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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.
CONTENTS

List of Tables ................................................................................................................... vii

List of Figures ................................................................................................................ vii

List of Abbreviations ..................................................................................................... viii

Acknowledgements ........................................................................................................ x

CHAPTER 1 – INTRODUCTION ..................................................................................... 1

The Hebrew Scriptures and other ancient Near Eastern Traditions ......................... 1

Textual Criticism, Its Objectives and Presuppositions ................................................. 3

Tools Available for Building a Methodology ............................................................... 9

Conceptual Frameworks for Viewing the Texts ........................................................... 10

The Categorisation of Variant Readings ....................................................................... 17

Errors ............................................................................................................................. 17

Variants in Reconstructive Approaches ................................................................... 19

Variants in Comparative Approaches to Biblical Texts ............................................. 22

Variants in Comparative Approaches to Non-Biblical Texts .................................... 24

CHAPTER 2: METHOD ................................................................................................. 30

Creating a Methodology ............................................................................................... 30

Textual Variants – Orthographic ................................................................................ 33

Textual Variants – Orthographic (linguistic) ............................................................. 34

Stylistic Variants ........................................................................................................... 37
Hermeneutic Variants ................................................................................................... 39
The Quantification of Texts .......................................................................................... 39

CHAPTER 3: INTRODUCTION TO THE CUNEIFORM TEXTS ................................ 47
Defining Parallel Texts ................................................................................................. 47
The Historical Setting ................................................................................................... 48
The History of the Collections ...................................................................................... 52
Selecting the Texts for Analysis ................................................................................... 53

CHAPTER 4 – ENŪMA ANU ENLIL TABLET 63 ....................................................... 60
The Text ........................................................................................................................ 60
The Tablets.................................................................................................................... 61
Description of the Sources ............................................................................................ 62
List of Variants Between the Parallel Sources for EAE 63 .......................................... 71
Discussion of the Variants ............................................................................................ 88
Orthographic Variants ............................................................................................... 88
Orthographic (linguistic) Variants ............................................................................ 90
Stylistic Variants (Type 2) ........................................................................................ 90
Hermeneutic Variants ............................................................................................... 91

CHAPTER 5 – MUL.APIN .............................................................................................. 94
The Text ........................................................................................................................ 94
The Tablets.................................................................................................................... 95
CHAPTER 7 – GILGAMESH XI ................................................................. 210

The Text ............................................................................................... 210

The Tablets ......................................................................................... 211

Description of the Sources ................................................................ 212

List of Variants Between the Parallel Sources for Gilgamesh XI ....... 218

Discussion of Variants ....................................................................... 262

Orthographic Variants ...................................................................... 262

Orthographic (linguistic) Variants ..................................................... 263

Stylistic Variants (Type 1) ................................................................. 265

Stylistic Variants (Type 2) ................................................................. 266

Stylistic Variants (Type 3) ................................................................. 267

Hermeneutic Variants ....................................................................... 268

CHAPTER 8 – MĪŠ PĪ ................................................................. 270

The Text ............................................................................................... 270

The Tablets ......................................................................................... 271

Description of the Sources ................................................................ 272

List of Variants Between the Parallel Sources for Mīš Pī .................. 281

Discussion of Variants ....................................................................... 285

Orthographic Variants ...................................................................... 285

Orthographic (linguistic) Variants ..................................................... 285
EAE63 ..................................................................................................................... 465
MUL.APIN ............................................................................................................. 467
The Laws of Hammurabi .................................................................................. 468
Gilgamesh XI .......................................................................................................... 471
Mīs Pī ...................................................................................................................... 472
Concluding Remarks on The Dead Sea Torah Scrolls................................. 473
The Significance of Ritual Texts ........................................................................... 477
Bibliography ........................................................................................................... 496
List of Tables

Table 1 - EAE 63: Tablets Under Examination ................................................................. 62
Table 2 - Number of SU preserved in the Sources for EAE 63 ................................. 68
Table 3 - Variants in the Parallel Sources for EAE 63 .............................................. 70
Table 4 - MUL.APIN: Tablets Under Examination .................................................... 95
Table 5 - Number of SU Preserved in the MUL.APIN Tablets ............................... 109
Table 6 - Variants in the Parallel Sources for MUL.APIN ................................. 111
Table 7 - Laws of Hammurabi: Tablets Under Examination ..................................... 161
Table 8 - Number of SU Preserved in the First Millennium Hammurabi Tablets .... 165
Table 9 - Variants in the Parallel Sources for the Laws of Hammurabi ................. 167
Table 10 - First Millennium Sources for Gilgamesh XI Under Examination ............ 211
Table 11 - Number of SU Preserved in the First Millennium Gilgamesh XI Tablets ... 215
Table 12 - Variants in the Parallel Sources for Gilgamesh XI .................................. 217
Table 13 - Sources for mîs pî Under Examination ................................................... 271
Table 14 - Number of SU Preserved in the Sources for Mîs Pî .............................. 278
Table 15 - Variants in the Parallel Sources for Mîs Pî ........................................ 280
Table 16 - Number of SU Preserved in the Torah Scrolls From the Dead Sea Area ... 314
Table 17 - Variants From the MT in the Dead Sea Torah Scrolls .............................. 317

List of Figures

Figure 1 - Average Variation Of All Sources .............................................................. 465
Figure 2 - Average Variation Including Nineveh Ritual Tablets and 'de Luxe' mss ..... 477
**List of Abbreviations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACh</td>
<td>C. Virolleaud, L’Astrologie Chaldéene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AfO</td>
<td>Archiv für Orientforschung (24 = H. Hunger, MUL.APIN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHw</td>
<td>W. Von Soden, Akkadisches Handwörterbuch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AO</td>
<td>tablets in the collections of the Musée du Louvre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BGP</td>
<td>J. Black, A.R. George and N. Postgate, A Concise Dictionary of Akkadian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIN</td>
<td>Babylonian Inscriptions in the Collection of J.B. Nies (4 = A.T. Clay, Letters and Transactions from Cappadocia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM</td>
<td>tablets in the collections of the British Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPO</td>
<td>Babylonian Planetary Omens (1 = E. Reiner and D. Pingree, The Venus Tablet of Ammisaduga)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAD</td>
<td>The Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>Cuneiform Texts from Babylonian Tablets in the British Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTN</td>
<td>Cuneiform Texts from Nimrud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DT</td>
<td>tablets from G. Smith’s 1873 expedition, now in the BM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HALOT</td>
<td>L. Koehler and W. Baumgartner, Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HV</td>
<td>hermeneutic variant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>tablets in the Kuyunjik collection of the British Museum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
KAO  A. Jeremias, H. Winckler and E.F. Weidner, Kampfe um dem alten Orient
KBo  Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazköi
KTS 1 J. Lewy, Die altassyrischen Texte vom Kültepe bei Kaisarije
LXX  Septuagint
MT   Massoretic Text
OV   orthographic variant
OV(l) orthographic variant (linguistic)
PBS  Publications of the Babylonian Section, University Museum, University of Pennsylvania
RLA  Realllexicon der Assyriologie
RawICu H. Rawlinson, Cuneiform Inscriptions of Western Asia
Rm  tablets in the collection of the British Museum from H. Rassam
Sm  tablets in the collection of the British Museum from G. Smith
Sp  tablets in the collections of the British Museum acquired from Spartali
SP  Samaritan Pentateuch
STT  D.R. Gurney, J.J. Finkelstein and P. Hilun, The Sultantepe tablets
SU  semogenic unit
SV  stylistic variant
VAT  tablets in the collections of the Staatliche Museen, Berlin
Acknowledgements

During the course of my research I have come into contact with several scholars, both established and emerging, without whose advice and insights this dissertation would have been much diminished. The foremost of these is Dr Ian Young, my supervisor and mentor, to whom I owe the initial inspiration for this thesis. His tireless efforts in reading the many drafts of this document, as well as his constant advice and friendship throughout the entire research process have proved invaluable.

I owe thanks to Ms Lucy Davey, Dr Robyn Vern and Dr Noel Weeks at the University of Sydney for their advice and support. I also owe thanks to Luis Siddall at the School of Oriental and African Studies at the University of London for bringing to my attention several pertinent articles in the scholarly literature of which I would otherwise have remained ignorant.

The Trustees of the Sir Zelman Cowen Universities Fund afforded me the opportunity to research at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem during the Spring semester of 2007. Studying at the Hebrew University significantly broadened the scope of my research thanks to the advice of several people. In particular I would like to thank Professor Mordechai Cogan for supervising my research at the Hebrew University and for giving so freely of his time, and also Professor Wayne Horowitz who directed me towards some of the more significant cuneiform astronomical literature included in this study.
I am indebted to the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls, and the Center’s director Professor Steven E. Fassberg, for providing valuable resources and support during my time in Jerusalem. Professor Avi Hurvitz contributed much guidance in the development of the methodology for this study, in particular the system for the classification of variants. Professor Emanuel Tov was also very generous with his time and provided some helpful suggestions and observations.

Finally and most importantly I owe the greatest debt of gratitude to my partner, Briony Dunn, who has been unceasing in her support during the last eight and a half years that I have spent in full time study. Without her I would never have had the capacity to complete this dissertation. It is also a truth that her support in this regard is only a small part of what she gives to me each day. During the last 15 months of my research she has first carried and then cared for our first child while I have, for the most part, had my head buried selfishly in books and papers. I look forward to rejoining her and our son now that this task has finally reached its end.
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. No other ancient Near Eastern text appears to have undergone quite the same recensional activity. Whether we view the background of biblical texts as conforming to the regional delineation of textual traditions, or as stemming from more diverse localised sources, 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.

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 medie-
val manuscript evidence.\textsuperscript{10} In the words of Eugene Ulrich “… the term ‘standard text’ im-
plies 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.”\textsuperscript{11}

Some care is needed here, for it is not the view of the writer that either of these assump-
tions 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 differ-
ent 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

\textsuperscript{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
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, \textit{Prole-
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 deliv-

\textsuperscript{11} E. Ulrich, "The Qumran Biblical Scrolls - The Scriptures of Late Second Temple Judaism," \textit{The Dead
Sea Scrolls in Their Historical Context} (eds T.H. Lim, L.W. Hurtado, A.G. Auld, and A. Jack; Edinburgh:
T&T Clark, 2000) 69 (italics in original).
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.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.

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’

---

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 Talmont: Studies in the Bible, Qumran and the Ancient Near East Presented to Shemaryahu Talmont" (eds M. Fishbane and E. Tov; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1992) 275 n. 26, Ulrich argued that “the Masada and Murabb'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 stabilisation from a more broadly comparative perspective. These studies call for the abandonment of the practice whereby the ‘original’ text is reconstructed by working backwards from the final ‘copy-text.’ Instead, each extant ancient manuscript is treated a priori 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

---


proved to exist before the first half of the second century C.E.,\textsuperscript{18} based on the variants in the early manuscript evidence.\textsuperscript{19} 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”.\textsuperscript{20} 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].”\textsuperscript{21}

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.\textsuperscript{22} Trebolle Barrera has suggested that at least some sacred texts at Qumran progress towards the proto-MT recension.\textsuperscript{23} This is despite the view put forward

\textsuperscript{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.


\textsuperscript{21} S. Talmon, "Aspects of the Textual Transmission," 228-29.


\textsuperscript{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 ba-
sically 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 ‘compara-
tive’ 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 typi-
cally corruptions, has been avoided wherever possible.\textsuperscript{25}

\textit{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 an-
cient 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 substan-
tive text has distinguishing features that show it cannot have derived from any other ex-
tant 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 ‘al-
ternative’ 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 \textit{Errors}.

\textsuperscript{26} R.B. McKerrow, \textit{Prolegomena for the Oxford Shakespeare: A Study in Editorial Method} (Oxford: Clar-
endon Press, 1939) 8.

\textsuperscript{27} Unlike McKerrow, Tov asserts that genetic variants “developed – by change, omission, addition, or in-
version – 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.\(^{29}\)

---

\(^{28}\) See S. Talmon, "Old Testament Text," 164-68. For a recent model that combines processes of oral and written textual transmission via the acquisition and reproduction of primarily memorised texts see D.M. Carr, *Writing on the Tablet of the Heart: Origins of Scripture and Literature* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005) 3-14, and the full discussion in this model in the Conclusion.

\(^{29}\) S. Talmon, "The Textual Study of the Bible - A New Outlook," *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text* (eds F.M. Cross and S. Talmon; Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1975) 368. In support of this we can draw attention to the study of the annals of Ashurbanipal in M. Cogan, "Some Text-Critical Issues,", which identifies persistent processes of creative and editorial activity on the part of copyists, sometimes only months after a text’s inception. Cogan’s study will be the subject of further discussion below.
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.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.”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.”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

---

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.


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).
Hever). 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. 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."  

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." 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. 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.” 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.

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.

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

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 (homoiooteleuton 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-

⁵¹ E. Tov, Textual Criticism, 234.
While this approach is certainly careful, it may on occasion be overcautious. In the present analysis we will prefer the approach of P. Pulikottil: “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-

---

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.  

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.
Variants in Comparative Approaches to Biblical Texts

Both Clines and Young have conducted recent studies on the transmission of biblical texts in various periods.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{60}

Young examines the biblical evidence from Qumran against the evidence from elsewhere in the Judean Desert, delineating between orthographic and non-orthographic variants.\textsuperscript{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.


\textsuperscript{60} For these categories applied to the texts of Psalm 18 and II Samuel 22, see D.J.A. Clines, "What Remains of the Old Testament? Its Text and Language in a Post Modern Age: Appendix A: Textual Variants Between 2Samuel 22 and Psalm 18," from:

\textsuperscript{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.62 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.63

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.64 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 discernible 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).\textsuperscript{69} Perhaps most importantly for our present purposes, Cogan defines a category for changes in details. Though limited to a small number of examples,\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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.”\textsuperscript{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,

\textsuperscript{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 some-
thing 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 na-
ture 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.”73

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.\(^{78}\) 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.\(^{79}\)

Finally, we turn to the examination of Tablet XI of the Gilgamesh Epic by Young.\(^{80}\) 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.\(^{81}\) 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.\(^{82}\) This is an important distinction, and is reflected, for example, in the classification of ‘grammatical’ type variants in the


\(^{80}\) See I. Young, "Textual Stability," 174-183.

\(^{81}\) 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.

\(^{82}\) 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.\(^{83}\)

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.

Rule 4: *The most conservative reading is preferred.* If a variant reading may be interpreted as either of two variant types, the variant type that has the least impact on the

---

\(^{83}\) “... 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).

\(^{84}\) 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 ḫ’, or affixed * of the hiph’il 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 לְ in a Qumran biblical text against ל 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 πν- in many Qumran texts, as opposed to the more famil-
iar τ- that occurs in the vast majority in the MT. However, it is likely that in the second
instance the addition of the letter π 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 ב with or without *mater lec-
tionis*, and masculine verbs ending in afformative π- or τ-, 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 ב did in fact represent a linguistic difference, serving as an indica-
tion 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.\(^91\) 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.\(^92\)

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.\(^93\)

---

\(^91\) E.Y. Kutscher, *Language and Linguistic Background*, 438, suggests that the long form of the third person masculine singular independent pronoun \(\text{אוק\textperiodcentered}\) retained the Proto-Semitic ending, softened to ‘-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\(^b\) [11Q20] v 21). The few occurrences in 1QM are mixed (two instances of the short form against four of the long form).


\(^93\) In MUL.APIN tablet I ii 9, BM86278 reads “MUŠEN aribu MUL ḫAdad,” while the parallel document BM32311 reads “MUŠEN aribi MUL ḫAdad.” In the next line “dŠubulu” appears in the former text against “dŠubula” 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 KU.GI.GA.KAM, while in one text (BM36395) we find the form KU.GI.GA.KEA. 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 ַ, or definite article; the exchange of prefixed prepositions; independent prepositions in the cases of ָה / ֹה; the use of resumptive particles such as ֶל and ֶל 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. 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.\textsuperscript{97} Thus, a typical Hebrew form like קִסְרַל 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 קִסְרַל 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.

\textsuperscript{97} M.A.K. Halliday, \textit{An Introduction to Functional Grammar} (London: Arnold, 2004\textsuperscript{3}) 9, describes the term ‘semogenic’ as relating to the smallest textual unit that creates meaning.
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 יִשְׁבַּב exists in one manuscript, and is paralleled in another manuscript of the same text by the form לְחַבֵּל. 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.98 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(l) variation between qal and hiph’il conjugations of the verb יִשְׁבַּב, 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 ‘emes,’ ‘sememes,’ ‘archisemes’ and ‘semantic units’ are all units of qualification, rather than quantification.99 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,’100 can be attributed to a lexeme while not actually finding graphical representation in the form of the lexeme itself.101 The ‘lexicogrammar,’ to borrow a term from Halliday,102 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 interpretation 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 exists in all occurrences.\(^\text{103}\)

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 elongated 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

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.\(^\text{104}\) 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 iden-

---

\(^{104}\) 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 IGI\(^{\text{ME}}\), 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 63\(^{\text{rd}}\) 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 syl-
labic forms in the statistical analysis. However, this solution creates a greater methodo-
logical 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 un-
der 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 defi-
nite 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 מִסְיָסִים would be read as containing one semogenic part: ‘horses,’ rather than two semogenic parts: ‘horse’ + ‘plurality.’ Likewise, the feminine noun בָּשָׂם 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.
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

---

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," AJO 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," Lingerings 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

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

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


109 See O. Pedersén, Archives and Libraries in the Ancient Near East 1500-300 B.C. (Maryland: CDL Press, 1998) 158-65. Pedersén determines that the approximate number of 30,000 tablets or fragments of 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, Ashurbanipal 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 Ashurbanipal created his extensive royal library in the citadel of his Assyrian capital city Nineveh he incorporated Assyrian and Babylonian tablets into the collection. The tablets written in Babylonian characters may have been imported from Babylonian libraries, whereas others could have been written by Babylonian scribes in the service of the Assyrian king.”

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. 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. These texts came not only from official collections but also from the private collections

---

10 J.C. Fincke, "Babylonian Texts of Nineveh," 112.
12 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.\textsuperscript{113} 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.\textsuperscript{114} 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.\textsuperscript{115}

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-

\textsuperscript{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.”

\textsuperscript{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.

\textsuperscript{115} U. Jeyes, "Assurbanipal’s Bārītu," \textit{Assyrien im Wandel der Zeiten: XXXIX\textsuperscript{e} Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale, Heidelberg 6-10 Juli, 1992} (eds H. Wetzoldt 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.\footnote{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.} Rather, our concern is for the accuracy of the records kept by those early archaeologists as to the find-spots of
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), Sultantepe (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. 118

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. 119 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.” 120

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

118 Much of the wording in the preceding summary stems from discussions with M. Cogan between Febru-
ary and June 2007.
119 W. Horowitz, private conversation.
120 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 Enûma Anu Enlil. The latter, presumably excavated from the libraries at Nineveh,
but originally of Babylonian origin, states that the tablet is the 63rd 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, Babylonische und Assyrische Kolophone (Kevelaer: Butson & Bercker,
1968) 58, 132, nos. 150 and 469 respectively.
tradition served by successive generations of learned and well-trained scribes.” 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.” 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.” 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.” Such textual entities are certainly well developed by the end of the

122 A.L. Oppenhein, Portrait of a Dead Civilization, 23.
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 Enūma Anu Enlil; the ritual for inducting the cult image known as mīs pī; 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 Enūma 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. 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.

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. The length of the Epic of Gilgamesh only tablet XI of the twelve tablet series will be analysed here. The text called mīṣ pī, ‘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 publica-
tions of the tablets have been used to augment the scores in the critical editions, espe-
cially where difficult readings are concerned. Drawings, photographs and, where possi-
ble, 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 au-
thor rather than from a pre-existing critical edition.
CHAPTER 4 – ENÜMA 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.¹²⁹

Reiner divides the text of the Venus Tablet into four sections, I-IV.¹³⁰ 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.¹³¹


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.\textsuperscript{132} 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.

\textit{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.\textsuperscript{133} Occasionally some inspection of the tablets themselves has been possible, and remarks will be made where appropriate.\textsuperscript{134}

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.\textsuperscript{135} More recently Walker has suggested that J can be added to F and H along

\begin{thebibliography}
\item \textsuperscript{132} E. Reiner, \textit{BPO 1}, 8.
\item \textsuperscript{133} Previous publications that have been consulted are: H.C. Rawlinson, \textit{The Cuneiform Inscriptions of Western Asia – Volume 3} (5 vols.; London: R.E. Bowler, 1870), henceforth \textit{RawlCu}; S. Langdon, J.K. Fotheringham, and C. Schoch, \textit{The Venus Tablets of Ammizaduga: A Solution of Babylonian Chronology by Means of the Venus Observations of the First Dynasty} (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1928); T.G. Pinches and J.N. Strassmaier, \textit{Late Babylonian Astronomical and Related Texts} (Brown University Studies 18; Rhode Island: Brown University Press, 1955), henceforth \textit{LBAT}.
\item \textsuperscript{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.
\item \textsuperscript{135} E. Reiner, \textit{BPO 1}, 11.
\end{thebibliography}
with some other fragments of section IV, BM37121+37432. Walker proposes that L and the other associated fragments can be joined to K7090.\textsuperscript{136} 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.

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|}
\hline
\textbf{Siglum} & \textbf{Museum Number} \\
\hline
A & K2321+3032 \\
B & W1924.802 \\
C & K160 \\
D & K7225 \\
F & BM37010 \\
H & BM36758+37496 \\
J & BM36395 \\
L & K12344+12758 \\
M & K3105 \\
N & BM41688 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{EAE 63: Tablets Under Examination}
\end{table}

\textit{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.\textsuperscript{137}

The script is Neo-Babylonian, as is indicated by Reiner, in agreement with Langdon & Fotheringham and also Weir.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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 \textit{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

\textsuperscript{137} See H. Hunger, \textit{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 UIS 3 KAM DÎŠ UD An “En-lîl.”

\textsuperscript{138} See E. Reiner, \textit{BPO I}, 11, and previously S. Langdon, J.K. Fotheringham, and C. Schoch, \textit{Venus Tablets}, 1, and J.D. Weir, \textit{The Venus Tablets of Ammizaduga} (Istanbul: Nederlands Historisch-Archaeologisch Instituut, 1972) 24-25. The signs are typically 2-3 mm high, with some extending to around 4 mm.

\textsuperscript{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, \textit{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 kṣru 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.\footnote{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 .} 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.

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.\footnote{A transliteration of this tablet was published for the first time in E. Reiner, \textit{BPO I}.} 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.\footnote{See C. Bezold, L.W. King, and E.A.W. Budge, \textit{Catalogue of the Cuneiform Tablets in the Kouyunjik Collection of the British Museum} (6 vols.; London: British Museum, 1899) 2.838, no. 2024b.} 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.

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.\footnote{C.B.F. Walker, "Notes on the Venus Tablet," 64-65.} 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.\footnote{J.E. Reade, "Rassam’s Babylonian Collection: The Excavations and the Archives," \textit{Catalogue of the Babylonian Tablets in the British Museum, Volume VI: Tablets From Sippar I} (ed. E. Leichty; London: British Museum, 1986) xxviii.}
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 (akītu) 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.\textsuperscript{155} The script, labelled Neo-Babylonian by Reiner and Late Babylonian by Walker, would fit this assumption.\textsuperscript{156} We will therefore consider this as a fragment from a tablet that was copied in the sixth century in central Babylonia.

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\caption{Number of SU preserved in the Sources for EAE 63\textsuperscript{157}}
\begin{tabular}{ll}
\textbf{Fragment} & \textbf{Total SU} \\
A+M & 462 \\
B & 282 \\
C & 1206.5 \\
D & 54.5 \\
F+H+J & 309 \\
G+L & 163 \\
N & 45 \\
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

\textsuperscript{155} J.E. Reade, "Rassam's Babylonian Collection," xxviii-xxxi 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.


\textsuperscript{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>
<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></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>47.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C vs. M</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>57.7</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C vs. G</td>
<td>196.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>196.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>2</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C vs. L</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>83.5</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>109</td>
<td></td>
<td></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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>1</td>
<td>4.8</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>1</td>
<td>24</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>1</td>
<td>4.8</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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 *nukur*tu with the Sumerian abstract prefix NAM plus KÚR.MEŠ, *nakāru*. B has the more common "SAL.KÚR.MEŠ," *nukur*tu.

\(^{160}\) A has the period of inferior conjunction as 15 days, recorded as 18 days in B.
V4  A:10  uh-ḥa-ram-ma  OV – A and B have syllabic spelling, against the logogram in J.\(^{161}\)
    B:10  uh-ḥa-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 *nasālu*, ‘to take away, remove’. However, given the close semantic relationship between *ḥarāmum* and *nasālu* 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 12\(^{th}\) day of Kislimi, while B has the 25\(^{th}\) 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.\(^{164}\)
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 = \( \text{tibni} \), “straw, chaff.” D has [composite gram] + ŠU. The meaning of D is uncertain.\(^{165}\)
B:15 IN.NU
D:1 ]ŠU

---

\(^{164}\) A has the western setting of Venus (Ω) occurring on 20\(^{th}\) day of Araḫsamna, B has the 18\(^{th}\) day. E. Reiner, \textit{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, \textit{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, \textit{Venus Tablets}, 15, n. 2 interprets “ḫi-pi eš-šú” as “‘a recent defacement of the text’. The units of this figure were lost on the original from which Ašurbanipal’s scribe made his copy”. R. Borger, \textit{Mesopotamisches Zeichenlexikon} (Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2004) 387, notes “ḫe-pu-ū, sind angebrochen. Auch + eš-šû, neu, rezent.” \textit{CAD Ḫ} 196 defines the term as meaning “new break.” The form is therefore not counted as a textual variant.

\(^{165}\) 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 \textit{The Instructions of Šuruppak}, line 27 (see R. Borger, \textit{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.UŠ, \textit{maštakaš}, 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.
V11  A:15  GÁL ub-bu-tu  
B:15  GÁL KI.MIN ub-bu-tu
J:14  GÁL ub-bu-tu

V12  A:16  uh-ḫa-ram-ma  
B:16  uh-ḫa-ram-ma
C:2  ]ram-ma
D:2  uh-ḫa-ram[  
J:15  ZAL-ma

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.
V13 B:17 ŠÈG.MEŠ
C:3 ŠÈG.MEŠ
D:3 ŠÈG.ME

OV – D has the plural marker ME, against MEŠ in B and C. ¹⁶⁷

V14 A:17 GAR.MEŠ
B:17 GAR.ME
C:3 GAR.ME
D:3 GAR-an
J:16 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.

V15 A:18 uḫ-ḫa-ram-ma
B:18 uḫ-ḫa-ram-ma
C:5 uḫ-ḫa-ram-ma
D:4 uḫ-ḫa-ram-ma
J:17 ZAL-ma

OV – A-D have syllabic spelling, against the logogram in J.

V16 C:6 IGI.DU₈ ŠÈG.MEŠ
D:5 IGI.DU₈ KI.MIN

SV(2) – D has an abbreviated apodosis.

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 zamu, “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
    B:19  GÁL.MEŠ
    C:6   GÁL.MEŠ

OV – A has the plural marker ME, against MEŠ in B and C.\textsuperscript{168}

V18  A:21  [K]Ù.GI.GA.KAM
    B:21  G]A.KAM
    C:8   KÙ.GI.GA.KAM
    D:6   KÙ.GI.GA.KAM
    J:19  KÙ.GI.GA.KE\textsubscript{4}

OV(l) – Difference in grammatical form, or possible difference in pronunciation.\textsuperscript{169}

\textsuperscript{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).

\textsuperscript{169} KE\textsubscript{4} 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 KA\textsubscript{13}, 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 sterneinst in Babel: assyriologische, astronomische und astralmythologische Untersuchungen} [2 vols.; Münster in Westfalen: Aschedorffische 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.  
D:7  UD.4.KAM  
J:20  ]5.KAM  

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

C:10  UD.15.KAM  
J:20  UD.16.KAM  

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 copyist “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. 

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) 𒀭Nin-su-anna 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 𒀭Ninsanna, lacking in C.

\textsuperscript{173} The difference in meaning here is significant: šarrī šalta išappendar, “the king will send messengers of war,” verses šarrī salīma išappendar, “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, wohlberein sein” without the emphatic particle attached, see BGP 237.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Column</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V26</td>
<td>A:26</td>
<td>ḫa-ram-ma OV – A has syllabic spelling, against the logogram in C and F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C:13</td>
<td>ZAL-ma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F:2</td>
<td>ZAL-ma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V27</td>
<td>C:14</td>
<td>IGI.DU₈ OV – J has an abbreviated form of the full composite logogram preserved in C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J:23</td>
<td>IGI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V28</td>
<td>A:28</td>
<td>ḫa-ram-ma Not Counted – Although Reiner restores two signs in C based on the length of the lacuna, the text is damaged so ultimately uncertain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C:15</td>
<td>[ZAL-ma]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V29</td>
<td>C:16</td>
<td>IGI.DU₈ OV – J has an abbreviated form of the full composite logogram preserved in C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J:24</td>
<td>IGI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V30</td>
<td>C:17</td>
<td>7 UD-mi SV(3) – C breaks from the standard formula for expressing the number of days, preserved in F and G.¹⁷⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F:4</td>
<td>UD.7.KAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G:1</td>
<td>UD.7.KAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V31</td>
<td>C:18</td>
<td>IGI.DU₈ OV – The compound logogram in C is abbreviated in J.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J:25</td>
<td>IGI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.\textsuperscript{175}
    G:3     UD.21.KAM
    J:26    2]1.KAM

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

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

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

\textsuperscript{175} C records Σ on the 20\textsuperscript{th} day of Tebēti, while G and J have the 21\textsuperscript{st} day.
\textsuperscript{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.
\textsuperscript{177} C records Ξ on the 21\textsuperscript{st} day of Šabāti, while G has the 11\textsuperscript{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 line18. 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.
\textsuperscript{178} C records Σ on the 20\textsuperscript{th} day of Abī, recorded as the 21\textsuperscript{st} day in G.
V36 C:23 ITI.ʾAPINʾ HV – Difference in cardinal number.\textsuperscript{179}
G:8 ITI.GAN

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

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

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

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

\textsuperscript{179} C has the period of superior conjunction as two months 15 days, while G seems to necessitate 3 months and 14 days.

\textsuperscript{180} C has the pronoun denoting the subject, which is only implied in G.

\textsuperscript{181} According to E. Reiner, \textit{BPO 1}, 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 ṜUTU.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 flood[s].”

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 ḫ have been confused for the lower stroke of ḫ.
V45  C:29  EBUR KI.A SI.Á  SV(2) – H has an expansive plus.\textsuperscript{185}  
H:7  KI[N-ár E[BUR

V46  C:35  UD.6.KAM  HV – Difference in ordinal number.\textsuperscript{186}  
H:11  UD.7.KAM

V47  C:42  IGI.DU₈  OV – J and H have an abbreviated form of the full compound logogram preserved in C.  
H:15  IGI  
L:1  IGI

V48  C:43  UD.9.KAM  HV – Difference in cardinal number.\textsuperscript{187}  
H:15  UD.8.KAM

V49  C:43  TŪM-ma  OV – L has syllabic spelling, against the logogram in C.  
L:2  i-tab-bal[-ma]

V50  C:44  UD.18.KAM  HV – Difference in ordinal number.\textsuperscript{188}  
H:16  U]D.17.KAM

\textsuperscript{185} H appears to have the word īšappar\textsuperscript{e} before EBUR (ebûr) in the apodosis. C lacks any such reference to sending messengers at this point.

