lacks the enclitic particle “-ma.”435

H153 LH xia 9 ù OV – The conjunction is written

431 The stele reflects the phonological change /n/+C > CC, not reflected in the Neo-Assyrian manuscript J. According to J. Hämeen-Anttila, Neo-Assyrian Grammar, 20, “n is rarely assimilated to a pronominal suffix.”

432 The sign in J may be a poorly executed MA (𒈠) rather than ŠU (šu), but in light of Rule 1 the form in J should be read as an anaphoric pronominal suffix referring to eqelu, “field,” kiru, “orchard,” or bitu, “house.” The variant is thus read as expanding or clarifying the text of the stele.

433 Cf. A.R. George, Gilgamesh, 441. This may be a case of vowel harmony in J on analogy with /u/ > /a/ when a stressed long penultimate vowel /ā/ assimilates the short ultimate vowel /a/ (see M. Luukko, Neo-Assyrian, 90).

434 J reflects the shift [i] > [e] in I weak roots. See the references in note above.

435 The form in J is difficult, and perhaps the last sign AT (𒀜) is best taken as an erroneous writing of the sign MA (𒈠).
J 1 ii 12  u  with the sign U in J.

H154  LH xia 9  É-sú  OV – The possessive pronominal suffix is written with the sign SU in J.

J 1 ii 12  É-su

H155  LH xia 10  in-na-ad-di-iš-šum-ma
J 1 ii 13  [i]n-na-ad-di-in-šum-ma  OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.  

H156  LH xia 11  šu-ma  OV – The stele has an unusual defective spelling of the particle šumma, “if.”

J 1 ii 14  šum-ma

H157  LH xia 12  i-il-la-ak  OV – J has defective orthography for the I/1 present future form of √alāku, “to go.”

J 1 ii 15  i-la-ak

H158  LH xia 13  UKU.ÚS  OV – J has a phonetic complement appended to the logogram UKU.ÚS, √redû, “runner, scout.”

J 1 ii 16  UKU.ÚS-am

H159  LH xia 18  DAM.GÀR  OV – J has a phonetic complement appended to the logogram DAM.GÀR, √tamkāru, “merchant, trader.”

J 1 ii 20  DAM.GÀR-ru

H160  LH xia 18  ip-tū-ra-aš-šu-ma  OV(l) – J lacks the ventive marker appended to √paṭāru, “release, loosen.”

J 1 ii 21  ip-tū-ra-šum-ma

H161  LH xia 19  uš-ta-ak-ši-da-aš-šu  OV(l) – The ventive in J is “-a” against “-am” in LH.

J 1 ii 22  uš-ta-ak-ši-da

H162  LH xia 19  uš-ta-ak-ši-da-aš-šu  SV(2) – J lacks the pronominal object suffix appended to √kašādum, “reach, arrive.”

J 1 ii 22  uš-ta-ak-ši-da

436 See note above.

437 While the ventive marker in Neo-Assyrian can appear as ‘-a,’ and so might possibly be read here in J, “if a suffix ... follows the ventive, its etymological -m- appears as gemination of the following consonant” (J. Hämeen-Anttila, Neo-Assyrian Grammar, 92). The form in J must therefore be read as lacking the ventive entirely.

438 As noted above (note ) the ventive marker in Neo-Assyrian is “a after a consonant or vowel belonging to the root” (J. Hämeen-Anttila, Neo-Assyrian Grammar, 92).
H163 LH xia 29 ip-pa-at-tár
J₁ ii 31 [ t]a-ar
OV – J has CV-VC against CVC in LH.

H164 LH xia 31 URU-šu
J₁ ii 32 URJU ki-šû
OV – J has the place determinative following the logogram URU, ālī, “cities.”

H165 LH xia 31 URU-šu
J₁ ii 32 URJU ki-šû
OV – The 3ms possessive pronominal suffix is written with the sign ŠÚ in J.

H166 LH xia 32 ip-pa-at-ta-ri-šu
J₁ ii 32 [ ]-ar-šum
OV(I) – Possible difference in pronunciation.⁴³⁹

H167 LH xia 32 ip-pa-at-ta-ri-šu
J₁ ii 32 [ ]-ar-šum
OV(I) – The pronominal suffix in J includes mimation.

H168 LH xia 36 É-sû
J₁ ii 35 É-su
OV – The possessive pronominal suffix is written with the sign SU in J.

H169 LH xia 40 ù lu-ú
J₂ ii 3 lu
SV(1) – Lexical interchange or omission of conjunction.⁴⁴⁰

H170 LH xiiia 34 i-ma-[d-d]a-ad
N i 2 [ Á]G.E
OV – The I/1 present future of ʾmadādû, “to measure,” is written logographically in N.⁴⁴¹

H171 LH xiiia 41 A.ŠÀ
N i 9 A.ŠÀ-[m]
OV – N has a phonetic complement appended to the compound logogram A.ŠÀ, eqlam, “field” (accusative singular).

H172 LH xiva 8 A.ŠÀ
L ii 2 A.ŠÀ-šu
SV(2) – L has a possessive pronominal suffix appended to ʾeqštu.⁴⁴²

H173 LH xiva 15 ši-ib-tam
OV – The noun ʾšibtu,

⁴³⁹ The stele has the addition of an anaptyctic vowel to ʾpaṭāru, “release, ransom,” most likely for literary purposes (see G.R. Driver and J.C. Miles, Babylonian Laws, 165).

⁴⁴⁰ See note above.

⁴⁴¹ The presumed composite logogram in N is LÁG.E (see CAD M 1 5b).

⁴⁴² The noun is clarified in L by the possessive pronominal suffix: ina la mé šeʾum ina eqlîšu la ittabšî, “with no water, grain in his field has not been grown.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Sign</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H174</td>
<td>LH xiva 16</td>
<td>ša</td>
<td>sv(1) – The relative pronoun ša is omitted in L.443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H175</td>
<td>LH xiva 17</td>
<td>i-na-ad-di-in</td>
<td>OV – L has defective orthography for the I/1 present future of 'nādānu, “to give.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H176</td>
<td>LH xiva 62</td>
<td>ši-ib-ti-šu</td>
<td>Not Counted – The damaged sign does not allow a certain reading.444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H177</td>
<td>LH xva 9</td>
<td>du-un-nu-[n]im</td>
<td>OV(l) – P lacks mimation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H178</td>
<td>LH xva 15</td>
<td>uš-ta-bil</td>
<td>OV – P has CV-VC against CVC in LH.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H179</td>
<td>LH xva 17</td>
<td>KAR-šu</td>
<td>OV – The pronominal object suffix is written with the sign ŠU in P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H180</td>
<td>LH xva 21</td>
<td>ŠE</td>
<td>OV – P has a phonetic complement appended to the logogram ŠE, šē'um, “grain.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

443 The omission of the relative particle in L suggests haplography. However, in light of Rule 1 it is possible that sibtam šattim, “annual interest,” is a set construction known to the scribe of L. Elsewhere the relative particle is written between these terms: in an Old Assyrian text from Kultepe, šumma sibtam ša šattim, “if the interest of (that) year” (KTS 12 17); between the term šibat and a genitive construction: šibassu ša adi ʾānim annīm, “its interest up to this day” (BIN 4 98 24). See also the construction without the relative particle in LH xva 75 (H184). Cf. similar cases in Gilgamesh XI cited in A.R. George, *Gilgamesh*, 428, “variant possessive constructions.”

444 The sign at the end of line 7 in manuscript N looks like it may be the remains of SU, but it is ultimately too damaged to be read with any certainty. The variant is not noted in R. Borger, *Babylonisch-Assyrische Lesestücke*, 16, nor in G.R. Driver and J.C. Miles, *Babylonian Laws*, 109. The reading SU does seem plausible and if taken to be accurate this variant would suggest a difference in number between the sources: šibtišu, 3fs in LH, against sībāššu > šībāssu, 3fpl in N. Thus N would have a different construction to the set phrase kispišu u sibtišu as it appears in the stele.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H181</th>
<th>LH xva 68</th>
<th>ka-an-nu</th>
<th>OV(l) – P has the wrong case vowel for the nominative singular.(^{445})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P2 obv. i 10</td>
<td>ka-an-ni</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H182</td>
<td>LH xva 68</td>
<td>ga-ma-ar-tim</td>
<td>OV(l) – P lacks mimation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P2 obv. i 10</td>
<td>ga-ma-ar-ti</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H183</td>
<td>LH xva 75</td>
<td>A.ŠÀ</td>
<td>OV – N has a phonetic complement appended to the compound logogram A.ŠÀ, eqlam, “field” (accusative singular).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P2 obv. i 17</td>
<td>A.ŠÀ-am</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H184</td>
<td>LH xva 75</td>
<td>omits</td>
<td>SV(1) – P has an extra relative particle ša, lacking in LH.(^{446})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P2 obv. i 18</td>
<td>ša</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H185</td>
<td>LH xva 76</td>
<td>i-na-ša-ar-ma</td>
<td>OV – LH has defective orthography for the I/1 present future of Ṽnašaru, “to guard.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P2 obv. i 19</td>
<td>i-na-‘aš-sa’-ar-ma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H186</td>
<td>LH xva 77</td>
<td>i-na BURU</td>
<td>SV(2) – The phrase ina ebūrim, “at harvest,” is omitted from P.(^{447})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P2 obv. i 19</td>
<td>omits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H187</td>
<td>LH xvia 32</td>
<td>ḤA.LA-šu</td>
<td>OV – The noun Ṽzittu, “agricultural produce,” is written syllabically in P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P1 obv. ii 2</td>
<td>zi-it-[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H188</td>
<td>LH xvia 33</td>
<td>i-ša-ka-nu-šum</td>
<td>OV – P has CV-V[C-CV] against CV-CV in LH.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P1 obv. ii 3</td>
<td>i-ša-a[k ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{445}\) P may in fact have the bound form of the noun with the short terminating vowel /i/ (cf. note above and the references there). The term Ṽkamu, “rope,” is here part of the genitive construction kannu gamartim, a “strip of fabric announcing the termination of the pasturing season” (CAD K 157a).

\(^{446}\) Cf. H174 above. The context is: eqlam ša ušākulu inaṣṣarma, “he shall guard the field (in) which he pastured.”

\(^{447}\) LH reads: ina ebūrim ana burum 60 kur ... imaddad, “at harvest he will measure 1 burum per 60 kur.” P lacks the initial phrase that clarifies when the action is required.
H189 LH ib 36   pa-ša-ri-im   OV(l) – P has the wrong case vowel for the genitive singular.448
    P3 rev. ii 8   pa-ša-ri-am
H190 LH ib 45   i-le-qé   OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.449
    T ii 7   i-le-eq
H191 LH ib 51   ḫar-ra-nim   OV(l) – P lacks mimation.
    P3 rev. iii 4   [ ]-ni
H192 LH iib 52   wa-ši-ib-ma   OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.450
    P3 rev. iii 4   a-ši-ib-’-[m]a
H193 LH iib 57   ši-bu-ul-tim   OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.451
    P3 rev. iii 8   še-[ ]-ti
    P4 rev. i 3   [ ]
H194 LH iib 58   ú-ša-bil-šu   OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.452
    P4 rev. i 4   ú-ša-bi-la-[ ]
H195 LH iib 63   it-ba-al   OV – T has CVC against CV-VC in LH.
    T iii 4   it-bal
H196 LH iib 22   a-na   SV(1) – Lexical interchange.453
    P2 rev. ii 16   a-šà

448 The genitive case vowel is expected here, as the infinitive follows the preposition: *ana pašarim iddin*, “he gives (something) in order to sell.” Reading an accusative singular in P would translate “he gives the selling (of something),” which conflicts with the other objects in the clause: *še’am šipātim šamnam u mima bišam*. See also the preposition plus infinitive with the case vowel incorrectly marked as accusative singular, *ana hulluqiam*, in manuscript B at H18 above.

449 T lacks the final vowel in III weak √leqû, “to take.”

450 P reflects the shift of I /w/ > /a/, a feature already seen in late Old Babylonian texts (see J. Huehnergard, *Grammar*, 259).

451 P3+P4 reads “še-[ ]-ti.” P therefore lacks mimation and also reflects [e] for /i/. For a discussion of the latter phenomenon see note above and the references there.

452 P has the addition of an anaptyctic vowel in the III/1 preterite of √wabâlu, “deliver.” See also H78 and H166.

453 P exchanges the preposition *ana*, “to, for,” for *aša* (=aššum?) “concerning, on account of.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Column</th>
<th>Stela</th>
<th>Column</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Column</th>
<th>Line</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H197</td>
<td>LH iiib 68</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ÏR</td>
<td>SAG[</td>
<td>SV(1) – Lexical interchange. 454</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H198</td>
<td>LH iiib 68</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>ū</td>
<td>Ú</td>
<td>OV – The conjunction is written with the sign Ś in P.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H199</td>
<td>LH iiib 71</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>ū-še-te-eq</td>
<td></td>
<td>OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation. 455</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H200</td>
<td>LH ivb 15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>a-na</td>
<td>i-na</td>
<td>SV(1) – Exchange of prepositions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H201</td>
<td>LH ivb 15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>ga-am-ri-im</td>
<td>ga-am-ri-am</td>
<td>OV(l) – P has the wrong case vowel for the genitive singular. 456</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H202</td>
<td>LH ivb 17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>ma-ḫar</td>
<td>ma-ḫa-ar</td>
<td>OV – P has CV-VC against CVC in LH.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H203</td>
<td>LH viiib 75</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>aš-ša-sú</td>
<td></td>
<td>OV – The 3ms possessive pronominal suffix is written with the sign SU in W.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H204</td>
<td>LH viiib 78</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>i-iz-zi-ib-ši</td>
<td>i-zi-ib-ši</td>
<td>OV – W has defective orthography for the I/1 present future of √ezēbu, “abandon, divorce.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H205</td>
<td>LH xiib 64</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>wa-ar-ka</td>
<td>wa-ar</td>
<td>Not Counted – Probable scribal error in Z. 457</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

454 This variant is properly considered a lexical interchange, though it may in fact be better described as an orthographic variation due to the fact that both sources employ logograms. The stele has ÏR, wardu, against SAG.ÍR, rēšu, in P. Both terms can be translated “servant, slave.”

455 P1+P4 reads “ū-še-et-ti-iq,” the III/1 present future of √etēqu, “to allow to pass, expire.” The form in the stele is supposed by G.R. Driver and J.C. Miles, *Babylonian Laws*, 208, to be an erroneous writing of the same form, but here the variant is counted as reflecting [e] for /i/ in P. The defective orthography of the stele (without the doubled middle radical of the present future) is not counted in light of Rule 3.

456 Cf. H189 above. The accusative case is incorrect following the preposition ana.

457 The form in Z is meaningless as it stands, and therefore, in the light of Rule 1, a scribal error is assumed where the sign KA was accidently omitted.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H206</th>
<th>LH xviib 12</th>
<th>i-tam-ma</th>
<th>SV(1) – Lexical interchange.(^{458})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e₂ obv. ii 2</td>
<td>na-[     ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H207</th>
<th>LH xxiib 39</th>
<th>im-tu-ut</th>
<th>OV(l) – Possible difference in grammatical form, or difference in pronunciation.(^{459})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b₁</td>
<td>im-ta-[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H208</th>
<th>LH xxiib 96</th>
<th>i-ma-ad-da-ad</th>
<th>OV – C has defective orthography for the I/1 present future of √madādu, “to measure.”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c ii 3</td>
<td>i-ma-[a     ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c ii 4</td>
<td>pī-ḫa-su</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H210</th>
<th>LH xxiib 97</th>
<th>pī-ḫa-sū</th>
<th>OV – Different spelling of the possessive pronominal suffix in c.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c ii 4</td>
<td>pī-ḫa-su</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{458}\) The term √tamû, “to swear,” in the stele is exchanged with another term in manuscript e, though the exact lexeme is uncertain. Possible synonyms for tamû may be: √našû, “to lift,” also “to offer (something),” (used intransitively?); or √nâpu, “to make (additional) payment.” Unfortunately neither term fits the context at all well. The stele reads: awīlum šû ina idû la amḫaṣu itamma u ašâm ippal, “that man shall swear ‘I did not knowingly strike,’ and he shall make payment to the surgeon.” If the restored term in manuscript e is read as √našû, then a possible translation is “that man shall offer (the reason) ‘I did not knowingly strike’ ... .” Assuming √napû is instead to be restored the translation may be “that man shall compensate (by saying) ‘I did not knowingly strike’ ... .” Perhaps a preferable reading of manuscript e assumes that “na-[ ]” is the remains of the word √napûtu, “to make supplementary payment,” which appears as the I/1 present future ippal later in the same line, perhaps written here as a stative or as a verbal adjective. Unfortunately this explanation introduces problems with the syntax of the line that prove more difficult to explain than supposing a lexical interchange. In light of this, counting this variant as SV(1) is preferred here, though admittedly with reservations. Assuming that the scribe was not in error, the intended meaning behind the variant in manuscript e at this point remains obscure.

\(^{459}\) According to the present understanding of the layout of the text the form in manuscript b is probably “im-ta-[ut]” where the medial weak √mātu, “to die,” has the diphthong preserved in the orthography. G.R. Driver and J.C. Miles, Babylonian Laws, 112, see the variant in b as part of the preceding line, parallel to the form imḫassuma in the stele, from √maḫāṣu, “to strike, wound.” Their reading takes the form in b of a I/1 perfect of √maḫāṣu, and in fact contends that the sign that supports this reading is visible: “im-ta-ḫa-[su-ma].” However, the sign ḫA is not visible in either the drawing in B. Meissner, Altbabylonische Gesetze,” 511, or in E. Bergmann, Codex Hammurabi, 47. That reading is therefore doubtful, especially if Meissner did not see the sign in 1908, nor Bergmann in 1953, and yet Driver and Mills claim to have seen it in 1955. R. Borger, Babylonisch-Assyrische Lesestücke, 38, omits the variant entirely.
| H211  | LH xxiib 2 | 8 ŠE.GUR | Not Counted – The damaged sign does not allow a certain reading.  
|       | c ii 10    | 4' |  

| H212  | LH xxiib 77 | li-pi-it | OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.  
|       | c i 2       | li-pi-it-ti |  

| H213  | LH xxiib 77 | DINGIR | OV – The genitive singular noun ilim, “god,” is written syllabically in c.  
|       | c i 3       | i-lim |  

| H214  | LH xxiib 78 | lu | OV – The long vowel in the conjunction lu is written in c.  
|       | c i 4       | lu-ú |  

| H215  | LH xxiib 78 | id-du-uk | OV – c has defective orthography for the I/1 present future of √dakû, “to kill.”  
|       | c i 5       | i-du-uk |  

| H216  | LH xxiib 78 | ma-ḫi | OV – The preposition /maḫu/ “before,” is written logographically in c.  
|       | c i 6       | IGI |  

| H217  | LH xxiib 78 | DINGIR | OV – The genitive singular noun ilim is written syllabically in c.  
|       | c i 6       | i-lim |  

| H218  | LH xxiib 79 | û-ub-ba-am-ma | OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.  
|       | c i 7       | û-ub-ba-ab-ma |  

---

460 From the drawings in B. Meissner, "Altbabylonische Gesetze," 509, and E. Bergmann, Codex Hammurabi, 47, the reading of the numeral in manuscript c as “4” seems feasible (so G.R. Driver and J.C. Miles, Babylonian Laws, 113), but R. Borger, Babylonisch-Assyrische Lesestücke, 39, has "ohne var." suggesting he sees the remaining wedges as half of the numeral “8.” The damaged state of the text urges a careful reading, and there seems to be sufficient cause for doubt that the figure in c is definitely “4,” so a reading of “ʻ8′” is made here in agreement with Borger.

461 The set phrase lipit ilim, “touch of (a) god,” referring to an epidemic, has no final vowel in its bound form in the stele. On the short vowel /i/ appended to the nomen regens in Neo-Assyrian see note above and the references there.

462 The form in LH reflects the assimilation /bm / > /mm/, where ʻubbabma > ʻubbamma (��babu, “cleanse, purify,” plus the enclitic particle “-ma”).
| LH xxiiib 80 | mi-qí-it-tí | OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation. 463 |
| LH xxiiib 81 | i-ma-har-šú | OV – c has CVC against CV-VC in LH. |
| LH xxiiib 81 | i-ma-ah-šú-šú | SV(2) – c lacks the pronominal object suffix. 464 |
| LH xxiiib 81 | i-ma-ah-šú-šú | SV(1) – c has an additional enclitic particle “-ma.” |
| LH xxiiib 82 | i-gu-ma | OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation. 465 |
| LH xxiiib 82 | e-gi-šú | SV(2) – c has an additional pronominal object suffix. 466 |
| LH xxiiib 82 | e-gi-šú | SV(1) – c lacks the enclitic particle “-ma.” |
| LH xxiiib 59 | GEMÉ | OV – The noun √amtu, “slave girl,” is written with the compound logogram in e. |
| LH xxiiib 60 | la | Not Counted – Scribal error or possible difference in pronunciation. 467 |

463 The stele appends the short vowel /i/ to the bound form of the nomen regens in the construction miqíti tarbíšim, “an outbreak of the (animal) enclosure.” Cf. H212 above.

464 Cf. H147 and H148 above, as well as H224 and H225 below. This is conceivably an erroneous writing of the sign ŠU in c. On this see note above.

465 The verbal preformative for primae aleph √egû, “careless, neglectful,” is [i] in the stele, against [e] in c. Here the second sign is read GU with R. Borger, Babylonisch-Assyrische Lesestücke, 40, against G.R. Driver and J.C. Miles, Babylonian Laws, 275, who read GE.

466 See note above.

467 The phrase in the stele is warḫšu la imlāma, literally “(when) the month is not full.” The form in manuscript e is marked in R. Borger, Babylonisch-Assyrische Lesestücke, 41, as an error, presuming parablepsis where the scribe wrote “la <am> im-la-ma” for “la im-la-ma” but did not correct the mistake before continuing. An alternative reading is to consider “la-am” as the conjunction lām(a), “before,” a variant spelling of which appears in the stele as lā (so CAD L 52b). The reading adopted here is in agreement with Borger.
H228 LH xxiiib 60  
e1 obv. i 9  
im-la-ma  
im-ta-la  
OV(l) – Difference in grammatical forms.468

H229 LH xxiiib 60  
e1 obv. i 9  
im-la-ma  
im-ta-la  
SV(1) – The enclitic particle “-ma” is lacking in e.

H230 LH xxiiib 63  
e1 obv. i 12  
nä-di-na-ni-šu  
nä-di-na-ni-ma  
SV(2) – e lacks the pronominal object suffix.469

H231 LH xxiiib 63  
e1 obv. i 12  
nä-di-na-ni-šu  
nä-di-na-ni-ma  
SV(1) – e has an additional enclitic particle “-ma.”

H232 LH xxiiib 63  
e1 obv. i 13  
p[ ]ta-ar-ma  
SV(1) – e lacks an additional enclitic particle.

H233 LH xxiiib 66  
e1 obv. i 15  
i-le-qé  
i-la-qé  
OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.470

H234 LH xxiiib 68  
e2 obv. i 4  
IR  
SAG.İR  
OV – The noun √wardu, “slave,” is written with the compound logogram in e.

H235 LH xxiiib 68  
e2 obv. i 4  
GEMÉ  
SAG.GE[MÉ]  
OV – The noun √amtu, “slave girl,” is written with the compound logogram in e.

H236 LH xxiiib 71  
e2 obv. i 8  
ba-aq-ri  
ba-aq-ri-šu  
SV(2) – e has an additional possessive pronominal suffix.471

468 The stele has the I/1 preterite of √malû, “to be complete,” against the I/1 perfect (or I/2 preterite) form in manuscript e.

469 See note above.

470 In the stele the I/1 present future of III weak √leqû, “to take,” reflects vowel harmonisation where ilaqqe > ileqeq.

471 The possessive pronominal suffix in e clarifies that, in the sale of a slave, any existing legal claims made against the slave remain the responsibility of the seller. Manuscript e reads: nādinânušu baqrîšu ippal, “his (the slave’s) seller will be liable (for) his claims.” Whether the pronominal suffix appended to √baqrâ/paqrû, “a (legal) claim,” refers to the slave or the slave’s seller is unclear. Regardless of this, the effect is to clarify the text as it stands in the stele.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H237</th>
<th>LH xxiiib 71</th>
<th>i-ip-pa-al</th>
<th>OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation. ④72</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e₂ obv. i 8</td>
<td>i-ip-pa-il</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H238</td>
<td>LH xxivb 18</td>
<td>eš-te-i-ši-na-ši[m]</td>
<td>OV – The III/2 of √šē’ū, “to search,” is written with full orthography in e.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e₁ obv. ii 23</td>
<td>e-eš-te-i-ši-i-na-ši-in-im</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H239</td>
<td>LH xxivb 18</td>
<td>eš-te-i-ši-na-ši[m]</td>
<td>OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation. ④73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e₁ obv. ii 23</td>
<td>e-eš-te-i-ši-i-na-ši-in-im</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H240</td>
<td>LH xxivb 19</td>
<td>wa-aš-ṭū-tim</td>
<td>OV(l) – e lacks mimation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e₁ obv. i 4</td>
<td>wa-aš-ṭū-ti</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H241</td>
<td>LH xxivb 20</td>
<td>u-[p]e-et-ti</td>
<td>OV – Different spelling of the II/1 present future of √petû, “to open” in e.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e₁ obv. ii 15</td>
<td>u-pē-et-ti</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H242</td>
<td>LH xxivb 21</td>
<td>nu-ra-am</td>
<td>OV(l) – e lacks mimation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e₁ obv. ii 5</td>
<td>nu-ra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H243</td>
<td>LH xxivb 27</td>
<td>i-ši-ma-am</td>
<td>SV(2) – The 1cs dative pronominal suffix is lacking in e. ④74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e₁ obv. ii 12</td>
<td>i-ši-ma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H244</td>
<td>LH xxivb 28</td>
<td>le-ū-tim</td>
<td>Not Counted – Probable scribal error in e. ④75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e₁ obv. ii 13</td>
<td>tu-ū-tim</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

④72 G.R. Driver and J.C. Miles, *Babylonian Laws*, 280, suggest that the final sign “IL” in manuscript e has only consonantal force, and the reading should therefore be īppal, “he will be liable.” However, in light of Rule 1, the possibility that a difference in pronunciation underlies the orthography cannot be excluded.

④73 The 3fpl dative pronominal suffix, written “-šim” in the stele, appears as “-šinim” in e. The 3fpl dative suffix in Standard Babylonian is ‘-šinātì,’ and ‘-šim’ for the 3fs. In Neo-Assyrian the 3fpl dative suffix is ‘-šina,’ and the 3fs is ‘-(aš)ši’ (see J. Hämeen-Anttila, *Neo-Assyrian Grammar*, 49, and J. Huehnergard, *Grammar*, 600-601). The form in manuscript e may be influenced by either the Standard Babylonian or Neo-Assyrian forms.

④74 The pronominal suffix in the stele refers to the receiver of the allotment of wisdom, clarifying Hammurabi as the beneficiary. The stele reads: ina igigallim ša Ea išimam, “with the wisdom Ea allotted to me.”

④75 The form in e appears to be a scribal error, where the sign TU (𒌅) was mistakenly written for LE (𒌇). Alternatively the form in e may be read as an abstract noun formed from √lû, “incantation” or “garment.” In the context, though, an abstract noun from √le’u, “to be able,” is most likely, so an error is read in e. Manuscript e has the correct spelling in e₁ obv. iii 5.
H245 LH xxivb 29
e₁ obv. ii 14
id-di-nam
iš-ru-kam

SV(1) – Lexical interchange.\(^\text{476}\)

H246 LH xxivb 30
e₁ obv. ii 15
na-ak-ri
[n]a-ki-ri

OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.\(^\text{477}\)

H247 LH xxivb 81
e₁ obv. iii 4
na-ás-qá
na-ás-[

OV – Different spelling of the adjective \(\sqrt{\text{nasqu}}\), “precious, choice,” in e.

H248 LH xxivb 84
d
e₁ obv. iii 8
ša AN ǔ KI mi-sa-ri i-na
KALAM li-iš-te-pi
HU

HV – Different grammatical agent and phraseology in e.\(^\text{478}\)

H249 LH xxivb 92
e₁ obv. iii 15
mu-ša-si-ka[m]
mu-ša-as-si-ka

OV(l) – e lacks mimation.\(^\text{479}\)

H250 LH xxivb 94
e₁ obv. iii 17
a-ra-am-mu
a-ra-am-mu-u[m]

OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.\(^\text{480}\)

\(^{476}\) The stele reads: ša Marduk ʾiddinam, “which Marduk has given to me.” This is against e, which reads: ša Marduk išrukam, “which Marduk has granted to me.”

\(^{477}\) See also H78, H166 and H194. Manuscript e has an additional anaptyctic vowel that is lacking in the stele.

\(^{478}\) The stele reads: Šamaš dayānim rabīm ša šame u ersetim mīšarī ina mātim lištēpi, “By the command of Šamaš, the great judge of heaven and earth, let my justice be promulgated in the land.” Against this e reads: ina qibīt Šamaš u Adad dayānu dīni pariṣu purussi dīni lištēpi, “By the command of Šamaš and Adad, expedite just judgement (or ‘they execute just judgement’), may my justice be promulgated.” The appearance of Adad here is probably related to the increased importance of that deity (see G.R. Driver and J.C. Miles, Babylonian Laws, 285). The rest of the variant seems to be similar in sentiment but wholly different in form and style.

\(^{479}\) Either mimation is lacking in e, or that manuscript lacks the ventive marker that is present in the stele (which seems to have an ablative sense). The orthography of e also has a doubled middle consonant for the III/1 participle of \(\sqrt{\text{nasāku}}\), “remove, reject.” The doubled middle radical would suggest the II/1 participle, but this is clearly ruled out by the infixed causative /š/. This leaves open the possibility that e has rare II/III participle form, or perhaps the form III/2, *muštansāku > mušassāku, where /šš/ > /šš/ (written <šš>), and /ns/ > /ss/. In favour of the latter interpretation (III/2) cf. the precative form “li-š-ša-as-sú-ku” in KBo I 11 obv. 20 (and see CAD N 2 20b).
H251 LH xxviiiib 12
e1 rev. i 2  gu-r[u ]  OV – Different spelling of the noun √gurunnu, “heap, mound,” in e.481

H252 LH xxviiiib 14
um-ma-na-ti-šu  SV(1) – Difference in gender.482
e1 rev. i 3  um-ma-ni-šu

H253 LH xxviiiib 16
li-it-ta-ad-di  OV(l) – Difference in grammatical form.483
e1 rev. i 4  li-iš-t[a  ]

H254 LH xxviiiib 17
ERIN-šu-ma  OV – The noun ERIN, ummanu, “army, troop,” is written syllabically in e.
e1 rev. i 5  um-[m]a-an-šu[m-m]a

H255 LH xxviiiib 17
ERIN-šu-ma  OV – e has CVC-CV against CV-CV in LH.
e1 rev. i 5  um-[m]a-an-šu[m-m]a

H256 LH xxviiiib 17
re-ma-am  Not Counted – The damaged sign does not allow a certain reading.
e1 rev. i 6  re-[e?]’-ma-am

H257 LH xxviiiib 18
a-i  OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.484
e1 rev. i 7  a

480 The final /m/ in e is not part of the root, which is taken as √râmu, “to love.” The form in e is perhaps best understood as archaising, by adding artificial mimation to a verbal form.

481 The sign QU can be read as GU8, so this is counted as a simple orthographic variant.

482 The lexeme √ummanu, “army, troop,” is written as a feminine noun in the stele, against the masculine form in e.

483 The stele appears to have the IV/1 or I/2 precative form of √nadâmu, “be set (in place),” against the III/2 present future form in e, “be left, put.” The difference in grammatical form produces essentially the same translation, though e carries a causative sense compared to the passive sense given in the stele. The possibility of scribal error in the stele is raised in G.R. Driver and J.C. Miles, Babylonian Laws, 301.

484 The prohibitive particle ay is written as a monophthong in e against the diphthong in the stele. See CAD A I 218a for the distribution of both spellings.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>L. No.</th>
<th>L. Exp.</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H258</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>a-na</td>
<td>SV(1) – Lexical interchange.  SV(2) – e has defective orthography for the I/1 preceptive of √malū, here with the meaning “to deliver in full.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e_1 rev. i 8</td>
<td>a-di</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H259</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>li-ma-al-li-šu-ma</td>
<td>OV – e has defective orthography for the I/1 preceptive of √malū, here with the meaning “to deliver in full.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e_1 rev. i 10</td>
<td>li-ma-li-šu-ma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H260</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>li-ru-šu</td>
<td>OV – The long vowel in √arû, “to lead,” is written in e.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e_1 rev. i 12</td>
<td>li-ru-ú-šu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H261</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>dan-nu-um</td>
<td>OV(l) – e lacks mimination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e_1 rev. i 14</td>
<td>da-an-nu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H262</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>omits</td>
<td>SV(2) – e has an additional relative particle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e_1 rev. i 15</td>
<td>ša</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H263</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>qā-ba-al</td>
<td>SV(2) – e has an additional possessive pronominal suffix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e_1 rev. i 15</td>
<td>qā-ba-al-šu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H264</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>mu-ša-ak-ši-du</td>
<td>OV – e has CVC against CV-VC in LH.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e_1 rev. i 17</td>
<td>mu-šak-ši-du</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H265</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>ra-bi-im</td>
<td>OV(l) – e lacks mimination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e_1 rev. i 18</td>
<td>ra-bi-i</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

485 The stele reads: ana qāt nakūšu, “into the hands of his enemies,” against e: adi qāt nakūšu, “unto the hands of his enemies.” The difference in e perhaps reflects a phrasing that the scribe was more familiar with, although ana qāt nakūšu ... limallūšum and ina qāt ... limallūšum are more familiar expressions (see CAD M 1 187).

486 The addition of a relative particle is counted as a clarifying stylistic addition in the phrase qabal la maḫār, “the irresistible onslaught,” to become ša qabalšu la maḫāru, “whose onslaught is irresistible.” With H264 this particle clarifies the possessor of the object qabal, “onslaught,” namely the god Nergal.

487 See note above. The addition of the possessive pronominal suffix clarifies the phrase.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Entry</th>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H266</td>
<td>LH xxviiib</td>
<td>i-ša-tim</td>
<td>OV(l) – e lacks mimation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e1 rev. i 19</td>
<td>i-il-ti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H267</td>
<td>LH xxviiib</td>
<td>ez-ze-tim</td>
<td>OV – e has defective orthography for the adjective √ezzu, “raging, furious.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e1 rev. i 20</td>
<td>e-zé-[ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H268</td>
<td>LH xxviiib</td>
<td>in</td>
<td>OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e1 rev. i 23</td>
<td>i-na</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H269</td>
<td>LH xxviiib</td>
<td>er-re-tam</td>
<td>OV(l) – e has the wrong vowel for the accusative singular.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e1 rev. ii 1</td>
<td>[ ]-re-[t(um)]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H270</td>
<td>LH xxviiib</td>
<td>li-ru-ru</td>
<td>SV(2) – e has an additional redundant pronominal object suffix.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e1 rev. ii 3</td>
<td>li-ru-ru-šu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H271</td>
<td>LH xxviiib</td>
<td>er-re-tim</td>
<td>OV(l) – e has the wrong vowel for the genitive singular.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e1 rev. ii 4</td>
<td>[ ]-re-tum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H272</td>
<td>LH xxviiib</td>
<td>da-ni-a-tim</td>
<td>OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e1 rev. ii 5</td>
<td>[ ]-ir-a-ta-an</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

488 The spelling with IL (𒅋) is most likely an error for ŠA (𒊭). If the form in e is not an error then the reading √i'iltu, “goddess,” is possible: kīma ilti ezzetim ša apim nišišu, “like a raging goddess in the rushes.” However the reading in the stele seems more likely: kīma išātim ezzetim ša apim nišišu, “like a raging fire in the rushes.” The reading of the form in e as √iltu, “bond,” faces similar problems as an inferior reading (see G.R. Driver and J.C. Miles, Babylonian Laws, 301).

489 See note above.

490 The pronoun in e clarifies the object of the verb līrušu, “may they (the gods) curse him.”

491 The reading in the stele may be amended to “ā-ni-a-tim” (see CAD D 100a, and M.T. Roth, Law Collections, 140), but is read danîtim, “strongly,” by G.R. Driver and J.C. Miles, Babylonian Laws, 288 and 304. According to R. Borger, Babylonisch-Assyrische Lesestücke, 46, the scribe of e may have erroneously written IR (𓃞) instead of NI (𒃊). The end of the form in e is difficult, where the element “-an” could be read as a ventive marker, or perhaps a dative pronominal suffix. Either interpretation is difficult to force into a translation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H273</th>
<th>LH xxviiib</th>
<th>KA-šu</th>
<th>OV – The noun <em>pê</em>, “mouth, command,” is written syllabically in e.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e1 rev. ii 6</td>
<td>pi-i-šu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H274</th>
<th>LH xxviiib</th>
<th>ut-ta-ak-ka-ru</th>
<th>OV(l) – Difference in grammatical forms.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e1 rev. ii 7</td>
<td>na-ak-ri-im</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H275</th>
<th>LH xxviiib</th>
<th>li-ru-ur-šu-ma</th>
<th>OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e1 rev. ii 8</td>
<td>[ ]ru-šu-ma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion of Variants

Orthographic Variants

Orthographic variants are the most common category of variation between the sources. The most frequently occurring orthographic variations are the exchange of like-valued signs, in particular regarding the conjunctions, as well as the use of fewer signs for writing syllables (usually CVC for CV-VC).

The representation of long vowels is also frequently at variance between the sources. Some sources, such as tablet B, frequently (but not always) write long vowels with an extra vowel sign against the short spelling in LH. See, for example, H12, H28, H50, H75 and H85. The opposite case occurs in H20. Other sources, such as J and N, have a ten-
tendency to add phonetic complements to logographic writings, where LH lacks such aids to pronunciation. See, for example, H158, H159, H179 and H183.

Another regularly appearing orthographic variation is the syllabic writing in the first millennium sources of words that are written logographically in LH. See, for example, H23, H49 and H125 (tablet B); H187 (tablet P); H213 and H217 (tablet c); H254 and H273 (tablet e). Less regularly we note the writing of some nouns, both proper and common, without determinatives where they would generally be expected.

*Orthographic (linguistic) Variants*

Among the most common linguistic variants in the sources are: the presence or absence of mimation relative to LH (particularly in tablets B and e); incorrectly written case vowels; and changes in the pronunciation of vowels. This latter class of variation could be related to scribal custom or dialect, depending on the particular vowel change and the form in which it occurs. For example, we find some evidence for the Assyrian vowel shift /i/ > /a/ in III weak roots (see H45), and the shift of [i] > [e] for some theme vowels, primae *aleph* verbal forms, genitive case and oblique plural case vowels. In one instance in tablet J (H144) we see primae /w/ > /m/, and once in tablet P (H192) we see primae /w/ > /a/.

Also possibly related to dialect is the occasional difference in the treatment of sibilants in one source (tablet B, see H60 and H83), and the lack of a terminating vowel in III weak verbs in another source (tablet T, see H190). Worth noting is the tendency for tablet B to
periodically have the apocopated bound form of the *nomen regens* that lacks the case vowel (see H107 and H117, but *cf.* H130), and its use of anaptyctic vowels (*cf.* the opposite in tablet J, H166, H212 and H246). Tablet B also exhibits a proclivity towards writing diphthongal vowels that may or may not reflect some underlying aspect of that scribe’s particular pronunciation.

**Stylistic Variants (Type 1)**

Minor changes in style occur throughout the entire text of the Laws, however some types of changes are more common in the poetic sections (the prologue and epilogue) rather than in the intervening law section. For example, changes in the gender of pronouns, describing both objects and subjects, are found in the prologue (H8 and H34) and in the epilogue (H252) but not in the laws themselves. This is effectively an argument from silence on account of the fact that the sources for the poetic sections (tablets B, C, D, and e) typically do not preserve any significant sections of the laws, though tablet e provides some overlap between the last laws and the epilogue. The differences between the types of variations in the poetic sections and those in the law section warrant further discussion, and will be returned to in the concluding remarks.

One type of minor stylistic variation that occurs in all sections of the text is the interchange of lexemes with other lexemes of a similar semantic range. Though the substituted lexemes are often not strictly synonymous, the semantic integrity of the text is relatively uncompromised by these interchanges. In the prologue, tablet B shows that certain
difficult terms may be substituted with more common ones. See, for example, H55, H114 (in agreement with tablet C), and possibly H123.

One lexical interchange in tablet B seems to reflect the wording of another ancient version contemporary with LH, namely AO10237 (see H82). A similar phenomenon is also reflected in tablet D (see H65). A variant of particular interest is the interchange of appellations that occurs in H64, where all three sources (LH, B and D) have different titles for the same deity (see note).

In the law section lexical interchanges potentially occur in tablet J, though this may be otherwise explained (H136, H138, H142 and H169 – see the comments in note). Tablet P does attest a clear lexical interchange (H206, and see H197, though the latter is not properly synonymous). The interchange of lexemes is also reflected in the epilogue in tablet e (see H245).

In addition to these variations, minor stylistic differences that frequently occur involve the addition or omission of certain forms relative to LH, such as conjunctions, the enclitic particle “-ma,” relative particles and pronouns.

**Stylistic Variants (Type 2)**

The most significant stylistic difference between the sources is found in the opening lines of the prologue. Here tablet B appears to diverge significantly from the text of LH in its description of the foundations of the kingship, and in particular the kingship of Hammu-
rabi. The variation between the sources effectively amounts to a different introduction in tablet B. In contrast to LH, the variant introduction in tablet B appears to give more attention to the instruments that symbolise kingship. In addition it ostensibly abbreviates the text as reflected in LH, though the extent to which the text is abbreviated is uncertain (see further H1 and note above).

Other less extensive expansive and clarifying pluses to the text are found in tablet B. For example, H10 reflects an expanded epithet for Hammurabi relative to LH. The clarification of the object is also attested, by way of a redundant pronominal object suffix in H59, and the probable addition of a divine title in H95. Similarly, in the section that contains the laws, J reflects additional pronominal suffixes in H147 and H172 (but cf. H162).

The same phenomenon is attested in tablet c (H224, but cf. H221) and tablet e (cf. H230 and H236). In one instance tablet P omits a phrase that indicates the thematic temporal setting of the clause (H186). Further, in the epilogue as reflected in tablet e, we note an omitted dative pronominal suffix (H243), as well as suffixed and relative pronouns that serve to clarify the grammatical object (H262-63 and H270).

**Hermeneutic Variants**

The three hermeneutic variants that occur are only attested in the poetic sections, that is in the prologue and the epilogue as recorded in tablets B and e.
Tablet B contains two variants that seem to point to its differing geographical affinity (H2 and H132). In light of these variants there seems to be grounds for linking tablet B, or its Vorlage, with the city of Nippur (see notes and above).

Tablet e contains a reference to the deity Adad (H248) as the instrument of Hammurabi’s justice. This has been described as possibly due to the increase cultic role of the deity Adad in the period in which the tablet was written (see note and the references there).
CHAPTER 7 – GILGAMESH XI

The Text

The Epic of Gilgamesh gained immediate popularity in modern times after it was first published by George Smith in 1872 as an ancient Babylonian parallel to Genesis 1-11. Later scholarship has determined that the text now known as the Epic of Gilgamesh is based on a collection of earlier Sumerian literary works based around a common hero, which date to the late third or early second millennium B.C.E. The early Akkadian versions of the Gilgamesh poems, extant from around the 19th century B.C.E., were apparently based on their Sumerian antecedents, but subsequent editing and transmission of the poems transplanted the hero Gilgamesh into some literary compositions not known in the earlier versions. It is in this way that tablet XI, containing the story of the Deluge

495 The first announcement of George Smith’s discovery appeared in a paper presented to the Society for Biblical Archaeology in London in late 1872. Subsequent publications by Smith culminated in the publication of a posthumous volume following his death whilst on an expedition in Mesopotamia in search of further cuneiform parallels to the early biblical accounts. See G. Smith, The Chaldean Account of Genesis: Containing the Description of the Creation, the Fall of Man, the Deluge, the Tower of Babel, the Times of the Patriarchs and Nimrod, Babylonian Fables and Legends of the Gods, From the Cuneiform Inscriptions (London: Sampson Low, Marston, Searle and Rivington, 1876). Smith’s publications are conveniently listed in R.S. Hess and D. Toshio Tsumura, I Studied Inscriptions From Before the Flood: Ancient Near Eastern, Literary, and Linguistic Approaches to Genesis 1-11 (Sources for Biblical and Theological Study 4; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1994) 4-6.
496 A.R. George, Gilgamesh, 7-8.
497 A.R. George, Gilgamesh, 17-22.
originally know from the Atra-hasīs poem, was included into what became the Standard Babylonian version of the Epic.\textsuperscript{498}

\textit{The Tablets}

The fragments of tablet XI in the standard Babylonian series examined here are from Neo-Assyrian and Neo-Babylonian sources. There are eight tablets represented by the fragments, which were excavated from Nineveh, Ashur, Nimrud and Babylonia, and two further tablets that hold only the incipit of our text.\textsuperscript{499} The following list and description of the tablets relies on the full treatment of the sources in A.R. George’s critical edition.\textsuperscript{500} The sigla used by A.R. George are also employed in the present analysis.

\textit{Table - First Millennium Sources for Gilgamesh XI Under Examination}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Siglum</th>
<th>Museum Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>K2252+2602+3321+4486+Sm1881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J1</td>
<td>K3375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J2</td>
<td>Rm616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>K7752+81-2-4, 245+296+460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2</td>
<td>Sm2131+2196+Rm2,383+390+82-5-22, 316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W1</td>
<td>K8517+8518+8569+8593+8595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W2</td>
<td>K8594+21502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W3</td>
<td>K17343</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{498} A.R. George, \textit{Gilgamesh}, 18. The version of the epic that is referred to as the ‘standard Babylonian Epic of Gilgamesh’ is thought by George to have been edited in the late second millennium B.C.E. (\textit{Gilgamesh}, 30).

\textsuperscript{499} These latter two sources are copies of tablet X that preserve the catch-line of tablet XI. The tablets, given the sigla K\textsubscript{1} and b in George’s critical edition, are from Kuyunjik and Babylon respectively. K\textsubscript{1} consists of K8589+Sm1681, while b consists of eleven other fragments joined to BM34160. As may be expected these sources have very little of the text of Gilgamesh tablet XI preserved and so will not feature in the description of the fragments. However, for comprehensiveness, the variants in the catch-lines of both tablets will be noted in the list of variants that follows.

\textsuperscript{500} See \textit{Gilgamesh}, 411-15.
Description of the Sources

C, K2252+2602+3321+4486+Sm1881

This tablet is written in a type of script defined by A.R. George as type C. Scripts of this type show a tendency to use distinctive forms of certain signs, from which George posits that such tablets were not written at Kuyunjik, but rather were brought in from elsewhere.\textsuperscript{501} The tablet has been mostly reconstructed and contains six columns in total. The colophon has the tablet series number plus the title of the series: DUB.11.KÁM ša naqbī īm[uru ēš.gâ]r 6GiŠ-gim-maš libir.ra.bi.gim [a]b.sar.âm ba.a.ē, “Tablet 11, ‘He who saw the Deeps,’ series of Gilgameš, written and checked according to its original.”\textsuperscript{502} Incised below this after the clay had dried is a line attributing ownership of the tablet to the palace of Ashurbanipal. The tablet has narrow ruled vertical margins of two lines between columns, and ruled horizontal lines dividing the text into sections.

J1, K3375; J2, Rm616

The script is Neo-Assyrian. The tablet contained six columns, with the writing at places cramped and the horizontal direction of the lines tending to drift upwards to the right. The tablet is made from high quality clay and, while it does not contain a colophon, other tab-

\textsuperscript{501} Gilgamesh, 384.

\textsuperscript{502} For the transliteration and translation see A.R. George, Gilgamesh, 736.
lets of this type indicate manufacture specifically for Ashurbanipal’s collection. Some vitrification on a fragment from the top left corner indicates that the tablet may have been burnt in a conflagration, possibly during the destruction of Nineveh.

T1, K7752+81-2-4, 245+296+460; T2, Sm2131+2196+Rm2,383+390+82-5-22, 316
This tablet is possibly to be grouped with tablet J as type A. The script is square Neo-Assyrian, and the clay is of high quality. The tablet originally contained six columns, which were each separated by two vertical ruled lines. There are some remains on fragment T2 of horizontal rulings that divided the text into sections. This text is therefore presumed to have been prepared for Ashurbanipal’s collection at Nineveh.

W1, K8517+8518+8569+8593+8595; W2, K8594+21502; W3, K17343
The script is Neo-Assyrian but more angular than that of tablets J and T. It originally contained six columns of around the same dimensions as tablet J. The tablet is categorised as type B, and contains a short colophon that states the tablet number, name of the series, and that it was “written and checked according to its original.” No information regarding the tablets provenience is given. Based on the museum catalogue numbers assigned to the fragments it can be assumed that this tablet was excavated at Kuyunjik, but its original place of preparation remains unknown. Three vertical rulings form margins between the columns. The clay is brittle and of poor quality.

---

503 The tablet is designated as type A according to A.R. George, *Gilgamesh*, 382-83. Tablets of this type have very square Assyrian script, narrow vertical margins ruled between columns, and long colophons of the type specified in H. Hunger, *Babylonische und Assyrische Kolophone* (Kevelaer: Butson & Bercker, 1968) no. 319.

504 See A.R. George, *Gilgamesh*, 382-84, 739.
b, VAT10586

The script is Neo-Assyrian and slightly angular. The tablet probably contained one or two columns per side. The exact provenience of this tablet and tablet c at Ashur is unknown, however another fragment of Gilgamesh tablet VI was found in a private library, so tablet b and tablet c may be connected with this private collection.506

c1, VAT11000; c2, VAT11087; c3, VAT11294

The script is Neo-Assyrian and very similar to tablet b. The similarity in script may be further cause for assuming that both of these tablets come from the same private library. The tablet originally contained six columns, and was probably similar to tablet W in its layout of the text.

j, BM35380

This tablet is Late Babylonian and is written in small crowded script. It is assumed to have come from Babylon on account of the initial catalogue designation Sp2,960. The merchant house Spartali & Co. sold several large collections of tablets to the British Museum in the later part of the 19th century. The second collection, Sp2, contained tablets that were re-catalogued as BM34529-35494. On this see J.E. Reade, "Rassam's Babylonian Collection," xv-xvii.

505 Alternatively the tablet may have contained six columns, thereby holding the text of tablet X and XI in the series. See A.R. George, Gilgamesh, 415.
506 O. Pedersén designates this library as 'N3,' the private library of the chief musicians. See O. Pedersén, Archives and Libraries in Assur, N3 no. 45.
507 See A.R. George, Gilgamesh, 415. The merchant house Spartali & Co. sold several large collections of tablets to the British Museum in the later part of the 19th century. The second collection, Sp2, contained tablets that were re-catalogued as BM34529-35494. On this see J.E. Reade, "Rassam's Babylonian Collection," xv-xvii.
This tablet, kept at the Iraq Museum in Baghdad, is written in a Neo-Assyrian script that probably dates to before the time of the Kuyunjik libraries.\textsuperscript{508} It originally contained six columns, holding sections of tablet X and tablet XI, as well as some sections that are unknown in the standard Babylonian epic. This tablet was excavated from the temple of Nabû at Nimrud (ancient Kalḫu), E-zida, a building that was most likely erected at the end of the ninth century B.C.E. Double vertical rulings separate the columns, though the text often exceeds the margins. Horizontal rulings separate the text into sections.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fragment</th>
<th>Total SU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>791.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J\textsubscript{1-2}</td>
<td>1014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T\textsubscript{1-2}</td>
<td>430.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W\textsubscript{1-3}</td>
<td>487.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c\textsubscript{1-3}</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>z</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following table gives the total number of SU and the total count of variant forms for each set of two parallel tablets preserving at least 20 SU in common. Following this table is an exhaustive list of all variant readings between any two first millennium sources for Gilgamesh XI that overlap in content, regardless of the amount of overlapping text preserved. Although every variant is given in the list, the discussion of the variants will refer

\textsuperscript{508} See A.R. George, \textit{Gilgamesh}, 364-65 for a full description of the tablet and its contents. The script is classified as early Neo-Assyrian.
in the main only to those texts preserving approximately 50 SU in parallel listed in the table. Variant readings in the parallel sources that are less fully preserved may be referred to periodically, but will not be made to bear any of the statistical argument put forward regarding types and frequencies of variants.
Table - Variants in the Parallel Sources for Gilgamesh XI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparison: Text vs Text</th>
<th>TOTAL PLL</th>
<th>Orthographic Variants</th>
<th>Orthographic (linguistic) Variants</th>
<th>Proportion: SU per Orth. <em>(l)</em> Variant</th>
<th>Stylistic (Type 1) Variants</th>
<th>Proportion: SU per St. <em>(1)</em> Variant</th>
<th>Stylistic (Type 2) Variants</th>
<th>Proportion: SU per St. <em>(2)</em> Variant</th>
<th>Stylistic (Type 3) Variants</th>
<th>Proportion: SU per St. <em>(3)</em> Variant</th>
<th>Hermeneutic Variants</th>
<th>Proportion: SU per Hermeneutic Variant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C:J</td>
<td>724.5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J:T</td>
<td>432.5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C:W</td>
<td>379.5</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J:W</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W:j</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>62.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J:c</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C:T</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>398</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C;j</td>
<td>188.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>377</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T:W</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C:c</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J:j</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T:j</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>168</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C:b</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T:c</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J:j</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C:z</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W:c</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T:b</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### List of Variants Between the Parallel Sources for Gilgamesh XI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Tablet</th>
<th>Variant Text</th>
<th>Categorisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G1</td>
<td>C i 1</td>
<td>MU-ra</td>
<td>OV(l) – Ventive suffix lacking in b and f.(^{509})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J₂ i 1</td>
<td>M[U-r]a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K₃ catchline</td>
<td>MU-ra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b catchline</td>
<td>MU-ár</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f catchline</td>
<td>[ ál]r</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2</td>
<td>C i 1</td>
<td>a-na</td>
<td>OV – The preposition <em>ana</em> is written syllabically in C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K₃ catchline</td>
<td>ana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b catchline</td>
<td>ana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f catchline</td>
<td>ana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3</td>
<td>C i 1</td>
<td>m UD.ZI ru-ú-qi</td>
<td>OV – The title <em>Ūta-napišti rúqi,</em> “distant <em>Ūta-napišti,</em>” is spelled differently in the sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K₃ catchline</td>
<td>UD.ZI ru-qi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b catchline</td>
<td>UD.ZI-tim ru-qi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f catchline</td>
<td>m UD.ZI SUD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G4</td>
<td>C i 2</td>
<td>m UD.ZI</td>
<td>OV – W has a phonetic complement on the final element of the proper noun <em>Ūta-napišti.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W₁ i 2</td>
<td>[ -]tim</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G5</td>
<td>C i 3</td>
<td>ia-ti-m[a]</td>
<td>OV – W writes the long medial vowel in the independent pronoun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W₁ i 3</td>
<td>ia-a-ti-m[a]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G6</td>
<td>C i 4</td>
<td>ia-ti-ma</td>
<td>OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.(^{510})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W₁ i 4</td>
<td>ia-ši-ma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G7</td>
<td>C i 5</td>
<td>‘gu-um-mur-ka’</td>
<td>OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.(^{511})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J₂ i 5</td>
<td>[ m]ur-’ka’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W₁ i 5</td>
<td>[ mu[r]-’ku’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G8</td>
<td>C i 5</td>
<td>ana</td>
<td>OV – The preposition <em>ana</em> is written syllabi-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^{509}\) See note below.

\(^{510}\) W exhibits the phonetic change /t/ > /š/, probably reflecting pronunciation. The correct form in the previous line indicates that the scribe was aware of the standard orthography for this lexeme.

\(^{511}\) W has a different vowel for the 2ms pronominal suffix. A possible alternative is to read the suffix in W as a dative pronoun, so as the phrase *gummurku libbi ana epeš ...* is translated “my heart is for (devoted to) you to do ...” (cf. M.B. Rowton, "The Use of the Permansive in Classic Babylonian," JNES 21 [1962] 260). The more straight forward reading of the suffix as accusative is more likely (cf. A.R. George, *Gilgamesh*, 878). The difference in the final vowel is therefore taken as a variation in pronunciation underlying an orthographic change.
J 2 i 5 ana ca
W 1 i 5 a-na
cally in W.

G9 C i 5 tu-qu-un-ti
W 1 i 5 t[u]u-qu-un-tú
j i 5 [t]u-qu-un-ti
OV(l) – W has the wrong case vowel.

G10 C i 6 [ a ]t
J 2 i 6 'na-da'-at
W 1 i 6 [n]a'-da'-at-ta
OV(l) – W has the long form of the verb *nd’,
“drop, throw down.”

G11 C i 6 e-lu še-ri-ka
J 2 i 6 e-[u]
W 1 i 6 e-li še-[ri]-ka
j i 6 l[u še-ri-ka
OV(l) – W has a different vowel appended to
the preposition elu, “upon.”

G12 C i 7 ba-la-ta teš-'ú'
W 1 i 7 'ba-la'--[a te]š-'-um
OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.

512 W has the case vowel for genitive singular /i/ > /u/ in the phrase ana epuš tuqunti, “to make trouble.”
The spelling in W may reflect a tendency toward vowel harmony on the part of the scribe, but such an ex-
planation could only be conjectured on analogy with other instances where similar changes occur in case
vowels. This is one possible explanation for case vowels that are identical to the penultimate vowel of the
root to which they are attached, as occurs frequently in W, cf. G7, G9, G11, G16, G22, G28, G40, G70,
G73, G275; and also sporadically in J, cf. G136, G138, G140, G142, G158. It should be noted, though, that
aberrant case vowels are explained as a matter of orthography rather than vowel harmony in the grammars.
It remains that the case vowels in J and W, where they vary from the other sources, typically follow the
penultimate vowels of the form to which they are appended. One may note the observation in J. Hämee-
Anttila, Neo-Assyrian Grammar, 32, that “a final vowel may be sporadically assimilated to a preceding
long stressed vowel ... [or] casus vowels may even affect the root vowel ... The impact of Babylonian dia-
lect on NA may, in fact, be the cause for some of these changes.”

513 See A.R. George, Gilgamesh, 878 where all sources are taken as writing a stative form. W writes the
final weak form as trisyllabic (with a “-t” affixed to the weak root to aid pronunciation). Alternatively the
form in W could be read as a stative plus an affirmative subject suffix (the so-called ‘permansive’) which
is apocopated in C and J (cf. M.B. Rowton, "Use of the Permansive," 260). This is equal to 2 ms ‘active
stative,’ or a predicative verbal adjective (cf. J. Huehnergard, Grammar, 393-95). A.R. George suggests
this could be an example of an unusual Kuyunjik orthographic form where VC is written as CV (see Gil-
gamesh, 438).

514 This variant is listed as a “minor difference in word or expression” in A.R. George, Gilgamesh, 429.
\[j\ i\ 7\]
\[ba\-'la\-\ta\ taš-ú\]

G13 \[J_2\ i\ 8\ a\]
\[W_i\ i\ 8\]
-\[n]a
\[ana\]
OV – The preposition \(\textit{ana}\) is written syllabically in J.

G14 \[J_2\ i\ 8\ a\]
\[W_i\ i\ 8\]
ša-šu [\]
ša-šu-ma
SV(1) – J lacks the emphatic particle ‘\(-\textit{ma}\.\)’

G15 \[C_i\ 8\]
\[J_2\ i\ 8\ a\]
\[J_i\ 8\]
a-na \(^d\) Giš[\]
a-na \(^d\) Giš-gim-maš
OV – The preposition \(\textit{ana}\) is written logographically in J.

G16 \[J_2\ i\ 9\]
\[W_i\ i\ 10\]
\[j\ i\ 10\]
riš-ta
pi-riš-ti
riš-ti
OV(I) – J has the correct case vowel for the accusative singular.

G17 \[C_i\ 10\]
\[W_i\ i\ 10\]
\[j\ i\ 190\]
\[-\[ú\-ri-pak\]
\[-\[ú\-ri-pak\]
\[-\[ú\-ri-pak\]
SV(1) – C has a redundant preposition marking the dative.

G18 \[J_2\ i\ 10\]
\[W_i\ i\ 11a\]
\[U\]\Ru šu-ri-pak
\[]\-\[ú\-ri-pak\]
OV – The first vowel of the city name \(\textit{Šuripak}\) is written fully in J.

G19 \[C_i\ 11\]
\[W_i\ i\ 11a\]
\[j\ i\ 11\]
\[d]\u-šú
ša ti-du-šu
ša ti-du-šú
OV – The pronominal suffix is written as ŠU.

\[\text{515}\] The lexeme ‘\(\textit{še‘ûm}, \text{“seek out,”}\) is written with medial \(\textit{aleph}\) and final “\(-m\)” in W. The glottal stop (written \(\textit{.isHidden}\)) is part of the root. The final sign in W could be read as \(U_{\text{16}}\), which would amount to an orthographic variant.

\[\text{516}\] Although J is broken after the sign ŠU it is clear that the sign MA does not follow as there is not enough room on the tablet. The missing sign MA is not noted in A.R. George, \textit{Gilgamesh}, 702, but is clear in the drawing (\textit{cf}. A.R. George, \textit{Gilgamesh}, pl. 132) and is listed in the apparatus in A.R. George, \textit{Gilgamesh}, 427. I owe this observation to I. Young.

\[\text{517}\] The form in W (and therefore j) is read as \(\text{-i}\) for accusative singular in A.R. George, \textit{Gilgamesh}, 439.

\[\text{518}\] The dative object is already expressed by the independent dative pronoun \(\textit{kaša}, \text{“to you”}\) in the other sources.
G20  C i 13  qer-bu-Šu  OV(l) – The pronominal suffix lacks the final vowel in j. 519
     W i 13  qer-bu-uš
     j i 13

G21  C i 13  qer-bu-Šu  OV – The pronominal suffix is written as ŠU in W.
     W i 13  ]-šu

G22  J2 i 12  a-bu-b[i  OV(l) – W has the wrong case vowel for the genitive singular abubi, “deluge.” 520
     W i 13  a-bu-bu
     j i 14  a-bu-bi

G23  C i 15  d a-nu-um  OV – C has CV-VC against CVC in j.
     j i 15a  d a-num

G24  W i 17a  ‘ana ki-i[k  OV – The preposition ana is written logographically in W.
     j i 18  a-na ki-ik-ki-šu

G25  J2 i 17a  [k]i-ik-š[u]  OV(l) – The case vowel is lacking in j. 521
     j i 19  ki-ik-kiš

G26  J2 i 18  [š]u-ù-[ ]  OV – J has the long spelling of the first vowel in the proper noun Šuripak.
     j i 21  šu-ru-up-pa-ku-ú

G27  W i 19  [š]i-ip-pa-ku-ú  OV(l) – j seems reflect a different pronunciation of the proper noun Šuripak.
     j i 21  šu-ru-up-pa-ku-ú

G28  W i 20a  bi-ni GIŠ.MÁ  OV(l) – j has the wrong stem vowel for ms imperative of III weak √banû, “to build.” 522
     j i 22a  bi-nu GIŠ.MÁ

519 The lack of the final vowel in j is a sign of elevated language and therefore considered a dialectal form. This reflects an Old Babylonian poetic form that survives as a rare literary affectation in Standard Babylonian (see A.R. George, Gilgamesh, 431-33).

520 See A.R. George, Gilgamesh, 440, where /u/ for genitive singular is listed as among the unusual Kuyunjik orthographies.

521 j lacks the case vowel in this line, but in the same word in the next line j has the case vowel. According to J. Huehnergard, Grammar, 595, Standard Babylonian orthography has a greater preponderance to use single signs with CVC values against two signs with the values CV-VC. j, a Neo-Babylonian tablet, appears to fit this pattern.

522 The form in j could be read as a plural imperative, but against this it should be noted that the subject in the following address is singular in both sources: “u-qur É,” “demolish the house;” “muš-šir NIG.TUKU-ма,” “abandon wealth;” and “še-’i ZI meš,” “seek survival.”
| G29 | W₁ i 21 | j i 23 | [..]’-ak-ku’-ra | OV(l) – j has the wrong case vowel for the accusative singular.\(^{523}\) |
| G30 | W₁ i 21 | j i 23 | na-’piš’-t[ū] | Not Counted – The sign in W is too damaged to be certain.\(^{524}\) |
| G31 | W₁ i 22 | j i 24 | a-na | OV – The preposition ana is written logographically in j. |
| G32 | W₁ i 22 | j i 24 | lib-bi | OV – j has the logogram for √libbu, “heart, midst.” |
| G33 | W₁ i 23 | j i 25a | ta-ban-nu-ši | SV(1) – Difference in gender.\(^{525}\) |
| G34 | W₁ i 24 | j i 25b | min-du-da | OV(l) – Difference in grammatical form.\(^{526}\) |
| G35 | W₁ i 24 | j i 25b | mi-na-tu-’šá’ | SV(1) – Difference in gender.\(^{527}\) |
| G36 | T₂ i 3’ | W₁ i 26 | alp-si-i | OV – The noun apsu, “subterranean waters,” is written logographically in W. |

\(^{523}\) According to J. Huehnergard, *Grammar*, 597, Standard Babylonian exhibits a merging of the accusative singular case ending towards the nominative singular case ending ‘-u,’ however A.R. George, *Gilgamesh*, 441, notes that the shift of accusative singular /i/ to /u/ is also peculiar to Kuyunjik orthographies. The final vowel in j could therefore be viewed as either a Standard Babylonian linguistic form or a peculiar Neo-Assyrian orthographic form.

\(^{524}\) The sign in W has only the lower head of a single wedge preserved in the lower left part. As well as TÚ (𒌓), this could just as easily be read as TI (𒈗), TI₁ (𒉗) or TI₅ (𒁁).

\(^{525}\) The 3fs pronominal object suffix is written as 3ms in j. According to J. Huehnergard, *Grammar*, 598, Standard Babylonian regularly fails to distinguish between masculine and feminine pronominal suffixes (šu versus ša). The referent elippu, “ship, boat,” is clearly treated as feminine singular in the other sources (W and T), but j has a masculine singular pronominal suffix referring to this noun in two instances.

\(^{526}\) The likely difference between the sources here is a participle form in W against a stative (or an attributive verbal adjective) in j. A.R. George, *Gilgamesh*, 426, classes this variant as a “difference of tense, stem or mood,” and more specifically A.R. George, *Gilgamesh*, 879, records the form in j as “II/1 stative mun-du-da.”

\(^{527}\) The gender of the possessive pronominal suffix is difference between the sources. Cf. G33 above.
G37 T₂ i 4’  a-zak-ka-r[a]  W₁ i 27  MU-ra  OV – T has the syllabic spelling of √zakaru, “to speak, mention,” against the logographic spelling in W.

G38 T₂ i 8a’  DUG₄.GA  [i]-‘qab-`bi  W₁ i 31a  OV – T has the logographic spelling for √qabû, “to say.”

G39 T₂ i 8b’  MU-[ra]  W₁ i 31b  i-zak-ka-ra  OV – T has the logographic spelling of √zakaru, “to speak, mention,” against the syllabic spelling in W.

G40 T₂ i 9’  ta-qab-b[ᵃ- água]-šu-nu-ti’  W₁ i 32  ta-qab-ba-aš-su-nu-tu  OV(I) – W has the wrong case vowel for the accusative singular.528

G41 T₂ i 12’  aš-šak-ka-n[a]  W₁ i 34b  ul a-šak-kan  OV(I) – Difference in grammatical form.529

G42 T₂ i 12’  p[i]-ia-a-ma  W₁ i 34b  še-pi-i-a  OV – Long /i/ is marked in W, against long /a/ marked in T.

G43 T₂ i 12’  p[i]-ia-a-ma  W₁ i 34b  še-pi-i-a  SV(1) – The enclitic particle “-ma” is lacking in W.

G44  C i 1a’  ‘GURUŠ.MEŠ’  T₂ i 23b’  łā GURUŠ.MEŠ  c₁ i 10’  łā GURUŠ.MEŠ  OV – T and c have the determinative LŪ denoting professional office, lacking in C.

G45  C i 1a’-b’  ‘GURUŠ.MEŠ [ ]’  T₂ i 23b’-24’  łā GURUŠ.MEŠ ‘[ ]’-b[i]-la  c₁ i 9’-10’  ši-bu-ti i-[zab ] 1ā GURUŠ.MEŚ i-[ ]  SV(3) – C and T have a different line order to c.53⁰

528 This could reflect Assyrian dialectal influence, where the Standard Babylonian form šunu > šunu in Neo-Assyrian (cf. J. Huehnergard, Grammar, 600). According to A.R. George, Gilgamesh, 440, this is a case of unusual Kuyunjik orthography where the wrong case vowel is written for the pronominal suffix.

529 T appears to mark the ventive suffix, which is lacking in W.

53⁰ C and T have the order “young men ... old men,” against the reverse in c. See A.R. George, Gilgamesh, 424, where this variation is categorised as “lines transposed.”
G46 C i 2’ šar-ru-’ú’  OV – C has CVC-CV against CV-CV in c.⁵³¹
   c₁ i 11’ [š]a-ru-u

G47 C i 3’ lap-nu  OV(l) – j has the wrong case vowel for the nominative singular.⁵³²
   j ii 6a lap-ni

G48 C i 4’ W₁ ii 1 ʾu₄-me’  OV(l) – The case vowel in W is written as /e/ against the expected /i/ in C.⁵³³
   W₁ ii 1 ʾu₄-me’

G49 C ii 2 10 NINDA.ÂM  OV – W and j write √nindanu, “measuring rod of 12 cubits,” with the full composite logogram.
   W₁ ii 3 10 NINDA.TA.ÂM
   j ii 8 10 NINDA.TA.ÂM

G50 T₁ i 31’ 6-šú  OV – Different spelling of the 3ms pronominal suffix.
   W₁ ii 5a 6-šu

G51 J₁ ii 8’ J₁ ii 8’ lū  OV – The long vowel in the asseverative particle lū, “indeed,” is written in W.
   T₂ i 34’ ’lū
   W₁ ii 7 lu-ū

G52 J₁ ii 8’ J₁ ii 8’ am-’ḥaš’  SV(1) – The pronominal suffix is lacking in J.⁵³⁴
   T₂ i 34’ am-ḥas-si

---

⁵³¹ A.R. George, *Gilgamesh*, 350 and 438, could read this as a Neo-Assyrian spelling (CVC) in C against a Standard Babylonian spelling (CV-CV) in c. However, A.R. George, *Gilgamesh*, 881-82 raises the possibility that this can be read as a theorised *parras* type adjective, šarrû, “rich.” In this case C has the correct orthography while c is defective.

⁵³² This could be read as a difference in number, where j has an oblique plural against the nominative singular in C, but a plural in this context is unlikely. It is possible that j (a text from Babylonia) has what A.R. George, *Gilgamesh*, 439 refers to as an unusual Kuyunjik spelling of /i/ or /e/ for nominative or accusative singular, even though the text from Kuyunjik (C) has the correct vowel /u/ for the nominative singular.

⁵³³ See the same phenomena in M119, M145 and M234; P13. The spelling difference is perhaps cosmetic, but the clear delineation between /i/ and /e/ in the writing of the specific signs ME (𒈪) and MI (𒈫) indicates that this could be the result of an underlying difference in pronunciation. Other shifts of /i/ > /e/ in analogous Assyrian forms could be invoked to suggest this is a dialectal variation: /i/ > /e/ in primæ *aleph* roots; /e/ for genitive singular and oblique plural case vowels; contraction of diphthong *ay* > /e/ in Assyrian against *ay* > /i/ in Standard Babylonian – cf. J. Huehnergard, *Grammar*, 601-3; see also G64 and G300 below, and the comments in note . However, in relation to this specific noun, the form in W is “a common spelling in Babylonia and hardly diagnostic of Assyrian morphology” (A.R. George, *Gilgamesh*, 436).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G53</th>
<th>J1 ii 9’</th>
<th>[ -t]i</th>
<th>OV(l) – W has the wrong vowel for the accumulative/oblique case.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W1 ii 8</td>
<td>ḫi-šiḫ-tum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G54</td>
<td>W1 ii 9a</td>
<td>3 šár ku-up-ri</td>
<td>HV – Difference in the cardinal number.535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>j ii 15</td>
<td>6 šár ku-u[p ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G55</td>
<td>J1 ii 10’</td>
<td>GIR₄</td>
<td>OV – J has the logogram for the noun √kīru, “storage jar.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T₁ ii 2</td>
<td>k[i]-i-ri</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W₁ ii 9a</td>
<td>ki-i-ri</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G56</td>
<td>W1 ii 9a</td>
<td>ana</td>
<td>OV – The preposition ana is written logographically in W.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J1 ii 10’</td>
<td>a-n[a]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G57</td>
<td>T₁ ii 4</td>
<td>[ l]i</td>
<td>OV(l) – W lacks the genitive case vowel.536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W₁ ii 10</td>
<td>giš su-us-su-ul</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G58</td>
<td>W₁ ii 11</td>
<td>e-zu-ub</td>
<td>OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>j ii 18</td>
<td>e-zi-[b]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G59</td>
<td>W₁ ii 12</td>
<td>2 šár ʃGIŠ[</td>
<td>SV(2) – j apparently lacks the noun √šamnu, “oil.”538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>j ii 19</td>
<td>2 šár u[</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

534 The 3fs dative pronominal suffix in T appears to refer to one of two accusatives (“peg,” or “boat”), or alternatively to both objects that are qualified by the verb to which the pronominal suffix is attached (cf. A.R. George, *Gilgamesh*, 427 and 882).

535 This is most likely confusion between the sign for the cardinal number 3 (𒆠) and 6 (𒆠). In each case the number written probably indicates a very large but indefinite number, as noted in A.R. George, *Gilgamesh*, 707 n. 8.

536 This is the genitive construct form of the noun √sussullu, “(wooden) box,” which in context is written: ERIN.MEŠ naš ṣussullī, “troops carrying (wooden) boxes.” The lack of case vowel in W is noted as very rare in the Kuyunjik orthographies, cf. A.R. George, *Gilgamesh*, 442.

537 The repetition of the ‘i’ class vowel in j could reflect vowel harmony. A.R. George, *Gilgamesh*, 429 notes this among “minor differences in words or expressions.”

538 The line in W is reconstructed: “2 šár ʃGIŠ ša u-pa-az-zi-ru lù MĀ.LAḪ₄₄,” šina šár šamni ša upazziru malāḫu, “there were two myriads [3600] of oil which the shipwright stowed away,” (A.R. George, *Gilgamesh*, 707). The text, according to j, is apocopated to become: šina šár upazziru malāḫu, “there were two myriads which the shipwright stowed away.”
Not Counted – The signs are marked in Young’s study as an orthographic variant, but we consider that the ligature in T is a palaeographic variant.539

SV(2) – T has an extra line that is omitted in the other sources.540

Not Counted – The sign in W is too damaged to allow a certain reading.

SV(1) – Lexical interchange.541

OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.542

OV – Different spellings of the conjunction.

OV – J has CVC-VV against [CV]-CV-VV in T.543

---

539 I. Young kindly made his unpublished notes on the specific variations between the first millennium sources for Gilgamesh XI available to me.

540 The working assumption in the present study is that additional material which is of uncertain content does not introduce contrary information and is therefore not considered as a hermeneutic variant. Instead the variant is considered to introduce expansionary or additional information and so is counted as SV(2). See the comments in note .

541 See also G163 and G212 below, and the comments in note .

542 An analogous shift of initial /i/ > /e/ in primae aleph verbs is considered an Assyrian dialect form (cf. J. Huehnergard, Grammar, 602; A.R. George, Gilgamesh, 349), so this variant could reflect a similar phenomenon. See also note above for analogous forms that exhibit the vowel shift /i/ > /e/ in Assyrian pronunciation. Here the form is 1cs, so the vowel indicates a verbal preformative rather than a root vowel for primae aleph (the root here is šênu, “to load cargo”). According to A.R. George, Gilgamesh, 816, “... examples of writings of the first-person conjugation prefix /e/ with signs normally displaying /i/ are not uncommon.” For another variation in the orthography of the 1cs preformative morpheme where /a/ > /e/ see G207 below.
| G67 | J₁ ii 29’ | um-ma-a-ni | OV(l) – W has the wrong vowel marking the oblique plural. |
| W₁ ii 23 | um-ma-nu |

| G68 | J₁ ii 29’ | ka-li-šú-nu | OV – Different spelling of the possessive pronominal suffix. |
| W₁ ii 23 | ’ka-li-šu’-n[u |

| G69 | J₁ ii 31’ | ú-šá-az-na-an-nu | OV – Repetition of final consonant at the morpheme boundary in J. |
| W₁ ii 25 | ú-šá-az-na-nu |

| G70 | J₁ ii 31’ | šá-mu-ut | OV(l) – Lack of case vowel in J against wrong case vowel in W. |
| W₁ ii 25 | šá-mu-t[u |

| G71 | J₁ ii 32’ | pi-ḫe KA-ka | SV(1) – Lexical interchange. |
| T₁ ii 22 | pi-ḫe KA-ka |
| W₁ ii 26a | pi-ḫe 435 MĀ |

| G72 | J₁ ii 34’ | ú-šá-az-na-na | SV(1) – Difference in grammatical forms, read as a lexical interchange. |
| W₁ ii 27 | i-za-an-na-nu |

| G73 | J₁ ii 34’ | šá-mu-ut | OV(l) – Lack of case vowel in J and T against the wrong case vowel in W. |
| T₁ ii 24 | [ u]t |
| W₁ ii 27 | šá-mu-tu |

---

543 The arrangement of syllables reflects the orthographic patterns given as (c) and (e) in A.R. George, *Gilgamesh*, 438.

544 The form in J is read as the genitive plural *nomens rectum* following the plural *nomens regens*, normalised as *mārī ummanī*, “craftsmen.” Against this W has the nominative case vowel, or /u/ for genitive/oblique plural, cf. A.R. George, *Gilgamesh*, 440.