\textsuperscript{186} C records that the final day of the western visibility of Venus was the 6\textsuperscript{th} day of Tebêti, while H has the 7\textsuperscript{th} day.

\textsuperscript{187} C records the period of western visibility as eight months and nine days, while H records [break] eight days.

\textsuperscript{188} C records Γ on the 18\textsuperscript{th} of Addari, while H has the 17\textsuperscript{th} of Addari
V51 C:r1 GÁL.IMEŠ  
H:17 GÁL.ME  
OV – H has the plural marker ME, against MEŠ in C.

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

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

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

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

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

V57 C:r10 DU-az  
L:11 ]-az  
M:4 DU  
OV – M lacks the phonetic complement.
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* i, 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V63</th>
<th>B:r2</th>
<th>ḫa-ram-ma</th>
<th>OV – B and M have syllabic spelling, against the logogram in C and N.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C:r35</td>
<td>ZAL-ma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M:r9</td>
<td>uh-ḫa-ram-ma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N:4</td>
<td>ZAL-ma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V64</th>
<th>C:r35</th>
<th>UD.17.KAM</th>
<th>HV – Difference in ordinal number.192</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M:r9</td>
<td>UD ḫi-pi eš-šú</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N:4</td>
<td>UD.14.KAM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V65</th>
<th>B:r3</th>
<th>ḫGĀN.ZI ḫS.SÁ</th>
<th>HV – C, M and N preserve a different apodosis to B.193</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C:r36</td>
<td>IGI MU SAL ina KUR SUD-ti GĀL ina É.GĀL GU[</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M:r10</td>
<td>SU[JD-ti GĀL ina É.GAL GU.LA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N:5</td>
<td>ina KUR SUD- ḫti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

192 C records Γ on the 17th of Ulālī arki, while N has the 14th of Ulālī 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 rāqti ibašši u ina É.GAL GU ḫLA,” 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  uḫ-ḫa[  OV – B and M have syllabic spelling, against the logogram in C and N.
      C:r38  ZAL-ma
      M:r11  uḫ-ḫa-ram-ma
      N:7    ZA][L-ma

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

V69  C:r38  dNin-si₂-an-na  SV(2) – N appears to supply alternative dates for Ξ, lacking in C.
      N:7    UD[ ]KAM  `UD`

V70  C:r40  UD.27.KAM dNin-si₂-an-na  SV(2) – N appears to supply alternative dates for Ω, lacking in C.
      N:8    `UD`27.ka\textsuperscript{M}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 Ulīlī, 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 ḫarāmu, 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.²⁹⁸

²⁹⁷ 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.

²⁹⁸ 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 MES 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.\(^{199}\) 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).\(^{200}\)

---

\(^{199}\) 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 ṣuṣaḫḫi ṣeʾi u *tibni ina māti ibašši*, *ēbār māti iššir, uḫbuta 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 *ēbār 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, *uḫbuta 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 ṣumu, “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 zunnû ina šame mülu ina nagbi ibaššû, while the text of G is more compact: zunnû u mülu ibbaššû. 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.SÂ ŠÂ KUR iṭ-ṭab,” ebûr rutibi iššir 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 išapparâr 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 ÁŠ, 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 salıma išappar raḫtušu ıššir libbi māṭi iṭab 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.\textsuperscript{204} 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.

\textsuperscript{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. The same sigla given to the tablets by Hunger and Pingree has been used in the following list.

Table - MUL.APIN: Tablets Under Examination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Siglum</th>
<th>Museum Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>BM86278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>K13254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>BM34814+35708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>AO7540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>K3852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>K15929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>BM76505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Rm319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>BM32311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>BM45922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>N1463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>BM33779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>K3020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Rm322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>BM35207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>BM41218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>BM33791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>BM33728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>BM32626</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 AfO 24 has been utilised.
Description of the Sources

A, BM86278

The script is Neo-Babylonian. The colophon states that this is “DUB.1.KAM MUL.APIN [... kīma] labīrīšu 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.

209 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.

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


212 See note below.
B, K13254

This tablet was originally described as a Babylonian fragment of a religious text,\textsuperscript{213} however the drawing in \textit{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.\textsuperscript{214} The museum catalogue number indicates that this tablet was

\textsuperscript{213} See the entry in C. Bezold, L.W. King, and E.A.W. Budge, \textit{Catalogue}, 3.1298.

\textsuperscript{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. 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. 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.

---

219 The description is from C. Bezold, L.W. King, and E.A.W. Budge, Catalogue, 2.571.
220 As noted in D. Brown, Mesopotamian Planetary Astronomy-Astrology, 18, collections were often mixed during the complex process of shipping and cataloguing the tablets in the late 19th and early 20th century, “so that even a ‘K’ number does not guarantee a Kuyunjik origin.”
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," JNES 42, 1 [1983] 4-9).
H, BM76505

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.222 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.223 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).
J, Rm319

The division of the text seems to be different in this tablet. The tablet is probably of Kuyunjik origin but this is ultimately uncertain. The text is separated into sections by single horizontal ruled lines, and columns are separated by a single vertical line on the reverse 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.

K, BM32311

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 “še-lu-ku šâr,” “Seleucus (is) king.”

L, BM45922

The tablet is written in Neo-Babylonian script, and probably comes from Rassam’s excavations 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. KU ša, 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 (\textit{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 is 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. AfO 24 does not provide a photograph or drawing of the tablet but some parts were quoted by Weidner. 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.\textsuperscript{233}

BB, VAT9435

Like tablet AA, this tablet is written in Neo-Assyrian script. Some parts of this tablet were previously published by Weidner.\textsuperscript{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: \textit{gabari}\textsuperscript{uru} TIN.[TIR\textsuperscript{ki}], “original from Babylon.”\textsuperscript{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.

\textsuperscript{233} According to O. Pedersén, \textit{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 Assur. 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 Assur, makes some connection with the temple library possible according to O. Pedersén, \textit{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, \textit{Archives and Libraries in Assur}, 2.81).

\textsuperscript{234} E.F. Weidner, \textit{Handbuch}, 141-42, and \textit{KAO 4}, 24-25.

\textsuperscript{235} The colophon is not given in \textit{AfO 24}. See the drawing in L.W. King, \textit{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. 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.

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. 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.
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

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).
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.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.245 The tablet originally held six columns and comprised the entire text of MUL.APIN.

<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>

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.

244 I owe this observation to M. Sigrist, private conversation.

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).
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. (linguistic) Variant</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>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>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></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>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></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>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></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>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></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></td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></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></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></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></td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></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>1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></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></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></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>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></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>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></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></td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></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>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></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>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></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>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></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>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></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>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></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>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></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>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></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>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></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>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></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>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M:N</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Tablets</td>
<td>Variant Text</td>
<td>Categorisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>M1</td>
<td>AA i 1</td>
<td>DIŠ₅ mul APIN</td>
<td>SV(1) – The preposition determinative DIŠ, preceding clauses or proper nouns, is lacking in CC.²⁴⁶</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CC 1</td>
<td>mul [</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>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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AA i 1</td>
<td>mul APIN</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></td>
<td>DD 1</td>
<td>mul APIN</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>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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B 1</td>
<td>IGI</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></td>
<td>AA i 1</td>
<td>IGI</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></td>
<td>BB 1</td>
<td>IGI</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></td>
<td>DD 1</td>
<td>IGI</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>M4</td>
<td>AA i 2</td>
<td>DIŠ₅ mul UR.BAR.RA</td>
<td>SV(1) – The preposition determinative DIŠ is lacking in BB and CC.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BB 2</td>
<td>mul UR.BAR.RA</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></td>
<td>CC 2</td>
<td>mul UR.BAR[</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>M5</td>
<td>A i 2</td>
<td>giš NINDA</td>
<td>OV – The preposition determinative GIŠ is lacking in BB.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B 2</td>
<td>giš NINDA</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></td>
<td>AA i 2</td>
<td>giš NINDA</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></td>
<td>BB 2</td>
<td>NINDA</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>M6</td>
<td>A i 2</td>
<td>ša₅ mul APIN</td>
<td>SV(1) – The relative pronoun ša is lacking in BB.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AA i 2</td>
<td>ša₅ mul APIN</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></td>
<td>BB 2</td>
<td>mul APIN</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>M7</td>
<td>AA i 3</td>
<td>DIŠ₅ mul ŠU.IGI</td>
<td>SV(1) – The preposition determinative DIŠ is lacking in BB and CC.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BB 3</td>
<td>mul ŠU.IGI</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></td>
<td>CC 3</td>
<td>mul ŠU[</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></td>
<td>DD 3</td>
<td>DIŠ₅ mul ŠU.IGI</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>M8</td>
<td>AA i 3</td>
<td>GĀM</td>
<td>Not Counted – The sign is uncertain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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.
BB 4  "giš" GÀM
CC 4  GÌ[ÀM
DD 3  GÀM

M9  AA i 4  d GAM.LUM
    BB 4  ]Ga [ 

M10  AA i 5  DIŠ mul
    BB 7  mul
CC 6  mul

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

M12  A i 5  d Lugal-gir-ra u d Mes-lam-ta-è-a
    B 5  d Lugal-gir-ra ü d[ ]
    BB 6  d Lugal[ ] ü d Mes-lam-ta-è-[ ]
    DD 4  d Lugal-gir-ra ü d[

M13  A i 5  d Lugal-gir-ra u d Mes-lam-ta-è-a
    B 5  d Lugal-gir-ra ü d[
    AA i 4  d Lugal-gir-ra ö Mes-lam-ta-è-a
    BB 6  d Lugal[ ] ü d Mes-lam-ta-è-[ ]
    DD 4  d Lugal-gir-ra ü d[

M14  AA i 5  DIŠ mul
    BB 7  mul
CC 6  mul

---

247 *AFO* 24 19 has "giš" 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.
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| M15 | A i 6 | d LÀL | OV – The spelling of the star name Alummuš varies in AA compared to the other sources.\textsuperscript{249} |
|     | AA i 5 | d MÙŠ.LÀL |
|     | BB 7   | d LÀL |
|     | DD 5   | d L[ÀL] |

| M16 | A i 6 | u | OV – A spells the conjunction with the sign Ú, whereas this is written with the sign Ū in B, BB and DD. |
|     | B 6   | Ū |
|     | BB 8   | Ū |
|     | DD 5   | Ū |

| M17 | A i 6 | d Nin EZENxGU₄ |
|     | AA i 5 | d Nin MAḤ (?) |
|     | BB 8   | d Nin (?) |
|     |        | Not Counted – The text appears to vary between the three preserved sources, but is only certain in A.\textsuperscript{250} |

| M18 | AA i 6 | DIŠ mul |
|     | BB 9   | mul |
|     | CC 7   | mul |
|     |        | SV(1) – The preposition determinative DIŠ is lacking in BB and CC. |

| M19 | AA i 7 | DIŠ mul |
|     | BB 10  | mul |
|     | CC 8   | m[u] |
|     | DD 6   | mul |
|     |        | SV(1) – The preposition determinative DIŠ is lacking in BB, CC and DD. |

| M20 | A i 8 | d La-ta-ra-ak |
|     | AA i 7 | d La-ta-rak |
|     | BB 10   | d La-ta-r[ak] |
|     |        | OV – AA and BB have the spelling CVC, against CV-VC in A. |

| M21 | AA i 8 | DIŠ MUL |
|     | BB 11  | MUL |
|     | CC 9   | MUL |
|     |        | SV(1) – The preposition determinative DIŠ is lacking in BB and CC. |

| M22 | AA i 8 | ša |
|     | BB 11   | ša |
|     |        | 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M23</td>
<td>A i 9</td>
<td>mul LUGAL</td>
<td>OV – The preposition determinative for <em>kakkabu</em>, “star,” is written with the sign MÚL in C, against MUL in the other sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C i 2</td>
<td>múl LUGAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AA i 8</td>
<td>múl LUGAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BB 12</td>
<td>múl LUGAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DD 7</td>
<td>mул</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M24</td>
<td>AA i 9</td>
<td>DIŠ MUL</td>
<td>SV(1) – The preposition determinative DIŠ is lacking in BB and CC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BB 13</td>
<td>MUL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CC 10</td>
<td>MЮL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| M25      | AA i 9 | MUL | OV – AA has an unmarked plural, *kakkabû*, “star,” marked as plural with MEŠ in BB.
|          | BB 13 | MUL meš | |
| M26      | A i 10 | l̄ju-tum | OV – A and AA preserve mimation, lacking in BB and DD. |
|          | AA i 9 | um-mu-lu-tum | |
|          | BB 13 | um-mu-lu-tu | |
|          | DD 8 | m̄Ju-lu-tú | |
| M27      | E i 1 | GUB-zu | OV – BB marks the plural verb izzazzû with the sign MEŠ, lacking in the other sources. |
|          | AA i 9 | GUB-zu | |
|          | BB 14 | GUB meš | |
|          | DD 8 | GUB-zu | |

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). A 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 *zwz*, “to stand,” see J. Huehnergard, *izzuzzum and itîlum,* *Riches Hidden in Secret Places: Ancient Near Eastern Studies in Memory of Thorkild Jacobsen* (ed. A. Abusch; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2002) 162.
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M28 AA i 9-10 GUB-zu\(^{(10)}\) sis-sin-nu

BB 14 GUB\(^{me\text{̃}si-si-nu}\) sis-si-nu

SV(2) – BB has a gloss following the proper noun Sissinu.\(^{254}\)

M29 A i 11 \(\text{dE}_4\text{-ru}_6\)
C i 3 \(\text{dE}_4\text{-ru}_6\)
AA i 10 \(\text{dE}_4\text{-ru}_6\)
BB 15 \(\text{dE}_4\text{-ru}_6\) e-ru

SV(2) – BB has a gloss following the proper noun Eru.\(^{255}\)

M30 AA i 11 DIŠ\(^{mul}\) mul

BB 16 DIŠ\(^{mul}\) mul

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

M31 A i 12 [\_\_\_]\text{l}il
AA i 11 \(\text{dEn-lîl}\)
BB 16 \(\text{dBE}\)
DD 9 \(\text{dEn-lîl}\)

OV – A, AA and DD preserve the usual spelling for Enlîl, while BB has the abbreviated form.\(^{256}\)

M32 A i 12 i-šim-mu
C i 5 i-š[im]-me
E i 3 ŋš-im-me
AA i 11 i-šim-ma
BB 16 i-šim-mu

OV(1) – Different inflected verbal ending.\(^{257}\)

M33 AA i 12 DIŠ\(^{mul}\) mul

BB 17 DIŠ\(^{mul}\) mul

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

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

OV – The pronominal object suffix is written with the sign ŠÚ in AA and DD.

\(^{254}\) According to \textit{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).

\(^{255}\) The close association of both names that are glossed in BB is indicated by the astronomical text published in LBAT 1510 11, which reads “[\text{E}_4\text{-ru}_6... sis-sin-nu ina qāṭ,]” “Eru ... date frond in hand.”


\(^{257}\) A and BB share the same spelling of the present future verb isemma, “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 siānu, “to fix, decree,” see \textit{CAD} Š 1 362.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M35</th>
<th>A i 13</th>
<th>mul</th>
<th>Hé-gal-a-a</th>
<th>OV(1) – Possible difference in pronunciation.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C i 6</td>
<td>mul</td>
<td>Hé-gal-a-a-a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E i 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>]-a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA i 12</td>
<td>mul</td>
<td>Hé-gal-a-a-ú</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB 17</td>
<td></td>
<td>]-gal-a-a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DD 10</td>
<td>mul</td>
<td>Hé-gal-a-a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M36</th>
<th>AA i 13</th>
<th>DIŠ</th>
<th>mul</th>
<th>SV(1) - The preposition determinative DIŠ is lacking in BB.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BB 19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M37</th>
<th>AA i 13</th>
<th>šá</th>
<th>BB 19</th>
<th>ša</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M38</th>
<th>AA i 13</th>
<th>šá</th>
<th>EGIR-šú</th>
<th>SV(1) – BB has an extra preposition ina which is lacking in AA. DD is broken and so uncertain.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BB 19</td>
<td></td>
<td>ša ina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DD 11</td>
<td></td>
<td>] EGIR-šú</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M39</th>
<th>AA i 14</th>
<th>DIŠ</th>
<th>mul</th>
<th>SV(1) - The preposition determinative DIŠ is lacking in BB.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BB 21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M40</th>
<th>A i 15</th>
<th>DIŠ</th>
<th>mul</th>
<th>SV(1) – The preposition determinative DIŠ is lacking in BB.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BB 22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M41</th>
<th>A i 16</th>
<th>za-ri-i</th>
<th>DD 13</th>
<th>za-ri-e</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M42</th>
<th>A i 16</th>
<th>MAR.GÍD.DA</th>
<th>AA i 15</th>
<th>MAR.GÍD.DA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M43</th>
<th>C i 9</th>
<th>DIŠ</th>
<th>mul</th>
<th>SV(1) - The preposition determinative DIŠ is lacking in C and BB.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AA i 16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB 23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

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  d A-a  C i 11  A-a  OV – The preposition determinative DINGIR is lacking in C.
   AA i 17  d A-a
M45 A i 19  d A-num  AA i 18  d A-nu-um  DD 15  d A-num  OV – AA has a longer spelling for the proper noun Anum.
M46 A i 19  GAL-ú  AA i 18  GAL-u  OV – The phonetic complement for rabû, “great,” is written differently in A and AA.
M47 A i 20  DIŠ mul  F 2  DIŠ mul  AA i 19  DIŠ mul`  BB 26  SV(1) – The preposition determinative DIŠ is lacking in BB.
M48 A i 21  DIŠ mul  F 3  DIŠ mul  AA i 20  DIŠ mul  BB 27  SV(1) – The preposition determinative DIŠ is lacking in BB.
M49 A i 21  mul IBILA.É.MAH  AA i 20  mul IBILA.É.MAH  DD 17  [m]ul IBILA[  BB 28  mul IBILA[  OV – The preposition determinative MUL is lacking in DD.260
M50 A i 22  DUMU reš-tu-ú  F 4  DUMU reš-tu-ú  AA i 21  [ ] MUL [ ] reš-tu-ú  SV(2) – AA has the preposition determinative MUL, lacking in A and F.261
M51 A i 22  d A-nu-um  AA i 21  d A-nim  OV(I) – Possible difference in pronunciation.
M52 A i 23  DIŠ mul  F 5  DIŠ mul  BB 30  SV(1) – The preposition determinative DIŠ is lacking in BB.

260 The apparent metathesis of the signs MAH and É in DD is broken and therefore uncertain. The signs are reads as follows: IBILA (=DUMU), aplu, “heir, (eldest) son;” É, biṭu, “house, temple;” and MAH, šīru, “eminent, sublime” (see CAD § 210) thus rendering the name “Heir of the Sublime Temple.”
261 This is read as a gloss that defines the phrase māru rešitu as a proper noun referring to an astronomical body. For examples of similar glosses lacking in the parallel sources see M132 and M299.
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.

OV – The preposition determinative MUL is lacking in AA.

SV(1) – Difference in number. 262

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

SV(1) – A and AA have different names for the same deity. 263

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

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

262 AA has the singular dingirušu, “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 Ninisina, “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-û
AA i 25 né-bu-u
BB 34 né-bu-û

OV – AA has the sign U for the final vowel, written as Ú in A and BB.

M61 A i 27 DIŠ 2
F 10 DIŠ 2
BB 36 2

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

M62 A i 27 šá
AA i 26 šā
BB 36 ša

OV – The relative particle ša is written with the sign ŠA in BB, against ŠÁ in A and AA.

M63 A i 27 GUB meš-zu
AA i 26 GUB-z[u]
EE i 3 GU]B-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.264

M64 A i 32 DIŠ mul
BB 44 mul

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

M65 A i 32 um-mu-lu-tu4
T i 6 m]u-lu-tu4
BB 44 um-mu-lu-[u]
EE i 10 ]mu-lu-tu

OV – A and T spell the final syllable with the sign TU4, written as TU in EE. BB is broken and therefore uncertain.

M66 A i 33 GUB meš-zu
T i 6 GUB-zu
BB 45 GUB meš

SV(1) – A and BB have the plural marker MEŠ for izzazzū, “they are positioned,” referring to multiplejects, while T lacks the plural marker. The context seems to require that T refers to the constellation in the singular.265

---

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 kakkabû ša arkiša izzazzû ..., “Two stars that are positioned after it ...” The reading of the form “GUB-zu” as the plural verb izzazzû is therefore certain. On the function of the phonetic complement “-zu” to mark the plural verb izzazzû 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 Manzût, “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 meš zu
BB 45    GUB meš
OV – A has the phonetic complement “-zu,” lacking in BB. 266

A i 34    DIŠ 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[u
OV – A, T and EE have the phonetic complement “-zu” for izzazzu, lacking in BB.

M69  A i 36    MUL meš šu-ut d En-líl
T i 9    meš šu-ut d En-líl
EE i 14    MUL šu-ut 50
SV(2) – A and T have an expansive plus. 267

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(I) – Possible difference in pronunciation.

M71  A i 37    MUL GAL UD.DA-su
EE i 15    MU]L GAL ú UD.DA-su
SV(1) – The conjunction between the words kakabu rabû, “a great star,” and şēssu, “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]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]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    d né-be-ru
OV – A lacks the preposition determinative DINGIR in the divine title for the star of Marduk, Nēberu, “the Ford.”

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).

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.

121
M75  A i 37  né-bi-ri
    EE i 17  d né-be-ru
          OV(l) – 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 ḪUN.GÁ
    T i 16  ḪUN.GÁ
    FF i 7  ḫū ḪUN.GÁ
          OV – The preposition determinative LŪ, denoting a professional office, is lacking in T.

M81  A ii 1  d is læ
    FF i 9  is læ-e
          OV – The title is læ 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 “āni ne-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 kakkabī šīt 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 ).
DINGIR in FF.270

M82 G 1 FF i 10 [d A-nim] u [d I[NNIN]
  d A-nim INNIN
SV(1) – The conjunction “u” is lacking between the divine names Anu and Ištar in FF.

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

M84 A ii 4 FF i 11 GUB meš-zu
GUB-zu
OV – A has the plural marker MEŠ following the logogram GUB, zazzū. This is written without the plural marker MEŠ in FF.271

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

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

M87 G 3 FF i 13 [d] DAR.LUGAL
  [mul DAR.LUGAL
SV(1) – The preposition DINGIR is simply an orthographic variation.

M88 G 4 [d MAŠ
OV – The proper noun Ninurta ap-

270 According to CAD I/J 188 the name "le-e" refers to the constellation Haydes, the “Jaw of the Bull” (the “Bull” being the constellation Taurus). Other possible readings are “giš LI,” burāšu, meaning “juniper;” and giš lē’u, “writing board,” which appears as “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.
| H i 1 | u]rta | pears as a logogram in G. |
| FF i 14 | d Nin-urta |

M89  
| A ii 7 | d Iš-tar NIM.MA-tu₄ | OV – The divine title Ištar Elamatu is written syllabically in K. |
| K ii 1 | ]el-la-ma-tú |
| FF i 15 | d Iš-tar NIM.MA-tu₄ |

M90  
| A ii 8 | EN er-se-tu₄ | OV – The divine title bēl eršeti, appears as a logogram in G, K and FF. |
| G 6 | EN KI-t[ |
| H i 3 | }tu₄ |
| K ii 2 | EN KI[ |
| FF i 16 | EN KI-t[ |

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

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

M97  
| A ii 15 | KÚR. KÚR-ir | SV(1) – The emphatic particle “ma” |

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.
J i 6  ]  K ii 8  ]
K ii 9  KÚR. KÚR-ir-ma

is lacking in A.

M98 A ii 16  MU.NI
K ii 9  MU-šú
OV – A writes the possessive pronominal 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 liū, while K has the full spelling.

M100 A ii 16  d UTU.È
J i 7  d UTU.È
K ii 9  d UTU.È.A
OV – The full composite logogram for šūt 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 liū, while K has the full spelling.

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

M103 A ii 19  MUL meš
J i 10  meš
K ii 11  MJUL
OV – The plural kakkapū 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  [MJU]L
SV(1) – The preposition DIŠ is lacking in A and AA.

M106 A ii 23  d A.È
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>Source</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AA ii 8</td>
<td>DUMU[</td>
<td>DINGIR is lacking from the proper noun Mār-biti in AA.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M107 A ii 24</td>
<td>lib-bi-šū</td>
<td>OV – The full spelling in A is shortened in K and AA.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K ii 14</td>
<td>lib-šu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA ii 9</td>
<td>lib-šu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M108 A ii 25</td>
<td>DIŠ 2 MUL</td>
<td>SV(1) – The preposition determinative DIŠ is lacking in Y.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C ii 6</td>
<td>DIŠ 2 MUL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X ii 7</td>
<td>DIŠ 2 MUL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y 6</td>
<td>2 MUL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA ii 10</td>
<td>DIŠ 2 MUL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M109 A ii 25</td>
<td>GUB me-zu</td>
<td>OV – The plural verb izzazzū is written without the plural marker MEŠ in X and AA.⁵⁷⁷</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X ii 7</td>
<td>GUB-zu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA ii 10</td>
<td>GUB-zu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M110 A ii 25</td>
<td>Sullat u ḫaniš</td>
<td>SV(1) – AA lacks the conjunction between the proper nouns Sullat and ḫaniš.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J i 16</td>
<td>Sullat u ḫaniš</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA ii 10</td>
<td>Sullat ḫaniš</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M111 A ii 27</td>
<td>ŠÚ meš</td>
<td>OV(l) – A has the sign MEŠ added to the logogram ŠÚ, irabbi, “it sets.” This is lacking in J and AA which vary in their final vowel.⁵⁷⁸</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J i 17</td>
<td>ŠÚ-ū</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA ii 12</td>
<td>ŠÚ-bi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M112 A ii 31</td>
<td>GUB meš-zu</td>
<td>OV – The verb izzazzū is written without the plural marker MEŠ in AA.⁵⁷⁹</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H ii 1</td>
<td>GU]B meš</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA ii 16</td>
<td>GUB-zu</td>
<td></td>
<td></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 izzazzū, “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 irtanabbi, “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 even though it lacks the plural marker MEŠ: “2 kakkbū (DIŠ 2 MUL) ša ina ziqit Zuqaqipí izzazzū (GUB-zu),” “two stars that are positioned in the tail of the Scorpion.”
| M113 A ii 32 | MUL Y 12 | SV(1) – Difference in number.  
| AA ii 17 | MUL meš |  

| M114 A ii 33 | EGIS-šu-nu AA ii 17 | Not Counted – The sign MEŠ is uncertain in AA.  
| MUL | EGIS meš (?)-šu-nu |  

| M115 A ii 34 | MÁ.GUR₸ u mul SUḪUR.MÂŠ₺ u | SV(1) – The conjunction between the proper nouns Makurru and Suḫurmašu is lacking in AA.  
| AA ii 18 | MÁ.GUR₸ u |  

| M116 A ii 40 | mul MAŠ.TAB.BA.GAL.GAL H ii 9 | SV(1) – The conjunction is lacking between the proper nouns Sidallu and Tūʿamū rabiṭu in GG.  
| GG ii 2 | mul MAŠ.TAB.BA.GAL |  

| M117 A ii 41 | mul MAŠ.TAB.BA.TUR.TUR u mul AL.LUL H ii 10 | SV(1) – The conjunction between the proper names Tūʿamū sēhrītu and Alluttu is lacking in GG.  
| GG ii 3 | mul MAŠ.TAB.BA.TUR.TUR u |  

| M118 A ii 42 | MUŠ u mul H ii 11 | Not Counted – The apparently lacking conjunction in GG is possibly obscured by damage.  
| M 2 | MUŠ u |  
| GG ii 4 | MUS₺ |  

---

280 AA refers to Pabilsag (the constellation Sagittarius) in the plural against the singular form in A. In addition to the subject “MUL meš,” kakkabû, 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.

281 The plural marker in AA “... šá EGIS meš-šu-nu,” ša arkišunu, “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 EGIS-šu-nu,” ša arkišunu, “which is after them.” However, the sign MEŠ in AA is recorded as uncertain in H. Hunger and D. Pingree, *AfO* 24, 39, so is not counted here.

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.

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, *AfO* 24, pl. XXI.
M119  A ii 43  u₄-me  H ii 12  u₄-mi
OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.²⁸⁴

M120  A ii 44  UD.5.KAM  M 4  UD.15.KAM  N ii 3  UD.15.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.

M121  A ii 44  IGI me  H ii 13  IGI me³
OV – The plural marker appears as the sign ME in A.

M122  A ii 45  IGI me  H ii 14  IGI me³
OV – The plural marker appears as the sign ME in A.

M123  A ii 47  UD.25  E ii 1  UD.25.KAM  H ii 16  UD.25.KAM  N ii 7  UD.25.KAM
SV(1) – The postposition determinative for ordinal numbers KAM is lacking in A.

M124  E ii 2  UD.15.KAM  H ii 17  UD.5.KAM  M 9  UD.15[  N ii 8  UD.15.KAM
HV – H has the 5th day of Tašrīti, recorded as the 15th day in E, M and N.

M125  E ii 3  u₄mul UR.KU  H ii 18  ù₄mul UR.KU  M 10  u₄mul UR.KU  N ii 9  u₄mul UR.KU
OV – H spells the conjunction with the sign Ù.

M126  E ii 3  IGI me²-ma  H ii 18  IGI me²-m[a]  M 10  IGI me²-ma  N ii 9  IGI.LÁ-ma
OV – E and M have the plural marker written with the sign ME, against MEŠ in H. N has the full composite logogram IGI.LÁ, ṣamaru, here probably innammarū, “they are

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.
M127  E ii 3  3 MA.NA  Not Counted – E.NA in N is taken as a misreading for MA.NA.  
H ii 19  3 MA.NA  
M 10  3 MA.NA  
N ii 9  3 E.NA  

M128  E ii 3  u₄-mi  OV(1) – Possible difference in pronunciation.  
H ii 19  u₄-mi  
N ii 9  u₄-m[u  
V 2  m]u  

M129  E ii 4  UD.5.KAM  HV – E, H and GG record the first visibility of Zuqaqīpu, Scorpius, on the 5th day of Araḫsammu, recorded as the 15th day in M and N.  
H ii 20  UD.5.KAM  
M 11  UD.15.KAM  
N ii 10  UD.15.KAM  
GG ii 2'  UD.5.KAM  

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 ūmū, “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 astromythologische Untersuchungen (2 vols.; Münster in Westfalen: Aschedorffsche 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 ūmi, “day,” against nominative ūmu in N and V. The genitive noun is required by the context: maṣṣartu 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  HV – L records the first visibility of
E ii 5   UD.15.KAM  Enzu, “the She-Goat,” on the 25\textsuperscript{th} day
H ii 21  UD.15.KAM  of Araḫsamnu, recorded as the 15\textsuperscript{th}
L iii 1  UD.25.KAM  day in the other sources.
M 12    UD.15.KAM
GG ii 3' UD.15.KAM

M131  A iii 4  mul ÛZ u mul[  SV(1) – The conjunction is lacking
E ii 5  mul ÛZ u mul GABA.GÍR.TAB between the proper nouns in GG.
H ii 21  mul ÛZ u mul GABA.GÍR.TAB
M 12    mul ÛZ u mul[ V 4    Û]Z u mul GABA.GÍR.T[AB
GG ii 3' mul ÛZ mul GA[BA.GÍR.TAB

M132  A iii 5  mul UD.KA.DUḪ.A  SV(1) – L has the preposition
E ii 6  mul UD.KA.DUḪ.A  minative DINGIR preceding the con-
H ii 22  mul UD.KA.DUḪ.A  stellation name Nimru, “the Panther.”
L iii 2  d UD.K[A  The other sources use the preposition
M 13    mul UD.KA.DUḪ.A  determinative MUL, kakkabu.\textsuperscript{288}
GG ii 4' mul UD.KA.DUḪ.A

M133  A iii 6  u mul Pabilsag  SV(1) – The conjunction preceding
E ii 7  u mul Pabilsag  the proper noun is lacking in GG.
H ii 22  u mul Pabilsag
M 14    u mul Pabilsag
GG ii 4' mul Pabilsag

M134  A iii 6  IGI meš  OV – The plural marker is written
E ii 7   IGI me with MEŠ in A, against ME in E.

M135  A iii 7  mul SIM.MAḪ mul ši-nu-nu-tu\textsubscript{4}  SV(1) – V has a conjunction between
E ii 8  mul SIM.MAḪ mul ši-nu-nu-tu\textsubscript{4}  the proper nouns, lacking in the other
H ii 23  mul SIM.MAḪ mul ši-nu-nu-tu\textsubscript{4}  sources.\textsuperscript{289}

\textsuperscript{288} The variant represents a stylistic variation rather than a hermeneutic one. Although the determinatives
DINGIR and MUL (\textit{ilu}, “god,” and \textit{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 constella-
tion Nimru. Indeed, the sign MUL is composed of three DINGIR signs, and the sign DINGIR originally
represented a star (see R. Labat, \textit{Manuel}, 48-49). This variant is therefore treated as a lexical interchange
and counted as SV(1).

\textsuperscript{289} This variant occurs in what appears to be a list of three names, SIM.MAḪ, Šīmānūtu, and IM.ŠEŠ. These
names probably all refer to the same constellation. Šīmānūtu, “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, šinūnutu, was a gloss for the first term, SIM.MAḪ.H.

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) meše, 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.
M139  A iii 8  m\mul KAK.SI.SÁ  OV – The conjunction appears as Ú in H, against U in the other sources.
    E ii 9  m\mul KAK.SI.SÁ
    H ii 24  ŋ\mul KAK.SI.SÁ
    L iii 4  m\mul KAK.SI.SÁ
    M 17  m\mul KAK.SI.SÁ

M140  A iii 8  m KAK.SI.SÁ  OV – The preposition determinative MUL is written as MÚL in L.
    E ii 9  m KAK.SI.SÁ
    H ii 24  m KAK.SI.SÁ
    L iii 4  m KAK.SI.SÁ
    M 17  m KAK.SI.SÁ

M141  A iii 8  li-la-a-ti  OV – E has a different spelling for īlâti, “evening.”
    E ii 9  li-lá-a-ti
    H ii 24  li-la-a-ti
    L iii 4  li-la-a[ ]
    GG ii 6' li-[l][a[ t]i]

M142  A iii 8  li-la-a-ti  OV(l) – M has the wrong case vowel for the genitive singular.292
    E ii 9  li-ł-a-a-ti
    H ii 24  li-la-a-ti
    M 17  l[ì ]tú
    GG ii 6' li-[l][a[ t]i]

M143  A iii 9  IGI.LÁ-ma  SV(1) – The verb IGI, innammaru, in E is marked as plural, against the singular verb in A and GG.293
    E ii 9  IGI må-me
    GG ii 6' IGI-ma

M144  A iii 9  IGI.LÁ-ma  OV – A has the full composite logo-gram for innammaru, against the short form in GG.294
    GG ii 6' IGI-ma

M145  A iii 9  u₄-me  OV(1) – Possible difference in pronunciation.295
    E ii 10  u₄-mi

292 M has nominative īlàtu, against genitive īlàti in the parallel sources. The full phrase reads: u Šukūdu ina īlàti 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 innammar between A and GG is counted in this instance.

295 See the comments in note above.
H ii 25

M 146 A iii 10 UD.5.KAM
E ii 11 UD.5.KAM
H ii 25 UD.5.KAM
M 20 UD.15.KAM
O ii 3 ]5.KAM
GG ii 7’ UD.5.KAM

HV – M records the first visibility of Ikû, “the Field,” and Lulîmu, “the Stag,” on the 15th day of Šaḇaṭu, recorded as the 5th day in the other sources.

M 147 A iii 10 mul GU.LA mul AŠ.IKU u mul lu-lim
E ii 11 mul GU.LA mul AŠ.IKU u mul lu-lim
H ii 26 mul GU.LA mul AŠ.IKU u mul lu-lim
M 20 mul AŠ.IKU mul [I]u-lim
O ii 3 mul GU.LA mul AŠ.IKU u mu[l]u
V 9 mul GU.LA mul AŠ.IKU u mu[l]
GG ii 7’ mul GU.LA mul AŠ.IKU u mul lu-lim

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

M 148 A iii 10 mul GU.LA mul AŠ.IKU u mul lu-lim
E ii 11 mul GU.LA mul AŠ.IKU u mul lu-lim
H ii 26 mul GU.LA mul AŠ.IKU u mul lu-lim
M 20 mul AŠ.IKU mul [I]u-lim
O ii 3 mul GU.LA mul AŠ.IKU u mu[l]u
V 9 mul GU.LA mul AŠ.IKU u mu[l]
GG ii 7’ mul GU.LA mul AŠ.IKU u mul lu-lim

SV(1) – M lacks the conjunction between the proper nouns mul AŠ.IKU, Ikû, “the Field,” and mul lu-lim, Lulîm, “the Stag.”

M 149 A iii 10 IGI meš
E ii 11 IGI me
H ii 26 IGI meš
GG ii 7’ IGI me

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

M 150 A iii 11 mul A-nu-ni-t[u]
E ii 12 mul A-nu-ni-t[u]
H ii 27 mul A-nu-ni-t[u]
M 21 mul A-nu-[n]i-t[u]
O ii 4 mul A-nu-ni-t[u]
V 10 mul A-nu-ni-t[u]
GG ii 8’ mul A-nu-ni-t[u]

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  ù
   V 11  u

M152  A iii 12  IGI.LÁ me  OV – A and GG spell innammarū, “it is seen,” with the full composite logogram, against the short form in E and H.²⁹⁶
   E ii 13  IGI mc
   H ii 28  IGI meš
   GG ii 9' IGI.LÁ me

M153  A iii 12  IGI.LÁ me  SV(1) – O has the singular verb form, innammaru, against the plural form, innammarū, in the other sources.²⁹⁷
   E ii 13  IGI me
   H ii 28  IGI meš
   O ii 5  IGI.LÁ
   GG ii 9' IGI.LÁ me

M154  A iii 13  KUR-ma  OV – V has a phonetic complement attached to the verb inappa”, “they (the stars) will rise,” lacking in the other sources.²⁹⁸
   E ii 14  KUR-ma
   H iii 1  KUR-ma
   O ii 6  KUR-ma
   V 12  KUJR-ḥa-ma

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 Addari UD 15 Nūnu u šību innammarā, “on the 15th day of Addari, 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, innammarā, 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 inappahma. 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 inappahšama rather than inappahšama, 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 inappahšinma 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 GÍ.R.TAB  
E ii 14  mul GÍ.R.TAB  
H iii 1  mul GÍ.R.TAB  
O ii 6  mul GÍ.R.TAB  
V 12  mül [GÍ]R.TAB  

OV – The preposition determinative MUL is written as MÚL in V.

M156  A iii 14  KUR-ma  
E ii 15  KUR-ma  
H iii 2  KUR-ma  
O ii 7  KUR-ma  
V 13  "]a-ma  

OV – V has a phonetic complement attached to the verb *inappa⁴*, lacking in the other sources.

M157  A iii 14  MUL.MUL  
E ii 15  MUL.MUL  
H iii 2  MUL.MUL  
O ii 7  MUL.MUL  
V 13  MÚL.MÚ[L  

OV – V spells *kakkabû*, “stars (Pleiades),” with the sign MÚL, against MUL in the other sources.

M158  A iii 17  mul d MUŠ  
E ii 18  mul MUŠ  
H iii 5  mul MUŠ  
O ii 10  mul MUŠ  

OV – The proper noun *Nira⁵*, “the Snake,” is written with the preposition determinative DINGIR in A, lacking in the other sources.

M159  A iii 17  KUR me-ma  
E ii 18  KUR meš-ma  

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

M160  A iii 17  KUR me-ma  
E ii 18  KUR meš-ma  
O ii 10  KUR-nim me-ma  

OV(I) – Difference in grammatical form.²⁹⁹

M161  A iii 18  mul GU.LA u mul TIš mušen  
E ii 19  G]U.LA u mul TIš mušen  
H iii 6  mul GU.LA u[  
O ii 11  mul GU.LA ü mul TIš[  

OV – The conjunction is written with the sign Ü in O, against U in the other sources.

M162  A iii 19  KUR me-ma  
E ii 20  KUR meš-ma  
H iii 7  KUR meš-ma  

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

²⁹⁹ O has a ventive suffix attached to the verb *inappaḫûnimma*, lacking in A and E. The verb KUR me-ma, *inappaḫûma*, “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-ha-ma  
O ii 14 KUR-ma  

OV – H has a phonetic complement attached to the verb, inappalyma, 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 d 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.DUH.A  
J ii 1 mul UD.KA.DUH.A  
N iii 1 mül UD.KA.DUH.A  
DD r.2 mül[  

OV – The preposition determinative is written as MÚL 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 Ū, against U in the other
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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M183</td>
<td>A iii 32</td>
<td>en.te.na.bar.hum mul d muš u mul en[ ] EN.TE.EN.NA.BAR.H[UM]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H iii 19</td>
<td>en</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N iii 3</td>
<td>en.te.en.na.bar.h[UM]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td>proper nouns Nira&quot; and Ḥabaširānu is lacking in N.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M184</td>
<td>A iii 32</td>
<td>en.te.na.bar.hum mul d en.te.en.na.bar.h[UM]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N iii 3</td>
<td>en.te.en.na.bar.h[UM]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td>OV – N has an extra sign in the proper noun Ḥabaširānu. 301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M185</td>
<td>A iii 33</td>
<td>ku₆ mul d ku₆</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J ii 5</td>
<td>ku₆</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N iii 4</td>
<td>ku₆</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DD r.5</td>
<td>]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td>OV – The preposition determinative is written as MÚL in N, against MUL in A and H.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M186</td>
<td>A iii 33</td>
<td>ku₆ u mul šu.gi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J ii 5</td>
<td>ku₆ u mul šu.gi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N iii 4</td>
<td>ku₆ mul šu.gi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td>SV(1) – The conjunction between the proper nouns Nūnu and Sību is lacking in N.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M187</td>
<td>A iii 33</td>
<td>šu.gi mul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J ii 5</td>
<td>šu.gi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N iii 4</td>
<td>šu.gi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td>OV – The preposition determinative is written as MÚL in N, against MUL in the other sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M188</td>
<td>J ii 5</td>
<td>kur me-n[im</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DD r.5</td>
<td>kur meš-nim[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td>OV – The plural marker is written as ME in J against MEŠ in DD.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

301 The composite logogram denoting this constellation is usually mul en.te.na.bar.hum (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>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| A iii 33 | KUR $\text{meš} \cdot \text{ma}$ | OV(l) – A and H lack the ventive suffix present in the other sources.  

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-ḫa-nim-ma” might therefore be read as inappahūnimma, where the phonetic complement in N does not directly reflect the vowel. In fact, N always writes the verb inappah 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.

| J ii 5 | KUR $\text{meš} \cdot \text{n}[\text{im}]$ |  |
|--------|------|------|-------|
| N iii 4 | KUR-ḫa-nim[ ] |  |
| DD r.5 | KUR $\text{meš} \cdot \text{n}[\text{im}]$ |  |
| J ii 5 | KUR $\text{meš} \cdot \text{n}[\text{im}]$ | OV – The verb inappahūnimma is written without the plural marker in N. |
| N iii 4 | KUR-ḫa-nim[ ] |  |
| DD r.5 | KUR $\text{meš} \cdot \text{n}[\text{im}]$ |  |
| A iii 33 | $\text{mul}$ AB.SÍN | OV – The preposition determinative is written as MÚL in N, against MUL in the other sources. |
| H iii 20 | $\text{mul}$ AB.SÍN |  |
| N iii 4 | $\text{mul}$ AB.SÍN |  |
| J ii 6 | KUR-ḫa | OV – A lacks the phonetic complement. |
| N iii 5 | KUR-ḫa |  |
| A iii 34 | KUR | OV – A lacks the phonetic complement. |
| J ii 6 | KUR-ḫa |  |
| N iii 5 | KUR-ḫa |  |
| A iii 34 | $\text{mul}$ KAK.SI.SÁ | OV – The preposition determinative is written as MÚL in N, against MUL in the other sources. |
| J ii 6 | $\text{mul}$ KAK.SI.SÁ |  |
| N iii 5 | $\text{mul}$ KAK.SI.SÁ |  |
| DD r.6 | $\text{mul}$ KAK.SI.SÁ |  |
| A iii 34 | UD $\text{meš}$ | OV – N has the phonetic complement “-mu” for ʿumū, “days,” written with the plural marker MEŠ in A and H.  

303 Plural forms are always written without the sign MEŠ in N. See notes  and  above. |
| H iii 21 | UD $\text{meš}$ |  |
| N iii 5 | UD-$\text{mu}$ |  |
| J ii 7 | KUR-ḫa | OV – A lacks the phonetic complement. |
| N iii 6 | KUR-ḫa |  |
| A iii 35 | $\text{mul}$ KAK.SI.SÁ | OV – The preposition determinative |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
is written as MÚL in N, against MUL in A and J.

OV – A lacks the phonetic complement.

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

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 N, against MUL in the other sources.

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.
M208 A iii 39  KUR  OV – A and FF lack the phonetic complement.
   J ii 11  KUR-ḫa
   FF ii 3  KUR

M209 A iii 39  múl ÙZ  OV – The preposition determinative is written as MÚL in N, against MUL in the other sources.
   J ii 11  múl ÙZ
   N iii 10  múl ÙZ
   FF ii 3  múl [ ]

M210 A iii 39  múl UD.KA.DUḪ.A  OV(l) – The proper noun Nimri, “the Panther,” is written without the final sign in W.³⁰⁴
   W 6  ]UD.KA.DUḪ

M211 A iii 40  KUR  OV – A and FF lack the phonetic complement.
   J ii 12  KUR-ḫa
   FF ii 4  KUR

M212 A iii 41  KUR  OV – A and FF lack the phonetic complement.
   J ii 13  KUR-ḫa
   FF ii 5  KUR

M213 A iii 41  20 UD meš  HV – Difference in cardinal number.³⁰⁵
   J ii 13  10 U[D

M214 A iii 41  múl AŠ.IKU  OV – The preposition determinative is written as MÚL in W, against MUL in A.
   W 8  múl AŠ.IKU

M215 A iii 42  KUR  OV – A and FF lack the phonetic complement.
   J ii 14  KUR-ḫa
   FF ii 6  KUR

M216 A iii 42  múl KU₆  OV – The preposition determinative is written as MÚL in W against MUL in A.
   W 9  múl KU₆

³⁰⁴ 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 ūmū ana napāḫi ša Nimri, “30 days to the rising of the Panther.” See also variant M277 and note below.

³⁰⁵ 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  
J ii 15 KUR-la  
FF ii 7 KUR  

OV – A and FF lack the phonetic complement.

M218 A iii 43 mul GÂM  
W 10 mul GÂM  

OV – The preposition determinative is written as MÚL in W, against MUL in A.

M219 A iii 44 KUR  
J ii 16 KUR-la  
FF ii 8 KUR  

OV – A and FF lack the phonetic complement.

M220 A iii 44 MUL.MUL  
K iii 1 M[ÚL  
W 11 MÚL.MÚL  

OV – The plural is written as MUL.MÜL in K and W, against MUL.MUL in A.

M221 A iii 45 KUR  
J ii 17 KUR-la  
FF ii 9 KUR  

OV – A and FF lack the phonetic complement.

M222 A iii 45 mul[  
K iii 2 mul GU₄₂₄₄ (N.N)A  
W 12 mul GU₄₂₄₄AN.NA  

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

M223 A iii 46 KUR  
J ii 18 KUR-la  
FF ii 10 KUR  

OV – A and FF lack the phonetic complement.

M224 A iii 46 UD meš  
K iii 3 m[u  
FF ii 10 UD meš  

OV – K has a phonetic complement for ūmû, written with the plural marker MEŠ in A and FF.³₀⁶

M225 A iii 46 mul[  
K iii 3 mul SIPA.ZI.AN.NA  
W 13 mul SIPA  

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

M226 K iii 3 mul SIPA.ZI.AN.NA  
W 13 mul SIPA  

SV(2) – K has an expansive plus.³₀⁷

³₀⁶ See the comments in note above relating to the writing of ūmû 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 mulSIPA, Šîdallî or Šîtaddaru, “the Shepherd,” is written in full form in K, mul-SIPA.ZI.AN.NA, “the True Shepherd of Anu.”
M227  A iii 47  KUR  
      J ii 19  KUR-ḫa  
          OV – A lacks the phonetic complement.

M228  A iii 47  UD meš  
      K iii 4  m|[u  
      FF ii 11 UD meš  
          OV – K has a phonetic complement for ūmû, written with the plural marker MEŠ in A and FF.

M229  A iii 48  KUR  
      J ii 20  KUR-ḫa  
          OV – A lacks the phonetic complement.

M230  A iii 48  UD meš  
      K iii 5  m|[u  
      FF ii 12 UD meš  
          OV – K has a phonetic complement for ūmû, written with the plural marker MEŠ in A and FF.

M231  K iii 5 múl BAN  
      JJ ii 1 mu J| BAN  
          OV – The preposition determinative is written as MUL in K, against MUL in JJ.

M232  A iii 49 šèr-t[i  
      K iii 6 š|er-tû  
          OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation or grammatical form.308

M233  A iii 50 li-la-a-t[i  
      K iii 7 li-la-a-tû  
          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 kakkabû ina šerti ana múši īrrubiû; ūmu 1 UŠ.TA.ÀM kakkabû ina lîlîti ana ūmi usṣûnî, “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|er-tû” 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M234</th>
<th>K iii 7</th>
<th>u₄-me</th>
<th>OV(1) – Possible difference in pronunciation.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JJ iii 3</td>
<td>m[i]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M235</th>
<th>A iv 1</th>
<th>MUL</th>
<th>SV(1) – The preposition determinative DIŠ is lacking in A.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J iii 3</td>
<td>DIŠ MUL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M236</th>
<th>A iv 1</th>
<th>DIŠ MUL meš šá ziq-pi</th>
<th>SV(1) – The relative pronoun is lacking in J.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J iii 3</td>
<td>DIŠ MUL meš ziq-pi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M237</th>
<th>A iv 2</th>
<th>šá</th>
<th>Not Counted – Though clearly not ŠÁ, the sign in Q is broken and therefore ultimately uncertain.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J iii 4</td>
<td>šā</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q iii 1</td>
<td>$[a (?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M238</th>
<th>A iv 2</th>
<th>GUB meš-ma</th>
<th>SV(1) – Difference in number.³¹⁰</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K iii 8</td>
<td>]az-ma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JJ ii 5</td>
<td>a]z-ma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M239</th>
<th>J iii 4</th>
<th>ŠÚ-bi</th>
<th>OV – K lacks the phonetic complement.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K iii 8</td>
<td>ŠÚ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

³¹⁰ K and JJ have a singular verb izzazzuma, “it is positioned,” against the plural verb izzazzūma 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: kakkabū ziqpi ša ina ḫarrān šīt Enlil ina ṣīval šāmē ina melēret irti ša naṣir šāmē izzazzūma mūṣa napāḫa u rabā ša kakkabū ina libbišunu immara, “The ziqpu 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 izzazzūma, written with the plural marker in A but without it in K and JJ, appears to refer to the subject kakkabū ziqpi, “the ziqpu 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, kakkabū ziqpi, 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 izzazzūma. However, if the noun plus possessive pronominal suffix libbišunu refers to something other than the ziqpu stars (such as šāmē, “the heavens”) then the reading of a singular verb in K and JJ is quite feasible.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Column</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M240</td>
<td>A iv 3</td>
<td>MUL&lt;sup&gt;meš&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>J iii 5</td>
<td>MUL&lt;sup&gt;meš&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>SV(1) – Difference in number. 311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K iii 9</td>
<td>MUL</td>
<td>Q iii 2</td>
<td>MUL&lt;sup&gt;meš&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M241</td>
<td>A iv 3</td>
<td>im-ma-r[u</td>
<td>K iii 9</td>
<td>IGI-mar</td>
<td>OV – A and J write the verb immaru, “he sees,” syllabically against the logographic form plus phonetic complement in K.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JJ ii 6</td>
<td>m[a-ru</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M242</td>
<td>A iv 4</td>
<td>mul ŠU.PA</td>
<td>J iii 6</td>
<td>DIŠ mul ŠU.PA</td>
<td>SV(1) – The preposition determinative DIŠ is lacking in A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M243</td>
<td>A iv 4</td>
<td>mul DINGIR.GUB.BA&lt;sup&gt;meš&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>K iii 10</td>
<td>múl DINGIR.GUB.BA&lt;sup&gt;meš&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>OV – The preposition determinative is written as MÚL in K, against MUL in A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M244</td>
<td>A iv 4</td>
<td>mul UR.KU</td>
<td>K iii 10</td>
<td>múl UR.KU</td>
<td>OV – The preposition determinative is written as MÚL in K, against MUL in A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K iii 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Q iii 3</td>
<td>UR.KU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M245</td>
<td>A iv 5</td>
<td>mul ŪZ</td>
<td>J iii 7</td>
<td>mul ŪZ</td>
<td>OV – The preposition determinative is written as MÚL in K against MUL in the other sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K iii 10</td>
<td>mul ŪZ</td>
<td>L iv 1</td>
<td>mul ŪZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q iii 4</td>
<td>mul ŪZ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M246</td>
<td>A iv 5</td>
<td>mul Lu-lim</td>
<td>K iii 11</td>
<td>mul Lu-lim</td>
<td>OV – The preposition determinative is written as MÚL in K and X, against MUL in A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X iii 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>múl&lt;sup&gt;l&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M247</td>
<td>A iv 5</td>
<td>mul ŠU.GI</td>
<td>K iii 11</td>
<td>mul ŠU.GI</td>
<td>OV – The preposition determinative is written as MÚL in K, against MUL in A and Q.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q iii 5</td>
<td>mul ŠU.GI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

311 K has the singular noun kakkabu, written as the plural kakkabû 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 | mul GÂM | OV – The preposition determinative is written as MÚL in K, against MUL in A and Q. |
|      | K iii 11 | múl GÂM |
|      | Q iii 5 | múl | |
| M250 | A iv 6 | mul MAŠ.TAB.BA.GAL.GAL | OV – The preposition determinative is written as MÚL in K, against MUL in A and J. |
|      | J iii 8 | mul MAŠ.TAB.BA.GAL.GAL |
|      | K iii 11 | múl MAŠ.TAB.BA.GAL.GAL |
| M251 | A iv 6 | mul E₄-ru₆ | OV – The preposition determinative is written as MÚL in K and X, against MUL in A and Q. |
|      | K iii 12 | múl E₄-ru₆ |
|      | Q iii 7 | mul E₄-ru₆ |
|      | X iii 2 | múl |
| M252 | A iv 6 | u mul Ḥé-gál-a-a | SV(1) – The conjunction between the last two list items is lacking in K. |
|      | K iii 11 | múl Ḥé-gál-la-a-a |
| M253 | A iv 6 | mul Ḥé-gál-a-a | OV – The preposition determinative is written as MÚL in K, against MUL in A. |
|      | K iii 11 | múl Ḥé-gál-la-a-a |
| M254 | A iv 6 | mul Ḥé-gál-a-a | OV – A has the proper noun Ḥegalayu, “the Abundant One,” written without the sign LA against the spelling in K.³¹² |
|      | K iii 11 | múl Ḥé-gál-la-a-a |
| M255 | A iv 7 | PAP an-nu-tu | SV(1) – The preposition determinative DIŠ is lacking in A. |
|      | J iii 9 | PAP DIŠ an-nu-tu₄ |
| M256 | A iv 7 | an-nu-tu | OV – The final syllable of annûtu, “those,” is written with the sign TU in A, against TU₄ in J. |
|      | J iii 9 | an-nu-tu₄ |
| M257 | A iv 7 | MUL meš ša ziq-pi | SV(1) – The noun kakkabû is written as singular in X, against the plural in the other sources.³¹³ |
|      | J iii 9 | MUL meš ziq-pi |
|      | Q iii 8 | MUL meš ša ziq-pi |
|      | X iii 3 | MUL ziq-pi |

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

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 kakkabû or an unmarked plural kakkabû. 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Column</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M258</td>
<td>A iv 7</td>
<td>MUL ṣa ziq-pi</td>
<td>SV(1) – The relative particle is lacking in J and X.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J iii 9</td>
<td>MUL ziq-pi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q iii 8</td>
<td>MUL ṣa ziq-pi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X iii 3</td>
<td>MUL ziq-pi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M259</td>
<td>A iv 8</td>
<td>ina IGI-it</td>
<td>SV(1) – The preposition <em>ina</em> is lacking in Q.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J iii 10</td>
<td>ina IGI-it</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q iii 9</td>
<td>IGI-it</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M260</td>
<td>A iv 8</td>
<td>ina IGI-it GABA-ka GUB meš-ma</td>
<td>SV(2) – X has a clarifying plus, lacking in the other sources. (^{314})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J iii 10</td>
<td>ina IGI-it GABA-ka GUB meš-ma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q iii 9</td>
<td>IGI-it GABA-ka iz-za-zu[</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X iii 4</td>
<td>ti šá EN.NUN AN-e ]GUB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M261</td>
<td>A iv 8</td>
<td>GUB meš-ma</td>
<td>OV – The plural marker is written as ME in A against MEŠ in J. (^{315})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J iii 10</td>
<td>GUB meš-ma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M262</td>
<td>A iv 8</td>
<td>GUB meš-ma</td>
<td>OV – The verb <em>izzazzū</em> is written logographically in A and J against the syllabic spelling in Q.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J iii 10</td>
<td>GUB meš-ma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q iii 9</td>
<td>iz-za-zu[</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M263</td>
<td>A iv 8-9</td>
<td>GI₆ SAR ṣá MUL meš</td>
<td>SV(3) – The sequence in Q varies from the sequence in A and J. (^{316})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J iii 11</td>
<td>ṣá MUL meš</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q iii 10</td>
<td>ṣá MUL meš</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M264</td>
<td>A iv 9</td>
<td>MUL meš</td>
<td>OV – The plural marker is written with the sign MEŠ in A against ME in J.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J iii 11</td>
<td>MUL meš</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^{314}\) A, J and Q all read *ina meḫret irtika izzazzūma*, “they are positioned opposite your breast,” against the reading in X *meḫret ša naṣīr 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 niphāti u rībī ša kakkašī ...*, “the nightly rising and setting of the stars.”
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M265 A iv 10 zi-iq-pa OV(l) – J and X have the wrong case vowel for the accusative singular.317
J iii 12 ziq-pi
X iii 6 ziq-pi

M266 A iv 10 a-ma-ri-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.
J iii 12 IGI-k[a
Q iii 11 a-ma-ri-ka
X iii 6 IGI-ka

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

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

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

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

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

The reading in the accusative case seems correct in the context: šumma ziqpa ana amärka, “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 šamê (ina) meḫret 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.”
The noun belongs to the phrase *kinṣu 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.

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 *izzazma*. 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.

The final sign ‘A’ is a possible Sumerian genitive ending. The noun is part of the construction “a-si-du ša a UD.KA.DUḪ(.A),” “asīdu 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  
R 10  u[m-mu-lu-tú  
T iv 9  m₇₉ um-mu-lu-tú  
AA iii 3  MUL né-b[u

HV – A and AA record *kakkabu nebu,* “the bright star,” as visible on the 15th of *Du’uzu,* against T and R which record *kakkâbu ummulûtu,* “the faint stars,” as visible on that date.322

M280  A iv 21  mul šu.GI  
O iii 5  m₇₉ šu.GI  
R 10  mul\[  
T iv 9  mul\[  

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

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

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

M282  A iv 22  UD.15.KAM  
O iii 7  UD.15[  
AA iii 5  UD.5.KAM

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

M283  A iv 22  MUL m₇₉ um-mu-lu-tu₄  
AA iii 5  MUL um-mu[  

SV(1) – A has a plural noun, *kakkabû ummulûtu,* “the faint stars,” against a singular noun in AA.324

322 A and AA read: *ina Du’ûzu UD 15 kakkabu nebu ša Šîbi ina qabal šamê ... ina Abi UD 15 kakkabû ummulûtu ša Šîbi ina qabal šamê,* “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’ûzu UD 15 kakkabu ummulûtu ša Šîbi ina qabal šamê ... ina Abi UD 15 kakkabu nebu ša Šîbi ina qabal šamê,* “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 zîqpu 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 m₇₉” in AA ii 17.
M284 A iv 22 MUL meš um-mu-lu-tu₄
O iii 7 ]ti
T iv 11 n][é-bu-ú
AA iii 5 MUL um-mu[

HV – A, O and AA record kakkabū ummulūtu, “the faint stars,” as visible on the 5th or 15th of Abu against T which records kakkabu nebû, “the bright star,” as visible on that date.325

M285 A iv 23 MIN
O iii 7 ina MURUB₄ AN-e

SV(2) – A writes Wiederholungszeichen against the full clause in O.326

M286 A iv 23 MIN
O 8 ilt GABA-ka G[UB
T iv 12 ]G]UB-ma
AA iii 6 KI.MIN

SV(2) – A writes Wiederholungszeichen against the full clause in O.327

M287 A iv 23 MIN
AA iii 6 KI.MIN

OV – A writes the sign MIN to signify Wiederholungszeichen against KI.MIN in AA.

M288 A iv 24 mul MAŠ.TAB.BA.GAL.GAL
O iii 9 mul MAŠ.TAB.BA.GAL.GAL
T iv 13 ]TAB.BA.GAL.GAL.LA

OV – A and O have the short spelling for Tūʾamū rabûtu, “the Great Twins,” against the longer spelling in T.328

M289 A iv 24 MIN
O iii 9 ina MURUB₄ AN-e

SV(2) – A writes Wiederholungszeichen against the full clause in O.329

M290 A iv 24 MIN
O iii 10 ilt GABA-ka GUB-ma

SV(2) – A writes Wiederholungszeichen against the full clause in O.

M291 A iv 24 mul ŠU.PA u mul NUN ki
O iii 10 mul ŠU.PA u mul NUN ki
AA iii 8 ŠJU.PA mul NUN ki

SV(1) – AA lacks the conjunction between the proper nouns ŠU.PA and Eridu.