545 This is a feature of unusual Kuyunjik orthography according to A.R. George, *Gilgamesh*, 440.

546 Both sources have unexpected orthographies. J lacks a case vowel entirely which can be considered a peculiar feature of Standard Babylonian (cf. J. Huennefeld, *Grammar*, 598). W has /u/ for genitive singular, which can be considered an unusual Kuyunjik spelling (cf. A.R. George, *Gilgamesh*, 440).

547 The term in J and T is *babka*, “your hatch/door,” against W *elippuka*, “your boat.” In the context there is very little change in the contextual meaning between the sources, even though in isolation the semantic range of the words is significantly different.

548 The difference in grammatical forms between the sources amounts to a lexical interchange. J has III/1 preterite */zānamu*, “he will bring down rain,” against I/1 present future */zānamu*, “he will continually rain” in W.

549 See the same type of variation above, note .
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G74</td>
<td>J i 36</td>
<td>i-ši</td>
<td>OV(l) – J has the wrong inflected verbal ending, or a possible difference in pronunciation.550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T i 26</td>
<td>i-šu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G75</td>
<td>C i 3</td>
<td>ana</td>
<td>OV – The preposition ana is written logographically in C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W i 29</td>
<td>’a’-na</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G76</td>
<td>C i 3</td>
<td>ana li-bi ħ ś MÁ</td>
<td>SV(2) – C has an additional clarifying noun.551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W i 29</td>
<td>a-na ħ ś MÁ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G77</td>
<td>J i 37</td>
<td>ap-te-ḫi</td>
<td>OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T i 27</td>
<td>a)p- ’te’-ḫi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W i 29</td>
<td>ap- ’ti’-ḫi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G78</td>
<td>C i 4</td>
<td>[ h]i-i</td>
<td>OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W i 30</td>
<td>a-na pe-ḫe- ’e’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G79</td>
<td>C i 4</td>
<td>pe-ḫi- ș ś GIŠ.MÁ m pu-zu-ur ș</td>
<td>SV(1) – The preposition ana precedes the proper noun in W.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

550 A.R. George, Gilgamesh, 429, counts this among “minor differences in words or expressions,” but this could equally be considered as a peculiarity of Kuyunjik orthography (cf. A.R. George, Gilgamesh, 441, type (s), “wrong vowel in inflected verbal ending”). Otherwise this may be a rare attestation of the allophone [ü] as described in M. Luukko, Neo-Assyrian, 87-88, appearing when /u/ is in contact with a sibilant.

551 The construct form in C clarifies the action, ērub ana li-bi elippi, “I entered into the midst of the boat,” expanding on the phrase in W, ērub ana elippi, “I entered into the boat.”

552 The spelling āpti-ḫi in W against āpte-ḫi in the other sources could reflect a pronunciation difference where /i/ > /e/, cf. note above. W. Von Soden, Akkadisches Handwörterbuch (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1981) 853, has /pāḫu as themed ‘ii/i,’ so here the spelling in W is to be expected while the other sources may reflect Assyrian orthography. Such seems to be the case in the orthography of both the 3ms verbal preformative and medial ‘i’ class vowels in Neo-Assyrian letters according to M. Worthington, ”Dialect Admixture of Babylonian and Assyrian in SAA VIII, X, XII, XVII and XVIII,” Iraq 68 (2006). However, the generally inconsistent picture that emerges regarding the representation of ‘i’ class vowels in the Neo-Assyrian texts does encourage the view that the phonemes /i/ and /e/ are in free variation, at least in this period, and this is certainly the view expressed in M. Luukko, Neo-Assyrian, 40-42, and 87. Luukko makes the novel suggestion that a solution to the problem of spellings with /i/ > /e/ in Neo-Assyrian might be to assign “high index number to some of the signs, e.g. te = ti, iš = eš” (M. Luukko, Neo-Assyrian, 41). This was kindly pointed out to me by L.R. Siddall (personal communication).

553 A similar phenomenon possibly underlies this orthographic difference as has been noted above, cf. note and . This variation is noted in A.R. George, Gilgamesh, 425, as a lexical interchange, but as both sources preserve an ‘i’ class vowel a difference in pronunciation of the same lexeme seems equally plausible.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>W1 ii 30</th>
<th>pe-ḫe-e šá GIŠ.MÁ a-na m pu-zu-&lt;ur&gt;-&lt;d KUR'.GAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G80 C ii 4’</td>
<td>m pu-zu-&lt;ur&gt;-d[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W1 ii 30</td>
<td>pu-zu-&lt;ur&gt;-&lt;d KUR'.GAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G81 C ii 5’</td>
<td>at-ta-din</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J1 ii 39’</td>
<td>[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W1 ii 31</td>
<td>at-[ta]-d��’n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G82 C ii 7’</td>
<td>iš-tu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W1 ii 33</td>
<td>ū[l-tu]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G83 J1 ii 42’</td>
<td>ir-tam-ma-am-ma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W1 ii 34a</td>
<td>iš-ir-(t)ag’-gu-um’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G84 C ii 10’</td>
<td>GU.ZA.LÁ.MEŠ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J1 ii 44’</td>
<td>[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W1 ii 35</td>
<td>gu-za-lú-ú’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G85 C ii 11’</td>
<td>d er-ra-kal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J1 ii 45’</td>
<td>[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G86 C ii 11’</td>
<td>ū-n[a]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SV(1) – Apparent difference in verbal mor-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

554 The possible orthographic variant where W lacks the sign UR in the name Puzur-Enlil is not counted as the tablet is too damaged to allow a certain reading.

555 A.R. George, *Gilgamesh*, 429, lists this variant among “minor differences in words or expressions.” The change /š/ > /l/ before a voiced velar plosive is termed a Babylonianism in J. Hämee-an-Anttila, *Neo-Assyrian Grammar*, 22 n. 30. The case here involves a voiceless dental plosive, but a similar change in pronunciation may be detected. J. Huehnergard, *Grammar*, 596, states that this phonological shift before /u/ is a feature of Standard Babylonian. See also G211 and G231 below.

556 This is counted as a lexical interchange irtagamma/irtagamma is “probably more original than ... irtammamma.”

557 The plural noun in W is marked with the spelling of long ‘-u’ instead of the plural marker MEŠ.

558 The sources apparently disagree in the use of a voiced or unvoiced velar fricative in the pronunciation of this proper noun. See M. Luukko, *Neo-Assyrian*, 71, on the possibility of the pronunciation of a voiced /q/ in Neo-Assyrian letters.
J1 ii 45’ i-na-as-saḥ phology.559

G87 C ii 12’ mi-ih-ra OV(l) – J has the wrong case vowel for the accusative singular.560
J1 ii 46’ i[h]-ri

G88 C ii 15’ i-ba’-’u’ OV – Different spelling of the final vowel.
J1 ii 49’ b]a’-’ū

G89 C ii 16’ u]m-[mat] Not Counted – The final sign is not preserved in C so the lack of case vowel is uncertain.
J1 ii 50’ [ ]ṭi

G90 J1 iii 5a a-ḥa-šú OV – Different spelling of the 3ms pronominal suffix.
T2 ii 42a a-ḥa-šu

G91 C iii 3b ina ’ka’-r[a SV(1) – Lexical interchange.561
J1 iii 5b ina A[N

G92 J1 iii 6 DINGIR.DINGIR OV – Different spelling of the plural noun ilū, “gods.”562
T2 iii 43 DINGIR.MEŠ

G93 J1 iii 6 ip-tal-ḥu OV(l) – Difference in verbal stem or tense.563
T2 ii 43 ip-la-ḥu

---

559 Noted as such in A.R. George, *Gilgamesh*, 427. J might be read as containing the form I/1 present future, against the form II/1 in C. In both sources the root is identical, √nasāḥu, “uproot, extract,” but in this case the variation is not read as a difference in verbal conjugation that would amount to a lexical interchange (cf. G72 above). Rather, the doubling of the medial radical indicates that the form is II/1 in both sources with an apparent difference in the preformative morphology of the verbal form.

560 This variant is read as a difference in number in A.R. George, *Gilgamesh*, 427, where C has the case vowel for the accusative singular against the oblique plural in J. However, it seems equally plausible to read this as /i/ for accusative singular /a/, cf. A.R. George, *Gilgamesh*, 439, and also the similar variation in case vowel in G158.

561 According to A.R. George, *Gilgamesh*, 886, the variation between the sources displays some semantic correspondence, and is therefore counted as a lexical interchange. The text of J, “ina A[N],” could be read as ina šamītti, “in the rain,” a metaphoric rendering of karāšu, “destruction,” where C preserves the latter, more original, term. See also A.R. George, "Notes on Two Extremes of Weather," *Revue d’Assyriologie* 79 (1985) 69.

562 See also G103 below.

563 The form in J could be read as I/1 against I/2 in T, or alternatively I/1 preterite in J against I/1 perfect in T, cf. A.R. George, *Gilgamesh*, 426.
The difference between the sources could reflect a dialectal shift of Babylonian /i/ > Assyrian /a/ for the stem vowel of certain roots, cf. J. Huehnergard, Grammar, 602, and more specifically A.R. George, Gilgamesh, 437. M. Luukko, Neo-Assyrian, 85-86, notes that on occasions when /i/ is written as /a/ it may be possible to detect an allophone of /i/, presumably [ä]. In the examples cited by Luukko it seems that this usually, though not exclusively, occurs after a dental, as is the case here. Interestingly Luukko holds that the allophone [ä] is most common among scribes of Babylonian origin, but the manuscript in question here is from Nineveh and written in Neo-Assyrian script. According to George, the blank space at the end of column vi would have held one of the long “type iv” colophons designating the tablet as written at the command of Ashurbanipal for his express use (see A.R. George, Gilgamesh, 382-85, and 415).

C has a preposition plus feminine singular noun, Ištar kima alitti, “Ištar, like a woman in childbirth.” J lacks the preposition and has a feminine singular participle, Ištar malitti, “Ištar, a woman in childbirth.” See A.R. George, Gilgamesh, 886.

J has the Standard Babylonian form where final weak > /i/ against the Assyrian form in T where final weak > /a/, cf. J. Huehnergard, Grammar, 598.

The form “DINGIR.MAḪ,” ilu šērī, or contextual ilu šērtī, “supreme goddess,” in J is contrasted with the proper noun in T, Bēlet-ilī, “Lady of the gods.” Both forms are titles for the same “archetypal female in childbirth,” (A.R. George, Gilgamesh, 886), and the variation is thus treated as a lexical interchange.

J has ša anaku, “(regarding) which I,” against T aššu anaku, “because I.”
The meaning conveyed in both sources may be contextually synonymous, where J has \textit{ina ma-ḫar}, “in the presence (of the gods),” and T has \textit{ina pu-ḫur}, “in the assembly (of the gods).” According to A.R. George, \textit{Gilgamesh}, 887, T retains the superior text.

---

569 See also G92 above.

---

570 C ostensibly follows J although not enough is preserved to be sure. According to A.R. George, \textit{Gilgamesh}, 887, T is to be preferred over J, which is seen as a corruption due to contact with a similar line in Atra-ḫasis. In the present sources J has \textit{ilū ašrū ašbī ina bikīti}, “downcast, the gods sat in grief,” (cf. CAD B 224b), whereas T has \textit{ina nurūb nissāti bākū ittiša}, “in the wetness of lamentation, they wept with her.” Some difference in hermeneutic is evident between the sources. These lines are listed among “variant lines” in A.R. George, \textit{Gilgamesh}, 424.

---

571 J has \textit{šaṭašu-nu}, “closed,” against \textit{šab-ba šaṭašu-nu} in T. The context of the narrative, where the subjects’ lips are stricken by fever, suggests a lexical interchange where J has replaced a difficult lexeme with a more familiar term, cf. A.R. George, \textit{Gilgamesh}, 887-88.

---

572 J is read as /a/ for oblique plural (cf. A.R. George, \textit{Gilgamesh}, 440) rather than as a collective singular.
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G107 J 1 iii 20
T 1 iii 5
mu-šá-a-ti
SV(2) – Extra cardinal number in T.\(^{574}\)

G108 J 1 iii 21
T 1 iii 6
il-lak šá-a-ru a-bu-’bu me-’-ḥu-ū/il-lak šá-’a-ru ra-a-du mi-ḥu-ū a-b[u
SV(3) – J preserves a different word order compared to T.\(^{575}\)

G109 J 1 iii 21
T 1 iii 6
(omits)
ra-a-du
SV(2) – J lacks the term rādu, “downpour.”

G110 C iii 20a
J 1 iii 22a
se-bu-ū u4-mu
T 1 iii 7a
7-’ú u4-’m[u
OV – J writes the ordinal number syllabically.

G111 C iii 20a
J 1 iii 22a
i-na
OV – The preposition is written syllabically in J.

G112 C iii 20a
J 1 iii 22a
i-na ka-šá-[a]-’-du’
T 1 iii 7a
k[a]-šá-di
OV(l) – C has the wrong case vowel for the genitive singular.\(^{576}\)

G113 J 1 iii 22a
T 1 iii 7a
ka-šá-a-’di’
OV – The long vowel in √kašādu is written in J.

---

\(^{574}\) Though broken, the sign partially preserved in T, probably “7,” seems to be a number and not the sign MU (see the drawing in A.R. George, *Gilgamesh*, pl. 130). The expression in J, 6 urra u mūšāti, is restored in T as 6 urri u 7 mūšāti, even though the actual numbers are ultimately uncertain. We can only read T as holding extra, not necessarily contradictory, information; as A.R. George, *Gilgamesh*, 515-16 notes: “the number of nights on MS T could be almost anything.” In light of this fact an expansionary stylistic variation is counted rather a hermeneutic variation.

\(^{575}\) J has šāru abūbu miḫu, “wind, flood, storm,” against šāru rādu miḫu abūbu, “wind, downpour, storm, flood” in T. A.R. George, *Gilgamesh*, 888, notes that T is closer to the text of Atra-ḫasis. The linguistic variation between the spelling of the word miḫu is miḫu is not counted in the light of Rule 3.

\(^{576}\) The expected case vowel for the I/I infinitive √kašādu, “to arrive,” is /i/ for genitive singular because the infinitive follows the preposition ina. C can be read as reflecting an irregular Kuyunjik orthography where /i/ > /u/ for genitive singular, cf. A.R. George, *Gilgamesh*, 440.
| G114 | C iii 20b | ʾit’-ta-raq me-ḫu-ū[
] | SV(2) – J has a different formulation of the line against C and T. 577 |
| J1 iii 22b | ʾte’-riq? šu-ū a-bu-bu qab-
| T1 iii 7b | it-ta-raq m[i |
| G115 | C iii 20b | me-ḫu-ū m[i | OV(1) – Possible difference in pronunciation. 578 |
| T1 iii 7b | | |
| G116 | C iii 21 | ša | OV – Different spelling of the relative pronoun. |
| J1 iii 23 | šá |
| T1 iii 8 | šá |
| G117 | C iii 21 | GIM ki-ma | OV – The preposition is written syllabically in J. |
| J1 iii 23 | GIM |
| T1 iii 8 | GIM |
| G118 | C iii 22 | uš-ḥa-ri-ir | SV(1) – J has the enclitic particle “-ma” lacking in the other sources. |
| J1 iii 24 | uš-ḥa-ri-ir-ma |
| T1 iii 9 | uš-ḥa-ri-ir |

577 The variation in the formulation of the line in J amounts to a difference in phraseology without a significant change in the contextual meaning. C and T have ittaraq meḫū ..., “the storm relented,” where the form of ʾtarāqu, “relent, take pity,” can be read as I/1 perfect, I/2 preterite, or IV/1 preterite, though in A.R. George, *Gilgamesh*, 888, the form is read somewhat more definitively as “what appears to be the I/2 stem”). This contrasts with J, teriq ša abābu qabla, which seems to have the active stative (the so-called ‘predicative verbal adjective’) plus the demonstrative pronoun, and mentions the abābu, “Deluge,” in place of the meḫū, “storm.” This difficult phrase in J might therefore be translated as “the flood was relenting (from) battle,” in light of the comments in J. Huehnergard, *Grammar*, 27, which states that the active stative with an active intransitive verb should be translated with a ‘resultative’ sense. A.R. George, *Gilgamesh*, 711 n. 26, translates J thus: “it was relenting, the Deluge, in respect of battle,” (italics in original). J. Bottéro, *L’Épopée de Gilgamesh: Le grand homme qui ne voulait pas mourir* (Paris: Gallimard, 1992) 192, has a variation on this: “Deluge ... cessèrent, après avoir distribué leurs coups (au hazard),” [(the) Deluge ... ceased, after dealing out blows (randomly)]. The unusual form of the active stative teriq in J possibly reflects an Assyrian dialect form where /a/ > /e/, on analogy with the form ittahšū > itteḫšū, also in J and noted in A.R. George, *Gilgamesh*, 437 (see G94 above). 578 J. Huehnergard, *Grammar*, 45 notes that the shift of /i/ > /e/ before the consonants /y/ and /r/ is common, though “not consistently indicated in the writing system.” Thus the form of the lexeme in C, meḫū, might be considered a byform of miḫū.  

234
The most convincing explanation for this variant is that Į (𒅇) was erroneously written for ḪUL (𒅆𒅇) in J. An alternative possibility is that the form in J represents some linguistic elision of the guttural phoneme /ḫ/ in this lexeme. The latter is highly unlikely given the regular writing of /ḫ/ elsewhere in the tablet and the lack of any known parallel linguistic phenomena in the Akkadian dialects.

The form in C is listed among those that display the “wrong stem vowel in final weak verbs” in A.R. George, *Gilgamesh*, 441. J has the expected stem vowel /a/. The writing of incorrect stem vowels in Neo-Assyrian letters is noted in M. Luukko, *Neo-Assyrian*, 150-51.

The form in J varies from the other sources in orthography and grammatical form. The lack of ventive suffix in J against C and T precludes counting the orthographic variant between these sources in line with Rule 3.

The term in J is /tāmtu, “sea,” written as tāmatu due to a literary interpolation of an anaptyctic vowel, cf. A.R. George, *Gilgamesh*, 432. In the context of the narrative J has Ūta-napištim gauging the state of the weather by looking “at the sea,” rather than “at the day” as the other sources have it. A.R. George, *Gilgamesh*, 889, suggests that the variant in J is due to a misreading of the sign U₄ for TAM in a previous copy from which the scribe of J took his Vorlage. However, in the light of Rule 1 the reading of a variation in J stands.
G125 C iii 24 u OV – The conjunction is written differently in J.  
J1 iii 26 ü  
T1 iii 11 u  
c3 iii 3’ u

G126 C iii 26 [a]p-ti OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.583  
J1 iii 28 ap-te  
T1 iii 13 ap-ti  
c3 iii 5’ ap-ti

G127 C iii 27 ]’me’es-ma OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.584  
J1 iii 29 uk-tam-mi-is-ma  
T1 iii 14 uk-tam-mi-is-ma  
c3 iii 6’ uk-tam-me-es-m[a

G128 J1 iii 31 ap-pa-li-is OV – T and c have CVC against CV-VC in J.  
T1 iii 16 ap-pa-lis  
c3 iii 8a’ ap-pa-lis

G129 C iii 29 r]a’a-ti OV(l) – c has the wrong case vowel for the genitive singular.585  
J1 iii 31 kib-ra-a-ti  
T1 iii 16 kib-ra[ ]ti  
c3 iii 8a’ kib-ra-a-tu

G130 C iii 29 pa’tu A.AB.BA SV(1) – T has the preposition ana, lacking in the other sources.586  
J1 iii 31 pa-tu A.AB.BA  
T1 iii 16 a-na[a  
c3 iii 8a’ pa’-a’[  

G131 C iii 29 pa’tu OV – The long vowel in the form pātu, “edge,” is written in c.  
J1 iii 31 pa-tu  
c3 iii 8a’ pa’-a’[  

583 The form in J is expected, while the other sources conform to the Standard Babylonian orthography where terminating vowels in final weak verbs > /i/, cf. J. Huehnergard, Grammar, 598.  
584 The spelling in C and c is with /e/ where the stem vowel /i/ would be expected for ’kamāsu, here written as II/2 reflexive, “sit (oneself) down, crouch.”  
585 The form in c is more common amongst the Kuyunjik irregular orthographies, where the case vowel for the genitive singular or oblique plural is written as /u/, cf. A.R. George, Gilgamesh, 440. However, in this case the tablet is from Babylon.  
586 The preposition in T is partially restored, but may be read appalis kibrāti ana pātu tāmti, “I looked to the shoreline, towards the sea’s edge.” This nuanced reading is in contrast to the other sources which, lacking the preposition, have appalis kibrāti pātu tāmti, “I looked to the shoreline, the sea’s edge.”
G132  J1 iii 32  12.TA.ÂM  14.TA.ÂM  
T1 iii 17  
HV – Difference in cardinal numbers.  587

G133  J1 iii 33  a-na  
T1 iii 18  ana  
c3 iii 9a’  a-na  
OV – The preposition is written logographically in T.

G134  J1 iii 33  a-na KUR ni-muš  
T1 iii 18  ana KUR ni-muš  
c3 iii 9a’  a-na ni-muš  
SV(2) – c lacks the clarifying plus šadû, “mountain,” before the proper noun.  588

G135  J1 iii 34  kur ni-muš  
T1 iii 19  ni-muš  
OV – The determinative KUR, šadu, is lacking in T.

G136  J1 iii 35  u₄-mu  
T1 iii 20a  u₄-ma  
c3 iii 10a’  u₄’-ma  
OV(l) – J has the wrong case vowel for the accusative singular.

G137  J1 iii 35  2-a  
T1 iii 20a  2  
c3 iii 10a  2-a  
OV – The ordinal number √šanû, “second,” is written without the phonetic complement in T.

G138  J1 iii 35  u₄-mu  
T1 iii 20a  u₄-ma  
c3 iii 10a  u₄-ma  
OV(l) – J has the wrong case vowel for the accusative singular.  589

587 The number of regions of land appearing after the flood waters recede in J is given as 12, whereas this figure is given as 14 in T. The number of nagû, “regions,” varies between the sources, as in other texts as well. See, for example, the eight nagû on the so-called ‘Babylonian Map of the World,’ BM92687 (see W. Horowit, Mesopotamian Cosmic Geography [Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1998] 30-40), and the seven nagû mentioned in AO6478 (W. Horowitz, Cosmic Geography, 182). On the interpretation of the term nagû here as referring to “temporary islands surrounded by the receding waters of the flood” see W. Horowitz, Cosmic Geography, 31.

588 See S. Parpola, The Standard Babylonian Epic of Gilgamesh: Cuneiform Text, Transliteration, Glossary, Indices and Sign List (SAACT I; Helsinki: Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project, 1997) 111 and 146, for the reading of the proper noun here as “ni-šir.”

589 According to J. Hämeen-Anttila, Neo-Assyrian Grammar, 77, the case vowel /u/ represents both the nominative and accusative singular in Neo-Assyrian. This also seems to be true for some manuscripts from Babylonia, where manuscript j twice has /u/ for accusative singular (see G273 and G281 below).
G139  C iii 33b  šal-šá  OV – The ordinal number √šalšu, “third,” is written syllabically in C and J.
   J1 iii 36  šal-šá
   W2 iii 2b’ 3-šá
   c3 iii 11’ 3-šá

G140  C iii 33b  u4-ma  OV(I) – J has the wrong case vowel for the accusative singular.
   J1 iii 36  u4-mu
   W2 iii 2b’  u4-ma
   c3 iii 11’  u4-ma

G141  C iii 33b  4-a  OV – The ordinal number √rebû, “fourth,” is written syllabically in J.
   J1 iii 36  re-ba-a
   W2 iii 2b’  4-a
   c3 iii 11’  4-a

G142  C iii 33b  u4-ma  OV(I) – J has the wrong case vowel for the accusative singular.
   J1 iii 36  u4-mu
   W2 iii 2b’  u4-ma
   c3 iii 11’  u4-ma

G143  C iii 33b  KUR-ú  SV(2) – The proper noun is lacking in C.
   J1 iii 36  KUR-ú ni-muš

G144  J1 iii 37  5-šú  OV(I) – J has the wrong case vowel for the accusative singular.
   T1 iii 21a  5-šá
   c3 iii 12’  5-šá

G145  J1 iii 37  5-šú  SV(2) – c has an expansive plus, uma, “(fifth) day,” lacking in the other sources.
   T1 iii 21a  5-šá
   c3 iii 12’  5-šá u4-ma

G146  J1 iii 37  6-šá  SV(2) – c has an expansive plus, uma, “(sixth) day,” lacking in the other sources.
   T1 iii 21a  6-šá
   c3 iii 12’  6-šá u4-ma

G147  C iii 34b  7-a  OV(I) – W and c have the wrong case vowel for the accusative singular.
   J1 iii 38  7-a
   W2 iii 3b’  7-ú
   c3 iii 13’  7-ú

590 J has the inclusion of the proper noun (šadû) Nimuš, “(mount) Nimuš,” against šadû, “(the) mountain,” in C.
591 Here and below (G148) J has the correct vowel /u/ for the accusative singular against /u/ in W and c. This is in contrast to the writing of the accusative singular with /u/ in J previously (see G136, G138, G140, G142 and G144 above).
G148  C iii 34b  u₄-ma  OV(l) – W and c have the wrong case vowel for the accusative singular.
      J ¹ iii 38  u₄-ma
      W₂ iii 3b’  u₄-mu
      c₃ iii 13’  u₄-mu
G149  C iii 34b  ina  OV – The preposition is written syllabically in J.
      J ¹ iii 38  i-na
      c₃ iii 13’  [i]na
G150  C iii 34b  ka-šá-a-di  OV – C writes the long medial vowel in √kašādu, “to arrive.”
      J ¹ iii 38  ka-šá-[d[i]
G151  C iii 35b  i-pi-ra-am-m[a]  SV(1) – Lexical interchange.⁵⁹²
      J ¹ iii 39b  i-tu-ram-m[a]
      W₂ iii 4b’  i-[p[i
      c₃ iii 15’  i-[t[u
G152  J ¹ iii 40  i-pa-áš-šum-ma  OV(l) – Difference in grammatical form.⁵⁹³
      W₂ iii 5’  [ ]pa-DA-áš-‘šum’-ma
      c₃ iii 16’  i-‘pa-áš-šum’-ma

⁵⁹² According to A.R. George, *Gilgamesh*, 889, the obscure verb in C and W, √epēru, “to provide food,” is exchanged with a more commonly known lexeme, √lāru, “to return,” in J and c. The reading of the sign PI (𒉿) as TÚ (𒌓) might otherwise be the result of scribal error or damage to the Vorlage, but here the form is read as a lexical exchange.

⁵⁹³ A.R. George, *Gilgamesh*, 712, marks this variant as a scribal error in W. However, the sign is clearly seen in the drawing (pl. 136), so the scribe clearly wrote the sign intentionally. If this is not an error then the meaning of the form in W is uncertain. The reading of the form “i-pa-ta-áš-šum-ma” as I/2 preterite or I/1 perfect of √epešu is problematic as one would expect itepuššumma instead of ipataššumma. In this instance a metathesis of the second and third signs would have to be presumed, and the vowels explained. If, however, the form was read as IV/3 preterite or IV/2(!) present future of √bašū, then a grammatical variant may be counted. The present study does count this variant as such in the light of Rule 1, though it should be noted that George’s assumption of scribal error is probably the most likely explanation of this difficult form.
G153  C iii 36  ši-ma  SV(1)  – Difference in gender of the dative
     J1 iii 40  i-pa-áš-šum-ma
     W2 iii 5’  [  ]pa-DA-aš-’šum’-ma
     c3 iii 16’  i-’ pa-áš-šum’-ma’

G154  C iii 37a  ša[r]  OV(l)  – The stem vowel of √wašāru, “to
     J1 iii 41a  ú-maš-šir
     W2 iii 6a’  ú-maš-š[ar

G155  C iii 37b  i-pi-ra-a[m  SV(1)  – Lexical interchange.
     J1 iii 41b  i-tu-ram-m[a]
     W2 iii 6b’  i-pi’-r[a

G156  C iii 38  man-za-[u  OV(l)  – Possible difference in pronuncia-
     J1 iii 42  man-za-zu
     W2 iii 7’  ]-su

G157  C iii 38  ši[m-ma  SV(1)  – Difference in gender of the dative
     J1 iii 42  i-pa-áš-šam-ma

G158  C iii 39  b[ja  OV(l)  – J has the wrong case vowel for the
     J1 iii 43  a-ri-bi
     W2 iii 8a’  jri-ba

G159  J1 iii 46  ni-qa-a  OV(l)  – W has the wrong case vowel for the
     W4 iii 1’  nji-q[u

594  C seems to read TU.MUŠEN as summatu, “dove,” a feminine noun if we are to read the dative pro-
nominal suffix “-simma” as correct. All other sources have this noun as masculine, thus reading
TU.MUŠEN as summu, cf. A.R. George, Gilgamesh, 889.

595  Both complete sources reflect the consonantal shift /w/ > /m/ (cf. J. Huehnergard, Grammar, 259 and
597). The form in J is II/1 preterite umaššir, “I released,” while C has the II/1 durative umaššar, “I was
releasing.” W, though broken, ostensibly follows C.

596  See above, G151.

597  See J. Hämeeen-Anttila, Neo-Assyrian Grammar, 9-10, on the contact of sibilants, voiced and unvoiced,
in Neo-Assyrian and Babylonian. In particular, the Babylonian voiced phoneme /z/ is theorised to have a
voiceless allophone [s] in Neo-Assyrian.

598  See above, G152.

599  Cf. A.R. George, Gilgamesh, 439.

600  The sign in W is very difficult to see in the drawing in A.R. George, Gilgamesh, pl. 136, however the
exclusion of the sign QA as a possible reading seems certain. The writing of /u/ for accusative singular, cf.
A.R. George, Gilgamesh, 441, seems the most likely reading.
G160  C iii 46a  i-ṣi-nù  OV – Different spelling of the verb ṯeṣēnu, “to smell (a fragrance).”
  J1 iii 50a  i-ṣi-nu

G161  J1 iii 50b  i-ri-šá
  W4 iii 4b’  ’e’-ri-šá  OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.601

G162  J1 iii 50b  DŪG.G[A]
  W4 iii 4b’  ṭa[ ]  OV – W writes the adjective ṯabu, “good,” syllabically.

G163  C iii 47  ’ki-i’
  J1 iii 51  ki-ma
  c2 iii 1’  ’ki-ma’  SV(1) – Lexical interchange.602

G164  C iv 1  d a-nu-um
  J1 iii 53  d a-num  OV – C has CV-VC against CVC in J.

G165  J1 iii 53  ṣu-ḥi-šú
  W3 iii 1’  ḫi-šu  OV – The pronominal suffix is written as ŠU in W.

G166  C iv 2  an-nu-tum
  J1 iii 54  an-nu-ti
  c2 iii 4’  an-nu-’tum’  OV(l) – C and c have the wrong case vowel for the oblique plural.603

601 The variation of the first vowel in the lexeme erešu, “scent, fragrance,” may reflect a difference in pronunciation although the two vowels seem to be in free-variation (cf. J. Hāmeen-Anttila, Neo-Assyrian Grammar, 27, especially note 35 and the references there). See also the comments in notes  and  above.

602 This reading follows A.R. George, Gilgamesh, 429, where the variation is classed among “minor differences in words or expressions,” and also CAD K 316 and 363, where these lexemes are listed as separate entries.

603 The case vowel in J is correct for the oblique plural form of the demonstrative annûti, which is given as the nominative plural form annûtu in C and c. It is difficult to make sense of the nominative form in this context as the subject seems to clearly be the speaker Bēlet Ili. The form of the demonstrative in C and c is therefore read as /u/ for oblique (accusative) plural, cf. A.R. George, Gilgamesh, 440.
G167 J 1 iii 54
W 3 iii 2’
a-a am-ši
SV(2) – Expansive plus in J, lacking in W.604

G168 C iv 2
J 1 iii 54
C 2 iii 4’
an-nu-tum
an-nu-ti
an-nu-‘tum’
OV(l) – C and c have the wrong case vowel for the oblique plural.

G169 C iv 3
J 1 vi 1
C 2 iii 5’
UD.MEŠ
UD.MEŠ
[UD.M]E
OV – The plural marker is written as ME in C.605

G170 C iv 3
J 1 iii 54
C 2 iii 4’
lu-ú-uḫ-su-sa-am-ma
lu-ú-uh-su-sa-a[m
‘ah’[]
SV(1) – C has an additional precative particle, lacking in the other sources.606

G171 J 1 iv 1
W 3 iii 3’
am-si
am-ši
OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.607

---

604 The plus, √šmaššu, “to forget,” is noted in A.R. George, *Gilgamesh*, 891, as a dittography from the following line. This is due to its singular occurrence in J, against W, and its absence from the Old Babylonian epic of Atra-ḫaššu. He translates the lines accordingly, minus the repeated negative phrase: “Oh gods, let these [great flies] be lapis lazuli (beads) around my neck, so that I remember these days and never forget them!” (A.R. George, *Gilgamesh*, 715). The repeated phrase *ai immi* does read well enough in context, though, and can thus be counted as an alternative reading in the light of Rule 1: *išš anniti lu uqni kišāđa ai amši; īmē anniti lu aḫšušamma ana dārīš ai amši*, “Oh gods, may these (great flies) be lapis lazuli about my neck, I will not forget; may I surely remember these days for ever, I will not forget.” An alternative reading that retains the repetition is given in J. Bottéro, *L’Épopée de Gilgamesh*, 195: Ô dieux ici présents ... , je n’oublierai jamais (ces) lazulites de mon collier! Jamais je n’oublierai ... , ces jours; j’en ferai perpétuellement mémoire!” [Oh gods here present, never shall I forget (these) lazulites of my necklace! Never shall I forget these days; I will always remember].

605 Two readings are possible for c: the second sign is either a variant writing of the plural determinative, ME, or a phonetic complement. In either case the reading is īmī, “days.”

606 The precative in C is written as preterite in J and c. This is counted as an additional particle in C, where the cohortative sense of the verb luḫšušamma, “may I surely remember,” is rendered as aḫšušamma, “I have surely remembered,” (both forms with emphatic “-ma”) in the other sources. A.R. George, *Gilgamesh*, 891, notes that the lack of the predicate in J and c is a corruption.

G172  C iv 4  [DI]NGIR.MEŠ  OV – The plural marker MEŠ is lacking in c. 608
      J1 iv 2  DINGIR.MEŠ
      e2 iii 6'  DINGIR

G173  J1 iv 3  sur-qin-ni  OV – The doubling of the final consonant in J is read as an orthographic variant.
      W3 iii 4b' sur-qí-ni

G174  C iv 6  im-tal-ku-ma  OV(l) – c has the durative form against the preterite in the other sources. 609
      J1 iv 4  im-tal-ku-ma
      e2 iii 8'  im-tal-li-ku[

G175  C iv 7  u  OV – The conjunction is written as U in C.
      J1 iv 5  ù

G176  J1 iv 5  ana  OV – The preposition ana is written syllabically in W.
      W3 iii 6' ˹a˺-na

G177  C iv 10  lib-ba-ti  OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation. 610
      J1 iv 7b  lib-ba-ti
      e2 iv 3  b]a-a-te

G178  J1 iv 7b  im-ta-li  OV(l) – J has the wrong stem vowel for final weak √malû, “to be filled.” 611
      e2 iv 3  im-ta-la

G179  J1 iv 7b  DINGIR.DINGIR  OV – The plural noun ilû, “gods,” is written as a compound logogram in J. 612
      e2 iv 3  ’DINGIR’.MEŠ

---

608  The sign in c is broken but MEŠ can probably be discounted on account of the top of the vertical wedge that can be seen at the right side of the sign in A.R. George, Gilgamesh, pl. 138. The singular form DINGIR is the most obvious reading, but ultimately this is uncertain as the sign could be part of a compound plural form DINGIR.DINGIR, such as is preserved in J, against c, in G179 below.

609  The variation is counted as a difference in tense in A.R. George, Gilgamesh, 427.

610  It is possible that c, a manuscript from Ashur, may reflect a variant pronunciation of the ultimate vowel. See the suggestion in J. Hämeen-Anttila, Neo-Assyrian Grammar, 27, that in Neo-Assyrian the allophone [e] is occasionally written for /i/. The writing of the long vowel /a/ in √libbātu, “anger, wrath,” is not counted in the light of Rule 3.

611  The verb in J is counted among forms with the “wrong stem vowel in final weak verbs” in A.R. George, Gilgamesh, 441.

612  See also the possible reading of this form of the plural in c above, G172.
| G180 | C iv 11a | a-a-‘um-ma’ | SV(2) – Exchange of lexemes clarifying the sense of the phrase.\(^{613}\)  
 | J₁ iv 8a | a-a-um-ma  
 | c₂ iv 4 | [ n]u-um-ma  
 | G181 | C iv 11a | ú-ṣ[i] | OV(l) – c has the wrong stem vowel for 3ms preterite √waṣu, “to go forth.”  
 | J₁ iv 8a | ú-ṣi  
 | c₂ iv 4 | û-ṣu  
 | G182 | J₁ iv 9b | MU-ār | OV(l) – J lacks the ventive suffix.\(^{614}\)  
 | c₂ iv 6b | MU-ra  
 | G183 | C iv 13 | m[a]-ti | OV(l) – J has the wrong case vowel for the oblique plural.  
 | J₁ iv 10 | a-ma-tu  
 | c₂ iv 7a | a-mat  
 | G184 | C iv 13 | i-‘ba’-a[ṇ] | OV – C has CV-VC against CVC in J and c.  
 | J₁ iv 10 | i-ban-n[ī]  
 | c₂ iv 7a | i-ban-ni  
 | G185 | J₁ iv 11 | ū | OV – The conjunction is written as Ū in J.  
 | c₂ iv 7b | u  
 | G186 | C iv 14 | ka-lu | OV(l) – C has the wrong case vowel for the accusative singular.  
 | J₁ iv 11 | ka-la  

\(^{613}\) The masculine indefinite demonstrative pronoun ayummā, “this,” in C and J is difficult in this context as it seems to refer to a feminine noun, napištu, “soul.” A better reading is given in c to which may be restored the interrogative adverb ayānumā, “where,” which suits the context grammatically and maintains the sense: ayānumā úṣu napištu, “from where has life escaped?” The text of C and J is acceptable as it is given in CAD A 1 237b and A 2 367b: ayummā úṣi napišti, “has someone escaped with his life?” Even so, in this interpretation the auxiliary verb and possessive pronoun must be supplied in the translation. In fact, c makes the best sense without demanding too much from the translator, and it is in this regard that this manuscript “has the better tradition of reading in this line” (A.R. George, Gilgamesh, 891).

\(^{614}\) The form in c can be read as a ventive in context: izakkara ana quradi Enlīl, “he said to the hero Enlil.” J has essentially the same sense given that it too has the preposition anā before the genitive. The lack of ultimate vowel in J could be read as a defective ventive, cf. M. Luukko, Neo-Assyrian, 36. Alternatively the extraneous ultimate vowel carried by the verb in c might be read as a post stress anaptyctic vowel of the type CVC > CV+CV, cf. M. Luukko, Neo-Assyrian, 105, or as an orthographic peculiarity of the type “CV for C,” cf. A.R. George, Gilgamesh, 441. See also G1, G226 and G233.
OV – The possessive pronominal suffix is written with the sign ŠU in b.

OV(I) – J lacks the ventive suffix.\(^{615}\)

OV(I) – J has the wrong case vowel for the genitive singular.\(^{616}\)

OV(I) – Difference in grammatical forms.\(^{617}\)

OV(I) – J has the wrong case vowel for the accusative singular.\(^{618}\)

OV – The interrogative \(kīkī\), “how,” is written differently in b.

SV(1) – Lexical interchange.\(^{619}\)

OV – The medial vowel is written as long in J.

\(^{615}\) See G182 above, and also note , for alternative readings for the ultimate vowel in the other sources that is lacking in J.

\(^{616}\) Cf. A.R. George, *Gilgamesh*, 441.

\(^{617}\) The form in c appears to be I/2 present future or II/1 perfect of \(\text{ṣmalāku}, \text{“to counsel, advise,”}\) against I/2 preterite in the other sources. Without the first part of the verb in c preserved it is impossible to make a judgement on which grammatical form was written there, \(\text{tamtalikma}\) or \(\text{tumtalikma}\). In any case a difference in stem or tense exists between the sources, and in light of G174 a difference in tense is most likely.


\(^{619}\) The sense remains the same between the sources. C and c have \(\text{ṣarnu}, \text{“guilt, wrong doing,”}\) against \(\text{ṣḥīṣu}, \text{“fault, crime,”}\) in J.
G195 C iv 18a  ḫa-šú
J1 iv 15a  ḫi-ḫa-šú
b obv. 3a’  ḫi-ḫa-šú’
OV – The possessive pronominal suffix is written with the sign ŠU in b.

G196 C iv 20  am-ma-ki
J1 iv 17a  am-ma-ku
OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.

G197 J1 iv 17a  taš-ku-nu
b obv. 5a’  n)a
OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.

G198 C iv 20  a-bu-b[u]
J1 iv 17a  a-bu-ba
b obv. 5a’  a-bu-ba
OV(l) – C has the wrong case vowel for the accusative singular.

G199 C iv 22a  am-ma-ki
J1 iv 18a  am-ma-ku
OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.

G200 C iv 22a  taš-k[un
J1 iv 18a  taš-ku-nu
OV – C has CVC against CV-CV in J.

G201 C iv 23a  am-ma-ki
J1 iv 19a  am-ma-ku
OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.

G202 C iv 23a  taš-ku[n
J1 iv 19a  taš-ku-nu
OV – C has CVC against CV-CV in J.

G203 C iv 24a  am-ma-ki
J1 iv 20a  am-ma-ku
OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.

G204 C iv 24a  taš-ku[n
J1 iv 20a  taš-ku-nu
OV – C has CVC against CV-CV in J.

G205 C iv 24b  KUR ÙG.MEŠ
J1 iv 20b  ÙG.MEŠ
SV(2) – Lexical interchange, counted as a clarifying plus in J.

---

620 J consistently writes the conjunction ammakı, “instead of,” as ammaku. The form in J is relatively common, though the Standard Babylonian form is found in C (cf. CAD A 2 67b). See also G199, G201 and G203.

621 The ventive suffix is written with /u/ in J, cf. A.R. George, Gilgamesh, 441.

622 The damage to C makes it impossible to know the exact sequence of signs, but one could assume that the final sign may have doubled the third radical. Perhaps CVC-CV was contained therein, but considering the broken state of the tablet it is only possible to count this variant as orthographic. See also G202 below.

623 The object in C is KUR, māta, “land,” given in J as ÜG.MEŠ, nisī, “life(s).” The context suggests a clarifying stylistic variation, where one lexeme is exchanged for another that suits the phraseology particu-
G206 C iv 25 ana-ku
J1 iv 21 a-na-ku
OV – C has VCV against V-CV in J.

G207 C iv 25 e[p OV(l)
J1 iv 21 ap-ta-a
b obv. 9’ a]p-ta-a
OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.624

G208 C iv 27 Š]u OV
J1 iv 23a mi-lik-šû
OV – The possessive pronominal suffix is written with the sign ŠU in C.

G209 J1 iv 23b d IDIM HV
b obv. 12’ ’d’ é-a LUGAL
HV – Different proper nouns given in the sources.625

G210 C iv 28 ‘a-na’
J1 iv 23b ana
OV – The preposition ana is written logographically in J.

G211 J1 iv 24 ul-te-la-an-ni
b obv. 13’ uš-te-la-a[n
OV(l) – Difference in pronunciation.626

lar to the scribe. C has: Erra litbamma māta, “Erra may destroy the land;” this is against J: Erra litbamma nišī, “Erra may destroy life.” In context the sources essentially agree in their meaning, namely that the eradication of all life is potentially at hand. Even though, strictly speaking, the two nouns, māta and nišī, have significantly divergent semantic ranges when divorced of this particular context, the contextual setting must be taken into account. C maintains the poetic repetition begun in line 193 (according to the line numbering in A.R. George, Gilgamesh, 714-15), and we therefore read J as clarifying the meaning implied in C – all forms of life are at risk.

624 The form in C has the verb preformative /a/ > /i/ for the 1cs I/1 preterite of √petû, “to open, reveal.” A.R. George, Gilgamesh, 428, lists this among possible differences in dialect. See also the references in notes , and .

625 A.R. George, Gilgamesh, 717 n. 44 notes that b is corrupt. In this source “King Ea” takes Ūta-napîtī from the boat following the subsidence of the Deluge, whereas J has Enlil. If not a corruption, the reason behind the substitution of Ea for Enlil in b is unclear. Perhaps there is some geo-political or socio-religious impetus for the change, as is suggested for a similar change in the manuscripts of the Laws of Hammurabi (see H2 and H132).

626 The expected consonantal shift /š/ > /l/ before dentals, reflecting Standard Babylonian (J. Huehnergard, Grammar, 596), is not applied in b. The same shift is generally expected in Neo-Assyrian before voiced velar plosives, though this is probably a Babylonianism (J. Hämneen-Anttila, Neo-Assyrian Grammar, 22 n. 30, and see also G82 and G231). The form in b is therefore archaic, or perhaps more correctly a phonological archaism.
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G212 C iv 33  ki-i  
J i iv 28  ki-ma  
SV(1) – Lexical interchange.  

G213 C iv 35  pi-i  
J i iv 30  KA  
OV – The bound form of √pū, “mouth,” is written logographically in J.  

G214 C iv 36  n]a  
J i iv 31  man-nu  
OV(l) – C has the wrong case vowel for the nominative singular of the interrogative pronoun √mannu, “who, whoever.”  

G215 C iv 37  b]a-ú  
J i iv 32  tu-ba-’-ú  
OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.  

G216 C iv 38  u  
J i iv 33  ù  
OV – The conjunction is written with the sign U in C.  

G217 C iv 42  ba-la-[a]  
J i iv 37  ba-la-śu  
OV(l) – J has the wrong case vowel for the accusative singular.  

G218 C iv 44  ru-’ú’-[qí]  
J i iv 39  ru-qí  
OV – The long vowel in medial weak √rūqu, “faraway, distant,” is written in C.  

G219 C v 1  re-ši-[u]  
J i iv 45  re-ši-śū  
OV – The possessive pronominal suffix is written with the sign ŠU in C.  

G220 C v 3  i-pi  
J i iv 47  e-pi  
OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.  

627 See also G63 and G163 above, and note.  
628 The elision of the glottal stop, or ‘hamza,’ in medial position between two dissimilar vowels is common in Neo-Assyrian orthography, cf. J. Hämeeen-Anttila, Neo-Assyrian Grammar, 13-14.  
629 The 1cs verb preformative /i/ > /e/ is considered an Assyrian dialect form, for which see note.
G221 C v 3 J1 iv 47 išt-tak-ka-ni OV(l) – Possible difference in grammatical form.

G222 C v 4 J1 iv 48 u ‘ū’ OV – The conjunction is written with the sign U in C.

G223 C v 5 J1 iv 49 j v 7’ išt-ta-at t]a-’at’ OV – The feminine form of the ordinal number išt-eeat, “one,” is written syllabically in C and J.

G224 C v 8 J v 11’ se-’bu’-tum 7[ OV – The ordinal number šebūtum, “seven,” is written syllabically in C.

G225 C v 8 J1 v 1 i-’te’-gēl-ta-’a’[ īg-gēl-ta-a OV(l) – Difference in stem or tense.

G226 C v 9 J1 v 2 MU-ra OV(l) – J lacks the ventive suffix.

G227 J1 v 2 T1 iv 6’ ru-qi r]u-ū-qi OV – The long vowel in the medial weak √rūqu, “faraway, distant,” is written in T.

G228 C v 12 J1 v 5 T1 iv 9’ d G[IŠ-gi]m-maš md GIŠ-gīm-maš OV – J has the masculine proper noun determinative preceding the divine determinative.

G229 J1 v 6 T1 iv 11’ ku-ru-um-me-ti-ka u]m-ma-ti-ka OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.

630 The final vowel in C may be read as a defective form of the Neo-Assyrian subjunctive maker, ‘-ū ... ni,’ cf. J. Hämeen-Anttila, Neo-Assyrian Grammar, 92, or as a redundant final vowel, cf. A.R. George, Gilgamesh, 442. The latter is more likely, perhaps under the influence of the I/3 feminine singular imperative form in line 221 šitakanāt (according to the line numbering in A.R. George, Gilgamesh, 716). If, on the other hand, a subjunctive form is assumed, one would have to read the form in C as a defective writing of *ištukkanātī > ištukkanāti, where the subjunctive marker ‘-ū’ has dropped out entirely, and the final consonant of the root *škn, “to put, place,” has assimilated to the subjunctive marker ‘-ni.’ Such a reading is possible but unlikely. On the ‘serial’ sense of the I/3 form of this root, meaning “to place (objects) one by one in a row,” see A.R. George, Gilgamesh, 893.

631 See CAD N 1 106b, and A.R. George, Gilgamesh, 427, where this variant is listed as a “difference of tense, stem or mood.” The form in C is a IV/1 perfect or IV/2 preterite of the intransitive verb √nagaltū, “to awake,” while the form in J is read as a IV/1 preterite.

632 See also G1, G182 and G233, and note above.
G230  C v 13  
J1 v 6  
T1 iv 11'  
t|e-`ka’  
ku-ru-um-me-ti-ka  
u|m-ma-ti-ka  
OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.634

G231  J1 v 9  
T1 iv 14a’  
l|ul-tum  
3-tum  
OV – J writes the ordinal number šalultum, “third,” syllabically.635

G232  C v 17  
J1 v 12  
T1 iv 16  
W1 v 4’  
|at-`ta’  
al-pu-ut-ka a-na-ku  
te-eth[ el-ta-a at-ta  
e|t-te-gél-ta[  
SV(2) – J has a different phraseology compared to the other sources.636

G233  J1 v 13  
T1 iv 17’  
MU-ár  
MU-ra  
OV(l) – J lacks the ventive suffix.

G234  C v 18  
J1 v 13  
T1 iv 17  
|ú-qí  
ru-qí  
u-rú-qí  
OV – The long vowel in medial weak √rūqu, “faraway, distant,” is written in C and T.

G235  J1 v 13  
W1 v 6’  
|lt-ZI  
|lt-ZI-tim  
OV – The proper noun “Üta-napištī(m)” is written with a phonetic complement in W.

G236  J1 v 14  
T1 iv 18’  
a-a-ka-ni  
j`a`-i-ka  
OV(l) – Difference in grammatical forms.637

---

633 The feminine marker `-āt’ is written as “-ēt” in J. A.R. George, *Gilgamesh*, 428, lists this as a possible Assyrian dialect form.

634 The writing /e/ for the oblique plural in C is perhaps a reflection of Assyrian pronunciation. See the references in note above.

635 The form in J reflects the Standard Babylonian shift /ʃ/ > /l/ before a voiceless dental plosive. See the notes to G82 and G211 above.

636 The flow of the narrative is essentially the same between the sources, but J changes the subject and exchanges the intransitive verb √nagātu, “to awake,” for the transitive verb √lapātu, “to touch.” Though the sources C, T and W must all be partially reconstructed, it seems reasonable to read them all similarly: tet-tegeltā atta, “you awoke,” against J: alputka anāku, “I touched you.”

637 CAD A 1 231b lists the form in T, ajika, as a variant spelling of the form in J, ayikāni. Both are forms of the interrogative √ayikī’am, “where.” Alternatively the ending “-ani” in J could be read as a 1cs accusative pronominal suffix in context: ayikāni lullik, “where may I, even I, go?” Another possibility is to read a Neo-Assyrian subjunctive ending, cf. J. Hämeeen-Anttila, *Neo-Assyrian Grammar*, 92. In the light of Rule 4 a grammatical variation is counted.
G237 J1 v 15 t|a OV(I) – Possible difference in pronunciation.
T1 iv 19’ usḥ-šab-bi-tu4

G238 J1 v 16 mu-ú-tum
T1 iv 20’ mu-tum

G239 J1 v 20
b rev. 7’ aḥ-šá

G240 J1 v 21a
b rev. 8a’ n|a-as-su

G241 C v 29 me-’e[’
J1 v 24 M]EŠ
T1 v 8 A.MEŠ
b rev. 11’ m|e-e

G242 J1 v 24 GIM
T1 v 8 GI|M
b rev. 11’ ’ki-ma’

G243 C v 30b ṭa-a-bu
J1 v 25b ṭa-a-bu
W1 v 16b [t]a’-[bu]’-um?’

G244 C v 30b ’ṭa-a-bu šū-pu[’
J1 v 25b ṭa-a-bu lu ša-pu
W1 v 16b [t]a’-[bu]’-um’ šu’-p[u

638 The form in T is read as a Neo-Assyrian orthographic variation of the ventive suffix where /a/ > /u/. This is the same categorisation of this variant as found in A.R. George, Gilgamesh, 441.

639 One possibility is to read the form in b as ā|nu, “front,” plus 3ms pronominal suffix, and therefore to count this variant as a lexical interchange. Such a reading is not preferred as it does not make sense of the writing of the sibilant in both sources as /š/. If the root is read as panātu in both sources the orthography satisfies the phonological change expected where a dental plosive [t] plus a palatal sibilant [ś] combine to become a single long alveolar sibilant /ss/. Interpreting the orthography of b as simply defective is therefore the best reading in terms of the grammar. See J. Huehnergard, Grammar, 87.

640 The sign in W is very damaged, but a variant of some kind is certain based on the remaining material. The variant here is read according to A.R. George, Gilgamesh, 718, where the sign UM is restored.

641 C and W both have a masculine singular imperative verb referring to the subject, Ur-šanabi: jābu ṣupā zumuršu, “soak his body well.” This is in contrast to J which has the precative particle lū plus a verbal adjective referring to the state of the object: jābu lū šapū zumuršu, “let his body be soaked well.”
Though C and b are damaged they appear to agree with J. These are read: lū udDuš parsāgu ša qaqqadišu, “may the head-band of his head be renewed.” W has a different phraseology here, with three different possibilities in translation: (i) the subject shifts from the noun √parsāgu, “head-band,” to an indefinite plural “they,” and the noun becomes the object parsīṛi, “head-band,” marked as accusative singular with the wrong case vowel /a/ > /i/; (ii) the subject shifts from the noun parsāgu to an indefinite plural “they,” and the noun becomes a plural object parsīṛi, “head-bands,” marked as oblique plural /i/; (iii) the noun parsīṛi is plural and remains as the subject, being marked with the wrong case vowel /ū/ > /ň/. The latter reading, (iii), is preferred in A.R. George, Gilgamesh, 427, and we similarly read W as lū udDušu parsīṛi ša qaqqadišu, “may the head-bands of his head be renewed,” reflecting a difference in number for the subject, although this is taken as expanding the subject of the other sources, in terms of describing the attire of the protagonist. We therefore count the variant as an expansion or clarification rather than a difference in hermeneutic.

A.R. George, Gilgamesh, 427, lists this as a difference in number, where C and T have the oblique plural against the accusative singular in W. There seems to be no reason why the forms in C and T cannot be read as instances of the wrong case vowel for the accusative singular /a/ > /ň/, as is often read for similar variations, cf. A.R. George, Gilgamesh, 439. Here the reading that reflects the lesser variant type is preferred, in accordance with Rule 4.
G250  C v 32b  URU-šú  SV(1) – Lexical interchange.644  
      J1 v 28a  'KUR-šú  
      W1 v 18a'  URU-šú  

G251  J1 v 28b  ana  OV – The preposition *ana* is written syllabically in W.  
      W1 v 18a'  a-na  

G252  C v 33b  id-di-ma  SV(1) – The emphatic particle “-ma” is lacking in J.  
      J1 v 29  id-di  
      b rev. 15'  i]d-di-ma  

G253  C v 34  an]a  OV – The preposition *ana* is written syllabically in W.  
      J1 v 30  ana  
      W1 v 20'  a' [  

G254  C v 35  ma-le-šú  OV – The 3ms possessive pronominal suffix is written with the sign ŠU in T.  
      T v 15  ma-le-šu  
      W1 v 21'  [m]a-le-šú  

G255  C v 35  i]l-li  OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.645  
      J1 v 31  el-li  

G256  C v 36b  ū-a-ba  OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.646  
      J1 v 32b  ū-a-bu  
      T1 v 17  ū-a-bu  
      W1 v 23a'  ū-a-bu  

---

644 C and W have a slightly different phrasing to J, but no significant difference is detectable between the sources. The narrative describes how Ūta-napišti arranges to dress Gilgamesh appropriately as a king for his return across the *apsū*. C and W have the destination of Gilgamesh’s journey as *ālišu*, “his city,” against *mātišu*, “his land” in J.

645 The first vowel of the adjective is expected to be /e/, so the use of /i/ here in C probably indicates that the phonemes /i/ and /e/ are in free variation in this manuscript. The underlying difference would therefore be in terms of pronunciation only. On this see note above.

646 The ultimate vowel of the adverb *ṭābu* is expected as /u/, so C reflects a possible difference in pronunciation, cf. G214 where /u/ > /a/ for the nominative singular case vowel in the same manuscript.
The writing of the ultimate vowel in final weak √ṣapū is expected to be /i/. The vowel in W could indicate the plural form of the verb, but in context the object of the verb is a singular noun plus possessive pronominal suffix zumuršu, “his body.” A possible explanation may be to read the orthography of W as reflecting a Neo-Assyrian shift of the final vowel towards the penultimate stressed vowel (see J. Hämeen-Anttila, Neo-Assyrian Grammar, 32), where the vowels /a/ and /u/ in this verb represent the same underlying allophone [o].

J seems to lack the lines: adi illaku ana əlīsu adi ıkkaššadu ana urḫišu tēdiqū šīpa ay īddīma edēšu ūliš, “until he goes to his city, he arrives at his path, may his garment show no stain but be always new.” The text is largely reconstructed, but can be restored with some confidence due to the overlap of the preserved sources. A.R. George, Gilgamesh, 894, posits that the omission in J is due to haplography, where the scribe skipped from the first instance of the noun tēdiqū, “garment,” in line 267 to the second instance in line 270 (according to George’s numbering of the lines in Gilgamesh, 720).
The verb √zakāru, “to speak, mention,” is written syllabically in b.\textsuperscript{649}

OV – The verb √zakāru, “to speak, mention,” is written syllabically in b.\textsuperscript{649}

OV – C writes an extra vowel in the interrogative √mištu, “what.”

OV – The conjunction is written with the sign U in C.

OV – W has a phonetic complement on the final element of the proper noun Ūta-napišti

OV – The noun √libbu, “heart, midst,” is written syllabically in C.

Not Counted – The sign in T is too damaged to allow a certain reading.

Not Counted – The sign in the first line of W\textsubscript{i} may be from the previous line.\textsuperscript{650}

OV(I) – j has the wrong case vowel for the nominative singular.

OV – C has V-CV against VCV in W.

OV – The preposition ana is written syllabically in C and j.

SV(2) – W has a different phraseology com-

\textsuperscript{649} The possible ventive suffix appended to the verb in b (cf. G1, G182, G188, G226 and G233 above) is not counted in the light of Rule 3.

\textsuperscript{650} W may have combined lines 298 and 299 (according to George’s line numbering in \textit{Gilgamesh}, 722) into one line that was written on the first line of column vi, meaning that this is a variation in the layout of the text rather than an actual textual variant. For this suggestion see A.R. George, \textit{Gilgamesh}, 896.
W₁ vi 2'   ana ṣe-e-ḫ-ri-[a
j vi 11'   a-na šu-ḫ-ri-ia-a-ma

G272   T₁ vi 3
j vi 11'   ana šu-ḫ-ri-ia-ma
a-na šu-ḫ-ri-ia-a-ma
OV – j writes an extra vowel in the possessive pronominal suffix.

G273   C vi 19a
T₁ vi 4a
W₁ vi 3a'
j vi 12'
ku-sa-pu
ku-sa-pa
ku-sa-'pa'
ku-sa-pu

G274   T₁ vi 4b
W₁ vi 3b'
ku-sa-pu

G275   C vi 20
W₁ vi 4'
j vi 14'
ku-sa-pu
bu-ú-ra
bu-aru
bju-ra

G276   T₁ vi 5
j vi 14'
A.MEŠ-šá
A.MEŠ-'ša'

G277   C vi 21
W₁ vi 5'
ku-sa-pu

G278   C vi 22a
T₁ vi 7
W₁ vi 6a'
j vi 16'
z vi 2'
i'te-ši-in'
i'n
i'te-še-en
tje-ši-in
i'n

---

651 The omission of the relative particle and the lexical interchange in W affects the sense of the phrase. C and j, with the relative particle, have something of a comparative sense: anāku lūkulma lātur ana ša šuḫriama, “let me eat, and let me turn into such as I was in my youth.” This is in contrast to W which lacks the relative particle and has a different form of the adjective: anāku lūkulma lātur ana šeḫrī[ama], “let me eat, and let me turn into my childhood (form).” See CAD § 122a for šeḫrū, “young, small child” and CAD § 236b for šuḫru, “youth, young days.”

652 The case vowel /u/ for the accusative singular is unexpected in the Babylonian manuscript j, cf. note above.

653 See the comments in note above.

654 W writes both vowels as [e] against the other sources. If the phonemes /i/ and /e/ are in free variation (see note above) this may reflect the actual pronunciation of the scribe, or may more simply be a habit of orthographic practice.
G279  C vi 22a  ni-piš  SV(1) – Possible lexical interchange. 655
        T 1 vi 7    ni-piš
        W 1 vi 6a'  nī
        j vi 16'   ni-piš
        z vi 2'    pi

G280  T 1 vi 8    l|am-ma  OV – z has CV-CV against CVC-CV in the other sources.
        j vi 3b'   ḫa-ma
        z vi 3b'   i-lam-ma

G281  T 1 vi 8    šam-ma  OV(1) – j has the wrong vowel for the accusative singular. 656
        j vi 17'   šam-mu

G282  C vi 23a    ta'ri-šú  OV – The possessive pronominal suffix is written with the sign ŠÚ in C.
        W 1 vi 7'  t|a-ri-šu
        z vi 4b'    ḫu

G283  T 1 vi 9    'qu'[ t]i  OV(1) – T and j have the wrong case vowel for the accusative singular. 657
        j vi 18'   qu-lip-tum
        z vi 5'    ḫa

G284  C vi 24a    i|l-la-ka[a  OV – The verb √alāku, “to go,” is written with a logogram plus phonetic complement in W.
        W 1 vi 9a    DU-ka
        j vi 20'   il-la-ka

G285  j vi 21'   ma-la-hu  OV – The noun √malāhu, “boatman,” is written logographically in z.
        z vi 7b'    MA.LAH₅

G286  C vi 25    ma\n-ni-ia  OV – The 1cs pronominal suffix is written with the sign IÁ in W.
        W 1 vi 10a'  ma\n-' ni-'iá

G287  C vi 25    m'ur-ša[nabi  OV – The proper noun Ur-šanabi is written with the inclusion of the divine determinative in W.
        W 1 vi 10a    m' ur-d šanabi
        j vi 22'  m' ur-šanabi

655 The sign at the end of line 2 in z is broken, but it is clearly not the sign NI and so cannot be read as √nipšu, “snort, smell.” The logogram IR with the value nipšu is also unlikely. The composite logogram PA.AN with the value napišu, “breath, smell,” is the only possibility (though admittedly a remote one based on the traces in A.R. George, Gilgamesh, pl. 33). If read as such then this variation reflects a lexical interchange.

656 See also G273 above, and also note .

657 The form in T is listed among Kuyunjik texts displaying accusative forms with unexpected case vowels in A.R. George, Gilgamesh, 439. On the blending of the nominative and accusative case vowels in j see note above.
| G288 | C vi 25 | m’ur-şá[nabi] | OV – The proper noun Ur-šanabi is written syllabically in z. |
| G289 | W1 vi 10a’ | i-na-ḥa | OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.658 |
|       | j vi 22’ | i-na-ḥu |
|       | z vi 8’ | e-na-ḥa |
| G290 | W1 vi 10a’ | i-na-ḥa | SV(1) – Difference in the gender of the verb form.659 |
|       | j vi 22’ | i-na-ḥu |
| G291 | C vi 25 | j’a’-a | OV – The noun idu, “arm,” is written logographically in z. |
| W1 vi 10a | i-da-a-a | |
| j vi 22’ | i’-da’a-a |
| z vi 8’ | Á’a’ |
| G292 | C vi 26 | a-na | OV – The preposition ana is written syllabically in C. |
| W1 vi 10b | an[a] |
| G293 | C vi 27a | āš-kun | OV – j has VC-CV-VC against VC-CVC in the other sources. |
| W1 vi 11’ | āš-kun |
| j vi 23b | āš-ku-un |
| G294 | C vi 27a | dum-qa | OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.660 |
| W1 vi 11’ | dum-qa |
| j vi 23b | dum-qa |
| z vi 9b’ | du-un-qi |

658 The form of the verb √anāḫu, “to toil, exhaust oneself,” in z reflects the shift [i] > [e] in primae aleph roots. On this as a matter of morphology or free variation of the phonemes /i/ and /e/ see the comments in note above.

659 The object of the verb is “i-da-a-a.” The noun √idu, “arm,” is here probably to be read as a dual (a rare declension in Neo-Assyrian – see J. Hämön-Anttila, Neo-Assyrian Grammar, 77-78), and according to the verb form it is treated as feminine in W and masculine in j. The uncommon use of the dual form in Neo-Assyrian may explain the difference in the gender of the governing verb between the sources. The feminine plural form in z is not counted in the light of Rule 3.

660 The variant form in z is similar to a form in manuscript W, described as a dialect variant (see G298 and note below). This form of the noun √dumqu, “favour,” might be explained as reflecting linguistic change over two stages: /m/ is assimilated before the plosive /q/ (J. Hämön-Anttila, Neo-Assyrian Grammar, 18), which is then subject to the phonetic change CC > /n/ + C (see J. Huehnergard, Grammar, 597). The variation in the ultimate vowel in z is not counted in the light of Rule 3.
The preposition *ana* is written logographically in C.

Lexical interchange.\(^{661}\)

— j has the wrong case vowel for the genitive singular.

— Possible difference in pronunciation.\(^{662}\)

— C has the wrong case vowel for the accusative singular.

— Possible difference in pronunciation.\(^{663}\)

— Different phraseology in z compared to the other sources.\(^{664}\)

\(^{661}\) The interchange of these prepositions is common in texts from this period. According to M. Luukko, *Neo-Assyrian*, 177, “the prepositions *ana* and *ina* were almost completely interchangeable in most Neo-Assyrian contexts.”

\(^{662}\) This is listed as a possible difference in dialect or pronunciation in A.R. George, *Gilgamesh*, 428. For an explanation of the variation through phonological change see note above. Note, however, that W has the form “dum-qa” written in the previous line, so determining which form reflects actual pronunciation is difficult.

\(^{663}\) The use of signs generally used to write /i/ instead representing /e/ has been noted above (see note above, and the references there). Here the I/1 perfect form of √epēsu, “to do,” is affected.

\(^{664}\) Following A.R. George, *Gilgamesh*, 722, z is restored: *assakan dumqa*, “I have established a favour.” This is in contrast to the other sources, which read: *dumqa etepus*, “I have done a favour.” The lexical change in z appears to expand on the poetic style of the line, echoing the use of the same lexeme in the previous line where we find the phrase *ul aškun dumqa ana ramnia*, “I did not establish a favour for myself.”
| G302  | C vi 28 W₁ vi 13’ | a-na  | OV – The preposition is written syllabically in C. |
| G303  | C vi 28 T₁ vi 15’ W₁ vi 13’ j vi 25’ z vi 11’ | ]i-na-aš-šam-ma[ ]aš-šam[ ] na-šá-a e-du-ú | SV(3) – z has a different syntax compared to the other sources.665 |
| G304  | C vi 29 W₁ vi 14’ | ra-a-ṭa  | OV(I) – W has the wrong case vowel for the accusative singular.666 |
| G305  | C vi 30 W₁ vi 15’ | a-a-i-ta  | OV – The diphthong *av is written fully in C. |
| G306  | C vi 30 W₁ vi 15’ | KI-ia | OV – The noun ittu, “mark, sign,” is written syllabically in W. |
| G307  | C vi 30 W₁ vi 15’ j vi 12’ z vi 12’ | ana KI-ia i[š ana KI-ia i[š  | OV(I) – Possible difference in pronunciation.667 |
| G308  | C vi 30 W₁ vi 15’ j vi 12’ z vi 12’ | ana KI-ia i[š ana KI-ia i[š  | OV(I) – z has a different grammatical form compared to the other sources.668 |

665 The syntax of z is reversed. Translated literally z has “rising was the tide,” against “the tide was rising” in C, T, W and j. In all cases the verb is intransitive and durative, though z appears to lack the ventive and enclitic particle “-ma” present in the other sources.

666 See note above on the blending of the nominative and accusative singular case vowels in Neo-Assyrian.

667 G307 and G308 may be treated as a single case of textual corruption in z (so A.R. George, Gilgamesh, 723 n. 59). C, W and j are restored: uttā ayīta ša ana ittia iššaknu, “what things will be placed for my landmark,” against z: ]x-DU issia šaknu, “... what things are placed for my landmark.” Here z is read as consisting of two linguistic variants, the first being the shift /tt/ > /ss/, and the second being a grammatical change of the IV/1 preterite verb iššaknu > 3mpl stative šaknü. In this reading the active stative šaknü (also called the predicative verbal adjective) in z has a resultative sense (see J. Huehnergard, Grammar, 393-95), thus the translation “... are placed.” The problem of the initial sign DU following the break in z remains unresolved, which is perhaps why George prefers to see z as containing a textual corruption rather than an alternative reading. However, in the light of Rule 1 the text of z is taken as it stands.

668 See note above.
G309 C vi 31b  
z vi 13b’  
ku-sa-pa  
ka-a-NI-pa  
OV(I) – Possible difference in pronunciation.\(^\text{669}\)

G310 C vi 32b  
z vi 14b’  
ik-šu-[u-ni]m-ma  
ik-šu-‘du’-ni-ma  
OV – The ventive suffix retains the final /m/ in the orthography of C.

G311 C vi 33  
z vi 15b’  
d GIŠ-gím-maš  
\(\text{id}\) GIŠ-TUK  
OV – The proper noun is spelled differently between the sources.\(^\text{670}\)

G312 C vi 33  
W\(_1\) vi 18’  
a-na  
an  
j’na’  
OV – The preposition \(\text{ana}\) is written logographically in W.

G313 C vi 33  
z vi 16’  
m ur-šánabi  
m ur-šu-na-be  
OV – The proper noun Ur-šanabi is written syllabically in z.

G314 C vi 33  
z vi 16’  
ma-la-ḫi  
omits  
SV(2) – C has a longer title for Ur-šanabi, adding the noun \(\sqrt{\text{malâhu}}, \text{“boatman.”}\)

G315 C vi 34  
W\(_1\) vi 19’  
m ur-šánabi  
m ur-\(\text{id}\) šánabi  
OV – The proper noun Ur-šanabi has the divine determinative on the second element in W.

G316 C vi 34  
z vi 17’  
šá  
ša  
OV – The relative particle \(\text{ša}\) is written with the sign ŠA in z.

G317 C vi 34  
z vi 17’  
UNUG ‘ki’  
UNUG kl su-pur  
SV(2) – The proper noun Uruk has an expansive adjective \(\sqrt{\text{supûru}}, \text{“sheepfold,” in z.}\)

G318 C vi 35a  
W\(_1\) vi 20a’  
ḫi-i- ti-ma  
}\(\text{hi’}[\text{’it’][}\)  
OV – C has CV-V-CV against W (restored) CV-V-VC.

G319 C vi 35b  
a-gur-rat  
OV – Possible spelling variant in z.\(^\text{671}\)

\(^\text{669}\) The form in z possibly reflects Neo-Assyrian vowel harmony, where the vowel of a short unaccented open syllable assimilates to the vowel of the following accented syllable (cf. J. Huehnergard, Grammar, 599). The sign NI (𒉌) is possibly an erroneous writing of the sign SA (𒊓), where the scribe missed one vertical wedge.

\(^\text{670}\) The form in C is expected, while z has an abbreviated spelling. The short writing of the proper noun is an abbreviated logographic form of the spelling GIŠ-TUK-maš that appears in copies of the lexical series “ḪAR.ra=ḫubûlu” and in Sumerian lists of early rulers found at Emar. This particular short form is only found here and in one other tablet of early Neo-Assyrian origin from Aššur (VAT10585b and VAT10916). For the references see A.R. George, Gilgamesh, 81.
Discussion of Variants

Orthographic Variants

The most common types of orthographic variations in the first millennium sources for Gilgamesh XI are: the exchange of like-valued signs; the full syllabic writing of logographic forms; the writing of CV-VC with single CVC signs (and also V-CV as VCV signs); and the writing of long word medial vowels with additional V signs.

671 The sign in z is very damaged, but it is certainly not the sign RAT. The form in z is therefore counted as an orthographic variant in the light of Rule 4.

672 The cardinal number is implied as W, which is restored: šār ālu šār kirātu šār īssû, “a šār of city, a šār of palm-grove, a šār of clay-pit ....” C has the cardinal number written before each instance of the unit of distance ŠĀR.

673 W lacks the final vowel on the noun šētra, “one-half of a šār,” as well as preserving the medial vowel that has been dropped in C. Presumably the lack of the case vowel in W allowed for the full writing of the medial vowel. Such an emendation to the grammatical form that follows phonetic rules in W suggests that the orthography reflects the underlying pronunciation.
Somewhat less frequent is the writing of certain nouns without determinatives. Also less frequent is the writing of plural nouns without the plural marker (MEŠ or ME), in place of which we find the writing of a long word final vowel or the double writing of a logogram (e.g. DINGIR.DINGIR for DINGIR.MEŠ in G92, G103, G179 and possibly G172).

Very rarely phonetic complements are attached to logograms in some manuscripts and not others. There is a single occurrence of the full writing of a diphthong in one source against parallel sources (G305). Some unusual orthographic forms that are attributed to peculiarities of perceived Kuyunjik orthographic systems are in evidence (e.g. the repetition of final consonants at the morpheme boundary in G69, and see G10 and note above).

Orthographic (linguistic) Variants

Incorrectly written case vowels occur very frequently in the sources. In some sources case vowels are periodically lacking (e.g. G323), as are final vowels on pronominal suffixes (e.g. G20). In other sources the vowels appended to pronominal suffixes can show variation (e.g. G7).

Perhaps as an indication of actual differences in the underlying pronunciation of certain forms we can point to the different writing of vowels in some proper nouns (e.g. G27), and the apparent cases of vowel harmony (G58, G181, G278, G309). Particular sources attest regular variation in the writing of some prepositions (e.g. tablet J in G196, G199, G201 and G203) that presumably also reflect a difference in the underlying pronunciation of those forms.
To some degree one may consider apparent variations in inflected verbal endings as evidence for pronunciation differences (G74, G120, G126, G256 and G257). The addition of anaptyctic vowels may also be included among this evidence, but may alternatively mark subjunction (e.g. G221).

More important for a discussion of the differences in pronunciation or dialect that underlie the sources are regular shifts in phones or phonemes that are attested in large proportions in the sources for Gilgamesh XI. Indeed, particular differences are significantly more numerous in the sources for Gilgamesh XI than in the other texts examined in this study. For example, the shift of the phoneme /i/ towards /e/ seems to be prevalent under several morphological conditions: in primae aleph roots (G64, G161 and G289); affecting the stem vowel of certain roots (G77 and G127); before guttural consonants (G115) and in ultimate vowels, such as genitive singular or oblique plural case vowels (G177 and G230).

Also significant for the discussion of dialectal differences is the attestation of the so-called Assyrian vowel shift /i/ > /a/ (e.g. G94 and G154). We also see /i/ > /a/ in some final weak forms (G97 and G178). Another Assyrian dialect form, namely the feminine marker ‘-at’ > ‘-et,’ is also attested (G229). Perhaps related to Assyrian dialectal influence is evidence concerning the 1cs verbal preformative. In particular, the shift /a/ > /i/ is attested (G207), as is /i/ > /e/ in primae aleph ‘i’ themed roots (G220 and G300).
Also worth mentioning in relation to pronunciation differences are examples of phonetic
shifts: /ṭṭ/ > /ss/ (G307); [k] > [g] (G85); shifts affecting sibilants (G156 and G171); /š/ >
/l/ before dentals (G211). Of some interest are phonetic shifts that appear to involve a two
stage process (G294 and G298, where /mq/ > /qq/ > /nq/).

Some other types of linguistic variations that are found among the sources for Gilgamesh
XI are of less significant value for discussions concerning pronunciation and dialect, but
may perhaps contribute to discussions around preferred grammatical forms and the use of
certain suffixed particles. For example, the use of the stative instead of the participle oc-
curs (G34), as do several other changes in verbal conjugation or tense that may reflect
preferred grammatical forms (G93, G174, G225, G236, G308, and possibly G152). The
shift in the final vowel indicating the ventive /a/ > /u/ is occasionally seen (G199 and
G237). The omission of the ventive in several places is also seen (G1, G41, G188, G226
and G233), as is the loss of mimation (e.g. G243).

Stylistic Variants (Type 1)
The addition, omission or interchange of prepositions occurs frequently (e.g. G17, G79,
G82, G99, G130, G170, G296). Occasionally a similar change occurs involving pro-
nominal suffixes (G52) and even syntactically redundant cardinal numbers (G321). There
are limited examples of differences in the gender of some pronominal suffixes (G33,
G153, G157) and verbal predicates (G290). Certain sources, especially tablet J, display a
proclivity for dropping the enclitic particle “-ma” (G14, G118, G123).
More significantly, sources for Gilgamesh XI attest a high number of lexical interchanges relative to the other genres in this study. Certain scribes appear to have replaced difficult words with more familiar terms in the process of transmission. This observation seems particularly true for tablet J (e.g. G151 and G155).

It might be said that the scribe of tablet J substituted terms that may have been more familiar on several occasions (G63, G72, G83, G86, G91, G98, G100, G101, G105, G193, G212, G250). Ultimately we cannot be certain in any of these instances whether J reflects a more ‘original’ reading or an updated text. However, the concentration of so many lexical differences in tablet J relative to the parallel sources seems to suggest that tablet J or its Vorlage did make updates to the language to some degree. Some other sources also display similar variations, albeit less frequently (G71, G163 and G279).

Stylistic Variants (Type 2)

Three major types of stylistic variation occur between the sources. These are: expansive pluses, where an additional element in the narrative exists in one source against another; explicating pluses, where an element in the narrative is clarified in one source against another; and changes in expression, where the same narrative information is re-phrased, ostensibly for reasons of clarity or stylistic preference.

Expansive pluses involve additional information about objects in the narrative that are common to all parallel sources (G59), additional objects not appearing in parallel sources (G108), repeated phrases that form refrains within the narrative (G167, and possibly
G260, but see note ), and extraneous adjectives that describe objects common to all parallel sources (G314 and G317).

Explicating pluses involve glosses (G124, possibly G134 and G143), the clarification of elements in the narrative by way of the repetition of redundant nouns (G145 and G146), and the clarification of a subject that is indefinite in a parallel source (G246).

Phraseology in some tablets seems to have been adjusted to suit the preference of the scribe, whether in a particular source examined here or in its Vorlage. Adverbs may be added for clarity of expression (G76, G205, G244), or a scribe may prefer the use of simile as opposed to the use of metaphor (G96). Some variants may reflect the personal preference of a scribe (G271), or echo phrases familiar to the scribe from the surrounding context (301).

Stylistic Variants (Type 3)
Changes in the sequence of elements in the narrative are relatively infrequent and minor. There is a small change in the order of the description of workers assisting in the construction of Ūta-napišti’s boat (G45), and a small variation in the order of listed elements in a dramatic sequence (G108). There is also a minor change in the syntax of a short phrase in tablet z which affects the order of the subject and predicate (G303).

Hermeneutic Variants
There are very few hermeneutic variations across the sources. Two of the variants categorised as hermeneutic actually reflect differences in cardinal numbers (G54 and G 132). The recording of numerals in cuneiform has been shown to be readily corruptible, so little significance may be attributed to these variants.674

There is some uncertainty about the nature of the variant at G104. While the text is damaged in all of the sources, there seems to be little doubt that there is some degree of difference in meaning between the sources. In tablet J (and probably tablet C as well) the reaction of the pantheon to the destruction of humanity by the Deluge is described as sitting in grief. In contrast to this, tablet T appears to have the entire pantheon lamenting along with the mother goddess, probably Bēlet Ilī, as she bemoans the death of her creation. While J and T do not contradict each other at this point, there does seem to be some difference in hermeneutic between the sources as we have them.

An interesting, but also enigmatic, variation in hermeneutic occurs at G209, again involving tablet J. In this instance tablet b has it that the deity Ea brings forth Ūta-napišti from the boat after the Deluge has subsided, while tablet J has the acting deity as Enlil.675 There may be some theological reason behind this variation (cf. H2 and H132). It can be noted that the domain of Ea is traditionally the apsû, the subterranean waters into which the Deluge subsides, while Enlil’s domain is the terrestrial sphere, where Ūta-napišti was to disembark from his boat and accept his gift of eternal life. In this sense there may be

674 See the discussion in note .
675 A.R. George, Gilgamesh, 717, notes that b is corrupt.
some reasoning in terms of cosmology behind this variant, though it is admittedly obscure.
CHAPTER 8 – MĪS PĪ

The Text

The ritual of mīs pī, “washing the mouth,” was an ancient Mesopotamian cultic practice by which material representations of deities, namely three dimensional statues, were imbued with divine presence before being stationed in their respective temples. While the practice of inducting a manufactured image of a deity for worship in a temple is known from the third millennium B.C.E., cuneiform sources for the textual form of the ritual come only from the first millennium B.C.E. The mouth washing ritual consists of a list of instructions, which also has placed throughout it the incipits of incantations that are to be read at certain times throughout the rite. The full incantations are contained in a separate series of tablets.

The ritual exists in two major recensions, each having a slightly different order of ritual acts and a differing number of incantations. The divergences in the recensions are seen most readily in the differences between the ritual tablets from Nineveh and tablets from Babylon. The entire series as we have it is composed of eight incantation tablets at Nineveh, six at Babylon, and in each a final tablet that supplies instructions for perform-


ing certain actions and prompts for reciting the incantations.\textsuperscript{678} It is the sources for the tablet containing the ritual instructions from Nineveh that will be the topic of examination here. The incantation tablets will not be considered.

\textit{The Tablets}

Fragments from 18 tablets have been recovered from Nineveh providing for some extensive overlap.\textsuperscript{679} These fragments are assumed to have been part of the collection amassed during Ashurbanipal’s reign, and most fragments are assumed to have been in the collection of the royal library.\textsuperscript{680} In addition to these tablets, fragments from three Late-Babylonian school texts that quote extensive sections of the Nineveh ritual have also been included in the analysis.\textsuperscript{681} The following list of tablets uses the sigla given to the various tablets by C.B.F. Walker and M.B. Dick with one minor adjustment.\textsuperscript{682}

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\caption{Sources for \textit{mīs pī} Under Examination}
\begin{tabular}{ll}
\textbf{Siglum} & \textbf{Museum Number} \\
A\textsubscript{1} & K6324+8146+8850+9337+9942+10361+10657+10705+13514 \\
A\textsubscript{2} & K6810+8568+9696 \\
B & K8117 \\
C & Rm2,344 \\
D & K10060 \\
E & K6883 \\
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

\textsuperscript{679} The following tablets have been inspected: A, B, D, G, and I. For all of the other tablets the high resolution digitised photographs that appear on the compact disc included with C.B.F. Walker and M.B. Dick, \textit{Transliteration, Translation, and Commentary}, have been consulted.
\textsuperscript{681} These tablets are given the sigla S, T and U.
\textsuperscript{682} C.B.F. Walker and M.B. Dick, \textit{Transliteration, Translation, and Commentary}. In line with the sigla used for the fragments of Gilgamesh XI and LH, the siglum A\textsubscript{1} designates the fragments K6324+8146+8850+9337+9942+10361+10657+10705+13514, and the siglum A\textsubscript{2} designates the fragments K6810+8568+9696.
### Siglum | Museum Number
---|---
F | K10473
G | K13259+13260
H | K15534
I | K7630+79-7-8, 67
J | K3248
L | K6683
M | K8994
N | K15279
O | K15325
P | K11920
Q | K13472
R | K10176
S | PBS 12/1 no. 7 rev 6-10 (CBS4506)
T | PBS 12/1 no. 6 obv 13-17 (CBS8802)
U | PBS ½ no. 116 obv 6-10 (CBS4507)

### Description of the Sources

A₁, K6324+; A₂, K6810+

After several joins were made this tablet is now the best preserved of all of the sources. It is written a regularly sized and spaced Neo-Assyrian script, with only minor crowding of the signs in obv i:35-36. The tablet contains four columns separated by narrow double vertical rulings. Single horizontal rulings mark the upper and lower margins, although obv i:61 is written below the lower margin. Single horizontal rulings separate the text into sections. While the height of the tablet cannot be determined with precision (it is ca. 23 cm in height), it is 15cm in width, 1.5cm thick at the edges and about 2.5 cm thick at the centre. The reverse is quite convex, and obverse only slightly so. Where the corner of the tablet is preserved (at the bottom left edge) the angle is less than 90 degrees, forming an acute point. The different colour of the individual fragments suggests the tablet was broken and burned in antiquity, though there is no visible vitrification. The cross section reveals that the clay is free of impurities.
B, K8117

The script is Neo-Assyrian, and the signs are well executed and evenly spaced. Only the top left corner of this tablet is preserved, so no information regarding its dimensions can be known. There is a horizontal ruling marking the top margin preserved, but there is no horizontal ruling marking sections as would be expected between lines 10-11. The horizontal direction of the written lines is straight, and the text does not appear to exceed the margin where preserved. This tablet may have been similar to tablet A in its preparation and execution, as is indicated by the very straight top edge and carefully written script. The clay is an even terracotta colour throughout, and contains very few impurities. There is no visible vitrification.

C, Rm2,344

The museum catalogue number suggests that this tablet was excavated from the North Palace at Nineveh. This is a fragment from the middle of a tablet written in a fairly crowded Neo-Assyrian script. There is some stylisation of the signs evident in the very elongated horizontal stroke of MEŠ in line 3. The horizontal direction of the lines appears to drift downwards to the right, but this is a small fragment of the original tablet so the linear character of the entire text is uncertain. There are two horizontal rulings preserved that separate the text into sections. No edges or vertical rulings dividing columns are preserved.

---

D, K10060

The script is Neo-Assyrian and very evenly written. The lines are written close together so that in some places signs from a lower line interfere with those from the line above.\textsuperscript{684} Horizontal rulings separate the text into sections.\textsuperscript{685} There are no edges preserved, and being a flake nothing can be said about the thickness of the original tablet. The clay is a similar colour to K2321 (tablet A of EAE 63) showing relatively uneven firing at very high temperatures. This suggests the unbaked tablet was broken in antiquity and burned in a conflagration. The clay composition seems to have been quite free of impurities, with only a few small stones visible in the cross section.

E, K6883

The script is Neo-Assyrian. The writing is small and even, although the signs are not executed with as much precision as tablet B and D. There is one horizontal ruling preserved that divides the text into sections, but no edges or margins remain.

F, K10473

The script is Neo-Assyrian, and more angular and elongated than the other tablets so far discussed. Part of the top of this fragment has suffered damage through erosion so only the signs on the lower half are clearly preserved. The writing is somewhat crowded, and the horizontal direction of the lines seems to tend upwards to the right. The right margin is preserved and has no vertical ruling, with text from line 9 extending past the margin into the edge of the tablet. No horizontal rulings are preserved.

\textsuperscript{684} For example, E on line 5 partially intersects ŠINIG on line 4.
\textsuperscript{685} The horizontal ruling between lines 1 and 2 is also attested in the same place in tablet B.
G, K13259+13260

The script is irregularly sized Neo-Assyrian, with signs ranging from 2.5mm to 4.5mm in height. The Winkelhaken and single vertical downstrokes of some signs are impressed quite deeply (e.g. U and BI on line 10). A double vertical ruling separates columns, slightly wider than other tablets at ca. 5mm-6mm. There is one horizontal ruling separating the text into sections, but no edges or ruled margins are preserved. The clay is relatively free of impurities. Under the discolouration on the surface of the tablet, the colour is terracotta with segments of whitish-brown, indicating some uneven baking temperatures that may indicate baking in a conflagration.

H, K15534

The script is Neo-Assyrian, and is quite corroded at some points. The writing ranges from 3mm to 5mm, and the horizontal direction of the lines tends to shift very slightly downwards to the right. The fragment is from the right edge, and a margin of about 6mm can be seen on that side. There are no ruled lines, whether vertical or horizontal.

I, K7630+79-7-8, 67

This is a fragment of a two column tablet written in an even Neo-Assyrian script. The tablet has narrow double ruled vertical lines separating columns. There is a clear horizontal ruling across the bottom margin of the obverse, but the top margin of the reverse is not ruled. Column II of the obverse shows a horizontal ruling separating the first and second

---

686 The consignment received at the British Museum on 8th July 1879 was almost entirely “Assyrian, apart from strays” (J.E. Reade, “Rassam's Babylonian Collection,” xxix).
lines, where the text is divided between morning and evening ritual instructions, and be-
tween the lines 8 and 9 of column II of the reverse. The width of the tablet is about 14cm, and it is about 1.3cm thick at the edge. The tablet was probably about 2.8cm thick at the centre. The obverse is quite flat while the reverse is convex. The clay is free from impuri-
ties and is a light terracotta throughout.

J, K3248
This is a fragment from the bottom left corner, written in a Neo-Assyrian script that is slightly less well executed that tablets B and D. From the remaining surface there are no horizontal or vertical rulings on the outside margins of the tablet.

L, K6683
The script is Neo-Assyrian, written in regularly sized signs. There are horizontal rulings separating the text into sections. There is a small part of the right edge preserved, and this shows no horizontal ruling. The horizontal direction of the lines is very regular.

M, K8994
The script is Neo-Assyrian and of a similar type to tablet J. The top left edge of the tablet shows no rulings, but the signs are aligned on a very straight vertical and horizontal axis.
N, K15279

The fragment is written in Neo-Assyrian script, but is severely damaged. The fragment seems to be from the middle of the tablet so little can be said regarding its margins or dimensions.

O, K15325

The script is Neo-Assyrian and of a similar type to tablet J and M, and the signs range from 3 mm to 6mm in height. There is one example of a horizontal line separating the text into sections. The left margin is not ruled but the preserved signs form a reasonably straight edge.

P, K11920

The script is Neo-Assyrian. The tablet is quite weathered, but the remaining surface does show on horizontal ruling below line 1. A small part of the right edge of the tablet is preserved, and some signs can be seen extending past the margin onto the edge of the tablet.

Q, K13472

This is a small flake from the middle of the tablet. The script is very straight Neo-Assyrian, and the horizontal direction of the lines is similarly straight. There are no ruled lines preserved, and no margins visible.
The script is Neo-Assyrian and quite angular. There is one horizontal ruling preserved that separates the text into sections. There are no margins preserved and the dimensions of the tablet cannot be known from the remaining material.

These sources are Neo-Babylonian school texts, excavated from Nippur. These tablets contain different excerpts of a variety of texts including sections of *mīs piṭ*. None of these tablets can be dated with any certainty.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fragment</th>
<th>Total SU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1,2</td>
<td>246.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>40.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>35.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>154.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following table gives the total number of SU and the total count of variant forms for each set of two parallel tablets preserving at least 20 SU in common. Following this table...

---

is an exhaustive list of all variant readings between any two sources for mīš pī that overlap in content, regardless of the amount of overlapping text preserved. Although every variant is given in the list, the discussion of the variants will refer in the main only to those texts preserving approximately 50 SU in parallel listed in the table. Variant readings in the parallel sources that are less fully preserved will be referred to but will not impact on the statistical analysis.
Table - Variants in the Parallel Sources for Mīs Pi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparison: Text vs Text</th>
<th>TOTAL PLL</th>
<th>Orthographic Variants</th>
<th>Proportion: SU per Orth. Variant</th>
<th>Orthographic (linguistic) Variants</th>
<th>Proportion: SU per Orth. (l) Variant</th>
<th>Stylistic (Type 1) Variants</th>
<th>Proportion: SU per St. (1) Variant</th>
<th>Stylistic (Type 2) Variants</th>
<th>Proportion: SU per St. (2) Variant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A:I</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A:G</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A:H</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B:S</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A:M</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G:I</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A:T</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H:I</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A:N</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M:N</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I:T</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C:S</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A:O</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B:C</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G:H</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I:P</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
List of Variants Between the Parallel Sources for Mīs Pī

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Tablets</th>
<th>Variant Text</th>
<th>Categorisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>B 1</td>
<td>KA DINGIR LUḪ-ū</td>
<td>SV(2) – The noun DINGIR, √ilu, “god,” is lacking in S. 688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S 6</td>
<td>KA LUḪ-ū</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>B 6</td>
<td>GI.URI3,ME</td>
<td>SV(1) – Difference in number. 689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S 9</td>
<td>GI.URI3,GAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>B 6</td>
<td>su-u’-ur[r</td>
<td>OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation. 690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C 4</td>
<td>su-ur-ta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S 10</td>
<td>su-u’-ur-ta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td>C 10</td>
<td>’i-ta’-at DINGIR BI</td>
<td>SV(2) – C lacks the noun √bītu, “house.” 691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D 3</td>
<td>’i’-ta-at É DINGIR BI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5</td>
<td>D 8</td>
<td>a-n[a</td>
<td>OV – The preposition ana is written syllabically in D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E 3</td>
<td>ana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6</td>
<td>A 1 i 12</td>
<td>DUG.A.GŪB.BA</td>
<td>OV – The vessel determinative DUG is lacking in F. 692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F 10</td>
<td>A.GŪB.BA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

688 Manuscript B reads: enūma pī ili temessû, “when you wash the mouth of a god.” S therefore has an abbreviated yet coherent text: enūma pī temessû, “when you wash the mouth.”

689 The noun √urigallu, “reed bundle,” is written with the plural marker ME in manuscript B against the singular form in S, though the form written with the composite logogram URI3.GAL in S may be read as the plural urigallā. On the translation “reed bundle” see C.B.F. Walker and M.B. Dick, *Transliteration, Translation, and Commentary*, 53 n. 41.

690 The medial weak is represented in the orthography of B and S by a glottal stop (Shows) while this phoneme is entirely lacking in the orthography of C. The convention of writing the glottal stop without specifically representing it in the orthography is also well known, as noted in J. Huehnergard, *Grammar*, 210. It remains, then, a distinct possibility that in reality no difference in pronunciation existed between the sources even though their respective orthographies are at variance. However, in light of Rule 1 the recording of a possible difference in pronunciation is required.

691 The phrase in C reads: itāt bīt ili šuāti, “beside the house (temple) of that god,” against D: itāt ili šuāti, “beside that god.”

692 The orthography of √egubbû, “holy water vessel,” is apparently not fixed. Even in manuscript A the noun is written without the determinative in i 27.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Transcript</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P7</td>
<td>A1 i 21</td>
<td>DUG.A.GÚB.BA</td>
<td>The vessel determinative DUG is lacking in H.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H 3</td>
<td>A.GÚB.BA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P8</td>
<td>A1 i 21</td>
<td>ŠID-nu-ma</td>
<td>OV – H lacks the phonetic complement appended to the noun ŠID, ṣukēnu, “to submit, prostrate oneself.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G i 7</td>
<td>]-nu-ma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H 3</td>
<td>ŠID-ma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P9</td>
<td>A1 i 24</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>SV(1) – I omits the conjunction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H 5</td>
<td>u</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I i 4</td>
<td>omits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P10</td>
<td>A1 i 27</td>
<td>túl-lal-šú</td>
<td>OV – The 3ms pronominal object suffix is written with the sign ŠU in I.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G 13</td>
<td>túl-lal-šu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I i 7</td>
<td>túl-lal-šu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T 16</td>
<td>túl-lal-šu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P11</td>
<td>A1 i 27-28</td>
<td>omits</td>
<td>SV(2) – T has an additional incantation, lacking in the other sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I i 8</td>
<td>omits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T 17</td>
<td>[ ] ni-bi-ta è-a 3-šú ŠID-nu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P12</td>
<td>A1 i 28</td>
<td>ki-a-am</td>
<td>OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I i 8</td>
<td>ki-a-am</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T 18</td>
<td>ka-a-am</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P13</td>
<td>A1 i 29</td>
<td>u₃-me</td>
<td>OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I i 9</td>
<td>u₃-mi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T 19</td>
<td>[ ]-mi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

693 The omission is not noted in C.B.F. Walker and M.B. Dick, *Transliteration, Translation, and Commentary*, 41, and the correct reading is difficult to see in the photograph. An inspection of the tablet reveals that manuscript I lists the proper nouns Ea and Asalluḫi without a separating conjunction.

694 The line in T reads: ét an-na ni-bi-ta ṣalāšišu tamannu, “The incantation ‘In heaven by your own power you emerge’ you recite three times,” (see C.B.F. Walker and M.B. Dick, *Transliteration, Translation, and Commentary*, 57). The incantation mentioned here does not appear on any other ritual tablet. The manuscripts G and H, although appearing to lack this incantation incipit as well, are broken and must ultimately be ignored. The reference to this incantation in manuscript T, a Late Babylonian school text, is therefore somewhat enigmatic. Further evidence would seem to be required before an explanation of this anomaly can be attempted.

695 The adverb ḫām, “thus,” appears commonly in various forms. See *CAD* K 325-326 for examples.

696 See note and the references there.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>[ ]’ak’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>GIN-ak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T19</td>
<td></td>
<td>tal-lak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>MIN gal-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>[ ]žu dè gal-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K1</td>
<td></td>
<td>MIN gal-’a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>ii 17</td>
<td>MU-ar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M8</td>
<td></td>
<td>MU-ár</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N5</td>
<td></td>
<td>MU-ár</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>ii 18</td>
<td>UDU.SISKUR₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M8</td>
<td></td>
<td>UDU.’SISKUR₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N6</td>
<td></td>
<td>UDU.NIT₂[SISKUR₂]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O4</td>
<td></td>
<td>UDU.SISKUR₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>ii 19</td>
<td>ŠUTUG.MEŠ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ii</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>ŠUTUG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>ii 27</td>
<td>BABBAR.MEŠ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ii</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>BABBAR.BABBAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Iii</td>
<td>14’</td>
<td>an-ki-bi-da-ke⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P6</td>
<td></td>
<td>an-ki-bi-da-kâm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

697 Manuscript E seems to have contained the full incipit: ê-a-zu-dè ê-a-zu-dè gal-a, “As you go out, as you go out, great ....” abbreviated in the other sources with the use of Wiederholungszeichen: ê-a-zu-dè MIN gal-a, “As you go out, ditto, great ....”

698 The noun ʕšutukku, “reed hut,” lacks the plural marker MEŠ in manuscript I, though this is very difficult to see from the photograph. An inspection of the tablet reveals the sign ŠUTUG is clearly preserved, followed by a break of two or three signs, then coming out of the break one sees the remains of the sign A. This would support the reading in C.B.F. Walker and M.B. Dick, *Transliteration, Translation, and Commentary*, 46, where the plural marker is missing. Indeed, there seems to be insufficient room to restore all of the text “ŠUTUG.MEŠ ana d é-a” as the parallel sources have it. Context would seem to demand that this form is read as a defective plural, seeing as the text continues to describe the erection of three thrones to the deities Ea, Šamaš and Assalluḫi, in the midst of the reed-huts. If the text of tablet I did indicate a single reed-hut here then the following instructions would make no sense.

699 See also V18 and the note for the variation between the signs KE⁴ and KÁM. While it is true that here the signs KE⁴ and KÁM vary, the same grammatical observations apply. It might also be said that there is very little graphical difference between the signs KÁM and KÁM.
P21 I iii 15’ ŠID-ma OV – Q has a phonetic complement appended to the verb √manû, “recite, recount.”

P 7 ŠID-m’a
Q 5 ŠID-n[u]

P22 A1 iii 20’ na-an-gub-bé-en OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.\(^{700}\)
U 6 na-an-gub-bé

P23 A1 iii 23’ omits SV(2) – U has the addition of the verb √šabātu, “to sweep.”\(^{701}\)
U 7 SAR

P24 A1 iii 25’ šá SV(1) – The relative particle ša is lacking in U.\(^{702}\)
U 9 omits

\(^{700}\) The lack of terminating ‘-n’ in the orthography of U may be read as a difference in the Sumerian subject post-position, where A has the 2ms subject “na-an-gub-bé-en,” “by him you shall not tarry,” against the 3mpl form in U “na-an-gub-bê,” “by him they shall not tarry.” A more likely resolution is to read the shorter form in U as dropping /n/ for phonetic reasons (W. Horowitz, personal communication). In any case, one cannot assume that Neo-Assyrian scribes were familiar with classical Sumerian, especially considering that the short form appears in manuscript U, which is a Late Babylonian school text that includes only an excerpt of the ritual.

\(^{701}\) Elsewhere the sign SAR has the meaning √šabātu, “to strike, to sweep (in a ritual context)” so there is no reason to read the sign differently here. The line in U reads: “EGIR-šû SAR ša DINGIR.MEŠ DUMU.MEŠ um-ma-ni DUR-âr,” “after it you sweep (or strike), you dismantle the gods of the craftsmen.” This is reminiscent of STT 73 67, “ŪR SAR A.MEŠ KÛ.MEŠ SUD,” “you sweep the roof, you sprinkle pure water.” Although the syntax here is similar, the verb ṣaṣabbit in U still lacks a clear object, and so the phrasing remains awkward. Clearly the phrase without the verb in manuscript A is preferred. As noted above, manuscript U is a Late Babylonian school text and so may not be considered a very reliable representative of the ritual text.

\(^{702}\) The line in manuscript A reads: “arkišu ša [ilâni] rabûti tapaṭṭar, “afterwards you dismantle the offering arrangements of the great gods” (see C.B.F. Walker and M.B. Dick, *Transliteration, Translation, and Commentary*, 67, for this translation). The lack of the relative particle in U does not alter the meaning of the text.
Discussion of Variants

Orthographic Variants

In all there are 12 orthographic variants, only half of which occur in sources that share more than 50 SU in parallel. Variations that occur among these sources are: the exchange of like-valued signs; syllabic writing of logographic forms; and the different spelling of plural forms. In sources with less than 50 SU in parallel we also see omitted determinatives and differences in the representation of phonetic complements.

Orthographic (linguistic) Variants

There are a small number of linguistic variants that may point to differences in the underlying pronunciation of some of the sources. The elision of a glottal stop in tablet C may reflect the linguistic reality of the scribe (P3). Similarly the writing of the preposition ki₃ without representing the diphthong in tablet T may also be related to pronunciation (P12). The same may be said for the writing of the genitive case as /e/ against /i/ once in tablet A (P13).

Two variations in the sources may be attributed to differences in the grammar of Sumerian forms, though this interpretation does depend upon the knowledge and conscious application of Sumerian grammatical forms on the part of the scribes. The first instance (P20) appears to involve a genitive post-position marker, while the second (P22) relates

---

703 This includes the comparisons A:T and G:I, which actually have just under 50 SU in parallel.
704 This occurs with the genitive noun āmi, “(of the) day,” written “u₄-me” in tablet A. This form is found in unparalleled sections of other sources (e.g. C 2 and S 8).
to the second person singular subject affirmative. However, these variations may in fact relate to phonetic differences between the scribes, and so also be treated as possible differences in pronunciation (see the comments in note above).

**Stylistic Variants (Type 1)**

There are two occurrences of differences in the grammatical number of nouns in the accusative. Plural nouns are required by the context in both places. Interestingly, both nouns relate to objects made from reeds, so there may be some collective meaning to the singular nouns in each instance. The first instance (P2) appears in one of the Late-Babylonian school texts (tablet S) so may be considered unreliable for that reason. The second instance (P18), occurring in tablet I, is better read as a defective plural noun given the context.\(^{705}\)

On a more minor level there is one instance of an omitted conjunction (P9), and one instance of an omitted relative particle (P24). The latter variation occurs in a Late Babylonian school text (U), while the former occurs in tablet I which has a high number of variants compared to the other sources. The same tablet partially preserves a fully written incipit where two parallel sources (A and K) abbreviate the incipit with *Wiederholungszeichen* (P15).

---

\(^{705}\) See note above.
Stylistic Variants (Type 2)

It is noteworthy that the only stylistic variants of type 2 occur in the Late Babylonian school texts. The three variants of this type are all expansive in nature. Tablet S lacks the object in the opening phrase of the tablet (P1). Tablet T seems to have a reference to an incipit that is not known from any of the other sources (P11). Finally tablet U has the apparent addition of one verb that lacks an object, but may be taken as an additional instruction relating to the clearing of the ritual space (P23).
CHAPTER 9 – THE TORAH SCROLLS FROM THE DEAD SEA AREA

Approaching the Evidence of the Dead Sea Scrolls

The question of how to treat the evidence of the Dead Sea scrolls deserves special consideration. While it seems obvious that all of the scrolls should be subjected to the same process of analysis, questions of how to approach the evidence from different localities are complicated by problems with the interpretation of archaeological data, and by issues associated with dating the finds through palaeographical and radiocarbon analyses. Ultimately we must proceed only after addressing some critical questions that relate to our understanding of the textual evidence. Should the scrolls from Qumran be treated as a separate data set to those from other sites in the Judaean Desert? Is it reasonable to treat the scrolls from Masada, ostensibly written in the first century C.E., with those written in the second century C.E. from Murabba‘at, Nahal Ḥever, and Wadi Sdeir? Or, accepting that the scrolls from all of these sites can only be examined in their overall context, should we treat them all together in the same analysis without trying to delineate between scrolls from the B.C.E. and C.E. periods?

A number of options are presented for tackling this methodological problem. One approach is that taken by Young, who breaks the corpus of Dead Sea scrolls into two parts.706 The first part, representing scrolls from the last three centuries B.C.E., contains the biblical scrolls uncovered in the caves near Qumran. The second part of the corpus is represented by the scrolls from the mid-first century C.E. to the mid-second century C.E.,

and contains the biblical scrolls from Masada, Murabba‘at, Naḥal Ḥever and Wadi Sdeir. This division of the evidence allows Young to view the results of his analysis in terms of two sets of data that inform on two separate stages of textual development. The Qumran biblical texts reflect processes that were underway in the closing stages of the first millennium B.C.E., while the Masada, Murabba‘at, Naḥal Ḥever and Wadi Sdeir biblical texts reflect developments that occurred in the first and second century C.E. In this way Young is able to plot developments in textual transmission that occur diachronically, rather than treating all of the evidence as a single data set that reflects synchronic phenomena. Critically, Young treats the evidence from Qumran as representing a collection of equally legitimate texts, without exploring the possibility that some biblical scrolls from Qumran may be more authoritative than others.

Young concludes that there was a change in the transmission of biblical scrolls between the late first century B.C.E. and the mid-first century C.E. His thesis relies on a relatively early dating of the Qumran scrolls, arguing for a first-century B.C.E. deposit of the scrolls in the caves near Qumran. With multiple forms of the biblical text at Qumran

---

707 This view is approached from the perspective of the arguments put forward by I. Hutchesson and G. Doudna in various publications. See the discussion in I. Young, "The Stabilization of the Biblical Text," 380-382, and in particular the references in I. Young, "The Stabilization of the Biblical Text," 380, n.38. Doudna’s position on an early deposit for the scrolls in the caves near Khirbit Qumran can be found in G. Doudna, *4Q Pesher Nahum: A Critical Edition* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002) 683-754, especially as regards the use of palaeography for precise dating of internally undated texts. In particular, Doudna points out that “in a situation of multiple sources of text production—which for the Qumran texts is a certainty—typologically later simply cannot be assumed to mean chronologically later due to the possibility, indeed likelihood, of different scribal habits occurring contemporaneously at different scribal centres” (G. Doudna, *4Q Pesher Nahum*, 675). Further to this, Doudna asserts, the accepted chronological stratification for the palaeographical development of Hebrew scripts between the first century B.C.E. and the first century CE relies on a starting point that finds no support from any “internally dated Hebrew
on the one hand, and the uniformly replicated MT-type biblical texts attested at Masada on the other hand, Young suggests that copies of the biblical scrolls made in the period represented by the Qumran finds were not replicated with the same level of exactitude as were later copies, such as those from Masada. He suggests that there was a change in copying practices between the first century B.C.E. and the first century C.E. The earlier practice of copying biblical scrolls non-uniformly transitioned to a later practice of exact copying that produced very uniform texts. He thus argues for the ‘stabilisation’ of the biblical text at some time between the deposit of the scrolls in the caves near Qumran and the deposit of the scrolls at Masada.

A second approach to our methodological problem can be found in the analysis of scroll-types by Emanuel Tov. This analysis recalls the well known categorisation of autor-
tative and non-authoritative text-types posited by Saul Lieberman, which relies on evidence found in the later Talmudic sources and analogy with contemporary Hellenistic practices. It will be helpful to firstly elucidate the ideas put forward by Lieberman before exploring the implications for Tov’s system for the categorisation of texts.

Lieberman discussed the practices behind literary transmission in Jewish Palestine in the period from the first century B.C.E. until the fourth century C.E. In relation to the exact copying of the Hebrew Bible, perhaps the most often cited section of this work deals with the texts of Scripture in the early rabbinic period. Lieberman infers from rabbinic sources that there was one authoritative biblical text that was deposited in the archives of the Temple. This, Lieberman says, was the

“standard copy par excellence, the book, as the Rabbis tell us, from which the Scroll of the king was corrected under the supervision of the High Court. A special college of book readers (מֵרָפָא), who drew their fees from the Temple funds, checked the text of the book of the Temple. This was probably the only genuine text which was legally authorized for the public service.”

However, this was not the only kind of biblical text which was to be found in the textual milieu of Jewish Palestine during this period. While the ‘copy par excellence’ that was deposited in the Temple archives represented the authoritative texts of the Hebrew bibli-

---


cal scrolls, Lieberman points to various other types of biblical texts that would have circulated in parallel with this ‘official’ version. As well as the official scrolls of the Temple archives (the ἴκριβομένα, or most exact scrolls), the Jewish public also made use of “authoritative popular texts circulated among the masses, in many synagogues and schools.” These texts, designated as κοινά, continued to exist as the standard texts used by the public even though the scrolls from the Temple archives were considered to be the most authoritative texts. κοινά, or vulgata, were not as fixed in form as the scrolls found in the Temple archives. Instead, they were generally correct in form, but subtly different across various localities. Lieberman thus talks obliquely about the “general vulgata of the Jews of the first centuries C.E.,” and asserts that “the Scriptures of the small Jewish localities in Palestine were inferior to the vulgata of Jerusalem.” This final observation suggests a third category of biblical texts. These last, designated as φαυλότερα, were essentially those copies kept in smaller communities in Palestine.

Lieberman thus describes three general types of biblical scrolls circulating in the period between the last century B.C.E. and the fourth century C.E. From his outline of their qualities, it seems that we can arrange these types of scrolls in an order of diminishing authoritativeness. The scroll-type that carried the most authority in Jewish Palestine during this period was the type that was stored in the Temple archives. These are presumably of the same scroll-type that is alluded to in some ancient sources. For example, as is well known, we encounter in the works of Josephus various allusions to scrolls that were ‘laid

up in the Temple. Likewise, sections of the Talmudic literature point to official scrolls that were kept in the Temple, the integrity of which was ensured by scribes in the employ of the Temple itself. This authoritative version was accepted as the most correct text, even though its exemplars were apparently not absolutely uniform throughout. The Talmudic literature makes reference to at least one occasion when even these model texts attested variant readings that had to be decided between by the Temple authorities.

715 See, for example, J.W. 7.161-162, Ant. 3.38 and Ant. 5.61. For a discussion on these references, see M. Greenberg, "The Stabilization of the Text of the Hebrew Bible, Reviewed in the Light of the Biblical Materials from the Judean Desert," JAOS 76, 3 (1956). As to the integrity of the biblical text itself at the turn of the Common Era, see the often cited remarks in Ag. Ap. 1.42. It is worth mentioning, though, that Josephus’s allusions to the letter-perfect integrity of the biblical text should in all likelihood be seen as a reference to a faithfulness to the text that he is paraphrasing in the late first century CE, and not as an indication that the scriptural texts of the last centuries B.C.E. were absolutely fixed. On this last point see L.H. Feldman and G. Hata; Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1989) 52. For an alternative position, see S. Leiman, "Josephus and the Canon of the Bible," Josephus, the Bible, and History (eds L.H. Feldman and G. Hata; Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1989) 52. For an alternative position, see M. Segal, "The Promulgation of the Authoritative Text of the Hebrew Bible," JBL 72, 1 (1953) 38, who states that “these words refer to the Hebrew text of the biblical books, and they prove beyond a doubt that in the days of Josephus the Hebrew text had been consecrated by the veneration of generations, and was regarded as fixed unalterably.” Cf. I. Young, "The Stabilization of the Biblical Text," 386.

716 For example, Bab. Ketuboth 106a makes reference to scribes in Jerusalem, paid from the Temple treasury, who corrected biblical scrolls. There is also reference made in Bab. Qiddushin 30a to particular letters that mark halfway points in various biblical scrolls. For discussions on each of these points see M. Segal, "The Promulgation of the Authoritative Text," 38. It is clear that using given letters and words to demarcate specific points in the text demands the utmost exactitude in copying practices, even though the age of such a tradition cannot be absolutely ascertained from the Talmudic sources. On this last matter, see E. Tov, "The Biblical Text in Ancient Synagogues in Light of Judean Desert Finds," Meghillot 1 (2003) 195 [Hebrew]. See also S. Safrai, "The Temple," The Jewish People in the First Century: Historical Geography, Political History, Social, Cultural and Religious Life and Institutions (eds S. Safrai and M. Stern; Assen: Van Gorcum, 1976) 905, esp. n. 5, for further references in the ancient literature supporting the view that activities relating to the copying and correction of scriptural texts were undertaken in the Temple.

therefore seems that scrolls of the ἑκριβωμένα type were not in absolute agreement, or were not the only text-type kept in the temple.\footnote{See, for example, \textit{M. Moed Katan} 3:4 and \textit{P.T. Sanhedrin} II, 20c. See also S. Safrai, "The Temple," 906 n. 1.}

Less authority is attributed to the scrolls designated as κοινά, although in this particular categorisation it is important to avoid being overly simplistic. Lieberman’s belief was that the κοινά type texts were not simply corrupt manuscripts, but rather were texts that lacked the official emendations and corrections that were present in the copies kept in the Temple archives. But, as Talmon has indicated, it should be recognised that these κοινά did not “reflect a single version, common to them all, but rather differed from one another in various details. They were not distinguished by a common textual tradition, but by deviating, individually and as a group, from the authoritative version which progressively crystallized in the model codices.”\footnote{S. Talmon, "Three Scrolls of the Law," 15.} The κοινά, then, were those personal copies made by authoritative figures\footnote{Examples given by Lieberman of such scroll-types are the copies ostensibly made by Rabi Meir, and the scroll taken to the synagogue of Severus. See S. Lieberman, \textit{Hellenism in Jewish Palestine}, 23-24, and the references there.} that could be used for study, as is referred to in various rabbinic debates.\footnote{See the reference to the practice of using what might amount to \textit{vulgata} in the academies in S. Talmon, "Three Scrolls of the Law," 14. See also A. Geiger, \textit{Urschrift und Übersetzungen der Bibel in Ihrer Abhängigkeit von der inneren Entwicklung des Judentums} (Frankfurt am Main: Verlag Madda, 1928) 97-100, 231.} However, κοινά were not seen as fit for deposit as authoritative texts in the Temple archives.

According to Lieberman, texts of the most inferior quality were limited to smaller localities throughout Palestine. It is these texts that, we read in the Talmud, should be avoided
as a source of authoritative literature. It would seem that these texts adhered least rigidly to the ‘standard copy par excellence’ held in the Temple archives. Such texts were conceivably copied by scribes who were of less ability, or were perhaps incompletely trained, compared to those scribes who were able produce texts of either of the first two levels of exactitude.

According to Tov scroll types at Qumran are delineable into what he terms ‘de luxe’ scrolls and non-luxury editions. ‘De luxe’ scrolls are carefully produced documents that reflect a high level of exactitude in replication and execution. Thus, Tov’s term ‘de luxe’ may be used somewhat synonymously with Lieberman’s term ἡκριβωμένα, though it will become apparent as this analysis progresses that a clear delineation between ἡκριβωμένα and κοινά type texts, and between κοινά and φαυλότερα type texts, is far from straightforward. In fact, the nature of the individual texts often demands a more nuanced description than this three tiered system of categorisation allows. Nevertheless, a consistent terminology is important for the overall clarity of our investigation, and so Lieberman’s terms will be adopted here.

Using Tov’s system of categorisation, ἡκριβωμένα scrolls can be recognised chiefly by the use of large upper and lower margins (ca. +3cm), and secondarily by the high number of lines per column (at least more than ca. 20 lines per column, but often over 30 lines),

---

722 See the example from T.B. Pesahim 112a, cited in S. Lieberman, Hellenism in Jewish Palestine, 26.
and the relative paucity of scribal intervention (less than once every 20 lines). According to this conceptualisation most ήκριβωμένα were proto-Rabbinic texts and may therefore represent scrolls that were produced in the circles of the Jerusalem Temple. Tov assigns this social connection to most of the scrolls that have been recovered from Masada, Murabba’at, Nahal Ḥever and Wadi Sdeir, while only a small number of the texts from Qumran display such exactitude in replication.

The majority of the biblical scrolls from Qumran therefore become categorised as κοινά or φαυλότερα type texts. While it seems clear based on the evidence from Masada that some ήκριβωμένα scrolls were very close, if not identical, to what would become the medieval MT, it would appear that not all ήκριβωμένα type scrolls were so carefully aligned. According to Tov’s list of ‘de luxe’ biblical scrolls at Qumran, a close affiliation with the MT can be expected, but not necessarily required, of ‘de luxe’ scrolls. This would seem to be a point of difference between those large format scrolls designated as ‘de luxe’ by

---

724 This is true, according to Tov, for the great majority of scrolls found in non-Qumran sites in the Judaean Desert. In the wider context there are, of course, exceptions. For example, 4QSam¹ fits all other criteria other than a closeness to the MT. Similarly, 4QpaleoExod⁶ has a text closer to the proto-Samaritan type, while displaying all of the other qualities that would define it as a ήκριβωμένα scroll.
726 At Qumran, only 4QDeut⁸ preserves a significant amount of text that does not deviate at all from the medieval MT. This scroll also preserves a large lower margin. 4QGen⁵ is very close to the MT, and preserves a large upper margin, and contains ca. 40 lines of text per column. Tov classifies a total of seven Torah scrolls from Qumran as ‘de luxe’ scrolls or, in the language of the present study, ήκριβωμένα type texts.
727 See E. Tov, "The Biblical Text in Ancient Synagogues," 186-90, for the suggestion that most of the scrolls from Qumran were of a lower production value, in terms of their adherence to the model text kept in the temple at Jerusalem, than those from the other find-sites along the western shore of the Dead Sea. That is, from the perspective of those aligned with the text that was affiliated with the temple, the majority of the Qumran scrolls were prepared with a diminished level of adherence to that ‘correct’ text.
Tov, and those ἠκριβομένα type scrolls as described by Lieberman. However, it remains that most of the large format ‘de luxe’ scrolls fit into the ἠκριβομένα category.

There is some support for this view in the Talmudic story of the three scrolls found in the Azarah, or Temple Court.728 In the context of the story, the differences between the scrolls indicate that there was some level of variation to be expected in the most authoritative texts that circulated during the Second Temple period. In particular, the fact that these scrolls were purported to have come from the Azarah itself suggests that the texts are of the ἠκριβομένα type. If this is accepted, it seems reasonable to assume that the textual variants alluded to in the story appeal to three stereotypical categories of variation that may have occurred in ἠκριβομένα texts.729 These are: orthographic confusion due to the graphical similarity of some letters (ח ו versus א י); the intrusion of foreign words (Hebrew נ ו versus Aramaic נ ו – perhaps a common vocable among the general public); and the updating of unusual grammatical forms (מ ל ו versus מ ל ו).730

728 See note above for the Talmudic references.
729 The didactic nature of this story is emphasised by the fact that “in the Palestinian Talmud, and especially in Aboth d'R. Nathan, the account of 'The Three Books' is adjacent to discussions of other subjects also arrayed in groups of three or four” (S. Talmon, "Three Scrolls of the Law," 19). It therefore seems pertinent to treat this story as representative of categories of variation that might have occurred in authoritative texts. The story thus serves as a warning of what types of error or variation should be guarded against in the copying of authoritative scrolls. However, it remains a possibility that the story could stem from a historical incident in which variant texts co-existed in the Temple archives, and therefore should be treated as evidence that ἠκριβομένα type texts were not necessarily entirely uniform.
730 I owe these observations to M. Cogan, who has suggested in a private conversation that the variant types outlined in the Tannaitic sources possibly echo an awareness at an earlier period of the kinds of variation that could infiltrate the authoritative Temple texts, especially confusion of graphically similar letters, the substitution of vernacular terminology in place of high register language, and the erosion of unusual grammatical forms. The confusion between graphemes such as ו ו and ו ו, כ ו and ב ו, ד ו and ר ו, etc., is well known in scrolls from the period under concern. Concerning the second feature, the reader is directed to the more general discussion on the friction between vernacular and high register language in tex-
Evidence for variation within ἡκριβωμένα texts is purely inferential, and the same must be said of evidence for the exactitude with which such texts were replicated. Our only hint at the requirement for a high level of exactitude in copying authoritative texts in the Second Temple period comes from the Damascus Document. While this evidence is slightly stronger than the Tannaitic material mentioned immediately above – due to the fact that the fragments of the Damascus Document uncovered at Qumran at least allow us to proceed from a point which is contemporary with the period in question – it still requires inferred reasoning to make it applicable to our present discussion.

The passage in question is partially preserved in three of the ten copies of the Damascus Document found at Qumran: 4Q266 frag. 5ii 1-3; 4Q267 frag. 5iii 3-5; and 4Q273 frag. 21. The passage informs us that there existed, at least at Qumran, a requirement for an accurate reading of an authoritative text.731

---

“And everyone whose [eye]s are dim or […] and everyone that is not quick to un[der]stand, and everyone wh[ose tongue] is cursed, [or] speaks [with] a continuous [voice] and does not divide his words so that [his voice] is heard, [men such as these will not read from the scroll of the Law] in case he makes a mistake in a capital matter.”

This text refers specifically to the capacities of one charged with publicly reading a scroll of the Law, and requires that anyone doing so must be perfect in their faculties of vision and speech to eliminate any possibility of misinterpretation of the text being read. Now, although the precision of the text from which the accurate reading was to be made is not explicitly referred to, one might assume that the scroll of the Law from which an exact reading was to be made would itself need to be a reliable copy. It seems reasonable to suppose that an exact text is a prerequisite for an exact reading, but it is perhaps too presumptuous to surmise that an exact text of the type termed by Lieberman as ἐκρίστωμένα underlies the practice referred to in this passage. Be that as it may, it is not impossible that this passage in the Damascus Document refers “to a practice which took place in the Jerusalem Temple, or to one which the sectarians [at Qumran] thought should take place there.” It may be permitted, then, to presume that scrolls replicated with a high level of precision were required for services, such as public readings, that took place within the Jerusalem religious institution during the Second Temple period.

---


The above discussion suggests that when looking at the evidence from the scrolls discovered in the Judaean Desert we must proceed from a position which is respectful of the complex nature of the evidence. It seems that we can approach the evidence from one of two perspectives. Following Young, we can take the Qumran scrolls *in toto* to represent earlier evidence than the scrolls from Masada, Nahal Ḥever, Murabba‘at and Wadi Sdeir. This would allow us to draw conclusions that fall into two temporally distinguished groups, namely evidence from the last centuries B.C.E. (Qumran), and evidence from the early centuries C.E. (all other sites).

Alternatively, we could take the position that supposes a contemporary provenience for the scrolls from Qumran and Masada, and adds to this body of synchronic evidence the material from Murabba‘at, Nahal Ḥever and Wadi Sdeir. As has been indicated above, such as position would take into account the considerations of Lieberman that delineate scrolls into groups which reflect particular care in their production and which have a specific intended function in Jewish Palestinian society. Lieberman’s observations would seem to fit well with Tov’s system which recognises scrolls of varying quality of production. We have outlined above some considerations towards seeing this particular system of categorisation as also pertaining to texts of varying degrees of authoritateness.

The present study will progress from the perspective that all of the scrolls from the Dead Sea area should be examined as a collective and relatively contemporaneous group, segregated not in terms of chronological placement but rather in terms of locality and quality of production. If the discussions of Doudna, Hutcheson and Young noted above should
alert us to anything, it should be that the dating of scrolls from the Judaean Desert, using palaeographical evidence that is unsubstantiated by external archaeological data, lends more uncertainty to our endeavour than it resolves.734 A firm position on the exact dating of the scrolls will thus be avoided as much as is possible in the following examination. Rather, this study will aim to reach conclusions that remain relevant irrespective of the precise dating that scholars attribute to the scrolls.

That is not to suggest that it suffices to ignore the question of dating the scrolls entirely. Indeed, it will need to be remembered that the differences in temporal setting considered in Young’s study must be taken into consideration in our final analysis. To this end, the material from Masada and Qumran will be treated primarily as contemporary evidence, and the later material from other sites from the Judaean Desert will be factored into the analysis with due consideration of their later provenience. Such an approach seeks to, at least partially, reconcile the diachronically driven views of Young with the synchronically driven views of Tov. However, it is the view of the writer that we can be relatively free to comment upon the textual character of certain scrolls that have been grouped according to the quality with which they have been manufactured and executed, without the need to enter into the arguments that surround the specific dating of these texts. Our comments in this respect should hold independently of whether we attribute an early dating to the deposit of the scrolls in the caves near Qumran (before the turn of the Common Era), or a late dating (after the turn of the Common Era). In either case, we are still discussing scrolls from Qumran and Masada that saw out their existence as authoritative

734 See note above.
texts (in the case of carefully produced documents) during the late Second Temple period in Jewish Palestine.

The Sites

There is no longer and single theory concerning the deposit of the Qumran Scrolls that can claim an outright consensus among scholars. However, it may not be too far from the truth to say that the most commonly held theory is that the Qumran Scrolls were deposited in the caves at around the middle of the first century C.E. This is based primarily on the terminus ante quem of the destruction of Qumran at the hands of the Roman army just before the destruction of the Temple in Jerusalem. Other evidence, such as C14 dating and palaeographical analysis, has been employed to support this view. As such, the majority position over the last six decades of research has continued to date the deposit of the scrolls in the caves near Qumran to around the year 68 C.E. This is roughly contemporaneous with the terminus ante quem for the deposit of the scrolls in the fortress at Masada, which was destroyed by the Roman 10th Legion in the year 73 C.E.735 Because of the temporal proximity of the destruction of both sites, the predominant scholarly view treats the corpora from Qumran and Masada as representing relatively contemporaneous deposits. The two corpora form a composite picture of the kind of biblical texts that were circulating in Jewish Palestine in the late Second Temple period.

735 The date for the destruction of Masada at the hands of the 10th Legion is given as Spring 73-74 CE in Y. Yadin, Masada II. The Yigael Yadin Excavations 1963 - 1965. Final Reports (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1989) 4-5. R. de Vaux thought it likely that the 10th Legion was also responsible for the destruction of Qumran – see R. de Vaux, Archaeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls (London: Oxford University Press, 1973) 38-41.
Khirbet Qumran sits atop a marl terrace close to the north-western shoreline of the Dead Sea. It is a relatively small site, with its most prominent features being a square tower of at least two stories, and a complex aqueduct and water storage system dissecting what appear to be largely functional buildings. Significant occupation at the site of Qumran spans between 150 and 200 years. The site’s first excavator, R. de Vaux, termed the earliest phase Period Ia, and the final phase Period III. The end of what de Vaux termed Period II at Qumran is attested by the discovery of first century C.E. Roman arrowheads around the site, and various signs of violent destruction and conflagration in many of the structures there. On the basis of numismatic evidence, and the description of the movements of the Roman army recorded by Josephus, de Vaux decided on the year 68 C.E. for the end of Period II. Even though the earlier periods defined by de Vaux as Periods Ia and Ib have been adjusted by more recent scholarship, there is general agreement with his dating of the end of Period II.


737 See R. de Vaux, *Archaeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 38. Josephus records that Roman troops travelled from Jericho to the Dead Sea under Vespasian’s command at around the time of Nero’s death in 68 C.E. Before Vespasian returned to Caesarea, fighting in the area had “gone through all the mountainous country, and all the plain country also” (*J.W.* 4.490). In addition to this, de Vaux found solid archaeological evidence to date the end of Period II to this year. He found Jewish coins associated with the end of Period II, the last of which was minted in 68 CE, while the earliest Roman coins associated with the period immediately after the destruction of the Period II buildings were minted in 67/68 C.E. Thus, de Vaux concludes that “the evidence of history agrees with that of the coinage… [therefore] it is reasonable to put forward the hypothesis that the year 68, at which the two numismatic sequences meet, marks the destruction of the
lower level and the initiation of the higher one. And, since this explanation is in accordance with the historical data, it acquires that degree of certainty with which a historian of antiquity often has to be content. It is in this sense that I consider it certain that Khirbet Qumran was destroyed by the Romans in June 68 of our era” (R. de Vaux, *Archaeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 41).

738 de Vaux’s Period Ia dates from ca. 130 B.C.E. to 100 B.C.E.; his Period Ib from ca. 100 B.C.E. to 31 B.C.E.; his Period II from 4-1 B.C.E. to 68 C.E. Recently Jodi Magness has proposed disregarding Period Ia entirely, and re-dating Period Ib to span from ca. 100-50 B.C.E. to 9-4 B.C.E., claiming that the site was not abandoned after the earthquake of 31 B.C.E. For this chronology see J. Magness, *Archaeology of Qumran*, 63-69. This proposal has found support from other scholars. For example, Hirschfeld agrees that de Vaux’s Period Ia should be abandoned, and says that Period Ib began no later than 100 B.C.E. He has also suggested that the earthquake damage at the site was not necessarily sustained in 31 B.C.E., a view supported by the geo-spatial and topographical analysis of K. Lönnkvist and M.P. Lönnkvist, “Spatial Approach to the Ruins of Khirbet Qumran at the Dead Sea,” *Proceedings of the XXth ISPRS Congress, 12-23 July 2004 Istanbul, Turkey, Commission V* (vol. 35, 2004) 558-63. Hirschfeld basically agrees with Magness that there is little or no break in the inhabitation of the site during Period Ib (see Y. Hirschfeld, *Qumran in Context: Reassessing the Archaeological Evidence* [Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers, 2004] 54-55). Davies has also argued that de Vaux’s dating of Period Ia to the mid-second century B.C.E. is symptomatic of his desire to parallel the period given in CD for the establishment of the ‘Damascus’ community, and thus locate that community at Qumran. On this see P.R. Davies, “How Not to Do Archaeology: The Story of Qumran,” *Biblical Archaeologist* 51, 4 (1988) 203-7, reprinted in P.R. Davies, *Sects and Scrolls* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996) 79-87. In addition, Hutchesson has suggested that de Vaux’s Period Ib came to an end in 63 B.C.E., when Aristobulus was forced to hand over the fortresses of Judea to Cnaeus Pompeius Magnus (I. Hutchesson, “63 B.C.E.: A Revised Dating for the Depositation of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” *The Qumran Chronicle* 8, 3 [1999] 188). Hutchesson’s dating of the end of Period Ib is chiefly based on Josephus (*Ant*. 14.52), but he also draws attention to uncertainties in de Vaux’s reading of the numismatic evidence. He argues that the coins found at Qumran do not necessarily prove any inhabitation during de Vaux’s Period Ib after 76 B.C.E. That is, the period dating from 76 B.C.E. to 31 B.C.E. (the end of Period Ib according to de Vaux) is represented by only ten coins. “Such a small number can easily be absorbed into the category of coins which circulated long after the reign of the king who minted them” (I. Hutchesson, “63 B.C.E.,” 186). Against this Hirschfeld notes that most rulers issued coins bearing their own image when they came into power, so coins can usually be associated with the period of the ruler they represent (Y. Hirschfeld, *Qumran in Context*, 55). Doudna, after initially suggesting the year 63 B.C.E. as the date for the deposit of the scrolls, has revised this date to ca. 40 B.C.E., based on textual evidence. On this see G. Doudna, "Redating the Dead Sea Scrolls Found at Qumran: The Case for 63 B.C.E.," *The Qumran Chronicle* 8, 4 (1999), 4Q *Pesher Nahum*, 683-754, most recently reiterated in G. Doudna, "The Legacy of an Error in Archaeological Interpretation: The Dating of the Qumran Scroll Deposits," *Qumran - The Site of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Archaeological Interpretations and Debates: Proceedings of a Conference Held at Brown University, November 17-19, 2002* (eds K. Galor, J. Humbert, and J. Zangenberg; STDJ 57; Leiden: Brill, 2006) 147-58.
The Connection Between Khirbet Qumran and the Scrolls Found Nearby

According to de Vaux, there is a clear link between the site of Khirbet Qumran and the caves in which the scrolls were discovered. He pointed to similarities in the ceramic assemblage uncovered at the site and also in the caves. According to de Vaux, there is a clear link between the site of Khirbet Qumran and the caves in which the scrolls were discovered. He pointed to similarities in the ceramic assemblage uncovered at the site and also in the caves. This view gained widespread ac-

---

739 The unusual ceramic storage jars with lids (which have come to be known as ‘scroll jars’) that appear at Khirbet Qumran were also found in the most of the caves that contained scrolls. In addition, other ceramic materials identifiable with the site of Qumran were discovered in the same archaeological context as the scrolls, namely pots, jugs, juglets and lamps (see R. de Vaux, *Archaeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 57, and pl. XL). Up to 30 caves contained evidence of the same pottery types that are almost unique to the Qumran site, with 11 of these caves also containing scrolls. Only Cave 5 contained scroll fragments without any ceramic evidence (R. de Vaux, *Archaeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 101). The connection between the scroll finds and the inhabitants of Qumran Period II seemed clear to de Vaux: “…in most cases [the ceramic assemblage] belongs exclusively to this general class… In some cases forms characteristic of both periods [Ib and II] have been found in the same cave, and no cave can be positively stated to have been used only during Period Ib. The forms most frequently occurring, and in many instances the only ones attested, are the cylindrical jars, the lids, and the bowls, and these are, in fact, common to both periods. The greater part of the materials which have survived probably belongs to Period II” (R. de Vaux, *Archaeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 54, and see also 102-104). Recent analyses of the ceramic finds from several sites show that a significant proportion of the clay used at sites such as Qumran, Ein Ghuweir and Masada came from deposits not local to Qumran. See the analyses of J. Yellin, M. Broshi, and H. Eshel, "Pottery of Qumran and Ein Ghuweir: The First Chemical Exploration of Provenience," *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 321 (2001) 65-78, and J. Yellin, *Masada IV. The Yigael Yadin Excavations 1963 - 1965 Final Reports* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1994). In particular, examples from the characteristic Qumran assemblage, namely the four scroll jars and three lids examined, were all shown to be manufactured using Jerusalem clay. In fact, about half of the material analysed from Qumran did not originate from that site (see J. Yellin, M. Broshi, and H. Eshel, "Pottery of Qumran and Ein Ghuweir," 75). Subsequent analyses have upheld this conclusion – see J. Gunneweg and M. Balla, "Neutron Activation Analysis, Scroll Jars and Common Ware," *Fouilles de Khirbet Qumrân et de 'Ain Feshkha II: Khirbet Qumrân et 'Ain Feshkha: Presentées par Jean-Baptiste Humbert et Jan Gunneweg* (Academic Press: Fribourg, 2003) 3-53, and J. Michniewicz and M. Krzysko, "The Provenance of Scroll Jars in the Light of Archaeometric Investigations," *Fouilles de Khirbet Qumrân et de 'Ain Feshkha II: Khirbet Qumrân et 'Ain Feshkha: Presentées par Jean-Baptiste Humbert et Jan Gunneweg* (Fribourg: Academic Press, 2003) 59-99. Added to this is the fact that “a potter's atelier and two kilns operated at Qumran for about a century and a half to serve a small and austere community. Such activity …, in a site lacking outstanding clay and cheap energy, can be explained only by the community's adherence to strict purity laws” (J. Yellin, M. Broshi, and H. Eshel, "Pottery of Qumran and Ein Ghuweir," 73). It would appear that the Qumran inhabitants’ requirements for ritually pure vessels were such that pottery production at the site was supplemented by imported clay or finished goods (most likely the former, according to J. Magness, "Qumran: The Site of
ceptance, both because of the material culture, and because of the feeling that the inhabi-
tants of Qumran must have been aware of the deposit of such a large collection of scrolls
that, in some cases, occurred little more than a stone’s throw from the site itself. “That
this library belongs to the group living at Khirbet Qumran is not only suggested by the
physical proximity between the caves and the Khirbeh but proved by the relation … es-
tablished between the material remains of the caves and Khirbet Qumran.”

Aspects of the site suggest it was home to a community that was very concerned with the
concept of ritual purity. A clear example is the number of *miqva’ot* situated throughout
the site. While there are some large cisterns capable of containing enough water for the

---

740 F. Garcia-Martinez and A.S. van der Woude, "A ‘Gröningen’ Hypothesis of Qumran Origins and Early History," *Revue de Qumran* 14, 4 (1990) 523. The proximity of the scrolls to the settlement would seem to demand the view that there was an awareness of the deposit of the scrolls by the occupants of Qumran, provided that the two were contemporary. Further, the presence of a ceramic assemblage that clearly connects the site with the caves would seem to mandate such a view, and suggest that those living at Qumran were in some way involved in the deposit of the scrolls. However, due to the clandestine excavations conducted by local tribesmen in the early days of the Scrolls’ discovery, there are some doubts as to the exact find-sites of a relatively large number of fragments – see S.A. Reed, "Find-Sites of the Dead Sea Scrolls," *DSD* 14, 2 (2007) 211-213. There is also good reason to be wary of directly superimposing the view of the community in the sectarian texts onto the site of Qumran. In particular, see P.R. Davies, "The Birthplace of the Essenes: Where Is 'Damascus'?," *Revue de Qumran* 14, 4 (1996) 509, reprinted in P.R. Davies, *Sects and Scrolls*, 95-112. Additionally, see S.B. Hoenig, "The Sectarian Scrolls and Rabbinic Research," *The Jewish Quarterly Review* 59, 1 (1968) 31, esp. n. 51.

741 The discovery of cooked animal bones around the settlement, deliberately covered with pots or pot-
sherds, also suggests sectarian activity at Qumran that was possibly in conflict with the institutional authority in Jerusalem (see J.M. Baumgarten, "The Pharisaic-Sadducean Controversies About Purity and the
site’s inhabitants (loci 91 and 110), almost half of the water capacity at Qumran was held in ritual baths. In fact, ten of the sixteen pools at Qumran have been designated as *miqva’ot*, and eight of these have broad steps to allow for separation of those entering and exiting the water. Perhaps the best example is the *miqveh* at locus 138, at the north-west extreme of the site. This structure was designed with two stepped entrances, each occupying separate sides of the pool (the eastern and southern sides). This design clearly indicates that there was a concern to have two defined access points. Their separation ensured that there would be no contact between those entering in an impure state and those exiting in a pure state. The broad-stepped *miqva’ot* at loci 48, 56, 68, 71, 117 and 118 also served this purpose.

Certain texts, such as S, D, M, the *pesharim*, and MMT, seem to have been the product of a Jewish sectarian group (or groups), whose beginnings are commonly thought to be found among either the Essenes or the Sadducees. The group’s members seem to have

---

742 See J. Magness, *Archaeology of Qumran*, 147. Of the 577,800 litre capacity, ca. 259,000 litres were contained in ritual baths.


744 See J. Magness, *Archaeology of Qumran*, 145 ff. As Magness has noted, this practice is mentioned in the Temple Scroll (45 4-5), and also in the Mishnah (*Sheqalim* 8:2, and *Middot* 2:2).

separated themselves from the ruling authority in Jerusalem at some point in the second century B.C.E., as recorded in CD I:5-6. Given the isolation of Khirbet Qumran, and its apparently ritualistic material culture and infrastructure, the identification of the site as a place of isolation for a splinter group like that mentioned in the sectarian documents seems reasonable.\(^\text{746}\) However, the extent to which socio-religious isolation can be equated with economic isolation is uncertain. Despite their socio-religious distinctions the inhabitants of Qumran apparently maintained connections with those outside their group to some degree.\(^\text{747}\)

Based on the link between the site of Qumran and the documents found in the nearby caves, a clear *terminus ante quem* of 68 C.E. emerges for the deposit of the Scrolls there.\(^\text{748}\) This date, which has gained widespread acceptance among the broader scholarly

---


\(^\text{747}\) Making a clear delineation between socio-religious isolation and economic isolation is complicated by aspects of the archaeology. Qumran was defined as an ‘open site’ by R. Donceel and P. Donceel-Voûte, "The Archaeology of Khirbet Qumran," *Methods of Investigation of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Khirbet Qumran Site: Present Realities and Future Prospects* (eds M.O. Wise, N. Golb, J.J. Collins, and D. Pardee; ANYAS 722; New York: New York Academy of Sciences, 1994) 9, who described it as “a place for which articles were not only purchased from Jerusalem or Jericho but from elsewhere in the Mediterranean world … this ‘open site’ not only received but most probably also produced and exchanged something of true commercial value.” In relation to this it is interesting to note the recent paper by M. Bélis, "The Production of Indigo Dye in the Installations of 'Ain Feshka," *Qumran - The Site of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Archaeological Interpretations and Debates: Proceedings of a Conference Held at Brown University, November 17-19, 2002* (eds K. Galor, J. Humbert, and J. Zangenberg; STDJ 57; Leiden: Brill, 2006) 253-61.

\(^\text{748}\) N. Golb has argued that the scrolls in the caves near Wadi Qumran are not linked to the settlement at Khirbet Qumran, but instead came from Jerusalem. See N. Golb, *Who Wrote the Dead Sea Scrolls?* (New
community, implies that the Scrolls represent the type of biblical texts that were in circulation in Jewish Palestine during the very end of the Second Temple period.\(^{749}\) Regardless of the dates attributed to individual scrolls, which range from the middle of the third century B.C.E. to the middle of the first century C.E., the fact that their deposit is perceived to be limited to a single event at around the year 68 C.E. encourages the view that the whole collection was in simultaneous circulation prior to that date.\(^{750}\) If the scrolls were

---

\(^{749}\) The tendency of recent scholarship seems to be to consider that the Qumran scrolls in general stem from broader Palestinian Jewish circles in the late Second Temple period, rather than constituting the product of a single isolated sect (see E. Tov, *Textual Criticism*, 101-3, and E. Ulrich, "The Scrolls and the Study of the Hebrew Bible," *The Dead Sea Scrolls at Fifty: Proceedings of the 1997 Society of Biblical Literature Qumran Section Meetings* [eds R.A. Kugler and E.M. Schuller; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1999] 35). The conception of a single historical ‘sect’ in the Scrolls is also problematic – see P.R. Davies, "The Ideology of the Temple in the Damascus Document," *JJS* 33 (1982) 289, n. 7 (reprinted in P.R. Davies, *Sects and Scrolls*, 45-60, and see pages 99-100 in the same volume). Consequently the alleged historical community at Qumran has been shown to lack a singular identity. Instead perhaps two stages in the development of certain sectarian divisions are discernable from CD and S. These considerations have been distilled into a revised hypothesis of Qumran origins that supposes both a diverse background for many of the biblical texts found in the caves near Qumran, and a two stage developmental process reflected in the sectarian writings also found there. On this see F. Garcia-Martinez, "Qumran Origins," 113-36, and F. Garcia-Martinez and A.S. van der Woude, "A 'Gröningen' Hypothesis,'" 521-41.

\(^{750}\) For a chronological synopsis for the Qumran texts, see B. Webster, "Chronological Index of the Texts from the Judaean Desert," *The Texts from the Judaean Desert: Indices and an Introduction to the Discoveries in the Judaean Desert Series* (ed. E. Tov; DJD 39; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2002) 371-75. The issues surrounding the dating of individual texts are complex, and there is a significant divergence of scholarly
not all in circulation at the same point in time, we would not expect to find them deposited together in the same archaeological context.\textsuperscript{751}

\textit{The Archaeology of the Masada Scrolls}

Masada is situated towards the south end of the western shore of the Dead Sea. The isolated plateau on which the fortress was built rises almost half a kilometre above the surrounding plain. Some of the buildings in the Western Palace appear to have been constructed in the Hasmonean period, however the majority of the construction, including its impressive three-tiered Northern Palace, is attributed to Herod's reign.\textsuperscript{752} There were also subsequent, though smaller, building phases at Masada under the Roman procurators and during the First Jewish Revolt. The fortress was, of course, the site of the last stand of the \textit{Sicarii}, famously documented by Josephus.\textsuperscript{753}

\textsuperscript{751} Attention should be drawn to the possible exception of Cave 1. Recently G. Brooke has made the observation that "it seems as if the Scrolls that were found in Cave 1 had been placed there because these were the Scrolls that were most damaged in antiquity, just as being the case, through the centuries damaged texts are much respected and are buried as in the \textit{genizas}. So it seems that it's possible to understand Cave 1 as such a \textit{geniza} from antiquity," (G.J. Brooke, interview by Rachael Kohn, \textit{The Spirit of Things}, ABC Radio National, 20 May, 2007).


\textsuperscript{753} \textit{J.W.} 7.275-406.
Fragments of 15 Hebrew documents from this final period at Masada were uncovered during the excavations led by Y. Yadin between 1963 and 1965. These were found around the site, the majority being unearthed in or close to the building known as the ‘synagogue’, loci 1042-1043.\textsuperscript{754} The documents, 14 parchment and one papyrus, represent those used by the rebels occupying the fortress during the First Jewish Revolt against Rome.\textsuperscript{755} Most scrolls are severely damaged by the effects of prolonged exposure to the desert environment, but several also show signs of tearing suggesting deliberate destruction. In locus 1039, a room close to the synagogue in the north-western casemate, three biblical and four extra-biblical texts were recovered by archaeologists.\textsuperscript{756} In the syna-

\textsuperscript{754} Fragments were found in the western, eastern and northern sections of the site. Loci 1039, 1042, 1043 and 1045 form part of the western casemate, in and around the ‘synagogue’. These rooms contained 10 of the 15 Hebrew scrolls discovered at Masada. In particular locus 1039 possibly served as a central place in which someone, perhaps the Roman besiegers or the Zealots themselves, collected and destroyed property. On this see Y. Yadin, \textit{The Excavation of Masada 1963/64: Preliminary Report} (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1965) 83. Elsewhere, in an open area approaching the Northern Palace, fragments of a Leviticus scroll (MasLev\textsuperscript{6}) were discovered amidst a large amount of debris, apparently discarded there by those who defaced it – see Y. Yadin, \textit{Masada: Herod's Fortress and the Zealots’ Last Stand} (New York: Random House, 1972) 179. A Ben Sirah scroll and one of the Psalms scrolls (MasPs\textsuperscript{5}) were found in rooms to the north and south of the Snake Path Gate, on the eastern side of the site. These scrolls were also deliberately defaced – see S. Talmon, \textit{Masada VI: Yigael Yadin Excavations 1963-1965. Final Reports} (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1999) 155. Locus 1276, which contained the fragment of Jubilees (MasJub) is located in the south western section of the casemate wall. Netzer believed that this locus served the same purpose for the Roman looters as locus 1039 – see E. Netzer, \textit{Masada III}, 445.

\textsuperscript{755} This much is beyond doubt concerning the scrolls found in locus 1039, which were uncovered along side coins from the First Revolt (Y. Yadin, \textit{Herod's Fortress}, 168-71). The scrolls in locus 1043 were buried beneath the floor made by the rebels, confirming that these belong to the same period. Although the palaeography of the square script Hebrew parchments was, with the exception of the Ben Sirah scroll, described as Herodian according to S. Talmon, \textit{Masada VI passim}, the circumstances of their deposit indicate that they were in circulation right up to the end of the Second Temple period.

\textsuperscript{756} Locus 1042 forms the main hall, while locus 1043 is a small room located in the north-western corner of locus 1042. These rooms were first identified as a synagogue or ecclesiasteria by Yadin, who initially posed the idea as conjecture (see Y. Yadin, \textit{Preliminary Report}, 78-79), before stating the case more defini-
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gogue itself, a scroll of Deuteronomy and a scroll of Ezekiel were found buried beneath the floor of locus 1043.  

The condition of the scrolls found at Masada, and the location of the finds, suggest that most of the scrolls were disposed of after a deliberate attempt was made to destroy or deface them. The two exceptional cases are MasDeut and MasEzek, found buried underneath the floor of locus 1043. These deposits were carried out intentionally, and one of the scrolls had been rolled before it was placed. It seems, therefore, that out of at least 15 Hebrew scrolls that existed at Masada during the First Jewish Revolt, only two of those were deposited in such a way that they might be spared mutilation at the hands of the Roman soldiers. The remaining scrolls that preserve sufficient material all appear to have suffered this exact fate: MasPs in locus 1103, the Ben Sirah scroll in locus 1109, Mas1n ‘Unidentified Qumran-Type Fragment’ in locus 1063, and the scrolls gathered together with other materials to be destroyed in locus 1039, 1045 and 1276; all these show signs of intentionally inflicted damage.

757 These scrolls were buried in two separate pits in the floor of locus 1043. See the description of the finds in E. Netzer, *Masada III*, 410, and the description in Y. Yadin, *Herod’s Fortress*, 187-89.

758 S. Talmon, "Hebrew Scroll Fragments From Masada," *The Story of Masada: Discoveries From the Excavations* (ed. G. Hurvitz; Utah: BYU Studies, 1997) 102-3, says of the fragmentary texts: “the margins seem to show that some scrolls were willfully torn, presumably by Roman soldiers who, after their conquest of the fortress, vented their rage on the sacred writings of the defenders of Masada.”

759 See Y. Yadin, *Herod’s Fortress*, 187. The pits themselves were quite large, about 1-2 metres in diameter and 70 centimetres deep according to E. Netzer, *Masada III*, 410. It is unclear whether or not the two scrolls were the only items of value that were laid in them, though the only other matter to be found in the pits was “a mixture of gravel, sherds and organic material.” The separation of the pits in which the scrolls were discovered suggests that they were deposited on different occasions. On this see E. Tov, “The Biblical Text in Ancient Synagogues,” 186-90, and E. Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 318.
The Sources

In total there are 95 Torah texts represented in the evidence that has been recovered from sites along the western shore of the Dead Sea. A small number of these texts occupy the same scroll but are treated in the analysis as separate texts.\textsuperscript{760} Regarding the provenience of the individual scrolls, it is a matter of no small concern that certain of the scrolls allegedly found in Qumran Cave 4 in uncontrolled excavations may in fact not have been uncovered in those caves.\textsuperscript{761} Nevertheless, it will be a working hypothesis in this study that scrolls with the designation 4Q were in fact found in Cave 4, unless there is good evidence to the contrary.

\textsuperscript{760} The scrolls are 4QGen-Exod\textsuperscript{a}, 4QpaleoGen-Exod\textsuperscript{b}, 4QExod-Lev\textsuperscript{c}, 4QLev-Num\textsuperscript{d}.