M292 A iv 24 KUR meš-ni
O iii 10 KUR me-ni
T iv 14 MUR me[ı

OV – The plural marker is written with the sign ME in O and T against MEŠ in A.

325 See the comments above, note .
326 O has ina qabal šamē, “in the middle of the sky.”
327 O and T have meḥret irtika i̯azzāmā, “they are positioned opposite your breast.” More accurately, the verb in T is i̯azzzzuma, “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>Reference</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M293 A iv 25 MIN O iii 11 ina MURUB₄ AN-e</td>
<td>SV(2) – A writes Wiederholungszeichen against the full clause in O.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M294 A iv 25 MIN O iii 12 GA]BA-ka GUB-ma</td>
<td>SV(2) – A writes Wiederholungszeichen against the full clause in O.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M295 A iv 26 MIN O iii 13 ina MURUB₄</td>
<td>SV(2) – A and T write Wiederholungszeichen against the full clause in O.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M296 A iv 26 MIN O iii 14 [ ] GUB-ma T iv 17 MIN</td>
<td>SV(2) – A and T write Wiederholungszeichen against the full clause in O.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M297 A iv 29 MIN E iii 4 IGI-it GABA</td>
<td>SV(2) – A writes Wiederholungszeichen against the full clause in E.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M298 A iv 30 MIN E iii 6 IGI-it[</td>
<td>SV(2) – A writes Wiederholungszeichen against the full clause in E.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M299 E iii 7 DIN GIR meš F r.3 MUL m[eš</td>
<td>SV(1) – E has ilāni, “the gods,” against kakkabū, “the stars,” in F.³³⁰</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M300 A iv 31 i-na E iii 7 ina</td>
<td>OV – A has the preposition ina, “in,” written syllabically against the logographic form in E.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M301 E iii 14 an-nu-tu₄ F r.11 an-nu-t[u</td>
<td>OV – The final syllable of annûtu, “those,” is written with the sign TU in F against TU₄ in E.³³¹</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

³³⁰ There is no apparent difference in meaning here as both sources refer to objects that ina ɨḥrān Sin ız-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

\[\text{See note above, and the reference there.}\]
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, kakkabū, “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 mālGU.LA, “the Great One,” during the month of Šabaṭṭu. 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. 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. 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.

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.

337 For the original assignment of sigla to the fragments see R. Borger, 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, 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\textsuperscript{338}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>K10778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J\textsubscript{1}</td>
<td>K4223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J\textsubscript{2}</td>
<td>Sm1008a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>K10483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>K8905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P\textsubscript{1}</td>
<td>K8321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P\textsubscript{2}</td>
<td>Rm277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P\textsubscript{3}</td>
<td>DT81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P\textsubscript{4}</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>e\textsubscript{1}</td>
<td>Bu. 91-5-9, 221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e\textsubscript{2}</td>
<td>K11571</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description of the Sources\textsuperscript{339}

B, BM34914

The script is Neo-Babylonian and the tablet is probably from Babylonia given the museum catalogue number.\textsuperscript{340} It is designated as Neo-Babylonian or Late Babylonian by

\textsuperscript{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.

\textsuperscript{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.\(^\text{341}\)

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 19\(^{\text{th}}\) century. The tablet was published by Bergmann and Falkenstein in 1953.\(^\text{342}\)

D, K10778

This is a Neo-Assyrian fragment from Kuyunjik, first published by Lassøe in 1950 from an earlier drawing made by F. Geers.\(^\text{343}\)

J\(_{1}\), K4223; J\(_{2}\), Sm1008a

These fragments belong to a Neo-Assyrian tablet from Kuyunjik first published by Meissner in 1908.\(^\text{344}\) From the catalogue designation ‘Sm’ it can be assumed that these fragments were discovered in the Southwest Palace.\(^\text{345}\)

---

\(^{340}\) 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.

\(^{343}\) See the drawing in J. Laessøe, "On the Fragments of the Hammurabi Code," *JCS* 4, 3 (1950) 182.

\(^{344}\) B. Meissner, "Altbabylonische Gesetze," *BASS* III (1908) 505, 511.
L, K10483

This is a Neo-Assyrian fragment from Kuyunjik first published by Meissner.\textsuperscript{346}

N, K8905

This Neo-Assyrian fragment from Kuyunjik was also published by Meissner in 1908.\textsuperscript{347}

Borger has suggested that this fragment may be part of the same tablet as tablet L, K10483.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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.

\textsuperscript{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.

\textsuperscript{346} B. Meissner, "Altbabylonische Gesetze," 507.

\textsuperscript{347} B. Meissner, "Altbabylonische Gesetze," 507.

\textsuperscript{348} See R. Borger, Babylonisch-Assyrische Lesestücke, 3.

\textsuperscript{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 1908.350

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 AN ši-ru-um, “the seventh tablet in (the series) ‘When the exalted Anum.’”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.352

350 B. Meissner, "Altbabylonische Gesetze," 507, and see the drawing in E. Bergmann, Codex Hammurabi, pl. 47.
351 See the colophon in G.R. Driver and J.C. Miles, Babylonian Laws, 114. This tablet and tablet Z were first published in A. Ungnad, 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, Codex Hammurabi, pl. 51.
352 See the reference in note above. Tablet b and tablet c were both published in B. Meissner, "Altbabylonische Gesetze," 509-10.
c, Sm26

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>146.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></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>1</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>1</td>
<td>14</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>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LH:W</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>133.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</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>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</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>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LH:c</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>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LH:N</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>133.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LH:L</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LH:Z</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LH:T</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LH:D</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</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>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LH:b</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P:T</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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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>
</table>
| H1  | LH ia 6-15 | ša-i-im ši-ma-at KALAM a-na DINGIR AMAR.UD DUMU re-eš-ti-im ša  
|     |         | d EN.KI d EN.LIL.-ut KIŠ ni-šī i-šī-mu-šum in l-gi₄-gi₄ ú-šar-bī-ū-šu | SV(2) – Different phraseology between the sources.²⁵⁴ |
| B i | 2-11    | [ ]ni-šī ’x’[ ]  
|     |         | [ ]t[a-pi [ m]u-ba-’li-ît’ [ ]ú-um[ ]  
|     |         | [ ]-it qá-[t]i-šu-un[ ]  

²⁵⁴ 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: ... nišī ... Hammurabi mārim rēštīm ša Sinmubalīṭ lipit qātīṣan rē ’ūtim mīšarīm anā širikti išrukāšu ušatlimūšu ḫaṭṭīm u agī ši-Šāmāt šarrūtim, “... people ... Hammurabi, the first son of Sinmuballit; 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 ’im šīmāt mātim anā Marduk mārim rēštīm ša Ea ellīlūṭ kīšṣat nišī išīmāṣum in Igigī ušarbiṣu, “... (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 Igigi.” Certainly the proper noun Hammurabi does not appear on the stele until later in the prologue (line ia 50), and the plural noun nišī 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 KÁ.DINGIR.RA.KI
B i 12 DUR.AN.KI
HV – Different proper nouns given in the sources. 355

H3 LH ia 19 ū-ša-te-ru-šu
B i 14 ’ū’-[a-t]j-ru-šu
OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation. 356

H4 LH ia 20 i-na
B i in
OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation. 357

H5 LH ia 21 šar-ru-tam
B i 15 ’šar’[ ]tim
OV(l) – B has the wrong case vowel for the accusative singular. 358

H6 LH ia 21 da-rí-tam
B i 15 da-rí-ti
OV(l) – B has the wrong case vowel for the accusative singular.

H7 LH ia 23 ù
B i 17 u
OV – The conjunction is written with the sign U in B.

355 The stele reads: Bābilam 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.”
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H8</td>
<td>LH ia 24 B i 18</td>
<td>iš-da-ša</td>
<td>SV(1) – Difference in the gender of the possessive pronominal suffix.(^{359})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H9</td>
<td>LH ia 26 B i 19</td>
<td>ú-ki-in-nu-šum</td>
<td>OV(l) – B lacks mimation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H10</td>
<td>LH ia 27-28 B i 20-21</td>
<td>i-nu-mi-šu ḫa-am-mu-ra-pi</td>
<td>SV(1) – The preposition inūmišu, “at that time,” is lacking in B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H11</td>
<td>LH ia 28 B i 20-21</td>
<td>ḫa-am-mu-ra-pi ša-ra mi-ša-ra-am</td>
<td>SV(2) – B has an expanded epithet.(^{360})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H12</td>
<td>LH ia 29 B i 22</td>
<td>ru-ba-am</td>
<td>OV – The long vowel (diphthong) in √rubû, “prince,” is written in B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H13</td>
<td>LH ia 30 B i 23</td>
<td>na’-dam</td>
<td>OV(l) – B lacks mimation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H14</td>
<td>LH ia 31 B i 25</td>
<td>ia-ti</td>
<td>OV – The long initial vowel (diphthong) of the independent pronoun īṭi is written in B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H15</td>
<td>LH ia 32 B i 25</td>
<td>mi-ša-ra-am</td>
<td>OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.(^{361})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H16</td>
<td>LH ia 33 B i 26</td>
<td>ma-tim</td>
<td>OV(l) – B lacks mimation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{359}\) 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.

\(^{360}\) The epithet in B reads: Hammurabi šarra mīšaram. The expected grammatical form would be: Hammurabi šar mīšarim “Hammurabi the king of justice” (see M.E.J. Richardson, *Hammurabi’s Laws*, 28 n. 12).

\(^{361}\) See also the spelling in B of the final vowel preceding the nominative case vowel in the form mīšarium in H2 above. The diphthongal spelling of the ultimate vowel may reflect the pronunciation of this lexeme for the scribe, possibly influenced by √ešēru, “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  [ṣe-`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-un  Not Counted – The sign in B is clearly not UM as contained in LH.363
   B i 30  [ ]-`am`
H20 LH ia 42  wa-še-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-še-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  ùEN.LÍL  OV – The conjunction is written with the sign U in B and C.
   B ii 3  u`EN.LÍL
   C i 1  `uˇ[EN].ˇLÍL`
H25 LH ia 47  ni-ši  OV(l) – C preserves mimation, 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 hulluqû, “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 √namáru, “to illuminate” (cf. J. Huehnergard, Grammar, 259 and 597), and also lacks mimation. 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 OV(l) – B and C preserve the diphthong in final weak √nabû, “to invoke.”

H28 LH ia 51 re-yu-um OV – The long vowel in medial weak √re ‘û, “shepherd,” is written in B.

H29 LH ia 52 ni-bi-it OV – Different spelling of the noun √nibîtu, “chosen, (one) called,” in B.

H30 LH ia 54 mu-kam-me-er OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.

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

H32 LH iia 5 mu-šar-bí OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.

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

H34 LH iia 10 u₄-mi-šu SV(1) – Difference in gender of the possessive pronominal suffix.

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 asallophones 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 mimination 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 √rabû, “to be large, great.” B reads: mušarbiu zikru Bābīlī, “(who) magnifies the name of Babylon,” against the bound form in the stele: mušarbi zikru Bābīlī, “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 /i/, 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-qù
   D i 8 [       ]-qi

H38 LH iia 19 mu-uš-te-mi-qum OV(l) – B lacks mimation.
   B ii 29 mu-uš-te-mi-qù

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-babbar2”?

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, "izuzzum and itiulum," 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 bar₁₁-bar₁₁, while M.E.J. Richardson, Hammurabi's Laws, 32 n. 26, reads bar₁₁-ra. Judging from Wiseman’s drawing (see D.J. Wiseman, "Hammurabi Again," 164) it looks like reading “babbar₂” (also read “bar₁₁-bar₁₁,” written 𒌓十堰) is acceptable, and so an orthographic variant is counted here.
| H42  | LH iia 37 | mu-ba-li-iṭ | B | mu-b[a-l]i-iṭ | OV – Different spellings of the II/I participle *muballiṭ*, “one who brings life (to).” 373 |
| H43  | LH iia 39 | me-e | B iii 8 | m[e] | OV – The ultimate vowel in √*mê*, “water,” is written as long in LH. |
| H44  | LH iia 40 | nu-ūḫ-ši-im | B iii 8 | nu-ūḫ-im | Not Counted – Possible error in B. 374 |
| H45  | LH iia 42 | mu-ul-li | B iii 10 | mu-ul-la | OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation. 375 |
| H46  | LH iia 44 | mu-kam-me-er | B iii 11 | mu-kam-mi-ir | OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation. 376 |
| H47  | LH iia 46 | AN-nim | B iii 13 | d A-nim | OV – The proper noun Anum is written with the divine determinative in B. |
| H48  | LH iia 47 | ĕ | B iii 13 | u | OV – The conjunction is written with the sign U in B. |
| H49  | LH iia 48 | AN.DÛL | B iii 14 | şu-lu-ul | OV – The noun √*ṣulûlu*, “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 *nuḫhu*, from √*nāḫu*, “pacify, give rest,” but the meaning is unclear. The full phrase in LH is *sākin mé nuḫšim ana niššu*, “provider of abundant waters for his people.” In B we would therefore read *sākin mé nūḫim ana niššu*, “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: *ināḫ tāmtu* (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 √*kanāru*, “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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>LH</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H50</td>
<td>LH iia 48</td>
<td>ma-tim</td>
<td>OV – The long vowel in (m)ātu, “land,” is written in B.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B iii 14</td>
<td>ma-a-[ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H51</td>
<td>LH iia 54</td>
<td>É-É.GAL.MAḪ</td>
<td>OV – The proper noun Egalmah is written without the first logogram in B.(^377)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B iii 20</td>
<td>É.GAL.MAḪ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C ii 5</td>
<td>É-É.GAL.MAḪ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H52</td>
<td>LH iia 55</td>
<td>šâr-ri</td>
<td>SV(1) – Possible added gloss in C.(^378)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B iii 20</td>
<td>šâ[r ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C ii 6</td>
<td>šâr-šâr²-ru₉⁹</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H53</td>
<td>LH iia 59</td>
<td>šàr-kiš²-kì</td>
<td>OV – The proper noun Kiš is written without the city name determinative in B.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B iii 23</td>
<td>kiš⁸-kì</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C ii 9</td>
<td>ūru kiš⁹-kì</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H54</td>
<td>LH iia 61</td>
<td>me-le-em-mi</td>
<td>OV(I) – Possible difference in pronunciation.(^379)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B iii 25</td>
<td>me-lam-mu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C ii 11</td>
<td>me-le-em-m[i]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H55</td>
<td>LH iia 63</td>
<td>mu-uš-te-eš-bi</td>
<td>SV(1) – Lexical interchange.(^380)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B iii 26</td>
<td>mu-uš-te-ši-ir</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C ii 13</td>
<td>mu-uš-te-eš-bi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H56</td>
<td>LH iia 66</td>
<td>bi-tim</td>
<td>OV – The noun (\sqrt{b})îtū, “house,” is written logographically in B.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B iii 28</td>
<td>Ŷ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H57</td>
<td>LH iia 68</td>
<td>na-ki-ri</td>
<td>OV – Different spellings of the noun nakru, “enemy.”(^381)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B iii 29</td>
<td>na-ki-ri₆</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^377\) 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 ŠÂR 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 \(\sqrt{m}elammu\), “radiance,” within the genitive construction melemmi Emeleursag, “the radiance of Emeleursag.”  
\(^380\) It is likely that B exchanges a difficult term with a more familiar term. LH and C have \(\sqrt{šutešbû}, “to execute (something) according to a plan,” (see CAD § 227a), while B has \(\sqrt{šutešuru}, “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.
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.

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

The apparent variation here concerns the shift [tš] > [ss] in the noun √nizmatu, “wish, desire,” with the 3ms pronominal suffix (J. Huehnergard, Grammar, 87). However in Neo-Assyrian “<š> and <s> have changed their places in the phoneme-field” (J. Häämæ-Anttila, Neo-Assyrian Grammar, 9) which means that the writing of <š> 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.

It is likely that the text of B preserves a stylistic variation here against the nominative phrase in LH ilu šarrī, “the god of kings.” M.T. Roth, Law Collections from Mesopotamia and Asia Minor (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997) 78 and 140 n. 1, restores the phrase as Ezida <šubat> ilu šarrī, “Ezida, <dwelling place of> the god of kings,” for which we would read B as containing the oblique plural <šubat> ili šarrī, “dwelling place of the gods of kings.” However, as this manuscript preserves only the variant case vowel, the noun ili is read not as a plural but as a nominative singular written with the wrong case vowel (cf. A.R. George, Gilgamesh, 439, “-i or -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.
H63 LH iiia 29 d Ma-ma
B iv 13 d Má-[ ]
OV – Different spelling of the proper noun Mama in B.

H64 LH iiia 35 d Nin-tu
B iv 19 d be-let ī-li
D ii 2 DINGIR.MAḪ
SV(1) – Different appellations for the same deity between the sources.386

H65 LH iiia 38 ša-i-im
B iv 21 ſa'[ ]
D ii 4 ša-ki-in
SV(1) – Lexical interchange.387

H66 LH iiia 39 mi-ri-tim
B iv 21 me-ri-tim
D ii 4 me[ ]
OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.388

H67 LH iiia 42 GIŠ.SU ki
B iv 24 GIŠ.SU[ ]
D ii 7 GIŠ.SU[ ]
OV – The proper noun Girsu is written with the sign GIŠ in B.

H68 LH iiia 44 ni-in-da-bé-e
B iv 25 nin-da-b[é ]
D ii 9 ni-in-da-bé-ʼe
OV – B has CVC against CV-VC in LH and D for the noun √nindabû, “offering, provision.”

H69 LH iiia 45 ra-bu-tim
B iv 26 ra-bi-ū-ti
D ii 10 ra-bu-tim
OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.389

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 ʼĒlet ʼIlī 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 √šāmu, “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 § 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-eḥ  OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.\(^{390}\)
   B iv 27  mu-ta-mi-iḥ
   D ii 11  mu-tam-mi-iḥ

H71  B iv 27  mu-ta-mi-iḥ
   D ii 11  mu-tam-mi-iḥ  OV – B has defective orthography for the II/1 participle of ṭamāḫu, “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  iš-tár
   B iv 32  ᵇ [        ]  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[i]  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.\(^{391}\)

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.\(^{392}\)

H78  LH iva 4  mu-še-eš-qī
   B v 17  mu-še-eš-še-qī  OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.\(^{393}\)

\(^{390}\) The orthography reflected in the stele for the II/1 participle of ṭamāḫu, “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.

\(^{391}\) See the comments in note above concerning the writing of /i/ before /ḫ/ or /r/.

\(^{392}\) The noun is clearly the object of the verb iqṣu (’iqṣūtu, “to bestow”) and so must be accusative. B apparently has /i/ for the accusative singular case vowel (cf. A.R. George, Gilgamesh, 439).

\(^{393}\) 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>H79</th>
<th>LH iva 6</th>
<th>mes-lam</th>
<th>OV – The sign Ė, bītu, appears before the proper noun Meslam in B. 394</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B v 18</td>
<td>É-mes-lam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H80</th>
<th>LH iva 7</th>
<th>em-qum</th>
<th>OV – Different spelling of the adjective emqu, “wise, skilled.”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B v 19</td>
<td>e-em-qum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H81</th>
<th>LH iva 8</th>
<th>mu-tab-bi-lum</th>
<th>OV(l) – B has the wrong vowel for the nominative singular.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B v 19</td>
<td>mu-ut-ta-ab-bi-lam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H82</th>
<th>LH iva 9</th>
<th>šu</th>
<th>SV(1) – Lexical interchange. 395</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B v 20</td>
<td>šá</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H83</th>
<th>LH iva 11</th>
<th>mu-uš-pa-az-zi-ir</th>
<th>OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation. 396</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B v 22</td>
<td>mu-uš-pa-aš-ši-ir</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H84</th>
<th>LH iva 12</th>
<th>MĀ.AL.NAG.A ki</th>
<th>OV – Different spelling of the proper noun Malgûm.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B v 23</td>
<td>MĀ.AL.NAG.A ki</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H85</th>
<th>LH iva 13</th>
<th>ka-ra-ši-im</th>
<th>OV – The long vowel in 𐤀karašu, “annihilation,” is written in B.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B v 24</td>
<td>ka-ra-a-ši-im</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H86</th>
<th>LH iva 15</th>
<th>šu-ba-ti-ši-in</th>
<th>OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation. 397</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B v 25</td>
<td>šu-ba-ti-ši-na</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

394 The name of the temple in Cuthah has the logogram for bītu, “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.

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.

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 𐤀pašāru, “give shelter, refuge,” against 𐤀pašāru 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 [ʃ], or otherwise to the “ejective” [s’], is not well attested (see J. Hämne-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.

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-i[m],” when the reading “nu-ūḫ-ši-i[n]” is equally as plausible. D.J.
| LH iva 17 | B v 27 | d EN.KI | OV – Different spelling of the proper noun Enki/Ea.  
| H87 |  
| LH iva 18 | B v 27 | ū | OV – The conjunction is written with the sign U in B.  
| H88 |  
| LH iva 18 | B v 27 | d dam-gal-nun-na | OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.  
| H89 |  
| LH iva 21 | B v 29 | iši-mu | OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.  
| H90 |  
| LH iva 22 | B v 30 | zi-bi | OV – The long vowel in √zību, “offering (of food),” is written in B.  
| H91 |  
| LH iva 23 | B v 30 | aša-re-ed | OV – B has CVC against CV-VC in LH.  
| H92 |  
| LH iva 25 | B v 31 | da-ad-mi | OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.  
| H93 |  

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 iasī(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.
The name of the river Euphrates is written differently between the sources.\(^{403}\)

Exchange of lexemes in B, perhaps for the purpose of clarification.\(^{404}\)

Lexical interchange.\(^{405}\)

Possible difference in pronunciation.\(^{406}\)

Different pronunciation of proper noun.\(^{407}\)

B lacks mimiation.

B lacks the ultimate vowel on the bound form of \(\sqrt{\text{panu}}\), “face.”

The reading in LH is uncertain.\(^{408}\)

---

\(^{403}\) 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 \(\text{ittum} \text{dDagan}\), “oracular sign of the god Dagan,” is written as \(\text{Idu u dDagan}\), “the god Naru and the god Dagan,” in B (where \(\text{ÍD} = \text{I7} = \text{dNaru}\)). It is possible that the scribe of B misunderstood the term \(\text{ittu}\) in the stele as the proper noun \(\text{Id}\) 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 \(\text{Ma-uru, Ma-e-ri, Ma-a-ri and Ma-ri}\). 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 \(\text{Ît}\) (\(\text{I1-}\text{it}\)). 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 \(\text{SUH}\) (\(\text{𒈽}\)) was originally read as \(\text{NIN}\) (\(\text{𒈹}\)) by A. Ungnad, *Keilschrifttexte der Gesetze Hammurapis*. The reading \(\text{SUH}\), signifying the god Tišpak, was suggested following the re-
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H102</th>
<th>LH iva 36</th>
<th>ša-ki-in</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B vi 2</td>
<td>t]a-ki-in</td>
<td>OV(l) – Possible difference in grammatical forms. 409</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H103</th>
<th>LH iva 36</th>
<th>el-lu-tim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B vi 2</td>
<td>e-el-lu-tú</td>
<td>OV(l) – B has the wrong case vowel for the oblique plural. 410</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H104</th>
<th>LH iva 40</th>
<th>mu-ki-in-nu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B vi 6</td>
<td>mu-ki-in</td>
<td>OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation. 411</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H105</th>
<th>LH iva 41</th>
<th>iš-di-ši-in</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B vi 6</td>
<td>SUḪUŠ-ši-na</td>
<td>OV – The initial weak √išdu, “foundation,” is written logographically in B.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H106</th>
<th>LH iva 41</th>
<th>iš-di-ši-in</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B vi 6</td>
<td>SUḪUŠ-ši-na</td>
<td>OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation. 412</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

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 mākālī, “feasts.” B has an erroneous nominative plural ending and lacks mimation.

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>LH</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</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>qé-re-eb</td>
<td>qer-bu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C v</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LH</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</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>KÁ.DINGIR.RA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C v</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>KÁ.DINGIR.RA ki</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LH</td>
<td>LH iva 45</td>
<td>ni-ši</td>
<td>OV – Different spelling of the noun (\sqrt{nišū}), “people.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B vi</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>ni-ši</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C v</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LH</td>
<td>LH iva 47</td>
<td>iš-š-tár</td>
<td>OV – The proper noun Ištar is written logographically in B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B vi</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>d (\text{INANNA})</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C v</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>[ ]-tár</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LH</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</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>mu-ki-in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LH</td>
<td>LH iva 48</td>
<td>iš-š-tár</td>
<td>OV – The proper noun Ištar is written logographically in B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B vi</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>d (\text{INANNA})</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C v</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>[ ]-‘tár’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LH</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</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>qé-er-bu-um</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{413}\) B lacks the case ending in the bound form of \(\sqrt{qerbu}\), “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 \(p\text{V}r\text{s} \ldots\) have the shape \(p\text{V}r\text{V}\text{s}\), 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 mimimation, and has the ‘-u’ vowel appended to the bound form of the noun \(\sqrt{qerbu}\). 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 mimimation indicates that the vowel ‘-u’ is grammatically extraneous, where according to J. Huehnergard, Grammar, 57-62, we would expect qereb or perhaps qerbi, 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 \(\sqrt{sapū}\), “to silence, subdue.”

\(^{414}\) B lacks the short ultimate vowel that appears in the stele 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 | SV(1) – Lexical interchange.  
B vi 12 | mu-šar'-bi |
| C v 8 | mu-[ša]-r-bi |
| H115 | LH iva 53 | ki-na-tim | OV – The long medial vowel in √kīnātu, “truth,” is written in C.  
B vi 12 | ki-n[a-ti]m |
| C v 8 | ki-n[a]-a-t[i]m |
| H116 | LH iva 57 | da-mi-iq-tim | OV(l) – B lacks mimiation.  
B vi 14 | da-mi-iq-ti |
| C v 11 | [ ]mi-iq-t[i]m |
| H117 | LH iva 59 | mu-še-ep-pí | OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.  
B vi 16 | mu-še-ep |
| C v 13 | [ ]ep[ ] |
| H118 | LH iva 59 | na-bi-ḫi | OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.  
B vi 16 | n[a-b]i-’i |
| H119 | LH iva 60 | ša | OV – The relative particle is written with the sign ŠA in B.  
B vi 17 | šá |
| C v 14 | ša |
| H120 | LH iva 60 | i-na | OV – The preposition ina is written logographically in B.  
B vi 17 | ina |
| C v 14 | ’i’-[n]a |

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 (nābiʾu), “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>H121</th>
<th>LH iva 60</th>
<th>ni-nu-a&lt;sup&gt;ki&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>OV – B has CV-V[C-CV]&lt;sup&gt;7&lt;/sup&gt; against CV-CV in LH.&lt;sup&gt;418&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B vi 17</td>
<td>ni-[n]&lt;sup&gt;ki&lt;/sup&gt;-a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H122</td>
<td>LH iva 62</td>
<td>ú-šu-pi-ù</td>
<td>OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.&lt;sup&gt;419&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B vi 19</td>
<td>ú-še-pu-ù</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C v 16</td>
<td>ú-ši-pu-ù</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H123</td>
<td>LH iva 63</td>
<td>me-e</td>
<td>SV(1) – Lexical interchange.&lt;sup&gt;420&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B vi 19</td>
<td>me-e-su</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C v 16</td>
<td>me-e[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H124</td>
<td>LH iva 65</td>
<td>mu-uš-te-mi-qum</td>
<td>OV(l) – B lacks the nominative singular case vowel for the III/2 participle of √emqu, “to pray, supplicate.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B vi 20</td>
<td>mu-ušte-mi-iq</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H125</td>
<td>LH iva 66</td>
<td>DINGIR.GAL.GAL</td>
<td>OV – The phrase ilī rabûtim, “(the) great gods,” is written syllabically in B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B vi 21</td>
<td>i-li ra-bi-ù-tim</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C v 19</td>
<td>DING[IR.GA]L.G[AL]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H126</td>
<td>LH iva 68</td>
<td>šu-ma-la-il</td>
<td>Not Counted – The proper noun Šumu-la-el is misspelled in B.&lt;sup&gt;421&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B vi 23</td>
<td>šu-la-il</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H127</td>
<td>LH va 1</td>
<td>da-ri-um</td>
<td>OV(l) – B lacks mimation.&lt;sup&gt;422&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B vi 25</td>
<td>da-ru-ú</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H128</td>
<td>LH va 8</td>
<td>šu-me-ri-im</td>
<td>OV(l) – B lacks mimation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


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 proclaim, decere.”

420 B has √mēšū, “cultic rituals,” in place of √mū, “cultic rites” in LH (see *CAD* M 2 35 and 156). The term mēšū 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 /š/ > /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.

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.

422 LH also preserves the diphthong of final weak √darū, “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.
B vi 30 rja-ti

H131 LH va 12 ar-ba-im OV(l) – B lacks mimation.
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.

H133 LH va 18 šu-ḫu-zi-im OV(l) – B has the wrong case vowel for the genitive singular.
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 ū lu SV(1) – Lexical interchange or

423 B preserves the short vowel /i/ appended to the bound form of the noun ẖibrātu, “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 ... ūšim šušuzim, 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.
J 1 i 23  lu omission of conjunction.427

H137  LH xa 5  pu-úḫ-šu  OV – Different spelling of the noun ṣḫūlu, “substitute, replacement” in J.
J1 i 28  pu-úḫ-šu

H138  LH xa 31  ū-lu  SV(1) – Lexical interchange or omission of conjunction.428
J1 i 31  lu

H139  LH xa 10  mu-na-ag-gi-šu  OV – J has CV-CV-VC against CV-VC-CV-VC in LH.
J1 i 33  mu-na-gi-š[u]

H140  LH xa 11  É-sū  OV – The possessive pronominal suffix is written with the sign SU in J.
J1 i 34  É-su

H141  LH xa 13  lu  SV(1) – J omits the conjunction lū.
J1 i 35  omits

H142  LH xa 14  ū lu-ū  SV(1) – Lexical interchange or omission of conjunction.429
J1 i 35  lu

H143  LH xa 15  dan-na-at  OV – J has defective orthography for the bound form of the noun ṣdannatu, “fortress.”
J1 i 36  da-na-at

H144  LH xa 18  wa-ar-[k]i-šu  OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.430
J2 i 2  a-ar-[ ]

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 ulū (J1 i 27 and ii 17) and lū (here and J1 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: šumma rēdim lū bā’irum, “if a runner or a fisher.” Against this see J1 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 ṣ(w)arka, “afterward”, retaining the initial /w/.
| H145 | LH xa 66 | É-sū | OV – The possessive pronominal suffix is written with the sign SU in J. |
| H146 | LH xa 68 | in-na-ad-di-šum | OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation. |
| H147 | LH xia 1 | iš-ša-ab-tu-ma | SV(2) – Additional pronominal suffix in J. |
| H148 | LH xia 1 | iš-ša-ab-tu-ma | SV(1) – J lacks the enclitic particle “-ma.” |
| H149 | LH xia 3 | it-ta-al-ku | OV(l) – J has the wrong vowel for the inflected verbal ending. |
| H150 | LH xia 4 | i-il-la-ak | OV – J has defective orthography for the I/1 present future form of √alāku, “to go.” |
| H151 | LH xia 6 | iš-ti-a-at-ma | OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation. |
| H152 | LH xia 6 | iš-ti-a-at-ma | SV(1) – J lacks the enclitic particle “-ma.” |
| 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. Hämeeen-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 (𒈠), but in light of Rule 1 the form in J should be read as an anaphoric pronominal suffix referring to eqelu, “field,” kūrū, “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 /a/ assimilates the short ultimate vowel /u/ (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.