\textsuperscript{761} A ready example is 4QGen\textsuperscript{b}, which is assumed to be from a location other than Qumran Cave 4, possibly Wadi Murabba‘at, as noted in E. Ulrich and F.M. Cross, \textit{Qumran Cave 4. VII: Genesis to Numbers} (DJD 12; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994) 31. See also the discussion in S.A. Reed, "Find-Sites," 211. Reed notes that as many as 80\% of the biblical scrolls from Cave 4 may be of unascertainable provenience due to their being excavated in uncontrolled circumstances.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scroll</th>
<th>Total SU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4QpExod^m</td>
<td>2147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11QpaleoLev^a</td>
<td>1667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QNum^b</td>
<td>1667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QpaleoGen-Exod^1 (Exod)</td>
<td>922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QExod^c</td>
<td>865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QLev-Num^a (Num)</td>
<td>808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QDeut^h</td>
<td>714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QGen-Exod^2 (Exod)</td>
<td>683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QDeut^c</td>
<td>605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QLev^b</td>
<td>577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MasLev^b</td>
<td>571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QExod^b</td>
<td>487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QDeut^h</td>
<td>467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QGen^b</td>
<td>447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QDeut^f</td>
<td>431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QGen-Exod^3 (Gen)</td>
<td>414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QLev-Num^a (Lev)</td>
<td>407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QpDeut^f</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QDeut^d</td>
<td>317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QExod-Lev^f (Exod)</td>
<td>309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1QDeut^b</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QDeut^f</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QGen^f</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QDeut^b</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QGen^g</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QGen^d</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MurExod</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QDeut^g</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5QDeut</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QDeut^k1</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MurGen^a</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2QExod^a</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QDeut^e</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QGen^f</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SdeirGen</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QDeut^k2</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QGen^e</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QLev^c</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QLev^d</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QDeut^a</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QDeut^f</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XHev/SeNum^b</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scroll</td>
<td>Total SU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QLev&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1QpaleoLev</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QDeut&lt;sup&gt;j&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11QLev&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MasLev&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1QDeut&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QGen&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QDeut&lt;sup&gt;m&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MasDeut</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1QExod</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QDeut&lt;sup&gt;i&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QGen&lt;sup&gt;k&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MurDeut</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QLev&lt;sup&gt;g&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QDeut&lt;sup&gt;f&lt;/sup&gt;  (Exod)</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1QGen</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QExod&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QDeut&lt;sup&gt;f&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2QExod&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MurNum</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QExod&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2QNum&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QpGen&lt;sup&gt;m&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XHev/SeDeut</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/6 HevNum&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2QNum&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6QpaleoGen</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11QDeut</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2QpaleoLev</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QDeut&lt;sup&gt;p&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QExod&lt;sup&gt;g&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8QGen</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QDeut&lt;sup&gt;k&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MurGen&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2QGen</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QExod&lt;sup&gt;h&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QpDeut&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MasGen</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2QDeut&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QExod&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6QpaleoLev</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QExod&lt;sup&gt;k&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QExod+Lev&lt;sup&gt;f&lt;/sup&gt;(Lev)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2QDeut&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2QDeut&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following table gives the total number of SU and the total count of variant forms for each scroll that contains at least 20 SU in common with the MT. Following this table is a list of variant readings between any scroll as compared with the MT regardless of the amount of overlapping text preserved. The discussion of the variants will refer mainly to those scrolls preserving at least 50 SU in parallel with the MT. Variant readings in the scrolls that have less parallel SU preserved may be referred to periodically, but will not be made to bear any of the statistical argument put forward regarding the type and frequency of the variants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scroll</th>
<th>Total SU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1QpaleoNum</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2QNumc</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QGenb1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QGenb</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2QExodc</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QGenb2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2QNumd</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QGenb-title</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

762 There is a total of 1,089 orthographic variants between the MT and the Torah scrolls from the western shore of the Dead Sea. While all of these variants were assessed and tallied in the data collection process, the representation in the present study of an exhaustive list of variants was considered too cumbersome, and so it was decided to eliminate orthographic variants from the list. The number of orthographic variants between each source and the MT has been given in the table. There will also be some minor comment on orthographic variants in the discussion that follows the list.
Table - Variants From the MT in the Dead Sea Torah Scrolls

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparison: Q vs MT</th>
<th>TOTAL PLL</th>
<th>Orth. Variant</th>
<th>SU per Orth. Variant</th>
<th>Orth. (l) Variant</th>
<th>SU per Orth. (l) Variant</th>
<th>Stylistic (Type 1) Variant</th>
<th>SU per St. (1) Variant</th>
<th>Stylistic (Type 2) Variant</th>
<th>SU per St. (2) Variant</th>
<th>Stylistic (Type 3) Variant</th>
<th>SU per St. (3) Variant</th>
<th>Herm. Variant</th>
<th>SU per Herm. Variant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4QpExod\textsuperscript{m}</td>
<td>4295</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11QpaleoLev\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>3335</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>606</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QNum\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>3335</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QpaleoGen-Exod\textsuperscript{f} (Exod)</td>
<td>1844</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>922</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QExod\textsuperscript{f}</td>
<td>1729</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>112</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QpaleoLev\textsuperscript{f} (Num)</td>
<td>1616</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>539</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QDeut\textsuperscript{f}</td>
<td>1428</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QGen-Exod\textsuperscript{f} (Exod)</td>
<td>1366</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QDeut\textsuperscript{f}</td>
<td>1210</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>173</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QLev\textsuperscript{f}</td>
<td>1154</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>115</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MasLev\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>1142</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QExod\textsuperscript{f}</td>
<td>973</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QDeut\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>934</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>144</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QGen\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>895</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>447</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QDeut\textsuperscript{f}</td>
<td>862</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>287</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QGen-Exod\textsuperscript{f} (Gen)</td>
<td>829</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QLev-Num\textsuperscript{f} (Lev)</td>
<td>813</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>116</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QpaleoDeut\textsuperscript{f}</td>
<td>755</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QDeut\textsuperscript{d}</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QExod-Lev\textsuperscript{f} (Exod)</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1QDeut\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>230</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QDeut\textsuperscript{f}</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QGen\textsuperscript{d}</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QDeut\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison: Q vs MT</td>
<td>TOTAL PLL</td>
<td>Orth. Variant</td>
<td>SU per Orth. Variant</td>
<td>Orth. (l) Variant</td>
<td>SU per Orth. (l) Variant</td>
<td>Stylistic (Type 1) Variant</td>
<td>SU per St. (1) Variant</td>
<td>Stylistic (Type 2) Variant</td>
<td>SU per St. (2) Variant</td>
<td>Stylistic (Type 3) Variant</td>
<td>SU per St. (3) Variant</td>
<td>Herm. Variant</td>
<td>SU per Herm. Variant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QGen^c</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QGen^g</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MurExod</td>
<td>318</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QDeut^g</td>
<td>312</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5QDeut</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QDeut^k1</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MurGen^a</td>
<td>292</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2QExod^a</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QDeut^e</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>142</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QGen^f</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SdeirGen</td>
<td>268</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QDeut^k2</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QGen^e</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>131</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QLev^c</td>
<td>253</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>127</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QLev^d</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QDeut^b</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QDeut^t</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XHev/SeNum^b</td>
<td>332</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QLev^e</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>109</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1QpaleoLev</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QDeut^a</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1QLev^b</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MasLev^c</td>
<td>177</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1QDeut^a</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QGen^d</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QDeut^m</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison: Q vs MT</td>
<td>TOTAL PLL</td>
<td>Orth. Variant</td>
<td>SU per Orth. Variant</td>
<td>Orth. (l) Variant</td>
<td>SU per Orth. (l) Variant</td>
<td>Stylistic (Type 1) Variant</td>
<td>SU per St. (1) Variant</td>
<td>Stylistic (Type 2) Variant</td>
<td>SU per St. (2) Variant</td>
<td>Stylistic (Type 3) Variant</td>
<td>SU per St. (3) Variant</td>
<td>Herm. Variant</td>
<td>SU per Herm. Variant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MasDeut</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1QExod</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QDeut</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QGen</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MurDeut</td>
<td>105</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QLev</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QDeut (Exod)</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1QGen</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QExod</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QDeut (Exod)</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2QExod</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MurNum</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QExod</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2QNum</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QpGen</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XHev/SeDeut</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/6 HevNum</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2QNum</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6QpaleoGen</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11QDeut</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2paleoLev</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QDeut</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QExod</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8QGen</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QDeut (Exod)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MurGen</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison: Q vs MT</td>
<td>TOTAL PLL</td>
<td>Orph. Variant</td>
<td>SU per Orph. Variant</td>
<td>Orph. (l) Variant</td>
<td>SU per Orph. (l) Variant</td>
<td>Stylistic (Type 1) Variant</td>
<td>SU per St. (1) Variant</td>
<td>Stylistic (Type 2) Variant</td>
<td>SU per St. (2) Variant</td>
<td>Stylistic (Type 3) Variant</td>
<td>SU per St. (3) Variant</td>
<td>Herm. Variant</td>
<td>SU per Herm. Variant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2QGen</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QExod³</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QpaleoDeut³</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MasGen</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2QDeut²</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QExod¹</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
List of Variants From the MT Torah Scrolls From Qumran and Masada

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Scrolls</th>
<th>Variant Text</th>
<th>Categorisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>MT Gen 1:20 1QGen 1 2</td>
<td>ת JW</td>
<td>OV(1) – Possible difference in pronunciation.763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>MT Gen 22:14 1QGen 3 2</td>
<td>omits</td>
<td>SV(1) – The MT lacks the object marker.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>MT Exod 16:14 1QExod 1 3</td>
<td>במשם</td>
<td>SV(1) – Interchange of prepositions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>MT Exod 20:25 1QExod 5-6 2</td>
<td>התהלל</td>
<td>SV(1) – Difference in gender.764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5</td>
<td>MT Lev 20:21 1QpaleoLev 3-4 2</td>
<td>ידה</td>
<td>SV(1) – Difference in gender.765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6</td>
<td>MT Lev 22:6 1QpaleoLev 6 10</td>
<td>ינש</td>
<td>SV(1) – MT lacks the conjunction.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

763 E. Qimron, *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986) 50-53, has shown that the most common form of the ‘o’ themed imperfect verb with affirmative in Qumran Hebrew maintains the root vowel, represented in the orthography as waw, where the Massoretic tradition has shewa. This may be an indication of penultimate stress in Qumran Hebrew, or related to dual forms of the indicative imperfect verb that existed in parallel in that dialect, on analogy with the dual forms of the infinitive and the imperative. See also S. Morag, "Qumran Hebrew: Some Typological Observations," *VT* 38, 2 (1988) 155-56.

764 The feminine singular pronominal object suffix in MT refers to the adjective תוחלת. The form of the pronominal object suffix in 1QExod appears to treat the adjective, which is not preserved, as masculine, perhaps due to a misunderstanding of the gender of the irregular feminine noun to which the adjective refers, namely תוחלת.

765 1QpaleoLev has the grammatically correct form of the masculine singular independent pronoun, also corrected in the gere of MT. This phenomenon is common in the MT and the correct grammatical form of the third person singular independent pronoun is found regularly in the Qumran biblical scrolls. The distinction between waw and yod in this script is clear, though this is not the case in many of the scrolls written in ‘Assyrian’ script.
Throughout this analysis suffixed pronominal forms written with final heh, such as 2ms חָפַר, 2mpl חסָה, and 3mpl חָסָה, as well as the independent pronominal forms written with final heh, such as 1cs חָא, 3mpl חָא, and 3fpl חָא, are treated as reflecting a potential difference in pronunciation when contrasted with the common Massoretic forms of these pronominal suffixes and independent pronouns without final heh. This observation extends also to particular verbal forms that show the same terminal heh, namely the 2ms perfect חָא and the 1c imperfect אֲלָמַיָּה. Discussion around the long forms of the suffixed and independent pronouns has focussed mainly on the issue of interpreting the final heh on these pronouns as signifying an orthographic or a morphological difference, that is, whether or not the variation in the spelling reflects an orthographic convention or an actual difference in pronunciation. An exhaustive list of the scholarly literature that makes up this discussion is difficult to collate, but see primarily M. Martin, The Scribal Character of the Dead Sea Scrolls (2 vols.; Louvian: Publications Universitaires, 1958) 8, E.Y. Kutscher, The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll (STDJ VI; Leiden: Brill, 1974) 45-48, 57-58, 434-38, 448-49, E. Qimron, Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls, 57-64, E. Tov, "The Orthography and Language of the Hebrew Scrolls found at Qumran and the Origin of these Scrolls," Textus 13 (1986), S. Morag, "Qumran Hebrew: Some Typological Observations," VT 38, 2 (1988) 158-59, F.M. Cross, "Some Notes on a Generation of Qumran Studies," The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid, 18-21 March, 1991 (eds L. Trebolle Barrera and L. Vegas Montaner; STDJ 11 Leiden: Brill, 1992), E. Tov, "Some Notes on a Generation of Qumran Studies: A Reply," The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid, 18-21 March, 1991 (eds L. Trebolle Barrera and L. Vegas Montaner; STDJ 11 Leiden: Brill, 1992), M.G. Abegg, "The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls," The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment (eds P.W. Flint and J.C. Vanderkam; Brill, 1998) 327-39, K. Dong-Hyuk, "Free Orthography in a Strict Society: Reconsidering To'v's "Qumran orthography"," DSD 11, 3 (2004), and E. Tov, "Reply to Dong-Hyuk Kim's Paper on 'To'v's Qumran Orthography'." DSD 11, 3 (2004). The view taken in this analysis is that in light of Rule 1 the spellings with final heh do represent an underlying difference in pronunciation. The similarities to Samaritan pronunciation go some way towards supporting this view (see E.Y. Kutscher, Language and Linguistic Background, 449), and one may see some influence of Samaritan or perhaps even Aramaic in the unusual forms that appear in Qumran Hebrew, as does W. Weinberg, The History of Hebrew Plene Spelling (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1985) 9. However this evidence should not be overstated, as it must be said that the similarities in Samaritan pronunciation do not extend to all of the peculiar orthographic nuances of Qumran Hebrew (see E. Tov, "Orthography and Language," 39, E.Y. Kutscher, Language and Linguistic Background, 567, and E. Qimron, Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls, 40-42). Rather, we can surmise with D. Talshir, "The Habitat and History of Hebrew During the Second Temple Period," Biblical Hebrew: Studies in Chronology and Typology (ed. I. Young; London: T&T Clark International, 2003) 264-66, that the Qumran Hebrew forms with extraneous terminal heh are a logical continuation of what is termed Late Biblical Hebrew, while the orthography of the Massoretic Text, without taking into account the vowel pointing of the Massoretes themselves, is in line with the spelling in Mishnaic Hebrew, for which see M.H. Segal, A Grammar of Mishnaic Hebrew (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1927; repr., Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1980) 41. We therefore adopt the view that the spelling of Qumran Hebrew forms with terminal heh reflect a pronunciation which stems...
from surviving archaic spellings, following F.M. Cross, The Ancient Library of Qumran (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995) 175-76, E.Y. Kutscher, Language and Linguistic Background, 438-39, and D. Talshir, "Habitat and History," 265. This stands against the Massoretic spelling that reflects a system of orthography based on the ‘proto-Rabbinic’ vernacular. The latter, as noted by Cross (see F.M. Cross, Ancient Library, 176, and "Some Notes," 4-5), was edited back towards the former by the Massoretes who applied, in most situations, vowel points that retained the pronunciation of long endings. See further B.K. Waltke and M. O'Connor, An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1990) 302, esp. note 46, and R. Steiner, "From Proto-Hebrew to Mishnaic Hebrew: The History of יקוק and הָכַּס," Hebrew Annual Review 3 (1979). Incidentally, it must be said that the designation ‘Late Biblical Hebrew’ used above can be either chronologically or stylistically defined, for which see I. Young, R. Rezetko, and M. Ehrensvaerd, Linguistic Dating of Biblical Texts: An Introduction to Approaches and Problems (Bible World 28; 2 vols.; London: Equinox, 2008).

767 This variation reflects different forms of a cardinal number in construct. By far the most common writing of the numeral ‘twelve’ in the MT is עשרים (occurring over 60 times) though the form עשר does occur twice (in Joshua 3:12 and 1 Kings 7:25).

768 The pronominal object suffix in MT seems to refer to the valley: וַיֶּהֶשֶׁ֥ת נַחֲל אֶשְׁקָל וַיַּעַמֵּ֥ד אֵֽהוָּדָ֥ה, “… and they came to the valley Eshkol, and they explored it.” In contrast 1QDeut arguably makes the object of the verb “the land”: אֶשְׁקָל [רֵדְוַנְו] אֶֽהוֹדָה, [… Eshko], [and they explored the land].”

769 The verb נָעָשָׁה, “to go out,” is written as imperfect (probably durative) in 1QDeut against the perfect in MT Deut 9:28.
| Q11 | MT Deut 13:4 | הָעַלְמָה | 1QDeut\textsuperscript{a} 7-8 3 | SV(1) – Difference in number.\textsuperscript{770} |
| Q12 | MT Deut 13:4 | אַרְשָׁאָה | 1QDeut\textsuperscript{a} 7-8 3 | OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.\textsuperscript{771} |
| Q13 | MT Deut 13:5 | אַרְשׁוֹבָּה | 1QDeut\textsuperscript{a} 9 2 | OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation. |

\textsuperscript{770} The verb is plural in 1QDeut\textsuperscript{a} against the singular in MT. 1QDeut\textsuperscript{a} agrees with LXX here and perhaps reflects a consistency of addressee in this section of the text. The phenomenon of \textit{Numeruswechsel} is well known in Deuteronomy so an exhaustive taxonomy of the relevant literature is impractical in the present context. In general see N. Lohfink, \textit{Das Hauptgebot: Eine Untersuchung literarische Einleitungsfragen zu Dtn 5-11} (Analecta Biblica 20; Rome: E Pontifico Instituto Biblico, 1963) 239-58. A worthwhile review of the literature until 1962 is found in G. Minette de Tillesse, "Sections 'tu' et sections 'vous' dans le Deutéronome," \textit{VT} 12, 1 (1962) 29-34, and see also C. Begg, "The Significance of the Numeruswechsel in Deuteronomy: The 'Pre-History' of the Question," \textit{Ephemerides Theologicae Louvianenses} 55 (1979). Several dissertations on the topic are also worth mentioning, namely C. Begg, \textit{Contributions to the Elucidation of the Composition of Deuteronomy with Special Attention to the Significance of Numeruswechsel} (Louvain University Ph.D. Dissertation: 1978); W.R. Higgs, \textit{A Stylistic Analysis of the Numeruswechsel Sections of Deuteronomy} (Southern Baptist Theological Seminary Ph.D. Dissertation: 1982); and Y. Suzuki, \textit{The 'Numeruswechsel' Sections of Deuteronomy} (Claremont Graduate School Ph.D. Dissertation: 1982).

\textsuperscript{771} See the discussion in note above. The long form in 1QDeut\textsuperscript{a} is typical of Qumran Hebrew, perhaps reflecting a preserved archaic ending from Proto-Semitic which is attested in Ugaritic. See D. Sivan, "The Contribution of the Akkadian Texts From Ugarit to Ugaritic and to Biblical Hebrew Grammar," \textit{Leshonenu} 47 (1983) 182 [Hebrew], for the reading of the Ugaritic pronoun “ú-PI” as “huwa.” See also E. Qimron, \textit{Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls}, 57 n. 56, and S. Morag, "Qumran Hebrew," 156-57, for the same suggestion. E.Y. Kutscher, \textit{Language and Linguistic Background}, 436-40, raises four possibilities and finally settles for one of two explanations: either the long forms of the 3ms and 3fs independent pronouns in Qumran Hebrew represent the preserved archaic ending with /a/, evident in Akkadian as /u/ and in Ugaritic and Phoenician as /v/; or these pronouns represent a long vowel that is appended on analogy with the 3mpl and 3fpl independent pronouns. According to Kutscher both arguments have their own merits and pitfalls that make deciding between the two options a matter of opinion. According to W.R. Garr, \textit{Dialect Geography of Syria-Palestine, 1000-586 B.C.E.} (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1985) 80-81, among first millennium Palestinian dialects only Old Byblian preserves a final vowel on the 3ms independent pronoun, and this dialect also shows a form of the same pronoun with final /u/ as found in Phoenician. 3ms and 3fs independent pronouns with final /a/ and /u/ also appear in Ugaritic, for which see S. Segert, \textit{A Basic Grammar of the Ugaritic Language: With Selected Texts and Glossary} (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985) 47. This may support Kutscher’s first possibility that the ending in Qumran Hebrew is related to an archaic form of the pronoun.
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The form in 1QDeut⁶ preserves paragogic nun. This occurs only on the last verb in the clause in MT. 4QDeut⁶ (Q598 below) and the SP also retain paragogic nun for this verb, with the SP preserving this ending also in the following verb יִמְנְא. The form in Biblical Hebrew is generally considered to be a genuine archaic form, a deliberate archaisms, a result of Aramaic influence or due to concerns of metre – see P. Joüon and T. Muraoka, A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew (Subsidia Biblica 14/1 Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1993) 137. In the case of the Qumran biblical scrolls the same explanations may apply. It is possible that the influence of Aramaic as a spoken language encouraged the use of the archaic verbal afformative -י particularly when proximate to instances of the same form as is the case in Deut 13:5. Similarly, the influence of Aramaic on the 2fs perfect afformative in Samaritan Hebrew has been conjectured by Z. Ben-Hayyim, A Grammar of Samaritan Hebrew (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 2000) 103-4, where the archaic afformative י- was preserved in Samaritan Hebrew due to its similarity to the afformative in the vernacular Aramaic (see also E.Y. Kutscher, Language and Linguistic Background, 25-27). Indeed, E.Y. Kutscher, Language and Linguistic Background, 193, seems to view the Qumran Hebrew forms with afformative י- as influenced by Aramaic. According to J. Hoftijzer, The Function and Use of the Imperfect Forms with Nun Paragogicum in Classical Hebrew (Studia Semitica Nederlandica 21 Nederlands: Van Gorcum, 1985) and B.K. Walke and M. O’Connor, Biblical Hebrew Syntax, 516-17, in Biblical Hebrew the verb form with paragogic nun may be a mark of what is termed ‘contrastivity,’ which occurs infrequently depending on style and syntax, and indicates that a particular action is unexpected in relation to the rest of the narrative or contrary to the wishes of one or more protagonists. This explanation has been criticised more recently by S.A. Kaufman, "Paragogic nun in Biblical Hebrew: Hypercorrection as a Clue to a Lost Scribal Practice," Solving Riddles and Untying Knots: Biblical, Epigraphic, and Semitic Studies in Honor of Jonas C. Greenfield (eds Z. Zevit, S. Gitin, and M. Sokoloff; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1995), who sees the use of paragogic nun in Biblical Hebrew as based on phonological rather than morphosyntactic principles. See also T. Zewi, A Syntactic Study of Verbal Forms Affixed by -n(n) Endings in Classical Arabic, Biblical Hebrew, El-Amarna Akkadian and Ugaritic (Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 1999) 72-73, for a critique of Hoftijzer’s position. Alternatively V. de Caën, "Moveable Nun in Biblical Hebrew: Verbal Nunation in Joel and Job," Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages 29, 1 (2003) sees paragogic nun in Biblical Hebrew as a function of disjunctive accents (pausal forms) and nuanced prosaic phraseology that introduces disjunction between verb and subject, or verb and object, in certain phono-syntactic situations. For de Caën the affirmative nun is a function of Hebrew grammar rather than a product of cross-linguistic influence, such as from Aramaic. “Indeed, the frequency of nunation is inversely correlated with the degree of Aramaic influence on BH” (V. de Caën, "Moveable Nun," 125, italics in original). While this view may a priori explain the writing of paragogic nun in Qumran Hebrew in a strictly grammatical sense, it remains the assessment of this study, following T. Zewi, Verbal Forms Affixed by -n(n), 187-88, that the affirmative nun on 2mpl and 3mpl imperfect indicative verbs represents an archaic form that entered Hebrew and Aramaic from an older linguistic stratum, visible in Amarna Canaanite and Ugaritic as described in A.F. Rainey, "The Ancient Hebrew Prefix Conjugation in the Light of Amarnah Canaanite," Hebrew Studies 27 (1986) 7 – but see his remarks on Hebrew as a strictly Tranjordanian language in "Inside, Outside: Where Did the Early Israelites Come From?," BAR 34, 6 (2008) – and in this respect is properly considered part of the prosaic morphology available to the scribe to be employed as a matter of linguistic style that directly
affected pronunciation. Perhaps, as proposed by W.R. Garr, "Paragogic Nun in Rhetorical Perspective," *Biblical Hebrew in its Northwest Semitic Setting: Typological and Historical Perspectives* (eds S.E. Fassberg and A. Hurvitz; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2006) 74, paragogic *nun* marks a ‘rhetorical satellite,’ an indication that the containing clause embellishes rather than grounds the discourse. However the use of verbs with paragogic *nun* is by no means mandated by rhetorical context. The occurrences of such textual variants in this study are therefore classified as linguistic variation.

773 The preserved text in 1QDeut\* suggests that the line is arranged differently to MT. The clause in MT is: בְּקִרְבּוֹתָ֖הוּ יְהוָ֣ה אֱלֹהֶ֑יךָ נָאִ֛ים תִּשְׁמְר֥וּ תְּר֖וּמָה, “After YHWH your god you shall walk, and you shall fear him, and you shall keep his commandments, and you shall listen to his voice, and you shall serve him, and you shall cleave to him.” Although the line is fragmentary in 1QDeut\*, the arrangement of the clause is clearly different: נָאִ֖ים תִּשְׁמְר֥וּ תְּר֖וּמָה, “... your god you shall walk, and you shall serve him.” With only this fragmentary line of 1QDeut\* remaining it is impossible to know if the rest of the verse as it is in MT appeared here, albeit in a different order, or if the verse was abbreviated in this manuscript.

774 1QDeut\* can probably be restored נָאִ֖ים תִּשְׁמְר֥וּ תְּר֖וּמָה, “and you shall keep his commandments,” which amounts to a rearrangement of the text as it is represented in MT. As noted above (see note ) the fragmentary state of the text only allows reading a variation of type SV(2).

775 See note above for a discussion of this variant type. The same note should be referred to for all subsequent occurrences of the long form of the 3ms independent pronoun, and more generally note above should be referred to for all subsequent occurrences of the long forms of the 3pl and 2pl independent pronouns.

776 The form in 1QDeut\* appears to be grammatically incorrect as the article appears on the first term in a construct chain. The phrase in MT is: הַיְלֵֽדֶן הַשְּׁלֹשִׁים הַלַּאֹנָשׁ, “the dreamer of the dream.” It is possible that the phrase in 1QDeut\* lacked the *nomens rectum* and can be restored הַיְלֵֽדֶן הַשְּׁלֹשִׁים הַלַּאֹנָשׁ.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qn.</th>
<th>MT Deut 13:6</th>
<th>מַכָּרַם</th>
<th>OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.(^{777})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q20</td>
<td>MT Deut 13:13</td>
<td>יָדָר</td>
<td>OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q21</td>
<td>MT Deut 13:14</td>
<td>יָרָה</td>
<td>OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q22</td>
<td>MT Deut 14:21</td>
<td>מַכָּרַם</td>
<td>OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q23</td>
<td>MT Deut 14:23</td>
<td>שָׁאוֹר</td>
<td>OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q24</td>
<td>MT Deut 14:24</td>
<td>לָשֶׁת</td>
<td>OV(l) – Difference in grammatical form.(^{779})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q25</td>
<td>MT Deut 14:24</td>
<td>שָׁאוֹר</td>
<td>OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q26</td>
<td>MT Deut 14:25</td>
<td>שָׁאוֹר</td>
<td>OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q27</td>
<td>MT Deut 16:4</td>
<td>לָשֶׁת</td>
<td>OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{777}\) See note above for a discussion of this variant type. The same note should be referred to for all subsequent occurrences of the long forms of the pronominal suffixes.

\(^{778}\) Exodus 23:19 contains the same dietary law as Deut 14:21: "you shall not boil a kid in its mother’s milk.” In Exod 23:19 of the SP we find the addition because doing this is like a lowly (or forgotten?) sacrifice, and it is an outrage to the god of Jacob.” 1QDeut\(^{a}\) may reflect the same textual tration that produced SP Exod 23:19, but the writing of ב instead of כ is difficult to explain in this context. Alternatively 1QDeut\(^{a}\) may have a gloss, possibly "together,” as is read in Tg. Ps.-J.: “... that you are not able to carry it.” MT has a different phrasing with the infinitive construct and lacking the preposition: מַכָּרַם, “... that you are not capable (of) carrying it.”
1QDeut\(^a\) 13 1

| Q28   | MT Deut 16:6 | אַלְכַּדְךְ | 1QDeut\(^a\) 14 1 | אַלְכַּדְךְ

Pronunciation.

| Q29   | MT Deut 16:6 | סְפַּר | 1QDeut\(^a\) 14 1 | ב

Possible difference in pronunciation.

Possible difference in pronunciation. 1QDeut\(^a\) clarifies the object of the verb הָעַב, “to choose.”

1QDeut\(^a\) reads: הָעַב הַכַּדְךְ אל כַּדְךְ הַלוֹכְדּוֹת, “[the place which] YHYH your god will choose.”

MT lacks the emphatic preposition plus pronominal object suffix here however does have the same phrase with the preposition plus pronominal suffix in Deut 12:18, 14:25, 16:7, 17:8 and 17:15.

---

\(^{780}\)
### Q30
MT Deut 16:7
1QDeut\(^a\) 14 2

**OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.**\(^781\)

### Q31
MT Deut 15:14
1QDeut\(^b\) 5 1

**SV(1) – Interchange of divine titles.**

---

\(^781\) According to E.Y. Kutscher, *Language and Linguistic Background*, 45-48, the affirmative \(\text{הָשַׁלֵּחַ} - \) on the 2ms perfect verb and the long form of the 2ms pronoun \(\text{הָשַׁלְתָּה} - \) are considered to be preserved archaic pronunciations. These forms pertain to a high register of the language used in liturgical scriptural readings, called ‘standard’ vocalisation by Kutscher. The longer pronunciations stand against the short 2ms perfective verbal affirmative \(\text{הָשַׁלֵּח} - \) (\(\text{הָשַׁלְתָּה} - \)) and the short pronominal suffix \(\text{הָשַׁלְתָּה} - \). These forms were common to Mishnaic Hebrew and were part of a ‘substandard’ vocalisation or lower register. Evidence for the different social uses for Biblical and Mishnaic Hebrew can be found in the early first millennium rabbinic sources, for which see M.H. Segal, *Grammar*, 2-5. It is the full spelling of these forms in Qumran Hebrew that Cross identifies as ‘baroque’ orthography which was “devised as an attempt to preserve archaic elevated or poetic speech, lost in vernacular or prosaic Hebrew” (F.M. Cross, "Some Notes," 4). For Kutscher “these two types of Hebrew existed side by side in the ancient Jewish communities,” (Language and Linguistic Background, 46), whereas for Cross the “baroque” orthography is “devised” and often “artificial” ("Some Notes," 4). The process of linguistic change in the biblical text can be seen as two-fold, as has been summarised by E. Qimron, "Observations on the History of Early Hebrew (1000 B.C.E.-200 C.E.) in the Light of the Dead Sea Documents," *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research* (eds D. Dimant and U. Rappaport; STDJ 10 Leiden: Brill, 1992) 350-51: “during the Second Temple period, attempts are said to have been made to write BH, but these were influenced by the spoken language, a type of MH; and at a later period, scribes who copied texts written in MH are said to have changed them to bring them more into line with BH.” The sociological role of this orthography has been described by W.M. Schniedewind, "Qumran Hebrew as an Antilanguage," *JBL* 118, 2 (1999) 248, who suggests long Qumran Hebrew forms are not “a peculiar dialect,” but rather a deliberate attempt to “mark off the sectarian texts from other Jewish literature in their [the sectarians’] library.” The long pronominal and verbal forms are therefore seen as markers of an “antilanguage created by conscious linguistic choices intended to set the speakers and their language apart from others” ("Qumran Hebrew," 235). In "Why Did the Qumran Community Write in Hebrew?" *JAOS* 119, 1 (1999) 45, S. Weitzman goes a step further, seeing the Qumran community’s use of Hebrew in general, and Qumran Hebrew in particular, as a way to affirm “through the avoidance of other ‘mundane’ languages ... its identity as a transcendent community, a symbolic gesture of its eternally valid status in a world of competing ideologies and languages.” Each of these scholarly positions, while subtly different, all consider that the long orthographic forms of pronouns and verbal affixes were, on some level, reflective of a particular vocalisation of the text. Whether the morphology underlying these forms is archaic (Kutscher) or archaising (Cross), and to what extent this reflects a socio-linguistic response to a contemporary political situation (Schniedewind and Weitzman), is debatable. Even so, this study’s categorisation of long pronominal and verbal forms as ‘possible differences in pronunciation’ is appropriate.
| Q32 | MT Deut 15:15 | omits לָשׁוֹת | SV(2) – 1QDeut\(^b\) has an expanded phrase that includes the infinitive construct \(nēṣā\) “to do.” \(^{782}\) |
| Q33 | MT Deut 24:14 | מַשְׂכֵּר | Not Counted – The reading in 1QDeut\(^b\) is not certain. \(^{783}\) |
| Q34 | MT Deut 24:16 | יָוֵית | SV(1) – Difference in number. \(^{784}\) |
| Q35 | MT Deut 29:10 | מְסַכֵּם | SV(1) – The MT lacks the conjunction. |
| Q36 | MT Deut 29:14 | מְסַכֵּם | OV(1) – Possible difference in pronunciation. \(^{785}\) |
| Q37 | MT Deut 31:1 | רְאוֹלָה יִרְבָּר | SV(2) – 1QDeut\(^b\) has an expanded or clarified syntax that includes a finite verb plus infinitive construct. \(^{786}\) |

---

\(^{782}\) The phrase in 1QDeut\(^b\) is restored: "therefore I am commanding you to do this thing today." While MT lacks the final infinitive construct, it is common to the LXX which has \(ποιεῖν\), and Tg. Ps.-J. which has \(rē♭\), both meaning “to do.” The phrase also appears in Deut 24:18 and 22 of the MT.

\(^{783}\) See D. Barthelemy and J.T. Milik, *Qumran Cave 1*, pl. X, where the left side of the sign is totally lacking. Although reading the vertical stroke as the top stroke of \(hē\) is ruled out, its restoration as \(taw\) is hardly certain.

\(^{784}\) The singular verb in 1QDeut\(^b\) may indicate a singular subject, though none of the versions attest such a reading. It is possible that this is a case of metathesis of the consonants \(waw\) and \(taw\). In light of Rule 1 the form in 1QDeut\(^b\) is read as a Qal 3ms imperfect verb, “he will die,” against the Hoph'al 3mpl imperfect, “they will be put to death,” in MT. The variant actually reflects two differences, firstly in grammatical number of the subject, and secondly in the interchange of causative and active lexemes. However, in light of Rule 3 only one variant may be counted.

\(^{785}\) See E. Qimron, *Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 27-28, where the form in 1QDeut\(^b\) is read as enclitic mem affixed to a word ending in an open syllable. The distinction between \(waw\) and \(yod\) is not clear in this script.

\(^{786}\) The construction of finite verb plus infinitive in 1QDeut\(^b\) is reflected in the LXX: \(καὶ συνετέλεσεν Ἰωνης λαλῶν πάντας τοὺς λόγους\), “And Moses finished speaking all of the words,” (see also MT Deut 32:45).
| Q38 | MT Deut 31:1 | omits | SV(2) – 1QDeut\(^b\) clarifies the ject with the addition of the adjective "all."\(^{787}\) |
| Q39 | MT Deut 31:5 | לָטְנִי | SV(1) – Difference in number.\(^{788}\) |
| Q40 | MT Deut 32:26 | לָטְנִי | OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.\(^{789}\) |
| Q41 | MT Deut 32:27 | יָרְדֶה | SV(1) – Interchange of divine titles. |
| Q42 | MT Deut 33:17 | יָרְדֶה | SV(2) – 1QDeut\(^b\) lacks the possessive pronominal suffix.\(^{790}\) |
| Q43 | MT Exod 1:12 | יָרְדֶה | SV(1) – Difference in number.\(^{791}\) |
| Q44 | MT Exod 1:12 | יָרְדֶה | SV(1) – Lexical interchange.\(^{792}\) |

---

\(^{787}\) See note above, where the LXX agrees with 1QDeut\(^b\) in the use of the adjective παντας, “all.”

\(^{788}\) 1QDeut\(^b\) consistently has Moses addressing the people with the 2ms pronominal suffix, whereas the MT changes from singular address in Deut 31:1-4, to plural in Deut 31:5-6a, and back to singular in Deut 31:6b.

\(^{789}\) The long cohortative form of the High'il verb נָשְׂבֶּה, “remove, conclude,” is written without the afformative (paragogic) heh in 1QDeut\(^b\). Alternatively this may indicate that the verb should be read as future indicative, נָשְׂבֶּה, “I will remove (them),” rather than the cohortative נָשְׂבֶּה, “let me remove (them).” In light of Rule 4 the forms are read as grammatically equivalent.

\(^{790}\) The possessive pronominal suffix clarifies the object, שְׂבָרָה, “his bull.” Both the LXX and the SP lack the pronoun.

\(^{791}\) The difference appears to be in the treatment of the קְרָא יָרְדֶה as a collective singular or a plural noun, or the similar treatment of the noun בֵּן which occurs in construct with the phrase קְרָא יָרְדֶה in verse 9. The LXX, Tg. Onq. and Tg. Ps.-J. agree with 2QExod\(^a\).

\(^{792}\) 2QExod\(^a\), the LXX, Tg. Ps.-J. and Tg. Neof. have a plural verb here against the singular in the MT. The LXX may reflect קְרָא יָרְדֶה, “they kept multiplying,” in its translation πληθοῦν κρύτων κρύτη, “they grew exceedingly strong.” M. Baillet, J.T. Milik, and R. de Vaux, Les ‘Petites Grottes’ de Qumran (DJD 3; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962) 49, suggest that the lacuna in 2QExod\(^a\) may have once held the adjectival phrase קֶרְיָה יָרְדֶה, reflecting the double use of the adjective κρύτη in LXX. The Tgs. have יְרָדָה יְרָדָה, “and thus they became strong,” which generally reflects the wording of the MT (see, for example, the similar translation of יְרָדָה, “to spread, increase,” in the Tgs. at Gen 28:14; 30:43; Exod 19:22). The use of יְרָדָה in 2QExod\(^a\) may reflect harmonisation with Exod 1:7.
Q45 MT Exod 1:14 2QExod\(^a\) 1 2

MT Exod 1:14 omits ויקוקיו מארשים מטונים מארשים

SV(2) – 2QExod\(^a\) has a repeated refrain lacking in the MT.\(^{793}\)

Q46 MT Exod 9:28 2QExod\(^a\) 1 6

MT Exod 9:28 omits און

SV(2) – 2QExod\(^a\) has an additional term lacking in the MT.\(^{794}\)

Q47 MT Exod 9:29 2QExod\(^a\) 1 6

MT Exod 9:29 אלייט omits ל

SV(2) – The preposition plus pronominal suffix is lacking in 2QExod\(^a\).\(^{795}\)

Q48 MT Exod 11:3 2QExod\(^a\) 1 6

MT Exod 11:3 בשאלא

SV(1) – Lexical Interchange.\(^{796}\)

Q49 MT Exod 11:4 2QExod\(^a\) 1 6

MT Exod 11:4 אל תאריה omits כ

SV(2) – 2QExod\(^a\) clarifies the addressee of Moses’ speech, lacking in MT.\(^{797}\)

Q50 MT Exod 12:39

MT Exod 12:39 נרשה

SV(2) – 2QExod\(^a\) clarifies the ob-

---

\(^{793}\) The end of Exod 1:12, "and they felt dread before the sons of Israel," is perhaps repeated at the end of verse 14 in 2QExod\(^a\) (see M. Baillet, J.T. Milik, and R. de Vaux, Les ‘Petites Grottes’, 49).

\(^{794}\) 2QExod\(^a\) has ירבד און, "and hail and fire," against ירבד, "and hail," in the MT. 2QExod\(^a\) is perhaps harmonised with Exod 9:24 which has the two terms together. The LXX has both terms, χαλαζαν and πυρ, in Exod 9:24 and 28.

\(^{795}\) The possibility remains that the word order is changed in 2QExod\(^a\), for which see M. Baillet, J.T. Milik, and R. de Vaux, Les ‘Petites Grottes’, 51. With the reconstruction 2QExod\(^a\) reads אלייט כ, against the MT אלייט כ. The word order of the LXX, SP and the Tgs. agree with the MT, which indicates reading 2QExod\(^a\) as omitting the preposition plus pronominal suffix is the most likely reading.

\(^{796}\) 2QExod\(^a\) seems to agree with the SP in the reading אלייט כ against the MT אלייט כ. In the context the preposition כ and the bound form of the substantive plus preposition מי can be treated as conveying synonymous meaning. In the SP the phrase אלייט כ appears in the long addition to Exod 11:3, which harmonises with the text of MT Exod 11:4-7, however there is not enough room in the lacuna to allow this additional material to be restored in 2QExod\(^a\).

\(^{797}\) The phrase in 2QExod\(^a\) is אלייט כ against the MT אלייט כ. The SP has the additional text as it appears in 2QExod\(^a\), but see note above regarding the long addition to the SP lacking in 2QExod\(^a\). The phrase in 2QExod\(^a\) may partially harmonise with the similar phrase in the following verse that appears also in MT, yet not to the extent that is preserved in the SP. Interestingly, the extended phrase is preserved in Tg. Ps.-J., which reads אלייט כ, but it does not appear in the parallel section of Tg. Neof.
| Q51 | MT Exod 12:39 | מפרשים | SV(1) – 2QExod² lacks the preposition מ, “from.” |
| Q52 | MT Exod 26:11 | תברחת | OV(1) – Possible difference in pronunciation. |
| Q53 | MT Exod 30:25 | מפרשים | SV(2) – 2QExod² has a repeated refrain lacking in the MT. |
| Q54 | MT Exod 31:16 | ל יהיה | SV(2) – The Tetragrammaton is lacking in the MT. |
| Q55 | MT Exod 19:10 | מפרשים | SV(2) – 2QExod⁶ inserts Exodus |

798 2QExod² agrees with the SP and the LXX in specifying the object of the verb with a pronoun. The phrase in 2QExod² and the SP reads: מפרשים מפרשים, in apparent agreement with the LXX εξεβαλον γαρ αυτους οι Αιγυπτιοι, but against the MT מפרשים מפרשים. See also note below for a solution to this reading in the MT.

799 With the previous variant, the MT reads מפרשים מפרשים against מפרשים מפרשים in 2QExod² and the other parallel sources. It is possible that the variant readings may be synthesised if we posit confusion over the correct word division of the two forms at some stage in the text’s transmission. In light of Rule 1 each variant is counted without the conjectural reconstruction of a theorised ‘original’ text. As such Q50 and Q51 must be considered separate textual variations.

800 2QExod² possibly harmonises this verse with Exod 30:31 which ends with the phrase "וה יתכן השם电脑 ים בַּהֲנָה" (see M. Baillet, J.T. Milik, and R. de Vaux, Les 'Petites Grottes', 52). Such an addition is not paralleled in any of the versions.

801 The addition of the Tetragrammaton in 2QExod² is also found in the Syriac but is lacking from the LXX, SP and Tgs. (see M. Baillet, J.T. Milik, and R. de Vaux, Les 'Petites Grottes', 54). The plus in 2QExod² clarifies the beneficiary YHWH in the phrase "וְהָעַמֶּדֶנָה מִן הַמְּרֹרֶת אֶלָה לְמַעֲרֹת יַהֲウェָה",” and the sons of Israel shall keep the Sabbath for Yahweh.”
2QExod\(^b\) 8 3-7

34:10 after Exodus 19:9.\(^{802}\)

Q56 MT Exod 34:10

SV(2) – 2QExod\(^b\) clarifies the speaker and addressee, lacking in the MT.\(^{803}\)

Q57 MT Exod 34:10

OV(1) – Possible difference in pronunciation.

Q58 MT Exod 34:10

SV(1) – Lexical interchange.

Q59 MT Lev 11:26

SV(3) – 2QpaleoLev has a different word order to the MT.\(^{804}\)

Q60 MT Num 33:52

OV(1) – Possible difference in pronunciation.

Q61 MT Num 33:52

SV(2) – 2QNum\(^b\) lacks the adjective describing the object of the verb \(\text{יושב}, \text{“possess.”}\)

---

\(^{802}\) The excise of the large section of text comprising MT Exod 19:10 – 34:10 from 2QExod\(^b\) does not mandate the view that this scroll should be considered among the florilegia, though such a view would not be unreasonable. Already M. Baillet, J.T. Milik, and R. de Vaux, *Les ‘Petites Grottes’*, 53, noted that “... le f. 8 révélant une importante variante dans l’ordre des péricopes et le tétragramme divin étant écrit en caractères paléo-hébraïques (ff. 2, 7 et 8), on pourra se demander s’il s’agit d’un manuscript proprement biblique ou d’un simple recueil de textes ... Après des textes législatifs, suivis de l’alliance et de l’apostasie (ch. 20-33), on revient au ch. 34 à la même situation qu’en 19, avec le renouvellement de l’alliance” [... with fragment 8 revealing a significant variant to the order of the pericopes and the Tetragrammaton being written in palaeo-Hebrew characters (fragments 2, 7 and 8), one may wonder if this is a legitimate biblical text or merely a collection of texts ... After the legislative text, followed by those of covenant and apostasy (chapters 20-33), the text returns in chapter 34 to the same situation as chapter 19, with the renewal of the covenant].

\(^{803}\) The clarification is suggested by the remaining letters \(\text{א} \text{ט} \text{ים} \text{כ} \text{נ} \text{כ}\), “[r]estitution suggérée par la trace oblique qui convient à un aleph” (M. Baillet, J.T. Milik, and R. de Vaux, *Les ‘Petites Grottes’*, 55). 2QExod\(^b\) presumably reflects the reading in the LXX: \( καὶ εἶπεν κυρίος πρὸς Μωυσῆν, “And the Lord said to Moses.”

\(^{804}\) In 2QpaleoLev the arrangement of the words \(\text{סָתָם סָתָמִין סָתָמֵי}, “and (whatever) is cloven of claw,” is the reverse of the MT which reads \(\text{סָתָמֵי סָתָמִין סָתָם}, “and (the) claw is cloven.” The phrasing in 2QpaleoLev possibly harmonises with Lev 11:3, which in the MT reads \(\text{סָתָם סָתָמִין סָתָמֵי}. The LXX has the same phrasing in 11:3 and 11:26, \(οὐνομάσας οὐνομάσαν/οὐνομάζει \).
Q62 MT Num 33:52
2QNum b 6
OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.

Q63 MT Deut 1:8
2QDeut a 2
SV(1) – Difference in number.805

Q64 MT Deut 17:14
2QDeut b 3
OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.

Q65 MT Deut 10:8
2QDeut b 2
SV(1) – The MT lacks the conjunction.

Q66 MT Deut 10:10
2QDeut c 5
OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.

Q67 MT Deut 10:10
2QDeut c 5
SV(1) – The MT lacks the conjunction.806

Q68 MT Deut 10:11
2QDeut c 7
OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.

Q69 MT Gen 22:14
4QGen-Exod a 1 1
SV(1) – Interchange of divine titles.

Q70 MT Gen 35:19
4QGen-Exod a 5 3
SV(1) – Difference in gender.807

Q71 MT Gen 35:25
4QGen-Exod a 5 7
SV(1) - 4QGen-Exod a lacks the conjunction.

Q72 MT Gen 35:26
4QGen-Exod a 5 7
SV(1) - 4QGen-Exod a lacks the conjunction.

805 The subject, יְתַחֵד, is treated with a singular imperative verb יְתַחֵד in the MT, but with the plural imperative יְתַחֵד in 2QDeut a. The LXX, SP and Tgs. agree with the plural form in 2QDeut a. The pronominal suffixes that refers to the subject in the MT later in this verse is also plural, ... לָאָמָה יְתַחֵד... לָאָמָה ... לָאָמָה ... לָאָמָה ... לָאָמָה ... לָאָמָה... לָאָמָה... לָאָמָה... לָאָמָה... לָאָמָה... לָאָמָה... לָאָמָה... לָאָמָה... לָאָמָה... לָאָמָה... לָאָמָה... לָאָמָה... לָאָמָה... לָאָמָה... לָאָמָה... לָאָמָה... לָאָמָה... לָאָמָה... לָאָמָה... לָאָמָה... לָאָמָה... לָאָמָה... לָאָמָה... לָאָמָה... לָאָמָה... לָאָמָה... לָאָמָה... לָאָמָה... לָאָמָה... לָאָמָה... لָאָמָה... לָאָמָה... לָאָמָה... לָאָמָה... לָאָמָה... לָאָמָה... לָאָמָה... לָאָמָה... לָאָמָה... לָאָמָה... לָאָמָה... לָאָמָה... לָאָמָה... לָאָמָה... לָאָמָה... לָאָמָה... לָאָמָה... לָאָמָה... לָאָמָה... לָאָמָה... לָאָמָה... לָאָמָה... לָאָמָה... לָאָמָה... לָאָמָה... לָאָמָה... לָאָמָה... לָאָמָה... לָאָמָה... לָאָמָה... לָאָמָה... לָאָמָה... לָאָמָה... לָאָמָה... לָאָמָה... לָאָמָה... לָאָמָה... لָאָמָה... לָאָמָה... LXX, SP, and Tgs. agree with the plural form in 2QDeut a. The pronominal suffixes that refers to the subject in the MT later in this verse is also plural, ... לָאָמָה יְתַחֵד... לָאָמָה ... לָאָמָה ... לָאָמָה ... לָאָמָה ... לָאָמָה ... לָאָמָה ... LXX, SP, and Tgs. agree with the plural form in 2QDeut a. The pronominal suffixes that refers to the subject in the MT later in this verse is also plural, ... לָאָמָה יְתַחֵד... לָאָמָה ... לָאָמָה ... לָאָמָה ... לָאָמָה ... לָאָמָה ... לָאָמָה ... LXX, SP, and Tgs. agree with the plural form in 2QDeut a. The pronominal suffixes that refers to the subject in the MT later in this verse is also plural, ... לָאָמָה יְתַחֵד... לָאָמָה ... LXX, SP, and Tgs. agree with the plural form in 2QDeut a. The pronominal suffixes that refers to the subject in the MT later in this verse is also plural, ... לָאָמָה יְתַחֵד... LXX, SP, and Tgs. agree with the plural form in 2QDeut a. The pronominal suffixes that refers to the subject in the MT later in this verse is also plural, ... לָאָמָה יְתַחֵד... LXX, SP, and Tgs. agree with the plural form in 2QDeut a. The pronominal suffixes that refers to the subject in the MT later in this verse is also plural, ... LXX, SP, and Tgs. agree with the plural form in 2QDeut a. The pronominal suffixes that refers to the subject in the MT later in this verse is also plural, ... LXX, SP, and Tgs. agree with the plural form in 2QDeut a. The pronominal suffixes that refers to the subject in the MT later in this verse is also plural, ... LXX, SP, and Tgs. agree with the plural form in 2QDeut a. The pronominal suffixes that refers to the subject in the MT later in this verse is also plural, ... LXX, SP, and Tgs. agree with the plural form in 2QDeut a. The pronominal suffixes that refers to the subject in the MT later in this verse is also plural, ... LXX, SP, and Tgs. agree with the plural form in 2QDeut a. The pronominal suffixes that refers to the subject in the MT later in this verse is also plural, ... 

806 The Masoretic qere agrees with 4QGen-Exod a; however in light of Rule 1 this variant is considered as a difference in gender based on the consonantal text of the MT.

807 The Masoretic qere agrees with 4QGen-Exod a; however in light of Rule 1 this variant is considered as a difference in gender based on the consonantal text of the MT.
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Q73 MT Gen 35:26
 Apparel • Apparel
 4QGen-Exod<sup>4</sup> 5 8
 Apparel • Apparel
 4QGen-Exod<sup>4</sup> 5 8
 Apparel • Apparel

Q74 MT Gen 41:7
 Apparel • Apparel
 4QGen<sup>4</sup> 1 ii 13
 Apparel • Apparel
 4QGen<sup>4</sup> 1 ii 13
 Apparel • Apparel

Q75 MT Gen 41:7
 Apparel • Apparel
 4QGen<sup>4</sup> 1 ii 14
 Apparel • Apparel
 4QGen<sup>4</sup> 1 ii 14
 Apparel • Apparel

Q76 MT Gen 41:11
 Apparel • Apparel

<sup>808</sup> The MT has אֲמָלֵת מֵעֵקָב אֶתְוַר ולְדָלִי מֵרַקְבּ, “these are the sons of Jacob who was (sic) born to him.” In this phrasing the Qal masculine singular passive participle √דָלִי, “to be born,” conflicts with the plural object, בְּמַעֶקָב, “the sons of Jacob.” The grammatical problem of the MT is not found in the LXX, which has the indicative aorist middle 3pl εγενοντο, “they were born,” also reflected in the SP which has מֵרַקְבּ, “they were born.” 4QGen-Exod<sup>4</sup> is still grammatically correct but instead has an active indicative, rendering the verb as Qal 3fs perfect in the phrase מֵרַקְבּ בְּמַעֶקָב אֶתְוַר ולְדָלִי מֵרַקְבּ, “these are the sons of Jacob that she (Zilpah) bore to him.” Targum Pseudo-Jonathan, Tg. Neof., and Tg. Onq. all reflect a similar phrasing to the LXX and the SP, with the hitpael 3mpl form of the verb in the phrase מֵרַקְבּ בְּמַעֶקָב אֶתְוַר ולְדָלִי מֵרַקְבּ, “these are the sons of Jacob who were born to him.”

<sup>809</sup> Here and below (Q76) the spelling of 4QGen<sup>4</sup> seems to reflect the use of short forms of verbal affixes and pronominal suffixes where the MT preserves the long (Qumran Hebrew) forms. This appears to go against all expectations of the grammar. However, it is not mandatory that the spelling in the MT must always be in preference of short forms against the preference for long forms in the Dead Sea Scrolls biblical manuscripts. Indeed, there is no requirement for the MT to have an absolute monopoly on the shorter forms against all of the manuscripts from Qumran. It may be acceptable that some manuscripts from Qumran, such as 4QGen<sup>4</sup>, reflect the orthographic practices that became most common in the text-type from which the MT stems, and this is quite possibly what we find in evidence here. In fact, the short form of the feminine plural prefixed conjugation נֶפֶל is relatively common in the MT (appearing about 38 times) but the long form נֶפֶל is clearly preferred (appearing some 297 times). Occasionally the affirmative (ח) is dropped entirely (Jer 49:11, Ez 37:7, and before a pronominal suffix in Jer 2:19 and Job 19:15). See W. Gesenius, E. Kautzsch, and A.E. Cowley, Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar (New York: Dover Publications, 2006) 161, §60a, for these exceptional forms. Gesenius also lists Ct 1:6 as containing a feminine plural imperfect verb that lacks the expected affirmative before a pronominal suffix, but it is unclear which verb he is referring to. The only possibility is the form נֶפֶל, which in the present writer’s understanding is best read as a masculine singular form that adheres to the expected grammar.

<sup>810</sup> 4QGen<sup>4</sup> harmonises the description of the ears of grain with that of the previous verse in MT Gen 41:6 נַעֲלֵת סָלָל עָמְלָת אֱמָלָת יָרָדָה לְדָלִי, “seven ears of grain, blighted and burned.” The LXX agrees with 4QGen<sup>4</sup>, where both adjectives are found in both verses. See the discussion in E. Ulrich and F.M. Cross, Qumran Cave 4. VII: Genesis to Numbers (DJD 12; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994) 42. Cf. Q79 below.
See the comments in note 811 above. The unexpected long form in the MT against the short form in the manuscript from Qumran has been noted in E. Ulrich and F.M. Cross, *Qumran Cave 4, VII*, 42: “It is surprising to find the ה- ending in [the MT] rather than in 4QGen, since the Hebrew at Qumran used this form of the perfect tense fairly often.” As this instance indicates, as well as those similar at Q40, Q73, Q335 and Q414, we cannot be certain that documents from Qumran that preserve ‘baroque’ spellings will employ that orthographic style consistently against shorter spellings in the MT. In some cases the trend for longer Qumran spellings against the MT is reversed.

812 It is possible that 4QGen reflects the interchange of the feminine form הולדה, a *hoph*al infinitive construct from_dlw, “to bear,” with a form that was more grammatically suitable according to the scribe. According to J. Davila, "New Qumran Readings for the Joseph Story," *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid, 18-21 March, 1991* (eds L. Trebolle Barrera and L. Vegas Montaner; STDJ 11 Leiden: Brill, 1992) 169, this amounts to a "grammatical smoothing over or ... a result of a phonetic haplography with the following ה).” The former interpretation requires that the form בִּוְיָהוֹל הָלְדָּה, a 3ms *hiphil* perfect, was viewed as suiting the context: בָּיֹם הָלְדָּה אָמַר אֶל פַּרָאָו, “on the day that Pharaoh was caused to have been born (*i.e.* Pharaoh’s birthday).” We suppose here that the scribe of 4QGen failed to understand the passive verb הולדה plus accusative ה(רפ) in its original ergative sense, where the marked object (Pharaoh) actually functioned grammatically as the subject of the passive verb הולדה. In this sense the phrase ה(רפ) הולדה אָמַר אֶל פַּרָאָו could be rather literally translated “on Pharaoh’s day of being caused to be born.” This variant may be read as a grammatical difference, and may thus be counted as OV(l). However, the exchange of the transitive finite verb לְדוּת for the intransitive infinitive verb לְדוּת should properly be read as a lexical interchange given that the exchange significantly affects the syntax of the whole verse. This type of variation is possibly due to synchronic changes in the syntax of the spoken language, and is more properly considered a variant in style rather than linguistic form. On this see E.Y. Kutscher, *A History of the Hebrew Language* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1982) 82, §122, and the references there. On the object marker ה(רפ) as marking the subject of a passive verb in an ergative clause see B.K. Waltke and M. O’Connor, *Biblical Hebrew Syntax*, 178-79, and F.I. Andersen, "Passive and Ergative in Hebrew," *Near Eastern Studies in Honor of William Foxwell Albright* (ed. H. Goedicke; Baltimore: John Hopkins, 1971). Alternatively, an indefinite subject might be read here following the suggestion of P. Joüon and T. Muraoka, *Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*, 461-62, so that ה(רפ) אָמַר אֶל פַּרָאָו would be translated “on the day of (somebody’s) bearing Pharaoh.” The problem with this reading is that it fails to take full account of the passive sense of the hophal verbal form, even though the transitive sense of the verb and the proper accusative function of the object marker are maintained.
813 It is possible that 4QGen\(e\) harmonised the readings אַתִּיק, “fine, thin,” and אַתָּיק, “thin, gaunt,” throughout the narrative of Pharaoh’s dreams, also reflected in the LXX. Alternatively, 4QGen\(e\) could be restored to retain both terms and refer to the cows as יִדְרְקָן and the ears of grain as יִדְרָק (so J. Davila, "New Qumran Readings for the Joseph Story," 170). The fragmentary state of the scroll makes a definitive reading impossible. It is likely that the textual tradition from which the MT stems suffered some confusion between the two graphically similar terms (see J. Davila, "New Qumran Readings for the Joseph Story," 169).

814 See note above.

815 Cf. Q74 above. The writing of the conjunction before the adjectival phrase יִדְרָק יִדְרָק, “burned by the east (wind),” in 4QGen\(e\) suggests that the first adjective יִדְרָק was omitted erroneously by the scribe. However, a stylistic variant is counted in light of Rule 1.

816 The opinion expressed in J. Davila, "New Qumran Readings for the Joseph Story," 172, is that the lexical interchange occurred when a scribe of the tradition from which the MT stems replaced the difficult lexeme יִדְרָק, “to be destroyed, effaced,” with a more familiar term יוֹטָה, “to cut off.” All of the versions appear to follow the wording reflected in the MT, although the LXX has the 3ms indicate future passive ἐκρίβησεται, “it will be rubbed out, destroyed,” often used elsewhere in Genesis to translate יִדְרָק, “ruin, annihilate” (cf. Gen 19:13, 14, 29). The use of the passive in the LXX suggests affiliation with the niph\(’\)al form in the MT, though this is hardly conclusive.

817 The form in 4QGen\(f\) probably reflects a corruption of the phrase יחָרָה אֶלֶף, as found in MT Gen 35:16, and in Gen 35:16 and 48:7 of the SP. The article is lacking in the phrase in MT 2 Kgs 5:19 and so is proba-
Q85 MT Gen 48:7  יְהַלָּלֵה הָעֲבֹדָה שֶׁאָסַרְתָּ הַמַּעֲשֶׂה
4QGenf 1 13  בָּרְדֶּרֶךְ אֶסְתָּרָה
SV(2) – 4QGenf lacks additional narrative information. 818

Q86 MT Gen 48:7  דְָא
4QGenf 1 13  דְָא
SV(1) – Difference in gender. 819

Q87 MT Gen 48:9  סֵל אֱבִי
4QGenf 1 14  omit
SV(2) – The MT clarifies the addressee. 820

Q88 MT Gen 48:10  מִצְקַר
4QGenf 1 16  מִצְקַר
SV(1) – Difference in gender. 821

Q89 MT Gen 48:10  וְרָשָׁם לָהַו רְשֹׁם לָהַו
4QGenf 1 17  וְרָשָׁם לָהַו רְשֹׁם לָהַו
SV(3) – 4QGenf has a different word order to the MT. 822

Q90 MT Gen 1:5  יוֹם
4QGeng 1 14  יוֹם
SV(1) – Lexical interchange. 823

818 The omission from 4QGenf may have been caused through haplography (J. Davila, "New Qumran Readings for the Joseph Story," 174).
819 See note above. Here the pronoun refers to the city Bethlehem.
820 The MT reads: רָשָׁם לָהַו רְשֹׁם לָהַו. J. Davila, "New Qumran Readings for the Joseph Story," 175, calls the phrase וְרָשָׁם לָהַו in the MT an "explicating plus." As Davila notes, the additional phrase appears in all versions except some manuscripts of the LXX.
821 The form in the MT only appears here. E. Ulrich and F.M. Cross, Qumran Cave 4. VII, 55, assumes that the form in the MT is "a scribal slip," but in light of Rule 1 we read a difference in gender between the sources.
822 Targum Neofiti seems to agree with 4QGenf, although Tg. Neof. does appear to have an extra verb: וַיִּשָּׁפֵר וַיִּשָּׁפֵר וַיַּסְּפַר וַיַּסְּפַר, "and he hugged and embraced him, and he kissed him." All of the other witnesses agree with the reading in the MT.
823 4QGenf uses the abstract noun יֹמִים, "daytime," against the absolute יום in the MT, the LXX and the SP. The Tgs. have forms equivalent to יָמִים throughout in Gen 1-2:4a whenever the word refers to daytime in the abstract sense, and from this E. Ulrich and F.M. Cross, Qumran Cave 4. VII, 59, assume that 4QGenf and the Tgs. stem from the same corrupted textual predecessor. This view was first expressed in J. Davila, "New Readings for Genesis One," Of Scribes and Scrolls: Studies on the Hebrew Bible, Intertestamental Judaism, and Christian Origins (eds H.W. Attridge, J.J. Collins, and T.H. Tobin; Maryland: University Press of America, 1990) 5-6.
Q91 MT Gen 1:9
4QGen\(^g\) 1 10
מָחַת הָאֲדָמָה
SV(1) – The prepositional phrase lacks the preposition \(b\) in the MT.\(^{824}\)

Q92 MT Gen 1:14
4QGen\(^g\) 2 3
רְוִי
OV(l) – Difference in grammatical form.\(^{825}\)

Q93 MT Gen 1:22
4QGen\(^g\) 2 14
ירבד
OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.\(^{826}\)

Q94 MT Gen 1:9
4QGen\(^h\) 3
מְקַהֵל
מקהל
SV(2) – 4QGen\(^h\) has a different phrase to the MT.\(^{827}\)

\(^{824}\) The particle \(\text{txt}+\text{preposition}\) can be used adverbially when followed by the preposition \(b\), for which usage see W. Gesenius, E. Kautzsch, and A.E. Cowley, *Hebrew Grammar*, 377-78, §119c; P. Jouon and T. Muraoka, *Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*, 346-47, §103n, and B.K. Waltke and M. O’Connor, *Biblical Hebrew Syntax*, 221, 11.3.2. 4QGen\(^g\) appears to use the particle \(\text{txt}\) in this sense, perhaps harmonising with the use in Gen 1:7: יָרָדָה בִּנְיָם אֶלָּם אֲדָמָה מְקַהֵל וְתַּנְתָּהּ נָעָם מֶהָאָדָם הַדְּבָרִים. The phrase in MT Gen 1:9 regularly appears when the particle \(\text{txt}\) plus preposition precedes the noun מָחַת (Gen 1:9; 6:17; Exod 17:14; Deut 7:24; 9:14; 25:19; 29:19; 2 Kgs 14:27), but this is in contrast to other adverbial forms of the particle \(\text{txt}\) plus the preposition \(b\) preceding the preposition \(b\) (cf. Exod 20:4; Deut 4:18; 5:8; etc.). Apparently the MT reflects a usage of the phrase מָחַת that does not utilise the preposition \(b\) to give adverbial force, whereas the use of the preposition \(b\) for adverbial force when pairing the complex preposition מָחַת with other nouns is normal. The scribe of 4QGen\(^g\) apparently treated the noun מָחַת in the same way as other nouns when constructing the adverbial phrase with the complex preposition מָחַת plus preposition \(b\).

\(^{825}\) 4QGen\(^g\) appears to have an imperfect verb plus \(waw\), against the perfect verb plus \(waw\) in the MT. The force of the \(waw\), whether conjunctive or consecutive, in either source is debatable but there appears to be little problem in assuming that the \(waw\) functions as consecutive in the MT and conjunctive in 4QGen\(^g\). In this case the difference in aspect between the sources amounts to a variant of type OV(l).

\(^{826}\) The form in each source is presumed to be the jussive masculine singular of יָרָדָה, “increase” in line with Rule 4 (for this reading see J. Davila, "New Readings for Genesis One," 6). 4QGen\(^g\) preserves the long form of the jussive with additional final \(heh\), perhaps on analogy with the long Qumran Hebrew cohortative form יָרַדָה. Perhaps a better alternative is to read 4QGen\(^g\) as in agreement with the SP which also has the form with final \(heh\).

\(^{827}\) 4QGen\(^h\) has נָעָם, “gathering,” against the reading in MT Gen 1:9 מְקַהֵל, “place.” J. Davila, "New Readings for Genesis One," 9-11, presumes that the original reading in 4QGen\(^h\) was נָעָם אֶלָּם מְקַהֵל מֶהָאָדָם אֶלָּם מְקַהֵל. “And God said let the waters gather into one collection.” According to this reading the Wortbericht is continued in 4QGen\(^h\) and 4QGen\(^i\) (and reflected in the LXX) by the Tatbericht that continues the expected format of the creation account: יִרְדָּה נָעָם מְקַהֵל אֶלָּם וְתַּנְתָּהּ נָעָם מֶהָאָדָם. “And the waters were gathered from under the heavens to their gatherings and the dry land appeared.” The Tatbericht is lacking from the MT, presumably through haplography.
Q95 MT Gen 41:16 אַל הָוִּית לְעָרָיָה סְלָלָה. 4QGen\textsuperscript{1} 1 2\textsuperscript{sup} SV(2) – The negative particle is lacking in the MT\textsuperscript{828}.

Q96 MT Gen 41:24 וְהַשְׁלֵשׁ שְׁלֵשִׁים שְׁלֵשִׁים התֹּמֵךְ. 4QGen\textsuperscript{1} 2 i 2\textsuperscript{sup} SV(2) – 4QGen\textsuperscript{1} has a harmonising plus lacking in the MT\textsuperscript{829}.

Q97 MT Gen 41:30 רְכֵה 4QGen\textsuperscript{1} 3-4 2 וְרַכֶּה OV(I) – Difference in grammatical form\textsuperscript{830}.

Q98 MT Gen 41:40 בַּעֲרֹת 4QGen\textsuperscript{1} 2 ii 3 בַּעֲרֹת SV(1) – Interchange of prepositions.

Q99 MT Gen 42:19 אָחָר 4QGen\textsuperscript{1} 5 5 אָחָר SV(1) – 4QGen\textsuperscript{1} has a definite article lacking in the MT.

Q100 MT Gen 42:22 רֵינֵי רָאֹבֹן אָסָמ 4QGen\textsuperscript{1} 5 9 רֵינֵי רָאֹבֹן אָסָמ SV(3) – The order of the subject and object are reversed in 4QGen\textsuperscript{1}\textsuperscript{831}.

Q101 MT Gen 45:17 נֵשֶׁה 4QGen\textsuperscript{1} SV(2) – 4QGen\textsuperscript{1} has a possible

\textsuperscript{828} The reading in 4QGen\textsuperscript{1} is supralinear, where the negative particle precedes the passive/reflexive niphal verb form נָשִׁה, “it will be answered,” plus its direct object, כָּלָה וֹשֵׁלֶשׁ מְבָלָבָה, “the wellbeing of Pharaoh.” According to J. Davila, "New Qumran Readings for the Joseph Story," 170-171, the verb, which is passive in 4QGen\textsuperscript{1}, the LXX, the SP and the Old Latin, was read as active in the MT tradition as a result of the direct object marker. This is despite the fact that the reflexive form of the verb can indeed take a direct object, for which see W. Gesenius, E. Kautzsch, and A.E. Cowley, Hebrew Grammar, 138 and 369, §51f and 117w. Subsequently “the verb was read as a Qal form and the preposition was read as having a first person singular suffix ... This understanding of the phrase seemed to make Joseph offensively arrogant and for this reason the כָּלָה was deleted” (J. Davila, "New Qumran Readings for the Joseph Story," 171). The reading in the MT is therefore considered as a clarification and counted as variant type SV(2).

\textsuperscript{829} 4QGen\textsuperscript{1} probably can be restored: כָּלָה וֹשֵׁלֶשׁ מְבָלָבָה, “and the seven thin ears of grain swallowed,” in agreement with the LXX καὶ κατεπιοιοι οἱ επτα σταχυες οἱ λεπτοι. The use of the cardinal number harmonises the phrase with other like phrases in this pericope.

\textsuperscript{830} The verb in 4QGen\textsuperscript{1} has waw consecutive, whereas the verb in the MT has waw conjunctive. J. Davila, "New Qumran Readings for the Joseph Story," 171-72, suggests that the latter reflects later syntax, or otherwise haplography due to confusion between the graphemes yod and waw. On the former syntactic feature of later Hebrew see E.Y. Kutscher, History of the Hebrew Language, 45, §67. See also Q91 above.

\textsuperscript{831} The same order of object and subject as 4QGen\textsuperscript{1} is reflected in Tg. Ps.-J., but all other witnesses reflect the order found in the MT.
4QGen\textsuperscript{j} 9 i-10 7 \quad \text{ששׁ} \quad \text{expansive plus lacking in the MT.}\textsuperscript{832}

Q102 MT Gen 45:17 \quad \text{בַּאָו} \quad \text{SV(2) – 4QGen\textsuperscript{j} has a possible expansive plus lacking in the MT.}\textsuperscript{833}

Q103 MT Gen 1:9 \quad \text{וֹרָדָה} \quad \text{OV(l) – Possible difference in grammatical form.}\textsuperscript{834}

Q104 MT Gen 1:14 \quad \text{לֵילָה} \quad \text{SV(1) – The MT lacks the preposition ל.}

Q105 MT Gen 3:1 \quad \text{ואַה} \quad \text{SV(1) – The MT lacks the interrogative particle.}

Q106 MT Exod 1:5 \quad \text{טָבָנִים} \quad \text{HV – Difference in cardinal num-}

\textsuperscript{832} The meaning of the form \text{ששׁ} in 4QGen\textsuperscript{j} is difficult to determine, particularly as the LXX, the SP and the \text{Tgs.} all agree with the reading as it appears in the MT, which has a plural imperative verb \text{לְדֹאָה} (סָדָה), “to do.” The phrase in the MT is: \text{אמר אל אחיך אוֹ לָשׁוֹן מָלָכָא אֵלֹא מְדֻרְדְּבֵי}, “say to your brothers, ‘do this: load up your cattle.’” The reading in 4QGen\textsuperscript{j} can be restored: \text{אמר אל אחיך אוֹ לָשׁוֹן מָלָכָא אֵלֹא מְדֻרְדְּבֵי}, which suggests two possible interpretations. We may read the form \text{ששׁ} as a number, and thus translate the phrase “say to your brothers this: ‘load up a tenth of your cattle.’” Alternatively we may read \text{ששׁ} as a noun, “wealth,” and the object marker as the conjunctive particle \text{לָא}, “with,” which produces the translation “say to your brothers this: ‘load up wealth with your cattle.’” Either reading amounts to an interchange of lexemes in 4QGen\textsuperscript{j} that is not reflected in any of the other witnesses. This is taken as an expansive plus on account of the fact that the variant introduces additional information, being either a restriction on the number of cattle to be taken, or an additional object of the imperative verb \text{ששׁ}. J. Davila, “New Qumran Readings for the Joseph Story,” 173 n. 18, instead reads the form \text{ששׁ} in 4QGen\textsuperscript{j} as “clearly a scribal slip for \text{פָּרָה}... The error arose through a waw-reś confusion.” However, in light of Rule 1 the variant form in 4QGen\textsuperscript{j} is considered here to be a genuine reading.

\textsuperscript{833} The form in 4QGen\textsuperscript{j} is restored as \text{ברָדָה}, “provisions,” which finds support in some manuscripts of LXX and in the Syriac (see E. Ulrich and F.M. Cross, \textit{Qumran Cave 4. VII}, 72, and J. Davila, "New Qumran Readings for the Joseph Story," 173-74).

\textsuperscript{834} The form in 4QGen\textsuperscript{k} is either imperfect or an apocopated jussive form (without final \text{heh}). If the form in 4QGen\textsuperscript{k} is to be read as jussive it could reflect a difference in pronunciation, where the long form of the jussive in the MT “appears to have been preferred before a guttural” (P. Joüon and T. Muraoka, \textit{Grammar of Biblical Hebrew}, 208, [§79]).
The sources refer to the number of sons of Jacob in Egypt. 4QGen-Exod\(^a\) agrees with the LXX in numbering the progeny of Jacob as 75, against 70 in the MT, the SP and the Tgs. The extra five sons in 4QGen-Exod\(^a\) and the LXX could be a reference to the children and grand-children of Ephraim and Manasseh listed in Num 26:33-40. On this see A.E. Steinmann, "Jacob’s Family Goes to Egypt: Varying Portraits of Unity and Disunity in the Textual Traditions of Exodus 1:1-5," *Textual Criticism* (1997) n.p. [cited 22 June 2008]. Online: http://rosetta.reltech.org/TC/vol02/Steinmann1997.html. The number order here is reversed as compared to the LXX and also 4QExod\(^b\) 1 5 (see E. Ulrich and F.M. Cross, *Qumran Cave 4, VII*, 19, and Q122 below).

Although in the previous line of 4QGen-Exod\(^a\) the verb יָרָם, “to abhor, be disgusted,” refers to the Egyptians in the plural, the verb יָרָה, “to be bitter,” refers to them in the singular. All of the other witnesses agree with the MT in the use of the plural form in both instances.

The construct form of the cardinal in 4QGen-Exod\(^a\) suggests that the number of days here should be taken as a block:CAD הָיָהָה, “and she hid him for (a group of) three days.” This is in contrast, in terms of grammar, with the phrase in the MT and the SP:CAD הָיָהָה, “and she hid him (for) three days.” On the difference between the absolute and construct form of the cardinals see P. Jouion and T. Muraoka, *Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*, 526, §142d, and B.K. Waltke and M. O’Connor, *Biblical Hebrew Syntax*, 278. The form in 4QGen-Exod\(^a\) does not appear to be particularly suited to the construct, but for a similar form in the MT we can point to 2 Sam 24:13 where the absolute and construct forms of the cardinal appear in close proximity with little difference in meaning:CAD הָיָהָה הַשָּׁלְשָׁה נְפַךְ, ...CAD הָיָהָה הַשָּׁלְשָׁה נְפַךְ, “will you flee for three months ... and will pestilence be in your land for (a group of) three days?”

4QGen-Exod\(^a\) has the expected form of the infinitive construct of יָדָה, “to know.” According to W. Gesenius, E. Kautzsch, and A.E. Cowley, *Hebrew Grammar*, 189, §69m, the infinitive construct of primae yod roots with the feminine ending י- is rare, which raises the possibility that the form in the MT may be read as containing paragogic heh.
Q111 MT Exod 3:8
4QGen-Exod² 19 ii 2
יהוה
SV(1) – 4QGen-Exod² lacks the conjunction.

Q112 MT Exod 3:8
4QGen-Exod² 19 ii 2
יהוה והם
SV(2) – 4QGen-Exod² includes a list item lacking in the MT.

Q113 MT Exod 3:15
4QGen-Exod 19 ii 10
בְּכֵי חָיָה
SV(1) – Interchange of prepositions.

Q114 MT Exod 3:15
4QGen-Exod 19 ii 11
אֲלֵהֶיהָ נִיטָךְ
SV(1) – The MT lacks the conjunction.

Q115 MT Exod 5:8
4QGen-Exod² 22 ii, 26 9
נָבָה
SV(1) – The MT lacks the conjunction.

Q116 MT Exod 6:8
4QGen-Exod² 25 ii, 28-31 6
הָאָרֶץ אֲשֶׁר תַּעַלָּה אֵלֶּיהָ
SV(2) – 4QGen-Exod² contains a possible expansion or harmonisation.

839 On the variation of this and other lists of Canaanite nations see K.G. O’Connell, “The List of Seven Peoples in Canaan: A Fresh Analysis,” The Answers Lie Below: Essays in Honor of Lawrence Edmund Toombs (ed. H.O. Thompson; Lanham: University Press of America, 1984) 221. See also J.E. Sanderson, An Exodus Scroll From Qumran: 4QpaleoExod and the Samaritan Tradition (Harvard Semitic Studies 30; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986) 78, who suggests that “the fact that the list varies so widely ... is due to the pitfalls involved in copying a list consisting of so many names.”

840 4QGen-Exod² obviously has a different text to the MT and the other witnesses here, though the sense is lost in the lacuna. There is a strong possibility that the text was harmonised with the similar phrase in Exodus 33:1 (and also in Num 14:23, 32:11; Deut 1:35, 10:11, 31:20, 21 and 23, 34:4; Jos 1:6 and Judg 2:1), where we read the set phrase “לְאֵלֶּיהָ נִיטָךְ אֲשֶׁר תַּעַלָּה אֵלֶּיהָ לְאַרְכָּא וּלְאַרְכָּא דּוֹסְקָא וּלְאַרְכָּא לְאַרְכָּא וּלְאַרְכָּא דּוֹסְקָא,” “to the land which I promised to Abraham, to Isaac and to Jacob.” A similar phrase, though not quite as common, appears in the MT and the other witnesses here: “אָרֵץ אֲשֶׁר לָבָה אֵלֶּיהָ לְאַרְכָּא אֵלֶּיהָ אֲשֶׁר תַּעַלָּה אֵלֶּיהָ וּלְאַרְכָּא לְאַרְכָּא וּלְאַרְכָּא דּוֹסְקָא וּלְאַרְכָּא לְאַרְכָּא דּוֹסְקָא,” “to the land concerning which I raised up my hand to give it to Abraham, to Isaac and to Jacob.” The latter phrase appears with various terminations in Num 14:30, Ezek 20:28 and 42. In Tg. Neof. we find a combination of each: “לְאֵלֶּיהָ נִיטָךְ אֲשֶׁר תַּעַלָּה אֵלֶּיהָ לְאַרְכָּא אֵלֶּיהָ אֲשֶׁר תַּעַלָּה אֵלֶּיהָ וּלְאַרְכָּא לְאַרְכָּא וּלְאַרְכָּא דּוֹסְקָא וּלְאַרְכָּא לְאַרְכָּא דּוֹסְקָא,” “to the land concerning which I raised my hand, concerning which I lifted up my hand in an oath, to give it to Abraham, to Isaac and to Jacob.” On the reading of אָשֶׁר as a corruption of אָשֶׁר, “to lift up,” see M. Sokoloff, A Dictionary of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic of the Byzantine Period (Ramat-Gan: Bar Ilan University Press, 1990) 519.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>MT Reference</th>
<th>Qumran Cave 4 Reference</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q117</td>
<td>MT Exod 7:10</td>
<td>4QGen-Exod a 33 6</td>
<td>SV(1) – Interchange of prepositions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4QGen-Exod a 34-35 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q118</td>
<td>MT Exod 7:19</td>
<td>4QGen-Exod a 33 6</td>
<td>SV(1) – The MT lacks the object marker.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4QGen-Exod a 34-35 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q119</td>
<td>MT Exod 7:19</td>
<td>4QGen-Exod a 33 6</td>
<td>SV(1) – The MT lacks the object marker.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4QGen-Exod a 34-35 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Q120     | MT Exod 1:1  | 4QExod b 1 3            | SV(2) – 4QExod b has an explicating plus. 
|          |              |                        | 841   |
| Q121     | MT Exod 1:3  | 4QExod b 1 4            | SV(2) – 4QExod b has a possible harmonisation lacking in the MT. 
|          |              |                        | 842   |
| Q122     | MT Exod 1:5  | 4QExod b 1 5            | HV – Difference in cardinal number.  
|          |              |                        | 843   |
| Q123     | MT Exod 1:5  | 4QExod b 1 5            | SV(2) – The clause in the MT is lacking in 4QExod b.  
|          |              |                        | 844   |
| Q124     | MT Exod 1:16 |                        | SV(2) – Difference in expres- |

---

841 So described in E. Ulrich and F.M. Cross, *Qumran Cave 4. VII*, 85. The addition in 4QExod b adds the description בִּיסגְשׁוֹ, “their father,” to the name of Jacob. This agrees with the LXX which reads Ἰακώβ τον πατέρα αὐτῶν, “Jacob their father.”

842 The mention of Joseph in 4QExod b may have harmonised with the mention of his death in Exod 1:6. In 4QExod b the mention of Joseph in Exod 1:5 is redundant, for which see Q123 and note below, and also A.E. Steinmann, "Jacob's Family Goes to Egypt."

843 See Q106 and the comments in note above.

844 The clause is misplaced in the LXX as compared to the MT and the Tgs. That it is lacking in 4QExod b entirely has given rise to the suggestion that there exist two different textual traditions for this verse: the former, represented by 4QExod b, and the latter by the MT, with the LXX assumed to be corrupt (see E. Ulrich and F.M. Cross, *Qumran Cave 4. VII*, 85).
Q125 4QExod\textsuperscript{b} 2 2 omits ההנה\textsuperscript{845} SV(2) – 4QExod\textsuperscript{b} has an explicating plus.\textsuperscript{846}

Q126 MT Exod 1:19, 2 4 מִצְבָּה\textsuperscript{845} סי离子 OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.

Q127 MT Exod 2:3, 2 6 תְּמוֹאָמָה לְפָסְחָה מִלְּכָּה\textsuperscript{845} omits SV(2) – 4QExod\textsuperscript{b} has an explicating plus.\textsuperscript{847}

Q128 MT Exod 2:3, 3 i-4 2 אֹתוֹ\textsuperscript{845} omits SV(2) – 4QExod\textsuperscript{b} has an explicating plus.\textsuperscript{848}

Q129 MT Exod 2:4, 3 i-4 3 לִדְתָּה\textsuperscript{845} OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.\textsuperscript{849}

Q130 MT Exod 2:6, 3 i-4 5 וְזָרְדוֹתָה\textsuperscript{845} SV(2) – 4QExod\textsuperscript{b} lacks the cataphoric pronominal object suffix.

Q131 MT Exod 2:6, 3 i-4 5 בַּה מִרְפָּה\textsuperscript{845} omits SV(2) – 4QExod\textsuperscript{b} clarifies the subject of the verb יָכָל, “to have compassion.”\textsuperscript{850}

\textsuperscript{845} The form of the verb in the MT is יָלְדָה, read as Qal 3fs perfect plus waw consecutive, “be alive.” The clause in the MT is וַאֲמַסְתָּהּ וּלְפָשַׁח, “and if she is a daughter, then she will live.” The verb in 4QExod\textsuperscript{b} is restored יָלְדָה, and if read with the LXX περιποιεῖται (2pl present middle imperative), is Pi’el 2fpl imperative of the same root. 4QExod\textsuperscript{b} therefore has a different reading: יָלְדָה וּלְפָשַׁח, “and if she is a daughter, you will preserve (her).” This is a rephrasing of the text.

\textsuperscript{846} The object of the verb is clarified in 4QExod\textsuperscript{b} with the addition of an adjective: מִצְרִיִּי, “Hebrew midwives.” The addition in 4QExod\textsuperscript{b} harmonises this phrase with those in Exodus 1:15 and 16.

\textsuperscript{847} In the MT narrative, the infant Moses is deposited in the river by his mother: וַיִּפְגָּשֶׁהָ בְּאֶיֶן הָרְכוֹזִים הָהָוָה, “and she put (it) in the reeds upon the bank of the river.” 4QExod\textsuperscript{b} is restored to suggest that it was the maidservant of the mother of Moses: וַיִּפְגָּשֶׁהָ בְּאֶיֶן הָרְכוֹזִים הָהָוָה, “and she said to her maidservant, ‘Go,’ and she put it in the reeds upon the bank of the river.” The longer text of 4QExod\textsuperscript{b} is not reflected in any of the other witnesses.

\textsuperscript{848} See note above. The object marker plus pronominal suffix clarifies the object of the (restored) verb מָלַסָה, “and she put.”

\textsuperscript{849} The form in 4QExod\textsuperscript{b} is restored לִדְתָּה. See Q109 and note above.

\textsuperscript{850} 4QExod\textsuperscript{b} agrees with the LXX which reads: καὶ ἐφεισατο αὐτὸν ἡ θεγατήρ Φαραώ, “and the daughter of Pharaoh has compassion on it.”
Q132 MT Exod 2:7  
4QExod\(b\) 3 i-4 6  
_balance[347]_

Q133 MT Exod 2:11  
4QExod\(b\) 3 i-4 12  
_balance[347]_

Q134 MT Exod 2:13  
4QExod\(b\) 3 i-4 14  
_balance[347]_

Q135 MT Exod 2:13  
4QExod\(b\) 3 i-4 15  
_balance[347]_

Q136 MT Exod 2:14  
4QExod\(b\) 3 i-4 15  
_balance[347]_

Q137 MT Exod 2:14  
4QExod\(b\) 3 i-4 15  
_balance[347]_

Q138 MT Exod 2:14  
4QExod\(b\) 3 i-4 16  
_balance[347]_

851 The form of √qny, “to suck,” in 4QExod\(b\) is Hiph‘il 3fs perfect against Hiph‘il 3fs imperfect plus waw consecutive in the MT. Both the SP and the Tgs. agree with the MT in the form of the verb.
852 The additional adjective in 4QExod\(b\) may well be secondary in “anticipation of the same expression in 2:23” (E. Ulrich and F.M. Cross, *Qumran Cave 4. VII*, 89). The phrase in 4QExod\(b\), יוהי תומי תראות חמה, seems to reflect the LXX εγενετο δε εν ταις ημεραις ταις πολλαις, “and it came to pass in those many days.”
853 An extra verb drives the narrative in 4QExod\(b\), which is restored: מיהא יוהי על אמהים בלעדיים ונסים, “and he saw, and behold, two Hebrew men were fighting.” The verb מיהא, “to see,” is lacking in all of the other witnesses. The occurrence here is difficult as the phrase only appears elsewhere in Exodus in 3:2 in reference to the burning bush, and a total of eight times in Genesis.
854 The preposition l plus dative pronominal suffix in 4QExod\(b\) clarifies the character (Moses) to whom the statement is directed: יוהי יוהי על ממי ספק של השפטים עליך, “who made you a ruler and for a judge over us?” The reading in 4QExod\(b\) is found also in some Greek manuscripts and in the Peshitta (see E. Ulrich and F.M. Cross, *Qumran Cave 4. VII*, 89).
855 The reading in 4QExod\(b\) agrees with the SP but is considered secondary in E. Ulrich and F.M. Cross, *Qumran Cave 4. VII*, 89.
856 On the unusual form of the adverb מאני, “very,” with final heh see E. Qimron, *Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 69 and 117. The final heh is considered locative in origin but retains no syntactic function in Qumran Hebrew.
Q139 MT Exod 2:16 omits רַשְׁפָּתיות 4QExod b 3 i-4 18 SV(2) – 4QExod b has an expansive plus. 857

Q140 MT Exod 2:16 omits אֲנָא 4QExod b 3 i-4 19 SV(1) – The MT lacks the object marker.

Q141 MT Exod 3:13 לִים 4QExod b 3 ii, 5-6 i 1 SV(1) – Interchange of prepositions. 858

Q142 MT Exod 3:15 נוּר אֶלְעָה 4QExod b 3 ii, 5-6 i 4 אַלָּדוֹת דּוֹר OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation. 859

Q143 MT Exod 3:15 יִצָּחֵק 4QExod b 3 ii, 5-6 i 5 שֶׁשֶׁמֶךָ OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.

Q144 MT Exod 3:16 אָסָפוּת 4QExod b 3 ii, 5-6 i 6 אָסָפוּת OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.

Q145 MT Exod 3:16 omits בֵּין 4QExod b 3 ii, 5-6 i 6 SV(2) – The MT lacks the masculine plural construct noun יִבְנֵי, "sons." 861

857 The feminine plural participle in 4QExod b describes the daughters of the “Priest of Midian.” The phrase is restored as רַשְׁפָּתיות, “seven daughters (who were) shepherds,” and agrees with the feminine plural present participle in the LXX ποιμαινονται, “shepherds.”

858 The form in 4QExod b is restored מָלוּם.

859 The adverbial particle דַּעְדַּע, “further,” follows the verb directly in the MT and most other witnesses, but in 4QExod b and some Greek manuscripts the subject of the verb מָלוּם interrupts the sequence. The syntax in MT Exod 3:15 is more common, appearing about 12 times in the Pentateuch where the adverb stands directly between the verb and its object. This is against four occurrences in the MT where the adverb stands after the verb and its object. One instance of this unusual syntax occurs in Exod 4:6, which, due to its proximity to the current verse, may be the exemplar towards which the scribe of 4QExod b harmonised the present passage. Note, however, that there seems to be little difference between the uses of each syntax, as is demonstrated in Gen 37:9 where both arrangements of verb, object and adverb occur in the very same verse: דַּעְדַּע מָלוּם וַיֹּאמֶר, "and he dreamed again another dream, and he recounted it to his brothers, and he said, ‘behold, I have again dreamed a dream.’"

860 The MT has the spelling יִצָּחֵק 108 times, used consistently 98 times in the Pentateuch. In contrast the spelling שֶׁשֶׁמֶךָ occurs only four times in the MT, in Jer 33:26, Amos 7:9 and 7:16, and Ps 105:9. See also Q148 below.
| Q146 | MT Exod 3:16 | אוּמֶרֶה | OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.  
4QExod⁶ 3 ii, 5-6 i 6 | | 862 |
| Q147 | MT Exod 3:16 | אוּלְמִּיָּו | SV(2) – The MT lacks the resumptive proper noun in construct | 4QExod⁶ 3 ii, 5-6 i 7 | 863 |
| Q148 | MT Exod 3:16 | בֵּיה | OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation. 4QExodb 3 ii, 5-6 i 7 | | |
| Q149 | MT Exod 3:16 | יִפְסָכְי | SV(2) – The MT lacks the resumptive proper noun in construct | 4QExod⁶ 3 ii, 5-6 i 7 | 864 |
| Q150 | MT Exod 3:17 | הָוָאִי | SV(1) – 4QExod⁶ lacks the resumptive conjunction. | 4QExodb 3 ii, 5-6 i 9 | 865 |
| Q151 | MT Exod 3:17 | הָוָאִי | SV(1) – 4QExod⁶ lacks the resumptive conjunction. | 4QExod⁶ 3 ii, 5-6 i 9 | |
| Q152 | MT Exod 3:18 | בַּי | SV(2) – The MT lacks the masculine plural construct noun יִבְּנָי, “son.” | 4QExod⁶ 3 ii, 5-6 i 10 | 866 |

---

861 The SP and the LXX agree with the reading in 4QExod⁶, which has the object of the verb הָמָס, “collect, gather,” as לְדָוִדָם וַנַּחֲלוּ לְפִיוֹ הָלֶא. The SP, Tgs. and a few Greek manuscripts have לְדָוִדָם וַנַּחֲלוּ לְפִיוֹ הָלֶא, “the elders of the sons of Israel.” The MT, Tgs. and a few Greek manuscripts have לְדָוִדָם וַנַּחֲלוּ לְפִיוֹ הָלֶא, “the elders of Israel,” assumed to be a corruption of the longer phrase by homoiooteleuton in E. Ulrich and F.M. Cross, Qumran Cave 4. VII, 92.

862 The form in 4QExod⁶ is restored בֵּיה. See note above.

863 There is some variation in this verse between the witnesses. The MT and Tgs. have the shorter phrasing: בֵּיה; the SP has an extra conjunction: בֵּיה, and the LXX appears to agree with 4QExod⁶: θῶς ἂν φησίν καὶ θῶς ἢσσας καὶ θῶς ἢσσας. The phrase in 4QExod⁶ may also be a harmonised reading with Exod 4:5. The addition is treated as an explicating plus. 4QExod⁶ is restored בֵּיה. See note above.

864 4QExod⁶ is restored בֵּיה. See note above.

865 Almost all witnesses lack the addition of the masculine plural construct noun בַּי, while only a small number of Greek manuscripts and the Peshitta agree with 4QExod⁶. In the light of this E. Ulrich and F.M. Cross, Qumran Cave 4. VII, 93, suggest that the construct noun is secondary here in contrast to Exod 3:16 (cf. Q145 and note above).
| **Q153** | MT Exod 3:19 | מִלְחַת | OV(I) – Difference in grammatical form. |
| **Q154** | MT Exod 3:19 | לְאָשֶׁה בָּדֶד | SV(1) – Interchange of prepositions. |
| **Q155** | MT Exod 3:21 | omitted | SV(1) – The MT lacks the adverbial particle כָּל, “thus.” |
| **Q156** | MT Exod 4:3 | נְשֵׁל בֵּיהֹל | SV(1) – The MT lacks the entreaty particle נ. |
| **Q157** | MT Exod 4:4 | רָאָה | SV(1) – Lexical interchange. |
| **Q158** | MT Exod 4:6 | לַא | SV(1) – Interchange of prepositions. |

---

867 The form of the infinitive construct of קָלַח, “to go,” in the MT is rare, whereas the more common form is found in 4QExod. According to W. Gesenius, E. Kautzsch, and A.E. Cowley, *Hebrew Grammar*, 192, §69x, the forms based on the regular inflexion of קָלַח are found “rarely, and almost exclusively late or in poetry,” neither of which circumstances suit the present context. This rare form of the infinitive construct occurs only seven times in the MT (Exod 3:19; Num 22:13, 14, 16; Job 34:23; Ecc 6:8 and 9), so it is difficult to see what is meant by ‘exclusively late’ in relation to these verses. In contrast the infinitive construct is written לָהַל מַלְכִּית a total of 129 times in the MT, 22 occurrences of which appear in the Pentateuch. The spelling in 4QExod is therefore regular and quite possibly secondary. More weight could be given to the consideration that the form in 4QExod is secondary by the fact that the SP agrees with the rare form in MT where it occurs in Exod 3:19 and in Num 22:13.

868 The scribe of 4QExod may have harmonised this form with Exod 4:13.

869 Both the MT and the SP have קָזֵח, “seize,” against קָזָח, “grow strong,” in 4QExod. In the context the exchange of lexemes amounts to an interchange of synonyms, where the Hiph'il of קָזֵח is translated as “grasp.” The MT reads: נָהָלֶת וּרְאָא הַיְתָה בְּחַזֵּק, “put out your hand and seize (the serpent) by its tail.” 4QExod may be translated similarly: נָהָלֶת וּרְאָא הַיְתָה בְּחַזֵּק, “put out your hand and grasp (the serpent) by its tail.” The verb of the *Wortbericht* in 4QExod is most likely harmonised with the verb in the accompanying *Tatbericht*: נָהָלֶת וּרְאָא הַיְתָה בְּחַזֵּק.
Q159 | MT Exod 4:8 | וְהוֹדוֹ הִיא לָהֶם | SV(1) – Interchange of prepositions.

Q160 | MT Exod 5:4 | הַנְּפָרִים | SV(1) – Lexical interchange.

Q161 | MT Exod 5:8 | וַעֲמַקָּה | SV(1) – The MT lacks the definite article.

Q162 | MT Exod 5:9 | רוּפֵרָה | SV(1) – Lexical interchange.

Q163 | MT Exod 5:10 | וַאֲבֹדָה | SV(1) – Lexical interchange.

Q164 | MT Exod 5:11 | קֶבֶר | SV(1) – The MT lacks the con-

---

870 The form in 4QExodb is possibly harmonised with the expression in Exod 4:2, 11 and 15.

871 The compound preposition לָמְשָׁנָן in 4QExodb is most likely harmonised with the same form in Exod 4:5. Both Exod 4:5 and 8 are difficult syntactically in that the apparent direct speech of Yahweh is not introduced by the usual form יַאֲרֵיָה, although reading these verses as direct speech is mandated by the context. The MT has two different prepositional phrases introducing each of these verses. The former is introduced by the compound preposition לָמְשָׁנָן, “so that,” while the latter is introduced by the prepositional phrase לָמְשׁ, and it will be if not.” 4QExodb certainly seems to have a propensity to harmonise various parts of the text that in the MT are divergent, as demonstrated in Q142, Q149, Q156, Q157 and Q158 above. It is likely that here also 4QExodb harmonises the prepositions that introduce the direct speech of Yahweh in Exod 4:5 and 8.

872 The verb חָרָה, which in Hiph'il has the meaning “to separate,” is unusual in 4QExodb. The verb חָרָה, “to loosen,” in Hiph'il meaning “to let off duties,” appears also in Exodus 32:25 (twice) in the MT and in the SP. Here the SP agrees with 4QExodb against the MT. If the general tendency is for 4QExodb to harmonise unique syntactic and linguistic forms towards more common ones (see note above) we should not expect to find a form here that does not appear elsewhere in Exodus. However the form that we encounter here in 4QExodb appears elsewhere in the Pentateuch only in Genesis and Deuteronomy.

873 The reading in 4QExodb is supported by the SP. The LXX has the 3pl present active imperative verb μετριμασθοῖν, “let them be concerned,” twice in this verse, where as the MT has once יִשָּׁפְתוּ, “to do,” and once יִשָּׁפְתוּ, “to look at, give attention.” It is conceivable that the textual tradition behind the MT has suffered metathesis, or paronomasia as suggested in E. Ulrich and F.M. Cross, *Qumran Cave 4. VII*, 95.

874 4QExodb agrees with the SP against the MT and the Tgs.
junction.

Q165  MT Exod 7:21, 4QExod\textsuperscript{c} i 17
4QExod\textsuperscript{c} lacks the definite article.

Q166  MT Exod 7:22, 4QExod\textsuperscript{c} i 17
OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.\textsuperscript{875}

Q167  MT Exod 8:12, 4QExod\textsuperscript{c} i 35
SV(1) – Lexical interchange.\textsuperscript{876}

Q168  MT Exod 8:17, 4QExod\textsuperscript{c} i 42
OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.

Q169  MT Exod 9:19, 4QExod\textsuperscript{c} ii 27
SV(1) – The MT lacks the object marker.

Q170  MT Exod 9:29, 4QExod\textsuperscript{c} ii 38
SV(1) – 4QExod\textsuperscript{c} lacks the object marker.

Q171  MT Exod 9:29, 4QExod\textsuperscript{c} ii 38
OV(l) – Difference in grammatical form.\textsuperscript{877}

Q172  MT Exod 9:30, 4QExod\textsuperscript{c} ii 39
OV(l) – Difference in grammatical form.

Q173  MT Exod 9:30, 4QExod\textsuperscript{c} ii 39
SV(1) – Interchange of divine ti-

\textsuperscript{875} 4QExod\textsuperscript{c} is restored \( \text{בִּזְרַעַת} \), in agreement with the SP. The spelling \( \text{בִּזְרַעַת} = \text{בִּזְרַעַת} \), for which see HALOT, 513 and 527. This suggests some confusion of gutturals as per the SP.

\textsuperscript{876} 4QExod\textsuperscript{c} is restored \( \text{בִּזְרַעַת} \), “reach out your hand with your rod,” in agreement with the SP. The LXX also would seem to support this reading: \( \text{ἐκτεινον τη \ χειρι την \ ραβδον \ σου} \), “stretch forth your rod with your hand.” The reading in 4QExod\textsuperscript{c} and the supporting witnesses clarifies the instrument of the action that follows: \( \text{בִּזְרַעַת} \), “and strike the dust of the earth.”

\textsuperscript{877} According to J. Hoftijzer, Imperfect Forms with Nun Paragogicum, 9, the use of paragogic \textit{ nun} here marks contrastivity whereby “the text speaks of the discontinuance of a certain situation.” For a discussion of the verb form with and without paragogic \textit{ nun} see note above. See also Q172, Q187 and Q194 below.
The phrase ידוהי אֵלֶּה ידוהי in the MT (37 times versus 293 times). In the case of the former many occurrences are found in Genesis, especially in direct address (see Genesis 15:2, 8; 2 Sam 7). However, the majority of the instances of the latter occur in the prophets, in particular Ezekiel. This may indicate that the language of the scribe of 4QExod remains less archaising, having dropped some of these stylistically early forms when compared to the MT. Such is the impression left by the language in respect of the occasional dropping of the object marker נון, the paragogic נון, etc.

The clause in 4QExod is restored: בִּי הַמַּשָּׁתָה נָבִיל הַמַּשָּׁתָה, “because the flax was in bloom and the barley was headed.” All of the other witnesses agree with the phrase order of the MT against 4QExod.

4QExod clarifies the secondary object as מְרַכְּבָּה, “in Egypt,” thus locating the place in which the narrative action occurs. All of the other witnesses agree with the MT.

The phrase in 4QExod, וַיִּתֵּן הַגֶּפֶן, “and the land was ruined,” probably harmonises with the phrasing in Exod 8:20 which reads: וַיִּתֵּן הַגֶּפֶן, “the land was continually ruined on account of the swarm.” The LXX appears to reflect a similar Vorlage: καὶ ὁ πόλος ἦ, “and the land was ruined,” against the MT, the SP and Tgs. וַיִּתֵּן הַגֶּפֶן, “and the land was darkened.”

4QExod agrees with the SP and the LXX. Pharaoh addresses both Moses and Aaron in Exod 10:16 where they are referred to in the plural: וַיֹּאמֶר לֹא יִדְהָה יְהֹוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם אֲלֵהֶם, “I have sinned toward Yahweh your god and toward you.” In this context the plural imperative נא in 10:17, as reflected in 4QExod, the SP and the LXX, seems to be the grammatically correct form, against the singular form in the MT: נא לא ידוהי אֵלֶּה נא לא ידוהי אֵלֶּה, “forgive my sin one more time.”
Q178 MT Exod 12:34
4QExod\(^{c}\) v 4
מַשָּׁלָהּ שְׁמַלַת

SV(1) – Lexical interchange.\(^{883}\)

Q179 MT Exod 12:35
4QExod\(^{c}\) v 5
מְפַסְדִּי
omits

SV(2) – 4QExod\(^{c}\) has an explicating plus.\(^{884}\)

Q180 MT Exod 12:40
4QExod\(^{c}\) v 10
בָּאר
omits

SV(2) – 4QExod\(^{c}\) has an explicating plus.\(^{885}\)

Q181 MT Exod 13:22
4QExod\(^{c}\) v 40
אַמֶּנֶּנֶּנ

SV(1) – 4QExod\(^{c}\) lacks the definite article.

Q182 MT Exod 13:22
4QExod\(^{c}\) v 40
אָמֶנ

SV(1) – 4QExod\(^{c}\) lacks the definite article.

Q183 MT Exod 14:3
4QExod\(^{c}\) v 43
לְבֵנִי

SV(1) – Interchange of prepositions.

Q184 MT Exod 14:10
4QExod\(^{c}\) vi 7
כַּמְשַׁל

SV(1) – Difference in number.\(^{886}\)

Q185 MT Exod 15:11
כַּכָּס

OV(l) – Possible difference in

\(^{883}\) According to J.E. Sanderson, *An Exodus Scroll from Qumran*, 60-61, the MT preserves the correct form along with 4QpaleoExod\(^{m}\). Sanderson suggests that, seeing as both √מַשָּׁלָהּ and √מְפַסְדִּי have the meaning “mantle, cloak,” the two roots are related forms. The difference is related to “a dialectal or similar variation in language” (J.E. Sanderson, *An Exodus Scroll from Qumran*, 61). The LXX consistently uses the same word, ιματιον, to translate both roots. The two forms are taken in the present study to be synonyms that perhaps were used in different geographical or ethnic distributions. Though the distribution of use of both roots is not ascertainable from the evidence, their synonymous value is reasonably certain. See, for example, the use of both forms in Exod 22:8, 25 and 26; or the distribution of both roots in Deut 22, 24 and 29. See also Q593 below.

\(^{884}\) 4QExod\(^{c}\) clarifies the secondary object by means of a prepositional phrase: יֵשְׁלַו מַשָּׁלָהּ מִלָּה, “and they asked for instruments of silver and instruments of gold from the Egyptians.” Cf. Q175 and note above.

\(^{885}\) The MT and the Tgs. lack the nomens regens, restored in 4QExod\(^{c}\) in the phrase בָּאר בָּאָר, not found in the Qumran manuscript (see E. Ulrich and F.M. Cross, *Qumran Cave 4. VII*, 116).

\(^{886}\) The form in 4QExod\(^{c}\) is restored בֵּשָׁל. The plural participle of √בֵּשָׁל, “to start out, pull up,” indicates that the noun בָּאָר, “Egyptians,” is treated as a plural in 4QExod\(^{c}\), with the SP and the LXX in agreement. The MT appears to treat the noun as singular, “Egypt.”
| Q186 | MT Exod 15:12 | נָתַתָּה | Not Counted – The reading in 4QExodc is uncertain. |
| Q187 | MT Exod 15:14 | וָרָאָתָה | OV(l) – Difference in grammatical form. |
| Q188 | MT Exod 15:16 | אִמְּתָה | OV(l) – Difference in grammatical form. |
| Q189 | MT Exod 15:17 | נְבִאָתָה | OV(l) – Difference in grammatical form. |
| Q190 | MT Exod 15:17 | וַתְנַחְמָה | OV(l) – Difference in grammatical form. |
| Q191 | MT Exod 15:18 | לָעָלָה | SV(1) – 4QExodc lacks the preposition ל. |

---

887 It is notable that the form of the pronominal suffix in the MT is long against the short form in the Qumran manuscript. The long spelling in the MT appears only here. For similar unusual spellings see Q74 and Q76, and also note above. 4QExodc has the common form of the preposition ו plus 2ms pronominal suffix. The short spelling appears in the MT 29 times with the 2ms pronominal suffix, and once with the 2mpl pronominal suffix (Job 12:3).

888 See the discussion in E. Ulrich and F.M. Cross, *Qumran Cave 4. VII*, 118, which raises the following points. A variant text to the MT is presumed on the basis of two partially preserved letters, read as mem and waw/yod. The phrase in the MT and the SP is נָתַתָּה וָרָאָתָה, “you reached out your right hand.” A likely but ultimately uncertain reconstruction of the phrase in 4QExodc might be נָתַתָּה וָרָאָתָה, “you raised up your right hand.” The evidence from the LXX, Peshitta and Tgs. is inconclusive.

889 The form in the MT may be understood as an archaic feminine accusative form, נ-ו, where the ending with [t], נ-ו-, is appended to “avoid the contact of two stressed syllables” (P. Joüon and T. Muraoka, *Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*, 281, §93f). This accusative form may be based on an ‘old locative,’ of which the form with the termination נ-ו, is “often used in poetry with feminines” (W. Gesenius, E. Kautzsch, and A.E. Cowley, *Hebrew Grammar*, 251, §90g). See also W.R. Garr, *Dialect Geography*, 117-18. The archaic termination seems to have been dropped in the SP and also in 4QExodc.

890 The archaic ending נ- is lacking in 4QExodc. The language of the Qumran manuscript seems to have been updated, for which see also Q188 and note above, and Q190 below. For a discussion of the suffix נ- as a feature of archaising style as distinct from an authentic archaic form, see R.C. Vern, *The Relevance of Linguistic Evidence to the Dating of Archaic Poetry of the Hebrew Bible* (University of Sydney Ph.D. Dissertation: Sydney, 2008) 4:4-6.
| Q192 | MT Exod 17:1 | מָשָׁהּ לְמָשָׁהּ | SV(3) – 4QExodc has a different word order to the MT.\textsuperscript{891} |
| Q193 | MT Exod 17:2 | מָתָה | SV(1) – The MT lacks the conjunction. |
| Q194 | MT Exod 17:2 | תַּנְבָּה | OV(l) – Difference in grammatical form. |
| Q195 | MT Exod 17:5 | עַל מָשָׁה | SV(2) – The MT has an explicating plus.\textsuperscript{892} |
| Q196 | MT Exod 17:7 | אָם | SV(1) – The MT lacks the conjunction. |
| Q197 | MT Exod 17:12 | רוֹוי | SV(1) – Difference in number.\textsuperscript{893} |
| Q198 | MT Exod 18:6 | תַּנְבָּה | SV(3) – 4QExodc has a different word order to the MT.\textsuperscript{894} |

\textsuperscript{891} The syntax in 4QExodc agrees with that of 4QpaleoGen-Exod against the MT, the LXX, the SP and 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{h} (see Q251 below). 4QExodc possibly harmonises with Num 10:12 which has the same word order.

\textsuperscript{892} The secondary object is specified in the MT: יָמָּה יָמָּה אֹאָרָה, “And Yahweh said to Moses.” All of the witnesses agree with the MT.

\textsuperscript{893} The object of the verb is the plural noun plus possessive pronominal suffix יָדָד, “his hands.” 4QExodc has the correct form, and is in agreement with 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{h}, the LXX, the SP and Tg. Neof. Partial agreement with the MT is found in Tg. Ps.-J. which refers to the noun with a singular pronoun but then has a plural verb describing it: יָמָּה יָמָּה אֹאָרָה, “and his hands were spread.”

\textsuperscript{894} The noun phrase Knx, “your father-in-law,” precedes the proper noun in the MT but follows it in 4QExodc. Several Latin, Coptic and Ethiopic manuscripts agree with the word order in 4QExodc (see ), though the majority of witnesses seems to agree with the MT. In the majority of cases, when the noun יָדָד appears with the proper noun to which it specifically refers, the proper noun precedes the common noun. In the MT this occurs nine times (Exod 3:1; 4:18; 18:1, 2, 5, 12; Num 10:29; Jdg 1:16; 4:11) against a single occurrence of the reverse order (Exod 18:6). It may well be assumed that 4QExodc harmonises the unusual word order towards the more common phrasing.
| Q201 | MT Exod 13:15 |ַאֵלַי | 4QExod[2] 2 | SV(1) – Lexical interchange.896 |
| Q202 | MT Exod 15:1 | 14:31 → 15:1 | 4QExod[4] 4 | SV(3) – Possible difference of verse order.897 |
| Q204 | MT Exod 13:3 | מַעֲרַד | 4QExod[2] 2 | SV(2) – The MT has an explicating plus.899 |
| Q205 | MT Exod 13:5 | וַדְּאוֹרֵד | 4QExod[2] 2 | SV(3) – Different order of listed |

895 The MT reads: וַיֵּרְאוּ, “and they came to the tent,” where the 3pl Qal of וַיְרָא, “to come,” refers to the action of each character in the narrative. 4QExod[2] has more specific phrasing, indicating the agency of one specific character over another: וַיֵּרְאוּ וַיֶּרְאוּ, “and he brought him to the tent,” where the verb וַיֶּרְא is given as Hiph‘îl, “to bring,” and has its object directly appended as a pronominal suffix.

896 On the different uses of the 1cs independent pronoun וָאֵלַי in the MT see W. Gesenius, E. Kautzsch, and A.E. Cowley, Hebrew Grammar, 105 n. 1. The short form of the pronoun is more common in the later books (see P. Jouon and T. Muraoka, Grammar of Biblical Hebrew, 119-20, §39a). The form in 4QExod[2] may therefore be viewed as archaic or archaising. See, for example, the use of the long form of this pronoun in 11QT and the comments in E. Qimron, Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls, 57. Archaising tendencies in 11QT reflect the biblical tone artificially adopted in that scroll, concerning which see S. Kaufman, "The Temple Scroll and Higher Criticism," HUCA 53 (1982) 35. According to M.G. Abegg, Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls, 330, the long form of the 1cs independent pronoun is used in other non-biblical scrolls a total of 19 times, and then only in reference to the deity. In contrast, the short form never refers to the deity, according to the list in M.G. Abegg, J. Bowley, and E. Cook, The Dead Sea Scrolls Concordance: The Non-Biblical Texts from Qumran (2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 2003) 75-77.

897 Either a verse similar to Exod 13:16 preceded 15:1 in 4QExod[4], or the text of Exod 13:17-14:31 is lacking in this part of the text. Two possibilities suggest themselves, namely that the scroll reflects a different textual tradition in which the narrative account of the crossing of the Red Sea was missing or repositioned, or that 4QExod[2] is in fact a liturgical scroll (see E. Ulrich and F.M. Cross, Qumran Cave 4. VII, 127-28).

898 4QExod[2] agrees with the LXX and the SP. See also Q180 above.

899 All of the witnesses agree with the MT.
| Q206 | MT Exod 13:5 | yrm | 4QExod$^6$ lacks the conjunction. |
| Q207 | MT Exod 13:5 | ywx | 4QExod$^6$ lacks the conjunction. |
| Q208 | MT Exod 13:5 | ytx | 4QExod$^6$ lacks the conjunction. |
| Q209 | MT Exod 13:5 | ytw | 4QExod$^6$ lacks the conjunction. |
| Q210 | MT Exod 13:5 | ysw | SV(1) – The MT lacks the preposition ב. |
| Q211 | MT Exod 39:7 | tdb | OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.$^{901}$ |
| Q212 | MT Exod 39:17 | tbt | 4QExod-Lev$^f$ lacks the definite article. |
| Q213 | MT Exod 39:21 | omits | SV(2) – 4QExod-Lev$^f$ has an ex-

---

$^{900}$ See Q110 and note above.

$^{901}$ The form in 4QExod$^6$ is restored: הָבְדוֹ, “and you shall serve.”

$^{902}$ The plural pronominal object suffix refers both to a masculine object (בַּשַּׁלֻּות, “carnelian” – a precious red-coloured stone) and to a feminine object (בַּשַּׁלֻּות, “gold ornamental work, filigree,”). It is therefore essentially correct for either the masculine or the feminine form to be used to refer to the multiple objects of the verb מָשְׂכוּ, “set, put.” However, in light of the so called “priority of the masculine” that prevails in biblical language and discourse, one may expect the form in the MT to be more grammatically acceptable (see B.K. Waltke and M. O’Connor, *Biblical Hebrew Syntax*, 108-9, for a discussion of the “intensely androcentric character of the world of the Hebrew Bible”). This may be interpreted to suggest that 4QExod-Lev$^f$ has an older, unrevised form.
4QExod-Lev f 1 ii 3 has an explicating plus.903

Q215 MT Exod 39:21 omits בתרה SV(2) – 4QExod-Lev f has an explicating plus.904

Q216 MT Exod 39:21 omits possui אשה אגוריה שלמה SV(2) – The MT lacks the explicating plus.905

Q217 MT Exod 39:22 possui מנהל SV(1) – The MT lacks the definite article.

Q218 MT Exod 40:10 possui יקשת OV(I) – Difference in grammatical form.906

Q219 MT Exod 40:12 possui תקריבת אשה היא איתה בנין SV(3) – 4QExod-Lev f has a difference word order to the MT.907

903 The insertion of the phrase הבאת אשה יהוה אсол אל הסנה, “as Yahweh commanded Moses,” in 4QExod-Lev f mirrors the many occurrences of the same phrase in this pericope (see Exod 39:1, 5, 7, 21, 26, 29 and 31). If the rest of verse 21 in 4QExod-Lev f is in line with the MT then there would be three occurrences of this phrase in the same verse. The end of verse 21, which in the MT contains the phrase, is not preserved in the Qumran scroll. It is of interest that the SP includes two instances of the phrase in this verse and an additional passage that is reflected in 4QExod-Lev f but not in the MT. On this see Q214 below.

904 The addition in 4QExod-Lev f reflects the description of the ephod in Exod 28:26 and 39:19 (see E. Ulrich and F.M. Cross, Qumran Cave 4. VII, 139).

905 The additional text appended to verse 21 is present in the SP and 4QExod-Lev f. The SP reads: והםVESSEN ממאריו ואארא, “And he made the urim and the tummim as Yahweh commanded Moses.” According to E. Ulrich and F.M. Cross, Qumran Cave 4. VII, 139, the additional text in 4QExod-Lev f “echoes Exod 28:30. It is best taken as original in the Hebrew text, lost by parablepsis ... in the other traditions.”

906 4QExod-Lev f can be read as a defective infinitive in place of the finite verb in the MT (so E. Ulrich and F.M. Cross, Qumran Cave 4. VII, 141). Alternatively the verb could be read as imperative: והםVESSEN ממאריו, “and sanctify the altar.” However, the latter is unlikely given the use of the 2ms perfect ממאריו, “you shall anoint,” at the beginning of the clause. Also, in favour of reading the verb as an infinitive, the infinitive absolute is known to function as “the continuation of a preceding finite verb” (W. Gesenius, E. Kautzsch, and A.E. Cowley, Hebrew Grammar, 345-46, §113y-aq). Note also the use of the infinitive absolute as an “emphatic imperative ... followed by a perfect consecutive” (W. Gesenius, E. Kautzsch, and A.E. Cowley, Hebrew Grammar, 346, §113bb, italics in original), which would also suit the context.

907 The witnesses agree with the MT. The placement of the verb in the MT agrees with that of verse 13, while the placement in 4QExod-Lev f agrees with that of verse 14 (see E. Ulrich and F.M. Cross, Qumran Cave 4. VII, 143).
Q220 MT Exod 40:12
4QExod-Lev f 2 ii 6
חֵרֵי יִשָּׁרֵי
OV(1) – Difference in grammatical form.  

Q221 MT Exod 40:14
4QExod-Lev f 2 ii 8
אֵל
SV(1) – The MT lacks the preposition אֵל, “with.”

Q222 MT Exod 40:14
4QExod-Lev f 2 ii 8
בְּהֵם
SV(1) – The MT lacks the definite article.

Q223 MT Exod 40:15
4QExod-Lev f 2 ii 9
יֵצְרוֹת
SV(1) – Difference in gender.  

Q224 MT Exod 40:16
4QExod-Lev f 2 ii 11
עַצְמָה
SV(1) – Difference in number.  

Q225 MT Exod 40:16
4QExod-Lev f 2 ii 11
כִּי יִשָּׁה
SV(2) – The MT has an expansive plus.  

Q226 MT Exod 40:17
omits
SV(2) – 4QExod-Lev f has an ex-

---

908 E. Ulrich and F.M. Cross, *Qumran Cave 4. VII*, 143, suggests that the use of the imperfect verb in 4QExod-Lev f and the change in word order reflects the shift in topic from cult instruments to the priesthood. The MT maintains the use of the perfect verb plus וָאָמַר consecutive throughout, except for the first of two verbs in verse 14.

909 The pronominal suffix appears to be a 3fpl object suffix, but this is very difficult in the context where the object is clearly יִשָּׁרֵי אֲבָנָיִם, “Aaron’s sons.” More preferable is the opinion of E. Ulrich and F.M. Cross, *Qumran Cave 4. VII*, 142, that the form in 4QExod-Lev f is “evidently an Aramaic suffix by a slip of the pen.” This view posits that the scribe accidentally wrote a defective form of the 3mpl Aramaic pronominal suffix יְהִי- which, according to S. Segert, *Altaramäische Grammatik: mit Bibliographie, Chrestomathie und Glossar* (Leipzig: Verlag Enzyklopädie, 1990) 173, is itself a late form of the pronominal suffix יְהִי-

910 E. Ulrich and F.M. Cross, *Qumran Cave 4. VII*, 142, raises the possibility that the plural pronominal suffix in 4QExod-Lev f refers to both Moses and Aaron, which names may have both been contained in the lacuna of the previous line. Such a reading would also explain the lack of the particle and singular verb that follows, for which see Q225 below.

911 The MT completes the ‘Priestly’ formula, according to E. Ulrich and F.M. Cross, *Qumran Cave 4. VII*, 142: כִּי אָמַר אֲלֵהוּ אֵלָה אַתָּה וַיִּשָּׁה, “as Yahweh commanded him, thus he did.” The same phrase appears in Gen 6:22 concerning Noah and in Num 17:26 concerning Moses.
4QExod-Lev\(^f\) 2 ii 13

Q227 MT Exod 40:17
4QExod-Lev\(^f\) 2 ii 13

SV(1) – The MT lacks the object marker.\(^913\)

Q228 MT Exod 40:18
4QExod-Lev\(^f\) 2 ii 13

SV(2) – The phrase is lacking in 4QExod-Lev.\(^914\)

Q229 MT Exod 40:18
4QExod-Lev\(^f\) 2 ii 13 omits

SV(2) – The phrase is lacking in the MT.\(^915\)

Q230 MT Exod 40:19

OV(l) – Possible difference in

---

\(^912\) 4QExod-Lev\(^f\) clarifies the period being discussed as "in the second year after their going out from Egypt." The additional material in 4QExod-Lev\(^f\) is also found in the SP and is reflected in the LXX: το δευτερω ετει εκπορευομενων αυτων εξ Αιγυπτου, "in the second year after their going out of Egypt."


\(^914\) The phrase in the MT appears to be lacking in 4QExod-Lev\(^f\). The restored phrase in E. Ulrich and F.M. Cross, *Qumran Cave 4. VII*, 142, is however there does not seem to be any necessity for the verb to be restored rather than. If the latter is restored the reading in 4QExod-Lev\(^f\) simply lacks the first phrase. Alternatively, with the verb restored as, one may assume a variant textual tradition that has in place of in the MT. From this 4QExod-Lev\(^f\) has suffered haplography losing the text between the first occurrence of the verb to the second. Of the two phrases, "and Moses raised up the tabernacle," and "and he set its base," 4QExod-Lev\(^f\) seems to lack the first while the LXX seems to lack the second.

\(^915\) The MT reads: "and he placed its boards." 4QExod-Lev\(^f\) has an extended phrase, restored: "and he placed its hooks and its boards." The listed items involved in the tabernacle's construction may have been harmonised in 4QExod-Lev\(^f\) with other such lists, e.g. Exod 35:11 and 39:33. Alternatively the textual tradition behind the MT may have suffered haplography and omitted the object marker and the noun. Against the latter the same haplography would have to underlie the textual traditions behind the SP and the LXX, and also those that are represented by the Tgs. and the Peshitta, as the noun is lacking in all of the other witnesses. Therefore harmonisation in 4QExod-Lev\(^f\) is the most likely explanation.
The initial nun is written regularly in 4QExod-Lev. See also Q231, Q232, Q234, and Q237 below. According to E. Ulrich and F.M. Cross, *Qumran Cave 4. VII*, 142, this may be an indication of Aramaic influence on the scribe. However, the assimilation of nun in verbal forms was regular in Aramaic by the Persian period, and the dissimilation of nun was an indication of a retrogressive, archaising orthography. “Formen mit n in den orthographisch besseren Texten des RA [Reichsaramäisch] können zwar zum Teil auf Systemzwag zurückgeführt werden ...” [Forms with n in the orthographically superior texts of Imperial Aramaic were in some part due to a retrogressive system ...] (S. Segert, *Altaramäische Grammatik*, 112.)

The MT reads: "And he spread the tent over the tabernacle," against the reading in 4QExod-Lev as “evidently an anticipation of נִטָנָה in vv 20 and 22.” All of the other witnesses agree with the MT. On the dissimilation of initial nun in the verb see note above.

The phrase in the MT includes the adverb מִשְׂפָּל, “above,” in the phrase וַיִּטְנוּ נִטְנָה עַל הַמִּשְׁפָּל, “and he put the atonement upon the ark above (it).”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q239</th>
<th>MT Exod 40:22</th>
<th>4QExod-Lev 2 ii 20</th>
<th>הַנַּחֲלָה</th>
<th>SV(1) – 4QExod-Lev $^f$ lacks the locative ה.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q240</td>
<td>MT Exod 40:27</td>
<td>4QExod-Lev 2 ii 25</td>
<td>לְאֵלֶה</td>
<td>SV(2) – 4QExod-Lev $^f$ has an explicating plus.(^{919})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q241</td>
<td>MT Exod 14:24</td>
<td>4QExod 5</td>
<td>יִתְנַן</td>
<td>Not Counted – 4QExod(^8) is too damaged to allow a certain reading.(^{920})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q242</td>
<td>MT Exod 1:1</td>
<td>4QpaleoGen-Exod 1 5</td>
<td>יָאַלְא</td>
<td>SV(1) – 4QpaleoGen-Exod(^1) lacks the conjunction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q243</td>
<td>MT Exod 2:23</td>
<td>4QpaleoGen-Exod 3-4 4</td>
<td>רְזִימָךְ</td>
<td>SV(1) – Interchange of synonyms.(^{921})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q244</td>
<td>MT Exod 10:3</td>
<td>4QpaleoGen-Exod 7 i, 8 11</td>
<td>יְכִי</td>
<td>SV(1) – The MT lacks the object marker.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q245</td>
<td>MT Exod 12:3</td>
<td>4QpaleoGen-Exod 7 ii 16</td>
<td>בָּנָי</td>
<td>SV(2) – The MT lacks the plural construct noun בָּנָי, “son.”(^{922})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{919}\) The occurrence of the prepositional phrase מִלָּהוֹ, “before him,” is considered secondary in E. Ulrich and F.M. Cross, *Qumran Cave 4. VII*, 143. The MT lacks the addition in agreement with the other witnesses.

\(^{920}\) Based on the photo we are in agreement with E. Ulrich and F.M. Cross, *Qumran Cave 4. VII*, 146, that the traces of ink left below the line following the lacuna immediately after the ‘ayin are most likely to be the remains of mem. The reading בָּשָׁם therefore seems most appropriate, though it must be admitted that the extremely poor preservation of the fragment precludes any certain reading. One may point to the phrase מְלָהוֹ in Isa 30:33 for a possible parallel to the phrase in 4QExod\(^8\), but in the context that wording is quite unlikely.

\(^{921}\) The form in 4QpaleoGen-Exod\(^1\) is more common in the Pentateuch. *HALOT*, 277, lists בַּשָּׁם as a by-form of בְּשָׁם (see also *HALOT*, 1042). The variant is treated as an interchange of synonyms rather than a difference in pronunciation of the same lexeme.

\(^{922}\) The phrase in 4QpaleoGen-Exod\(^1\) is restored: בְּהַלָּמְדָא בִּנְי יִשְׂרָאֵל, “the whole congregation of the sons of Israel,” in agreement with the SP and the LXX.
Q246 MT Exod 12:3
4QpaleoGen-Exod\(^1\) ii 17

SV(3) – 4QpaleoGen-Exod\(^1\) has a different word order to the MT.\(^{923}\)

Q247 MT Exod 12:5
4QpaleoGen-Exod\(^1\) ii 19

SV(1) – Lexical interchange.\(^{924}\)

Q248 MT Exod 12:9
4QpaleoGen-Exod\(^1\) ii 24

OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.\(^{925}\)

Q249 MT Exod 12:9
4QpaleoGen-Exod\(^1\) ii 24

SV(1) – The MT lacks the conjunction.

Q250 MT Exod 14:23
4QpaleoGen-Exod\(^1\) 10 ii 13

SV(1) – The MT lacks the conjunction.

Q251 MT Exod 17:1
4QpaleoGen-Exod\(^1\) 17-18 ii 7

SV(3) – 4QpaleoGen-Exod\(^1\) has a different word order to the MT.\(^{926}\)

Q252 MT Exod 18:20
4QpaleoGen-Exod\(^1\) 20 6

SV(1) – The MT lacks the relative particle.

Q253 MT Exod 18:21
4QpaleoGen-Exod\(^1\) 20 7

SV(1) – Interchange of divine titles.

---

\(^{923}\) 4QpaleoGen-Exod\(^1\) is restored: שֶׁהָלַבְתָה אָבֵיתָהּ לָבֵיתָהּ, “a lamb for a father’s house, a lamb for a house.”

\(^{924}\) See also Q243 and note above. Here, too, the interchange of synonyms is counted as such rather than as a metathesis or dialectal by-form. See HALOT, 501.


\(^{926}\) 4QpaleoGen-Exod\(^1\) is restored: לְמָטָם מַעְרַכָּה מַעְרַכָּה, in agreement with 4QExod\(^2\) against the MT, the SP and the LXX. See Q192 and note above.
| Q254 | MT Exod 18:21  | 4QpaleoGen-Exod $^d$ | omits | SV(2) – 4QpaleoGen-Exod $^d$ has an object marker plus pronominal suffix clarifying the object. |
| Q255 | MT Exod 23:8   | 4QpaleoGen-Exod $^d$ | יוערフェ켸 | SV(2) – 4QpaleoGen-Exod $^d$ has an explicating plus. |
| Q256 | MT Exod 23:9   | 4QpaleoGen-Exod $^d$ | 4חיתו | SV(1) – Difference in number. |
| Q257 | MT Exod 23:9   | 4QpaleoGen-Exod $^d$ | שא | SV(1) - 4QpaleoGen-Exod $^d$ lacks the object marker. |
| Q258 | MT Exod 25:11  | 4QpaleoGen-Exod $^d$ | שבס | SV(2) - 4QpaleoGen-Exod $^d$ lacks the adverbial particle, “around.” |
| Q259 | MT Exod 26:29  | 4QpaleoGen-Exod $^d$ | מבע 오히려 ענשה והב | SV(3) - 4QpaleoGen-Exod $^d$ has a different word order to the MT. |
| Q260 | MT Exod 26:30  | 4QpaleoGen-Exod $^d$ | מטפפמש | SV(2) – The MT clarifies the object, י‘מש, “the tabernacle,” with a possessive pronominal suffix. |

927 4QpaleoGen-Exod $^d$ reads: כי השדה ייער, кан פקיחת, “for a bribe blinds the eyes of the seeing,” in agreement with the SP, the LXX and Tg. Ps-J.

928 In the MT the subject in the verse is plural except for this verb: אֶתְנוּ אָרוֹן וְאָשֶׁר תְּכַנְּסֵי אֲרוֹן פִּרְסָא חַיָּה. The plural form in 4QpaleoGen-Exod $^d$ may be viewed as harmonising the singular form in the MT with the plural forms in the rest of the verse.

929 4QpaleoGen-Exod $^d$ is restored to have an altered order of verb and object: תִּשְׁמַעְתָּ וְהָיָה, “you will make gold rings.” All of the other witnesses agree with the MT.

930 The phrase in the MT reads: יִרְאֶהְיָהּ וְאָשֶׁר תְּקַנְּסֵי, “and you will raise the tabernacle according to its design which you were shown on the mountain.” The pronominal suffix is found also in the SP, while the Tgs. and the LXX seem to agree with 4QpaleoGen-Exod $^d$. Both Tg. Ps-J. and Tg. Neof. lack a pronoun between the noun and the relative particle ("לְחֵלֶבֵת/ לְלֵבֵת/ לְחֵלֶבֵת"). The LXX also lacks a pronoun after the accusative εἰδος, “form, shape.”
Q261 MT Exod 26:33  
4QpaleoGen-Exod$^1$ lacks the locative ה.

Q262 MT Exod 27:9  
4QpaleoGen-Exod$^1$ lacks the locative ה.

Q263 MT Exod 27:11  
4QpaleoGen-Exod$^1$ lacks the conjunction.

Q264 MT Exod 7:10  
4QpaleoExod$^m$ I 22

Q265 MT Exod 7:14  
4QpaleoExod$^m$ I 29

Q266 MT Exod 7:14  
4QpaleoExod$^m$ I 29

Q267 MT Exod 7:15  
4QpaleoExod$^m$ I 30

Q268 MT Exod 7:15  
4QpaleoExod$^m$ I 30

Q269 MT Exod 7:18  
4QpaleoExod$^m$ II 4

931 4QpaleoExod$^m$ agrees with the SP. The LXX reads: εναντιον Φαραώ, “before Pharaoh,” which also seems to reflect a Vorlage like 4QpaleoExod$^m$.

932 The SP agrees with 4QpaleoExod$^m$.

933 The pronoun clarifies with subject of the phrase: הוהי, “behold, he goes towards the water.” The pronoun is also found in the SP and in Tg. Neof. According to J.E. Sanderson, An Exodus Scroll from Qumran, 78-79, the pronoun is probably original given that in the usual construction of the particle הוהי plus present participle, the two forms are generally intersected by a pronoun.

934 The phrase in 4QpaleoExod$^m$ is restored: ryh Kwtb, “in the midst of the river.” Here the SP follows the MT. The phrase רַּצְמָה יִדְמוֹר is not found anywhere in the MT or the SP, so 4QpaleoExod$^m$ appears to be alone in using this construction.
Q270 MT Exod 7:18 omits
4QpaleoExod\(^\text{II}\) 6-11
SV(2) – The MT lacks the additional text in 4QpaleoExod\(^\text{III}\).\(^935\)

Q271 MT Exod 7:29 omits
SV(2) – The MT lacks the addi-

\(^935\) The damaged text in 4QpaleoExod\(^\text{III}\) can be restored on the basis of the SP which seems to contain the same additional material:

וילך משה וארא רכין אל פרעה ויאמר אל יהוה אלהם הנביחו שלוחות
לאמור שלח אתי לך הנביאים מברכת והנה לא שמעה נא המdecess מכלה יהוה
והנה כו אתי יהוה אלהים מברכת הנה הגדול לברך הנה הגדל מברכת
ולא שמעה על הנה מברכת הנה לברך הנה הוא הנה הנה

And Moses and Aaron went to Pharaoh and they said to him, ‘Yahweh the god of the Hebrews has sent us to you to say: ‘Send away my people that they may serve me in the wilderness;' and behold until thus you did not listen. Thus Yahweh has said: ‘With this you will know that I am Yahweh: behold I am striking with the staff that is in my hand upon the waters that are in the river, and they will be turned into blood. And the fish that is in the river will die, and the river will be odorous, and the Egyptians will give up drinking the water from the river.’

The SP and 4QpaleoExod\(^\text{III}\) both contain an additional Tatbericht that compliments the Wortbericht in Exod 7:16-18. Other instances of additional Wortberichte and Tatberichte in 4QpaleoExod\(^\text{III}\) that reflect the SP are frequent: see Q273, Q275 and Q281 below.
And Moses and Aaron went to Pharaoh and they spoke to him. ‘Thus said Yahweh: send my people away that they may serve me; and if you refuse to send , behold, I am afflicting your every border with frogs, and the river will teem with frogs and they will go up and enter into your houses, and into your bed chambers, and upon your beds, and into your servants’ houses, and against your people, and into your ovens and into your kneading troughs; and against your and against your people and against all of your servants the frogs will go up.’

936 The Tatbericht in 4QpaleoExodm can be restored on the basis of the SP:

937 The subject of the verb √ הוהי is "gnats, lice." The pluralis inhumanus is “frequently construed with the feminine singular of the verbal predicate” (see W. Gesenius, E. Kautzsch, and A.E. Cowley, Hebrew Grammar, 464, §145k).
And Moses and Aaron came to Pharaoh and they said to him, ‘Thus said Yahweh: “Send my people away that they may serve me, because if you do not send my people away, behold, I am sending the horse-fly against you and against your servants and against your people and against your houses; and the houses of the Egyptians will be filled with the horse-fly, and also the ground upon which they are; and I will define the land of Goshen that day, upon which my people stand: no horse-fly will be there, so that you will know that I, Yahweh, am in the midst of the land; and I have put a distinction between my people and between your people, for tomorrow will be this sign.”’

938 The Tatbericht in 4QpaleoExod can be restored on the basis of the SP:

מִבְּרָה יְהוָה לִי כָּלַם וְלָא יִהְיֶה בּוֹמָם כָּל הַיָּעַר שֶפֶר עָלָיו בַּקָּר שֶפֶר עָלָיו וּבָאָר שֶפֶר עָלָיו וְלָא יִהְיֶה בּוֹמָם כָּל הַיָּעַר שֶפֶר עָלָיו בַּקָּר שֶפֶר עָלָיו וְלָא יִהְיֶה בּוֹמָם כָּל הַיָּעַר שֶפֶר עָלָיו B

939 The adjective appears in 4QpaleoExod to form the phrase מִבְּרָה יְהוָה כָּלַם, “very dense (swarms of) horse-flies,” also in the SP.

940 The subject of the verb מִבְּרָה, “to die,” is clarified in 4QpaleoExod, the LXX and the SP: יְהוָה לָא מַתְתַּמְכִּי לָא שֶפֶר כָּל הַיָּעַר שֶפֶר עָלָיו וְלָא יִהְיֶה בּוֹמָם כָּל הַיָּעַר שֶפֶר עָלָיו וְלָא יִהְיֶה בּוֹמָם כָּל הַיָּעַר שֶפֶר עָלָיו אֲנִי יְהוָה כָּל הַיָּעַר שֶפֶר עָלָיו אֲנִי יְהוָה כָּל הַיָּעַר שֶפֶר עָלָיו אֲנִי יְהוָה כָּל הַיָּעַר שֶפֶר עָלָיו אֲנִי יְהוָה כָּל הַיָּעַר שֶפֶר עָלָיו אֲנִי יְהוָה כָּל הַיָּעַר שֶפֶר עָלָיו אֲנִי יְהוָה כָּל הַיָּעַר שֶפֶר עָלָיו אֲנִי יְהוָה כָּל הַיָּעַר Sh"h ytlbl hyl( dm( ym( r#) N#g Cr) t) hzh tw)h hyhy rxml Km( Nybw ym( Nyb twdp ytm#w Cr)h brqb

941 See also Q273 above.

942 The adjective describes the construct phrase כָּל הַיָּעַר, “all the land of Egypt.” The LXX and the SP agree with the MT.
Q281 MT Exod 10:2 omits
4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} VI 27-29
SV(2) – The MT lacks the additional text in 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m}.\textsuperscript{943}

Q282 MT Exod 10:5 omits
4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} VII 2
SV(2) – 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} has an expansive plus.\textsuperscript{944}

Q283 MT Exod 10:21
4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} VII 28
SV(1) – 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} lacks the conjunction.

Q284 MT Exod 10:21
4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} VII 28
SV(1) – Lexical interchange.

Q285 MT Exod 10:21
4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} VII 29
SV(2) – The MT has an expansive plus.\textsuperscript{945}

\textsuperscript{943} The Wortbericht in 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} can be restored on the basis of the SP:

\[\text{And you will say to Pharaoh, ‘Thus said Yahweh the god of the Hebrews: ‘For how long will you refuse to humble yourself before me? Send my people away that they may serve me. If you refuse to send away my people, behold, tomorrow I am bringing (the) locust into your territory, and it will cover the surface of the earth so that none shall be able to see the earth, and it will eat everything that remained preserved to you from the hail; and it will eat every plant of the ground, and every fruit of the tree growing for you from the field. And your houses and the houses of all your servants and the houses of every Egyptian will be filled; which your fathers and your fathers’ fathers did not see from the day they came into existence on the ground until now. }\]

\textsuperscript{944} 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} and the SP have additional listed items: \textit{אִתּוֹ הַהֶרְצֵי אֲדֹנִי אֲדֹנִי}, “every green plant of the ground and every fruit of the tree.” The LXX and the Tgs. agree with the MT.

\textsuperscript{945} The phrase \textit{אָרְךַּֽהּ עָשָּׂרָֽהְךָ}, “and may the darkness be palpable” is present in all other witnesses.
SV(1) – Interchange of prepositions.

SV(2) – 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} includes Aaron in the narrative.\textsuperscript{946}

SV(1) – Difference in number.\textsuperscript{947}

SV(1) – Difference in person.\textsuperscript{948}

Not Counted – The conjunction in

\textsuperscript{946} The lack of the figure of Aaron in the narrative in MT is conspicuous as his presence is described in several of the other visits to Pharaoh (see Exod 7:20; 8:8; 10:3, etc.). The SP agrees with 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} as does the LXX. The Targums are divided, with Tg. Neof, agreeing with 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} and Tg. Ps-J agreeing with the MT. There is, however, some evidence that the name of Aaron was interpolated into the text of Exodus, perhaps in two separate periods, to increase the role of this priestly figure in the narrative. This can be judged from the fact that although both the characters of Moses and Aaron appear in chapter 10 the verb forms remain predominantly singular in form. Aaron’s name also fails to appear where it may reasonably be expected in Exod 10:3, 8 and 16. “Thus it appears that whatever drive did exist to include Aaron’s name, while it antedated the division of the text into the various extant traditions, it occurred late enough in the literary history to disturb syntactical relationships” (J.E. Sanderson, \textit{An Exodus Scroll from Qumran}, 277).

\textsuperscript{947} The verb in 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} is plural due to the plural subject. See Q287 above.

\textsuperscript{948} The subject of the verb in the MT, the SP and the Tgs. is הָרָא, “hoof,” and the verb רָּאָה is read as 
Niphal 3fs of הָּאָה, “to be left, remaining.” The reading in 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} may be read as masculine Niphal but in the light of the LXX, which has a 1cpl indicative middle future verb, υπολειφομεθα, “we (will not) leave remaining,” the form in 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} should probably be read as 1cpl. J.E. Sanderson, \textit{An Exodus Scroll from Qumran}, 296, reads the form as Hiph'il, presumably because the only 1cpl imperfect form of הָּאָה attested in the MT is in Hiph'il at 1Sam 14:36.
MT appears as a paragraph marker in 4QpaleoExod.\textsuperscript{949}

Q291 MT Exod 12:6
4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{vii} VIII

SV(1) – Difference in number.\textsuperscript{950}

Q292 MT Exod 16:34
4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{vii} XVII 4

SV(1) – Interchange of prepositions.\textsuperscript{951}

Q293 MT Exod 17:2
4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{vii} XVII 11

SV(1) – The MT lacks the conjunction.

Q294 MT Exod 17:12
4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{vii} XVII 29

SV(1) – Difference in number.\textsuperscript{952}

Q295 MT Exod 17:13 omits

SV(2) – 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{vii} has an

\textsuperscript{949} The writing of paleo-Hebrew \textit{waw} in the margin of the scroll is identified in E. Tov, \textit{Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert} (Leiden: Brill, 2004) 185, as signifying a paragraph break. The difference is arguably aesthetic, given that where the marginal \textit{waw} occurs the adjacent verb form typically lacks the \textit{waw} consecutive that is read in the MT. It is conceivable that the \textit{waw} marks a paragraph break and also functions in the text as marking the consecutive imperfect. See also P.W. Skehan, E. Ulrich, and J.E. Sanderson, \textit{Qumran Cave 4. IV}, 58.

\textsuperscript{950} 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{vii} is unique in reading a plural pronominal object suffix here, against the singular in all of the other witnesses. The plural suffix seems to refer incorrectly to the singular object: \textit{אִישׁ הָעָם נָאֵר תְּנֵה הָאֵשׁ}, “a lamb, pure, male, one year old.”

\textsuperscript{951} 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{vii} can be restored \textit{אָשֶׁר שָׁם הָאֱלֹהִים אֶל הַמַּעֲשֹׁת אֲשֶׁר חָבָּרָנָנוּ}, “as Yahweh commanded (to) Moses.” The construction with the object marker is used with \textit{שָׁם הָאֱלֹהִים אֶל הַמַּעֲשֹׁת אֲשֶׁר חָבָּרָנָנוּ} approximately 75 times in the MT. The construction with \textit{אָשֶׁר שָׁם} occurs only seven times. It might be argued that the preposition \textit{אָשֶׁר} should mark the indirect object of the verb \textit{שָׁם}, as in Exod 25:22: \textit{רָאָהוּ אֶל הָאֱלֹהִים אֶל הַמַּעֲשֹׁת אֲשֶׁר חָבָּרָנָנוּ}, “all that I will command you for the sons of Israel.”

\textsuperscript{952} The singular verb in the MT refers the plural noun \textit{יָדִים}, “his hands.” 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{vii} agrees with the SP and the LXX in referring to the noun with the plural verb. If, however, the singular verb refers instead to the noun \textit{יָדִים}, “steadfastness, fidelity,” (read as a substantive: “remained steadfast” – \textit{cf.} W. Gesenius, E. Kautzsch, and A.E. Cowley, \textit{Hebrew Grammar}, 451, §141b), then the disagreement of gender between the verb and the noun may echo a similar disagreement of gender in the first half of the verse: \textit{יָדִים סְשָׁסָה}, “And Moses’ hands (feminine) were heavy (masculine).” Note the similar use of the substantive as predicate in both phrases. The form in the MT may then represent a stylistic choice that was dropped in the other witnesses.
The verb מְדַבֵּר, "discomfit, defeat," does double duty in the MT taking both the object מִלְחָה יְהוָה, "Amaleq and his people," and the instrument מִשְׁרֵץ יַפִּיר, "the edge of the sword." The MT has the following construction: מְדַבֵּר מִלְחָה יְהוָה, "And Joshua defeated Amaleq and his people with the edge of the sword." 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} and the SP both have the verb מָשָׁל, "to strike," coordinating with the instrument and restate the object as a pronominal suffix attached to the verb, giving the following reading: מָשָׁל מִלְחָה יְהוָה, "And Joshua defeated Amaleq and his people, and he struck them with the edge of the sword."

The form in 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} can be restored מָשָׁלָה, which is used as an adverb with a temporal sense, while the form in the MT is also used adverbially and has essentially the same temporal meaning of "after" (see HALOT, 35-36). The difference between the forms may be dialectal.

J.E. Sanderson, An Exodus Scroll from Qumran, 142, regards the two lexemes as synonymous in the context: "If it is taken impersonally ... then a third party is announcing Jethro’s coming to Moses, with the word מַה ... If it is taken as Jethro’s speaking through a messenger, then the messenger has gone ahead and is speaking in Jethro’s name, with the word מַה."
Q302 MT Exod 18:20 omits אֲצַה. 4QpaleoExodm XVIII 32
SV(1) – The MT lacks the relative particle.956

Q303 MT Exod 18:21 הנָר. 4QpaleoExodm XIX 1
SV(1) – The MT lacks the conjunction.

Q304 MT Exod 18:21 הנָר. 4QpaleoExodm XIX 1
SV(1) – The MT lacks the conjunction.

Q305 MT Exod 18:23 עליה. 4QpaleoExodm XIX 5
SV(1) – Interchange of prepositions.

Q306 MT Exod 18:25 omits [אֲשַׁר אֲשַׁר]. 4QpaleoExodm XIX 7-17
SV(2) – The MT lacks the additional text in 4QpaleoExodm.957

Q307 MT Exod 18:27 לֹא. 4QpaleoExodm 23 omits
SV(2) – The MT has an explicating plus.958

Q308 MT Exod 20:19 omits
SV(2) – The MT lacks the addi-

956 The relative particle marks the subordinate clause in 4QpaleoExodm, in agreement with the SP and the LXX: והזהות אלת את החורף אֲנָחָה לָפֶת תַּלֶּה, “and you will make known to them the way in which they must walk.” Note that the MT marks the next clause, subordinated to the same verbal predicate, with the relative particle: והזהות אלת את החורף אֲנָחָה לָפֶת תַּלֶּה, “and the deeds that they must do” (see J.E. Sanderson, An Exodus Scroll from Qumran, 117).

957 The MT lacks the harmonisation with Deut 1:9-18. 4QpaleoExodm agrees with the SP in this addition.

958 The SP and the LXX agree with the MT. The preposition introduces the *dativus commodi*: לֹא אֲנָחָה, “he got himself to his land” (see W. Gesenius, E. Kautzsch, and A.E. Cowley, Hebrew Grammar, 381, §119s).
On the apparent exegetical change of the adjective describing מִלְיוֹן from plural מִלְיוֹן in Deut 5:26 to singular מִלְיוֹן in the 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} interpolation, see E. Eshel, "4QDeut - A Text That Has Undergone Harmonistic Editing," \textit{HUCA} 62 (1991) 141. J.E. Sanderson, \textit{An Exodus Scroll from Qumran}, 217, is less certain that the change is exegetical in nature, preferring to see multiple possible reasons for the variant: "Were corrections made by later scribes ... or, alternatively, were there two equally acceptable usages?" \textit{Cf.} Q809 below.

959 The MT lacks the harmonisation with Deut 5:24-27. 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} agrees with the SP in this addition. On the apparent exegetical change of the adjective describing מִלְיוֹן from plural מִלְיוֹן in Deut 5:26 to singular מִלְיוֹן in the 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} interpolation, see E. Eshel, "4QDeut - A Text That Has Undergone Harmonistic Editing," \textit{HUCA} 62 (1991) 141. J.E. Sanderson, \textit{An Exodus Scroll from Qumran}, 217, is less certain that the change is exegetical in nature, preferring to see multiple possible reasons for the variant: "Were corrections made by later scribes ... or, alternatively, were there two equally acceptable usages?" \textit{Cf.} Q809 below.

960 The number of animals is clarified in 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m}. The phrase is restored on the basis of the SP, which also contains the addition: אֲשֶׁר הָעַלָּמֶה מְכַסְתַּה וְדַוְדַוָּה מְכַסְתַּה ... אִי נְאֹר שֶׁיָּדְתָה שֶׁיָּדְתָה, "If the theft (of an animal) is certainly found in his hand ... one alive (is) two restored."

961 The form in the MT is considered \textit{Pu’al} of \( √bng \), "be stolen away," against the \textit{Niph’al} of the same root in 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m}, "to be stolen" (see \textit{HALOT}, 198). The difference in the grammatical forms amounts to a lexical interchange, for which classification see J.E. Sanderson, \textit{An Exodus Scroll from Qumran}, 118-19.

962 See J.E. Sanderson, \textit{An Exodus Scroll from Qumran}, 76-77, for a discussion of the likely reading of a variant here in line with the SP and the LXX. However, in light of Rule 2 the variant is not counted here. The letter ב is doubtful, and though the ב is clear it may be read as part of another word that suits the context of the MT.
Q314 MT Exod 22:24 שָׁמַרְתָּ אֵלֶּה 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} XXV 5 OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.

Q315 MT Exod 22:26 דָּוִד 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} XXV 7 SV(1) – Difference in gender.\textsuperscript{963}

Q316 MT Exod 22:26 דָּוִד 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} XXV 7 SV(1) – Difference in gender.

Q317 MT Exod 23:31 אַשְׁרֵי 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} XXVI 15 SV(1) – Lexical interchange.\textsuperscript{964}

Q318 MT Exod 24:1 omits אָבִים 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} XXVI 20 SV(2) – 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} has an expansive plus.\textsuperscript{965}

Q319 MT Exod 24:7 נְשֵׁתָה וְנֵסֵתָה 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} XXVI 29 SV(3) – 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} has a different word order to the MT.\textsuperscript{966}

Q320 MT Exod 24:9 omits 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} SV(2) – 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} has an

\textsuperscript{963} The grammatically correct reading is found in the qere of the MT.

\textsuperscript{964} According to J.E. Sanderson, An Exodus Scroll from Qumran, 88, the scribe of 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} replaced the less common word נַשְׁתָּ, “put, set,” with the better known synonym נֶשֶׁת, “place, set.”

\textsuperscript{965} At least one extra name is appended to the list of names of those who ate and drank in the presence of Yahweh on Sinai. The SP includes two extra names, נַשְׁתָּה וְנֵסֵתָה, on which basis 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} can probably be similarly restored. The addition of the two names is a minor textual addition, but it has particular exegetical significance, in that all four sons of Aaron are here mentioned as joining those who witnessed the presence of Yahweh on Sinai. The MT includes only the two older sons of Aaron, Nadab and Abihu, who are later to be found guilty of ritual malpractice in Lev 10:1-2. The change to this taxonomy is assumed to be part of a gradual process that increased the representation of the two younger sons of Aaron in the Pentateuch. On this see J.E. Sanderson, An Exodus Scroll from Qumran, 212-14. See also Q320 below.

\textsuperscript{966} The SP and some manuscripts of the LXX agree with the word order as it appears in 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m}. The scribe of 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} was perhaps more familiar with the expression that has the verb נַשְׁתָּ first, as is known from Deut 6:3; 30:12, 13; see also 2 Kgs 18:22 and Jer 35:10 for similar constructions. The phrasing with נַשְׁתָּ in first position occurs only here in the MT.
Q321 MT Exod 25:20
4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m}
XXVI 31
אֲשֶׁרֶה אֲרֹת
š'í
having an expansive plus.

Q322 MT Exod 25:26
4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m}
XXVII 31
ותֵת
t

Q323 MT Exod 25:29
4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m}
XXVIII 5
בְּהָר
š'

Q324 MT Exod 26:10
4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m}
XXVIII 8
וָמְשֶׁת לְלַאֶת
š'v

Q325 MT Exod 26:26
4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m}
XXIX 3
מְרוֹיָהּ עַלְּפָה
š'

967 The expression refers to the cherubim that face each other on the top part of the ark of the covenant. The phrase in 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} can be restored based on the reading in the SP: אֲשֶׁרֶה אֲרֹת, “one to the other,” against the phrase in the MT: וְאֵל אֲרֹת, “each man to his brother.” The textual tradition underlying 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} and the SP appear to use more familiar expressions regularly, often replacing those rarely occurring in the tradition behind the MT, for which see B.K. Waltke, “The Samaritan Pentateuch and the Text of the Old Testament,” New Perspectives on the Old Testament (ed. J. Barton Payne; Waco: Word Books, 1970) 220. According to J.E. Sanderson, An Exodus Scroll from Qumran, 94-95, other contributing factors may involve the definition through such expressions in the SP between human and non-human entities in tandem, of which the present instance is an example of the latter, or simply a propensity for phraseological standardisation.

968 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} can be restored on the basis of the SP: בֹּס. The nouns to which the pronominal suffix refers are feminine, וְמְשֶׁת לְלַאֶת, “its dishes, and its spoons, and its covers, and its bowls.” The MT appears to have the correct feminine form against 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} and the SP.

969 The cardinal number and the object are reversed. 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} and the SP read: לַאֶת לַאֶת, “loops (by) 50,” against the MT: לַאֶת לַאֶת, “50 loops.”
4Q<sup>paleoExod</sup><sup>m</sup> has a different word order to the MT. 971

Q326 MT Exod 26:35 → 26:36
4Q<sup>paleoExod</sup><sup>m</sup> 12-13
26:35 → 30:1-10

SV(3) – 4Q<sup>paleoExod</sup><sup>m</sup> has a different word order to the MT. 971

Q327 MT Exod 27:19
4Q<sup>paleoExod</sup><sup>m</sup> XXXI 9

omits

V(2) – 4Q<sup>paleoExod</sup><sup>m</sup> has an expansive plus. 972

Q328 MT Exod 28:11
4Q<sup>paleoExod</sup><sup>m</sup> XXXI 29

다함

SV(I) – Difference in person. 973

Q329 MT Exod 28:23
4Q<sup>paleoExod</sup><sup>m</sup> XXXII 10

 פרטי

OV(I) – Possible difference in pronunciation.

Q330 MT Exod 28:41
4Q<sup>paleoExod</sup><sup>m</sup>

והלו לאתח

SV(I) – Difference in number. 974

---

970 The MT has the plural absolute noun בַּרְזֵי שַׂדִּים in apposition to the construct phrase בָּשָׁלֶג, שַׂדִּים, "bars, shittim wood." The noun in 4Q<sup>paleoExod</sup><sup>m</sup> and also in the SP is in construct: בַּרְזֵי שַׂדִּים, "bars of shittim wood." The form in 4Q<sup>paleoExod</sup><sup>m</sup> and the SP possibly harmonise with the form in Exod 36:31, where the MT also has בַּרְזֵי שַׂדִּים. J.E. Sanderson, *An Exodus Scroll from Qumran*, 118, considers the form in 4Q<sup>paleoExod</sup><sup>m</sup> to be a synonymous interchange.

971 The SP agrees with 4Q<sup>paleoExod</sup><sup>m</sup> in inserting Exod 30:1-10 between 26:35 and 26:36. The placement of the fragments of 4Q<sup>paleoExod</sup><sup>m</sup> to support this reading is based primarily on reconstructed margins and letter spaces, but such reconstruction seems certain. Only four SU from a total of 191 SU, about 2% of the text, are preserved of this paragraph in 4Q<sup>paleoExod</sup><sup>m</sup>. See the discussion in J.E. Sanderson, *An Exodus Scroll from Qumran*, 111-14. This small number of preserved units, and the placement of the fragment that contains them, is sufficient to maintain our adherence to Rule 2.

972 The SP agrees with 4Q<sup>paleoExod</sup><sup>m</sup> in adding the introductory line concerning the priestly garments. The clause can be restored: וְתֹאֲדוּ בְּעָנָן וּבְּבֹדֶקָהּ וּבְּנֵפֶשׁ עֲלֵיהֶם וְזֵרָה בָּרֵד מְרַסֶּת, "And you will make clothes of violet and purple and crimson scarlet, to minister in them in the sanctuary." See the discussion on the placement of this clause in J.E. Sanderson, *An Exodus Scroll from Qumran*, 209-11.

973 The 2ms imperfect form in the MT suits the context, and is in agreement with the LXX, the SP and the Tgs.

974 The plural form in 4Q<sup>paleoExod</sup><sup>m</sup> does not fit the context and disagrees with all other witnesses. The erroneous form is considered a scribal lapse in J.E. Sanderson, *An Exodus Scroll from Qumran*, 90.
4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} XXXIII 3

Q331 MT Exod 29:2
4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} omits
XXXIII 11

SV(2) – The MT has an expansive plus.\textsuperscript{975}

Q332 MT Exod 29:21
4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} 29:21 → 29:29
XXXIV 6

SV(3) – 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} has a different verse order to the MT.\textsuperscript{976}

Q333 MT Exod 29:22
4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} ידהי
XXXIV 8

SV(1) – The MT lacks the definite article.\textsuperscript{977}

Q334 MT Exod 29:22
4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} המא
XXXIV 7

SV(1) – The MT lacks the object marker.

Q335 MT Exod 30:36
4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} ותַּחְתָּה
XXXVI 22

OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.\textsuperscript{978}

Q336 MT Exod 31:4
4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} לשַׁתָּה
XXXVI 28

Not Counted – The reading in 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} is uncertain.\textsuperscript{979}

Q337 MT Exod 31:5
4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} מלאֲבָּה
XXXVI 28

Not Counted – The reading in

\textsuperscript{975} The phrase in the MT is reflected in the other witnesses, and is only lacking in 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m}. The reference is to ותַּחְתָּה מָשָׁתָה, “unleavened wafers,” which in the versions is described as being מָשָׁתָה מָשָׁת, “smeared with oil.”

\textsuperscript{976} Exod 29:22 is inserted after verse 28 in 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} and also in the SP.

\textsuperscript{977} The form in 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} is restored: ותַּחְתָּה, “the caudate lobe” (a small posterior lobe of the liver).

\textsuperscript{978} See also Q40, Q73 and Q75 above, as well as note and .