H155  LH xia 10  [i]n-na-ad-di-iš-šum-ma  OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.436

H156  LH xia 11  šu-ma  OV – The stele has an unusual defective spelling of the particle šumma, “if.”

H157  LH xia 12  i-il-la-ak  OV – J has defective orthography for the l/1 present future form of √alāku, “to go.”

H158  LH xia 13  UKU.ÚS  OV – J has a phonetic complement appended to the logogram UKU.ÚS, √redû, “runner, scout.”

H159  LH xia 18  DAM.GÀR  OV – J has a phonetic complement appended to the logogram DAM.GÀR, √tiamkāru, “merchant, trader.”

H160  LH xia 18  ip-tū-ra-aš-šu-ma  OV(l) – J lacks the ventive marker appended to √paṭāru, “release, loosen.”437

H161  LH xia 19  uš-ta-ak-ši-da-aš-šu  OV(l) – The ventive in J is “-a” against “-am” in LH.438

H162  LH xia 19  uš-ta-ak-ši-da  SV(2) – J lacks the pronominal object suffix appended to √kašādum, “reach, arrive.”

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 | OV – J has CV-VC against CVC in LH. |
|      | J1 ii 31  | [ t]a-ar     |

| H164 | LH xia 31 | URU-šu | OV – J has the place determinative following the logogram URU, ālī, “cities.” |
|      | J1 ii 32  | URJU ki-šū |

| H165 | LH xia 31 | URU-šu | OV – The 3ms possessive pronominal suffix is written with the sign ŠU in J. |
|      | J1 ii 32  | URJU ki-šū |

| H166 | LH xia 32 | ip-pa-at-ta-ri-šu | OV(I) – Possible difference in pronunciation.439 |
|      | J1 ii 32  | [ ]-ar-šum      |

|      | J1 ii 32  | [ ]-ar-šum      |

| H168 | LH xia 36 | É-sú | OV – The possessive pronominal suffix is written with the sign SU in J. |
|      | J1 ii 35  | É-su     |

| H169 | LH xia 40 | uth-ú | SV(1) – Lexical interchange or omission of conjunction.440 |
|      | J2 ii 3   | lu       |

| H170 | LH xiiia 34 | i-ma-[d-d]a-ad | OV – The I/1 present future of 'madādu, “to measure,” is written logographically in N.441 |
|      | N2 ii 3   | [ Á]G.E    |

| H171 | LH xiiia 41 | A.ŠA | OV – N has a phonetic complement appended to the compound logogram A.ŠA, eqlam, “field” (accusative singular). |
|      | N2 ii 9   | A.ŠA-a[m] |

| H172 | LH xiva 8 | A.ŠA | SV(2) – L has a possessive pronominal suffix appended to 'eqši.442 |
|      | L2 ii 2   | A.ŠA-šu |

| H173 | LH xiva 15 | ši-ib-tam | OV – The noun 'šibtu, |

---

439 The stele has the addition of an anaptyctic vowel to 'paṭāru, “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 LÁ.G.E (see CAD M 1 5b).

442 The noun is clarified in L by the possessive pronominal suffix: ina la mé še’um ina eqšíšu la ittabši, “with no water, grain in his field has not been grown.”
L ii 9  [  ]MAŠ  tary) interest,” is written logographically in L.

H174  LH xiva 16  ša  SV(1) – The relative pronoun ša is omitted in L.

H175  LH xiva 17  i-na-ad-di-in  L ii 10  i-na-di-in  OV – L has defective orthography for the I/1 present future of īnadānu, “to give.”

H176  LH xiva 62  ši-ib-ti-šu  N ii 7  [       ]-śu’  Not Counted – The damaged sign does not allow a certain reading.


H178  LH xva 15  uš-ta-bil  P1 obv. i 8  uš-ta-bi-il  OV – P has CV-VC against CVC in LH.

H179  LH xva 17  KAR-šu  P1 obv. i 10  KAR-šú  OV – The pronominal object suffix is written with the sign ŠU in P.

H180  LH xva 21  ŠE  P1 obv. i 12  ŠE-am  OV – P has a phonetic complement appended to the logogram ŠE, īše’um, “grain.”

443 The omission of the relative particle in L suggests haplography. However, in light of Rule 1 it is possible that sbítam 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 šibtam ša šattim, “if the interest of (that) year” (KTS 12 17); between the term šibat and a genitive construction: šibassu ša adi ānim 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 šibāṣsu > šibāssu, 3fpl in N. Thus N would have a different construction to the set phrase kispišu u sibtišu as it appears in the stele.
H181 LH xva 68 ka-an-nu
  P2 obv. i 10 ka-an-ni
OV(l) – P has the wrong case
  vowel for the nominative sin-
  gular.\(^{445}\)

H182 LH xva 68 ga-ma-ar-tim
  P2 obv. i 10 ga-ma-ar-ti
OV(l) – P lacks mimation.

H183 LH xva 75 A.ŠÀ
  P2 obv. i 17 A.ŠÀ-am
OV – N has a phonetic comple-
  ment appended to the compound
  logogram A.ŠÀ, eqlam, “field”
  (accusative singular).

H184 LH xva 75 omits
  P2 obv. i 18 ša
SV(1) – P has an extra relative par-
  ticle ša, lacking in LH.\(^{446}\)

H185 LH xva 76 i-na-ša-ar-ma
  P2 obv. i 19 i-na-‘aš-ša’-ar-ma
OV – LH has defective orthogra-
  phy for the I/1 present future of
  √nasāru, “to guard.”

H186 LH xva 77 i-na BURU
  P2 obv. i 19 omits
SV(2) – The phrase ina ebūrim, “at
  harvest,” is omitted from P.\(^{447}\)

H187 LH xvia 32 ḪA.LA-šu
  P1 obv. ii 2 zi-it-[ ]
OV – The noun √zittu,
  “agricultural produce,” is written
  syllabically in P.

H188 LH xvia 33 i-ša-ka-nu-šum
  P1 obv. ii 3 i-ša-a[k ]
OV – P has CV-V[C-CV] against
  CV-CV in LH.

\(^{445}\) 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 √kamu, “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 ušākilu inaṣṣarma, “he shall guard the field (in) which he pas-
tured.”

\(^{447}\) 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
P3 rev. ii 8 pa-ša-ri-am
OV(l) – P has the wrong case vowel for the genitive singular.448

H190 LH ib 45 i-le-ğé
T ii 7 i-le-eq
OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.449

H191 LH ib 51 ḫar-ra-nim
P3 rev. iii 4 [       ]-ni
OV(l) – P lacks mimation.

H192 LH iib 52 wa-ši-ib-ma
P3 rev. iii 4 a-ši-‘ib’-[m]a
OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.450

H193 LH iib 57 ši-bu-ul-tim
P3 rev. iii 8 [       ]-ti
P4 rev. i 3 še-[       ]
OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.451

H194 LH iib 58 ú-ša-bīl-šu
P4 rev. i 4 ú-ša-bi-la-[ ]
OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.452

H195 LH iib 63 it-ba-al
T iii 4 it-bal
OV – T has CVC against CV-VC in LH.

H196 LH iib 22 a-na
P2 rev. ii 16 a-šā
SV(1) – Lexical interchange.453

---

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 šannam 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 šleqû, “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 šiwaḫatu, “deliver.” See also H78 and H166.

453 P exchanges the preposition ana, “to, for,” for aša (=aššum?) “concerning, on account of.”
| H197 | LH iiib 68 | ÌR | P1 rev. i 43 | SAG[ | SV(1) – Lexical interchange.\(^{454}\) |
| H198 | LH iiib 68 | ù | P4 rev. ii4 | ù | OV – The conjunction is written with the sign Ú in P. |
| H199 | LH iiib 71 | ú-šē-te-ecq | P1 rev. i 6 | ú-šē-et-[ ] | OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.\(^ {455}\) |
| H200 | LH ivb 15 | a-na | P2 rev. iii 3 | i-na | SV(1) – Exchange of prepositions. |
| H201 | LH ivb 15 | ga-am-ri-im | P2 rev. iii 6 | ga-am-ri-am | OV(l) – P has the wrong case vowel for the genitive singular.\(^ {456}\) |
| H202 | LH ivb 17 | ma-ḥar | P2 rev. iii 6 | ma-ḥa-ar | OV – P has CV-VC against CVC in LH. |
| H203 | LH viiib 75 | aš-ša-sú | W i 12 | [ ]-su | OV – The 3ms possessive nominative suffix is written with the sign SU in W. |
| H204 | LH viiib 78 | i-iz-zi-ib-ši | W i 14 | i-zi-ib-ši | OV – W has defective orthography for the I/1 present future of \( \sqrt{ezēbu} \), “abandon, divorce.” |
| H205 | LH xiib 64 | wa-ar-ka | Z 4 | wa-ar | Not Counted – Probable scribal error in Z.\(^ {457}\) |

\(^{454}\) 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 ÌR, \textit{wardu}, against SAG.ÌR, \textit{rēšu}, in P. Both terms can be translated “servant, slave.”

\(^{455}\) P1+P4 reads “ú-šē-et-ti-iq,” the III/1 present future of \( \sqrt{etēqu} \), “to allow to pass, expire.” The form in the stele is supposed by G.R. Driver and J.C. Miles, \textit{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 \textit{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>e₂ obv. ii 2</th>
<th>i-tam-ma</th>
<th>SV(1) – Lexical interchange.⁴⁵⁸</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>na-[     ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H207</th>
<th>LH xxib 39</th>
<th>b 1</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></td>
<td></td>
<td>im-ta-[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H208</th>
<th>LH xxib 96</th>
<th>c ii 3</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></td>
<td></td>
<td>i-ma-[a]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pi-ḥa-su</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H210</th>
<th>LH xxib 97</th>
<th>c ii 4</th>
<th>pi-ḥa-sū</th>
<th>OV – Different spelling of the possessive pronominal suffix in c.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pi-ḥa-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 amḫasu 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’ ... .” Perhaps a preferable reading of manuscript e assumes that “na-[ ]” is the remains of the word √napû, “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 √mâtu, “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 √maḫāsu, “to strike, wound.” Their reading takes the form in b of a I/1 perfect of √maḫāsu, and in fact contends that the sign that supports this reading is visible: “im-ta-ḫa-[su-ma].” However, the sign I/A 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H211</th>
<th>LH xxiib 2</th>
<th>8 ŠE.GUR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c ii 10</td>
<td>4[  ]</td>
<td>Not Counted – The damaged sign does not allow a certain reading.(^{460})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H212</th>
<th>LH xxiib 77</th>
<th>li-pí-it</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c i 2</td>
<td>li-pí-it-ti</td>
<td>OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.(^{461})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H213</th>
<th>LH xxiib 77</th>
<th>DINGIR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c i 3</td>
<td>i-lim</td>
<td>OV – The genitive singular noun ilim, “god,” is written syllabically in c.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H214</th>
<th>LH xxiib 78</th>
<th>lu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c i 4</td>
<td>lu-ú</td>
<td>OV – The long vowel in the conjunction ī is written in c.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H215</th>
<th>LH xxiib 78</th>
<th>id-du-uk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c i 5</td>
<td>i-du-uk</td>
<td>OV – c has defective orthography for the I/1 present future of (\sqrt{\text{dakú}}), “to kill.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H216</th>
<th>LH xxiib 78</th>
<th>ma-ḫi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c i 6</td>
<td>IGI</td>
<td>OV – The preposition (\sqrt{\text{maḫu}}), “before,” is written logographically in c.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H217</th>
<th>LH xxiib 78</th>
<th>DINGIR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c i 6</td>
<td>i-lim</td>
<td>OV – The genitive singular noun ilim is written syllabically in c.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H218</th>
<th>LH xxiib 79</th>
<th>ú-ub-ba-am-ma</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c i 7</td>
<td>ú-ub-ba-ab-ma</td>
<td>OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.(^{462})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{460}\) 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 “”8” 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 ubblema > ubblemma (\(\sqrt{\text{ubbubu}}\), “cleanse, purify,” plus the enclitic particle “-ma”).
H219 LH xxiib 80 c i 8 mi-qí-it-ti mi-qí-it OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.463

H220 LH xxiib 81 c i 10 i-ma-hār-šu i-ma-ah-ḥar-ma OV – c has CVC against CV-VC in LH.

H221 LH xxiib 81 c i 10 i-ma-hār-šu i-ma-ah-ḥar-ma SV(2) – c lacks the pronominal object suffix.464

H222 LH xxiib 81 c i 10 i-ma-hār-šu i-ma-ah-ḥar-ma SV(1) – c has an additional enclitic particle “-ma.”

H223 LH xxiib 82 c i 11 i-gu-ma e-gi-šu OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.465

H224 LH xxiib 82 c i 11 i-gu-ma e-gi-šu SV(2) – c has an additional pronominal object suffix.466

H225 LH xxiib 82 c i 11 i-gu-ma e-gi-šu SV(1) – c lacks the enclitic particle “-ma.”

H226 LH xxiiib 59 e₁ obv. i 7 GEMÉ SAG.GEMÉ OV – The noun √amtu, “slave girl,” is written with the compound logogram in e.

H227 LH xxiib 60 e₁ obv. i 9 la la-am 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 miqītī tarbisim, “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 waršu 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.

197
H228  LH xxiib 60  e₁ obv. i 9  im-la-ma  im-ta-la  OV(l) – Difference in grammatical forms.⁴⁶⁸

H229  LH xxiib 60  e₁ obv. i 9  im-la-ma  im-ta-la  SV(1) – The enclitic particle “-ma” is lacking in e.

H230  LH xxiib 63  e₁ obv. i 12  na-di-na-ni-šu  na-di-na-ni-ma  SV(2) – e lacks the pronominal object suffix.⁴⁶⁹

H231  LH xxiib 63  e₁ obv. i 12  na-di-na-ni-šu  na-di-na-ni-ma  SV(1) – e has an additional enclitic particle “-ma.”

H232  LH xxiib 63  e₁ obv. i 13  ú-ta-ar-ma  [ ]-ta-ar  SV(1) – e lacks an additional enclitic particle.

H233  LH xxiib 66  e₁ obv. i 15  i-le-qé  i-la-qé  OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.⁴⁷⁰

H234  LH xxiib 68  e₂ obv. i 4  ÏR  SAG.ÏR  OV – The noun √wardu, “slave,” is written with the compound logogram in e.

H235  LH xxiib 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 xxiib 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: nadinansu baqršu īppal, “his (the slave’s) seller will be liable (for) his claims.” Whether the pronominal suffix appended to √baqrū/paqrū, “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.
### Annotations

| H237  | LH xxiiib 71 e2 obv. i 8 | i-ip-pa-al i-ip-pa-il | OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.  

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 ippal, “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 ‘-šināṭi,’ 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 (𒇷). Alternatively the form in e may be read as an abstract noun formed from ‘ši’tu, “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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H245</th>
<th>LH xxivb 29</th>
<th>id-di-nam</th>
<th>SV(1) – Lexical interchange. 476</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e₁ obv. ii 14</td>
<td>iš-ru-kam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H246</th>
<th>LH xxivb 30</th>
<th>na-ak-ri</th>
<th>OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation. 477</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e₁ obv. ii 15</td>
<td>[n]a-ki-ri</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H247</th>
<th>LH xxivb 81</th>
<th>na-ás-qá</th>
<th>OV – Different spelling of the adjective √nasqu, “precious, choice,” in e.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e₁ obv. iii 4</td>
<td>na-ás-[ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H248</th>
<th>LH xxivb 84</th>
<th>d UTU da-a-a-nim ra-bi-im ša AN ù KI mi-sa-ri i-na KALAM li-iš-te-pí</th>
<th>HV – Different grammatical agent and phraseology in e. 478</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e₁ obv. iii 8</td>
<td>d UTU ù d IM da-i-nu de-e-ni pa-ri-su pu-ru-us-se-e de-e-ni li-iš-te-pí</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H249</th>
<th>LH xxivb 92</th>
<th>mu-ša-si-ka[m]</th>
<th>OV(l) – e lacks mimation. 479</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e₁ obv. iii 15</td>
<td>mu-ša-as-si-ka</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H250</th>
<th>LH xxivb 94</th>
<th>a-ra-ām-mu</th>
<th>OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation. 480</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e₁ obv. iii 17</td>
<td>a-ra-ām-mu-u[m]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

476 The stele reads: ša Marduk iddinam, “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 ra-bim ša šamē u erṣetim mēšarī 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 dīnī parsu purussī dīnī lištēpi, “By the command of Šamaš and Adad, expedite just judgement (or ‘they execute just judgement’), may my just decisions 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 √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 /št/ > /šš/ (written <š>), and /ns/ > /ss/. In favour of the latter interpretation (III/2) cf. the preceptive form “li-iš-ta-as-sū-ku” in KBo I 11 obv. 20 (and see CAD N 2 20b).
H251 LH xxviiib
12
e₁ rev. i 2 gu-ru-un
OV – Different spelling of the noun √gurunnu, “heap, mound,” in e.481

H252 LH xxviiib
14
e₁ rev. i 3 um-ma-na-ti-šu
SV(1) – Difference in gender.482

H253 LH xxviiib
16
e₁ rev. i 4 li-it-ta-ad-di
OV(l) – Difference in grammatical form.483

H254 LH xxviiib
17
e₁ rev. i 5 ERIN-šu-ma
OV – The noun ERIN, ummanu, “army, troop,” is written syllabically in e.

H255 LH xxviiib
17
e₁ rev. i 5 ERIN-šu-ma
OV – e has CVC-CV against CV-CV in LH.

H256 LH xxviiib
17
e₁ rev. i 6 re-ma-am
Not Counted – The damaged sign does not allow a certain reading.

H257 LH xxviiib
18
e₁ rev. i 7 a-i
OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.484

---

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 preceptive form of √nadāmu, “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 1 218a for the distribution of both spellings.
H258  LH xxviiib  20  a-na  a-di  SV(1) – Lexical interchange.485
       e1 rev. i 8
H259  LH xxviiib  21  li-ma-al-li-šu-ma  OV – e has defective orthography for the I/1 precative of √malû, here with the meaning “to deliver in full.”
       e1 rev. i 10  li-ma-li-šu-ma
H260  LH xxviiib  23  li-ru-šu  OV – The long vowel in √arû, “to lead,” is written in e.
       e1 rev. i 12  li-ru-ú-šu
H261  LH xxviiib  25  dan-nu-um  OV(l) – e lacks mimation.
       e1 rev. i 14  da-an-nu
H262  LH xxviiib  26  omits  SV(2) – e has an additional relative particle.486
       e1 rev. i 15  ša
H263  LH xxviiib  26  qá-ba-al  SV(2) – e has an additional possessive pronominal suffix.487
       e1 rev. i 15  qá-ba-al-šu
H264  LH xxviiib  27  mu-ša-ak-ši-du  OV – e has CVC against CV-VC in LH.
       e1 rev. i 17  mu-šak-ši-du
H265  LH xxviiib  30  ra-bi-im  OV(l) – e lacks mimation.
       e1 rev. i 18  ra-bi-i

485 The stele reads: ana qāī nakrišu, “into the hands of his enemies,” against e: adi qāī nakrišu, “unto the hands of his enemies.” The difference in e perhaps reflects a phrasing that the scribe was more familiar with, although ana qāī nakrišu ... limallišuma and ina qāī ... limallišuma 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.
H266 LH xxviiib 31 e1 rev. i 19  iša-tim  
OV(l) – e lacks mimation.488

H267 LH xxviiib 32 e1 rev. i 20  ez-ze-tim  
OV – e has defective orthography for the adjective √ezzu, “raging, furious.”

H268 LH xxviiib 35 e1 rev. i 23  in  
OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.489

H269 LH xxviiib 82 e1 rev. ii 1  [ ]-re-t[um]  er-re-tam  
OV(l) – e has the wrong vowel for the accusative singular.

H270 LH xxviiib 83 e1 rev. ii 3  li-ru-ru  
SV(2) – e has an additional redundant pronominal object suffix.490

H271 LH xxviiib 84 e1 rev. ii 4  [ ]-re-tum  er-re-tim  
OV(l) – e has the wrong vowel for the genitive singular.

H272 LH xxviiib 85 e1 rev. ii 5  [ ]-ir-a-ta-an  da-ni-a-tim  
OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.491

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 √ištu, “goddess,” is possible: kīma ilti ezzetim ša apim niššu, “like a raging goddess in the rushes.” However the reading in the stele seems more likely: kīma isšātim ezzetim ša apim niššu, “like a raging fire in the rushes.” The reading of the form in e as √ištu, “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 lirurušu, “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 (𒅌) instead of NI (𒉌). 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 pé, “mouth, command,” is written syllabically in e.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e1 rev. ii 6</td>
<td>pi-i-šu</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></td>
<td>e1 rev. ii 7</td>
<td>na-ak-ri-im</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></td>
<td>e1 rev. ii 8</td>
<td>[  ]ru-šu-ma</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-

---

492 The stele has the II/2 present future of ṣnakāru, “to be hostile, countermand” against the stative (verbal adjective), in e. In the context the sense is very similar between the sources. LH reads: ša la uttakkamu, “which will not be over-ruled,” while e reads: ša la nakrim, “which (is) without over-ruling.”

493 The subject, Enlil, is certainly singular in e, so the vowel is best read as an anaptyctic addition.

494 For the increased use of CVC signs as a feature of Standard Babylonian see J. Huehnergard, Grammar, 596.
dency 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.\footnote{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).}

\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.\footnote{These latter two sources are copies of tablet X that preserve the catch-line of tablet XI. The tablets, given the sigla K₁ and b in George’s critical edition, are from Kuyunjik and Babylon respectively. K₁ 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.} The following list and description of the tablets relies on the full treatment of the sources in A.R. George’s critical edition.\footnote{See \textit{Gilgamesh}, 411-15.}

The sigla used by A.R. George are also employed in the present analysis.

\begin{table}
\centering
\begin{tabular}{ll}
\textbf{Siglum} & \textbf{Museum Number} \\
C & K2252+2602+3321+4486+Sm1881 \\
J₁ & K3375 \\
J₂ & Rm616 \\
T₁ & K7752+81-2-4, 245+296+460 \\
T₂ & Sm2131+2196+Rm2,383+390+82-5-22, 316 \\
W₁ & K8517+8518+8569+8593+8595 \\
W₂ & K8594+21502 \\
W₃ & K17343 \\
\end{tabular}
\caption{First Millennium Sources for Gilgamesh XI Under Examination}
\end{table}
**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.\(^{501}\) 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 naqbi īm[uru ėš.gā]r ⁴GlŠ-gim-maš libir.ra.bi.gim [a]b.sar.ām ba.a.ē, “Tablet 11, ‘He who saw the Deeps,’ series of Gilgameš, written and checked according to its original.”\(^{502}\) 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-

---

\(^{501}\) *Gilgamesh*, 384.

\(^{502}\) For the transliteration and translation see A.R. George, *Gilgamesh*, 736.
lets of this type indicate manufacture specifically for Ashurbanipal’s collection.\textsuperscript{503} 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.

T\textsubscript{1}, K7752+81-2-4, 245+296+460; T\textsubscript{2}, 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 T\textsubscript{2} of horizontal rulings that divided the text into sections. This text is therefore presumed to have been prepared for Ashurbanipal’s collection at Nineveh.

W\textsubscript{1}, K8517+8518+8569+8593+8595; W\textsubscript{2}, K8594+21502; W\textsubscript{3}, 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.”\textsuperscript{504} 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.

\textsuperscript{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.

\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{505} 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.\textsuperscript{506}

\textit{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.

\textit{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.\textsuperscript{507} Narrow vertical rulings separate columns, though the text frequently extends beyond the margins. There are some horizontal rulings preserved that separate the text into sections.

\textsuperscript{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, \textit{Gilgamesh}, 415.
\textsuperscript{506} O. Pedersén designates this library as ‘N3,’ the private library of the chief musicians. See O. Pedersén, \textit{Archives and Libraries in Assur, N3 no. 45.}
\textsuperscript{507} See A.R. George, \textit{Gilgamesh}, 415. The merchant house Spartali & Co. sold several large collections of tablets to the British Museum in the later part of the 19\textsuperscript{th} 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. 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 - Number of SU Preserved in the First Millennium Gilgamesh XI Tablets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fragment</th>
<th>Total SU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>791.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J1-2</td>
<td>1014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1-2</td>
<td>430.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W1-3</td>
<td>487.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c1-3</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

508 See A.R. George, *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

<p>| Comparison: Text vs Text | TOTAL PLL | Orthographic Variants | Proportion: SU per Orth. Variant | Orthographic (linguistic) Variants | Proportion: SU per Orth. (l) Variant | Stylistic (Type 1) Variants | Proportion: SU per St. (1) Variant | Stylistic (Type 2) Variants | Proportion: SU per St. (2) Variant | Stylistic (Type 3) Variants | Proportion: SU per St. (3) Variant | Hermeneutic Variants | Proportion: SU per Her. Variant |
|--------------------------|-----------|-----------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------|----------------|
| C:J                      | 724.5     | 33                    | 12.7                            | 35                                | 13.4                             | 11              | 42.6                         | 8                          | 29                              |                 |                               |                |
| J:T                      | 432.5     | 21                    | 11.5                            | 15                                | 14.9                             | 10              | 27                          | 7                          | 30.9                            | 1               | 48.1                         | 2             | 43.3                         |
| C:W                      | 379.5     | 37                    | 5.8                             | 21                                | 11.7                             | 5               | 69                          | 2                          | 63.3                            |                 |                               |                |
| J:W                      | 300       | 25                    | 7.7                             | 20                                | 9.4                              | 7               | 22.2                         | 6                          | 20.6                            |                 |                               |                |
| W:j                      | 219       | 8                     | 12.5                            | 17                                | 8.1                              | 2               | 62.6                         | 2                          | 33.7                            |                 | 1                            | 109.5          |
| J:c                      | 204       | 13                    | 8.9                             | 20                                | 5.4                              | 1               | 136                         | 2                          | 102                             |                 |                               |                |
| C:T                      | 199       | 6                     | 19                              | 6                                 | 22.1                             | 1               | 398                         |               |                                 |                 |                               |                |
| C:j                      | 188.5     | 7                     | 14                              | 4                                 | 23.5                             | 1               | 377                         |               |                                 |                 |                               |                |
| T:W                      | 183       | 10                    | 11.1                            | 6                                 | 19.3                             | 2               | 45.8                         | 2                          | 30.5                            |                 |                               |                |
| C:c                      | 103       | 8                     | 9.4                             | 8                                 | 7.9                              | 4               | 17.1                         |               |                                 |                 |                               | 1              | 20.6                         |
| J:b                      | 101       | 11                    | 6                               | 2                                 | 33.7                             | 1               | 101                         | 1                          | 28.9                            |                 |                               | 1              | 40.4                         |
| T:j                      | 84        | 3                     | 18.7                            | 4                                 | 12.9                             | 1               | 168                         |               |                                 |                 |                               |                |
| C:b                      | 43        | 7                     | 3.7                             | 2                                 | 17.2                             |               |                             |                             |                                 |                 |                               |                |
| T:c                      | 43        | 2                     | 10.8                            | 2                                 | 12.3                             | 1               | 86                          | 2                          | 21.5                            | 1               | 6.1                          |                |
| J:j                      | 41        | 2                     | 11.7                            | 3                                 | 10.3                             |               |                             |                             |                                 |                 |                               |                |
| C:z                      | 40        | 8                     | 3.1                             | 4                                 | 5.7                              | 2               | 11.4                         | 3                          | 8.9                             | 1               | 13.3                         |                |
| W:c                      | 29        | 1                     | 19.3                            | 1                                 | 29                               |               |                             |                             |                                 |                 |                               | 1              | 29                           |
| T:b                      | 20        | 2                     | 8                               |                                   |                                  |               |                             |                             |                                 |                 |                               |                |</p>
<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>[ â]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 Ūta-napišti rūqi, “distant Ūta-napišti,” 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 Ūta-napišti.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W1 i 2</td>
<td>[ -t]im</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 syllabically.</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 is 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 straightforward 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
W 1 i 5 a-na
cally in W.

G9 C i 5 tu-qu-un-ti
W 1 i 5 [t]u-qu-un-tú
j i 5 [t]u-qu-un-ti
OV(l) – W has the wrong case vowel.512

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.”513

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[ə]še-ri-ka
OV(l) – W has a different vowel appended to the preposition elu, “upon.”514

G12 C i 7 ba-la-ta teš-’ú’
W 1 i 7 ’ba-la’-[t a teš]-’um
OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.515

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 explanation 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-
dialect on NA may, in fact, be the cause of 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.
The preposition *ana* is written syllabically in J.

J lacks the emphatic particle ‘*-ma.'

The preposition *ana* is written logographically in J.

J has the correct case vowel for the accusative singular.

C has a redundant preposition marking the dative.

The first vowel of the city name *Šuripak* is written fully in J.

The pronominal suffix is written as *ŠU* in W.

---

515 The lexeme *še’ûm*, “seek out,” is written with medial aleph and final “-m” in W. The glottal stop (written $\sqcup$) is part of the root. The final sign in W could be read as U₄, which would amount to an orthographic variant.

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, *Gilgamesh*, 702, but is clear in the drawing (cf. A.R. George, *Gilgamesh*, pl. 132) and is listed in the apparatus in A.R. George, *Gilgamesh*, 427. I owe this observation to I. Young.

517 The form in W (and therefore j) is read as /i/ for accusative singular in A.R. George, *Gilgamesh*, 439.

518 The dative object is already expressed by the independent dative pronoun *kaša*, “to you” in the other sources.
G20  C i 13  qer-bu-’šû’  j-šu  
W1 i 13  qer-bu-uš  
j i 13  
OV(l) – The pronominal suffix lacks the final vowel in j.\textsuperscript{519}

G21  C i 13  qer-bu-’šû’  j-šu  
W1 i 13  
OV – The pronominal suffix is written as ŠU in W.

G22  J2 i 12  a-bu-b[i  
W1 i 13  a-bu-bu  
j i 14  a-bu-bi  
OV(l) – W has the wrong case vowel for the genitive singular abubi, “deluge.”\textsuperscript{520}

G23  C i 15  d a-nu-um  a-num  
OV – C has CV-VC against CVC in j.

G24  W1 i 17a  ’ana ki’-i[k ]  
j i 18  a-na ki-ik-ki-šu  
OV – The preposition ana is written logographically in W.

G25  J2 i 17a  [k]i-ik-ki-[u]  
j i 19  ki-ik-kiš  
OV(l) – The case vowel is lacking in j.\textsuperscript{521}

G26  J2 i 18  [ s]u-’û’-[  
j i 21  šu-ru-up-pa-ku-û  
OV – J has the long spelling of the first vowel in the proper noun Šuripak.

G27  W1 i 19  [ r]i-ip-pa-ku-û  
j i 21  šu-ru-up-pa-ku-û  
OV(l) – j seems reflect a different pronunciation of the proper noun Šuripak.

G28  W1 i 20a  bi-ni GIŠ.MÁ  
j i 22a  bi-nu GIŠ.MÁ  
OV(l) – j has the wrong stem vowel for ms imperative of III weak √banû, “to build.”\textsuperscript{522}

\textsuperscript{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, \textit{Gilgamesh}, 431-33).

\textsuperscript{520} See A.R. George, \textit{Gilgamesh}, 440, where /u/ for genitive singular is listed as among the unusual Kuyunjik orthographies.

\textsuperscript{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, \textit{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.

\textsuperscript{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-šîr NIG.TUKUMa,” “abandon wealth;” and “še-’i ZI mêš,” “seek survival.”
G29  W₁ i 21  j i 23  [ ]’-ak-ku’-ra  [m]a-ak-ku-ru  OV(l) – j has the wrong case vowel for the accusative singular.\textsuperscript{523}

G30  W₁ i 21  j i 23  na-’piš’-t[u] ?  na-piš-ti  Not Counted – The sign in W is too damaged to be certain.\textsuperscript{524}

G31  W₁ i 22  j i 24  a-na  ana  OV – The preposition ana is written logographically in j.

G32  W₁ i 22  j i 24  lib-bi  ŠÀ  OV – j has the logogram for √libbu, “heart, midst.”

G33  W₁ i 23  j i 25a  ta-ban-nu-ši  ‘ta-ban’-nu-šú  SV(1) – Difference in gender.\textsuperscript{525}

G34  W₁ i 24  j i 25b  min-du-da  ‘mun-du-da’  OV(l) – Difference in grammatical form.\textsuperscript{526}

G35  W₁ i 24  j i 25b  mi-na-tu-šá  ‘mi-na-tu’-šú  SV(1) – Difference in gender.\textsuperscript{527}

G36  T₂ i 3’  W₁ i 26  abp-si-i  ABZU  OV – The noun apsu, “subterranean waters,” is written logographically in W.

\textsuperscript{523} According to J. Huehnergard, \textit{Grammar}, 597, Standard Babylonian exhibits a merging of the accusative singular case ending towards the nominative singular case ending ‘-u,’ however A.R. George, \textit{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.

\textsuperscript{524} The sign in W has only the lower head of a single wedge preserved in the lower left part. As well as TÚ (FTWARE), this could just as easily be read as TU (ปราที), TI (ปราที) or TI3 (ปราที).

\textsuperscript{525} The 3fs pronominal object suffix is written as 3ms in j. According to J. Huehnergard, \textit{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.

\textsuperscript{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, \textit{Gilgamesh}, 426, classes this variant as a “difference of tense, stem or mood,” and more specifically A.R. George, \textit{Gilgamesh}, 879, records the form in j as “II/1 stative mun-du-da.”

\textsuperscript{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]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,G₄A
W1 i 31a [i]-’qab’-bi
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-áš]-’šú-nu-ti’
W1 i 32 ta-qab-ba-áš-šu-nu-tu
OV(I) – W has the wrong case vowel for the accusative singular.528

G41 T2 i 12’ ul a-ša-k-na[a]
W1 i 34b ul a-ša-k-kan
OV(I) – Difference in grammatical form.529

G42 T2 i 12’ pji-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’ pji-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’ ü GURUŠ.MEŠ
C i 10’ ü GURUŠ.MEŠ
OV – T and C have the determinative LÚ denoting professional office, lacking in C.

G45 C i 1a’-b’ ‘GURUŠ.MEŠ’[ ]
T2 i 23b’-24’ ü GURUŠ.MEŠ ‘i’-[ ] bji-’lu’
C i 9’-10’ ši-bu-ti i-[zab ] ü GURUŠ.MEŠ 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 šunuti > 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’ C i 11’ [š]a-ru-u OV – C has CVC-CV against CV-CV in c.531

G47 C i 3’ lap-nu j ii 6a lap-ni OV(l) – j has the wrong case vowel for the nominative singular.532

G48 C i 4’ ut-4-mi W i i 1 ’ú-t-me’ OV(l) – The case vowel in W is written as /e/ against the expected /i/ in C.533

G49 C ii 2 W i ii 10 NINDA.ÂM j ii 3 10 NINDA.TA.ÂM j ii 8 10 NINDA.TA.ÂM OV – W and j write √nindanu, “measuring rod of 12 cubits,” with the full composite logogram.

G50 T i 31’ W i ii 5a 6-šú 6-šu OV – Different spelling of the 3ms pronominal suffix.

G51 J i ii 8’ T 2 i 34’ J ii 8’ lú ’lu’ lú-ú OV – The long vowel in the asseverative particle lú, “indeed,” is written in W.

G52 J i ii 8’ T 2 i 34’ am-‘haš’ am-ḥas-si OV(l) – The pronominal suffix is lacking in J.534

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 (𒄁) and MI (𒄄) 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 primae 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 532. 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 accusative/oblique case.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W₁ ii 8</td>
<td>ḫi-šīh-tum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G54</td>
<td>W₁ ii 9a</td>
<td>3 šár ku-up-ri 6 šár ku-u[p ]</td>
<td>HV – Difference in the cardinal number.(^{535})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j ii 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></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 (\sqrt{\text{kīru}}), “storage jar.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T₁ ii 2</td>
<td>k[i-i-ri]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W₁ ii 9a</td>
<td>ki-i-ri</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G56</td>
<td>W₁ ii 9a</td>
<td>ana</td>
<td>OV – The preposition (\text{ana}) is written logographically in W.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J₁ ii 10’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G57</td>
<td>T₁ ii 4</td>
<td>[ l]i (\text{gū} \text{su-us-su-ul})</td>
<td>OV(l) – W lacks the genitive case vowel.(^{536})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W₁ ii 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></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>j ii 18</td>
<td>e-zi-[b]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G59</td>
<td>W₁ ii 12</td>
<td>2 šár Ï.GIŠ[</td>
<td>SV(2) – j apparently lacks the noun (\sqrt{\text{šamnu}}), “oil.”(^{538})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j ii 19</td>
<td>2 šár u[</td>
<td></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 (𒐈) and 6 (𒐋). 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 \(\sqrt{\text{sussullu}}\), “(wooden) box,” which in context is written: ERIN.MEŠ naš gū sussulli, “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 Ï.GIŠ ša u-pa-az-zi-ru lâ MÁ.LAḪ₄,” šina šâr šamnu ša upazziru malâḫu, “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 šâr upazziru malâḫu, “there were two myriads which the shipwright stowed away.”
G60  J₁ ii 17'  ḫ.GIŠ  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
   T₁ ii 8  ḫ-GIŠ

G61  T₁ ii 10a  [ ]-ri  SV(2) – T has an extra line that is omitted in the other sources. 540
   J₁ ii 18-19  omits
   W₁ ii 16  omits
   j ii 23-24  omits

G62  J₁ ii 19'  [ Š]ú  Not Counted – The sign in W is too damaged to allow a certain reading.
   T₁ ii 10b  ip-pu-šú
   W₁ ii 16b  [ Š]u?

G63  J₁ ii 19'  ki-ma  SV(1) – Lexical interchange. 541
   T₁ ii 10b  ki-i
   W₁ ii 16b  ki-i

G64  J₁ ii 25b  e-še-en-ši  OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation. 542
   T₁ ii 16b  i-še-en-ši

G65  J₁ ii 28'  u  OV – Different spellings of the conjunction.
   W₁ ii 22  'û'

G66  J₁ ii 28'  sa-lat-ia  OV – J has CVC-VV against [CV]-CV-VV in T. 543
   T₁ ii 18  [ ]ti-ia

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 šēnu, “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 W₁ ii 23 um-ma-nu OV(l) – W has the wrong vowel marking the oblique plural.⁵⁴⁴
G69 J₁ ii 31’ ú-šá-az-na-an-nu W₁ ii 25 ú-šá-az-na-nu OV – Repetition of final consonant at the morpheme boundary in J.⁵⁴⁵
G70 J₁ ii 31’ šá-mu-ut W₁ ii 25 šá-mu-t[u OV(l) – Lack of case vowel in J against wrong case vowel in W.⁵⁴⁶
G71 J₁ ii 32’ pi-ḫe KA-ka T₁ ii 22 pi-ḫe KA-ka W₁ ii 26a pi-ḫe MA SV(1) – Lexical interchange.⁵⁴⁷
G72 J₁ ii 34’ ú-šá-az-na-na W₁ ii 27 i-za-an-na-nu SV(1) – Difference in grammatical forms, read as a lexical interchange.⁵⁴⁸
G73 J₁ ii 34’ šá-mu-ut T₁ ii 24 [ u]t W₁ ii 27 šá-mu-tu OV(l) – Lack of case vowel in J and T against the wrong case vowel in W.⁵⁴⁹

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. Huehnergard, 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 ľzananu, “he will bring down rain,” against I/1 present future ľzananu, “he will continually rain” in W.
⁵⁴⁹ See the same type of variation above, note .
G74 J1 ii 36’ i-ši T1 ii 26 i-šu OV(l) – J has the wrong inflected verbal ing, or a possible difference in pronunciation.550

G75 C ii 3’ ana W1 ii 29 ’a”-na OV – The preposition ana is written logographically in C.

G76 C ii 3’ ana lib-bi šá MÁ W1 ii 29 a-na SV(2) – C has an additional clarifying noun.551

G77 J1 ii 37’ ap-te-ḫi T1 ii 27 a)p-’te´-ḫi W1 ii 29 ap-’ti´-ḫi OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.552

G78 C ii 4’ [ h]i-i W1 ii 30 a-ne pa-he-’e’ OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.553

G79 C ii 4’ pe-ḫi-i šá GIŠ.MÁ pu-zu-ur SV(1) – The preposition ana precedes the proper noun in W.

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 libbi 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 apteḫi in W against apteḫi 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 ʾpaḫu as themed ‘i/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 = ti₃, iš = eš₉” (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>W</th>
<th>G80</th>
<th>G81</th>
<th>G82</th>
<th>G83</th>
<th>G84</th>
<th>G85</th>
<th>G86</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W1 ii 30</td>
<td>pe-ḫe-e šá GIŠ.MÂ a-na m pu-zu-&lt;ur&gt;-Š KUR’.GAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G80 C ii 4’</td>
<td>m pu-zu-ur-[d][ OV – The proper noun Puzur-Enlil lacks the determinative in W. 554</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W1 ii 30</td>
<td>pu-zu-&lt;ur&gt;-Š KUR’.GAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G81 C ii 5’</td>
<td>at-ta-din</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J1 ii 39’</td>
<td>[ i]n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W1 ii 31</td>
<td>at-[ta]-’din’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G82 C ii 7’</td>
<td>iš-tu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W1 ii 33</td>
<td>u[l-tu]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G83 J1 ii 42’</td>
<td>ir-tam-ma-am-ma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W1 ii 34a</td>
<td>iš/ir-(t)ag]-’gu-um’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G84 C ii 10’</td>
<td>GU.ZA.LÁ.MEŠ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J1 ii 44’</td>
<td>[ ME]Š</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W1 ii 35</td>
<td>gu-za-lú-’ú’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G85 C ii 11’</td>
<td>d er-ra-kal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J1 ii 45’</td>
<td>[ g]al</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G86 C ii 11’</td>
<td>ú-n[a SV(1) – Apparent difference in verbal mor-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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. Hämäen-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 /t/ is a feature of Standard Babylonian. See also G211 and G231 below.

556 This is counted as a lexical interchange /šragamu, “shout, exclaim,” and /šramamu, “roar, rumble.” A.R. George, *Gilgamesh*, 884, notes that iš(t)agamma/irtagamma is “probably more original than ... irtam-mamma.”

557 The plural noun in W is marked with the spelling of long ‘-a’ 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.
J i i 45’  i-na-as-saḫ  phology. 559

G87  C ii 12’  mi-ih-ra  OV(l) – J has the wrong case vowel for the accusative singular. 560
     J i i 46’  i[i]-ri

G88  C ii 15’  i-ba-’-u’  OV – Different spelling of the final vowel.
     J i i 49’  bja-’-u

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.
     J i i 50’  [ ting]

G90  J i iii 5a  a-ḥa-šú  OV – Different spelling of the 3ms pronominal suffix.
     T ii 42a  a-ḥa-šu

G91  C iii 3b  ina ’ka’-r[a  SV(1) – Lexical interchange. 561
     J i iii 5b  ina A[N

G92  J i iii 6  DINGIR.DINGIR  OV – Different spelling of the plural noun ilū, “gods.” 562
     T ii 43  DINGIR.MEŠ

G93  J i iii 6  ip-tal-ḫu  OV(l) – Difference in verbal stem or tense. 563
     T ii 43  ip-la-ḫu

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, √nasāḫu, “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 šamūtu, “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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Characters</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G94</td>
<td>J1</td>
<td>it-te-eh-su</td>
<td>OV(I) – Possible Assyrian dialect form in T. (^{564})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2</td>
<td>ii</td>
<td>it-taḥ-su</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G95</td>
<td>J1</td>
<td>ki-ma</td>
<td>OV – The preposition <em>kima</em> is written logographically in T.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2</td>
<td>ii</td>
<td>GIM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G96</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>klj-ma</td>
<td>SV(2) – C has a different phraseology compared to J. (^{565})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J1</td>
<td>iii</td>
<td>ma-li-ti</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G97</td>
<td>J1</td>
<td>ú-nam-bi</td>
<td>OV(I) – Possible difference in pronunciation. (^{566})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2</td>
<td>ii</td>
<td>ú-nam-ba</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G98</td>
<td>J1</td>
<td>DINGIR.MAḪ</td>
<td>SV(1) – Lexical interchange. (^{567})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2</td>
<td>ii</td>
<td>ḍ be-lEt-D[GIＲ.MEŠ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G99</td>
<td>J1</td>
<td>šá a-na’-ku</td>
<td>SV(1) – Interchange of prepositions. (^{568})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2</td>
<td>ii</td>
<td>áš-šú a-na-ku</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{564}\) 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 /ī/, 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).


\(^{566}\) 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.

\(^{567}\) The form “DINGIR.MAḪ,” *ilu šīri*, or contextual *ilu šīrti*, “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.

\(^{568}\) J has ša anaku, “(regarding) which I,” against T aššu anaku, “because I.”
| G100 | J1 iii 12 | ina ma-ḫar | SV(1) – Lexical interchange. 
| T2 ii 49 | ina pu-ḫur |

| G101 | J1 iii 13 | ina ma-ḫar | SV(1) – Lexical interchange. 
| T2 ii 50 | ina pu-ḫur |

| G102 | J1 iii 15 | a-na-ku-[u]m-ma | OV – J writes V-CV against VCV in T. 
| T2 ii 25 | ana-ku-um-ma |

| G103 | J1 iii 17 | DINGIR.DINGIR | OV – Different spelling of the plural noun iššu. 
| T1 iii 2 | DINGIR.MEŠ |

| G104 | J1 iii 18 | DINGIR.MEŠ aš-ru āš-bi i-na bi-ki-ti | HV – Variant lines in J and T. 
| T1 iii 3 | ina nu-ru-ub ni-is-ša-ti ba’-k[u-ú |

| G105 | J1 iii 19 | kat-ma šap-ta-šu-nu | SV(1) – Lexical interchange. 
| T1 iii 4 | šab-ba šap-ta-šu-nu |

| G106 | J1 iii 20 | 6 ur-ri | OV(l) – J has the wrong case vowel for the oblique plural. 
| T1 iii 5 | ’6’ ur-ri |

---

569 The meaning conveyed in both sources may be contextually synonymous, where J has *ina ma-ḫar*, “in the presence (of the gods),” and T has *ina pu-ḫur*, “in the assembly (of the gods).” According to A.R. George, *Gilgamesh*, 887, T retains the superior text.

570 See also G92 above.

571 C ostensibly follows J although not enough is preserved to be sure. According to A.R. George, *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 *iššu aš-bišša ina bikiti*, “downcast, the gods sat in grief,” (cf. CAD B 224b), whereas T has *ina nurub nissati bakī 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, *Gilgamesh*, 424.

572 J has *š[katāmu]*, “closed,” against *š[sabābu]*, “parched” 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, *Gilgamesh*, 887-88.

573 J is read as /a/ for oblique plural (cf. A.R. George, *Gilgamesh*, 440) rather than as a collective singular.
G107  J1 iii 20  mu-šá-a-ti  SV(2) – Extra cardinal number in T.\textsuperscript{574}
T1 iii 5  '7'[ ]

G108  J1 iii 21  il-lak šá-a-ru a-bu-’bu me’-ḫu-ū  SV(3) – J preserves a different word order compared to T.\textsuperscript{575}
T1 iii 6  il-lak šá-’a'-ru ra-a-du mi-ḫu-ū a-b[u

G109  J1 iii 21  (omits)  ra-a-du  SV(2) – J lacks the term rādu, “downpour.”
T1 iii 6

G110  C iii 20a  7-ú u₄’-mu  OV – J writes the ordinal number syllabically.
J1 iii 22a  se-bu-ū u₄-mu
T1 iii 7a  7-ú u₄’-m[u

G111  C iii 20a  ina  OV – The preposition is written syllabically in J.
J1 iii 22a  i-na

G112  C iii 20a  ina ka-šá-[a]’-di’  OV(l) – C has the wrong case vowel for the genitive singular.\textsuperscript{576}
J1 iii 22a  i-na ka-šá-a-’di’
T1 iii 7a  k[ja]-šá-di

G113  J1 iii 22a  ka-šá-a-’di’  OV – The long vowel in √kašādu is written in J.
T1 iii 7a  k[ja]-šá-di

\textsuperscript{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 mišatti, is restored in T as 6 urri u 7 mišatti, 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 than a deliberative one.

\textsuperscript{575} J has šaru abūbu meḫu, “wind, flood, storm,” against šaru rādu miḫu abubu, “wind, downpour, storm, flood” in T. A.R. George, Gilgamesh, 888, notes that T is closer to the text of Atra-šasī. The linguistic variation between the spelling of the word meḫu / miḫu is not counted in the light of Rule 3.

\textsuperscript{576} The expected case vowel for the I/1 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 \( \text{`it'-ta-raq } \text{me-ḫu-ú[} \) ] SV(2) – J has a different formulation of the line against C and T.\(^{577}\)

\[ J_1 \text{ iii 22b } \text{`te'-riq`'} \text{šu-ú a-bu-bu qab-la} \]

\[ T_1 \text{ iii 7b it-ta-raq m[i} \]

\[ G115 \] C iii 20b me-ḫu-ú T1 iii 7b m[\]

OV(I) – Possible difference in pronunciation.\(^{578}\)

\[ G116 \] C iii 21 ša

OV – Different spelling of the relative pronoun.

\[ J_1 \text{ iii 23 šá} \]

\[ T_1 \text{ iii 8 šá} \]

\[ G117 \] C iii 21 GIM J1 iii 23 ki-ma T1 iii 8 GIM

OV – The preposition is written syllabically in J.

\[ G118 \] C iii 22 uš-ḫa-ri-ir J1 iii 24 uš-ḫa-ri-ir-ma T1 iii 9 uš-ḫa-ri-ir

SV(1) – J has the enclitic particle “-ma” lacking in the other sources.

\([577]\) 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 meḫû ..., “the storm relented,” where the form of √tarāqu, “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 šā abūbu qabla, which seems to have the active stative (the so-called ‘predicative verbal adjective’) plus the demonstrative pronoun, and mentions the abūbu, “Deluge,” in place of the meḫû, “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 distribue leurs coups (au hasard),” [(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 ittahšû > itteḫšû, 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, meḫû, might be considered a byform of míḫû.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G119</td>
<td>C iii 22</td>
<td>im-ḫul-lu</td>
<td>OV – Probable spelling error in J.579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J1 iii 24</td>
<td>im-šu-lu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G120</td>
<td>C iii 22</td>
<td>ʾik`-lu</td>
<td>OV(l) – Wrong stem vowel in final weak √kalû, “abated, held back” in C.580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J1 iii 24</td>
<td>ik-la</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G121</td>
<td>C iii 23</td>
<td>ap-pal-sa-am-ʾma`</td>
<td>OV – J has CV-VC against CVC in the other sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e3 iii 2'</td>
<td>'ap`-[p]al[ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G122</td>
<td>C iii 23</td>
<td>ap-pal-sa-am-ʾma`</td>
<td>OV(l) – J lacks the ventive suffix.581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J1 iii 25</td>
<td>ap-pa-al-sa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1 iii 10</td>
<td>ap-pal-sa-am-ma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G123</td>
<td>C iii 23</td>
<td>ap-pal-sa-am-ʾma`</td>
<td>SV(1) – J lacks the enclitic particle ‘ma.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J1 iii 25</td>
<td>ap-pa-al-sa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1 iii 10</td>
<td>ap-pal-sa-am-ma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G124</td>
<td>C iii 23</td>
<td>uš-ma</td>
<td>SV(2) – The interchange of lexemes amounts to a clarification in J.582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J1 iii 25</td>
<td>ta-ma-ta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1 iii 10</td>
<td>uš-ma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

579 The most convincing explanation for this variant is that Š (𒉠) was erroneously written for ḪUL (𒆠) in J. An alternative possibility is that the form in J represents some linguistic elision of the guttural phoneme /ḥ/ in this lexeme. The latter is highly unlikely given the regular writing of /ḥ/ elsewhere in the tablet and the lack of any known parallel linguistic phenomena in the Akkadian dialects.

580 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.

581 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.

582 The term in J is √tāmu, “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 Uš 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  ù
     T1 iii 11  u
     c3 iii 3'  u

G126  C iii 26  [a]p-ti  OV(I) – 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(I) – 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(I) – c has the wrong case vowel for the
genitive singular.585
     J1 iii 31  kib-ra-a-ti
     T1 iii 16  kib-ra[t]i
     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
     J1 iii 31  pa-tu A.AB.BA
     T1 iii 16  a-n[a
     c3 iii 8a'  pa'-a'

G131  C iii 29  pa'-tu  OV – The long vowel in the form pātu,
     J1 iii 31  pa-tu  “edge,” is written in c.
     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 Babylonia.

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, lack-
ing the preposition, have appalis kibrāti pātu tāmti, “I looked to the shoreline, the sea’s edge.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G132</th>
<th>J_1 iii 32</th>
<th>12.TA.ÀM</th>
<th>HV – Difference in cardinal numbers.\textsuperscript{587}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T_1 iii 17</td>
<td>14.TA.ÀM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G133</td>
<td>J_1 iii 33</td>
<td>a-na</td>
<td>OV – The preposition is written logographically in T.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T_1 iii 18</td>
<td>ana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c_3 iii 9a’</td>
<td>a-na</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G134</td>
<td>J_1 iii 33</td>
<td>a-na KUR ni-muš</td>
<td>SV(2) – c lacks the clarifying plus šadû, “mountain,” before the proper noun.\textsuperscript{588}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T_1 iii 18</td>
<td>ana KUR ni-muš</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c_3 iii 9a’</td>
<td>a-na ni-muš</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G135</td>
<td>J_1 iii 34</td>
<td>kur ni-muš</td>
<td>OV – The determinative KUR, šadu, is lacking in T.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T_1 iii 19</td>
<td>ni-muš</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G136</td>
<td>J_1 iii 35</td>
<td>u₄-mu</td>
<td>OV(I) – J has the wrong case vowel for the accusative singular.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T_1 iii 20a</td>
<td>u₄-ma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c_3 iii 10a</td>
<td>u₄’-ma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G137</td>
<td>J_1 iii 35</td>
<td>2-a</td>
<td>OV – The ordinal number √šanû, “second,” is written without the phonetic complement in T.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T_1 iii 20a</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c_3 iii 10a</td>
<td>2-a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G138</td>
<td>J_1 iii 35</td>
<td>u₄-mu</td>
<td>OV(I) – J has the wrong case vowel for the accusative singular.\textsuperscript{589}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T_1 iii 20a</td>
<td>u₄-ma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c_3 iii 10a</td>
<td>u₄-ma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{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. Horowitz, 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.

\textsuperscript{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.”

\textsuperscript{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 ħšalšu, “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(l) – J has the wrong case vowel for the accusative singular. |
| J1 iii 36 | u4-ma |
| W2 iii 2b’ | u4-ma |
| G141 | C iii 33b | 4-a | OV – The ordinal number ħrebu, “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(l) – J has the wrong case vowel for the accusative singular. |
| J1 iii 36 | u4-ma |
| W2 iii 2b’ | u4-ma |
| G143 | C iii 33b | KUR-ú | SV(2) – The proper noun is lacking in C.590 |
| J1 iii 36 | KUR-ú ni-muš |
| G144 | J1 iii 37 | 5-šú | OV(l) – 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, ħuma, “(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, ħuma, “(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(l) – W and c have the wrong case vowel for the accusative singular.591 |
| J1 iii 38 | 7-a |
| W2 iii 3b’ | 7-ú |
| c3 iii 13’ | 7-ú |

590 J has the inclusion of the proper noun (ḫadu) Nimuš, “(mount) Nimuš,” against šadu, “(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(I) – W and c have the wrong case vowel for the accusative singular.
J₁ 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.
J₁ iii 38  i-na
C iii 13'  [i]na

G150 C iii 34b  ka-šá-a-di  OV – C writes the long medial vowel in √kašādu, “to arrive.”
J₁ iii 38  ka-šá-d[i]

G151 C iii 35b  i-pi-ra-am-m[a]  SV(1) – Lexical interchange.
J₁ iii 39b  i-tu-ram-m[a]
W₂ iii 4b'  [i][p]i[
C₁ iii 15'  [i][t][u]

G152 J₁ iii 40  i-pa-áš-šum-ma  OV(I) – Difference in grammatical form.
W₂ iii 5'  [i][p-a-DA-áš-šum]-ma
c₁ iii 16'  i'-pa-áš-šum'-ma

---

592 According to A.R. George, *Gilgamesh*, 889, the obscure verb in C and W, √ēpēru, “to provide food,” is exchanged with a more commonly known lexeme, √láru, “to return,” in J and c. The reading of the sign PI (𒈹) 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 √ēpešu 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 šim-ma SV(1) – Difference in gender of the dative pronominal suffix.\textsuperscript{594}

J\textsubscript{1} iii 40 i-pa-āš-šum-ma
W\textsubscript{2} iii 5’ [ ]pa-DA-aš-šum’-ma
\textsubscript{c} iii 16’ i-’pa-āš-šum’-ma’

G154 C iii 37a ša[r] OV(l) – The stem vowel of √wašāru, “to send,” is different in J.\textsuperscript{595}

J\textsubscript{1} iii 41a ú-maš-šir
W\textsubscript{2} iii 6a’ ú-maš-š[ar]

G155 C iii 37b i-pi-ra-a[m] SV(1) – Lexical interchange.\textsuperscript{596}

J\textsubscript{1} iii 41b i-tu-ram-m[a]
W\textsubscript{2} iii 6b’ i-pi’-r[a]

G156 C iii 38 man-za-[u] OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.\textsuperscript{597}

J\textsubscript{1} iii 42 man-za-zu
W\textsubscript{2} iii 7’ ]-su

G157 C iii 38 ši[m-ma] SV(1) – Difference in gender of the dative pronominal suffix.\textsuperscript{598}

J\textsubscript{1} iii 42 i-pa-āš-šam-ma

G158 C iii 39 b[a] OV(l) – J has the wrong case vowel for the accusative singular.\textsuperscript{599}

J\textsubscript{1} iii 43 a-ri-bi
W\textsubscript{2} iii 8a’ ]ri-ba

G159 J\textsubscript{1} iii 46 ni-qa-a OV(l) – W has the wrong case vowel for the accusative singular.\textsuperscript{600}

W\textsubscript{4} iii 1’ nji-q[u]

\textsuperscript{594} C seems to read TU.MUŠEN as summatu, “dove,” a feminine noun if we are to read the dative pronominal suffix “-simma” as correct. All other sources have this noun as masculine, thus reading TU.MUŠEN as summu, cf. A.R. George, Gilgamesh, 889.

\textsuperscript{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.

\textsuperscript{596} See above, G151.

\textsuperscript{597} See J. Hämeen-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.

\textsuperscript{598} See above, G152.

\textsuperscript{599} Cf. A.R. George, Gilgamesh, 439.

\textsuperscript{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-nū  OV – Different spelling of the verb √eṣēnu, “to smell (a fragrance).”
J1 iii 50a  i-ṣi-nu

G161  J1 iii 50b  i-ri-šā  OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.601
W4 iii 4b’  ’e’-ri-šā

W4 iii 4b’  ta[

G163  C iii 47  ’ki-i’  SV(1) – Lexical interchange.602
J1 iii 51  ki-ma
C2 iii 1’  ’ki-ma’

G164  C iv 1  d a-nu-um  OV – C has CV-VC against CVC in J.
J1 iii 53  d a-num

G165  J1 iii 53  šu-hi-šū  OV – The pronominal suffix is written as ŠU in W.
W3 iii 1’  ]hi-šu

G166  C iv 2  an-nu-tum  OV(l) – C and c have the wrong case vowel for the oblique plural.603
J1 iii 54  an-nu-ti
C2 iii 4’  an-nu-’tum

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. Hämee-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 annūti, which is given as the nominative plural form annūtu 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 | J1 iii 54 | a-a am-ši | SV(2) – Expansive plus in J, lacking in W.  
W3 iii 2’ | omsits |
| G168 | C iv 2 | an-nu-tum | OV(l) – C and c have the wrong case vowel for the oblique plural.  
J1 iii 54 | an-nu-ti |
|       | c2 iii 4’ | an-nu-‘tum’ |
| G169 | C iv 3 | UD.MEŠ | OV – The plural marker is written as ME in C.  
J1 vi 1 | UD.MEŠ |
|       | c2 iii 5’ | [UD.M]E |
| G170 | C iv 3 | lu-ú-uh-su-sa-am | SV(1) – C has an additional precative particle, lacking in the other sources.  
J1 iii 54 | lu-ú-uh-su-sa-a[m |
|       | c2 iii 4’ | ‘ah’ |
| G171 | J1 iv 1 | am-si | OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.  
W3 iii 3’ | am-si |

---

604 The plus, √mašû, “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-ḫasî. 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 imšî does read well enough in context, though, and can thus be counted as an alternative reading in the light of Rule 1: ilî annûti lu uqnî kišâdîa ai amšî; imê annûti lu aḥṣamma ana dârîš ai amšî, “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 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 ūmi, “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 luḥṣamma, “may I surely remember,” is rendered as aḥṣamma, “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  
    J1 iv 2  DINGIR.MEŠ  
    e2 iii 6'  DINGI[ ]R 
    OV – The plural marker MEŠ is lacking in c. 608

G173  J1 iv 3  sur-qin-ni  
    W3 iii 4b'  sur-qí-ni  
    OV – The doubling of the final consonant in J is read as an orthographic variant.

G174  C iv 6  im-tal-ku-ma  
    J1 iv 4  im-tal-ku-ma  
    e2 iii 8'  im-tal-li-ku[  
    OV(l) – c has the durative form against the preterite in the other sources. 609

G175  C iv 7  u  
    J1 iv 5  ù  
    OV – The conjunction is written as U in C.

G176  J1 iv 5  ana  
    W3 iii 6'  'a`-na  
    OV – The preposition ana is written syllabically in W.