\textsuperscript{979} There is perhaps a trace of a supralinear ז written to correct the form in 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} according to P.W. Skehan, E. Ulrich, and J.E. Sanderson, \textit{Qumran Cave 4. IV}, 121. The MT reads: לְשַׁתָּה וַתָּה, “to make with gold.” Restoring the correction in 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} gives the identical text: לְשַׁתָּה וַתָּה.
| Q338 | MT Exod 31:13-14 | מִסְפֶדּוֹת וּמְסַפְּרֹת ... כֹּהֵן דָּאָה | SV(2) – 4QpaleoExod is uncertain.  
4QpaleoExod omits | 980 |
| Q339 | MT Exod 32:7 | וּמִסְפֶדּוֹת ... כֹּהֵן דָּאָה | 4QpaleoExod has an expansive plus.  
4QpaleoExod omits | 981 |
| Q340 | MT Exod 32:7 | לֶא | SV(2) – The MT has an expansive plus.  
4QpaleoExod omits | 982 |
| Q341 | MT Exod 32:10 | וּמִסְפֶדּוֹת ... כֹּהֵן דָּאָה | 4QpaleoExod agrees with the SP in adding the expression of Yahweh’s anger towards Aaron over the incident involving the golden calf. The addition can be restored on the basis of the same reading in the SP:  
4QpaleoExod omits | 983 |

---

980 The final letter of the word in 4QpaleoExod is quite damaged. The reading with ב is tentative, while “heh could be possible but much less likely” (P.W. Skehan, E. Ulrich, and J.E. Sanderson, *Qumran Cave 4. IV*, 121).

981 The versions agree with the MT. The omission in 4QpaleoExod may have been through error, but may equally present an original reading. See the comments in P.W. Skehan, E. Ulrich, and J.E. Sanderson, *Qumran Cave 4. IV*, 123.

982 4QpaleoExod has an additional infinitive construct, restored on the basis of the SP, introducing Yahweh’s instruction to Moses to descend from Sinai. The additional infinitive agrees with the LXX and the SP, but the Tgs. agree with the MT.

983 The instruction רד ס, “go, descend,” is given simply as רד, “descend,” in 4QpaleoExod. The other witnesses agree with the MT.

984 4QpaleoExod agrees with the SP in adding the expression of Yahweh’s anger towards Aaron over the incident involving the golden calf. The addition can be restored on the basis of the same reading in the SP:  
And against Aaron Yahweh was very enraged, so as to destroy him, but Moses prayed on Aaron’s behalf.” The addition is a likely harmonisation with Deut 9:20. For a discussion of the exegetical significance of the harmonisation see J.E. Sanderson, *An Exodus Scroll from Qumran*, 208-9.
| Q342 | MT Exod 32:11 | בּוֹרֵד | SV(1) – Lexical interchange.985 4QpaleoExodm XXXVIII 4 |
| Q343 | MT Exod 32:13 | וַגָּזַר | SV(2) – The MT lacks the 3fs pronominal object suffix.986 4QpaleoExodm XXXVIII 9 |
| Q344 | MT Exod 32:27 | תִּבְרָא | SV(1) – The MT lacks the conjunction. 4QpaleoExodm XXXVIII 28 |
| Q345 | MT Exod 34:1 | דָּרָאָסִים | SV(2) – The MT has an expansive plus.987 4QpaleoExodm XL 12 |
| Q346 | MT Exod 34:11 | וֹדְחַּמְתֵּן | SV(2) – 4QpaleoExodm has an extra listed item lacking in the MT.988 4QpaleoExodm XL 29 |
| Q347 | MT Exod 34:13 | אֶנֶּס | SV(1) – 4QpaleoExodm lacks the object marker. 4QpaleoExodm XL 32 |
| Q348 | MT Exod 34:16 | חֲיְלִיָא הָעָנָא אָחְרֵי אָלָמָה | SV(2) – The MT has an expansive plus.989 4QpaleoExodm XLI 2 |

985 The MT has the phrase וְבוֹרֵד וְבָרוֹדָה, “and with a strong hand,” against the phrase in 4QpaleoExodm, restored: וְבָרוֹדָה וְבוֹרֵדָה, “and with a strong arm.” The SP has וְבָרוֹדָה וְבוֹרֵדָה, “and with an outstretched arm,” and the LXX also seems to reflect this reading: καὶ τοῖς βραχίονισι τοῦ υψίου, “with a high arm.” On the use of υψίου to translate וּבְרָאָסִים in the LXX see Deut 4:34, where the phrase וְבָרוֹדָה וְבוֹרֵדָה, “and with a strong hand, and with an outstretched arm,” is rendered καὶ τοῖς χειρὶ κραταια καὶ τοῖς βραχίονισι υψίου.

986 The form in 4QpaleoExodm is restored on the basis of the SP: וַגָּזַר וַגָּזַר, “and they will inherit it.”

987 The MT clarifies the object with an adjective: מַמְּלָכָה יָרָאָסִים, “the first tablet.” The other witnesses agree with the MT.

988 On the variation of the list of foreign nations see note above.

989 4QpaleoExodm is alone among the witnesses in lacking this addition. It is possible that the MT and the versions preserve a harmonisation with Exod 34:15 that was not added in the textual tradition behind 4QpaleoExodm. For this thesis, and the complications that arise from the reading in the LXX, see J.E. Sanderson, *An Exodus Scroll from Qumran*, 149.
Q349 MT Exod 37:13
4QpaleoExod⁷⁹ XLV 8
לֵא יָרְבֵּץ
SV(1) – Interchange of prepositions.

Q350 MT Lev 14:42
4QLev-Numᵃ 4 3
יֶה
SV(1) – Difference in gender.⁹⁹⁰

Q351 MT Lev 14:42
4QLev-Numᵃ 4 3
יֶה
SV(1) – Difference in number.⁹⁹¹

Q352 MT Lev 14:43
4QLev-Numᵃ 4 4
אָהֶר
OV(l) – Difference in grammatical form.⁹⁹²

Q353 MT Lev 14:43
4QLev-Numᵃ 4 4
אוּהָר יָהָרָת אֶת הָבְיָה
omits
SV(2) – 4QLev-Numᵃ lacks the additional text in the MT.⁹⁹³

Q354 MT Lev 14:43
4QLev-Numᵃ 4 4
ואָהֶר
OV(l) – Difference in grammatical form.⁹⁹⁴

Q355 MT Lev 14:44
4QLev-Numᵃ 4 5
אָהָר
SV(1) – Difference in gender.

Q356 MT Lev 14:45
4QLev-Numᵃ 4 ⁶_Init
ונֶנֶד
SV(1) – Difference in number.⁹⁹⁵

Q357 MT Lev 14:45
סֵבֵנִי
SV(1) – Difference in gender or

⁹⁹⁰ Leviticus 14:32-57 describes actions pertaining to the treatment of leprosy. In the MT the plural verbs in this passage seem to refer to the occupants of a dwelling in which leprosy has been found, while the singular verbs refer to the priest treating the disease. In MT Lev 24:42 the task of re-plastering the house would appear to belong to the priest, while this task is assigned to the occupants of the house in 4QLev-Numᵃ.

⁹⁹¹ This verb forms part of the same phrase as the previous variant. See note above.

⁹⁹² See note above. The form in 4QLev-Numᵃ agrees with the SP. The opposite arrangement of forms appears later in the same clause, for which see Q353 below.

⁹⁹³ The phrase may have been omitted from 4QLev-Numᵃ due to parablepsis as the scribe mistook the second instance of the word “בְּאָר מָאָר” for the third. Otherwise 4QLev-Numᵃ may preserve the more original reading (see E. Ulrich and F.M. Cross, *Qumran Cave 4. VII*, 158, for these suggestions).

⁹⁹⁴ See note above.

⁹⁹⁵ See note above.
4QLev-Num⁸ 4 6

Q358 MT Lev 14:46

4QLev-Num⁸ 4 6

Q359 MT Lev 14:49

4QLev-Num⁸ 4 9

Q360 MT Lev 14:50

4QLev-Num⁸ 4 10

Q361 MT Lev 14:51

4QLev-Num⁸ 5 2

Q362 MT Lev 16:23

4QLev-Num⁸ 8-14 i 10

Q363 MT Lev 1:11

4QLev-Num⁸ number.⁹⁹⁶

sv(1) – 4QLev-Num⁸ lacks the object marker.⁹⁹⁷

sv(1) – Lexical interchange.⁹⁹⁸

sv(1) – Difference in number.⁹⁹⁹

sv(1) – Interchange of prepositions.

sv(1) – The MT lacks the definite

---

⁹⁹⁶ The possessive pronominal suffix refers to Elohim, “the house,” a masculine definite noun. In this case the MT would appear to have the correct form. However, the suffix in 4QLev-Num⁸ may be read as a masculine singular suffix, either with an archaic Hebrew spelling or otherwise under Aramaic influence. In such a case the noun in 4QLev-Num⁸ may be read as singular, and hence a difference in number would result. On the archaic 3ms pronominal suffix see the discussion in F.I. Andersen, “The Spelling of Suffixes,” Studies in Hebrew and Aramaic Orthography (eds D.N. Freedman, A.D. Forbes, and F.I. Andersen; Biblical and Judaic Studies 2 Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1992) 63-65.

⁹⁹⁷ The pronominal object suffix is appended directly to the verb in 4QLev-Num⁸, which is restored wrgsh, “he has caused it to be shut.” This form may be read as a plural verb with no pronominal object on the basis that some Samaritan manuscripts read wrgsh, “they have caused it to be shut” (see E. Ulrich and F.M. Cross, Qumran Cave 4. VII, 158). Such a reading would also fit the context given the other plural forms in this scroll (see Q351, Q356 and Q357 above, and Q360 below). However in light of Rule 4 the reading with the pronominal object is preferred.

⁹⁹⁸ The reading in the MT is supported by the SP, and possibly also by the LXX. The latter has an infinite form of ἀφανίζω, “to purify,” which is used more often to translate so than ἁρακνεῖς (for ἁρακνεῖς = ἀφανίζω see Lev 14:49, 52; Num 19:12, 13, 19, 20; Num 31:20; for ἁρακνεῖς = ἀφανίζω see Num 8:6, 21).

⁹⁹⁹ See note above.

¹⁰⁰⁰ The form in 4QLev-Num⁸ is restored here as ἀθάνατον. In the edition princeps the form in 4QLev-Num⁸ is restored as ἀθάνατος (see E. Ulrich and F.M. Cross, Qumran Cave 4. VII, 159). That is, the MT has a preposition preceding an infinitive construct, as opposed to the conjunction plus finite verb in 4QLev-Num⁸. The condition of fragment 13 allows for very little certainty for this reading, and so restoring in favour of the MT reading would seem plausible.
4QLevb 1-7 13  דָּהָשׁ article.

Q364 MT Lev 1:11  דֶּרֶךְ SV(2) – 4QLevb lacks the pronominal suffix.
4QLevb 1-7 13  דָּהָשׁ

Q365 MT Lev 1:16  מַרְאָא OV(1) – Possible difference in grammatical form.\(^{1001}\)
4QLevb 1-7 19  מַרְאן

Q366 MT Lev 1:17  לָהֳ MT Lev 1:16  מַרְאן SV(1) – The MT lacks the conjunction.
4QLevb 1-7 20  לָהֳ

Q367 MT Lev 1:17  דָּהֵא SV(1) – Difference in gender.\(^{1002}\)
4QLevb 1-7 21  דָּהֵא

Q368 MT Lev 1:17  אֵאָה SV(2) – The MT has an explicating plus.\(^{1003}\)
4QLevb 1-7 20  אֵאָה omits

Q369 MT Lev 2:8  יְדָהְסָא SV(1) – Difference in person.\(^{1004}\)
4QLevb 1-7 29  יְדָהְסָא

Q370 MT Lev 2:11  מִנְחָה SV(1) – 4QLevb lacks the definite article.
4QLevb 1-7 32  מִנְחָה

Q371 MT Lev 2:14  יָבְרֵי SV(1) – Interchange of prepositions.
4QLevb 1-7 36  יָבְרֵי

\(^{1001}\) The pronominal suffix in 4QLevb may be 3fs, but see note above for a discussion of the reading of the ה- pronominal suffix as an archaic 3ms form. The form is regarded as coming from archaic Hebrew or Aramaic influence – the possibility that it is due to early or late dialectal influence is left open.

\(^{1002}\) The pronoun refers to מֵלֶל(, “burnt offering,” a feminine singular noun. The MT gēre has the correct form of the pronoun.

\(^{1003}\) The phrase in the MT reads: נָלָהָ הַמַּמַּת הָאָשֶׁת רַוחַ נִשָּׁת לֵיהָ נוֹתֵה, “it (is) a burnt offering, an offering by fire, a pleasing smell to Yahweh.”

\(^{1004}\) The form in the MT agrees with the SP, while the form in 4QLevb agrees with the LXX. The address of this passage of Leviticus alternates between second and third person, and there would appear to be some disagreement between the witnesses. See also verse 4 for similar differences between the MT and the LXX.
| Q372 | MT Lev 2:16 | סדנאה | 4QLev<sup>b</sup> 1-7 38 | SV(1) – Lexical interchange.\textsuperscript{1005} |
| Q373 | MT Lev 3:1 | ולדוהי | 4QLev<sup>b</sup> 1-7 39 | SV(2) – 4QLev<sup>b</sup> has an explicating plus.\textsuperscript{1006} |
| Q374 | MT Lev 3:11 | והקפריר | 4QLev<sup>b</sup> 8 4 | SV(2) – The MT has an explicating plus.\textsuperscript{1007} |
| Q375 | MT Lev 22:11 | אוול | 4QLev<sup>b</sup> 9 i, 10-17 19 | SV(1) – Difference in number.\textsuperscript{1008} |
| Q376 | MT Lev 22:12 | אנה | 4QLev<sup>b</sup> 9 i, 10-17 26 | SV(1) – Difference in gender.\textsuperscript{1009} |
| Q377 | MT Lev 22:18 | ורמ |  | SV(2) – 4QLev<sup>b</sup> has an expansive |

\textsuperscript{1005} The unusual noun סדנאה in the MT is found only in Lev 2:2, 9, 16; 5:12; 6:8 and Num 5:26. The form that appears in 4QLev<sup>b</sup> is not found at all in the MT, so it is unlikely that the scribe of 4QLev<sup>b</sup> exchanged an unusual lexeme for a more common one here. According to G.R. Driver, “Three Technical Terms in the Pentateuch,” \textit{Journal of Semitic Studies} 1, 2 (1956) 99-100, the term סדנאה, not necessarily of Aramaic origin, denoted a token amount of a sacrificial offering that was burnt on the altar, leaving the rest of the offering to be consumed in other ways (presumably by the priests). If, as Driver suggests, the term is used specifically in the Priestly code, its particular meaning may have been unclear to the scribe of 4QLev<sup>b</sup>, who then exchanged it for a term that was closer in appearance to the obvious root רקזר, “to remember.” This view, of course, presumes that the form in the MT is the more original, but this is not necessarily the case. See, for example, the tendency for Mishnaic Hebrew to use prosthetic aleph as a noun former (apparently as a phonemic modification of preformative h) in M.H. Segal, \textit{Grammar}, 38, 113.

\textsuperscript{1006} 4QLev<sup>b</sup> clarifies the beneficiary of the peace offering: אָבֶּדֶן אתֶּסֶת שְׁלַמוֹת בְּרַבִּים לְיהוָה, “If his offering is a sacrifice of peace offering to Yahweh.” The LXX agrees with 4QLev<sup>b</sup>, as do many Latin manuscripts (see E. Ulrich and F.M. Cross, \textit{Qumran Cave 4. VII}, 180).

\textsuperscript{1007} The MT clarifies the object of the verb ורקזר, “to burn,” by appending the pronominal object suffix.

\textsuperscript{1008} It is possible that 4QLev<sup>b</sup> has a plural noun with a pronominal suffix appended, restored יִיוֹד בָּשָׂר, “his progeny.” According to E. Ulrich and F.M. Cross, \textit{Qumran Cave 4. VII}, 183, “At the end of the word is an intentional ink stroke; the leather is damaged, making it impossible to determine whether the scribe wrote יִיוֹד בָּשָׂר or began to write וָו or an extra yod but stopped.” Regardless of whether or not we read a pronominal suffix at the end of the word it can be assumed that the noun is plural in 4QLev<sup>b</sup>.

\textsuperscript{1009} The pronoun refers to נֹתַנְתָּ לֹא בֶּן, “the daughter of a priest.” Clearly the 3fs pronoun in 4QLev<sup>b</sup> and the MT \textit{qere} is correct.
plus.1010

Q378 MT Lev 22:18
4QLev b 9 i, 10-17 27
לִבְּלָה
SV(1) – Interchange of prepositions.

Q379 MT Lev 22:20
4QLev b 9 i, 10-17 28
לְבָה
SV(1) – Difference in number.1011

Q380 MT Lev 22:21
4QLev b 9 i, 10-17 29
לְרֹבֵה
SV(1) – Interchange of prepositions.

Q381 MT Lev 22:22
4QLev b 9 i, 10-17 30-31
אמורתּ
SV(2) – 4QLev b has an expansive plus.1012

Q382 MT Lev 22:22
4QLev b 9 i, 10-17 31 omits
אלה
SV(2) – 4QLev b lacks the demonstrative.1013

Q383 MT Lev 22:22
4QLev b 9 i, 10-17 31 omits
אֲסָה
SV(2) – 4QLev b has an expansive plus.1014

Q384 MT Lev 22:23
4QLev b 9 i, 10-17 32
הַנַּתֵּה
SV(1) – Difference in number.1015

1010 4QLev b has a different phrasing that is found in the MT, with a definite noun followed by a definitive participle: לִבְּלָה, "and from the sojourner, the one sojourning in Israel." The MT, on the other hand, has only the definite article plus participle. The phraseology in 4QLev b is not foreign to the MT, where in other places the same root is used for the noun and following definitive participle a total of 15 times (see, for example, Gen 1:26; 7:14, 21; 8:17; Lev 11:29, 41, 42, 43).

1011 The plural pronominal suffix is also reflected in the other witnesses. The verb seems to demand a plural suffix: מַקְלוּ הִמְרָאָה קָּלִים נִכְרְאֵל, "you will not bring (it) near because it shall not be desirable to you.”

1012 The MT lacks the addition מַקְלוּ הִמְרָאָה קָּלִים נִכְרְאֵל, “or one with crushed testicles,” which is probably a harmonisation with Lev 21:20.

1013 The demonstrative refers to the listed items that are forbidden to bring as offerings to Yahweh in Lev 22:22. 4QLev b lacks the demonstrative but does include a noun in its place, for which see the next variant. The SP and the LXX agree with the MT.

1014 The phrase in 4QLev b reads: מַקְלוּ הִמְרָאָה קָּלִים נִכְרְאֵל, "you shall not bring (them) as an offering by fire to Yahweh.”

1015 The plural form in 4QLev b fits the context and is in agreement with the SP.
| Q385 | MT Lev 22:31 | SV(2) – The MT has an expansive plus. |
| Q386 | MT Lev 23:14 | SV(1) – 4QLev⁰ lacks the conjunction. |
| Q387 | MT Lev 24:10 | SV(1) – The MT lacks the definite article.¹⁰¹⁶ |
| Q388 | MT Lev 25:46 | SV(1) – Lexical interchange.¹⁰¹⁷ |
| Q389 | MT Lev 4:14 | OV(l) – Possible difference in grammatical form.¹⁰¹⁸ |
| Q390 | MT Lev 5:12 | SV(1) – Difference in gender.¹⁰¹⁹ |
| Q391 | MT Lev 14:36 | SV(2) – 4QLevd has an expansive plus.¹⁰²⁰ |
| Q392 | MT Lev 17:3 | SV(2) – 4QLevd has an expansive plus.¹⁰²¹ |

---

¹⁰¹⁶ This may amount to a difference in expression, where the MT has the construct noun phrase יִשְׁכַּרְךָ, “and the man of the Israelites,” against the restored adjectival phrase in 4QLev⁰ יִשְׁכַּרְךָ, “and the Israelite man.” The same phrasing as 4QLev⁰ is found in the LXX and in 11QpaleoLev⁵. The SP lacks any definite article in the phrase.

¹⁰¹⁷ The reflexive form in the MT is treated as a different lexeme to the causative form in 4QLev⁰.

¹⁰¹⁸ See the comments in note above.

¹⁰¹⁹ The pronoun refers to a ministers, “a sin offering,” a feminine singular noun, so the form in 4QLev⁰ and the MT qere is correct.

¹⁰²⁰ The phrase in 4QLev⁰ is probably harmonised with similar forms in Lev 13 and 14.

¹⁰²¹ The phrase in the MT reads: יִשָּׁבֵהוּ, “a man from the house of Israel,” which has some type of expansion in 4QLev⁰. The Greek manuscripts, including Vatikanus and Alexandrinus, seem to support the restoration of 4QLev⁰ יִשָּׁבֵהוּ, “a man from the house of Israel and the sojourner, the one sojourning in Israel.”
Q394 MT Lev 17:4 4QLevd 4 4-5 omits אַהֲרֵה פָטוֹרָה SV(2) – 4QLevd has an expansive plus.\textsuperscript{1022}

Q395 MT Lev 17:4 4QLevd 4 5 לַהֲרוֹקִית SV(2) – The MT lacks the re- sumptive pronominal suffix that clarifies the object.\textsuperscript{1023}

Q396 MT Lev 17:10 4QLevd 4 15 omits אֲמָה SV(1) – The MT lacks the object marker.

Q397 MT Lev 17:11 4QLevd 4 16 omitס הבשר SV(2) – 4QLevd has an explicat- ing plus.\textsuperscript{1024}

Q398 MT Lev 17:11 4QLevd 4 16 הבשר SV(1) – 4QLevd lacks the definite article.\textsuperscript{1025}

Q399 MT Lev 17:11 4QLevd 4 16 ברה הבѣז(sv) SV(2) – The MT lacks the pro- nominal suffix that clarifies the object.\textsuperscript{1026}

Q400 MT Lev 3:6 4QLevd 2 3 שָׁלָם SV(1) – The MT lacks the definite article.

Q401 MT Lev 19:36 4QLevd 3 3 מַעֲנִיָּן אָדָם SV(2) – The MT has an expansive plus.\textsuperscript{1027}

\textsuperscript{1022} The plus describes additional sacrifices that are suitable to offer, reflected also in the LXX and the SP.

\textsuperscript{1023} The pronominal object suffix refers to the masculine noun קַּרְבַּן, “an offering,” equated with the list of possible offerings in Lev 17:3. The MT has a similar form, referring to the same object, in the preceding phrase "וַיְבֹא אֲלֵהֶם בִּשְׂדֵי," “he shall not bring it.”

\textsuperscript{1024} The phrase in the MT reads: וַיְבֹא אֲלֵהֶם בִּשְׂדֵי, “because the soul of the flesh (is) in the blood.” The LXX agrees with 4QLevd with the addition of the adjective: וַיְבֹא אֲלֵהֶם בִּשְׂדֵי, “because the soul of all flesh (is) in the blood.”

\textsuperscript{1025} The difference in phrasing accounts for the loss of the article in 4QLevd – see the previous variant.

\textsuperscript{1026} The form in 4QLevd is harmonised with the form in Lev 17:14, also reflected in the LXX.

\textsuperscript{1027} 4QLevd lacks the reference to מַעֲנִיָּן אָדָם, “correct scales.” E. Ulrich and F.M. Cross, \textit{Qumran Cave 4. VII}, 198, supposes homoioteleuton, on the basis that the LXX also lacks one of the listed items in this verse, מַעֲנִיָּן אָדָם, “a correct ephah.”
Q402 MT Lev 21:1
4QLev\(e\) 5 4
OV(l) – Possible difference in grammatical form.\(^{1028}\)

Q403 MT Lev 21:9
4QLev\(e\) 6 2
 omits
SV(2) – 4QLev\(e\) has an expansive plus.\(^{1029}\)

Q404 MT Lev 21:24
4QLev\(e\) 7 5
SV(2) – The MT has an expansive plus.

Q405 MT Lev 22:5
4QLev\(e\) 8 3
SV(2) – 4QLev\(e\) has an expansive plus.\(^{1030}\)

Q406 MT Lev 2:1
4QExod-Lev\(f\) 4 3
SV(2) – The MT lacks the dative pronominal suffix.\(^{1031}\)

Q407 MT Lev 2:1
4QExod-Lev\(f\) 4 4
SV(2) – 4QExod-Lev\(f\) has an expansive plus.\(^{1032}\)

\(^{1028}\) Cf. the discussion on the 3ms pronominal suffix on singular nouns \([\text{o}]\) written \(\text{v}-\) or \(\text{v}\)- in note above. The same pertains to the 3ms pronominal suffix on plural nouns \([\text{a(y)}\text{w}]\), for which an archaic spelling \(\text{w}\)- was updated towards the standard spelling \(\text{wy}-\). See F.I. Andersen and A.D. Forbes, *Spelling in the Hebrew Bible: Dahood Memorial Lecture* (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1986) 324-26, and F.I. Andersen and D.N. Freedman, "Another Look at 4QSam\(g\)," *Studies in Hebrew and Aramaic Orthography* (eds D.N. Freedman, A.D. Forbes, and F.I. Andersen; Biblical and Judaic Studies 2 Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1992) 196. The spelling of the singular suffix appended to a plural noun as \(\text{v}\)- is noted as a characteristic Qumran Hebrew orthographic form in E. Qimron, *Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 59.

\(^{1029}\) The phrase in the MT states that the prostituted daughter of a priest is \(\text{tllxm hyb} \) t), "profaning her father," against the expansive phrase in 4QLev\(e\) which is restored \(\text{tllxm hyb} \) tyb \(\text{t}\), "she is profaning her father's house." Among the Targums, Tg. Neof. and Tg. Onq, agree with the MT, but the phrase is somewhat altered by the injection of a temporal clause in Tg. Ps.-J. This texts possibly reflects a different Vorlage: \(\text{tyynzw } \text{hwb} \) tyb \(\text{M( )yhd } \text{ynzb y( +ml hmrg sypt Mwr)}\), "if she becomes desecrated by straying in harlotry while she is in her father's house, and she is a harlot."

\(^{1030}\) The phrase in 4QLev\(e\) reads: \(\text{wl } \text{)m+ } \text{r#) )m+ Cr# lkb (gy r#) #y)}\), "a man who touches any unclean swarming thing which will make him unclean." The word may have been lost in the MT by parablepsis considering that the same lexeme occurs three other times in the same verse. The SP and the LXX support the reading in 4QLev\(e\).

\(^{1031}\) The secondary object is specified by the pronominal suffix: \(\text{wnbrq byrqt yk #pn}\), “one that will offer his offering.” The MT has the same form later in the same verse.

\(^{1032}\) The phrase in 4QExod-Lev\(f\) is restored \(\text{hxnm hnbl}\), “a frankincense tribute,” which reflects the similar phrasing \(\text{hxnm Nbrq}\), “tribute offering,” earlier in the same verse. The SP and the LXX agree with 4QExod-Lev\(f\).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q408</th>
<th>MT Lev 7:20</th>
<th>סָדָה</th>
<th>4QLev# 2</th>
<th>SV(1) – Difference in gender.1033</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q409</td>
<td>MT Lev 7:21</td>
<td>סָדָה</td>
<td>4QLev# 4</td>
<td>SV(1) – Difference in gender.1034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q410</td>
<td>MT Lev 7:25</td>
<td>נָכָרָה</td>
<td>4QLev# 8</td>
<td>SV(1) – Difference in number.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q411</td>
<td>MT Lev 7:25</td>
<td>סָדָה</td>
<td>4QLev# 8</td>
<td>SV(1) – Lexical interchange.1035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q412</td>
<td>MT Num 1:38</td>
<td>לְמַעַר</td>
<td>4QLev-Num# 29 2</td>
<td>SV(1) – Difference in number.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q413</td>
<td>MT Num 3:3</td>
<td>לְמַעַר</td>
<td>4QLev-Num# 31, 32 i, 33 6</td>
<td>SV(1) – Difference in number.1036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q414</td>
<td>MT Num 3:9</td>
<td>נָכָרָה</td>
<td></td>
<td>OV(l) – Possible difference in</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1033 The pronoun refers to סָדָה, an irregular feminine definite noun, so the form in 4QLev# and the MT qere is correct.

1034 The pronoun refers to סָדָה. See the previous note.

1035 The MT reads: יִנְּסָרָה מִלְּאָסָר אֲנָשָׁה לְיַהוֹ, “from which you bring near an offering made by fire to Yahweh,” against the restored reading in 4QLev#: יִנְּסָרָה מִלְּאָסָר אֲנָשָׁה לְיַהוֹ, “from which you bring near an offering to Yahweh.” The SP and the LXX agree with the MT, but the Tgs. support the reading in 4QLev#. The verb could refer to either the singular noun יִנְּסָרָה or the plural יִנְּסָרָה. The verse is poorly preserved in 4QLev-Num#, but the MT reads: יִנְּסָרָה מִלְּאָסָר אֲנָשָׁה לְיַהוֹ, “These are the names of the sons of Aaron, the anointed ones, whose hand (lit. ‘which their hand’) was filled for performing priestly duties” (the final infinitive construct is read here as a stative). It seems evident that in both sources the noun יִנְּסָרָה, “hand, power,” is singular, and so the singular verb in the MT likely coordinates thus: “the hand of whom was filled.” The plural verb in 4QLev-Num# may refer instead to יִנְּסָרָה, thus: “the sons of Aaron ... who had filled their hand.” In the MT the verb is intransitive and takes only a secondary object לְמַעַר, whereas in 4QLev-Num# the verb is transitive and takes the noun יִנְּסָרָה as its direct object. While this variant is therefore read as a change in expression and syntax, the variation is only indicated in the verb itself, and so only a difference in number is counted.
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4QLev-Num² 31, 32  נָתָנָה
i, 33 11  pronunciation.¹⁰³⁷

Q415 MT Num 3:12 מִבְּנֵי שָׂרָאָל
4QLev-Num² 31, 32 מִבְּנֵי שָׂרָאָל
i, 33 14  SV(1) – Interchange of prepositions.

Q416 MT Num 5:3 נָעָה
4QLev-Num 34 ii, 44-50 17  נָעָה  SV(1) – The MT lacks the conjunction.

Q417 MT Num 5:6 נָעָה
4QLev-Num² 34 ii, 44-50 22  נָעָה  SV(1) – Difference in gender.¹⁰³⁸

Q418 MT Num 9:3 בָּיְמֹה
4QLev-Num² 53-54 1  בָּיְמֹה  SV(2) – 4QLev-Num² has a different expression to the MT.¹⁰³⁹

Q419 MT Num 12:3 נָאָה 4QLev-Num² 60-61 1  נָאָה  OV(I) – Difference in grammatical form.¹⁰⁴⁰

¹⁰³⁷ See the comments in note  above.
¹⁰³⁸ The pronoun refers to #פָּנִי. See note  above.
¹⁰³⁹ Not enough text is preserved to read a hermeneutic variant here. It is true, though, that the wording in 4QLev-Num² seem difficult to reconcile with the MT if the placement of the fragment is accurate. Where the MT reads: לָבַיְמֹהוּ, "between the evenings," 4QLev-Num² has a phrase the begins with לָבַיְמֹהוּ, "in the day." The SP and the LXX support the reading in the MT. The phrase in Tg. Ps.-J. may shed some light on the problem, as it reads: לִבְּמֵי, “at twilight,” (see M. Sokoloff, Dictionary of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic, 558-59) but literally means “between the suns.” While the particle לָבַיְמֹהוּ agrees with the reading in the MT, the use of the term לָבַיְמֹהוּ may somehow reflect a text like 4QLev-Num². While this translation may provide some clues it does not allow for any firm conclusions. The tone of E. Ulrich and F.M. Cross, Qumran Cave 4. VII, 168, is equally perplexed: “If frg. 53 is placed correctly, the scribe wrote לָבַיְמֹהוּ where [the MT and the SP] have לָבַיְמֹהוּ. What the ensuing text would have read is uncertain.”
¹⁰⁴⁰ The form in 4QLev-Num² is restored לִבְּמֵי, “very.” This is a form of the regular adverb לִבְּמֵי, terminating with a locative י, which had arguably become part of the spoken dialect reflected in certain scrolls from Qumran (see E. Qimron, Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls, 117-18). The form is identical in meaning the לִבְּמֵי, according to Qimron, as “the he of direction has lost its syntactical function in DSS Hebrew. It was rather perceived as a locative termination without any syntactical function” (Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls, 68.)
| Q420 | MT Num 12:8 | וּכְרַעְתָּה | 4QLev-Num\textsuperscript{a} 60-61 | SV(1) – The MT lacks the preposition ב. |
| Q421 | MT Num 11:32 | omit | 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} I 1-4 2 | SV(2) – The MT lacks the adjective that clarifies the object.\textsuperscript{1041} |
| Q422 | MT Num 11:32 | יָמֶשׁ | 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} I 1-4 2 | SV(1) – The MT lacks the definite article. |
| Q423 | MT Num 11:32 | לָהֵם | 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} I 1-4 3 | OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation. |
| Q424 | MT Num 11:33 | מָאָרֵד | 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} I 1-4 4 | OV(l) – Difference in grammatical form.\textsuperscript{1042} |
| Q425 | MT Num 11:34 | הָדוּרָה | 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} I 1-4 4 | OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation. |
| Q426 | MT Num 11:35 | נָסְעָה | 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} I 1-4 5 | SV(1) – Difference in number.\textsuperscript{1043} |
| Q427 | MT Num 11:35 | הָרְוָרָה | 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} I 1-4 5 | SV(2) – The MT has an explicating plus.\textsuperscript{1044} |
| Q428 | MT Num 12:6 | יָדוּחַ אַלַּמְיָא | 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} I 1-4 12 | SV(2) – 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} has an explicating plus.\textsuperscript{1045} |

---

\textsuperscript{1041} 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} is restored: יָדֹחַ אַלַּמְיָא, “And all the people stood up all that day.” All of the other witnesses agree with the MT. There may be some tendency toward harmonisation as there is repeated reference to יָדֹחַ אַלַּמְיָא in Num 11:11, 12 and 14.

\textsuperscript{1042} See note above.

\textsuperscript{1043} The noun יָדֹחַ is treated as plural in the MT and the SP. On the general variability of the grammatical number of verbs when coordinating with the collective noun יָדֹחַ in Qumran biblical manuscripts see I. Young, "Am Construed as Singular and Plural in Hebrew Biblical Texts: Diachronic and Biblical Perspectives," Zeitschrift für Althebraistik 12, 1 (1999) 65-66, esp. note 73.

\textsuperscript{1044} In the MT the goal is clarified in the phrase מַקְּרַעְתָּה הָדוּרָה נָסְעָה הָרְוָרָה, “From Kibroth-hattaavah the people journeyed (to) Hazeroth.” The SP and the LXX support the reading in the MT.

\textsuperscript{1045} 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} clarifies the subject of the verb יָדוּחַ אַלַּמְיָא, “to say.” One Greek manuscript agrees with 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} in this regard.
| Q429 | MT Num 12:8 | וְהָרָא הַמֶּרֶא | SV(1) – Interchange of prepositions.¹⁰⁴⁶ |
| Q430 | MT Num 13:17 | אֶתָּ֖ם | OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation. |
| Q431 | MT Num 13:18 | הָרֶפֶּאֶה | SV(1) – 4QNumᵇ lacks the definite article. |
| Q432 | MT Num 13:18 | הָוָ֔א הָרֶפֶּאֶה | SV(3) – 4QNumᵇ has a different word order to the MT. |
| Q433 | MT Num 13:19 | וְהָאָ֖ה | OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation. |
| Q434 | MT Num 13:19 | וְהָאָ֖ה | OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation. |
| Q435 | MT Num 13:19 | וְהָאָ֖ה | SV(1) – The MT lacks the conjunction. |
| Q436 | MT Num 13:20 | וְלֹא הָיָ֖ה | SV(2) – 4QNumᵇ has an explicating plus.¹⁰⁴⁷ |
| Q437 | MT Num 13:20 | וְהָוָ֖א הָיָ֖ה | OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation. |
| Q438 | MT Num 13:20 | וַּלֹא הָיָ֖ה | OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation. |

¹⁰⁴⁶ The MT reads: וְהָרָא הַמֶּרֶא, “and clearly, and not in riddles,” against the restored reading in 4QNumᵇ: וְהָרָא הַמֶּרֶא, “with clarity, and not in riddles.” This amounts to a minor change in expression via an interchange of prepositions, perhaps according to the preferred syntax of the scribe, or perhaps in harmonisation with the form in Num 12:6. The SP probably supports the reading in 4QNumᵇ (see E. Ulrich and F.M. Cross, Qumran Cave 4. VII, 217).

¹⁰⁴⁷ The independent pronoun in 4QNumᵇ specifies the subject of the phrase וְלֹא הָיָ֖ה, “and if it (is) impoverished.”
The masculine noun, "grapes," is constructed with the *nomens regens* תַּרְכָּבָה in 4QNum b, and SP, and possibly also the LXX. The latter has the feminine plural adjective προδρομοι, "forerunners," but the noun it describes is feminine (σταφυλης, "grape bunch"). It is unclear why 4QNum b and the SP have the feminine *nomens regens*. In the MT Torah the feminine form of this noun as *nomens regens* only appears with a feminine noun in Gen 4:4, וָנָכַר תַּרְכָּבָה, "his choice sheep," but see the *nomens rectum* in Jer 24:2 כֶּרֶם תַּרְכָּבָה, "first-ripe figs," and the construction in Neh 10:37 וְנִנְבַּנְתָּ תַּרְכָּבָה, "our first-born sons." The latter two instances can hardly be expected to be triggers for harmonisation in the present context. The overwhelming majority of plural *nomens regens* formed from נַעַרְבָּה in the MT are masculine (at least 13 times).

The expression in 4QNum b agrees with the SP, possibly harmonising with Num 13:26 (for this suggestion see E. Ulrich and F.M. Cross, *Qumran Cave 4. VII*, 220).

The grammatical number of the indefinite subject differs between the sources. 4QNum b agrees with the SP and the LXX.

The conjunction could otherwise be read as *waw* consecutive plus perfect verb, for which see note below.
The entire phrase is constructed as a past temporal sequence in 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} in agreement with the LXX, against the future sequence in the MT and the SP. The verb form, taken with the preceding perfect form בְּרָפָה, indicates that this is indeed the case. The entire phrase can be restored as a series of past temporal clauses thus: וַיִּפְרַע יְהוָה את אאמֹר לָאָמָר וַיָּפְרַע יְהוָה, “And Yahweh has scrutinised, and has made known who belongs to him, and the holy he has drawn near to himself, and the one he has chosen he has drawn near to himself.” Here the form בְּרָפָה is translated as פִּילָן 3ms perfect ᴮʳᵖ, “examine,” following E. Ulrich and F.M. Cross, Qumran Cave 4. VII, 222. Against this the MT has the וָאָמָר consecutive plus perfect verb בְּרָפָה (see Q446 above) and the imperfect verb בָּרָא, as well as writing בָּרָא as a noun meaning “morning.” The phrase in the MT is translated thus: “(By) morning Yahweh will make known who belongs to him, and the holy he will draw near to himself, and the one he has chosen he will draw near to himself.” However, the two variants taken individually could be otherwise interpreted. The first form, Q446 where 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} lacks וָאָמָר consecutive, could be read simply as the elision of a conjunction with no impact on the tense or aspect of the phrase. The second form, Q447, could be read as a participle, and similarly have no significant impact on the overall incomplete aspect of the phrase. In light of Rule 4 this interpretation is preferred, and so two separate minor variants are counted. Such a reading admittedly makes no use of the LXX reading, which otherwise sheds light on the verbal forms in this passage of 4QNum\textsuperscript{b}. However, seeing as we can find a reading of the bare consonantal text that maintains the sense of the MT, this reading is preferred.

The phrase in 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} harmonises with Num 16:5 and 6.
1055 The phrase in 4QNum\(^b\) has a different construction, restored to read: אֶתְנֵֽהַ יִשְׂרָאֵל מַעְלָה מִן וַתֵּשֶׁר, “the tribute of tenths from the tenths,” against the MT reading: אֶתְנֵֽהַ יִשְׂרָאֵל מַעְלָה מִן וַתֵּשֶׁר, “a tribute to Yahweh, a tenth from the tenths.” The *nomens regens* is the same between the sources, but the tribute itself is classified as being Yahweh’s in the MT, while the construct chain is extended to include the following chain in 4QNum\(^b\), namely “a tenths of the tenths.” The phrase is written with the proper noun included in 4QNum\(^b\) X 12.5 and 6 (Num 18:29-30).

1056 The MT clarifies the addressee of the speech, namely the Levites, given only as the 2mpl pronominal suffix in 4QNum\(^b\). The Levites are already mentioned as the addressees of the speech in Lev 18:26. The MT agrees with the SP and the LXX.

1057 4QNum\(^b\) specifies the “best part of it,” *i.e.* the tithe of the priests, as “your (the priests’) tribute,” harmonising with Num 18:27 (see E. Ulrich and F.M. Cross, *Qumran Cave 4. VII*, 224).

1058 This variant and Q457 amount to a difference in expression between the sources. The construct chain in the MT reads: לְקָרָא אֵלֶֽיךָ, “like the produce of the winepress.” The same information is differently phrased in 4QNum\(^b\), which is restored: לְקָרָא מִן תֵּחָלָה, “like the produce from the winepress.” This phrasing in 4QNum\(^b\) finds support in the wording of the LXX which includes the genitive preposition: ως γενημα απο ληνον, “as produce from the winepress.”

1059 The pronominal object suffix refers to the singular noun תלֶב, “best part,” in the previous verse. The scribe possibly read the objects as תלֶב ... שָׁכָא נָא ... תלֶב ... שָׁכָא נָא ... תלֶב, “the best part ... the produce of the threshing floor ... the produce of the winepress.”
Q461 MT Num 18:31 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} X 12 8  אַתָּם  אַתָּם  OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.

Q462 MT Num 19:2 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} X 12 12  אלָּתָם  אלָּתָם  OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.

Q463 MT Num 19:3 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} X 12 13  נָתַתּוּ  נָתַתּוּ  SV(1) – Difference in number.\textsuperscript{1060}

Q464 MT Num 19:3 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} X 12 14  וָשָּׁתֵם  וָשָּׁתֵם  SV(1) – Difference in number.\textsuperscript{1061}

Q465 MT Num 19:4 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} X 12 15  פָּעַמ  פָּעַמ  SV(1) – Lexical interchange.\textsuperscript{1062}

Q466 MT Num 20:13 omits 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XI 13 i-14, 25-30  כְּעַסְדָּתָם  כְּעַסְדָּתָם  SV(2) – The MT lacks the additional text in 4QNum\textsuperscript{b}.\textsuperscript{1063}

Q467 MT Num 20:20 omits 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XII 13 ii, 15-17 i 14  בְּעַסְדָּתָם  בְּעַסְדָּתָם  SV(2) – 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} has an expansive plus.\textsuperscript{1064}

Q468 MT Num 20:24 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XII 13 ii, 15-17 i 23  אֹיִם  אֹיִם  SV(1) – 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} lacks the object marker.

\textsuperscript{1060} 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} treats the subject of the verb, בֵּית שִׂמְךָ אֲנָשָׁיו, “the sons of Israel,” as singular, in agreement with the LXX.

\textsuperscript{1061} The indefinite subject is given as singular in the MT, but as plural in 4QNum\textsuperscript{b}. The LXX has a plural indicate active verb, καὶ σφαξοῦσιν, “and they shall slay,” supporting the reading in 4QNum\textsuperscript{b}.

\textsuperscript{1062} The location of the action of the verb נָשָׁתֵם, “to scatter,” is given as בְּעַסְדָּתָם, “before the tent,” in the MT, against נָשָׁתֵם בְּפָנָיו, “the opening of the tent,” in 4QNum\textsuperscript{b}.

\textsuperscript{1063} 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} includes a major interpolation which is also reflected in the SP. The additional in the SP is taken from Deut 3:24-28 and Deut 2:2-6, though only part of the first pericope is preserved in 4QNum\textsuperscript{b}. See E. Ulrich and F.M. Cross, *Qumran Cave 4. VII*, 225-26, for the restored text based on the SP, and for the variants from the SP contained therein. The additional material is not found in the LXX. See also the similar interpolations in this section in variant Q470, Q471 and Q472 below.

\textsuperscript{1064} The additional in 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} repeats the threat issued by the Edomites in Num 20:18.
Q469 MT Num 20:26 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XII 13 ii, 15-17 i 24
\begin{align*}
\textit{דנהנהו} & \text{OV(I) – Difference in grammatical form.}\phantom{1065} \\
\end{align*}

Q470 MT Num 21:12 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XIII 17 ii-18 13-15
\begin{align*}
\textit{וְאֵֽלִי} & \text{omits} \\
\textit{וְאֵֽלִי} & \text{SV(2) – The MT lacks the additional text in 4QNum\textsuperscript{b}.}\phantom{1066} \\
\end{align*}

Q471 MT Num 21:13 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XIII 17 ii-18 16-17
\begin{align*}
\textit{נִבְּהָל} & \text{omits} \\
\textit{יִבְּהָל} & \text{SV(2) – The MT lacks the additional text in 4QNum\textsuperscript{b}.}\phantom{1067} \\
\end{align*}

Q472 MT Num 21:21 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XIII 17 i-18 27
\begin{align*}
\textit{וְרָאֱֽמֵת} & \text{omits} \\
\textit{וְרָאֱֽמֵת} & \text{SV(2) – The MT lacks the additional text in 4QNum\textsuperscript{b}.}\phantom{1068} \\
\end{align*}

Q473 MT Num 22:5 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XIV 19 27
\begin{align*}
\textit{וָֽזֵגוּ} & \text{OV(I) – Possible difference in pronunciation.} \\
\end{align*}

Q474 MT Num 22:6 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XIV 19 29
\begin{align*}
\textit{וָֽזֵגוּ} & \text{OV(I) – Possible difference in pronunciation.} \\
\end{align*}

Q475 MT Num 21:7 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XV 20-22 1
\begin{align*}
\textit{מָשַּֽׁי} & \text{omits} \\
\textit{מָשַּֽׁי} & \text{SV(1) – The MT lacks the object marker.} \\
\end{align*}

Q476 MT Num 22:9 omits
\begin{align*}
\textit{מָשַּֽׁי} & \text{SV(2) – 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} has an explicat-} \\
\end{align*}

\textsuperscript{1065} The Hiph\textsuperscript{’}il imperative in the MT is written as jussive in 4QNum\textsuperscript{b}, in agreement with the SP.

\textsuperscript{1066} The SP agrees with 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} in the interpolation from Deut 2:9. See E. Ulrich and F.M. Cross, \textit{Qumran Cave 4. VII}, 229, for a restoration of the text based on the SP, and for the variants from the SP contained therein. The additional material is not found in the MT or the LXX.

\textsuperscript{1067} The SP agrees with 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} in the interpolation from Deut 2:17-19. See E. Ulrich and F.M. Cross, \textit{Qumran Cave 4. VII}, 229, for a restoration of the text based on the SP, and for the variants from the SP contained therein. The additional material is not found in the MT or the LXX.

\textsuperscript{1068} The SP agrees with 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} in the interpolation from Deut 2:24-25. See E. Ulrich and F.M. Cross, \textit{Qumran Cave 4. VII}, 229, for a restoration of the text based on the SP, and for the variants from the SP contained therein. The additional material is not found in the MT or the LXX.
4QNum$^b$ XV 20-22

Q477 MT Num 22:9
4QNum$^b$ XV 20-22

Q478 MT Num 22:10

Q479 MT Num 22:11

Q480 MT Num 22:11

Q481 MT Num 22:11

Q482 MT Num 22:11

Q483 MT Num 22:11

1069 The secondary object is clarified in 4QNum$^b$, restored לִבַּדַּר, “and he said to him.” The LXX agrees with the reading in 4QNum$^b$: καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ.

1070 4QNum$^b$ includes the infinitive construct לְמַסְיָר, the ‘of saying’ (see W. Gesenius, E. Kautzsch, and A.E. Cowley, Hebrew Grammar, 351, §1140), which is perhaps harmonised with Num 12:5 (so E. Ulrich and F.M. Cross, Qumran Cave 4. VII, 233), but in reality is so common throughout the syntax of the Torah that the scribe of 4QNum$^b$ may have added the form based on personal preference. The form agrees with the LXX, which has the nominative active present participle λεγών, “saying.”

1071 The phrase in 4QNum$^b$ is restored: ἔσται ἱππὸς, “and he lives next to me.” The addition of this phrase harmonises the reported speech of the king of Moab with his message to Balaam in Num 22:5. The LXX also supports the reading in 4QNum$^b$.

1072 The pronominal suffix ἅ- in 4QNum$^b$ is written as ᾧ- in the MT.
4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XV 20-22 \textsuperscript{5} 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XV 20-22 \textsuperscript{6} 

Q484 MT Num 22:12 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XV 20-22 \textsuperscript{5} 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XV 20-22 \textsuperscript{6}  

Q485 MT Num 22:12 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XV 20-22 \textsuperscript{5} 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XV 20-22 \textsuperscript{6}  

Q486 MT Num 22:12 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XV 20-22 \textsuperscript{5} 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XV 20-22 \textsuperscript{6}  

Q487 MT Num 22:12 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XV 20-22 \textsuperscript{5} 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XV 20-22 \textsuperscript{6}  

Q488 MT Num 22:12 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XV 20-22 \textsuperscript{5} 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XV 20-22 \textsuperscript{6}  

Q489 MT Num 22:13 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} 20-22 \textsuperscript{7} 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} 20-22 \textsuperscript{7}  

Q490 MT Num 22:13 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} 20-22 \textsuperscript{7} 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} 20-22 \textsuperscript{7}  

Q491 MT Num 22:13 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} 20-22 \textsuperscript{7} 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} 20-22 \textsuperscript{7}  

\textsuperscript{1073} The phrase in 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} is restored: \textit{מִן הָאָרְץ}, “from the land,” and harmonises with Num 22:6, \textit{cf.} note above. 

\textsuperscript{1074} 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} is restored: \textit{מִן הָאָרְץ}, “from the land,” and harmonises with Num 22:6, \textit{cf.} note above. The masculine plural definite noun \textit{הָאָרְץ} is given only as a 3mpl pronominal suffix in the MT. The latter finds support in the readings of the SP and the LXX. 

\textsuperscript{1075} The command that Balaam gives the princes of Moab is equivalent between the sources in the context. 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} is restored: \textit{לֹא אָרְצֵיכֶם}, “go to your master,” against the reading in the MT: \textit{לֹא אָרְצֵיכֶם}, “go to your land.” There is support for both readings: 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} agrees with the LXX, while the MT agrees with the SP.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q492</th>
<th>MT Num 22:14</th>
<th>omits</th>
<th>SV(2) – 4QNum⁶ has an explicating plus.¹⁰⁷⁷</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q493</td>
<td>MT Num 22:16</td>
<td>ולא</td>
<td>SV(1) – Interchange of prepositions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q494</td>
<td>MT Num 22:16</td>
<td>omits</td>
<td>SV(2) – 4QNum⁶ has an expansive plus.¹⁰⁷⁸</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q495</td>
<td>MT Num 22:17</td>
<td>אבסדר</td>
<td>OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q496</td>
<td>MT Num 22:17</td>
<td>ולבה</td>
<td>SV(2) – 4QNum⁶ has an expansive plus.¹⁰⁷⁹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q497</td>
<td>MT Num 22:18</td>
<td>omits</td>
<td>SV(2) – 4QNum⁶ has an expansive plus.¹⁰⁷⁹</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

¹⁰⁷⁶ The infinitive construct of לְהַדֵּה with the 1cs dative pronominal suffix is rare in the MT, occurring only here. Cf. also the difficult instance of the infinitive construct with the 1cs possessive (genitive) pronominal suffix in 2 Sam 4:10 (and see W. Gesenius, E. Kautzsch, and A.E. Cowley, *Hebrew Grammar*, 349, §114f, n. 3). According to W. Gesenius, E. Kautzsch, and A.E. Cowley, *Hebrew Grammar*, 109, §33g, the long form '-ן is strictly accusative, while the short form '- is genitive in function.

¹⁰⁷⁷ See note above.

¹⁰⁷⁸ 4QNum⁶ is restored to read: בַּלָּק בֶּן צִיפֹּר, קִין מֹאָב.” The title of Balak son of Zippor in 4QNum⁶ that includes the phrase “the king of Moab,” is harmonised with Num 22:10. Both the SP and the LXX lacks the addition in agreement with the MT.

¹⁰⁷⁹ The phrase in 4QNum⁶ includes the preposition plus genitive pronominal suffix, clarifying the beneficiary of the action. “I shall do.” The clause is restored to read: בִּלּוֹ שַׁמֵּר הַעֲמָרָא אֲלֵי אָסְתַר לָבֹא, “and all that you will say to me I shall do for you.” See the similar addition in Q504 below.
4QNum\(^b\) XV 20-22

Q498 MT Num 22:19  
4QNum\(^b\) XV 20-22

12

omits  

sv(2) – 4QNum\(^b\) has an expansive plus.\(^{1080}\)

Q499 MT Num 22:20

4QNum\(^b\) XV 20-22

13-14

לבנה  

OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.

Q500 MT Num 22:20

4QNum\(^b\) XV 20-22

14

יאחז  

OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.

Q501 MT Num 22:31

4QNum\(^b\) XV 20-22

28

למסחי  

SV(1) – Lexical interchange.\(^{1082}\)

Q502 MT Num 22:32

4QNum\(^b\) XV 20-22

28

דיברה  

OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.

Q503 MT Num 22:32

4QNum\(^b\) XV 20-22

28

שׁאלה  

OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.

Q504 MT Num 22:32

omits  

SV(2) – 4QNum\(^b\) has an expansive plus.\(^{1081}\)

---

\(^{1080}\) In 4QNum\(^b\), and also in the LXX, the words that Balaam tells the servants of the king of Moab in Num 22:18 are harmonised with the words he tells the king directly in Num 24:13 (see E. Ulrich and F.M. Cross, *Qumran Cave 4. VII*, 233). 4QNum\(^b\) is restored: יבבל ילודג ול ועדנ, “to do less or more in my mind.”

\(^{1081}\) 4QNum\(^b\) includes an additional phrase that harmonises with Num 22:8. The SP and the LXX agree with the MT. 4QNum\(^b\) is restored: יבבל ילודג ובו ודענ, “And the princes of Moab dwelt with Balaam.”

\(^{1082}\) The MT has Balaam falling “on his face,” against 4QNum\(^b\) which has Balaam falling “before him.” For the meaning of the form ולעפ as “before” in the same sense as ולעפ, see L. Koehler and W. Baumgartner, *HALOT*, 77, who point to the use of this form in Gen 48:12 and 1 Sam 20:41.
4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XV 20-22

Q505 MT Num 22:32

4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XV 20-22

Q506 MT Num 22:33

4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XV 20-22

Q507 MT Num 22:33

4QNum\textsuperscript{b} 22 33

Q508 MT Num 23:3

4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XVI 23-26

Q509 MT Num 23:3

4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XVI 23-26

Q510 MT Num 23:3

SV(1) – Lexical interchange.\textsuperscript{1084}

SV(1) – The MT lacks the preposition ב.

SV(1) – The MT lacks the preposition ב.

OV(I) – Possible difference in pronunciation.

SV(2) – 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} has an expansive plus.\textsuperscript{1085}

OV(I) – Difference in grammatical.

\textsuperscript{1083} 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} has the addition of the secondary object in the phrase "Behold, I have come out to be hostile towards you." The addition of the preposition plus genitive pronominal suffix is similar to the addition noted in Q496 above. The SP and the LXX agree with the MT, so the addition probably reflects the preferred syntax of the scribe.

\textsuperscript{1084} The MT and the SP have the rare form ירח, "to throw down," which seems to have the sense of implied difficulty in the context: ירח ירהב ירדהב ירהב, "for the way has become difficult in my presence," that is, the presence of the messenger of Yahweh has made Balaam’s path treacherous. Perhaps the rarity of this lexeme, which occurs only here and possibly in Job 16:11 (though the latter may be ירח, "push, shove") prompted the scribe of 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} to replace the lexeme with a more commonly occurring word, ירהב, "to be wicked."

\textsuperscript{1085} The cohortative form in the MT is written as an imperfect verb preceded by the first person singular independent pronoun in 4QNum\textsuperscript{b}, in agreement with some Greek manuscripts. The difference in expression may be related to the diminished syntactical function of the cohortative form in Qumran Hebrew (see E. Qimron, Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls, 44).
The imperfect form in 4QNum'b is in contrast with the cohortative form in the MT. While some Greek manuscripts agree with 4QNum'b, the MT finds support in the major editions of the LXX, and in the SP. See note above.

4QNum'b preserves a description of Balak’s actions following the speech of Balaam in Num 23:3. The description comes between the final two words of the verse as preserved in the MT. Where the MT has the phrase יִפְגָּשׁ קָלוֹן, “and he (Balaam) went to a bare hill” (on the translation of יִפְגָּשׁ as “bare hill” or “barren high plain” see the discussion in HALOT, 1628; or alternatively “quietly” for which see M. Sokoloff, Dictionary of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic, 563, and the LXX εὐθείαν, from εὐθύς, “directly, honestly”), against the restored reading in 4QNum'b: יָגוֹל וַיֹּאכְלָה וַיַּרְא גְּדַלָה, “and he (Balak) went and stood by his sacrifice, and Balaam went and encountered God, and he went to a bare hill.” See E. Ulrich and F.M. Cross, Qumran Cave 4. VII, 235, where the evidence that points to the support of the LXX for this reconstructed text of 4QNum'b is given.

The clause in the MT reads: יִפְגָּשׁ הָאָדָם, “And God encountered Balaam,” against the restored reading in 4QNum'b: יָגוֹל וַיֹּאכְלָה וַיִּרְא אֲדָמָה, “And a messenger of God found Balaam.” The divergent reading in 4QNum'b finds support in the SP. The theological implications of the variant reading are clear, in that 4QNum'b assigns the role of contact with Balaam to a divine messenger rather than to the deity directly. In addition the verb is made active, the Qal 3ms הָרְא, “to find,” in place of the Niphal 3ms מָרָא, “to encounter, meet.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q516</th>
<th>MT Num 24:5</th>
<th>4QNum&lt;sub&gt;b&lt;/sub&gt; XVII 24 ii, 27-30 17</th>
<th>OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q517</td>
<td>MT Num 24:6</td>
<td>4QNum&lt;sub&gt;b&lt;/sub&gt; XVII 24 ii, 27-30 18</td>
<td>SV(1) – Lexical interchange.(^{1089})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q518</td>
<td>MT Num 24:9</td>
<td>4QNum&lt;sub&gt;b&lt;/sub&gt; XVII 24 ii, 27-30 21</td>
<td>Not Counted – Error of transposition.(^{1090})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q519</td>
<td>MT Num 24:9</td>
<td>4QNum&lt;sub&gt;b&lt;/sub&gt; XVII 24 ii, 27-30 21</td>
<td>SV(1) – Lexical interchange.(^{1091})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q520</td>
<td>MT Num 25:16</td>
<td>4QNum&lt;sub&gt;b&lt;/sub&gt; XVIII 31-33 i, 25</td>
<td>SV(2) – 4QNum&lt;sub&gt;b&lt;/sub&gt; has an explicating plus.(^{1092})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q521</td>
<td>MT Num 25:18</td>
<td></td>
<td>OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{1089}\) The clause in the MT reads: "like the aloes planted by Yahweh," against the restored reading in 4QNum<sub>b</sub>: "like the tents spread by Yahweh." The SP and the LXX both reflect the reading in 4QNum<sub>b</sub>. The verb הוהי (+n מלח), "to spread out," is possibly influenced by the occurrence of the same verb earlier in the verse, but the obvious difference between the sources is the reading of the noun פָּרָה in the MT as "aloes," against "tents" in 4QNum<sub>b</sub>.\(^{1090}\) See E. Ulrich and F.M. Cross, *Qumran Cave 4. VII*, 237, for this interpretation of the form in 4QNum<sub>b</sub>. Other possible readings are הוהיה (meaning "indecent, ugly," for which see M. Jastrow, *A Dictionary of the Targum, the Talmud Babli, the Talmud Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature* (London: Luzac & Co., 1903) 656. However, such a reading is conceivable in breach of Rule 1, in that the form in 4QNum<sub>b</sub> ‘disrupts the logical flow of the passage.’ Additionally, the agreement between 4QNum<sub>b</sub> and the SP in the next variant suggests that reading these texts as agreeing here is preferrable. In this instance the SP agrees with the MT in reading הבש, therefore an error involving the metathesis of the letters כה and י is read.\(^{1091}\) The variant amounts to an interchange of synonyms. The MT has כְּבָשׁ כָּאָרִים, "he crouched, he lay like a lion," against the reading in 4QNum<sub>b</sub>, restored on the basis of the SP: כְּבָשׁ כָּאָרִים, "he crouched (sic), he lay down like a lion."\(^{1092}\) The additional phrase in 4QNum<sub>b</sub> is in agreement with the LXX, and clarifies the beneficiary of Moses’ address. 4QNum<sub>b</sub> is restored to read: וַיֹּאמֶר יהוה אל משה לְאֹתָרִים כָּלֵי יֶשֶׁר שְׁחֵר, "And Yahweh spoke to Moses, saying: ‘Speak to the sons of Israel.’"
4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XVIII 31-33 i 26

Q522 MT Num 26:10 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XIX 33 ii-40 8

Q523 MT Num 26:10 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XIX 33 ii-40 9

Q524 MT Num 26:15 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XIX 33 ii-40 14

Q525 MT Num 26:33 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XIX 33 ii-40 31

Q526 MT Num 26:33 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} 33 ii-40 31

Q527 MT Num 26:62 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XX 41 29

Q528 MT Num 27:1 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XXI 42-47 4

Q529 MT Num 27:1

pronunciation.

SV(2) – 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} has an explicating plus.\textsuperscript{1093}

SV(2) – 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} has an expansive plus.\textsuperscript{1094}

SV(1) – The MT lacks the conjunction.

SV(2) – 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} has an expansive plus.\textsuperscript{1095}

SV(1) – Difference in number.\textsuperscript{1096}

OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.

SV(1) – The MT lacks the conjunction.

SV(1) – 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} lacks the con-

\textsuperscript{1093} 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} has a redundant repetition of the subject of the verb לְבָנָה, namely לְבָנָה, “the land.” The SP agrees with the reading in 4QNum\textsuperscript{b}.

\textsuperscript{1094} The additional text in 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} is possibly harmonised with Num 16:35 (so ) though this addition is not found in any other witness. 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} can be restored on this basis: "two hundred and fifty men from the midst of the incense.”

\textsuperscript{1095} The demonstrative pronoun is lacking in the MT, cf. Num 26 passim.

\textsuperscript{1096} The LXX agrees with the plural noun in 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} which, given that five names are referred to in the text following, appears to be the grammatically correct form. The singular noun in the MT is in agreement with the SP.
4QNum<sup>b</sup> XXI 42-47

juncture.

Q530 MT Num 27:3
4QNum<sup>b</sup> XXI 42-47

SV(1) – Difference in number.  

Q531 MT Num 27:18
4QNum<sup>b</sup> XXI 42-47

OV(1) – Possible difference in pronunciation.

Q532 MT Num 27:21
4QNum<sup>b</sup> XXI 42-47

SV(3) – 4QNum<sup>b</sup> has a different word order to the MT.  

Q533 MT Num 27:22
4QNum<sup>b</sup> XXI 42-47

SV(2) – 4QNum<sup>b</sup> has an expansive plus.  

Q534 MT Num 27:23
4QNum<sup>b</sup> XXI 42-47

SV(2) – 4QNum<sup>b</sup> has an expansive plus.  

Q535 MT Num 28:14
4QNum<sup>b</sup> XXI 42-47

SV(4) – 4QNum<sup>b</sup> has a different

---

1097 The clause in the MT is דַּי הָמוֹן מְנַשֶּׁה, “and he had no sons,” against the restored reading in 4QNum<sup>b</sup>: יָהַנ מְנַשֶּׁה. The plural noun מְנַשֶּׁה, “sons,” is treated as singular in 4QNum<sup>b</sup>, in agreement with some manuscripts of the SP (so E. Ulrich and F.M. Cross, *Qumran Cave 4. VII*, 245).

1098 The remaining letters make it clear that the particle plus pronominal suffix לִית לְהוֹ בָּא, “with him,” is clause final in 4QNum<sup>b</sup> against the reading in the MT. 4QNum<sup>b</sup> is restored: יָהַנ מְנַשֶּׁה לִית לְהוֹ בָּא, “and all the sons of Israel, and the whole congregation with him.” The word sequence is slightly different to the MT: “and all the sons of Israel with him, and the whole congregation.”

1099 The full name “Joshua ben Nun” is given in 4QNum<sup>b</sup>, in line with the listing of this name in various other places in Numbers (see E. Ulrich and F.M. Cross, *Qumran Cave 4. VII*, 245, for a list of occurrences). The other witnesses agree with the MT.

1100 The interpolation in 4QNum<sup>b</sup> is harmonised with Deut 3:21-22, and is also reflected in the SP, against the MT and the LXX.
4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XXII 46 ii word order to the MT.\textsuperscript{1101}

Q536 MT Num 29:11
4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XXIII 48-50 21

Q537 MT Num 29:28 omit
4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XXIV 51-54 8

Q538 MT Num 30:5
4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XXIV 51-54 29

Q539 MT Num 30:8
4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XXIV 51-54 31

\textsuperscript{1101} The qualifying term \textit{ין}, “wine,” describes the material that is offered in a drink offering. The noun itself is clause final in the MT, but in 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} the noun is moved to precede the predicate of the final clause, improving the syntax of the entire phrase. See E. Ulrich and F.M. Cross, \textit{Qumran Cave 4. VII}, 246, for the various formulations of this verse in the different witnesses, none of which appear to directly agree with each other.

\textsuperscript{1102} The plural possessive pronoun suffix in 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} probably harmonises with the plural possessive pronoun suffix appended to the following form מַעְטָרִים, “their drink offerings.” A difference in gender need not be read if the pronoun suffix in the MT is taken as an archaic form (see note above). The noun to which the pronoun suffix refers is not clear, but if it refers to the noun at the beginning of the verse, namely מַעְטָרִים, “a young male goat,” then a masculine pronoun suffix would be required. Also in favour of the plural reading in 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} see 11QT XVII 14; XXV 6 and 14.

\textsuperscript{1103} The description of the offering in Num 29:28 appears to be extended in 4QNum\textsuperscript{b}, though the damaged state of the text makes a certain reconstruction impossible. See E. Ulrich and F.M. Cross, \textit{Qumran Cave 4. VII}, 249, for a suggested reconstruction and the variant readings in the other witnesses.

\textsuperscript{1104} The reading in 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} is uncertain, with only the lower part of the \textit{mem} and \textit{waw} preserved. The bottom horizontal ligature of a medial \textit{mem} may also be visible between these letters, though this is very poorly preserved. The possibility of a plural verb underlying the form remains strong. E. Ulrich and F.M. Cross, \textit{Qumran Cave 4. VII}, 249-50, note that in several places “the textual witnesses preserve widespread confusion between sing. and pl. forms in this chapter.” The MT has the form with the pronoun suffix 3ms \textit{ינ} in Num 30:14, so it may be that the form in 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} is harmonised with the form occurring there, giving us the form מַעְטָרִים. Without a certain reading the context would seem to require a plural verb, and so the reading of a plural has been adopted here, and the possibility of a pronoun suffix \textit{ינ} left aside.

\textsuperscript{1105} The order of the phrases are reversed. 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} agrees with the word sequence in the LXX.
Q540 MT Num 30:9  
4QNum b XXIV 51-54 32  
omitsvi

SV(2) – 4QNum b has an expansive plus.  

Q541 MT Num 30:9  
4QNum b XXIV 51-54 32  
omitstdrh

SV(1) – Difference in number.  

Q542 MT Num 30:9  
4QNum b XXIV 51-54 32  
omitshrsrw

SV(2) – 4QNum b has an expansive plus.  

Q543 MT Num 31:2  
4QNum b XXV 55 i-56 12  
omitstnr

SV(1) – The MT lacks the object marker.  

Q544 MT Num 31:3  
4QNum b XXV 55 i-56 13  
omitshym

SV(2) – 4QNum b has an explicating plus.  

Q545 MT Num 31:23  
4QNum b XXVI 55 ii, 57-59 11  
omitshyrm

SV(2) – 4QNum b has an expansive plus.  

Q546 MT Num 31:30  
4QNum b XXVI 55 ii, 57-59 18  
omitshym

SV(3) – 4QNum b has a different word order to the MT.  

Q547 MT Num 31:30  
omitshyrm

SV(1) – 4QNum b lacks the con-

1106 The phrase “all her vows,” in 4QNum b harmonises with the same phrase in Num 30:5, 6, 12 and 15.

1107 The MT has a singular noun, נרדה, “her vow,” against the plural in 4QNum b, the SP and the LXX.

1108 The phrase נרדה ሃምርחוש, “her vows and obligations,” in 4QNum b harmonises with the same or similar phrase used repeatedly in Num 30:5-8.

1109 The audience of Moses’ address is clarified in 4QNum b as ሃ}$/\text{נ}\text{ר}\text{ה} n\text{ב}\text{א}, “the sons of Israel,” perhaps in line with the reference to the same in the previous verse. This is against the more general description of the audience as ሃ}$/\text{נ}\text{ר}\text{ה} n\text{ב}\text{א}, “the people,” in the MT, the SP and the LXX.

1110 4QNum b replaces the absolute noun ሃ}$/\text{נ}\text{ר}\text{ה} n\text{ב}\text{א}, “waters,” with the construct ሃ}$/\text{נ}\text{ר}\text{ה} n\text{ב}\text{א}, “waters of (purity from) menstruation.” This possibly harmonises with the same construction in Num 19:9, 13 and 20.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q548</th>
<th>MT Num 31:48</th>
<th>4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XXVII 60-64 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>omits [בּוֹל]</td>
<td>SV(2) – 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} has an expansive plus.\textsuperscript{1111}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q549 | MT Num 31:48 | 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XXVII 60-64 3-4 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>omits [הַמַּלְאָכִים]</td>
<td>SV(2) – 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} has an expansive plus.\textsuperscript{1112}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q550 | MT Num 31:49 | 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XXVII 60-64 4 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>סְבָּרֶד</td>
<td>OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q551 | MT Num 31:50 | 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XXVII 60-64 6 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>הַנְּנָה</td>
<td>SV(1) – The MT lacks the conjunction.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q552 | MT Num 31:50 | 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XXVII 60-64 6 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>לְבָעָר</td>
<td>OV(l) – Difference in grammatical forms.\textsuperscript{1113}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q553 | MT Num 31:52 | 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XXVII 60-64 8 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>הֵסֹסֶנ</td>
<td>SV(1) – The MT lacks the conjunction.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q554 | MT Num 32:23 | 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XXVIII 65-71 4 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>הָמַאֶסְסְנָה</td>
<td>OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q555 | MT Num 32:24 | 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XXVIII 65-71 5 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>לָמַאֲסָנָה</td>
<td>OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q556 | MT Num 32:24 | |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>מְסָסֲנָה</td>
<td>OV(l) – Possible difference in</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{1111} 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} specifies [בּוֹל] הַמַּלְאָכִים, “all the officers.” The LXX also has the adjective παντες, “all.”

\textsuperscript{1112} The interpolation in 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} harmonises with Num 31:14.

\textsuperscript{1113} A likely reading of the text is that the infinitive construct in the MT לְבָעָר, “to atone,” is written as a "waw consecutive plus perfect verb in 4QNum\textsuperscript{b}: (מַאֶסְסִי, “and it/they will atone.”
4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XXVIII 65-71 5

Q557 MT Num 32:25 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XXVIII 65-71 6

Q558 MT Num 32:25 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XXVIII 65-71 6

Q559 MT Num 32:25 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XXVIII 65-71 6

Q560 MT Num 32:26 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XXVIII 65-71 7

Q561 MT Num 32:27 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XXVIII 65-71 7

Q562 MT Num 32:30 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XXVIII 65-71 12

Q563 MT Num 32:39 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XXVIII 65-71 20

The sequence in 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} agrees with the SP and the LXX.

4QNum\textsuperscript{b} has an interpolation that harmonises with Num 32:1 and 29, also found in the SP.

The additional text in 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} is lacking from the MT and the SP, but can be restored on the basis of the LXX: "to make war before Yahweh, then you will cause to pass over their small children, and their wives, and their cattle before you to the land of Canaan." See E. Ulrich and F.M. Cross, *Qumran Cave 4. VII*, 257, for this reconstruction.

The phrase, restored \textsuperscript{p}\textsuperscript{w}y \textsuperscript{n}b, "the sons of Joseph," appears to be included in the list in 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} against the other witnesses.
Q564 MT Num 34:21
4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XXX 75-79 17

(לָמָה)

SV(1) – Difference in number.\textsuperscript{1118}

Q565 MT Num 35:5
4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XXX 75-79 27

(ז)

SV(1) – The MT lacks the locative ה.\textsuperscript{1119}

Q566 MT Num 35:18 omits
4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XXXI 80-84 9

omits [יהמ]

SV(2) – 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} has an expansive plus.\textsuperscript{1120}

Q567 MT Num 35:20
4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XXXI 80-84 11

יִלְּוָא בְּעַרְּבָה יָרְפֶּה

SV(3) – 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} has a different word order to the MT.\textsuperscript{1121}

Q568 MT Num 35:21 omits
4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XXXI 80-84 12

מִים יֵמָה הָרוֹצָה

SV(2) – 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} has an expansive plus.\textsuperscript{1122}

Q569 MT Num 35:21 omits
4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XXXI 80-84 12

דָּא

SV(2) – 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} has an expansive plus.\textsuperscript{1123}

Q570 MT Num 35:23
4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XXXI 80-84 14

ָבָּלִּים

SV(2) – Difference in expression.\textsuperscript{1124}

\textsuperscript{1118} The plural construction in 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} refers to “the tribes of Benjamin,” against the singular “tribe of Benjamin” in the MT.

\textsuperscript{1119} The LXX supports reading a locative with the accusative preposition προς indicating motion toward or general direction.

\textsuperscript{1120} 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} harmonises with Num 35:21 and can be restored on that basis: מוֹת יֵמָּה הָרֹצָה, “the one who strikes will certainly die.”

\textsuperscript{1121} The position of the adverb in 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} follows Num 35:22, against the syntax of the MT, the SP and the LXX.

\textsuperscript{1122} The repeated refrain in 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} is perhaps harmonised with Num 35:16-18. The MT agrees with the SP and the LXX.

\textsuperscript{1123} The independent pronoun has an emphatic sense in 4QNum\textsuperscript{b}: יְהֵם הָרֹצָה, “he, the redeemer of blood.”

\textsuperscript{1124} The MT, the SP and the LXX are in agreement: בָּלִּים, “with any stone,” against the phrase in 4QNum\textsuperscript{b}: בָּלִּים, “with an instrument of stone.”
SV(2) – The MT has an expansive plus.  

4QNum\(^b\) XXXI 80-84 27

Q571 MT Num 35:27

SV(2) – 4QNum\(^b\) has an expansive plus.  

4QNum\(^b\) XXXI 80-84 30

Q572 MT Num 36:1

SV(2) – 4QNum\(^b\) has an expansive plus.  

4QNum\(^b\) XXXII 81 ii 15-16

Q573 MT Num 36:4

SV(2) – 4QNum\(^b\) has an expansive plus.  

4QNum\(^b\) XXXII 81 ii 18

Q574 MT Num 36:6

SV(2) – The MT has an expansive plus.  

4QDeut\(^a\) 3

Q575 MT Deut 24:2

SV(1) – 4QDeut\(^a\) lacks the preposition.  

4QDeut\(^a\) 8

Q576 MT Deut 24:5

SV(1) – 4QDeut\(^b\) lacks the relative particle.  

4QDeut\(^b\) I 1

Q577 MT Deut 29:24


1125 The object of the verb נפשׂ, to find,” is clarified in the MT in agreement with the SP.

1126 4QNum\(^b\) adds the priest Eleazar to the audience that hears the address of the tribe of Gilead and the family of Joseph. The reading agrees with the LXX.

1127 4QNum\(^b\) has additional names added to the list, though damaged, which seem to include Eleazar the priest, Joshua ben Nun and Caleb ben Jephunneh. Cf. the additional name in Q572 above. On the exegetical significance of this addition see E. Ulrich and F.M. Cross, *Qumran Cave 4. VII*, 263.

1128 According to E. Ulrich and F.M. Cross, *Qumran Cave 4. VII*, 263, 4QNum\(^b\) has the additional infinitive absolute ויִהְיֶה, “being,” harmonising with the form in Num 30:7 which has the phrase ויִהְיֶה לַמְשִׁיס, “if they shall certainly be for wives.”

1129 The MT has the expanded phrase concerning the divorced wife: יִהְיֶה לַמְשִׁיס, “and (if) she went out from his house and she went and she became (a wife) to another man,” in agreement with the SP 4QDeut\(^b\) omits the phrase ויִהְיֶה לַמְשִׁיס, having only the second verb in agreement with the LXX and the Vulgate. The shorter text may represent the more original reading, but the evidence is inconclusive according to S.A. White, "Three Deuteronomy Manuscripts from Cave 4, Qumran," *JBL* 112, 1 (1993) 27.
| Q578 | MT Deut 30:9 | 4QDeutb I 13 | SV(3) – 4QDeutb has a different word order to the MT.\(^{1130}\) |
| Q579 | MT Deut 30:10 | 4QDeutb I 14 | SV(1) – Difference in gender and number.\(^{1131}\) |
| Q580 | MT Deut 30:11 | 4QDeutb I 16 | SV(1) – Difference in gender.\(^{1132}\) |
| Q581 | MT Deut 30:11 | 4QDeutb I 16 | SV(2) – 4QDeutb has an explicating plus.\(^{1133}\) |
| Q582 | MT Deut 30:13 | 4QDeutb I 17 | SV(2) – 4QDeutb has an explicating plus.\(^{1134}\) |
| Q583 | MT Deut 30:14 | omits | SV(2) – The MT lacks the addi- |

\(^{1130}\) The word order in 4QDeutb is restored on the basis of the SP: וּבֵיתְךָ אַלְמָן, “in the fruit of your land, and in the fruit of your cattle.” The LXX also supports the reading in 4QDeutb: καὶ εν τοῖς γεννημασίᾳ της γῆς σου καὶ εν τοῖς εκγονοῖς των κτηνῶν σου, “in the fruits of your land, and in the offspring of your cattle.” See also Q615 below.

\(^{1131}\) The participle is written as a feminine singular in the MT, in agreement with the SP, while the masculine plural is written in 4QDeutb. The latter form agrees with that required by the context, where the participle מִשְׁמַרְתֶּךָ, “those that are written,” refers to the plural nouns מִשְׁמַרְתֶּךָ וּמִשְׁמַרְתֶּךָ, “his commandments and his statutes.” While the nouns to which the participle refers are feminine in form the use of the masculine plural in 4QDeutb may be attributed to the ‘priority of the masculine’ (see W. Gesenius, E. Kautzsch, and A.E. Cowley, Hebrew Grammar, 468, §146d, and the comments in note above). The Vorlage to the LXX appears to have had an additional term מִשְׁמַרְתֵּנִים, “and his judgements,” which may account for the masculine form in 4QDeutb as suggested by J.A. Duncan, A Critical Edition of Deuteronomy Manuscripts From Qumran Cave IV: 4QDp, 4QDt, 4QDt\(\prime\), 4QDf, 4QDf, 4QDf (Harvard University Ph.D. Dissertation: 1989) 22. The preference for the masculine form to describe a series of nouns, only the last of which is masculine, is again reflective of the ‘priority of the masculine.’

\(^{1132}\) The pronoun refers to מִשְׁמַרְתֶּךָ, “the commandment,” a feminine singular noun. The MT qere has the correct form of the pronoun.

\(^{1133}\) The MT lacks the preposition plus 2ms pronominal suffix, which is possibly a harmonisation with the phrase immediately preceding: מִשְׁמַרְתֶּךָ אַלְמָן, “it is not too extraordinary for you.” The additional prepositional phrase is also reflected in the LXX.

\(^{1134}\) The independent pronoun in 4QDeutb specifies the subject. The SP also reflects the reading in 4QDeutb.
4QDeut\(^b\) has an additional prepositional phrase that is also reflected in the LXX, but is lacking from the other witnesses. According to J.A. Duncan, *Deuteronomy Manuscripts*, 22, the variant is significant as “there is no parallel reading which would have prompted it, suggesting that it may in fact have been original.”

1135 The subject is grammatically plural, “all the elders of Israel.” The pronominal object suffix in Deut 31:10 that describes the subject of the verb in verse 11 is also plural (יְהוָה). It should be noted that *Numeruswechsel* is particularly prevalent in this passage (cf. the singular and plural pronominal suffixes referring to the הָרוֹם הָיוֹם in Deut 31:3-6, esp. verse 6 which uses both grammatical forms in the same clause). 4QDeut\(^b\) may have harmonised the forms in this pericope to correct obvious grammatical inconsistencies. On *Numeruswechsel* in Deuteronomy in general see note above.

1136 4QDeut\(^b\) clearly has מִקְיָם, though the peh is somewhat damaged. Based on the LXX the text can be restored: מִקְיָם אֲלֵי אֶת-כָּל-יִשְׂרָאֵל תֵּבִיא אֶלָּא לְדַת אֵלֶּה הָרוֹם הָיוֹם הָרוֹם הָיוֹם הָרוֹם הָיוֹם, “gather together to me all the elders of your tribes and your elders and your judges and your officials.” The LXX includes the phrase καὶ τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους ὑμῶν καὶ τοὺς κρίτας ὑμῶν, which would support the reconstruction in 4QDeut\(^b\) that includes the form מִקְיָם, however only the second term πρεσβυτέρους ὑμῶν is preserved.

1137 If waw is read between dalet and lamed the form in 4QDeut\(^b\) appears to be adjectival against the nominal form in the MT. Against this reading we note that the form is read without waw in J.A. Duncan, *Deuteronomy Manuscripts*, 28, and although the most recent reading in E. Ulrich and F.M. Cross, *Qumran Cave 4. IX: Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Kings* (DJD 14; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995) 13, contains the waw, the doubtful nature of the text is evident from this disagreement. J.A. Duncan does not note her correction in the later publication, only providing a comment that “the head of waw is just visible on the edge of the leather, as is the top of lamed” (E. Ulrich and F.M. Cross, *Qumran Cave 4. IX*, 14. This seems
Q589 MT Deut 4:14 omits מראDenver. SV(2) – 4QDeut c has an expansive plus. 1140

Q590 MT Deut 7:4 omits אלאי. SV(2) – 4QDeut c has an expansive plus. 1141

Q591 MT Deut 8:2 לאסם. SV(1) – 4QDeut c lacks the preposition ב.

Q592 MT Deut 8:2 הלוה. SV(1) – The MT lacks the conjunction.

Q593 MT Deut 8:4شملות. SV(1) – Lexical interchange. 1142

Q594 MT Deut 10:1בראשית. SV(1) – 4QDeut c lacks the preposition ב. 1143

Q595 MT Deut 10:2 omits ידה. SV(2) – 4QDeut c has an expansive plus. 1144

Q596 MT Deut 11:10 חמה. SV(1) – Difference in gender. 1145

Q597 MT Deut 12:19 אדין. SV(2) – The MT has an explicat-

---

incompatible with the earlier remark concerning the last letter before the break: “If it is lamed, then only the hook remains. It may be that the upper portion is not seen due to the surface damage in this spot.”

1140 The name of the river is supplied in 4QDeut c against all other witnesses.

1141 The phrase in 4QDeut c is restored מראDenver מקר, “Yahweh your god,” against the other witnesses that have only the Tetragrammaton.

1142 See also Q178 above, and the comments in note . The lexemes אלהים and שמלות (with sin) are synonymous, both meaning “cloak, mantle.” Scribal error through metathesis of the second and third radical is also possible, but in light of Rule 1 lexical interchange is preferred.

1143 In the Massoretic pointing the MT lacks the definite article, but this is not evident in the consonantal text.

1144 The placement of the Tetragrammaton is uncertain, but it is clearly not present in the MT. See the discussion in E. Ulrich and F.M. Cross, *Qumran Cave 4. IX*, 20, for the possible readings of this variant.

1145 The pronoun refers to חמה, “the land,” a feminine singular noun. The MT qere has the correct form of the pronoun.
Q598 MT Deut 13:5
4QDeut 21 1
והלך]
OV(l) – Difference in grammatical form.\textsuperscript{1147}

Q599 MT Deut 13:7
4QDeut 22-23 1
[אמר
SV(2) – 4QDeut\textsuperscript{c} has an expansive plus.\textsuperscript{1148}

Q600 MT Deut 13:7
4QDeut 22-23 1
אֶת בּוֹקֵץ
SV(2) – The MT has an expansive plus.\textsuperscript{1149}

Q601 MT Deut 15:2
4QDeut 26-27 4
אַּפּ יָהַד אוֹתוֹ
SV(2) – The MT has an explicating plus.\textsuperscript{1150}

Q602 MT Deut 16:8
4QDeut 32 i, 33 4
שמא[ בֵּית
HV – Difference in cardinal number.\textsuperscript{1151}

Q603 MT Deut 16:8
4QDeut 32 i, 33 4
מאָתַל מָעָה
SV(3) – 4QDeut\textsuperscript{c} has a different word order to the MT.\textsuperscript{1152}

Q604 MT Deut 16:8
4QDeut 32 i, 33 4
מאָתַל
SV(1) – Difference in number.\textsuperscript{1153}

Q605 MT Deut 16:8
omits
SV(2) – 4QDeut\textsuperscript{c} has an expans-

\textsuperscript{1146} The noun יָדִים, “the earth,” is specified with a possessive pronoun as אִמְסֵךְ, “your earth.”

\textsuperscript{1147} See Q14 above, where 1QDeut\textsuperscript{a} agrees with 4QDeut\textsuperscript{c}. See also the references in note above.

\textsuperscript{1148} The phrase in 4QDeut\textsuperscript{c} is restored on the basis of the SP and the LXX: בֵּית אָבִיךָ, “or the son of your father.”

\textsuperscript{1149} The phrase is lacking in 4QDeut\textsuperscript{c} against the other witnesses. Given the repetition of forms in this verse one may reasonably suspect haplography through homoioteleuton.

\textsuperscript{1150} All of the other witnesses have the phrase: בֵּית תִּשְׁבַּיָּהָ, “six days you shall eat unleavened bread.” 4QDeut\textsuperscript{c} seems to have read seven days for this activity during Passover, perhaps harmonised with the similar statement in Deut 16:3, בֵּית תִּשְׁבַּיָּהָ עַל יַנְיס הַמַּעַה, “seven days you shall eat unleavened bread.” The specification in verse 8 that follows the variant תִּשְׁבַּיָּהָ עַל יַנְיס הַמַּעַה, “and on the seventh day, a celebration,” is not preserved in 4QDeut\textsuperscript{c}.

\textsuperscript{1151} 4QDeut\textsuperscript{c} has a rearranged word order, restored: בֵּית תִּשְׁבַּיָּהָ עַל יַנְיס הַמַּעַה, “seven days unleavened bread you shall eat,” against the arrangement in the MT: בֵּית תִּשְׁבַּיָּהָ עַל יַנְיס הַמַּעַה, “six days you shall eat unleavened bread.” See also Q602 and Q604.

\textsuperscript{1152} On Numeruswechsel in Deuteronomy see note above.
The reading in 4QDeutε is supported by the LXX. The phrase in 4QDeutε reads: לֹא תֹאַשּׁ בִּגְלָה מֵעַל הָנַּחֲלָה, “you shall not do any work in it (the seventh day).”

4QDeutε would appear to have מֶשֶׁךְ, “gift,” in place of מֶשֶךְ, “sufficiency,” in the MT, but the scroll is too damaged to be sure. Only a portion of the left edge of the second letter is preserved which seems to rule out samek, but the reading taw is not certain (see E. Ulrich and F.M. Cross, Qumran Cave 4. IX, 25).

4QDeutε seems to have originally been written to agree with the phrasing as found in the MT, however it was subsequently changed to reflect a different phrasing that finds support in the Vorlage underlying Codex Vaticanus. The MT reads: וְהָלְוָא אֲשֶׁר מַשַּׁךְ חָוִי וַחֲזִיקָה וַאלָמָנָה בַּכַּרְקָפִּים, “and the Levite who is within your gates, and the stranger, and the orphan, and the widow who are in your midst.” This is against the reading in 4QDeutε: וְהָלוֹו אֲשֶׁר חָוִי וַחֲזִיקָה וַאלָמָנָה בַּכַּרְקָפִּים. “the Levite and the stranger, the orphan and widow, who are in your midst.” The phrasing in the MT separates the Levite “who is within your gates” from the three other entities “who are in your midst.” In constrast with this the phrasing in 4QDeutε forms binary pairs of “the Levite and the stranger” and “the orphan and widow,” all of whom are “within your midst.” The lack of conjunction between “the stranger” and “the orphan” emphasises this pairing.

4QDeutε has the grammatically correct form. The pronominal suffix refers to וְהָלוֹו אֲשֶׁר חָוִי וַחֲזִיקָה וַאלָמָנָה בַּכַּרְקָפִּים, “this second law.” The SP supports the reading in 4QDeutε.
| Q612 | MT Deut 27:1 | omits | SV(2) – The MT lacks the definite article plus demonstrative pronoun. |
| Q613 | MT Deut 27:26 | יאמר | SV(1) – Difference in number. |
| Q614 | MT Deut 28:1 | השלמה | SV(2) – The MT has an expansive plus or a different phraseology to 4QDeut. |
| Q615 | MT Deut 28:11 | והמשרה בדמתך | Not Counted – The text is too short. |

1158 The restored phrase in 4QDeut is: **לכשת התשמה וחתמה ויראתה** “for renown, and for praise, and for glory.” The phrase is found only here in the Pentateuch, and the order of the terms in the MT is not repeated elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible. By contrast the order of the terms in 4QDeut is reflected in Jeremiah 13:11 and 33:9. The LXX supports the reading in 4QDeut: **ονομαστον και καυχημα και δοξαστον**, “renowned, and a boast, and glorious.”

1159 The verb refers to **אזר**, “the people.” On **Numeruswechsel** in Deuteronomy see note , and on the grammatical number of the term **אזר** specifically see note .

1160 The variant in the MT may be read as containing an additional infinitive construct, or as a difference in phrasing. In general this particular syntactical use of the infinitive construct is a recognised rhetorical construction which has the sense of “namely by x,” where x is typically translated with the gerund. Regarding this see I. Soisalon-Soininen, "Der Infinitivus contractus mit b im Hebräischen," *VT* 22, 1 (1972) 87: “Der gerundive Infinitiv verursacht dem Übersetzer oft Schwierigkeiten. Die Benennung geht von einer modalen Bedeutung aus. Dieser Infinitiv kann sehr oft mit dem franzöischen „en faisant” oder mit dem englischen „doing” übersetzt werden, im Deutschen würde dann „etwas tuend” die entsprechende Übersetzung sein. Dafür wird aber lieber der Ausdruck „indem ...” gebraucht.” [The gerundive infinitive often causes trouble. This infinitive can often be translated with the French „en faisant” or with the English „doing,” for which in German the appropriate translation would be „doing something.” For this, though, the expression „by ... ” is preferably used”). Instances of the double use of preposition b plus infinitive construct are more limited but still recognised: “The object of an infinitive may itself be an infinitive governing an object with the preposition l” (B.K. Waltke and M. O’Connor, *Biblical Hebrew Syntax*, 610 n. 37). This syntactic construction occurs some 14 times in the Pentateuch, with nine instances occurring in Deuteronomy, totalling 50 instances in the entire MT. Here the phrase **לכשת התשמה** is translated “to observe by doing.” The identical construction occurs also in Deut 15:15; 28:1, 15; 32:46. No other occurrences are preserved in 4QDeut for comparison, but by way of conjecture it could be suggested that the second preposition plus infinitive construct is syntactically redundant and so for this reason may have been dropped by the scribe. The regular occurrence of this type of construction in the MT would seems to count against taking the reading in 4QDeut as original.
The remains of the first letter, possibly aleph, are visible in the scroll but are too damaged to give a certain reading. 4QDeut is restored in E. Ulrich and F.M. Cross, *Qumran Cave 4. IX*, 29, to agree with the word order in Codex Vaticanus: בָּהֵם בָּהֵמֶשׁ אֲדֻמִּים לָבָּא בָּהֵם, “in the offspring of your loins, and in the fruits of your land, and in the offspring of your cattle.” The difference in word order in 4QDeut agrees with the similar passage in 4QDeut (which likewise varies from Deut 30:9, for which see Q578 above).

The waw consecutive plus perfect in the MT is written as an imperfect verb in 4QDeut. The distinction between waw and yod is clear in this script, with the vertical stroke of the waw extending almost twice as far as that of the yod.

The MT has וָּיֶהֶבֶּלַד, “to lay upon,” against 4QDeut וָּיֶהֶבֶּלַד, “to cleave to.” The phrase is equivalent in each text: רָפָעֵל יָדוֹ וָּיֶהֶבֶּלַד לָשׁוֹנָהוּ, “And every curse that is written in this scroll will lay upon / cleave to him.” Cf. the similar phrase with לָשׁוֹנָהוּ plus preposition ב in Deut 28:60.

The verb refers to הבּ, “the people.” See also note and above.

The verb refers to ההַ, “the people.” See the previous note.

In the MT the verb refers to Moses, who is the addressee, while in 4QDeut the verb refers to the people. All of the other witnesses support the reading in the MT.

See note and above.
4QDeut\textsuperscript{c} 54-55 i 5 \textit{והנה} sive plus.\textsuperscript{1168}

Q623 MT Deut 31:18 omits \textit{מתמ} SV(2) – 4QDeut\textsuperscript{c} has an explicating plus.\textsuperscript{1169}

Q624 MT Deut 31:19 \textit{ונתת} OV(I) – Difference in grammatical form.\textsuperscript{1170}

Q625 MT Deut 31:19 omits \textit{דר} SV(2) – 4QDeut\textsuperscript{c} has an explicating plus.\textsuperscript{1171}

Q626 MT Deut 31:19 \textit{شهيدa} SV(1) – Difference in number.\textsuperscript{1172}

Q627 MT Deut 2:25 omits \textit{וס} SV(1) – The MT lacks the object marker.\textsuperscript{1173}

Q628 MT Deut 2:34 \textit{הדאה} SV(1) – Difference in gender.\textsuperscript{1174}

Q629 MT Deut 3:16 \textit{ויע} SV(1) – 4QDeut\textsuperscript{d} lacks the conjunction.

Q630 MT Deut 3:19 \textit{טעמצם} SV(1) – 4QDeut\textsuperscript{d} lacks the conjunction.

\textsuperscript{1168} 4QDeut\textsuperscript{c} includes the Tetragrammaton in the phrase הלך מלך יאש ויהוה אלהי יברק, “Did (it) not come up because Yahweh my god is not in my midst?” The LXX supports this reading.

\textsuperscript{1169} The phrase in 4QDeut\textsuperscript{c} is restored: ו赎回 בני ויבי יכהי בקבר, “and I will certainly hide my face from them.” The MT lacks the preposition plus the 3mpl dative pronominal suffix בקבר, in agreement with all of the other witnesses.

\textsuperscript{1170} The form in 4QDeut\textsuperscript{c} is best read as a short form of the adverbial particle \textit{נה}, “now, henceforth” (see \textit{HALOT}, 901), as reading the form as the noun \textit{נה}, “time” does not fit the context.

\textsuperscript{1171} The phrase in 4QDeut\textsuperscript{c} is restored on the basis of the LXX: הביאם חベストם אфорה יב כְּפָר, “the words of the song.”

\textsuperscript{1172} The plural imperative agrees with the first imperative in the verse, בְּאצַר, “write.” In the MT the first imperative verb in the verse is plural but the second and third imperative verbs are both singular. On this see the references in note above.

\textsuperscript{1173} The object marker is restored in 4QDeut\textsuperscript{d} on the basis of the SP. See S.A. White, ”Three Deuteronomy Manuscripts,” 31.

\textsuperscript{1174} The pronoun refers to \textit{הנה}, “the time,” a feminine noun. The MT \textit{qere} has the correct form of the pronoun.
| Q631 | MT Deut 3:22 | הַרְאָתָם |
|      | 4QDeut<sup>d</sup> II 11 | ![Image](https://example.com) |
|      | SV(1) – Difference in number. | ![Image](https://example.com) |

| Q632 | MT Deut 3:23 | אֶתֹם |
|      | 4QDeut<sup>d</sup> II 12 | ![Image](https://example.com) |
|      | SV(1) – Difference in gender. | ![Image](https://example.com) |

| Q633 | MT Deut 3:26 | יְהֵבֹר |
|      | 4QDeut<sup>d</sup> II 15 | ![Image](https://example.com) |
|      | Not Counted – Scribal error is assumed. | ![Image](https://example.com) |

| Q634 | MT Deut 3:27 | omit |
|      | 4QDeut<sup>d</sup> II 17 | ![Image](https://example.com) |
|      | SV(1) – The MT lacks the preposition עַ.
|      | ![Image](https://example.com) |

| Q635 | MT Deut 3:27 | יָמ |
|      | 4QDeut<sup>d</sup> II 17 | ![Image](https://example.com) |
|      | SV(1) – 4QDeut<sup>d</sup> lacks the locative ה.
|      | ![Image](https://example.com) |

| Q636 | MT Deut 3:27 | רְמ |
|      | 4QDeut<sup>d</sup> II 17 | ![Image](https://example.com) |
|      | SV(1) – 4QDeut<sup>d</sup> lacks the conjunction.
|      | ![Image](https://example.com) |

| Q637 | MT Deut 7:23 | לְפַנֵיה |
|      | 4QDeut<sup>e</sup> 2 ii, 3 i, 4 11 | ![Image](https://example.com) |
|      | SV(2) – 4QDeut<sup>e</sup> has a different phraseology to the MT.
|      | ![Image](https://example.com) |

---

1175 The plural form of the verb is expected because the following pronoun, which also refers to the subject, is plural: יָרָאתָם, “your god.” Some manuscripts of MT as well as the SP agree with the reading in 4QDeut<sup>d</sup> (see S.A. White, "Three Deuteronomy Manuscripts," 34).

1176 The pronoun refers to הָעִל, “the time,” a feminine noun. The MT qere has the correct form of the pronoun.

1177 The MT has the Hithpa‘el of יָה, “to show oneself to be angry, excited,” against the Hithpa‘el of יָת, which does not occur in the MT. Thus the sense of the text as it is in 4QDeut<sup>d</sup> is difficult, so Rule 1 cannot be applied. E. Ulrich and F.M. Cross, Qumran Cave 4. IX, 38, assumes a scribal error where ד is written instead of ר, and this reading is adopted here.

1178 The phrase in 4QDeut<sup>e</sup> is restored: יָמְתַּהְת יָעִיל אֶל שֵׁלָה בַּרְד, “And Yahweh your god has delivered them into your hand,” against the MT: יָמְתַּהְת יָעִיל אֶל שֵׁלָה בַּרְד, “And Yahweh your god has delivered them before you.” The different idioms seem to be equivalent, with the former occurring in the Pentateuch some six times (Exod 23:31; Deut 2:24, 30; 7:24; 20:13; 21:10) and the latter some eight times (Deut 1:21; 2:31; 7:2, 23; 23:15; 30:1, 15, 19). Notably the two forms of the idiom occur in the MT in close proximity here, in 7:23 and 24, so 4QDeut<sup>e</sup> might be considered to be harmonising the two different expressions. The LXX could reflect a Vorlage like 4QDeut<sup>e</sup>, where εἰς τὰς χειρὰς generally translates יָמְת and προσοπὸν / ενώπιον generally translates יָמ, but there can be no certainty in this regard (see J.A. Duncan, Deuteronomy Manuscripts, 46).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q638</th>
<th>MT Deut 7:22</th>
<th>OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation. 1179</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4QDeut f 2-3 1</td>
<td>אַל</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q639</td>
<td>MT Deut 7:24</td>
<td>SV(1) – Interchange of prepositions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QDeut f 2-3 4</td>
<td>יִבְנֵי</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q640</td>
<td>MT Deut 8:7</td>
<td>SV(2) – 4QDeut f has an expansive plus. 1180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QDeut f 4-6 8</td>
<td>רֹדוּתָה</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q641</td>
<td>MT Deut 8:9</td>
<td>SV(1) – The MT lacks the conjunction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QDeut f 4-6 10</td>
<td>עָלָה</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q642</td>
<td>MT Deut 8:9</td>
<td>OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation. 1181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QDeut f 4-6 11</td>
<td>יָלוּלֶה</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q643</td>
<td>MT Deut 9:7</td>
<td>SV(1) – Interchange of prepositions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QDeut f 7 3</td>
<td>ק</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q644</td>
<td>MT Deut 19:21</td>
<td>SV(1) – 4QDeut f lacks the conjunction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QDeut f 13-16 4</td>
<td>עָלָה</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1179 4QDeut f has the regular form of the demonstrative pronoun אַל, which appears as the by-form ל in the MT some nine times (see HALOT, 50). The SP, which always has the longer spelling (see W. Gesenius, E. Kautzsch, and A.E. Cowley, Hebrew Grammar, 109, §34b), supports the reading in 4QDeut f. B.K. Waltke and M. O’Connor, Biblical Hebrew Syntax, 307, suggest that the short form should be taken as an orthographic variant that is vocalised like the long form, but in light of Rule 1 the variant is counted as a possible difference in pronunciation.

1180 The phrase in 4QDeut f is פֶּן וְשָׂרָה רְדוּתָה, “to a land good and broad.” The MT lacks the second adjective, whereas the SP and the LXX support the reading in 4QDeut f, as does 4QDeut V 5 and 4QDeut a 1 3 (see Q694 and Q771 below). The same phrase appears in Exod 3:8 of the MT.

1181 The spelling in 4QDeut f is typical of Qumran orthography according to E. Qimron, Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls, 26-27. E.Y. Kutscher, Language and Linguistic Background, 531, suggests that reּ֥ had certainly taken on the characteristics of a guttural consonant in Qumran Hebrew, so the form in 4QDeut f may be viewed as the later spelling. Against this E.Y. Kutscher, Language and Linguistic Background, 372, argues that the spelling of the absolute noun with the geminate consonant preserved, מִרְרָה, is the late form. The same view is expressed in E. Eshel, "4QDeut f," 136, where it is suggested the the late form in the MT is updated towards the more common (archaic) form in 4QDeut f. It should be noted, though, that both spellings מִרְרָה and מְרָה occur in personal names as early as the mid-second millennium B.C.E., for which see W.F. Albright, "The Names Shaddai and Abrām," JBL 54, 4 (1935) 191 n. 59. See also Q695 and Q772 below for the same reading in 4QDeut f and 4QDeut f, and Q847 for the same reading in 5QDeut.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q645</th>
<th>MT Deut 20:1</th>
<th>סמ</th>
<th>SV(1) – The MT lacks the conjunction.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q646</td>
<td>MT Deut 20:3</td>
<td>שָמַם</td>
<td>OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.¹¹⁸²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q647</td>
<td>MT Deut 21:4</td>
<td>תָּחָנָה</td>
<td>SV(1) – Difference in gender.¹¹⁸³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q648</td>
<td>MT Deut 21:7</td>
<td>שָׁבֵל</td>
<td>SV(1) – Difference in number.¹¹⁸⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q649</td>
<td>MT Deut 21:9</td>
<td>הדַּתְק</td>
<td>SV(2) – Difference in expression.¹¹⁸⁵</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q650</td>
<td>MT Deut 22:15</td>
<td>הַגִּנֵּר</td>
<td>SV(1) – Difference in gender.¹¹⁸⁶</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q651</td>
<td>MT Deut 26:18</td>
<td>א</td>
<td>SV(1) – The MT lacks the object marker.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q652</td>
<td>MT Deut 1:7</td>
<td>בָּנָה</td>
<td>SV(1) – 4QDeutᵇ lacks the conjunction.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹¹⁸² According to E. Qimron, *Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 46-47, two forms of the masculine imperative coexist in Qumran Hebrew, with and without the appended heh. See Q678, Q775 and Q812 for the same form at Deut 5:1. The long form of the imperative (with *paragogic* heh) is also known in Biblical Hebrew (see B.K. Waltke and M. O’Connor, *Biblical Hebrew Syntax*, 568, 571), most commonly, amongst the books of the Pentateuch, in Genesis and Numbers.

¹¹⁸³ The pronoun refers to הָרוֹי, “the city,” a feminine noun. The MT *qere* has the correct form of the pronoun.

¹¹⁸⁴ The verb in 4QDeut¹ agrees in form with the other verbs of the verse, which are all 3 cpl. The MT *qere* also has the correct form of the verb. On the possible reading of an archaic feminine plural verbal afformative h-, known in Akkadian, see W. Gesenius, E. Kautzsch, and A.E. Cowley, *Hebrew Grammar*, 121-22 (§44m).

¹¹⁸⁵ The MT has a noun plus adjective אֲשֶׁר הָדוֹר, “innocent blood,” against the construct chain in 4QDeut¹ אֲשֶׁר הָדוֹר, “the blood of the innocent” (see also Deut 19:13 of the MT). All of the other witnesses agree with the MT.

¹¹⁸⁶ The MT *qere* has the correct form. On the gender of this term in the MT see J. Blau, *Topics in Hebrew and Semitic Linguistics* (Jerusalem: Magness Press, 1998) 127.
Q653 MT Deut 1:33
Q4Deut\(^b\) 2-4 26

לֶאָבָאָה

לֶהַרְחָא

OV(l) – Difference in grammatical form or possible difference in pronunciation.\(^{1187}\)

Q654 MT Deut 1:33
Q4Deut\(^b\) 2-4 26

לֶאָבָאָה

לֶהַרְחָא

SV(2) – The MT has an explicating plus.\(^{1188}\)

Q655 MT Deut 1:37
Q4Deut\(^b\) 2-4 29

שָׁם

שָׁמָה

SV(1) – The MT lacks the locative.\(^{1189}\)

Q656 MT Deut 1:39
Q4Deut\(^b\) 2-4 30

יַרְדֵּנָה

יַרְדֵּנ

SV(1) – Difference in number.\(^{1189}\)

Q657 MT Deut 1:44
Q4Deut\(^b\) 5-6 5

חוֹרָה

חוֹרָה

SV(1) – The MT lacks the definite article.

Q658 MT Deut 2:3
Q4Deut\(^b\) 5-6 8

לֶבֶם

לֶב

SV(1) – Difference in number.\(^{1190}\)

---

\(^{1187}\) The form in the MT could be Qal, though Hiph’il better suits the context. The Hiph’il is clearly written with affirmative heh in Q4Deut\(^b\). On the elision of the affirmative heh on Hiph’il infinitives in the MT see the examples listed in W. Gesenius, E. Kautzsch, and A.E. Cowley, Hebrew Grammar, 148, §53q.

\(^{1188}\) Q4Deut\(^b\) lacks the pronominal object suffix appended to the infinitive construct. The word stands at the extreme left margin of the column so it is impossible to ascertain if the pronoun was written with the preposition l marking the nota dative (see W. Gesenius, E. Kautzsch, and A.E. Cowley, Hebrew Grammar, 381, §119s) preceding the direct object (cf. Deut 4:38; 5:5; 6:23).

\(^{1189}\) The MT reads: “And your toddler of whom you said, ‘he will be as plunder,’ and your sons who this day do not know good or evil, they will come therein.” Only the words לֶאָבָאָה לֶהַרְחָא לֹא אֲנָחִי יִשְׂרָאֵל נַעֲשֶׁהָיָהוּ מַלְאָךְ אֱלֹהִי יְהֹוָה, יָרְדֵּנָה הָרוֹסָה לֹא אֲנָחִי יִשְׂרָאֵל נַעֲשֶׁהָיָהוּ מַלְאָךְ אֱלֹהִי יְהֹוָה, יָרְדֵּנָה הָרוֹסָה, “And your toddler of whom you said, ‘he will be as plunder,’ and your sons who this day do not know good or evil, they will come therein.” Only the words לֶאָבָאָה לֶהַרְחָא לֹא אֲנָחִי יִשְׂרָאֵל נַעֲשֶׁהָיָהוּ מַלְאָךְ אֱלֹהִי יְהֹוָה, יָרְדֵּנָה הָרוֹסָה לֹא אֲנָחִי יִשְׂרָאֵל נַעֲשֶׁהָיָהוּ מַלְאָךְ אֱלֹהִי יְהֹוָה, יָרְדֵּנָה הָרוֹסָה, “And your toddler who this day does not know good or evil.” Another alternative is to read the phrase in Q4Deut\(^b\) as a rearranged word order of that found in the MT, where the singular מַלְאָךְ אֱלֹהִי יְהֹוָה is paired with לֶאָבָאָה לֶהַרְחָא and the plural מַלְאָךְ אֱלֹהִי יְהֹוָה is paired with לֶאָבָאָה לֶהַרְחָא. Seeing as the preserved text in Q4Deut\(^b\) does not clearly show a rearranged word order, the reading that assumes an abbreviated text is preferred in light of Rule 4.

\(^{1190}\) The MT switches from singular to plural address, whereas Q4Deut\(^b\) continues to use the singular. The audience for Yahweh’s speech here is ostensibly the people as is clear in the following verse, though Q4Deut\(^b\) appears to have Yahweh addressing Moses individually. The other witnesses agree with the MT. See note above for references to the literature on Numeruswechsel in Deuteronomy.
| Q659 | MT Deut 31:9 | omits | סֵלֶד | SV(2) – 4QDeuth has an expansive plus. \(^{1191}\) |
| Q660 | MT Deut 33:8 | omits | חזון לוח | SV(2) – 4QDeuth has an expansive plus. \(^{1192}\) |
| Q661 | MT Deut 33:9 | רָאָהֲה | SV(1) – Difference in person. \(^{1193}\) |
| Q662 | MT Deut 33:9 | שָמֶךָ | SV(1) – Difference in number. \(^{1194}\) |
| Q663 | MT Deut 33:9 | בָּרוֹחַ | SV(1) – 4QDeuth lacks the conjunction. |

\(^{1191}\) 4QDeuth is restored on the basis of the LXX: יִתְנַבֵּשׁ הַמַּשֶּה אֶת הַתּוֹרָה הָזָה אֵלֶּה שֶׁאֲרֵבִי, “And Moses wrote this law upon a scroll.”

\(^{1192}\) The phrase in the MT lacks a verb: תָּמִךְ וְעָמִידֵךְ לְאִשָּׁה הָסָדֶד, “your Tumim and your Umim belong to your faithful man.” 4QDeuth provides an imperative verb: תָּמִךְ וְעָמִידֵךְ לְאִשָּׁה הָסָדֶד, “give to Levi your Tumim, and your Umim to your faithful man,” which is supported by the reading in the LXX and in 4QTestimonia (4Q175) 114. J.A. Duncan, "New Readings for the 'Blessings of Moses' from Qumran," JBL 114, 2 (1995) 280, suggests that 4QDeuth has the original reading with the LXX.

\(^{1193}\) The pronominal object suffix in 4QDeuth refers to אֶלְּכָּאָה, “to his father and to his mother,” here in the second person, while the MT refers to the same nouns in the third person. Among the witnesses the reading in 4QDeuth is supported by the LXX, which has the second person accusative singular pronoun σε, while the SP lacks a pronominal object altogether. The parallel text in 4QTestimonia I 15-16 has no pronominal object in reference to σε, but has a separate verb plus unusual pronominal object suffix in reference to αὐτοῦ, written as οὐ δύσκολον, “I do not know you.” J.A. Duncan, "New Readings," 280, assumes that confusion as to the grammatical function of the preposition αὐτοῦ led to the difference between our sources, where the tradition underlying 4QDeuth and the LXX read the preposition as nota dativi, while that underlying the MT read the preposition as specification. In this sense the MT can be translated “Who says of his father and his mother I have not seen him” against 4QDeuth “Who says to his father and his mother I have not seen you.” Both nouns are referred to with the masculine singular pronominal suffix, for which see note above on the ‘priority of the masculine.’

\(^{1194}\) The use of the singular throughout Deut 33 in 4QDeuth is in contrast to the variation between singular and plural forms in the MT. Here the singular verb fits the context of verse 9, where the pronominal suffixes and other verb forms are generally in the singular. The LXX agrees with the reading in 4QDeuth. J.A. Duncan notes that the “3pl is at variance with the poetic convention of the singular utilized throughout the blessings” (Deuteronomy Manuscripts, 71, but see also n. 3 there).
Q664 MT Deut 33:10
4QDeut b 11-15 3
יוהי
יוהי
SV(1) – Difference in number.1195

Q665 MT Deut 33:10
4QDeut b 11-15 3
שם
שם
SV(1) – Difference in number.1196

Q666 MT Deut 33:11
4QDeut b 11-15 4
ועשל
ועשל
OV(1) – Difference in grammatical form.1197

Q667 MT Deut 33:11
4QDeut b 11-15 4
מלונים
מלונים
Not Counted – The reading in 4QDeut h is not certain.1198

Q668 MT Deut 33:11
4QDeut b 11-15 4
מל
מל
SV(1) – Lexical interchange.1199

Q669 MT Deut 33:12
4QDeut b 11-15 5
לבונים
לבונים
SV(1) – The MT lacks the conjunction.

Q670 MT Deut 33:12
4QDeut b 11-15 5
אלה
אלה
SV(1) – Lexical interchange.1200

1195 The form in 4QDeut b is read as a defective writing for 3ms imperfect Hiph’îl הַיָּרֵא, “to teach” (see E. Ulrich and F.M. Cross, Qumran Cave 4. IX, 69, and W. Gesenius, E. Kautzsch, and A.E. Cowley, Hebrew Grammar, 218, §76f, for the apocopated form in the imperfect). J.A. Duncan, "New Readings," 281-82, suggests that the apocopated form in 4QDeut b should be read as jussive against the indicative in the MT (so P. Joüon and T. Muraoka, Grammar of Biblical Hebrew, 139, §47 a-b: “The jussive tends to take a form shorter than that of the indicative ... In 3ms verbs the shortening amounts to apocope”).

1196 See the references in the previous note regarding reading the short verbal forms in this section of 4QDeut b as 3ms jussive against 3mpl indicative in the MT. The verbal forms in the blessings are consistently singular in 4QDeut b.

1197 The form in 4QDeut b is read as feminine singular construct of ꝏ, “work,” in the phrase ꝏ, “the work of his hands.” The possibility of reading the form as a defective feminine plural noun in 4QDeut h is not taken up here, but see the comments in J.A. Duncan, "New Readings," 283.

1198 The reading of a final mem in 4QDeut b “slightly separated from the yod is not impossible” (E. Ulrich and F.M. Cross, Qumran Cave 4. IX, 68).

1199 According to J.A. Duncan, "New Readings," 283-84, one possible reading of this variant is that the privative use of the preposition ꝏ was changed to the adverbial particle ꝏ, “not” in 4QDeut b. The reading in 4QDeut b is also reflected in 4QTestimonia I 20.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q671</th>
<th>MT Deut 33:12</th>
<th>יַעֲשֶׂה</th>
<th>SV(1) – Lexical interchange.1201</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4QDeut⁷ 11-15 5</td>
<td>מַעֲשֶׂה</td>
<td>מַעֲשֶׂה</td>
<td>4QDeut⁷ 11-15 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q672</th>
<th>MT Deut 33:13</th>
<th>מִמַּכָּר</th>
<th>SV(1) – The MT lacks the con-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4QDeut⁷ 11-15 6</td>
<td>נִמְכָּר</td>
<td>נִמְכָּר</td>
<td>4QDeut⁷ 11-15 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q673</th>
<th>MT Deut 33:15</th>
<th>תִּמאֲס</th>
<th>SV(1) – Lexical interchange.1202</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4QDeut⁷ 11-15 6</td>
<td>לְמַמֵּש</td>
<td>לְמַמֵּש</td>
<td>4QDeut⁷ 11-15 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q674</th>
<th>MT Deut 33:19</th>
<th>הד</th>
<th>SV(2) – 4QDeut⁷ has a different</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4QDeut⁷ 11-15 9</td>
<td>הד</td>
<td>הד</td>
<td>4QDeut⁷ 11-15 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q675</th>
<th>MT Deut 33:20</th>
<th>יָאָס</th>
<th>SV(1) – The MT lacks the con-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4QDeut⁷ 11-15 11</td>
<td>יָאָס</td>
<td>יָאָס</td>
<td>4QDeut⁷ 11-15 11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q676</th>
<th>MT Deut 22:5</th>
<th>שֵׁם</th>
<th>SV(1) – Lexical interchange.1204</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4QDeut¹ 3 i, 4 5 i 7</td>
<td>שם</td>
<td>שם</td>
<td>4QDeut¹ 3 i, 4 5 i 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q678</th>
<th>MT Deut 5:1</th>
<th>שָׁמַע</th>
<th>OV(l) – Possible difference in</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4QDeut¹ 11</td>
<td>שָׁמַע</td>
<td>שָׁמַע</td>
<td>4QDeut¹ 11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q679</th>
<th>MT Deut 5:1</th>
<th>הוה</th>
<th>SV(2) – 4QDeut¹ have an expa-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4QDeut¹ 12</td>
<td>הוה</td>
<td>הוה</td>
<td>4QDeut¹ 12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q680</th>
<th>MT Deut 5:22</th>
<th>הָרִים</th>
<th>SV(1) – 4QDeut¹ lacks the defi-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4QDeut¹ III 1</td>
<td>הָרִים</td>
<td>הָרִים</td>
<td>4QDeut¹ III 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1201 4QDeut⁷ appears to have the Polel participle מַעֲשֶׂה against the Qal participle, “shield,” in the MT, which is itself a *hapax legomenon*. According to J.A. Duncan, “New Readings,” 285 n. 44, this substitution could be related to a tendency in Qumran Hebrew to infrequently substitute intensive stems for Qal stems.

1202 The form in 4QDeut⁷ may pre-empt the same form in the following colon (see J.A. Duncan, “New Readings,” 285).

1203 The phrase in the MT is difficult: “then shall call people to (the) mountain.” The phrase in 4QDeut⁷ is more readily understood syntactically and also has parallels elsewhere in the MT (see J.A. Duncan, “New Readings,” 286 n. 49), restored: בְּמֶסָּרְתָּם רָאָס, “people offered thanksgiving.”

1204 See Q178 and Q593 above and the comments in note.

1205 See Q775 and Q812 below for the same reading, and the comments in note above.

1206 4QDeut¹ clarifies הוה מְּיָה, “this day.”
| Q681 | MT Deut 5:24 | 4QDeut IV 3 |OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation. |
| Q682 | MT Deut 5:25 | 4QDeut IV 3 | SV(1) – Lexical interchange. |
| Q683 | MT Deut 5:27 | 4QDeut IV 3 | SV(2) – 4QDeut IV 3 has an expansive plus. |
| Q684 | MT Deut 5:27 | 4QDeut IV 3 |OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation. |
| Q685 | MT Deut 5:31 | 4QDeut IV 3 |SV(1) – 4QDeut IV 3 lacks the conjunction. |
| Q686 | MT Deut 5:33 | 4QDeut IV 3 |OV(l) – Difference in grammatical form. |
| Q687 | MT Deut 8:5 | 4QDeut IV 3 |OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation. |
| Q688 | MT Deut 8:5 | 4QDeut IV 3 |SV(2) – 4QDeut IV 3 has an expansive plus. |
| Q689 | MT Deut 8:5 | 4QDeut IV 3 |OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation. |

---

1207 The lexeme in MT is a Qal participle of יְָשִּׁים, “to continue, add.” The form in 4QDeut IV 3 is reconstructed on the basis of the supralinear yod, and the parallel form in 4QPhyl b, h, j (see E. Ulrich and P.M. Cross, *Qumran Cave 4. IX*, 83, and J.A. Duncan, *Deuteronomy Manuscripts*, 98 n. 2), as a Hiph‘il masculine plural participle יְָשִּׁים, “do again, yet more.” On the phenomenon of Qal forms that appear as intensive or causative forms in Qumran Hebrew see the references in note above. The interchange of a basis stem for an intensive or causative stem is treated here and elsewhere as an interchange of lexemes.

1208 4QDeut IV 3 includes a preposition plus dative pronominal suffix clarifying the secondary object in the phrase מִּצְבִּיתָךְ אֶל פָּנַי, “everything that Yahweh our god said to you.” A similar phrase, with the verb מָכַה replacing מִצְבִּיתָךְ, appears in the second part of the verse in the MT. The reading in 4QDeut IV 3 is supported by Codex Alexandrinus.

1209 4QDeut IV 3 has a regular form of the 2ms independent pronoun, also in the SP, against the apocopated form in the MT. The short form appears three times in the MT: Num 11:15, Deut 5:27 and Ezek 28:14.

1210 On the form with and without paragogic nun see note above.

1211 4QDeut IV 3 has an adverbial particle appended to the phrase, restored: בְָּךְ נִעֲרָתָתְךָ מֵאֲצָרַךְ, “thus Yahweh your god disciplines you.”
4QDeut\textsuperscript{f} V 2

Q690 MT Deut 8:6
4QDeut\textsuperscript{f} V 2

Q691 MT Deut 8:6
4QDeut\textsuperscript{f} V 3

Q692 MT Deut 8:6
4QDeut\textsuperscript{f} V 3

Q693 MT Deut 8:7
4QDeut\textsuperscript{f} V 4

Q694 MT Deut 8:7
4QDeut\textsuperscript{f} V 5

Q695 MT Deut 8:9
4QDeut\textsuperscript{f} V 9

Q696 MT Deut 8:10
4QDeut\textsuperscript{f} V 10

Q697 MT Deut 8:10
4QDeut\textsuperscript{f} V 10

Q698 MT Deut 11:6
4QDeut\textsuperscript{f} VIII 2

\textsuperscript{1212} 4QDeut\textsuperscript{f} has an additional construct noun that is lacking in the MT and the other witnesses, excepting the Lucianic text. The phrase is restored \textit{wykrd lwkb}, “in all of his ways.”

\textsuperscript{1213} See also Q640 above, where the same adjective appears in 4QDeut\textsuperscript{f}, and the references in note . See also Q771 below for the same variant in 4QDeut\textsuperscript{g}.

\textsuperscript{1214} See Q642 above for the same spelling in 4QDeut\textsuperscript{f}, and the reference in note .
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q699</th>
<th>MT Deut 11:7</th>
<th>שָׁרָדָּה</th>
<th>4QDeut₁ VIII 3</th>
<th>SV(1) – Difference in number.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q700</th>
<th>MT Deut 11:8</th>
<th>וָאֵלָו</th>
<th>4QDeut₁ VIII 4</th>
<th>SV(2) – 4QDeut₁ has an expansive plus.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q701</th>
<th>MT Deut 11:11</th>
<th>אָבָה</th>
<th>4QDeut₁ VIII 10</th>
<th>OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q702</th>
<th>MT Exod 12:46</th>
<th>לְיִשָּׁרָה</th>
<th>4QDeut₁ X 1</th>
<th>SV(1) – Interchange of preposition ב and postposition locative יה.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q703</th>
<th>MT Exod 12:48</th>
<th>אָסֶק</th>
<th>4QDeut₁ X 2</th>
<th>SV(1) – Difference in number.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q704</th>
<th>MT Exod 13:4</th>
<th>אָבָה</th>
<th>4QDeut₁ X 11</th>
<th>OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q705</th>
<th>MT Exod 13:5</th>
<th>אָדוֹן</th>
<th>4QDeut₁ X 12</th>
<th>SV(1) – The MT lacks the definite article.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q706</th>
<th>MT Exod 13:5</th>
<th>וָאֵלָו</th>
<th>4QDeut₁ X 12-13</th>
<th>SV(2) – Difference in listed items.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q707</th>
<th>MT Exod 13:5</th>
<th>אָבָה</th>
<th>4QDeut₁</th>
<th>SV(1) – The MT lacks the prepo-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---

1215 4QDeut₁ is supported by the reading in 4QDeutkl, which has defective תְּנָאֹלֶת (see Q712 below). The verse in 4QDeut₁ is restored: יִרְמָאֶלֶת שָׁרָדָּה, "Because your eyes see all of Yahweh’s great works that he did," where the noun תְּנָאֹלֶת, "work," is taken as the plural construct שָׁרָדָּה, "works." E. Qimron, *Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 20 n. 9, notes the infrequent occurrence of the phonetic spelling שָׁרָדָּה for plural תְּנָאֹלֶת, and the same phonetic reading may underly the forms in 4QDeut₁ and 4QDeutkl. See further E. Ulrich and F.M. Cross, *Qumran Cave 4. IX*, 87.

1216 4QDeut₁ is supported by the reading in 4QDeutkl (see Q713 below). The phrase is reconstructed on the basis of the parallel in 4QDeutkl2 2:4: בְּךָ-יִרְמָאֶלֶת נִבְּרוּ עַל פָּנַי, וּבְךָ תְּנָאֹלֶת נִבְּרוּ עַל פָּנַי, "every commandment, the statutes and the judgements." According to E. Ulrich and F.M. Cross, *Qumran Cave 4. IX*, 87, the expansion in 4QDeut₁ and 4QDeutkl "is influenced by parallel passages such as Deut 5:31; 6:1; 7:11."

1217 The pronominal suffix refers to Moses and Aaron, so the plural form in 4QDeut₁ is expected. This reading is supported by the other witnesses, and also by some manuscripts of the MT (see E. Ulrich and F.M. Cross, *Qumran Cave 4. IX*, 90).

1218 The list of nations in 4QDeut₁ includes the Girgashites against the other other witnesses. See the comments in note above.
4QDeut X 13  לְאָבָא
dition ב.

Q708 MT Exod 13:5  לְאָבָא
4QDeut X 13  נְהוֹדוּ
OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.

Q709 MT Exod 13:5  הֶעָבְרָה
4QDeut X 14  מִשְׁבָּדוּ
OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.

Q710 MT Deut 32:8  בְּנֵי שַׁרְא
4QDeut XII 14  בְּנֵי אֲלֹהִים
HV – Difference in indirect object. 1219

Q711 MT Deut 5:29  אֲבָא
4QDeutkl 1 2  omits
SV(2) – The MT has an expansive plus. 1220

Q712 MT Deut 5:31  אֱלֹהִים
4QDeutkl 1 4  אֱלֹה
OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.

Q713 MT Deut 11:7  הָרְדָי
4QDeutkl 2 3  הַרְדִּי
SV(1) – Difference in number. 1221

Q714 MT Deut 11:8  omits
4QDeutkl 2 4  הָיָה וּ[ הָיָה
d.test]
SV(2) – 4QDeutkl has an expansive plus. 1222

---

1219 The phrase in the MT reads: לְאָבָא כַּמַּח נְוֵי לְאָבָא רַבֵּי, “he set up the borders of the peoples according to the number of the sons of Israel.” The reading in 4QDeutl is supported by the LXX and is restored on that basis: לְאָבָא כַּמַּח נְוֵי לְאָבָא רַבֵּי, “he set up the borders of the peoples according to the number of the sons of god” (the LXX has ἄγγελον θεοῦ, “angels of god”). See E. Tov, Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001) 269, for a brief discussion of the issues surrounding the possible hermeneutic backgrounds to this variant, presented as an anti-polytheistic or theological correction. See also note 46 there for references to the relevant scholarly literature, and more recently see I. Himbaza, "Dt 32, 8, une correction tardive des scribes. Essai d'interprétation et de datation," Biblica 83 (2002). For the suggestion that the original reading should be לְאָבָא כַּמַּח רַבֵּי, “sons of Bull El,” based on a common cognate phrase in Ugaritic, see J. Joosten, "A Note on the Text of Deuteronomy xxxii 8," VT 57, 4 (2007) 551-52. See also A.v.d. Kooij, "Ancient Emendations in MT," L’Ecrit et l’Esprit. Études d’histoire du texte et de théologie biblique en hommage à Adrian Schenker (eds D. Böhler, I. Himbaza, and Ph. Hugo; OBO 214; Göttingen: Fribourg Academic Press, 2005).

1220 The phrase in the MT reads: אֲבָא כַּמַּח נְוֵי לְאָבָא רַבֵּי, “to keep all of my commandments.” The SP has the object marker but lacks the construct noun בֶּל.

1221 See Q699 above, and the comments in note .

1222 See Q700 above, and the comments in note .
Q715 MT Deut 11:8
4QDeut$^{k1}$ 2 5

omits

ሮብሮስ

SV(2) – 4QDeut$^{k1}$ has an expansive plus.\(^{1223}\)

Q716 MT Deut 11:8
4QDeut$^{k1}$ 2 5

יריהמה

OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.

Q717 MT Deut 11:8
4QDeut$^{k1}$ 2 6

אבהר

SV(2) – 4QDeut$^{k1}$ has an expansive plus.\(^{1224}\)

Q718 MT Deut 11:9
4QDeut$^{k1}$ 2 6

אבהר

OV(l) – Difference in grammatical form.\(^{1225}\)

Q719 MT Deut 11:10
4QDeut$^{k1}$ 2 8

אמה

SV(1) – Difference in number.\(^{1226}\)

Q720 MT Deut 11:10
4QDeut$^{k1}$ 2 8

אמה

SV(1) – Difference in number.\(^{1227}\)

Q721 MT Deut 11:10
4QDeut$^{k1}$ 2 9

אמה

SV(1) – Difference in gender.\(^{1228}\)

Q722 MT Deut 11:10
4QDeut$^{k1}$ 2 10

Verse

OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.

Q723 MT Deut 11:10

Verse

OV(l) – Possible difference in

\(^{1223}\) The phrase in 4QDeut$^{k1}$ echoes Deut 8:1, "you will live and be increased." The reading in 4QDeut$^{k1}$ is supported by the LXX, ινα ζητη και πολιτοπλανασθητε, "that you may live and be multiplied."

\(^{1224}\) The phrase in 4QDeut$^{k1}$ is restored: אבהר( r#) (the land) which you cross over the Jordan towards (in order) to possess it." The MT lacks the direct object of the verb, "to cross over," namely the Jordan river, but the LXX supports the reading in 4QDeut$^{k1}$. According to J.A. Duncan, Deuteronomy Manuscripts, 144, the plus in 4QDeut$^{k1}$ is an expansion influenced by parallel passages in Deut 30:18 and 31:13.

\(^{1225}\) See note above on verbal forms with paragogic nun in Qumran Hebrew.

\(^{1226}\) The plural pronoun and the following participle (see the following variant) maintain the plural subject indicated by the pronominal suffix in Deut 11:9, "your fathers." The present pericope in the MT contains numerous instances of Numeruswechsel, for which see note above, that appear regularly as plural forms in 4QDeut$^{k1}$.

\(^{1227}\) The subject in this section is treated consistently as plural in 4QDeut$^{k1}$. See note above.

\(^{1228}\) The pronoun refers to כ"ה, "the land," a feminine noun. The MT qere has the correct form of the pronoun.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q724</th>
<th>MT Deut 11:12</th>
<th>אֲדֹנָי</th>
<th>OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q725</td>
<td>MT Deut 11:12</td>
<td>הוּא</td>
<td>SV(1) – 4QDeut&lt;sup&gt;k1&lt;/sup&gt; lacks the conjunction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q726</td>
<td>MT Deut 19:9</td>
<td>מִצְרָיִם</td>
<td>SV(1) – Difference in number.(^{1229})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q727</td>
<td>MT Deut 19:10</td>
<td>עַל־יָד</td>
<td>OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q728</td>
<td>MT Deut 19:11</td>
<td>omissions</td>
<td>SV(1) – The MT lacks the preposition מ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q729</td>
<td>MT Deut 19:11</td>
<td>הָאָלָה</td>
<td>OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.(^{1230})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q730</td>
<td>MT Deut 19:14</td>
<td>בְּנֵלָה</td>
<td>OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q731</td>
<td>MT Deut 20:8</td>
<td>מַשְׁפְּרִים</td>
<td>SV(2) – 4QDeut&lt;sup&gt;k2&lt;/sup&gt; has a clarifying plus.(^{1231})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q732</td>
<td>MT Deut 20:11</td>
<td>תֶּןָכָה</td>
<td>OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q733</td>
<td>MT Deut 20:11</td>
<td>לָה</td>
<td>OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{1229}\) Both Tg. Neof. and Tg. Ps.-J. read the plural pronominal suffix consistently in this verse. In the MT there is no confusion over grammatical number, which is treated consistently as singular throughout the passage. The SP and the LXX support the reading in the MT.\(^{1230}\)

\(^{1231}\) The form in 4QDeut<sup>k2</sup> either replaces the term והרשימים, “the officials,” in the MT, or is an additional term, although the lack of conjunction preceding the term would seem to argue against the latter. The two terms are not synonymous, as can be seen from Jos 8:33, 1 Chron 23:4 and 1 Chron 26:29, but the fact that the terms occur in close proximity in these passages may have prompted the addition of the second term in 4QDeut<sup>k2</sup>.
| Q734 | MT Deut 20:13 | וְיַבֵּיתָ | 4QDeutk2 2-3 8 | OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation. |
| Q735 | MT Deut 20:16 | לֵךְ | 4QDeutk2 2-3 11 | OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation. |
| Q736 | MT Deut 20:17 | דָּוָה | 4QDeutk2 2-3 12 | SV(1) – The MT lacks the conjunction. |
| Q737 | MT Deut 23:24 | בֶּן | 4QDeutk2 4 3 | OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation. |
| Q738 | MT Deut 23:25 | יְלֵדָה | 4QDeutk2 4 4 | OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation. |
| Q739 | MT Deut 24:3 | יָדִיעָה | 4QDeutk2 4 8 | SV(2) – 4QDeutk2 has an expansive plus.1232 |
| Q740 | MT Deut 26:1 | אַלִּישָׁה | 4QDeutk2 5 2 | OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation. |
| Q741 | MT Deut 26:2 | הָלָבָה | 4QDeutk2 5 4 | OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation. |
| Q742 | MT Deut 26:2 | שַׁם | 4QDeutk2 5 5 | SV(1) – The MT lacks the locative י.1233 |
| Q743 | MT Deut 26:3 | לְזֵיתֶה | 4QDeutk2 5 6 | SV(1) – Interchange of prepositions. |

---

1232 The phrase in 4QDeutk2 is harmonised with the same phrase in the following clause (so E. Ulrich and F.M. Cross, *Qumran Cave 4. IX*, 103). All of the other witnesses support the reading in the MT.

1233 The phrase in 4QDeutk2 is restored: "אמֶלֶךָ אָמֶלֶךָ יְהוָה נָשִּׁי נָשִּׁי לֵךְ לֵךְ נָשִּׁי נָשִּׁי," literally “to the place that Yahweh your god will choose to put his name there.” The locative marker in 4QDeutk2 is difficult, and one should note that the force of the locative is largely lost in Qumran Hebrew (see the reference in note above). The phrase without the locative marker occurs commonly in the MT, but Deut 12:11 is the only close parallel to the phrase with locative, and even here the syntax is significantly different. In E. Ulrich and F.M. Cross, *Qumran Cave 4. IX*, 100, the form in 4QDeutk2 is noted as an orthographic variant, but the reasons for this are unclear.
Q744 MT Deut 26:4 4QDeut\textsuperscript{k2} 5 7 omits אָ֫מָה SV(1) – The MT lacks the object marker.

Q745 MT Deut 26:18 4QDeut\textsuperscript{k2} 6-7 1 נְפָלָה OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.

Q746 MT Deut 31:12 4QDeut\textsuperscript{l} 6-7 1 לַיְדוֹתָּם SV(1) – Difference in person.\textsuperscript{1234}

Q747 MT Deut 34:6 4QDeut\textsuperscript{l} 10 3 רִכְבָּה מְאָה SV(1) – 4QDeut\textsuperscript{l} lacks the object marker.\textsuperscript{1235}

Q748 MT Deut 3:19 4QDeut\textsuperscript{m} 1-3 2 נְשַׁבְּרוּ OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.

Q749 MT Deut 3:19 4QDeut\textsuperscript{m} 1-3 2 וְנָסָכָם OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.

Q750 MT Deut 3:19 4QDeut\textsuperscript{m} 1-3 2\textsuperscript{sup} וְנָסָכָם קִנְיָם OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.

Q751 MT Deut 3:19 4QDeut\textsuperscript{m} 1-3 3 לֶבֶנֶס OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.

Q752 MT Deut 3:20 omits SV(2) – 4QDeut\textsuperscript{m} has an expansion.

\textsuperscript{1234} The reading in 4QDeut\textsuperscript{l} is restored אָ֫מָה on the basis of the SP, and is supported by some manuscripts of the MT and the LXX (see E. Ulrich and F.M. Cross, Qumran Cave 4. IX, 111). In all probability nothing remains of the letter preceding the final mem, although it may be argued that some very minimal trace of the left stroke of heh may be preserved. If the form in 4QDeut\textsuperscript{l} was read in agreement with the MT one would expect to see traces of the lower stroke of kaph abutting the final mem. The phrase in 4QDeut\textsuperscript{l} is restored: אָ֫מָה וְקִנְיָם אֲשֶׁר הָיוּ ... לְמִשְׁמְרָתָם, וְרָאָתָם אָ֫מָה בְּיָדָם, “gather the people ... so that they may learn and fear Yahweh their god,” against the reading in the MT with the second person pronominal suffix, “gather the people ... so that they may learn and fear Yahweh your god.”

\textsuperscript{1235} The pronominal object suffix is attached to the verb directly in 4QDeut\textsuperscript{l}, against the reading in the MT and the SP which appends the pronominal object to the object marker. The LXX has καὶ ἐθάψαν αὐτόν, “And they buried him,” which would support reading the form in 4QDeut\textsuperscript{l} as a plural verb, presumably with the pronominal object suffix appended to the object marker in the lacuna (so J.A. Duncan, Deuteronomy Manuscripts, 168). Such a reading finds support in some manuscripts of the SP and in Tg. Neof. (the latter has אָ֫מָה לְכָלָם), but the reading that is closest to the MT is preferred in light of Rule 4.
1236 4QDeut\textsuperscript{m} has the supralinear addition of the noun plus possessive pronominal suffix, אֱלֹהֵיכֶם, “your god,” after the Tetragrammaton. This reading is supported by the LXX, against the other witnesses including 4QDeut\textsuperscript{d} II 7. The same phrase, אֱלֹהֵיכֶם יָהֹוָה, “Yahweh your god,” appears in the following clause in the MT.

1237 The pronoun refers to יָמִנוּ, “time,” read here as a feminine noun. The MT qere has the correct form of the pronoun.

1238 The omission of the locative heh is not unusual in 4QDeut\textsuperscript{m} if, as suggested above, the affix had lost its syntactic function as a directional marker in Qumran Hebrew. See the reference in note above.

1239 The verb refers to עַם, “people.” On the treatment of this noun as singular or plural in the sources see note above. All of the other witnesses support the reading in the MT.
| Q763 | MT Deut 7:18 | וָאָלָדָךְ | 4QDeut m 5 1 | OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation. |
| Q764 | MT Deut 7:19 | וָאָלָדָךְ | 4QDeut m 5 3 | OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation. |
| Q765 | MT Deut 7:20 | סַמֹּמֶה | 4QDeut m 5 4 | OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation. |
| Q766 | MT Deut 7:21 | בּקְרֵבָךְ | 4QDeut m 5 5 | OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation. |
| Q767 | MT Deut 7:22 | לְפָנֶיהָ | 4QDeut m 5 6 | SV(1) – The MT lacks the preposition ל. |
| Q768 | MT Deut 7:22 | לְפָנֶיהָ | 4QDeut m 5 6 | OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation. |
| Q769 | MT Deut 8:6 | טָמָר | 4QDeut n 1 1 | OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation. |
| Q770 | MT Deut 8:6 | וָלָרָאתָ | 4QDeut n 1 3 | SV(2) – 4QDeut n has a different phraseology to the MT. |
| Q771 | MT Deut 8:7 | ommits | 4QDeut n 1 3 | SV(2) – 4QDeut n has an expansive plus. |
| Q772 | MT Deut 8:9 | וּפָרָהָירָה | | OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation. |


1241 See Q640 and Q694 above for the same reading in 4QDeut f and 4QDeut j. See also the references in note above.
| Q773 | MT Deut 8:10 | הָעַבְרַת | OV(I) – Possible difference in pronunciation. |
| Q774 | MT Deut 8:10 | הָעַבְרַת | OV(I) – Possible difference in pronunciation. |
| Q775 | MT Deut 5:1 | שְׁמַעְתָּ | OV(I) – Possible difference in pronunciation or grammatical form. |
| Q776 | MT Deut 5:3 | omissions | SV(2) – 4QDeut has an expansive plus. |
| Q777 | MT Deut 5:4 | אַנְנֵי | SV(1) – The MT lacks the conjunction. |
| Q778 | MT Deut 5:5 | וְרָבָּרָיוֹ | SV(1) – Difference in number. |
| Q779 | MT Deut 5:5 | אַלָּוֹדֹבֶם | SV(2) – 4QDeut has an expansive plus. |
| Q780 | MT Deut 5:8 | בְּלָל | SV(1) – The MT lacks the conjunction. |
| Q781 | MT Deut 5:10 | לְעִי | SV(1) – 4QDeut lacks the conjunction. |

---

1242 See Q642 and Q695 above for the same reading in 4QDeut and 4QDeut, and the references in note.
1243 See Q678 and Q812 for the same reading in 4QDeut and 4QDeut, and the references in note above.
1244 The phrase in 4QDeut reads: מַיְיָה פֶּהַ נַפְלֵתָה הִיוֹם הַיּוֹם, “those of us here today, all of us alive today.” The MT lacks the second instance of the noun שֵׁם while the LXX lacks the first instance of the noun.
1245 The phrase in 4QDeut reads: יָהֵウェָה יָהֵウェָה, “the words of Yahweh your god.” All of the other witnesses, excepting the Peshitta, agree with the reading in the MT: יָהֵウェָה יָהֵウェָה, “the word of Yahweh.” Notably, Exod 24, in which the events to which Deut 5:5 refers are narrated, uses the phrase with the plural nōmens regens: יָהֵウェָה יָהֵウェָה, “the words of Yahweh” (see Exod 24:3-4).
1246 4QDeut is possibly influenced by the phrase יָהֵウェָה יָהֵウェָה which occurs at the end of the pericope in the MT (see Deut 5:32-33).
| Q782 | MT Deut 5:10 | 4QDeut⁸ III 7 | מָתָאָה | Not Counted – The distinction between the graphemes is not certain.¹²⁴⁷ |
| Q783 | MT Deut 5:13 | 4QDeut⁸ III 10 | אַמ | SV(1) – The MT lacks the object marker. |
| Q784 | MT Deut 5:14 | 4QDeut⁸ III 11 | וֹו | SV(1) – The MT lacks the preposition ב. |
| Q785 | MT Deut 5:14 | 4QDeut⁸ III 11 | צ | SV(2) – 4QDeut⁸ has an expansive plus.¹²⁴⁸ |
| Q786 | MT Deut 5:14 | 4QDeut⁸ III 12 | וֹבָכ | SV(1) – 4QDeut⁸ lacks the conjunction. |
| Q787 | MT Deut 5:14 | 4QDeut⁸ III 12 | עַבְדַּך | SV(1) – 4QDeut⁸ lacks the conjunction. |
| Q788 | MT Deut 5:14 | 4QDeut⁸ III 12 | וֹשֵׁדָך | SV(1) – 4QDeut⁸ lacks the conjunction. |
| Q789 | MT Deut 5:14 | 4QDeut⁸ IV 1 | צ | SV(2) – The MT has an expansive plus.¹²⁴⁹ |
| Q790 | MT Deut 5:14 | 4QDeut⁸ IV 1 | וֹרֵד | SV(1) – 4QDeut⁸ lacks the conjunction. |
| Q791 | MT Deut 5:15 | | וֹבְרָה | OV(l) – Possible difference in |

¹²⁴⁷ Although the text is transliterated in E. Ulrich and F.M. Cross, *Qumran Cave 4. IX*, 124, as אָנ, the note to the text there states that "waw and yod are indistinguishable in this script, therefore the 4QDeut⁸ reading is materially uncertain." ¹²⁴⁸ The phrase in 4QDeut⁸ reads: לֹא תַעֲשֶׂה בְּהַיָּמָה, "you shall not do any work on it (the Sabbath day)." ¹²⁴⁹ The list of those forbidden to do work on the Sabbath in Deut 5:14 is somewhat apocopated in 4QDeut⁸, both in terms of the use of the conjunction waw (see Q786, Q787 and Q788 above) and in the omission of the construct noun לֵב. For a discussion of the various forms of this list on Exodus and Deuteronomy throughout the sources see S.A. White, "The All Souls Deuteronomy and the Decalogue," *JBL* 109, 2 (1990) 198-99.
| Q792 | MT Deut 5:15 | לְשׁוֹנָה | SV(2) – 4QDeut⁴ has a different phraseology to the MT.¹²⁵⁰ |
| Q793 | MT Deut 5:15 | 4QDeut⁴ IV 5-7 |SV(2) – 4QDeut⁴ has an expansive plus.¹²⁵¹ |
| Q794 | MT Deut 5:18 | זָה | SV(1) – 4QDeut⁴ lacks the conjunction. |
| Q795 | MT Deut 5:19 | זָה | SV(1) – 4QDeut⁴ lacks the conjunction. |
| Q796 | MT Deut 5:20 | זָה | SV(1) – 4QDeut⁴ lacks the conjunction. |
| Q797 | MT Deut 5:21 | זָה | SV(1) – 4QDeut⁴ lacks the conjunction. |
| Q798 | MT Deut 5:21 | 4QDeut⁴ IV 11 | SV(1) – 4QDeut⁴ lacks the conjunction. |

¹²⁵⁰ See the comments in note above concerning the phrase with both √ח and √רמ in the infinitive construct. In Deuteronomy the two terms are generally used in combination when referring to the proper observation of שלומ, “commandments” (see Deut 13:19; 15:5; 24:8; 28:1, 15). The interchange of these terms in the present context, being in reference to the proper observation of the שלומ of Sabbath, may have been influenced by the use of both terms in related contexts. According to S.A. White, "All Souls Deuteronomy," 200, the use of √רמ in 4QDeut⁴ is “reminiscent of the first word of 5:12.”

¹²⁵¹ 4QDeut⁴ has additional text that is harmonised with the end of the fourth commandment in Exod 20:11, with minor differences. It is possible that 4QDeut⁴ contains the more original reading, but this view does give rise to problems concerning the mechanics of such haplography. Instead, the addition in 4QDeut⁴ is considered as a ‘reminiscence,’ or unintentional harmonisation, with Exod 20:11, for which view see the discussion in S.A. White, "All Souls Deuteronomy," 200-201. See also the comments in E. Eshel, "4QDeut⁴," 146, regarding the placement of this plus in Codex Vaticanus and its relationship to the plus in 4QDeut⁴.
The consistent use of the verb שׁוֹאָה, “desire passionately,” in 4QDeut contrasts with the use of דֵּלָה, “crave, long for,” in the MT. The tenth commandment in Exodus 20:17 uses הדֵּלָה throughout, and it may be that 4QDeut is harmonised with that text (see E. Eshel, “4QDeut,” 143). S.A. White, “All Souls Deuteronomy,” 203-5, suggests that the difficult verb הדֵּלָה in the MT was replaced with the more well known form in 4QDeut. There is much variation between the witnesses concerning the listed items in this commandment in Exodus and Deuteronomy, but it seems that the LXX supports the reading in 4QDeut.

4QDeut has an extra noun in the description of the delivery of the commandments on Sinai, which reads: דָּבָר אֲדָמָה הָעִנָּה, “from the midst of the fire, darkness, cloud and murkiness.” The reading in 4QDeut is supported by the SP, and probably also reflects the Vorlage to the LXX. The same phrase is found in the MT in Deut 4:11.
| Q808 | MT Deut 5:26 | 4QDeut⁰ V 9 | סחיים | SV(1) – Difference in number.¹²⁵⁴ |
| Q809 | MT Deut 5:27 | 4QDeut⁰ V 10 | יאמר | SV(1) – Lexical interchange.¹²⁵⁵ |
| Q810 | MT Deut 5:27 | 4QDeut⁰ V 10 | ואמת | OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.¹²⁵⁶ |
| Q811 | MT Deut 5:27 | 4QDeut⁰ VI 3 | להוה | OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation. |
| Q812 | MT Deut 5:1 | 4QDeut⁰ 5 1 | כמתה | OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation or grammatical form.¹²⁵⁷ |
| Q813 | MT Deut 5:9 | 4QDeut⁰ 6-7 2 | יהבדר | Not Counted – The placement of the fragment is uncertain.¹²⁵⁸ |
| Q814 | MT Deut 32:37 | 4QDeut⁰ I 1 | וראתי | SV(2) – 4QDeut⁰ has an expansive plus.¹²⁵⁹ |
| Q815 | MT Deut 32:37 | 4QDeut⁰ I 2 | אשאר | SV(1) – The MT lacks the relative pronoun. |

---

¹²⁵⁴ The phrase translated as “the living god” appears with both the singular and plural adjective יְהֹوָה, “living,” in the MT. The phrase with the plural adjective occurs once in Deuteronomy, twice in Samuel (1Sam 17:26, 36) and once in Jeremiah (Jer 23:36). With the singular adjective the phrase occurs twice in Kings (2 Kgs 19:4, 16) and twice in Isaiah (Isa 37:4, 17). According to E. Eshel, “4QDeutn,” 141-42, the change from a plural adjective to a singular adjective is exegetical.

¹²⁵⁵ The use of the verb יָרָא in 4QDeut⁰ harmonises with the same verb in the next clause. All of the other witnesses support the reading in the MT.

¹²⁵⁶ See note above.

¹²⁵⁷ See the comments in note above, and the same reading in Q678 and Q775.

¹²⁵⁸ 4QDeuto may be restored: נָניָהוּֽילַכּ לֵא וְיָרָה, “and you shall not serve them.” Against the reading in the MT נָניָהוּֽילַכּ לֵא וְיָרָה, “and you shall not serve them.” In this reading the dative pronominal object suffix is marked with nota dativi in 4QDeut⁰ against being appended directly to the verbal predicate in the MT. However, as noted in E. Ulrich and F.M. Cross, *Qumran Cave 4. IX*, 131-32, the placement of fragments 6 and 7 of 4QDeut⁰ is not certain, and it remains a possibility that the fragments preserve a text or texts that agree with the MT here.

¹²⁵⁹ The subject is clarified in 4QDeut⁰: יָשָׁר, “And Yahweh will say.”
Q816 MT Deut 32:42 OV(I) – Difference in grammatical form. 1260
4QDeut⁴ II 2

Q817 MT Deut 32:42 SV(1) – The MT lacks the conjunction.
4QDeut⁴ II 5

Q818 MT Deut 32:43 SV(2) – 4QDeut⁴ has a different expression to the MT. 1261
4QDeut⁴ II 6

Q819 MT Deut 32:43 omits SV(2) – 4QDeut⁴ has an expan-

1260 The form in 4QDeut⁴ is restored: נְהַרְכָּר. On the long form of the 1cs imperfect נְהַרְכָּר in Qumran Hebrew see E. Qimron, Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls, 44, who notes that “It is a well known feature of DSS Hebrew that cohortative forms נְהַרְכָּר denote the indicative alongside the forms ל+ו, as in the late books of the Bible and the Samaritan Pentateuch.” However, as Qimron also notes, the two forms are not simply in free variation, but rather the first person imperfect forms following waw consecutive or conjunctive are regularly long. Here, though, no waw precedes the verb, so it may properly be read as a cohortative, and thus represents a different grammatical form than the form in the MT. For other references concerning long forms with appended ל in Qumran Hebrew see note above.

1261 The colon in 4QDeut⁴ reads: מְלֹא מְדֻבָּר, “Rejoice, o heavens, (in) his people” (or “with him”). The LXX seems to have translated a similar Vorlage: εὐφρανθῆτε οὐρανοι αὐτῷ αὐτοῦ, “Rejoice, o heavens, with him,” reading the final form as the preposition “with” rather than the noun “people”). The MT has a different subject in this colon: מְלֹא מְדֻבָּר, מְדוּנָּה נְהַרְכָּר, “Rejoice, o nations, (in) his people.” On the emendation of Deut 32:43 to include both versions of this colon, whereby parablepsis is assumed, see W.F. Albright, "Some Remarks on the Song of Moses in Deuteronomy XXXII," VT 9, 4 (1959) 340-341. For an alternative view that posits the variant in the MT as a theological correction see A. Rofe, "The End of the Song of Moses (Deuteronomy 32:43)," Liebe und Gebot: Studien zum Deuteronomium: Festschrift zum 70. Geburtstag von Lothar Perlitt (eds R.G. Kratz and H. Spiekermann; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000) 167. Such a view would demand that the variant be read as a difference in hermeneutic, where the term נְהַרְכָּר, read “heavenly beings” by Rofe, is replaced with the “nations,” which better suited the theological view of a later copyist. Indeed, graphical corruption is difficult to imagine in this context, and Albright’s suggestion of haplography seems to have little advantage over Rofe’s proposal of an ideological correction to the text that removed unwanted polytheistic material. However, in light of Rule 4 our methodology demands that we read here with Albright, and adopt the reading that supposes the least amount of intentional alteration to the text. The more obvious reading is, of course, to assume an exegetical concern behind the omission of the line in the MT, however the fact that the line is omitted rather than changed, necessitates the view that it is conceivably an addition in 4QDeut⁴ in light of Rule 4. This is perhaps a limitation of the methodology employed here that inhibits our ability to successfully describe very divergent texts. It should be noted, though, that the purpose of our methodology is to describe close parallel texts that diverge subtly, and not to deal robustly with very different sources.
4QDeut\textsuperscript{4} II 7 וֹתָםָהָוָו לְפָלָלָאלָחֵים
Q820 MT Deut 32:43 וֹתָםָהָו בְּנֵי
4QDeut\textsuperscript{4} II 8 טֶבְרָדָו
Q821 MT Deut 32:43 וֹתָםָהָו לְפָלָלָאלָחֵים
4QDeut\textsuperscript{4} II 10 שְׁלוֹם
Q822 MT Deut 32:43 וֹתָםָהָו וֹתָםָהָו
4QDeut\textsuperscript{4} II 11 וֹתָםָהָו
Q823 MT Deut 32:43 וֹתָםָהָו וֹתָםָהָו
4QDeut\textsuperscript{4} II 11 וֹתָםָהָו
Q824 MT Deut 12:3 מַעֲבָדָה מַעֲבָדָה
4QpaleoDeut\textsuperscript{1} 15 2 מַעֲבָדָה מַעֲבָדָה
Q825 MT Deut 7:4 וֹתָםָהָו וֹתָםָהָו
4QpaleoDeut\textsuperscript{1} 5-6 6 וֹתָםָהָו

\textsuperscript{1262} See the discussion in the previous note, and see also A. Rofe, "The End of the Song of Moses," 169-70. The LXX supports the reading in 4QDeut\textsuperscript{4}.

\textsuperscript{1263} The phrase in the MT is harmonised with the phrase in verse 36 (see W.F. Albright, "Some Remarks," 341).

\textsuperscript{1264} 4QDeut\textsuperscript{4} is again supported by the reading in the LXX. See the references in note \textsuperscript{1262} above.

\textsuperscript{1265} The \textit{waw} consecutive plus perfect in the MT is written as \textit{waw} conjunctive plus imperfect in 4QDeut\textsuperscript{4}.

\textsuperscript{1266} The object is specified in the MT as רָאוּתָצָו אֲלָמָו, "his land." The reading in 4QDeut\textsuperscript{4}, which lacks the possessive pronominal suffix, is supported by the SP and the LXX (see E. Ulrich and F.M. Cross, \textit{Qumran Cave 4. IX}, 142). The reading in 4QDeut\textsuperscript{4} renders the final phrase as a construct chain רָאוּתָצָו אֲלָמָו, "the land of his people," against the difficult reading in the MT רָאוּתָצָו אֲלָמָו, "his land (and) his people." The LXX has an expansive plus not reflected in 4QDeut\textsuperscript{4}, but otherwise supports the reading in that scroll by its use of the genitive construction: εκκαθαριει κυριος την γην λαου αυτου, "the Lord will cleanse the land of his people." An alternative reading of the form in 4QDeut\textsuperscript{4} is to read the final waw on the \textit{nomens regens} as an archaic case marker, however this view suffers in that the incorrect vowel is applied. If this were the case we would expect the accusative ending on the \textit{nomens regens} rather than the nominative. On the difficulties in the evidence for proto-Hebrew case vowels preserved in Biblical Hebrew see R.C. Vern \textit{The Relevance of Linguistic Evidence}, 11:1-24.