G177  C iv 10  lib-ba-ti  
    J1 iv 7b  lib-ba-ti  
    e2 iv 3  b[ ]a-a-te  
    OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation. 610

G178  J1 iv 7b  im-ta-li  
    e2 iv 3  im-ta-la  
    OV(l) – J has the wrong stem vowel for final weak √malû, “to be filled.” 611

G179  J1 iv 7b  DINGIR.DINGIR  
    e2 iv 3  'DINGIR'.MEŠ  
    OV – The plural noun ilû, “gods,” is written as a compound logogram in J. 612

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.

243
| 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-š[i]     | OV(l) – c has the wrong stem vowel for 3ms preterite ㈜wašû, “to go forth.” |
|       | J1 iv 8a | ú-ši       | |
|       | c2 iv 4  | ú-šu       | |

| G182  | J1 iv 9b | MU-ár      | 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[n | OV – C has CV-VC against CVC in J and c. |
|       | J1 iv 10 | i-ba-n[i]  | |
|       | c2 iv 7a | i-ban-ni   | |

| G185  | J1 iv 11 | û          | OV – The conjunction is written as Ù 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 ayumma, “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 ayanišma, “where,” which suits the context grammatically and maintains the sense: ayanišma ūši napišti, “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: ayumma ūši 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 Enlil, “he said to the hero Enlil.” J has essentially the same sense given that it too has the preposition ana 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.
\(\text{G187} \quad \text{C iv 15a} \quad -'\text{sú}' \quad \text{OV} - \text{The possessive pronominal suffix is written with the sign ŠU in b.}\)

\(\text{J1 iv 12a} \quad \text{pa-a-šú} \quad \text{b obv. 1a'} \quad \text{š}][u \quad \text{c2 iv 8a} \quad p[\text{a-}'a-šú}

\(\text{G188} \quad \text{C iv 15b} \quad r\]a \quad \text{OV(I)} - \text{J lacks the ventive suffix.}\,^{615}

\(\text{J1 iv 12b} \quad \text{MU-ár} \quad \text{c2 iv 8b} \quad \text{MU-ra}

\(\text{G189} \quad \text{J1 iv 12b} \quad \text{qu-ra-du} \quad \text{OV(I)} - \text{J has the wrong case vowel for the genitive singular.}\,^{616}

\(\text{c2 iv 8b} \quad \text{qu'-ra-di}

\(\text{G190} \quad \text{C iv 17} \quad \text{t\}a-li[k} \quad \text{OV(I)} - \text{Difference in grammatical forms.}\,^{617}

\(\text{J1 iv 14} \quad \text{tam-ta-lik-ma} \quad \text{c2 iv 10} \quad \text{t'al-lik'-ma}

\(\text{G191} \quad \text{C iv 17} \quad \text{b\}ju-ba} \quad \text{OV(I)} - \text{J has the wrong case vowel for the accusative singular.}\,^{618}

\(\text{J1 iv 14} \quad \text{a-bu-bu}

\(\text{G192} \quad \text{C iv 17} \quad \text{ki'-i['} \quad \text{OV} - \text{The interrogative kiki, “how,” is written differently in b.}\)

\(\text{J1 iv 14} \quad \text{ki-i-ki-i} \quad \text{b obv. 2b'} \quad \text{ki-ki[}

\(\text{G193} \quad \text{C iv 18a} \quad \text{ár-ni} \quad \text{SV(1)} - \text{Lexical interchange.}\,^{619}

\(\text{J1 iv 15a} \quad \text{ḥi-ṭi} \quad \text{c2 iv 11} \quad \text{ḥ[}'r-n[i}

\(\text{G194} \quad \text{C iv 18a} \quad \text{ḫa-šú} \quad \text{OV} - \text{The medial vowel is written as long in J.}\)

\(\text{J1 iv 15a} \quad \text{ḥi-ṭa-a-šú} \quad \text{b obv. 3a'} \quad \text{ḥi-ṭa-}'\text{šu'}

\(^{615}\text{See G182 above, and also note , for alternative readings for the ultimate vowel in the other sources that is lacking in J.}\)

\(^{616}\text{Cf. A.R. George, Gilgamesh, 441.}\)

\(^{617}\text{The form in c appears to be I/2 present future or II/1 perfect of }\sqrt{\text{malâku}}, “to counsel, advise,” against I/2 preterite in the other sources. Without the first part of the verb in c preserved it is impossible to make a judgement on which grammatical form was written there, }\text{tam-tallikma or tuntallikma}. \text{In any case a difference in stem or tense exists between the sources, and in light of G174 a difference in tense is most likely.}\)

\(^{618}\text{Cf. A.R. George, Gilgamesh, 440.}\)

\(^{619}\text{The sense remains the same between the sources. C and c have }\sqrt{\text{arnu}}, “guilt, wrong doing,” against }\sqrt{\text{ḥīṭu}}, “fault, crime,” in J.\)
| G195 | C iv 18a | ]ṭa-šú | OV – The possessive pronominal suffix is written with the sign ŠU in b. |
| G196 | C iv 20 | am-ma-ki | OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.620 |
| G197 | J1 iv 17a | am-ma-ku |
| G198 | J1 iv 17a | taš-ku-nu | OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.621 |
| G199 | C iv 20 | a-bu-b[u] | OV(l) – C has the wrong case vowel for the accusative singular. |
| G200 | J1 iv 17a | a-bu-ba |
| G201 | b obv. 5a’ | a-bu-ba |
| G202 | C iv 22a | am-ma-ki | OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation. |
| G203 | J1 iv 18a | am-ma-ku |
| G204 | C iv 22a | taš-ku[n] | OV – C has CVC against CV-CV in J.622 |
| G205 | J1 iv 19a | taš-ku-nu |
| G206 | C iv 24a | am-ma-ki | OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation. |
| G207 | J1 iv 20a | am-ma-ku |
| G208 | C iv 24a | taš-ku[n] | OV – C has CVC against CV-CV in J. |
| G209 | J1 iv 20a | taš-ku-nu |
| G210 | C iv 24b | KUR | SV(2) – Lexical interchange, counted as a clarifying plus in J.623 |
| G211 | J1 iv 20b | ÜG.MEŠ |

620 J consistently writes the conjunction ammaki, “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, niṣi, “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          OV – C has VCV against V-CV in J. J1 iv 21   a-na-ku

G207  C iv 25           e[p          OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation. J1 iv 21   ap-ta-a

b obv. 9’          a[p-ta-a

G208  C iv 27           š]u          OV – The possessive pronominal suffix is written with the sign ŠU in C. J1 iv 23a   mi-lik-šû

G209  J1 iv 23b          d IDIM b obv. 12’          ṭ-d’ é-a LUGAL

G210  C iv 28             ’a-na‘          OV – The preposition ana is written logographically in J. J1 iv 23b   ana

G211  J1 iv 24           ul-te-la-an-ni          OV(l) – Difference in pronunciation.626 b obv. 13’   uš-te-la-a[n

lar to the scribe. C has: Erra littamma māta, “Erra may destroy the land;” this is against J: Erra littamma nišš, “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 nišš, 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 √petût, “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-napištī 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. Hämeen-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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G212</th>
<th>C iv 33</th>
<th>ki-i</th>
<th>SV(1) – Lexical interchange.(^{627})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J(_i) iv 28</td>
<td>ki-ma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G213</th>
<th>C iv 35</th>
<th>pi-i</th>
<th>OV – The bound form of √pū, “mouth,” is written logographically in J.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J(_i) iv 30</td>
<td>KA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G214</th>
<th>C iv 36</th>
<th>n]a</th>
<th>OV(l) – C has the wrong case vowel for the nominative singular of the interrogative pronoun √mannu, “who, whoever.”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J(_i) iv 31</td>
<td>man-nu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G215</th>
<th>C iv 37</th>
<th>b]a-ú</th>
<th>OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.(^{628})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J(_i) iv 32</td>
<td>tu-ba-’-ú</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G216</th>
<th>C iv 38</th>
<th>u</th>
<th>OV – The conjunction is written with the sign U in C.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J(_i) iv 33</td>
<td>ù</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G217</th>
<th>C iv 42</th>
<th>ba-la-[a]</th>
<th>OV(l) – J has the wrong case vowel for the accusative singular.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J(_i) iv 37</td>
<td>ba-la-[u]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G218</th>
<th>C iv 44</th>
<th>ru-’ú’-[qí]</th>
<th>OV – The long vowel in medial weak √rūqu, “faraway, distant,” is written in C.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J(_i) iv 39</td>
<td>ru-qí</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G219</th>
<th>C v 1</th>
<th>re-ši-[u]</th>
<th>OV – The possessive pronominal suffix is written with the sign ŠU in C.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J(_i) iv 45</td>
<td>re-ši-šū</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G220</th>
<th>C v 3</th>
<th>i-pi</th>
<th>OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.(^{629})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J(_i) iv 47</td>
<td>e-pi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^{627}\) 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. Hämeen-Anttila, Neo-Assyrian Grammar, 13-14.

\(^{629}\) The 1cs verb preformative /i/ > /e/ is considered an Assyrian dialect form, for which see note .
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G221 C v 3  
J₁ iv 47  
iš-tak-ka-ni  
iš-tak-ka-an  
OV(l) – Possible difference in grammatical form. 630

G222 C v 4  
J₁ iv 48  
u  
ˈù’  
OV – The conjunction is written with the sign U in C.

G223 C v 5  
J₁ iv 49  
iš-ta-at  
t]a-at’  
OV – The feminine form of the ordinal number išteat, “one,” is written syllabically in C and J.

G224 C v 8  
j v 11’  
se-ˈbu’-tum  
7[  
OV – The ordinal number šebūtum, “seven,” is written syllabically in C.

G225 C v 8  
J₁ v 1  
i-ˈte’-gēl-ta-ˈa’[  
ig-gēl-ta-a  
OV(l) – Difference in stem or tense. 631

G226 C v 9  
J₁ v 2  
MU-ra  
MU-ár  
OV(l) – J lacks the ventive suffix. 632

G227 J₁ v 2  
T₁ iv 6’  
ru-qi  
r]u-ú-qi  
OV – The long vowel in the medial weak √ruqu, “faraway, distant,” is written in T.

G228 C v 12  
J₁ v 5  
md G[IŠ-gi]m-maš  
d GIŠ-gim-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. 633

630 The final vowel in C may be read as a defective form of the Neo-Assyrian subjunctive marker, ‘-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 šitakkanī (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 *ištakkāni > ištakkanī*, 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                          tje-‘ka’                      OV(I) – Possible difference in pronunciation.634
J1 v 6                          ku-ru-um-me-ti-ka
T1 iv 11’                         ujm-ma-ti-ka

G231 J1 v 9                             l]ul-tum                      OV – J writes the ordinal number šalultum, “third,” syllabically.635
T1 iv 14a’                         3-tum

G232 C v 17                             ]at-‘ta’        SV(2) – J has a different phraseology compared to the other sources.636
J1 v 12                          al-pu-ut-ka a-na-ku
T1 iv 16                         te-et[g]el-ta-a at-ta
W1 v 4’                           e]t-te-gel-ta[

G233 J1 v 13                          MU-á̄r                          OV(I) – J lacks the ventive suffix.
T1 iv 17’                          MU-ra

J1 v 13                          ru-qi
T1 iv 17                          ru-ú-qi

G235 J1 v 13                          u]t-ZI                            OV – The proper noun “Ûta-napištī(m)” is written with a phonetic complement in W.
W1 v 6’                           u]t-ZI-tim

G236 J1 v 14                          a-a-ka-ni                      OV(I) – Difference in grammatical forms.637
T1 iv 18’                         j’a-‘i-ka

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 /š/ > /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-tegel-ta, “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. Hämene-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.⁶³⁸
     T₁ iv 19’ uṣ-šab-bi-tu₄
G238 J₁ v 16 mu-ú-tum OV – The long vowel in medial weak \(^{\sqrt{mūtu}}\), “death,” is written in J.
     T₁ iv 20’ mu-tum
G239 J₁ v 20 aḥ-sā b rev. 7’ aḥ-šā OV – The pronominal suffix is written with the sign ŠA in b.
     b rev. 7’ aḥ-šā
G240 J₁ v 21a n]a-as-su b rev. 8a’ pa’-na-su OV – The long vowel in the noun \(^{\sqrt{paantu}}\), “front part,” is written in J.⁶³⁹
G241 C v 29 me-’e’[ J₁ v 24 M]EŠ T₁ v 8 A.MEŠ b rev. 11’ m]e-e OV – The plural noun \(^{\sqrt{mē}}\), “water,” is written logographically in J and T.
G242 J₁ v 24 GIM T₁ v 8 GI[M b rev. 11’ ‘ki-ma’ OV – The preposition kīma is written syllabically in b.
G243 C v 30b ṭa-a-bu J₁ v 25b ṭa-a-bu W₁ v 16b [t]a’-[bu]-’um? OV(I) – W preserves mimination, lacking in the other sources.⁶⁴⁰
             J₁ v 25b ṭa-a-bu ṭa-a-bu [t]a’-[bu]-’um? W₁ v 16b [t]a’-[bu]-’um? šu’-p[⁺]
G244 C v 30b ṭa-a-bu šu-pu’[ J₁ v 25b ṭa-a-bu lu ša-pu W₁ v 16b [t]a’-[bu]-’um? šu’-p[u SV(2) – J has a different phraseology compared to the other sources.⁶⁴¹

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 \(^{\sqrt{panū}}\), “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 /s/. 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 [ʃ] 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: *fābu šupā 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: *fābu lū šapā zumuršu,* “let his body be soaked well.”
G245 J1 v 25b zu-mur-šú 
b rev. 13a’ zu-m[ur]-šu 
OV – The pronominal suffix is written with the sign ŠU in b.

G246 C v 31 lu-ú ud-du-šu 
J1 v 26 d[u-uš pár-si-gu 
W1 v 17a’ lu-ú ud-du-šu par-si-gi 
b rev. 13b’ lu-ú[- d][u-u]$-si-gu 
SV(2) – The subject is clarified in the other sources against W.642

G247 C v 31 S[AG.D]U-šú 
J1 v 26 qaq-qa-di-šú 
W1 v 17a’ D]U-šú 
OV – The noun qaqqadu, “head,” is written syllabically in J.

G248 C v 32a te-di-qí 
T1 v 11 te-di-qí 
W1 v 17b te-di-qa 
OV(l) – C and T have the wrong case vowel for the accusative singular.643

G249 C v 32a lu-ú 
J1 v 27 ]’ú 
T1 v 11 lu 
W1 v 17b lu 
OV – The long vowel in the precative particle lū is written in C and J.

642 Though C and b are damaged they appear to agree with J. These are read: lū uduš parsīgu 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 parsīgu, “head-band,” to an indefinite plural “they,” and the noun becomes the object parsīgī, “head-band,” marked as accusative singular with the wrong case vowel /a/ > /i/; (ii) the subject shifts from the noun parsīgu to an indefinite plural “they,” and the noun becomes a plural object parsīgī, “head-bands,” marked as oblique plural /ī/; (iii) the noun parsīgī is plural and remains as the subject, being marked with the wrong case vowel /ū/ > /i/. The latter reading, (iii), is preferred in A.R. George, Gilgamesh, 427, and we similarly read W as lū udušū parsīgī 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.

643 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/ > /i/, 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G250</th>
<th>C v 32b</th>
<th>URU-šú</th>
<th>SV(1) – Lexical interchange. 644</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J1 v 28a</td>
<td>'KUR-šú</td>
<td>W1 v 18a'</td>
<td>URU-šú</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G251</th>
<th>J1 v 28b</th>
<th>ana</th>
<th>OV – The preposition <em>ana</em> is written syllabically in W.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W1 v 18a'</td>
<td>a-na</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G252</th>
<th>C v 33b</th>
<th>id-di-ma</th>
<th>SV(1) – The emphatic particle “-ma” is lacking in J.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J1 v 29</td>
<td>id-di</td>
<td>b rev. 15'</td>
<td>i]d-di-ma</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G253</th>
<th>C v 34</th>
<th>an]a</th>
<th>OV – The preposition <em>ana</em> is written syllabically in W.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J1 v 30</td>
<td>ana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W1 v 20'</td>
<td>a'[</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G254</th>
<th>C v 35</th>
<th>ma-le-šú</th>
<th>OV – The 3ms possessive pronominal suffix is written with the sign ŠU in T.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T v 15</td>
<td>ma-le-šu</td>
<td>W1 v 21'</td>
<td>m]a-le-šú</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G255</th>
<th>C v 35</th>
<th>i]l-li</th>
<th>OV(I) – Possible difference in pronunciation. 645</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J1 v 31</td>
<td>el-li</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G256</th>
<th>C v 36b</th>
<th>ţa-a-ba</th>
<th>OV(I) – Possible difference in pronunciation. 646</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J1 v 32b</td>
<td>ţa-a-bu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1 v 17</td>
<td>ţa-a-bu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W1 v 23a'</td>
<td>ţa-a-bu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

644 C and W have a slightly different phrasing to J, but no significant difference is detectable between the sources. The narrative describes how Ûta-napišti arranges to dress Gilgamesh appropriately as a king for his return across the *apsú*. C and W have the destination of Gilgamesh’s journey as *ălišu*, “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.
G257  C v 36b  ṣa'-pi'  OV(I) – Possible difference in pronunciation.\(^{647}\)
   J\(1\) v 32b  ṣa-pi
   W\(1\) v 23a'  ṣa-pu

G258  C v 36b  SU-šú  OV – The noun \(\sqrt{\text{zumru}}\), “body,” is written
   J\(1\) v 32b  zu-mur-šú
   W\(1\) v 23a'  zu-m[u]r

G259  C v 37a  Š][ú  OV – The possessive pronominal suffix is
   J\(1\) v 33a  S][AG.DU-šú
   b rev. 18a'  ]šu

G260  C v 38a-39  [i][l-  SV(2) – Three lines omitted in J.\(^{648}\)
   'i-kaš-šá-du’ ana  ]li-diš
   J\(1\) v 34  omits
   T\(1\) v 20a-21  'a’-di ’il’[
   ]
   ]

W\(1\) v 24b’-
   25b'  'a’-di i-kaš-šá-’du’ ana
   b rev. 18b’-
   19'  'ur-ḫi-šú'

\(^{647}\) The writing of the ultimate vowel in final weak \(\sqrt{\text{ṣapû}}\) is expected to be \(\text{i}/\). 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 \(\text{zumuršu}, \text{“his body.”}\) 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, \textit{Neo-Assyrian Grammar}, 32), where the vowels /a/ and /u/ in this verb represent the same underlying allophone [o].

\(^{648}\) J seems to lack the lines: \(\text{adi illaku ana ālīšu adi ikaššadu ana urḫišu tēdiqū šīpa ay īddīma edēšu lādīš, “until he goes to his city, he arrives at his path, may his garment show no stain but be always new.”}\) The text is largely reconstructed, but can be restored with some confidence due to the overlap of the preserved sources. A.R. George, \textit{Gilgamesh}, 894, posits that the omission in J is due to haplography, where the scribe skipped from the first instance of the noun \(\text{tēdiqū, “garment,”}\) in line 267 to the second instance in line 270 (according to George’s numbering of the lines in \textit{Gilgamesh}, 720).
OV – The verb √zakāru, “to speak, mention,” is written syllabically in b.\textsuperscript{649}

OV – C writes an extra vowel in the interrogative √mīnu, “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 Īta-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} vi 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 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, Gilgamesh, 896.
W₁ vi 2’  ana še-čḫ-ri-i[ą]
j vi 11’  a-na šu-ulḫ-ri-ia-a-ma  pared to the other sources.⁶⁵¹

G272  T₁ vi 3
j vi 11’  a-na šu-ulḫ-ri-ia-ma  OV – j writes an extra vowel in the possessive pronominal suffix.

G273  C vi 19a  ku-sa-pu OV(l) – C and j have the wrong case vowel for the accusative singular.⁶⁵²
T₁ vi 4a  ku-sa-pa
W₁ vi 3a’  ku-sa-’p̣a’
j vi 12’  ku-sa-pu

G274  T₁ vi 4b  a-na
W₁ vi 3b’  ana  OV – The preposition ana is written syllabically in T.

G275  C vi 20  bu-ra OV(l) – W has the wrong case vowel for the accusative singular.⁶⁵³
W₁ vi 4’  bu-ú-ru
j vi 14’  bju-ra

G276  T₁ vi 5  A.MEŠ-šá
j vi 14’  A.MEŠ-’ša’  OV – The possessive pronominal suffix is written with the sign ŠA in j.

G277  C vi 21  a-na
W₁ vi 5’  ana  OV – The preposition ana is written syllabically in C.

G278  C vi 22a  ‘i-te-ši-in’ OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.⁶⁵⁴
T₁ vi 7  ijn
W₁ vi 6a’  i-te-še-en
j vi 16’  t[e-ši-in
z vi 2’  ijn

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 lūtur ana ša šūriama, “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 lūtur ana šeḫri[ama], “let me eat, and let me turn into my childhood (form).” See CAD § 122a for šeḫru, “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.  
| T₁ vi 7 | ni-piš |
| W₁ vi 6a’ | nǐ |
| j vi 16’ | ni-piš |
| z vi 2’ | pi? |

| G280 | T₁ vi 8 | l’am-ma |
| j vi 3b’ | ğa-ma |
| z vi 3b’ | i-lam-ma |

| G281 | T₁ vi 8 | šam-ma |
| j vi 17’ | šam-mu |

| G282 | C vi 23a | ta’-ri-šú |
| W₁ vi 7’ | t)a-ri-’šu’’ |
| z vi 4b’ | šu |

| G283 | T₁ vi 9 | ’qu[ t]i |
| j vi 18’ | qu-lip-tum |
| z vi 5’ | ša |

| G284 | C vi 24a | i]l-la[k[a |
| W₁ vi 9a | DU-ka |
| j vi 20’ | il-la-ka |

| G285 | j vi 21’ | ma-la-ḫu |
| z vi 7b’ | MĀ.LAḪ₃ |

| G286 | C vi 25 | ma]n-ni-ia |
| W₁ vi 10a’ | ma]n’ ni’-iá |

| G287 | C vi 25 | m’ ur-šā[nabi |
| W₁ vi 10a | m’ ur’. d šānabi |
| j vi 22’ | m’ ur-šānabi |

---

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 פשוט, “snort, smell.” The logogram IR with the value nipšu is also unlikely. The composite logogram PA.AN with the value napīšu, “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.
OV – The proper noun Ur-šanabi is written syllabically in z.

OV(I) – Possible difference in pronunciation.

SV(1) – Difference in the gender of the verb form.

OV – The noun idu, “arm,” is written logographically in z.

OV – The preposition ana is written syllabically in C.

OV – j has VC-CV-VC against VC-CVC in the other sources.

OV(I) – Possible difference in pronunciation.

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. Hämeen-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. Hämeen-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.
G295  C vi 27a  ana  OV – The preposition *ana* is written logographically in C.
     W1 vi 11'  a[  
     j vi 23b  a-na

G296  C vi 27a  ana  SV(1) – Lexical interchange.  
     W1 vi 11'  a[  
     j vi 23b  a-na
     z vi 9b'  i-'na’?

G297  W1 vi 12'  qaq-qa-ri  OV(l) – j has the wrong case vowel for the
     j vi 24'  qa]q-ra-ru  genitive singular.

G298  C vi 27b  du]m-qí  OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.  
     W1 vi 12'  du-un[  
     j vi 24'  dum-qa

G299  C vi 27b  du]m-qí  OV(l) – C has the wrong case vowel for the  
     j vi 24’  dum-qa  accusative singular.

G300  C vi 27b  i-te-pu-uš  OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.  
     W1 vi 12'  ’e’[t[  
     j vi 24'  e-te-pu-uš’

G301  C vi 27b  du]m-qí i-te-pu-uš  SV(2) – Different phraseology in z compared  
     W1 vi 12'  du-un[  ’]e’[t[  
     j vi 24’  dam-qa e-te-pu-uš’
     z vi 10b’  ]sa-kan du[  to the other sources.  

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 *epēšu*, “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 ētepuš*, “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 ranniā*, “I did not establish a favour for myself.”
The preposition is written syllabically in C.

SV(3) – z has a different syntax compared to the other sources.\(^{665}\)

OV – The diphthong *ay is written fully in C.

OV – The noun ittu, “mark, sign,” is written syllabically in W.

OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.\(^{667}\)

OV(l) – 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: uttâ ayîta ša ana itti iššaknu, “what things will be placed for my landmark,” against z: Š-DU Is-sia šaknu, “… what things are placed for my landmark.” Here z is read as consisting of two linguistic variants, the first being the shift /tu/ > /ss/, and the second being a grammatical change of the IV/1 preterite verb iššaknu > 3mpl stative šaknû. In this reading the active stative šaknû (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.
Possible difference in pronunciation.

The ventive suffix retains the final /m/ in the orthography of C.

OV – The proper noun is spelled differently between the sources.

OV – The preposition ana is written logographically in W.

OV – The proper noun Ur-šanabi is written syllabically in z.

SV(2) – C has a longer title for Ur-šanabi, adding the noun √malāhu, “boatman.”

OV – The proper noun Ur-šanabi has the divine determinative on the second element in W.

OV – The relative particle ša is written with the sign ŠA in z.

SV(2) – The proper noun Uruk has an expansive adjective √supūru, “sheepfold,” in z.

OV – C has CV-V-CV against W (restored) CV-V-VC.

Possible spelling variant in z.

---

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 (𒒑) is possibly an erroneous writing of the sign SA (𒊓), where the scribe missed one vertical wedge.

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=ḫubullu” 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: šár ālu šár kirātu šár īsu, “a šár of city, a šár of palm-grove, a šár of clay-pit ... .” C has the cardinal number written before each instance of the unit of distance ŠÁR.

673 W lacks the final vowel on the noun šiptra, “one-half of a šár,” 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: /tt/ > /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 occurs (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 pronominal 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 III, 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}

\textit{Table - Sources for mīs pī Under Examination}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Siglum</th>
<th>Museum Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A\textsubscript{1}</td>
<td>K6324+8146+8850+9337+9942+10361+10657+10705+13514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A\textsubscript{2}</td>
<td>K6810+8568+9696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>K8117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Rm2,344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>K10060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>K6883</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</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.
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 15 cm in width, 1.5 cm 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.\textsuperscript{683} 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 between 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 impurities 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 pi*ī. None of these tablets can be dated with any certainty.\(^{687}\)

<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 *mīs 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 Mis Pī

<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>1</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B:S</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A:M</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G:I</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>37.5</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>1</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H:I</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A:N</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17.3</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>7.4</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>1</td>
<td>10.5</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, šilu, “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-ú'-u[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-ú'-ur-ta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td>C 10</td>
<td>ʾi-ta'-at DINGIR BI</td>
<td>SV(2) – C lacks the noun šbītu, “house.” 691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D 3</td>
<td>ʾi'-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>A₁ 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: enûma pī ilî temessû, “when you wash the mouth of a god.” S therefore has an abbreviated yet coherent text: enûma pī temessû, “when you wash the mouth.”

689 The noun šurigallu, “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 GI 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 (𒄴) 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 ilî šuātī, “beside the house (temple) of that god,” against D: itāt ilî šuātī, “beside that god.”

692 The orthography of šegubbû, “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>Column</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Characters</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P7</td>
<td>A₁ i 21</td>
<td>DUG,A.GÚB.BA</td>
<td>OV – The vessel determinative DUG is lacking in H.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H 3</td>
<td>A.GÚB.BA</td>
<td></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, √šukēnu, “to submit, prostrate oneself.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G i 7</td>
<td>]-nu-ma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H 3</td>
<td>ŠID-ma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P9</td>
<td>A₁ I 24</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>SV(1) – I omits the conjunction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H 5</td>
<td>u</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I i 4</td>
<td>omits</td>
<td></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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G 13</td>
<td>túl-lal-ʾšú</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I i 7</td>
<td>túl-lal-šu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T 16</td>
<td>túl-lal-šū</td>
<td></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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I i 8</td>
<td>omits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T 17</td>
<td>[       ] ni-bi-ta è-a 3-šú ŠID-nu</td>
<td></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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I i 8</td>
<td>ki-a-am</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T 18</td>
<td>ka-a-am</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P13</td>
<td>A₁ i 29</td>
<td>u₄-me</td>
<td>OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I i 9</td>
<td>u₄-mi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T 19</td>
<td>[       ]-mi</td>
<td></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: "én an-na ni-bi-ta ṣalāšīšu 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 √kīam, “thus,” appears commonly in various forms. See *CAD K* 325-326 for examples.

696 See note  and the references there.
OV – The verb ˹alāku, “to go,” is written syllabically in T.

SV(1) – The incantation incipit is abbreviated in A and K.697

OV – Different spelling of the noun ˹zakāru, “to speak,” in A.

OV – N has a masculine determinative marking the noun ˹niqū, “offering, sacrifice.”

SV(1) – Difference in number.698

OV – Different spelling of the plural adjective ˹pešū, “white, pure.”

OV(l) – Possible difference of grammatical forms or pronunciation.699

697 Manuscript E seems to have contained the full incipit: è-a-zu-dè è-a-zu-dè gal-a, “As you go out, as you go out, great ...,” abbreviated in the other sources with the use of Wiederholungszeichen: è-a-zu-dè MIN gal-a, “As you go out, ditto, great ....”

698 The noun ˹šutukku, “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 ˹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 Asalluḫi, 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 KAM. While it is true that here the signs KE₄ and KAM vary, the same grammatical observations apply. It might also be said that there is very little graphical difference between the signs KAM and KAM.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>iii 15'</th>
<th>ŠID-ma</th>
<th>OV – Q has a phonetic complement appended to the verb √manû, “recite, recount.”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P7</td>
<td>ŠID-‘ma’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 5</td>
<td>ŠID-n[u]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P22</td>
<td>A 20’</td>
<td>na-an-gub-bé-en</td>
<td>OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U 6</td>
<td>na-an-gub-bé</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P23</td>
<td>A 23’</td>
<td>omits</td>
<td>SV(2) – U has the addition of the verb √šabātu, “to sweep.”701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U 7</td>
<td>SAR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P24</td>
<td>A 25’</td>
<td>šá</td>
<td>SV(1) – The relative particle ša is lacking in U.702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U 9</td>
<td>omits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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-bē,” “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-šā SAR šā DINGIR.MEŠ DUMU.MEŠ um-ma-ni DUḪ-ār,” arkišu tašabbit ša ilâni màrê ummâni tapatṭar, “after it you sweep (or strike), you dismantle the gods of the craftsmen.” This is reminiscent of STT 73 67, “ÛR SAR A.MEŠ KÛ.MEŠ SUD,” uri tašabbit mé ellâti tasallâh, “you sweep the roof, you sprinkle pure water.” Although the syntax here is similar, the verb tašabbit 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 tapatṭar, “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 kiam 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 ūmi, “(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 Hever, 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 form 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.708 This analysis recalls the well known categorisation of authori-

manuscript written in a formal hand... let alone a stratified sequence of dated texts at some archaeological site at which the first appearance of distinctive script characteristics (at that site) could be dated to individual quarter- or half-centuries" (G. Doudna, 4Q Pesher Nahum, 777). This is one reason why Young maintains that “we must take the first century B.C.E. dating proposal seriously, and investigate its claims accordingly” (I. Young, "The Stabilization of the Biblical Text," 382). The main arguments that are supplied for this view are the lack of historical references post-dating 40 B.C.E. within the textual corpus at Qumran outlined in M.O. Wise, The First Messiah: Investigating the Saviour Before Jesus (San Fransisco: Harper, 1999), and issues with the radiocarbon dating put forward in G. Doudna, "Dating the Scrolls on the Basis of Radiocarbon Analysis," The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment (eds P.W. Flint and J.C. Vanderkam; 2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1998) 430-71. See the complete list of references in I. Young, "The Stabilization of the Biblical Text," 380-382, n. 38-43).