\textsuperscript{1267} According to E. Qimron, \textit{Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls}, 63 n. 81, the short form of the 3mpl pronominal suffix following the fpl marker רְפִּי is more common in the Qumran non-Biblical literature, but "the biblical texts from Qumran as well as the Samaritan Pentateuch prefer the long form."

\textsuperscript{1268} The verb refers to the masculine singular noun יָבְרָדָו, so the form in 4QpaleoDeut\textsuperscript{1} is grammatically correct and is supported by the reading in the SP. On \textit{Numeruswechsel} in Deuteronomy see note \textsuperscript{1266} above.
| Q826 | MT Deut 7:19 | וַיֵּשֵׁבוּ | 4QpaleoDeut’ 5-6 | SV(1) – 4QpaleoDeut’ lacks the conjunction. |
| Q827 | MT Deut 7:24 | כִּבְשָׁנָה | 4QpaleoDeut’ 7-10 | SV(1) – Interchange of prepositions. |
| Q828 | MT Deut 7:25 | הַמִּשְׁמַרְתָּן | 4QpaleoDeut’ 7-10 | SV(1) – Difference in number.¹²⁶⁹ |
| Q829 | MT Deut 12:1 | אַלּוֹ | 4QpaleoDeut’ 13-14 | SV(1) – The MT lacks the conjunction. |
| Q830 | MT Deut 13:19 | דָּוִיד | 4QpaleoDeut’ 19 | SV(2) – 4QpaleoDeut’ has an expansive plus.¹²⁷⁰ |
| Q831 | MT Deut 14:19 | אֵּלָה | 4QpaleoDeut’ 21 i, 22 | SV(2) – Difference in expression.¹²⁷¹ |
| Q832 | MT Deut 15:8 | כָּנֹס | 4QpaleoDeut’ 21 ii | SV(1) – 4QpaleoDeut’ lacks the object marker. |
| Q833 | MT Deut 23:14 | דַּקְנִית | 4QpaleoDeut’ 31-32 | SV(1) – The MT lacks the definite article. |

¹²⁶⁹ In the MT the first verb in the verse is the 2mpl form פִּרְשֵׁה, “you shall burn,” but the following verbs and pronouns are singular. 4QpaleoDeut’ maintains the plural subject throughout. In this instance the LXX supports the reading with Numeruswechsel in the MT.

¹²⁷⁰ The phrase in 4QpaleoDeut’ is restored: לְשַׁמְשָׁה תַּשֶּׁר אֶחָד עַד אֲנָחָה יְהוָה, “to do the right and the good (thing) in the eyes of Yahweh.” The MT lacks the second adjective. The idiom is known in Deuteronomy usually with only the first adjective:" (see Deut 12:25; 21:9), or with both (Deut 6:18, or Deut 12:28 in reverse order). The LXX reads: το καλον και το απεστον, “the right and the pleasing (thing),” which supports the reading in 4QpaleoDeut’.

¹²⁷¹ The phrase in 4QpaleoDeut’ reads: פָּסִא הָא לֹא לָא הָא, “it is unclean to you, you shall not eat (it).” In contrast the MT constructs the phrase thus: פָּסִא הָא לֹא לָא הָא, “it is unclean to you, they shall not be eaten.” The form in 4QpaleoDeut’ is read as a Qal 2ms of √לָקֵח, “to eat,” against the Niphal 3mpl in the MT.
Q834 MT Deut 23:14
4QpaleoDeut’ 31-32
3
כַּרְתָּה ְבָּהַת
SV(1) – Lexical interchange. 1272

Q835 MT Deut 28:15
4QpaleoDeut’ 33 2
דְּמָמוֹן
demônon
SV(1) – Difference in number. 1273

Q836 MT Deut 28:15
4QpaleoDeut’ 33 3-4
כַּלָּה ְכַּלָּה
SV(1) – 4QpaleoDeut’ lacks the definite article.

Q837 MT Deut 28:19
4QpaleoDeut’ 33 6
אָרוֹר אַתָּה חָטָאָה ... בָּאֶסַף
omits
SV(2) – The MT has an expansive plus. 1274

Q838 MT Deut 33:3
4QpaleoDeut’ 42-43
2
תֹּבְרָה
tobrâh
OV(l) – Difference in grammatical form. 1275

Q839 MT Deut 33:7
4QpaleoDeut’ 42-43
5
כַּזְלֹה ְכַּזְלֹה
SV(1) – The MT lacks the preposition ב.

Q840 MT Deut 33:7
4QpaleoDeut’ 42-43
6
לָא
omits
SV(2) – 4QpaleoDeut’ has an explicating plus. 1276

Q841 MT Deut 33:29
רְבִיתָה
SV(1) – 4QpaleoDeut’ lacks the

1272 The Qal of √bw#, “to return,” is written as Hiph’îl in 4QpaleoDeut’. The tendency for intensive or causative stems to replace some basic stem roots in Qumran Hebrew has already been observed. See note and above, and also E. Qimron, Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls, 49. For this spelling of the 2ms perfect Hiph’îl of √bw# cf. Ps 85:4.
1273 The singular verb in the MT fits the context and is supported by the SP and the LXX. The Tgs. support the reading in 4QpaleoDeut’.
1274 The phrase in the MT is אָרוֹר אַתָּה חָטָאָה ... בָּאֶסַף, “cursed are you in your coming in and curse are you in your going out.” This curse follows similar clauses in the three previous verses that use the same formula: ... אָרוֹר אַתָּה בָּאֶסַף ... אָרוֹר אַתָּה בָּאֶסַף. The lack of the fourth repetition of this curse formula may be due to haplography in 4QpaleoDeut’.
1275 See the comments on the forms with paragogic nun in note above.
1276 4QpaleoDeut’ clarifies the subject by adding the nota dativi plus pronominal suffix, perhaps to harmonise the phrase with the phrase preceding: ... ויָשָׁב לַיְוָע לָא אֵלֶּה הָאֶרֶץ ... ,(with) his hands he has contended for him, and you will be a help for him from his enemies.”
| Q842 | MT Deut 7:15 | omits | רכיהת והם | 5QDeut 1 i 1 | SV(2) – 5QDeut has an expansive plus.1277 |
| Q843 | MT Deut 7:17 | | נל | 5QDeut 1 i 3 | OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.1278 |
| Q844 | MT Deut 7:19 | omits | אָוִים | 5QDeut 1 i 4 | SV(2) – 5QDeut has an expansive plus.1279 |
| Q845 | MT Deut 7:19 | | נל | 5QDeut 1 i 4 | SV(1) – 5QDeut lacks the conjunction. |
| Q846 | MT Deut 7:19 | | נל | 5QDeut 1 i 4 | OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.1280 |
| Q847 | MT Deut 8:9 | | בְּהֵרִים | 5QDeut 1 ii 4 | OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.1281 |
| Q848 | MT Deut 8:12 | omits | בָּּ | 5QDeut 1 ii 6 | SV(2) – 5QDeut has an expansive plus.1282 |
| Q849 | MT Deut 8:13 | | בָּּ | 5QDeut 1 ii 6 | SV(1) – 5QDeut lacks the conjunction. |

---

1277 The expanded phrase in 5QDeut is restored: “all the wicked sicknesses of Egypt which you have seen and which you have known.” The reading is supported by the LXX which has: καὶ πᾶσας νοσους Αιγυπτου τας πονηρας ας εωρακας και οσα εγνως, “and all of the wicked diseases of Egypt which you have seen, and all that you have known.”

1278 See the discussion in note above.

1279 The phrase in 5QDeut is restored: הָּ, “the great trials this day which your eyes saw.”

1280 The spelling of the noun with ‘ayin in 5QDeut is treated as an orthographic variant (see E. Qimron, Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls, 25-26), but in light of Rule 1 is counted here as OV(l).

1281 See also Q642, Q695 and Q772 above for the same reading, and see the discussion in note .

1282 5QDeut clarifies the dative in the phrase: רְבִּים, “and you will build good houses and you will dwell in them.” The addition in 5QDeut is supralinear and agrees with the reading in the LXX, which has the dative preposition plus dative plural pronoun: εν αυταις, “in them.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>MT Text</th>
<th>Vehement Text</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q850</td>
<td>MT Deut 8:17</td>
<td>דָּלַמֵּךְ</td>
<td>SV(1) – Difference in number.1283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5QDeut 1 ii 9</td>
<td>דָּלַמֵּךְ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q851</td>
<td>MT Deut 8:19</td>
<td>omit</td>
<td>SV(1) – The MT lacks the conjunction plus object marker.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5QDeut 1 ii 12</td>
<td>omit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q852</td>
<td>MT Gen 6:19</td>
<td>אֶתֵּךְ</td>
<td>OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6QpaleoGen 8</td>
<td>אֶתֵּךְ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q853</td>
<td>MT Gen 6:20</td>
<td>לְפִיהֵנָה</td>
<td>SV(1) – Difference in number.1284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6QpaleoGen 9</td>
<td>לְפִיהֵנָה</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q854</td>
<td>MT Lev 4:25</td>
<td>אָמַר הַדָּרָם</td>
<td>SV(2) – The MT has an expansive plus.1285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11QpaleoLevᵃ frg. A 3</td>
<td>omit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q855</td>
<td>MT Lev 4:26</td>
<td>מְסִהלָה וּמְסִהלָם</td>
<td>SV(2) – The MT has an expansive plus.1286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11QpaleoLevᵃ frg. A 4</td>
<td>omit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q856</td>
<td>MT Lev 10:7</td>
<td>וְהַמַּשָּה</td>
<td>SV(1) – 11QpaleoLevᵃ lacks the preposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11QpaleoLevᵃ frg. B 5</td>
<td>וְהַמַּשָּה</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1283 5QDeut reads: "[and] you said in your heart." The singular pronominal suffix fits the context, so the MT has the grammatically correct form. Both Tg. Ps.-J. and Tg. Neof. support the reading in 5QDeut, though with the plural verb at the beginning of the phrase: נָשִּׁיעְ תַּבָּקִית לְבָּקִית. The form with the singular possessive pronominal suffix is more frequent in the MT, occurring eight times in Genesis (see Gen 1:12ᵇⁱˢ, 21, 25; 6:20ᵇⁱˢ, 7:14ᵇⁱˢ) against only one occurrence with the plural suffix (see Gen 1:21).

1284 The precise placement of fragment A of 11QpaleoLevᵃ is uncertain. According to D.N. Freedman and K.A. Mathews, *The Paleo-Hebrew Leviticus Scroll* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1985) 26, the fragment may represent Lev 4:25-26, 30-31 or 34-35, with the first passage being the most likely. If any of these placements are accepted the fragment still represents a variant reading. The most likely reading is of a change in word order, where the phrase אָמַר הַדָּרָם, "he shall poor out its blood," in the MT is written as אָמַר הַדָּרָם, וְהַמַּשָּה in 11QpaleoLevᵃ. The full phrase is not preserved, however, so reading a change in word order relies on the reconstruction of a variant reading in breach of Rule 2. Therefore the variant is counted as a plus in the MT that includes the phrase אָמַר הַדָּרָם, "its blood," which is lacking in 11QpaleoLevᵃ.

1285 See the reference in the note above. The most likely reading is that the phrase מְסִהלָה וּמְסִהלָם, "like the fat of the sacrifice of the peace offering," is lacking in 11QpaleoLevᵃ.
Q857 MT Lev 11:27
11QpaleoLev\(^a\) frg. C
עַל הַבָּשָׂר

SV(2) – 11QpaleoLev\(^a\) has a different expression to the MT.\(^{1287}\)

Q858 MT Lev 13:42
11QpaleoLev\(^a\) frg. E
בְּכַרְתָּה

SV(2) – 11QpaleoLev\(^a\) has an expansive plus.\(^{1288}\)

Q859 MT Lev 14:16
11QpaleoLev\(^a\) frg. F
עָמָסָנָה

SV(2) – The MT has an expansive plus.\(^{1289}\)

Q860 MT Lev 14:17
11QpaleoLev\(^a\) frg. F
הָמָנָה [ ]

SV(2) – 11QpaleoLev\(^a\) has a different expression to the MT.\(^{1290}\)

Q861 MT Lev 14:20
11QpaleoLev\(^a\) frg. F
נִלּוֹן

Not Counted – The form in 11QpaleoLev\(^a\) is considered erroneous.\(^{1291}\)

Q862 MT Lev 15:3
omits

SV(2) – 11QpaleoLev\(^a\) has an ex-

---

\(^{1287}\) The phrase in 11QpaleoLev\(^a\) is restored: יל דֵב לֵבָשׂר נַחּ, “all that go upon the belly,” perhaps influenced by the similar phrase in verse 42.

\(^{1288}\) The possessive pronoun suffix clarifies the subject, and the same form appears in the latter part of the verse in the MT. The reading in 11QpaleoLev\(^a\) is supported by the same reading in the SP, and by the reading in the LXX.

\(^{1289}\) The noun is repeated in the MT from an occurrence earlier in the verse, clarifying the object of the verb נָצָל, “dip,” and the instrument of the verb יָזֵז, “spatter.” The SP supports the reading in 11QpaleoLev\(^a\), while the LXX supports the reading in the MT.

\(^{1290}\) D.N. Freedman and K.A. Mathews, assume that a scribal error lead to the inclusion of the letters reš and aleph being introduced into the scroll, but are unable to explain the mechanical process by which this would have occurred. , M. Jastrow, Dictionary, 1438, has the root נֵתָר, “a certain skin disease,” but this makes no sense of the following kaph. In light of Rule 1 this variant must be considered as a legitimate reading on the basis that no reasonable explanation for error can be determined.

\(^{1291}\) The form in 11QpaleoLev\(^a\) is לַיְלָה for לַיְלָה in the MT. The 1cs pronominal object suffix does not fit the context, and in this script there can be no graphical confusion between the letters yod and waw, so a defective 3ms pronominal suffix is also ruled out. Reading the form in 11QpaleoLev\(^a\) as a scribal error for לַיְלָה is the most likely explanation of this variant (so D.N. Freedman and K.A. Mathews, 31).
The final phrase of Lev 15:3 in the MT reads: "it (is) his uncleaness." 11QpaleoLev has the longer phrase, restored: "it (is) his uncleaness all the days that it flows." The reading in the LXX agrees with the reading in 11QpaleoLev, for which see D.N. Freedman and K.A. Mathews, 32-33.

The sons of Aaron are not mentioned in 11QpaleoLev, which may have been due to homoioarchton (so D.N. Freedman and K.A. Mathews, 34), or to some theological or exegetical reason (cf. note above).

The scribe of 11QpaleoLev appears to confuse the phones [h] and [ḥ]. There is some evidence for the commutation of certain laryngeals in this scroll, for which see D.N. Freedman and K.A. Mathews, 80.

See the comments in note above.

The reading in 11QpaleoLev is restored: "you shall inherit their land." Both the SP and the LXX support the shorted reading in the MT. 11QpaleoLev may be influenced by the similar phrase in Lev 20:24 (see D.N. Freedman and K.A. Mathews, 36).
The phrase in 11QpaleoLev\textsuperscript{a} reads: אַתָּה אֲשֶׁר מִבָּהֵן שֵׁרָאֵל, “any man from among the house Israel,” against the MT: אַתָּה אֲשֶׁר מִבָּהֵן שֵׁרדָאֵל, “any man from among the sons of Israel.” The idiom selected in 11QpaleoLev\textsuperscript{a} is semantically identical but stylistically different from that selected in the MT. That in 11QpaleoLev\textsuperscript{a} occurs four times in the Pentateuch, all of which occur in Leviticus (see Lev 17:3, 8, 10; 22:18), while the idiom in the MT occurs only twice in Leviticus (see Lev 17:13 and here), and also in Numbers (see Num 16:2; 25:6). The scribe of 11QpaleoLev\textsuperscript{a} may then have harmonised the idiom in Lev 20:2 with that which was more familiar.

11QpaleoLev\textsuperscript{a} is restored: בִּכָּל בֵּית אֵל יָבֹע שֹׁרַע, “because I, Yahweh, am holy (who) sanctifies them,” against the MT: בִּכָּל בֵּית אֵל יָבֹע שֹׁרַע, “because I, Yahweh, am holy (who) sanctifies you.” The LXX supports the reading in 11QpaleoLev\textsuperscript{a}.

On the list of defects that render offering unsuitable, the fourth and sixth items are reversed in 11QpaleoLev\textsuperscript{a}. All of the other witnesses agree with the order of items in the MT.

The phrase in appears to have the masculine plural noun followed by the 3mpl independent pronoun, restored: רִחָם עָזָיֶה יָבֹע מַקְדֶּשֶׁת, “their corruption (is) in them.”
| Q875 | MT Lev 24:10 | אֶזְרָה | SV(1) – The MT lacks the definite article. |
| Q876 | MT Lev 24:12 | רֹגִיהוֹת | SV(1) – The MT lacks the object marker. |
| Q877 | MT Lev 25:30 | סָאֶר | SV(1) – 11QpaleoLev a lacks the relative pronoun. |
| Q878 | MT Lev 25:31 | יִיתָבַע | SV(1) – Difference in number. |
| Q879 | MT Lev 25:31 | בִּיבָל | SV(1) – 11QpaleoLev a lacks the conjunction. |
| Q880 | MT Lev 25:32 | אֹלָותָה | OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation. |
| Q881 | MT Lev 25:34 | פְּלִרָה | OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation. |
| Q882 | MT Lev 26:19 | אֶזְרָה | SV(1) – 11QpaleoLev a lacks the object marker. |
| Q883 | MT Lev 26:22 | הַדְּסָלוֹתָה | SV(1) – Lexical interchange. |

1301 The pronominal object suffix is appended to the verb directly in the MT, against the reading in 11QpaleoLev a which appends the pronominal object to the object marker.

1302 The verb refers to a plural subject, כְּתַבְּרִים, “village houses,” so the form in 11QpaleoLev a is grammatically correct. The SP and the LXX support the reading in 11QpaleoLev a.


1305 The form in 11QpaleoLev a is read as Pi’el, against the Hiph’il in the MT. Alternatively, if the form in 11QpaleoLev a is read as Qal, this variant would appear to go against the observed tendency for some basic stem roots to be written as intensive or causative stems in Qumran Hebrew (see E. Qimron, *Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 48-49), a phenomenon also observed in Samaritan Hebrew (see Z. Ben-Hayyim, *Grammar*, 222-23). The variation between different stemmed roots is here treated as a lexical interchange.
11QpaleoLeva V 7

Q884 MT Lev 26:22
11QpaleoLeva V 7
ואף אלי shall walk with you in hostility.

SV(2) – The MT has an expansive plus.1306

Q885 MT Lev 26:24
11QpaleoLeva V 7
ומחה

SV(2) – 11QpaleoLeva has an expansive plus.1307

Q886 MT Lev 27:19
11QpaleoLeva VI 9
את

SV(1) – The MT lacks the object marker.

Q887 MT Lev 9:23
11QLevb 2 1
 possibilità

SV(2) – 11QLevb has an expansive plus.1308

Q888 MT Lev 9:24
11QLevb 2 3
 possibilità

SV(2) – 11QLevb has a different direct object to the MT.1309

Q889 MT Lev 10:1
11QLevb 2 4
shall

SV(2) – 11QLevb has an expansive plus.1310

Q890 MT Lev 10:1
11QLevb 2 7
זא

SV(2) – 11QLevb has an expansive plus.1311

Q891 MT Lev 13:59
11QLevb 3 4
ים

SV(1) – 11QLevb lacks the definite article.

Q892 MT Lev 13:59
11QLevb
משרתים

SV(1) – 11QLevb lacks the definite article.

---

1306 The phrase in the MT reads: "I, even I, shall walk with you in hostility." The emphatic particle plus independent pronoun is lacking in 11QpaleoLeva. In the SP the phrase contains a different emphatic construction: "I, also I, shall walk with you in hostility," while the LXX has: πορευσμαι καγω μεθ ημου θυμω πλαγιω, "I shall walk, even with you, with crooked wrath". See the following variant for the full phrase in 11QpaleoLeva.

1307 The phrase in 11QpaleoLeva reads: "and I shall walk with you in fierce hostility." The phrase is possibly influenced by the same construction in Lev 26:28.

1308 11QLevb specifiesעל כל העם, "all the people."

1309 11QLevb has the phrase restored as: הימים, "the days." The MT lacks the second term, having only the noun ימות, "the days."

1310 11QLevb clarifies the number of sons of Aaron, restored on the basis of the LXX: כנין בני אהרן, "the two sons of Aaron."

1311 The reading in 11QLevb clarifies the subject, namely Yahweh.
11QLev\(^b\) 3 4  מִשְּׁרְשָׂהוֹת
nite article.

Q893 MT Lev 13:59 מְלַמְּדַל לְפָרְדָהוֹת OV(I) – Difference in grammatical form.\(^{1312}\)

Q894 MT Lev 25:33 בֵּית נַעְרֵי 11QLev\(^b\) 7 3

Q895 MT Gen 46:7 מַלְרָא מַלְרָא MasGen 1

Q896 MT Gen 46:8 מַלְרָא מַלְרָא MasGen 2

Q897 MT Gen 46:8 מְלַמְּדָהּ יְכָּפֵל MasGen 2

\(^{1312}\) The form in the MT is read as a preposition l plus Pi’el infinitive construct with an appended pronominal object suffix: לְפָרְדָהוֹת, “to pronounce it clean,” against the preposition plus feminine noun with appended pronominal object suffix in 11QLev\(^b\): מְלַמְּדַל, “for its cleaness.” The form in the MT appears only here, while the form in 11QLev\(^b\) appears also in MT Lev 13:7; 14:23 and 15:13. The form in 11QLev\(^b\) may therefore be seen as a harmonisation towards a more common form.

\(^{1313}\) The form in 11QLev\(^b\) appears to be an error in letter spacing rather than an alternative reading. The reading in the MT is admittedly difficult, but the reading in 11QLev\(^b\) does not make sense in the context. It is perceivable that the word division in 11QLev\(^b\) or its textual predecessor may have become confused due to the difficult placement of the waw conjunction. None of the versions support the reading in 11QLev\(^b\).

\(^{1314}\) See S. Talmon, Masada VI, 32, esp. n. 6, where this variant is analysed as a spelling difference. However, in this analysis the final heh is read as locative in agreement with the modern translations. For example, see NIV: “he took with him to Egypt,” and RSV: “he brought with him into Egypt.”

\(^{1315}\) S. Talmon, Masada VI, 33, reads this as the particle “with,” which is lacking in the other witnesses.
Discussion of Variants

Orthographic Variants

Although not represented in the preceding list of variants, the proportion of orthographic variants to other types of variation in the sources is significant, comprising about 55% of the total number of variants.\(^{1316}\) By far the most common variations between the orthography of the sources and that of the MT involve the use of *matres lectionis* to represent the long and short ‘i’ and ‘o’ class vowels. Also relatively frequent is the writing of the digraph $\text{ṣ}$ to represent [i]; the defective writing of some suffixes, such as the marker of mpl nouns $\text{מ}$, and the marker of fpl nouns $\text{נ}$-. In general it is fair to state that the majority of Torah scrolls from Qumran reflect a *plene* orthography as compared to the generally defective style of the MT, but this is by no means a universal rule that applies to all of the sources uncovered along the western shore of the Dead Sea.\(^{1317}\) By contrast the scrolls from find-sites other than Qumran show a distinct alignment with the orthographic style of the MT.

\(^{1316}\) The total number of variants in the Dead Sea Torah scrolls relative to the MT is 1,985. Of these 1,089 are orthographic variants.

\(^{1317}\) On the use of the terms ‘*plene*’ and ‘defective’ see the useful description in W. Weinberg, *The History of Hebrew Plene Spelling* (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1985) 3-7. Weinberg designates as *plene* an orthographic style that employs *matres lectionis* more frequently than the MT, while the MT is seen as a kind of benchmark for defective texts, though the MT itself is not as defective as the Hebrew inscriptions. This must remain an essentially relative definition, as Weinberg himself admits that *plene* never means that every long vowel is rendered by a *mater lectionis*, nor does defective mean that no *matres lectionis* are used at all. Indeed, certain scrolls, such as 11QpaleoLev, display a defective orthographic style relative to the MT (see J. Cook, "Orthographic Peculiarities in the Dead Sea Biblical Scrolls," *RevQ* 14 [1989] 299-300). For a full discussion of the evidence see D.N. Freedman, "The Masoretic Text and the Qumran Scrolls: A Study in Orthography," *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text* (eds F.M. Cross and S. Talmon; Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1975) 196-211.
Orthographic (linguistic) Variants

There are 197 variations in the sources classified as OV(l). Of these 42 involve possible differences in dialect or pronunciation and 155 involve differences in grammatical form. The most common variations categorised as possible differences in pronunciation are those that involve terminal ḫ- on various forms, such as on pronominal suffixes, independent pronouns, 2ms, 2mpl and 2fpl verbal afformatives, and cohortative forms in the indicative mood. See note above for a complete description of these forms and the relevant literature.

Other less frequent variations that may relate to pronunciation or dialect include the elision of guttural consonants (Q166, Q642), assimilated or non-assimilated nun in first position (see specifically variant Q230, Q232, Q234 and Q237 in 4QExod-Lev), and the elision of III heh in 4QGen and 4QGen (Q93 and Q103 respectively).

Regarding the variant grammatical forms the most common types encountered are changes in the tense or aspect of verbs. These typically involve the interchange of durative and perfective (e.g. Q10, Q447), or waw consecutive plus imperfect and waw conjunctive plus perfect (e.g. Q132, Q220), but can include the presence or absence of paragogic nun (e.g. Q14, Q171, Q686), though the function of this latter feature is debated – see note above. More rarely one finds the use of waw to mark qames hāṭuf or shewa (for which see note ), different genitive constructions for numerals (Q8) or infinitive constructs (Q153), and infinitive constructs with and without prepositions (Q24).
There are also infrequent examples of differences between passive and active constructions (e.g. Q892).

**Stylistic Variants (Type 1)**

A total of 393 variants between the sources and the MT are categorised as SV(1). Stylistic variants of the most minor category present a rather broad range of differences. The most important variants of this type are those that involve the interchange of single lexemes. There are 46 instances of such variations relative to the MT in the sources. The highest concentration is found in 4QNum\(^b\), which has a total of six such interchanges (Q489, Q465, Q501, Q505, Q517, Q519), and 4QpaleoExod\(^m\), which also has a total of six interchanges (Q266, Q284, Q299, Q311, Q317, Q342). Both of these scrolls also display a particular affinity with what is called the pre-Samaritan or harmonistic textual tradition.\(^{1318}\) Another of the pre-Samaritan scrolls, 4QDeut\(^n\), has two such interchanges, neither of which agree with the wording of the SP (Q799, Q809).

There are 16 instances of interchanged prepositions. Again 4QpaleoExod\(^m\) has the highest concentration of variations, totalling six (Q264, Q269, Q286, Q292, Q296, Q305). 4QExod\(^b\) has the next highest number of interchanged prepositions, totalling three (Q154, Q158, Q159).

Also considered among the minor stylistic variants are differences in the grammatical person, gender or number of forms. The latter is the most frequently occurring difference,\(^{1318}\)

---

\(^{1318}\) See the description in E. Tov, *Textual Criticism*, 97-98.
with 64 instances in all. 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} has the highest number of differences from the MT in this respect with 11 variants (Q526, Q426, Q443, Q444, Q463, Q464, Q460, Q530, Q538, Q541, Q564). In terms of gender there are 34 instances of variation, with 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} showing a total of four (Q272, Q315, Q316, Q323), and 4QLev-Num\textsuperscript{a} totalling three (Q417, Q350, Q355).

Differences in the grammatical person of forms are much less frequent, with only seven occurrences throughout the parallel sources relative to the MT. Only 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} has two such variations (Q289, Q328). Other single occurrences are: Q369, Q871, Q620, Q661, Q746.

Very frequent in occurrence are omissions or additions of conjunctions (87 times in all, 15 of which occur in 4QDeut\textsuperscript{b}), prepositions (54 times, 7 times in 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} [Q264, Q269, Q286, Q292, Q296, Q305, Q349]), the definite article (35 times, 7 times in 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} [Q458, Q422, Q431, Q479, Q480, Q515, Q514]), and the definite direct object marker (30 times, 5 times in 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} [Q452, Q454, Q468, Q475, Q543]). Less frequently added or omitted are the locative marker (16 times, twice in each of 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} [Q441, Q565], 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} [Q279, Q309] and 4QpaleoGen-Exod\textsuperscript{d} [Q261, Q262]), adverbial particles (10 times), and the relative particle (only twice [Q815, Q876]).

\textit{Stylistic Variants (Type 2)}

There are 255 variants from the MT classified under this category. These can be further divided into three sub-groups, namely expansive pluses, explicating pluses, or differences
in expression. As each sub-group contains variants that are essentially unique, given that each variant contributes to its own unique context, only some of the most significant pluses and differences in expression will be presented in this section.

There is a total of 166 expansive pluses, ranging from long interpolations to short adverbial or adjectival additions and omissions. The highest concentration of expansive pluses is found in 4QNum\textsuperscript{b}, which has a total of 36 instances. This figure includes four extensive interpolations (Q466, Q470, Q471, Q472), which are in agreement with the SP, and one (Q562) which is in agreement with the LXX. Similarly 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} has a total of 24 expansive pluses, of which seven are extensive interpolations that appear to agree with the text of the SP where they are preserved (Q270, Q271, Q275, Q281, Q308, Q338, Q341).

In terms of explicating pluses the highest concentration is again found in 4QNum\textsuperscript{b}, which has a total of 11 such variations relative to the MT (Q427, Q428, Q436, Q453, Q455, Q476, Q485, Q492, Q520, Q522, Q544). 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} also has three differences in expression relative to the MT (Q440, Q513, Q570), superseded only by 11QpaleoLev\textsuperscript{a} which has four such differences (Q856, Q859, Q867, Q873).

Finally there are 15 variants categorised as SV(2) in which the grammatical object (direct or dative) is clarified by way of an additional pronominal suffix. These are scattered over a range of scrolls, and might more properly be considered among the variants listed above under expansive or explicating pluses but for the fact that the common feature of
each of these cases is the presence or absence of the pronominal object (e.g. Q9, Q29, Q200, Q254, Q343, Q395, Q887).

Stylistic Variants (Type 3)

Instances in which the sequence of words or verses is changed occur far less frequently in the sources than any of the previously mentioned variant types. In all there are 29 such variations, and the vast majority of these involve minor re-arrangements of words across short phrases or single verses. Of interest among these minor changes in sequence are Q110 and Q205 which represent different orders of the list of nations that occurs frequently throughout the Pentateuch (see the discussion in note above).

Significant alterations to the order of verses can be found in three instances. One of these, Q202, probably occurs in a liturgical scroll rather than a variant edition of Exodus (4QExod⁴, for which see note above). The two remaining instances, however, occur in the well preserved Exodus scroll 4QpaleoExodᵐ, and reflect the same ordering of the text as is found in the SP (Q326, Q332). This scroll therefore displays variants of multiple characteristics that align it with the same textual tradition from which the SP has developed.

Hermeneutic Variants

There are only four variants between the sources and the MT that can be categorised as HV. Three of these variations involve differences in cardinal numbers. One such difference, Q602 in 4QDeut⁵, possibly represents a harmonisation with an immediately preced-
ing verse and so is perhaps not to be considered as an exegetical change but rather a clarifying plus. However, the fact that it shows a difference in definitive information dictates that it must be categorised as a possible difference in hermeneutic.

Two sources preserve the same variant relative to MT Exod 1:5. Q106 (4QGen-Exod$^b$) and Q122 (4QExod$^b$) both record the number of Jacob’s sons that lived in Egypt as 75, although the numeric construction is reversed in each source. For a discussion of this variation see note.

The final variation that is classified as HV appears to be of particular exegetical significance. Q710 reflects a difference between the reading in 4QDeut$^i$ and the reading in MT Deut 32:43 which mentions “sons of God” and “sons of Israel” respectively. The reading in 4QDeut$^i$ is supported by the LXX, and it is possible that 4QDeut$^i$ represents a textual tradition that is apparently related to that of the Vorlage for the LXX. The exegetical problems associated with the concept of “sons of God” are obvious and significant, so the reading in 4QDeut$^i$ represents a clear case of variation at the hermeneutic level (see the comments in note). This is perhaps the only clear case of hermeneutic variation among the entire collection of the Dead Sea Torah scrolls.
CHAPTER 10 – CONCLUSION

Issues in the Statistical Analysis

A detailed summary of all of the variants that have been presented in the preceding chapters that takes every facet of this study into account is impossible. One can only make informed and qualified generalisations, and try to capture some overarching pattern that may be found in the variations that occur throughout the sources discussed. Where there are specific findings that can be inferred form the evidence we must be mindful of distortions that result from the methodology we have constructed for this study. Similarly, while we may speculate that our findings could reflect overarching trends in the greater textual corpus, we must avoid the notion that they are valid in any direct sense beyond the particular texts examined here.

The preceding analysis remains a study of individual representative texts from a selected range of genres, which, for our present purposes, provides more than enough material for consideration. However the present study can only nominate some directions for future research that seem, from this small sampling, to warrant further investigation. A more comprehensive study of the ancient sources would determine if the conclusions presented here are truly born out by the data.

A hazard to be avoided in summarising a study such as this is the application of prescriptive conclusions that attempt to define too narrow a view as to what types of variation may or may not be expected in a given textual genre. In particular one should be pru-
dently aware that historical accident, in large part reflected in the random and fragmentary preservation of the sources, plays a significant role in the emergence of statistical trends. Equally, we must recognise that, when dealing with historical evidence, the apparent results of statistical analyses may be quickly overturned as new and contradictory evidence comes to light at some future date. In the present endeavour, then, one must remain mindful of counsel against the application of statistical results to questions of history, as was so well expressed by G.E. Elton:

“Those determined to put their faith in ‘sophisticated’ mathematical methods and to apply ‘general laws’ to the pitifully meagre and very uncertain detail that historical evidence often provides for the answering of interesting and important questions, are either to be pitied because they will be sinking in quicksand while believing themselves to be standing on solid earth, or to be combated because they darken counsel with their errors.”

With these preliminary remarks in mind, we will proceed to outline some of the more prominent features that are apparent from the presentation of the data, and to show graphically how some of this data may be statistically interpreted. What follows is a series of bar graphs that give a horizontal representation of the total number of parallel SU between all of the sources for a given text. Each bar is divided into colours that indicate whether the parallel SU found in those sources is either in perfect agreement, or varies in terms of orthography, linguistic perspective, style, or hermeneutic.

---

Figure - Average Variation Of All Sources

Concluding Remarks on the Cuneiform Sources

EAE63

Tablets of EAE63 can show major variations between sources, even if those sources have similarities in terms of format and geographical provenience. For example, tablet A+M is close to tablet C in respect to its format, with each sharing similar dimensions and marginal rulings. Both tablets were ostensibly excavated from the collections at Kuyunjik in Nineveh. A+M is written in Neo-Babylonian script and, while C is written in a Neo-Assyrian script, its colophon indicates that it is a copy of a Babylonian original.

Yet, despite these similarities, A+M and C differ from each other significantly at V23, where the same protasis is followed by contradictory apodoses. Tablets D (a Neo-Assyrian copy also from Nineveh) and F+H+J (a sixth century B.C.E. Late Babylonian
copy) both support the reading in A+M. Critically, tablet C is the only tablet of the four that shows evidence that it was carefully baked in antiquity.\textsuperscript{1320} Such signs of careful preparation for creating a durable text might be taken as an indication that the tablet was authoritative. If this is so, how can such a significant divergence between an authoritative copy of the text and three other sources for that text be explained?

In this instance tablet C is unlikely to be simply erroneous in respect of this reading. Rather, the possibility arises that this variation reflects the reality that omen apodoses could be changed according to other extraneous circumstances, whether this involves political, observational, or otherwise mitigating factors. Indeed, this phenomenon is prevalent in the astronomical reports to Neo-Assyrian kings.\textsuperscript{1321} This shows that although factors such as tablet sequence or the sequence of individual omens may have been rela-

\textsuperscript{1320} S.J. Lieberman, “Canonical and Official Cuneiform Texts,” 330, notes that holes are generally bored into carefully prepared tablets to ensure that these tablets do not explode during the firing process.

\textsuperscript{1321} The following examples are cited using the tablet numbers as found in H. Hunger, Astrological Reports to Assyrian Kings (Helsinki: Helsinki University Press, 1992). Minor changes in these texts include reference to Venus as ša’āmDili-bat in text nos. 51, 145, 156, 175, 338, 451, 538 and 539, against the title 8Ninsi-anina in the tablets; additional phonetic complements in text no. 51 (BM 81-2-4, 86) 5, which has ŠE-am (ša’ām) versus ŠE in C r.17; and a lexical interchange in line 3 of text no. 175 (K121) and no. 247 (K1342), which both have the word “LÚ.KÚR,” nukurta, in place of “ERIN ma-at-ti,” ummani matti, as it appears in A, F+H+J and VAT11253. More significantly, the dates given for the heliacal rising and setting of Venus often stray considerably from the generalised dates given in EAE63. For example, see text no. 145 (K725) line 5 against C 31. This phenomenon is most easily explained as relating to the observed movements of Venus as against the formulaic movements unrealistically predicted in EAE63. Other letters give only broad date ranges for risings that are dated specifically in EAE63. For example, text no. 451 (K13087+82-5-22, 85) 1 gives the broad range “ina ITI.BÁR UD.1.KÁM EN UD.30.KÁM,” “between the 1st and the 30th day of Nisanu,” where C 31 has “ina ITI.BÁR UD.2.KÁM,” “on the second of Nisanu.” Text nos. 538 and 539 (K8407 and 83-1-18, 319, respectively) lack a date entirely for the omen that appears at C r.25, giving just the month name.
tively fixed within the textual traditions reflected by these fragments, the textual details themselves were yet open to interpretation, abbreviation or conflation, and even contradiction, by the scribes that reproduced these texts.

**MUL.APIN**

Certain copies of MUL.APIN show significant agreement where overlaps are preserved. For example, tablet A (a third century Neo-Babylonian tablet “written and checked” according to its colophon) is in complete agreement with tablet Y (a Neo-Babylonian tablet from Kuyunjik), and is also in full agreement with tablet GG (from the Southwest Palace at Kuyunjik). Similarly tablet C (a Neo-Babylonian tablet from southern Iraq) agrees fully with tablet X (a Neo-Babylonian tablet of uncertain provenience) in the places that these tablets overlap.

While these examples show that significant agreement between copies is indeed possible between geographically and temporally distant sources within this series, it is not a common feature. For example, in many of the other sources we find that there is a high likelihood that cardinal numbers will vary, due to either textual corruption or adjustment according to observed reality. Sometimes the sequence of the taxonomy varies, as is the case with tablet T (from a temple context in either Babylon or Borsippa) which appears to be in error against tablets A, O (a Neo-Assyrian tablet from Kuyunjik) and AA (from a private library in Ashur).
Tablet AA affords a special opportunity to compare the form of a copy of MUL.APIN in a private library against sources from the Kuyunjik collections and Babylonian temple contexts. As noted immediately above, the particular taxonomy, common to most sources including the private text AA, varies in tablet T, a temple affiliated text. The close agreement between AA and X, Y and DD (from Nimrud ca. eighth century B.C.E.) in other respects shows that the privately owned text, AA, is closer to earlier Neo-Babylonian sources than it is to Neo-Assyrian Kuyunjik and later Neo-Babylonian sources. By extension, the close agreement between AA and C may therefore indicate that C is also based on an earlier southern source.

It is important to note that agreement between two sources where they overlap does not imply that these sources would be in complete agreement were they more fully preserved. For example, the agreement between C and A, and C and AA, may be considered to imply that A and AA would necessarily agree with each other. However, the truth is that A and AA are significantly different, and so it is a fact that at some point, no longer preserved in the fragments, C must have significantly differed from either A, or AA, or perhaps both.

_The Laws of Hammurabi_

Only tablet W, and to a lesser extent tablet Z (both Late Babylonian texts of unknown provenience), can be said to agree closely with the stele in the places in which they are preserved. The colophon of tablet W suggests it was one tablet in a series that contained the full text of the stele. Among the other sources, tablets T and b exhibit a text also close
to that of the stele, but include some indications that they differed linguistically from the Old Babylonian *Haupttext*.

The majority of the variations that exist in the first millennium sources occur in the preserved portions of the prologue and epilogue. The sources for these sections constitute slightly more than half the total number of parallel SU, but they contain more than double the number of variations compared to the sources for the law section. Further to this, there are no large-scale interpolations or hermeneutic variations attested in the law section, whereas the poetic sections show significant variations of these types.

For example, tablet B (a Neo-Babylonian text of unknown provenience) and possibly tablet D (a Neo-Assyrian text from Kuyunjik) may preserve a textual tradition that is in closer agreement with a variant Old Babylonian source. This variant source has been determined to come from another stele identical in material and antiquity to the *Haupttext*. In addition, significant exegetical variations indicate that variation could occur between sources for the poetic sections due to regional or theological considerations.

In contrast, the sources that preserve the legal section of the stele show a much closer agreement with the *Haupttext*. There are very few differences in style, and those that do occur are relatively minor. They include enclitic particles, conjunctions and redundant pronouns. Hermeneutic variations are entirely lacking in the sources for the legal section. This could be indicative of some distinction in the way the different sections were transmitted. There is perhaps some connection to be made between the agreement of the
sources for the legal section of LH and those of EAE63, in that rather codified language may be less prone to variation. It certainly appears from the evidence presented here that manuscripts of LH which contain the codified legal material are more likely to agree than manuscripts that contain the poetic material.

From this we may be inclined to conclude that the poetic sections of LH were more likely to be transmitted by scribes with some degree of stylistic freedom, while the actual laws were copied with relatively more precision. However, there is no solid indication that the laws themselves were always copied with a very high degree of exactitude. Rather, the syntactical structure and sequence of the laws were transmitted relatively intact, but the linguistic and orthographic style of the scribe could still have an impact on the final form of the reproduction. Indeed, the Haupttext and AO10237, a contemporary exemplar, can be shown to disagree in stylistic, linguistic and orthographic aspects, and so we may expect that similar types of variation between the first millennium sources would have been quite common.

In reality we lack any significant overlap between the poetic and legal sections in the first millennium manuscripts, and so it is currently impossible to say definitively whether or not the law section was transmitted differently to the prologue and epilogue. It may be that our sources for the poetic sections would be found to vary in the legal section too if it was also preserved. The only manuscript to preserve such an overlap is tablet e, which holds a significant portion of the epilogue as well as the last two lines of the preceding legal section. This source shows comparable levels of variation between the legal and po-
etic sections in terms of orthographic and linguistic features. Minor variations in style occur slightly more frequently in the laws than in the epilogue. The complete absence of major stylistic changes and hermeneutic variations in the legal section of tablet e is perhaps significant, however there remains too little of the actual laws preserved to allow any substantial comment.

*Gilgamesh XI*

Gilgamesh XI shows a far greater proportion of minor variations in the sources, reflecting differences in dialect, pronunciation, lexical preferences, and the sequence of words and phrases. However, there is in general a smaller number of significant variations in style and hermeneutic between the first millennium sources compared to some other textual genres. Significant differences in hermeneutic that are preserved included some possible exegetical changes, particularly in tablet J (a Neo-Assyrian text from Kuyunjik). Other significant variations relate to cardinal numbers and limited expansions to the narrative.

Close agreement between the sources may to some extent be related to geographical distribution. For example, tablet C (a text excavated from Kuyunjik but probably not written there) shows greater agreement with texts from outside Nineveh, such as tablet b (a Neo-Assyrian text from Ashur) and tablet j (a Late Babylonian text from Babylon), than with texts from Kuyunjik proper (tablets J and W). With this said, tablet C does show some agreement with one text from Kuyunjik (tablet T, similar in format and script to tablet J), so there is no absolute determination that can be made in this respect. Certain tablets os-
tensibly copied at Kuyunjik are in disagreement with most of the parallel sources and also with each other (J and W).

**Mîs Pî**

All of the tablets from Nineveh for this text agree in almost all respects. While the nature of the preserved fragments means that less parallel text is preserved in these sources as compared to some of the other texts examined here, it remains significant that there are no variations in hermeneutic between the sources, and very few major stylistic variants. The small number of differences between the sources relates to orthographic or linguistic style, and occasionally to minor stylistic adaptations. Tablet A agrees with tablets G and O in their entirety, and with H, M and N in all aspects except orthography. Tablet A also agrees with tablet I in almost all respects except for one abbreviation to the text of A (and K) where a dittography is indicated by two vertical marks in place of the full text as given in I.

The majority of the variations between the sources, and indeed all of the major stylistic variants, that do exist are to be found in the three Late Babylonian school texts (S, T and U) that preserve only small excerpts of the ritual. These differences are primarily connected with pronunciation, which is a phenomenon probably to be expected in sources written by apprentice scribes in later centuries. One tablet from Kuyunjik (I) shows differences from other Kuyunjik texts (such as A and H), which indicates that not all copies of this ritual text that were geographically proximate were necessarily in total agreement with each other. However, it is of particular significance that almost all of the sources
show very close agreement with each other, and that even excerpts found in the school texts from the Late Babylonian period are closer to the Kuyunjik sources for this ritual than many of the geographically proximate sources for the other textual genres examined above. The significance of this finding concerning ritual texts in relation to the transmission of the biblical scrolls will be discussed further below.

Concluding Remarks on The Dead Sea Torah Scrolls

The documents from Qumran show a wide range of variations relative to the MT. Even so, it must be said that there are surprisingly few major stylistic variations. Only 12 out of the 1,985 variations are hermeneutic in nature. A significant proportion of the major stylistic variants exist in 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} and 4QExod\textsuperscript{m}, both of which may be tentatively associated with the same tradition that eventually produced the SP. Another scroll that has a significant number of major stylistic variations is 4QExod\textsuperscript{b}, which has close associations with the textual tradition underlying the LXX. In this way scrolls that show major stylistic variations or hermeneutic variations relative to the MT are close, in terms of these major stylistic and hermeneutic differences, to known textual editions, and do not \textit{a priori} constitute independent textual traditions in themselves.

It should be noted, though, that this observation does not extend to include the multitude of minor variations that exist between the scrolls and the MT. Seeing as we lack any significant overlap between the ancient manuscripts themselves, it is very difficult to know what would result if we were to compare the manuscripts with each other, were they more completely preserved. One may guess that the emergent picture would be substan-
tially less crisp if we did not nominate a Haupttext to provide a textual ‘yard-stick’ against which to compare such fragmentary data. It seems fair to say that, were we to approach the evidence without prior knowledge of the recensions that eventually emerged, we would be absolutely unable to predict the shape of any of the recensions based on these disparate fragments. In this sense, descriptions of variations in terms of ‘additions,’ ‘omissions,’ and the like, are really projections that we ourselves cast onto the data, derived from the methodology here employed, rather than reflecting the objective nature of the evidence.

With this said, it has often been observed that some Torah scrolls from Qumran can be classed as ‘independent’ of any of the later recensions. For example, 11QpaleoLev\textsuperscript{a} may be said to have an orthographic style that is close to the MT, but also reflects some confusion of gutturals that seems out of place in that orthographic tradition. 4QDeut\textsuperscript{c} reflects several differences in grammatical gender and number, and has some short additions or omissions relative to the MT that are not known in the other witnesses. Even 4QNum\textsuperscript{b}, though in agreement with the SP in several of its interpolations, has a distinct orthographic style common to many of the Qumran sectarian documents, while also reflecting some features known from the LXX Vorlage (against the SP), and some unique features.

Some of the Torah scrolls counted in the present analysis may not be scriptural manuscripts in the strict sense, instead being identified as short excerpts or abbreviated
Recalculating the types and frequency of variation without taking these texts into account would certainly result in a decrease in the number of major stylistic variations overall. However, all scrolls designated as ‘biblical’ scrolls by their sigla are included to represent as broad a picture as possible of the shape of the Torah at Qumran.

A small number of Torah scrolls from Qumran reflects a text that is identical or extremely close to the MT. 4QDeut\textsuperscript{d} has a total of 156 SU preserved in exact agreement with the MT, while 4QGen\textsuperscript{b} disagrees with the MT in the writing of a single vowel letter by employing *mater lectionis* in a total of 447 SU. 4QLevc has 127 SU preserved in which only two variations occur relative to the MT – one read as a difference in morphology and the other in agreement with the MT *qere perpetuum* (for *ketib*). Of these three scrolls 4QGen\textsuperscript{b} stands alone in being of slightly doubtful provenience, and may in fact have originally been discovered in clandestine excavations in one of the second century C.E. caves further towards the southern end of the Dead Sea, and later mixed with the Qumran fragments.

The scrolls from sites other than Qumran tell a significantly different story. As has been outlined in chapter nine, I. Young has shown convincingly that the scrolls from Masada, Murabba’at, Nahal Hever and Wadi Sdeir all have a much closer textual affiliation with

\footnote{Examples are 4QGen\textsuperscript{d}, 4QExod\textsuperscript{d}, 4QDeut\textsuperscript{1, j, n, q}, and possibly 2QExod\textsuperscript{b}. See E. Tov "A Categorized List of All the ‘Biblical Texts’ Found in the Judean Desert," *DSD* 8, 1 (2001) 69, and also "Excerpted and Abbreviated Biblical Texts From Qumran," *Hebrew Bible, Greek Bible, and Qumran* (Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism 121; Tübingen: Morh Siebeck, 2008) 32-40, first appearing in RevQ 16, 4 (1995) 581-600.}

\footnote{The variation is orthographic and so not presented in the list of variants. See 4QGen\textsuperscript{b} 1:17.}
the MT than do the vast majority of scrolls from Qumran. Though Young’s arguments extend to the entire corpus of biblical scrolls, this is especially true of the scrolls of the Torah uncovered at these sites. As can be easily seen in the list of variants, the number of variations relative to the MT in the Qumran Torah scrolls is overwhelmingly superior to the number of variations relative to the MT in those from Masada, Murabba‘at, Nahal Ḥever and Wadi Sdeir. Only three out of the total of 1,985 variants from the MT are found in scrolls that are not assumed to have come from Qumran.

Moreover, the type and frequency of variation relative to the MT in the scrolls from Qumran is significantly lower if we limit our analysis to those scrolls designated by Tov as ‘de luxe,’ or ἡκριβωμένα in the language of Lieberman. The following bar graphs show the level of variation in all texts including those scrolls termed ‘de luxe’ by Tov.

---

1324 See above, page 288-90.
1325 See Q895, Q896 and Q897, all occurring in scrolls from Masada. This number may be extended to four if 4QGenb is presumed to have been originally discovered at a site other than Qumran. On the other hand, this figure can be reduced to one if we consider 4QGenb to be a legitimate Qumran scroll, and also consider MurGen to in fact be a copy of Jubilees, or some other retelling of Genesis (see I. Young "The Stabilization of the Biblical Text," 371, and cf. I. Young "The Biblical Scrolls from Qumran," 121-22).
The Significance of Ritual Texts

Among the representative texts of the five textual genres examined here, the genres of ritual and, to a lesser extent, law appear to reflect a high level of exactitude in transmission. The type and frequency of variation found in the ritual texts most closely reflects the type and frequency of variation found in the most stable biblical texts. In fact, most of the variations between copies of mīs pî stem from copies of the ritual that have been classed as Late Babylonian school texts. The copies of mīs pî that stem from the royal collections at Nineveh in particular exhibit a very high degree of textual constancy. Significant amounts of variation between the Nineveh manuscripts of the mīs pî ritual are limited to matters of orthography and, as has been shown in the above analysis, orthographic variation is especially prevalent in the cuneiform writing system.
From this we can make the preliminary observation that, based on the mīs pî sources from Nineveh in the first millennium BCE, ritual texts may have been more likely to attain and maintain a level of stabilisation throughout their transmission than some other types of texts. The same may be said of legal texts based on LH, but the extent to which this is an effect of the accidental preservation of the tablets is unclear. Our samples of ritual texts stemming from a centralised locus reflect the highest levels of stabilisation among the cuneiform sources encountered in this examination. As will be discussed below, this finding is supported by recent scholarship on the history of the transmission of the biblical text in its ritual context.

In a recent publication D.M. Carr put forward a theory for the transmission of the biblical text in the first millennium B.C.E. that emphasised the role of education mechanisms in the propagation and stabilisation of what he called ‘long-duration texts.’1326 Carr’s idea is that the process of educating scribes in various ancient Near Eastern cultures was focused on the memorisation of culturally significant texts. This process, by which scribes were trained to commit whole texts to memory, instilled apprentice scribes with an arsenal of established structures, phrases and motifs that could be utilised to reproduce culturally significant texts, or, at more advanced levels of training and aptitude, to produce new texts based on the skeletal structures and motifs acquired through the earlier memoris-

1326 D.M. Carr, Writing on the Tablet of the Heart: Origins of Scripture and Literature (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005) 4. Carr’s term ‘long-duration texts’ describes “texts that have been used over a long period of time,” quite often in multiple editions and recensions, and that have been copied and transmitted by generations of scribes within a given textual tradition. This definition naturally precludes ‘one-off’ texts such as mathematical tablets, autographed correspondence, astronomical diaries, accounting texts, etc. Such texts have also been precluded from the present study, for which see above, page 55.
tion-driven learning process. Carr calls this process “education-enculturation.”\textsuperscript{1327} In this view of the ancient scribal craft, the memory of the scribe is the most important tool in the composition and propagation of long-duration texts.

According to Carr the formalisation of education in the Old Babylonian period meant that scribes were inducted into their profession through the memorisation of a standardised set of texts. From around the Kassite period, and extending into the first millennium B.C.E., access to specialised literature, such as divination and magical texts, beyond the standardised curriculum used in the early stages of education became increasingly restricted through the specialisation of extended curricula for different scribal professions.\textsuperscript{1328}

As a result, the transmission of specialised texts became the task of a more selective body of professional scribes. Specific form and content became important aspects of these specialised texts. This is indicated by the appearance in the first millennium of colophons that claim that a given tablet was “written and checked according to its original.”\textsuperscript{1329} Such evidence indicates that written texts had begun to serve as “authoritative reference points for the checking of scribal memory.”\textsuperscript{1330} The ongoing training of scribes under this pro-

\textsuperscript{1327} See the description in D.M. Carr, \textit{Writing on the Tablet of the Heart}, 12.
\textsuperscript{1328} D.M. Carr, \textit{Writing on the Tablet of the Heart}, 20-26.
\textsuperscript{1329} Several indications contribute to this view. Aside from the colophons that claim review according to an original exemplar, we also see evidence of counting lines, notation of breaks or damage in \textit{Vorlagen}, and the extent of such damage. Occasionally variants are noted, or the older script of the \textit{Vorlage} is imitated and glossed. On this see S.J. Lieberman, “Canonical and Official Cuneiform Texts,” 330. These types of variation in the manuscripts were already noted in C. Bezold, L.W. King, and E.A.W. Budge, \textit{Catalogue}, 5.xxvi-xxix.
\textsuperscript{1330} D.M. Carr, \textit{Writing on the Tablet of the Heart}, 38.
gramme reinforced the use of increasingly standardised textual forms in building a scribe’s stock of culturally significant material.\textsuperscript{1331}

Despite this trend towards standardisation, the idea that written texts were somehow ‘canonised’ in this period must be rejected. As can be seen from the number of variants recorded for the majority of textual forms examined in this study, it is clear that, although there is a recognisable integrity to the general forms of our sources, the specific details of those written forms remained quite fluid in the first millennium B.C.E. This is true even of texts that are ostensibly part of the same localised collection, such as is the case with many of the tablets recovered from Kuyunjik. This would seem to support Carr’s model of a principally memory-driven mode of textual transmission, for which written forms of the text served as authoritative reference points to aid a scribe’s recollection, but were ultimately not the primary source for the reproduction of long-duration texts. The primary sources that a scribe dealt with, even in the first millennium B.C.E., were those that had been committed to memory.

This point has been well discussed in the scholarly literature. In an important paper F. Rochberg-Halton argued that the concept of ‘canonisation,’ as it relates to first millennium B.C.E. cuneiform literature, can only apply to very generalised conceptions of textual stability and fixed tablet sequence.\textsuperscript{1332} Beneath these generally standardised forms of

\textsuperscript{1331} D.M. Carr, \textit{Writing on the Tablet of the Heart}, 46.

\textsuperscript{1332} Rochberg-Halton notes that by the seventh century B.C.E. some cuneiform ‘scientific’ series (particularly divinatory, medical and magical texts) had “attained a kind of literary stabilization in the sense that old material was conscientiously maintained in its traditional form and new material was no longer being incorporated... [but] a degree of flexibility remained permissible in the content, in terms of exactly what a
Cuneiform texts were a series of ‘streams of tradition’ that included the authoritative written form, extrinsic materials that adjoined and informed the primary texts, and orally communicated traditions that supplemented each of these components.\(^{1333}\) Again, Carr’s view of the primacy of memorisation in textual transmission explains the general tendency for standardisation that seems to co-exist with instances of specific fluidity in the various sources examined here.

While processes of textual transmission by memorisation allowed for divergence in specific forms of texts in many cases, from the evidence we have presented it would seem that such was not the case regarding the ritual and legal texts presented here. In particular the \textit{mīš pī} ritual at Nineveh appears to have been transmitted with a degree of attention given to a specific written form that is not paralleled in the other textual genres. Instead we find that scribes copying an epic, an observational scientific text and part of an omen series did so with a much diminished degree of exactitude than did scribes copying a ritual instruction text. In the case of the legal text, the legal material itself may adhere to a relatively rigid form, but the poetic sections that bookend the laws show levels of variation on par with the majority of texts examined.

\footnotesize


---

particular tablet was to include and in what order, thus resulting in only a relative stabilization of the wording of the text ... Exact wording does not seem to have been an essential ingredient in textual transmission” (F. Rochberg-Halton, "Canonicity in Cuneiform Texts," \textit{JCS} 36 [1984] 127-28).
From this we may make a tentative observation regarding the texts that do not fall under the genres of ‘ritual’ or ‘law.’ Much of the minor levels of fluidity that are evidenced in the parallel copies of these texts could be attributed to subtle changes in form that resulted from the imperfect processes of memory recall. It is conceivable that, during the regular course of transmission as posited by Carr, texts recalled from a scribe’s memory would have been especially susceptible to unconscious variations in orthography, language, and even minor changes in style.

Certainly, greater differences in style and hermeneutic would likely be due to the scribe’s conscious reworking of the text using literary motifs memorised from other sources, or supplanting certain details with others that served an exegetical motive. It seems clear, though, that when a scribe was applied to “copying and checking” a text “according to its original,” which had a relatively fixed format and an established place in a literary series, the memorised version seems to have had primacy over its textual counterpart. In the light of this observation we can ask what qualities of the mīš pî ritual text at Nineveh allowed it to remain relatively impervious to the vicissitudes that are so apparent in the other texts examined here.

Two recent studies may be invoked to elucidate this phenomenon. Firstly, it has been observed by M. Worthington that it is a characteristic of Assyrian priests to use relatively few Babylonianisms in their correspondence to Assyrian kings, in particular when compared to the relatively extensive use of Babylonian technical and dialect forms by Assyrian...
ian scholars in similar correspondence. The tendency of priests to restrict their language to a particular form may reflect limitations imposed by an education-enculturation programme that focused narrowly on literature of a singular purpose, namely texts that were utilised only by those who specialised in matters associated with the temple. Thus it may be inferred that the narrow specialisation of scribes trained for proficiency in ritual matters may have meant that they had a decreased likelihood of adjusting the form of long-duration ritual texts during transmission simply because they had a more narrowly defined stock of memorised texts from which to draw. Scribes who specialised in other textual genres may have had a greater cache of textual frames and motifs upon which to draw when reproducing memorised texts in their given field.

The second study is that of J. Watts, and concerns the propensity for ritual texts to begin to function as ritual objects after extended periods of textual authoritativeness. Watts determined that the process of textual centralisation under a curriculum engendered towards education-enculturation, as envisioned by Carr, could explain the process through which texts were collated into officially sanctioned collections, but could not satisfactorily explain why some texts, in particular the Hebrew Torah, appear to have adhered to a precise written form.

---

1334 See M. Worthington, “Dialect Admixture,” 80. Worthington suggests that the disparity may be partially due to differences in the subject-matter of the letters. It is also “possible that scholars’ learning earned them a greater active knowledge of Babylonian than the priests, and the scholars may have been more inclined than the priests to use elevated language because intellectual prestige in the eyes of the king meant possible career advancement for them.”

In Watts’s view the tendency for written texts to develop precise forms in transmission was a result of the ritualisation of those texts. This process of ritualisation was in turn due to the fact that these texts were known in temple circles because of their prominence in the process of education. According to this view, the use of specific texts in ritual contexts explains the origin and development of the phenomenon of sacred texts. A concern with absolute accuracy in the execution of ritual promoted a strict adherence to the particular codification of that ritual in an exact written form.¹³³⁶ In Watts’ view this process was to some extent self-perpetuating: the ritualisation of texts increased the concern for the text’s accuracy in transmission, and the perceived fidelity to an ancient textual ancestor increased a text’s status as a ritual object.

“... texts were used in a variety of cultures to establish correct ritual performance and to legitimize the ritual practices of priests, kings, and temples. Thus the idea of enacting ritual instructions, that is, ‘doing it by the book,’ involved first of all doing rituals. There is also some evidence that texts began to be manipulated and read as part of the rituals themselves. Therefore as texts validated the accuracy and efficacy of rituals, rituals elevated the authority of certain texts to iconic status.”¹³³⁷

This proclivity for ritual texts to become ritual objects, and to thereby become stabilised on account of their iconic status, fed into a secondary process in which other texts that were not originally ritual instructions also became included into the ritualised textual objects and so entered the same process of stabilisation. By the second century B.C.E. “the

¹³³⁷ J. Watts, "Rhetoric of Scripture," 208.
ritual authority of the Torah was extended beyond the temple to other aspects of daily life that, by falling under the Torah’s precepts, were ritualized as well."1338 The authority of the Mosaic Torah seems to have been elevated in this period from the ritualised context of the temple to broader areas of social and legal discourse.1339

The prestige of the Torah as an increasingly fixed text was established on the authority of the temple’s ritual traditions, which themselves derived authority from the perception that the temple priests practiced ancient authoritative rites. In effect, “the prestige of the temple elevated the status of the book, which in turn guaranteed the legitimacy of the temple’s rites.”1340 Moreover, Watts finds that periods of social or political tension provided a platform for authoritative texts to function as tools for the validation of ritual practices.1341 Threats to Jewish national identity served to elevate the status of texts that were seen to somehow embody that identity.

Two aspects of this discussion give rise to legitimate objections. Firstly, Watts claims that several textual genres became amalgamated into one fixed textual tradition through a process of textual ritualisation. While this may be understandable for texts of a ritual nature, it is less clear why this process would have operated on texts of other genres. Sec-

1338 J. Watts, "Rhetoric of Scripture," 213 (italics in original).
1339 See the discussion in J. Watts, "Rhetoric of Scripture," 212-13. According to G. Boccaccini, Roots of Rabbinic Judaism: An Intellectual History, From Ezekiel to Daniel (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002) 137-39, the value of the Mosaic Torah in sapiential Jewish circles was greatly increased in the beginning of the second century B.C.E., as is reflected in the attitude towards Torah as the main source of wisdom in Ben Sira.
1341 J. Watts, "Rhetoric of Scripture," 203.
ondly, the self-perpetuating process of textual ritualisation Watts proposes leaves unanswered the question of how the process actually began. We are left with something of a ‘chicken-and-egg’ causality dilemma in which the exact form of a text in transmission is driven by that text’s ritual status, yet the ritual status of that same text is simultaneously driven by its exact form in transmission. One cannot help but ask the question: which came first – the ritual status of the text, or its exact form?

In answer to the first objection, we can look to the development of the Hebrew scriptural texts proposed by Carr. His view of the process through which the Torah became a largely invariant long-duration text proposes a significant role of priestly transmission and textual ritualisation – both mechanisms that feature prominently in the model proposed by Watts. While the process of education-enculturation in pre-exilic Israel is envisioned as effectively mirroring that of the larger empires of Assyria and Babylon in the first millennium B.C.E., Carr sees a shift in the centralisation of education-enculturation from the context of the palace towards the context of the temple in late pre-exilic times.\textsuperscript{1342} This shift is evident in the Deuteronomistic History, especially in the Book of Deuteronomy itself, which was “shaped and used for education.”\textsuperscript{1343} Deuteronomy positions itself as the only material to be used for education-enculturation, refocusing the educational curriculum on a text which imparts commandments, statues and laws that claim singular authority.

\textsuperscript{1342} D.M. Carr, \textit{Writing on the Tablet of the Heart}, 117-19. See also G. Boccaccini, \textit{Rabbinic Judaism}, 56-57, who sees the re-alignment of political power being complete in the post-exilic period.

\textsuperscript{1343} D.M. Carr, \textit{Writing on the Tablet of the Heart}, 142.
In the post-exilic period the curriculum in ancient Israel was transferred to the temple authority following the cessation of the monarchy as a real political force. If social and political authority became the domain of the temple priests at this time, it is conceivable that texts that were traditionally in the domain of the royal court would have come under the control of the temple. In this view previously disparate textual collections were formed into a national curriculum under the authority of the Jerusalem temple.

At the centre of this singularly authoritative scribal curriculum were Leviticus and Numbers, priestly literature which originally comprised cultic instructions that are themselves still visible through the superscriptions that define their composite character. Such texts would generally have been reserved for higher scribal circles, but were repackaged in the late pre-exilic period with earlier education-enculturation texts such as cosmological narratives, legal discourse, and poetic compositions. This occurred as part of the Deuteronomistic ideal of an encompassing curriculum that promoted education-enculturation via its singularly authoritative text. This process, which proceeded with greater influence on the part of the priestly class during the exilic period, in effect drew the priestly materials out of the circles of the educated temple elites and into the wider scribal milieu. By the time of the early post-exilic period the Mosaic Torah emerged as a conflation of priestly and non-priestly parts, possibly a “compromise between remnants of royal groups in early post-exilic Judah and the newly dominant priests.”

---

In response to the second objection raised above, it can be suggested from the evidence presented here that ritual texts, and to some extent also law texts, were likely to have been relatively fixed in terms of content and form independent of the textual ritualisation process. The causality dilemma of ritual status or exact form can be averted on the grounds that particular texts may have tended towards fixed states, only later becoming objects of ritual veneration due to their relatively precise forms. While it is important to note that a great deal of additional research needs to be done to confirm or deny this position, the cuneiform evidence presented above does indicate that this area of investigation is worth pursuing.

During the last centuries of the Second Temple period the various recensional streams through which the text of the Torah was transmitted had become largely solidified. “For the bulk of Judaism, it appears that the highly complex process of formation of the Torah had come to an end. This relatively fixed Mosaic Torah instruction now stands at the center of a temple-centered community headed by priests.”\textsuperscript{1346} In response to the cultural dominance of Hellenism, which threatened to eclipse much of Egyptian and Palestinian Jewish cultural identity, the focus in Jewish education-enculturation under the Hasmonean leadership hardened around the authority of the priests and the absolute primacy of the Torah.

\textsuperscript{1346} D.M. Carr, \textit{Writing on the Tablet of the Heart}, 172.
This picture is confirmed by indications in the pseudepigraphic literature of the third and second century B.C.E.\(^{1347}\) It is in this context that we find Watts’ model of the ritualisation of temple affiliated texts most at home. Jewish society at the outbreak of the Hasmonean revolt has in place all of the requirements for the ritualisation of priestly textual traditions that Watts has outlined in his model, namely the centralisation of the cult and the cultic texts, veneration of those texts producing a form that is singularly authoritative, and a real and present threat to the political and social world that effectively hardens the cultic structure.

If we accept the propositions of Carr and Watts that Judaism in the Second Temple period essentially produced stabilised sacred texts through particular external influences and internal processes, we must also explain the varied forms of the Torah scrolls from the Dead Sea area. In particular we must describe the differences between the Qumran Torah scrolls and the broadly contemporary Torah scrolls from Masada.\(^{1348}\)

\(^{1347}\) See D.M. Carr, *Writing on the Tablet of the Heart*, 202-6. Carr points to early indications that education-enculturation was the specific domain of the priests in such pre-Hasmonean texts as Enoch and Aramaic Levi, and in early Hasmonean texts such as Jubilees. According to Carr all of these pseudepigraphic texts show signs that the priestly conception of controlling education through small genealogical circles was prevalent in the society in which this literature was produced.

\(^{1348}\) In reference to the arguments for an early deposit of the scrolls at Qumran recently put forward by G. Doudna and I. Young, see the discussion of the evidence from archaeology on pages 302-9 above. As has been discussed there, the material culture from Qumran and the nearby caves very strongly suggests a link between the Qumran scrolls and the second phase of occupation at the site itself. It was reasonably established by R. de Vaux that the site of Qumran was destroyed by a Roman force, probably the X\(^{th}\) legion, in around 68 C.E. This dating puts the Qumran scroll deposit in very close temporal proximity to the destruction of Masada, which in turn makes a strong case for seeing the scrolls at both sites as being contemporary manuscripts that were in use at essentially the same time. The arguments put forward by Doudna and Young on the basis of textual evidence do not satisfactorily address the facts that arise from the archae-
We have already gone some way to addressing this question by adopting Tov’s view that distinguishes between ‘de luxe’ temple affiliated editions and manuscripts that do not fit this category. The scrolls from Masada, Murabba’at, Naḥal Ḥever and Wadi Sdeir all show similar qualities in formatting and content that connect them with this ‘de luxe’ group of temple affiliated texts. In contrast, many of the scrolls from the caves near Qumran can be viewed as reflecting different, perhaps sub-standard, production values.

---

1349 E. Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches*, 91, notes that “the large format was used mainly or only for authoritative texts, since this distinctive format gave the scroll prestige, as in the case of luxury scrolls ... If indeed the large size of a scroll was an indication of its authoritative status, this assumption would have to be linked with a certain center or period, since many small scrolls contained equally authoritative texts.” This view is echoed by D.M. Carr, *Writing on the Tablet of the Heart*, 269: “such exact textual standardization [of the proto-rabbinic texts] is only possible with reference to single exemplars of the relevant texts, exemplars almost certainly kept in the temple.”

1350 D.M. Carr, *Writing on the Tablet of the Heart*, 221, has suggested that a number of the less professionally executed scrolls from Qumran could be exercise texts. Similarly M.O. Wise, “Accidents and Accident: A Scribal View of Linguistic Dating of the Aramaic Scrolls from Qumran,” *Thunder in Gemini and Other Essays on the History, Language and Literature of Second Temple Palestine* (JSPSup 15; Sheffield:
The idea that the scrolls at Qumran were associated with a differently aligned Jewish group to those found at Masada is well established in modern scholarship. In recent decades F. Garcia-Martinez and A.S. van der Woude have put forward a theory of Qumran origins that can perhaps lay claim to being the consensus position among a slim majority of scholars. This view holds that the sectarian occupants of Qumran should be associated with the scrolls that were found in the nearby caves, but also that many of the scrolls that were in the possession of this sect represent works that stemmed from a period preceding its formation. The scrolls therefore reflect a collection composed during several stages. Some of the documents represent common Essenism, while others belonged to the formative group that directly preceded the sect, or to the sect itself. Yet others reflect works that belonged to the apocalyptic tradition from which the Essene movement arose and which were considered as part of their common heritage. This implies that “all of works found in Qumran that cannot be classified as strictly sectarian must have been composed before the split that gave rise to the Qumran group.”

---

Sheffield Academic Press, 1994) 103-51, provides a basis for differentiating between various qualities of Aramaic scrolls in the Qumran collection, with a view to extending the model to include the Hebrew manuscripts.

1353 F. Garcia-Martinez and A.S. van der Woude, "A 'Gröningen' Hypothesis'" 525.
1354 F. Garcia-Martinez and A.S. van der Woude, "A 'Gröningen' Hypothesis'" 526.
More recently G. Boccaccini has suggested that the settlement at Qumran represents a splinter group that grew out of a greater divide in Judaism in the Second Temple period. According to this view Judaism in the Second Temple period was divided between temple affiliated Zadokite and dissenting Enochic traditions. Other competing divisions, such as Tobiad landowners and non-priestly groups more aligned with sapiential world views, also formed significant opposing factions that allied and diversified throughout the Second Temple period.\footnote{Boccaccini’s assertion is that, upon the return from exile, Judaism was effectively dominated by a Zadokite line of priests that controlled the authoritative centre of the Jerusalem temple. A group that Boccaccini defines as ‘Enochic Judaism,’ initially a non-separatist aristocratic opposition to the Zadokites that eventually became a more rigidly opposed identity, positioned itself against the authority of the Zadokites and their powerbase at the Jerusalem temple (see G. Boccaccini, \textit{Rabbinic Judaism}, 90-102). The subsequent rift materialised in the texts as a divergent doctrine on the origins of evil, which was particularly prominent at Qumran. Boccaccini agrees with Garcia-Martinez that the Qumran library is not the literature of a single group, but rather a historical collection outlining the development of a narrow group from a broader socio-religious context (G. Boccaccini, \textit{Beyond the Essene Hypothesis: The Parting of the Ways Between Qumran and Enochic Judaism} [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998] 53-67).} In this context it is certainly conceivable that different socio-religious groups lie behind the diverse collections at Qumran and the other sites along the south-western shore of the Dead Sea. Judaism in the late-Second Temple period is diversified to such an extent under Boccaccini’s model that supposing a single unified group, wholly aligned with the institution in Jerusalem, to be responsible for such a large and disparate corpus of manuscripts is more improbable than it is likely. The weight of probability instead seems to fall on the likelihood that more than one socially and politically defined group must be responsible for the manuscripts in question.

In this way, the alignment of the Masada Torah scrolls with the MT would indicate that these scrolls were affiliated with a group that was different from those that concealed the
scrolls near Qumran. The Masada scrolls ostensibly had some genetic connection to the texts affiliated with the ritual centre in Jerusalem. The scrolls found at Qumran, on the other hand, stemmed from a diverse social context that had no singular affinity with the scrolls in the Jerusalem temple. While the collection at Qumran does exhibit some manuscripts that closely resembled the temple exemplars, others clearly vary from the ‘standard’ text kept at the temple. The key difference between the collections at Masada and Qumran seems to be that the scrolls at Qumran do not necessarily reflect one particular textual tradition, while those at Masada do reflect a single textual tradition.

We can therefore support the notion that ritually significant texts became fixed in the late Second Temple period. This occurred through a combination of education-enculturation processes, centred in the Jerusalem temple in the post-exilic period, which led to a singular, officially sanctioned set of documents being associated with the temple. The ritualisation of this text inevitably prevailed in an environment where text and ritual practice was brought into closer and closer proximity, until finally the distinction between ritual text and ritual object was lost. What emerged from this process was a fixed, sacred text.\footnote{Implicit in this discussion is the assumption that other texts of the Hebrew Bible would come to be considered as ritual objects as well, and thus be included in a growing body of sacred literature. It is in this light that rabbinic discussions of texts that “defile the hands,” such as Esther, the Song of Songs and Qohelet, can be seen (for example \textit{m. Yad.} 3:5). That is, these discussions relate to the ritual functions of such texts, or their status as ritual objects, due to their containing ritually significant material (as is the case, for example, with the storing of texts that contained the Tetragrammaton in \textit{genizot} in later periods). I owe this observation to I. Young.}

It is in this same context that we can best explain the unique stability that appears to pert

\footnote{Implicit in this discussion is the assumption that other texts of the Hebrew Bible would come to be considered as ritual objects as well, and thus be included in a growing body of sacred literature. It is in this light that rabbinic discussions of texts that “defile the hands,” such as Esther, the Song of Songs and Qohelet, can be seen (for example \textit{m. Yad.} 3:5). That is, these discussions relate to the ritual functions of such texts, or their status as ritual objects, due to their containing ritually significant material (as is the case, for example, with the storing of texts that contained the Tetragrammaton in \textit{genizot} in later periods). I owe this observation to I. Young.}
particular, the centre of scribal activity at Nineveh produced a ritual text that shows comparable levels of standardisation to the ritualised texts associated with the centre at Jerusalem. While this observation is accurate for manuscripts that were affiliated with scribal centres, whether in Nineveh or in Jerusalem, it is not necessarily true for those manuscripts that did not share such an affiliation with a centre of scribal activity, such as those exemplified by the cuneiform literature from diverse areas and the disparate biblical scrolls in the collection at Qumran. Further, the failure of this process of stabilisation to apply to texts of other genres is exemplified by the variation in the manuscripts examined from Nineveh that represent the genres of epic, astronomical observations and omens. As has been discussed above, the evidence from the law text examined here is suggestive but ultimately inconclusive.

In this sense it seems justifiable to talk of ritual texts, and more specifically ritualised texts, as being objects that pertain in an almost exact form to the localised centres of ritual at which they were copied. The evidence from the first millennium cuneiform sources would appear to support the view that, with regard to the biblical text in the late Second Temple period, we can to some extent talk in terms of ‘one temple, one text.’ Certainly this is a terminology that can in part be supported by the ancient Near Eastern cuneiform evidence at Nineveh, where a ritual text is the only text-type found to conform to a level of standardisation that is comparable to the Torah scrolls of the late Second Temple period.
The link between the fixity of long-duration ritual texts in Mesopotamia in the first millennium B.C.E., and the ritualisation of the biblical text that arguably led to its relatively fixed form in the late Second Temple period, supports this terminology. Early indications are that ritual instructions and law codes were noticeably more stable than other text-types in the first millennium B.C.E., but it would be up to a much broader investigation to determine if this is born out by the data. Certainly a more comprehensive study that takes into account a greater array of texts, from a wider selection of genres and stemming from different scribal centres, is called for on the basis of the evidence presented here.
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