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 (מִרְפֵּס חָגִים), 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-


710 See S. Lieberman, Hellenism in Jewish Palestine, 22-27.

711 S. Lieberman, Hellenism in Jewish Palestine, 22, italics in original.
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 ἔκριβωμένα, 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

---

712 S. Lieberman, Hellenism in Jewish Palestine, 22.
713 S. Lieberman, Hellenism in Jewish Palestine, 24.
714 S. Lieberman, Hellenism in Jewish Palestine, 26.
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. It

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 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 ἡκριβωμένα type were not in absolute agreement, or were not the only text-type kept in the temple.\textsuperscript{718}

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.”\textsuperscript{719} The κοινά, then, were those personal copies made by authoritative figures\textsuperscript{720} that could be used for study, as is referred to in various rabbinic debates.\textsuperscript{721} 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

---

\textsuperscript{718} 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.

\textsuperscript{719} S. Talmon, "Three Scrolls of the Law," 15.

\textsuperscript{720} 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.

\textsuperscript{721} See the reference to the practice of using what might amount to \textit{vulagata} 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.
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).\textsuperscript{723} 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.\textsuperscript{724} Tov assigns this social connection to most of the scrolls that have been recovered from Masada, Murabba’at, Nahal Ḥever and Wadi Sdeir,\textsuperscript{725} while only a small number of the texts from Qumran display such exactitude in replication.\textsuperscript{726}

The majority of the biblical scrolls from Qumran therefore become categorised as κοινά or φαυλότερα type texts.\textsuperscript{727} 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

\textsuperscript{724} This is true, according to Tov, for the great majority of scrolls found in non-Qumran sites in the Judean Desert. In the wider context there are, of course, exceptions. For example, 4QSam\textsuperscript{a} fits all other criteria other than a closeness to the MT. Similarly, 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{a} has a text closer to the proto-Samaritan type, while displaying all of the other qualities that would define it as a ήκριβωμένα scroll.
\textsuperscript{725} See E. Tov, "Biblical Texts from the Judean Desert," 158.
\textsuperscript{726} At Qumran, only 4QDeut\textsuperscript{a} preserves a significant amount of text that does not deviate at all from the medieval MT. This scroll also preserves a large lower margin. 4QGen\textsuperscript{b} is very close to the MT, and preserves a large upper margin, and contains \textit{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.
\textsuperscript{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 ἐκριβωμένα type scrolls as described by Lieberman. However, it remains that most of the large format ‘de luxe’ scrolls fit into the ἐκριβωμένα category.

There is some support for this view in the Talmudic story of the three scrolls found in the Azarah, or Temple Court. 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 ἐκριβωμένα 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 ἐκριβωμένα texts. These are: orthographic confusion due to the graphical similarity of some letters (חא, versus חא); the intrusion of foreign words (Hebrew נח versus Aramaic נח – perhaps a common vocable among the general public); and the updating of unusual grammatical forms (הלא versus מלח).}

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 ἐκριβωμένα 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 ז and ו, ק and ב, ד and ר, 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.”732

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 ήκριβωμένα 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.”733 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.

733 L.H. Schiffman, “Public Reading,” 46.
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 authoritativeness.

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.\textsuperscript{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

\textsuperscript{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 a 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.
The Archaeology of Khirbet Qumran

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.736 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.737 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.738


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.\(^{739}\) 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 'Aïn Feshkha II: Khirbet Qumrán 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 'Aïn Feshkha II: Khirbet Qumrán 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 inhabitants 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 … established 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 potsherds, 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.\textsuperscript{742} In fact, ten of the sixteen pools at Qumran have been designated as \textit{miqva’ot}, and eight of these have broad steps to allow for separation of those entering and exiting the water.\textsuperscript{743} Perhaps the best example is the \textit{miqveh} at locus 138, at the northwest 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 \textit{miqva’ot} at loci 48, 56, 68, 71, 117 and 118 also served this purpose.\textsuperscript{744}

Certain texts, such as S, D, M, the \textit{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.\textsuperscript{745} The group’s members seem to have

\textsuperscript{742} See J. Magness, \textit{Archaeology of Qumran}, 147. Of the 577,800 litre capacity, ca. 259,000 litres were contained in ritual baths.

\textsuperscript{743} See J. Magness, \textit{Archaeology of Qumran}, 147-50.

\textsuperscript{744} See J. Magness, \textit{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 (\textit{Sheqalim} 8:2, and \textit{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. 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.

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. This date, which has gained widespread acceptance among the broader scholarly

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.
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. Despite 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. If the scrolls were...
not all in circulation at the same point in time, we would not expect to find them deposite
ted 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 iso-
lated plateau on which the fortress was built rises almost half a kilometre above the sur-
rounding plain. Some of the buildings in the Western Palace appear to have been con-
structed 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}

\footnotesize{opinion on some points. The palaeographical sequencing established by F. M. Cross, while gaining general
acceptance, has not escaped criticism (\textit{e.g.} G. Doudna, "Radiocarbon Analysis," 464; R. Eisenman and M.
application of Cross’s sequencing has lead to some questionable outcomes. Scholars often “limit their dis-
cussion of the date of a document to identifying a line on one of Cross’s charts to which the script of their
scroll bears a similarity. Cross’s date for the exemplar is then adopted as the date of the text being pub-
lished” (B. Webster, "Chronological Index," 354).

\textsuperscript{751} Attention should be drawn to the possible exception of Cave 1. Recently G. Brooke has made the obser-
vation 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

\textsuperscript{752} See E. Netzer, \textit{Masada III. The Yigael Yadin Excavations 1963 - 1965. Final Reports} (Jerusalem: Israel
The two references by Josephus to the beginnings of the fortification of Masada do not specifically
identify its founders (see \textit{J.W.} 4.399 and \textit{J.W.} 7.285), but do allow the view that the site was first developed
between the middle of the second century B.C.E. and early first century B.C.E., either by Jonathan the
brother of Judah Maccabee, or by Alexander Yannai.

\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. The documents, 14 parchment and one papyrus, represent those used by the rebels occupying the fortress during the First Jewish Revolt against Rome. 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. In the syna-

---

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, *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) were discovered amidst a large amount of debris, apparently discarded there by those who defaced it – see Y. Yadin, *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) 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, *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, *Masada III*, 445.

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, *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, *Masada VI passim*, the circumstances of their deposit indicate that they were in circulation right up to the end of the Second Temple period.

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, *Preliminary Report*, 78-79), before stating the case more defini-
gogue itself, a scroll of Deuteronomy and a scroll of Ezekiel were found buried beneath the floor of locus 1043.\textsuperscript{757}

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.\textsuperscript{758} 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.\textsuperscript{759} 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\textsuperscript{b} 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.

\textsuperscript{757} These scrolls were buried in two separate pits in the floor of locus 1043. See the description of the finds in E. Netzer, \textit{Masada III}, 410, and the description in Y. Yadin, \textit{Herod's Fortress}, 187-89.

\textsuperscript{758} S. Talmon, "Hebrew Scroll Fragments From Masada," \textit{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.”

\textsuperscript{759} See Y. Yadin, \textit{Herod's Fortress}, 187. The pits themselves were quite large, about 1-2 metres in diameter and 70 centimetres deep according to E. Netzer, \textit{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, \textit{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{1}, 4QExod-Lev\textsuperscript{1}, 4QLev-Num\textsuperscript{1}.

\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\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>2147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11QpaleoLev\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>1667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QNum\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>1667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QpaleoGen-Exod\textsuperscript{d} (Exod)</td>
<td>922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QExod\textsuperscript{c}</td>
<td>865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QLev-Num\textsuperscript{b} (Num)</td>
<td>808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QDeut\textsuperscript{h}</td>
<td>714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QGen-Exod\textsuperscript{a} (Exod)</td>
<td>683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QDeut\textsuperscript{c}</td>
<td>605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QLev\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MasLev\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QExod\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QDeut\textsuperscript{h}</td>
<td>467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QGen\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QDeut\textsuperscript{f}</td>
<td>431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QGen-Exod\textsuperscript{a} (Gen)</td>
<td>414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QLev-Num\textsuperscript{b} (Lev)</td>
<td>407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QpDeut\textsuperscript{f}</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QDeut\textsuperscript{d}</td>
<td>317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QExod-Lev\textsuperscript{f} (Exod)</td>
<td>309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1QDeut\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QDeut\textsuperscript{f}</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QGen\textsuperscript{f}</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QDeut\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QGen\textsuperscript{g}</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QGen\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MurExod</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QDeut\textsuperscript{g}</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5QDeut</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QDeut\textsuperscript{k1}</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MurGen\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2QExod\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QDeut\textsuperscript{g}</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QGen\textsuperscript{f}</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SdeirGen</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QDeut\textsuperscript{k2}</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QGen\textsuperscript{g}</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QLev\textsuperscript{c}</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QLev\textsuperscript{d}</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QDeut\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QDeut\textsuperscript{f}</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XHev/SeNum\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scroll</td>
<td>Total SU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QLev*</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1QpaleoLev</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QDeut#</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11QLev*</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MasLev*</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1QDeut*</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QGen#</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QDeutm</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MasDeut</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1QExod</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QDeut* (Exod)</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1QGen</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QGen#</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MurDeut</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QLev*</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QDeut* (Exod)</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1QExod</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QExod#</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QDeut*</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2QExod#</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MurNum</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QExod*</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2QNum*</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QGenm</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XHev/SeDeut</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/6 HevNum*</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2QNum*</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*</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QExod*</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8QGen</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QDeut*</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MurGen*</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2QGen</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QExod*</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QpDeut*</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MasGen</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2QDeut*</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QExod*</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6QpaleoLev</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QExod*</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QExod-Lev* (Lev)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2QDeut*</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2QDeut*</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>2QNum\c</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QGen\h1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QGen\h</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2QExod\c</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QGen\b2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2QNum\d</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QGen\b-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>4QExod\textsuperscript{f}</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>4QpaleoGen-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{h}</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>4QDeut\textsuperscript{h}</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>4QpaleoDeut\textsuperscript{h}</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{h}</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>4QpaleoGen\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>4QpaleoGen\textsuperscript{b}</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>4QGen\textsuperscript{b}</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>4QpaleoDeut\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>1</td>
<td>271</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></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QGen\textsuperscript{b}</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 TOTAL PLL</td>
<td>Orh. Variant</td>
<td>SU per Orh. Variant</td>
<td>Orh. (l) Variant</td>
<td>SU per Orh. (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>
<td></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>5</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>386</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>2QEexod(^d)</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(^g)</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(^c)</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>127</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></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</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>1</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QDeut(^l)</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>118</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(^c)</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>109</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>43</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></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QDeut(^b)</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>11QLev(^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>1</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MasLev(^a)</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>4QDeutg</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QGeni</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td></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>4QLevβ</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>4QDeutl (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>4QExodf</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>4QDeutl</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>2QExodf</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>4QExodf</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>2QNumf</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>2QNumb</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></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>2QpaleoLev</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>4QDeutf</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>4QExodf</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^k</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>MurGenf</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>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparison: Q vs MT</th>
<th>TOTAL PLL</th>
<th>Orth. Variant</th>
<th>SU per Orth. Variant</th>
<th>SU per Orth. (l) Variant</th>
<th>SU per Stylistic (Type 1) Variant</th>
<th>SU per Stylistic (Type 2) Variant</th>
<th>SU per Stylistic (Type 3) Variant</th>
<th>SU per Herm. Variant</th>
<th>SU per Herm. Variant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2QGen</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QExod₅</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QpaleoDeutₑ</td>
<td>25</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>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2QDeutₖ</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QExod₇</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</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</td>
<td>וָכַרְיָר</td>
<td>OV(1) – Possible difference in pronunciation. 763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1QGen 1 2</td>
<td>נַ[כ]וֹרָו</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>MT Gen 22:14</td>
<td>א</td>
<td>SV(1) – The MT lacks the object marker.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1QGen 3 2</td>
<td>מָתַסס</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>MT Exod 16:14</td>
<td>מְתָסס</td>
<td>SV(1) – Interchange of prepositions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1QExod 1 3</td>
<td>מְתָסס</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>MT Exod 20:25</td>
<td>נַתְתָלָת</td>
<td>SV(1) – Difference in gender. 764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1QExod 5-6 2</td>
<td>נַתְתָלָת</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5</td>
<td>MT Lev 20:21</td>
<td>נַ</td>
<td>SV(1) – Difference in gender. 765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1QpaleoLev 3-4 2</td>
<td>נַ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6</td>
<td>MT Lev 22:6</td>
<td>נַמַס</td>
<td>SV(1) – MT lacks the conjunction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1QpaleoLev 6 10</td>
<td>נַמַס</td>
<td></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 נְגִיָּה. 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 נַגִּית.

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 לָהָם-, 2mpl לְהָמוֹן- and 3mpl לָהֵם(ו)-, as well as the independent pronominal forms written with final heh, such as 1cs לָהֶם-, 3mpl לָהֶם and 3mpl לְהוֹם-, 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 לְהָמָה and the 1c imperfect לָהֵם. 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 ToV's "Qumran orthography"," DSD 11, 3 (2004), and E. Tov, "Reply to Dong-Hyuk Kim's Paper on 'ToV'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...

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 תב[ל]גמ (occurring over 60 times) though the form תב[ל]גמ does occur twice (in Joshua 3:12 and I Kings 7:25).

768 The pronominal object suffix in MT seems to refer to the valley: ובא ובה יבנ נחל אֲשִּׁקְל וַיִּפְקְדוֹ הָאָרֶץ, "... and they came to the valley Eshkol, and they explored it." In contrast 1QDeut makes the object of the verb "the land":乙烯 אֲשִּׁקְל] [וַיַּפְקֹד אֵלֶּה], [and they explored the land."

769 The verb נָעַשׁ, "to go out," is written as imperfect (probably durative) in 1QDeut against the perfect in MT Deut 9:28.
Q11 MT Deut 13:4
1QDeut⁸ 7-8 3

1QDeut – Difference in number.⁷⁷⁰

Q12 MT Deut 13:4
1QDeut⁸ 7-8 3

OV(1) – Possible difference in pronunciation.⁷⁷¹

Q13 MT Deut 13:5
1QDeut⁸ 9 2

OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.

⁷⁷⁰ The verb is plural in 1QDeut against the singular in MT. 1QDeut agrees with LXX here and perhaps reflects a consistency of addressee in this section of the text. The phenomenon of 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, 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 Tilless, "Sections 'tu' et sections 'vous' dans le Deutéronome," VT 12, 1 (1962) 29-34, and see also C. Begg, "The Significance of the Numeruswechsel in Deuteronomy: The 'Pre-History' of the Question," Ephemerides Theologicae Lovianenses 55 (1979). Several dissertations on the topic are also worth mentioning, namely C. Begg, 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, A Stylistic Analysis of the Numeruswechsel Sections of Deuteronomy (Southern Baptist Theological Seminary Ph.D. Dissertation: 1982); and Y. Suzuki, The 'Numeruswechsel' Sections of Deuteronomy (Claremont Graduate School Ph.D. Dissertation: 1982).

⁷⁷¹ See the discussion in note above. The long form in 1QDeut 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," Leshonenu 47 (1983) 182 [Hebrew], for the reading of the Ugaritic pronoun "ú-PI" as "huwa." See also E. Qimron, Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls, 57 n. 56, and S. Morag, "Qumran Hebrew," 156-57, for the same suggestion. E.Y. Kutscher, 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, 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, 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.
The form in 1QDeut⁷ preserves paragogic nun. This occurs only on the last verb in the clause in MT. 4QDeut⁷ (Q598 below) and the SP also retain paragogic nun for this verb, with the SP preserving this ending also in the following verb מְנַגְּפָּה. The form in Biblical Hebrew is generally considered to be a genuine archaic form, a deliberate archaism, 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 נון 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 נון 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, sees to view the Qumran Hebrew forms with afformative נון- as influenced by Aramaic. According to J. Hofstijzer, 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 Hofstijzer’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 Israelis 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 1QDeuta suggests that the line is arranged differently to MT. The clause in MT is: יוהי אלהים תלך ואמר תוחמי תмирין בקולם תטש יאמ תולדו ובבוקך אתך, “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 1QDeuta, the arrangement of the clause is clearly different: אל יהוה תרומא תמרין איהוAlchemy תמרין תמרין, “… your god you shall walk, and you shall serve[ve] him.” With only this fragmentary line of 1QDeuta 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 1QDeut⁹ can probably be restored אוך תמרין תמרין, “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 1QDeuta appears to be grammatically incorrect as the article appears on the first term in a construct chain. The phrase in MT is: תרומא התלומא אתך, “the dreamer of the dream.” It is possible that the phrase in 1QDeuta lacked the *nomens rectum* and can be restored אתך תרומא התלומא.
| Q23 MT Deut 14:23 | אַלְיָרְךָ | 1QDeut⁸ 12 1 | OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.⁷⁷⁷ |
| Q24 MT Deut 14:24 | לא תשא עֲשָׁהּ | 1QDeut⁸ 12 2 | OV(l) – Difference in grammatical form.⁷⁷⁹ |
| Q25 MT Deut 14:24 | אַלְיָרְךָ | 1QDeut⁸ 12 3 | OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation. |
| Q26 MT Deut 14:25 | אַלְיָרְךָ | 1QDeut⁸ 12 4 | OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation. |
| Q27 MT Deut 16:4 | לֹא | | OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation. |

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 המְשֹׁלָה קָרָּבָה, “because doing this is like a lowly (or forgotten?) sacrifice, and it is an outrage to the god of Jacob.” 1QDeuta may reflect the same textual tradition that produced SP Exod 23:19, but the writing of ב instead of ל is difficult to explain in this context. Alternatively 1QDeut⁸ may have a gloss, possibly בָּהֵד, “together,” as is read in Tg. Ps.-J.: "... it is unlawful for you to boil, much less to eat, meat and milk when both are mixed together;" and Tg. Neof.: "... that you are not able to carry it." MT has a different phrasing with the infinitive construct and lacking the preposition: מְשֹׁלָה קָרָּבָה, “... that you are not capable (of) carrying it.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Verse Reference</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>MT Deut 16:6</td>
<td>נַעַרְדַּךְ</td>
<td>אֵלָהוֹרָבָה</td>
<td>OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>MT Deut 16:6</td>
<td>שומע</td>
<td>bi</td>
<td>1QDeut(^a) clarifies the object of the verb ( \sqrt{בְּרַח} ), “to choose.”(^{780})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{780}\) 1QDeut\(^a\) reads: \( {יְהוֹ הַיָּדָה יִשְׂרָאֵל יְהוָה עָזָה הָרָע} \), “[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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q30</th>
<th>MT Deut 16:7</th>
<th>OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.</th>
<th>781</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1QDeut^a 14 2</td>
<td>השמ$^3$ת</td>
<td></td>
<td>781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q31</td>
<td>MT Deut 15:14</td>
<td>SV(1) – Interchange of divine titles.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1QDeut^b 5 1</td>
<td>י$^4$וה</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

781 According to E.Y. Kutscher, *Language and Linguistic Background*, 45-48, the affirmative י$^5$וה- on the 2ms perfect verb and the long form of the 2ms pronoun י$^6$וה- 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 י$^7$- (י$^8$-) and the short pronominal suffix י$^9$- (י$^{10}$). 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
1QDeut\(^b\) 5 2
\(לְשׁוֹןָה\)
SV(2) – 1QDeut\(^b\) has an expanded phrase that includes the infinitive construct \(יָֽשוֹן\), “to do.”\(^{782}\)

Q33 MT Deut 24:14
1QDeut\(^b\) 8 4
\(מלַאָם\)
Not Counted – The reading in 1QDeut\(^b\) is not certain.\(^{783}\)

Q34 MT Deut 24:16
1QDeut\(^b\) 8 6
\(יִתְמָה\)
SV(1) – Difference in number.\(^{784}\)

Q35 MT Deut 29:10
1QDeut\(^b\) 11 2
\(תַּבָּכָם\)
SV(1) – The MT lacks the conjunction.

Q36 MT Deut 29:14
1QDeut 12-13 i 2
\(תְּמִינָה\)
OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.\(^{785}\)

Q37 MT Deut 31:1
1QDeut\(^b\) 13 ii 4
\(רֹאֵלָה מְשֵׁהַ רְוָהָד\)
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 \(לְשׁוֹןָה\), it is common to the LXX which has \(ποιεῖν\), and Tg. Ps.-J. which has \(לָלֵבַשׁ\), both meaning “to do.” The phrase \(לְשׁוֹןָה\) also appears in Deut 24:18 and 22 of the MT.

\(^{783}\) See D. Barthélemy 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 \(het\) 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: \(καὶ συνετελεσεν Μωυσης λαλων παντας τους λόγους\), “And Moses finished speaking all of the words,” (see also MT Deut 32:45).
Q38 MT Deut 31:1 omissions
1QDeut\(^b\) 13 ii 4
SV(2) – 1QDeut\(^b\) clarifies the ject with the addition of the adjective לַכְּכֵן, “all.”\(^{787}\)

Q39 MT Deut 31:5 לַכְּכֵן
1QDeut\(^b\) 13 ii 8
SV(1) – Difference in number.\(^{788}\)

Q40 MT Deut 32:26 וַעֲשָׂרִים
1QDeut\(^b\) 18 4
OV(I) – Possible difference in pronunciation.\(^{789}\)

Q41 MT Deut 32:27 וַעֲשָׂרִים
1QDeut\(^b\) 18 5
SV(1) – Interchange of divine ti- tles.

Q42 MT Deut 33:17 וַעֲשָׂרִים
1QDeut\(^b\) 20 4
SV(2) – 1QDeut\(^b\) lacks the posses- sive pronominal suffix.\(^{790}\)

Q43 MT Exod 1:12 וַעֲשָׂרִים
2QExod\(^a\) 1 2
SV(1) – Difference in number.\(^{791}\)

Q44 MT Exod 1:12 וַעֲשָׂרִים
SV(1) – Lexical interchange.\(^{792}\)

---

\(^{787}\) See note above, where the LXX agrees with 1QDeut\(^b\) in the use of the adjective πάντας, “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 Hiph'il verb לִסֵּבַנ, “remove, conclude,” is written without the affirma- tive (paragogic) heh in 1QDeut\(^b\). Alternatively this may indicate that the verb should be read as future in- dicative, לִסֵּבַנ, “I will remove (them),” rather than the cohortative לִסֵּבַנ, “let me remove (them).” In light of Rule 4 the forms are read as grammatically equivalent.

\(^{790}\) The possessive pronominal suffix clarifies the object, כְּנַיְיוֹ, “his bull.” Both the LXX and the SP lack the pronoun.

\(^{791}\) The difference appears to be in the treatment of the לֵבָנָן בֵּית as a collective singular or a plural noun, or the similar treatment of the noun בֵּית which occurs in construct with the phrase לֵבָנָן בֵּית 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 יִסְדָּר, “they kept multiplying,” in its translation יִסְדָּר נַפְּרָד, “they grew exceed- ingly 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 מְסֹף נַפְּרָד, reflecting the double use of the adjective נַפְּרָד in LXX. The Tgs. have רְבָּרָד, נַפְּרָד, “and thus they became strong,” which generally reflects the wording of the MT (see, for example, the similar translation of וַיִּשְׁרְדִּי, “to spread, increase,” in the Tgs. at Gen 28:14; 30:43; Exod 19:22). The use of מְסֹף in 2QExod\(^a\) may reflect harmonisation with Exod 1:7.
Q50 MT Exod 12:39 omit
 מִבְּרָה
 SV(2) – 2QExod⁵ clarifies the ob-

793 The end of Exod 1:12, יִתְכְּרוּ מַעֲרֵ損害 מְכֻנָּ נָא שַׁמָּא, “and they felt dread before the sons of Israel,” is perhaps repeated at the end of verse 14 in 2QExod⁴ (see M. Baillet, J.T. Milik, and R. de Vaux, Les 'Petites Grottes', 49).

794 2QExod⁵ has וַּיֶּהֶל אָס אָס, “and hail and fire,” against וַּיֶּהֶל אָס, “and hail,” in the MT. 2QExod⁵ 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. The word order of the LXX, SP and the Tgs. agree with the MT, which indicates reading 2QExod⁵ as omitting the preposition plus pronominal suffix is the most likely reading.

795 The possibility remains that the word order is changed in 2QExod⁵, for which see M. Baillet, J.T. Milik, and R. de Vaux, Les 'Petites Grottes', 51. With the reconstruction 2QExod⁵ reads רָאָס מָשָׂא אֱלֹהִים אֱלֹהִים, against the MT רָאָס מָשָׂא אֱלֹהִים אֱלֹהִים. The word order of the LXX, SP and the Tgs. agree with the MT, which indicates reading 2QExod⁵ as omitting the preposition plus pronominal suffix is the most likely reading. 2QExod⁵ seems to agree with the SP in the reading בְּרֵד אֱלֹהִים בְּרֵד אֱלֹהִים against the MT בְּרֵד אֱלֹהִים בְּרֵד אֱלֹהִים. In the context the preposition ב and the bound form of the substantive plus preposition בְּרֵד can be treated as conveying synonymous meaning. In the SP the phrase בְּרֵד אֱלֹהִים בְּרֵד אֱלֹהִים 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 2QExod⁵.

796 The phrase in 2QExod⁵ is רָאָס מָשָׂא אֱלֹהִים אֱלֹהִים against the MT רָאָס מָשָׂא אֱלֹהִים אֱלֹהִים. The SP has the additional text as it appears in 2QExod⁴, but see note above regarding the long addition to the SP lacking in 2QExod⁴. The phrase in 2QExod⁵ 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 רָאָס מָשָׂא אֱלֹהִים אֱלֹהִים, but it does not appear in the parallel section of Tg. Neof.
| Q51 | MT Exod 12:39 | מַעַטְרֵהָ | SV(1) – 2QExod⁸ lacks the preposition ו, “from.”

| Q52 | MT Exod 26:11 | והברת | OV(1) – Possible difference in pronunciation.

| Q53 | MT Exod 30:25 | omit [לָדוּרוּת] | SV(2) – 2QExod⁸ has a repeated refrain lacking in the MT.

| Q54 | MT Exod 31:16 | omit לָדוּרוּת | SV(2) – The Tetragrammaton is lacking in the MT.

| Q55 | MT Exod 19:10 | omit | SV(2) – 2QExod⁸ inserts Exodus

---

798 2QExod⁸ agrees with the SP and the LXX in specifying the object of the verb with a pronoun. The phrase in 2QExod⁸ and the SP reads: מַעַטְרֵהָ, in apparent agreement with the LXX εξεβαλον γαρ αυτους οι Ἁιγυπτιοι, but against the MT מַעַטְרֵהָ ו. See also note below for a solution to this reading in the MT.

799 With the previous variant, the MT reads מַעַטְרֵהָ ו מַעַטְרֵהָ in 2QExod⁸ 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 2QExod⁸ possibly harmonises this verse with Exod 30:31 which ends with the phrase מִקְטָדֵּל יָלֶהוֹת (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 2QExod⁸ 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 2QExod⁸ clarifies the beneficiary YHWH in the phrase, “and the sons of Israel shall keep the Sabbath for Yahweh.”
2QExod\textsuperscript{b} 8 3-7
\begin{align*}
\text{ואֹמֵר רָעָב} & \ldots \begin{array}{c}
\text{אֻפָּתְרָה} \\
\text{אַכִּילוֹת}
\end{array}
\end{align*}
34:10 after Exodus 19:9.\textsuperscript{802}

Q56
MT Exod 34:10
2QExod\textsuperscript{b} 8 3
\begin{align*}
\text{אָמֹר} & \quad \text{אַח} \\
\text{אָמֹר} & \quad \text{אֱלֹהִים}
\end{align*}
SV(2) – 2QExod\textsuperscript{b} clarifies the speaker and addressee, lacking in the MT.\textsuperscript{803}

Q57
MT Exod 34:10
2QExod\textsuperscript{b} 8 4
\begin{align*}
\text{עָמַר} & \quad \text{עָמָה} \\
\text{עָמַר} & \quad \text{עָמָה}
\end{align*}
OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.

Q58
MT Exod 34:10
2QExod\textsuperscript{b} 8 7
\begin{align*}
\text{אַלְמָה} & \quad \text{אַלְמָה} \\
\text{אַלְמָה} & \quad \text{אַלְמָה}
\end{align*}
SV(1) – Lexical interchange.

Q59
MT Lev 11:26
2QpaleoLev 5-6
\begin{align*}
\text{טְסֵתֶה תָּסָמָת} & \quad \text{טְסֵתֶה תָּסָמָת}
\end{align*}
SV(3) – 2QpaleoLev has a different word order to the MT.\textsuperscript{804}

Q60
MT Num 33:52
2QNum\textsuperscript{b} 5
\begin{align*}
\text{רְוֹרֵה} & \quad \text{זָה} \\
\text{רְוֹרֵה} & \quad \text{זָה}
\end{align*}
OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.

Q61
MT Num 33:52
2QNum\textsuperscript{b} 5
\begin{align*}
\text{בָּל} & \quad \text{בָּל} \\
\text{בָּל} & \quad \text{בָּל}
\end{align*}
SV(2) – 2QNum\textsuperscript{b} lacks the adjective describing the object of the verb \textsuperscript{805}

802 The excise of the large section of text comprising MT Exod 19:10 – 34:10 from 2QExod\textsuperscript{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, \emph{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 \textsuperscript{806}
\begin{align*}
\text{אָמֹר} & \quad \text{אָמֹר} \\
\text{אָמֹר} & \quad \text{אָמֹר} \\
\text{אָמֹר} & \quad \text{אָמֹר}
\end{align*}

804 In 2QpaleoLev the arrangement of the words \textsuperscript{807}
\begin{align*}
\text{טְסֵתֶה תָּסָמָת} & \quad \text{טְסֵתֶה תָּסָמָת}
\end{align*}

805 The LXX has the same phrasing in 11:3 and 11:26, \textit{ονυχιστήρας ονυχίζεται/ονυχίζεται}.
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 c 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, לְרוּ, is treated with a singular imperative verb לְרֹא in the MT, but with the plural imperative לְרֹא 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, לְרֹא,... לְשָׁמַע, as are the subsequent imperative verbs לְרֹא...

806 The SP agrees with 2QDeut c.

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.
Q73  MT Gen 35:26  אֲשֵׁר לֹא לָכֵּן 4QGen-Exod 5 8
SV(1) – Difference in gender.808

Q74  MT Gen 41:7  תְּבִלֵּנָה 4QGen 1 ii 13
OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.809

Q75  MT Gen 41:7  omit 4QGen c 1 ii 14
SV(2) – 4QGen c adds an expansive plus lacking in the MT.810

Q76  MT Gen 41:11  גִּנּוֹתָה 4QGen c 1 ii 14
OV(l) – Possible difference in

808 The MT has אֲשֵׁר לֹא לָכֵּן, “these are the sons of Jacob who was (sic) born to him.” In this phrasing the Qal masculine singular passive participle dly, “to be born,” conflicts with the plural object, מַלְאַךְ, “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 wdl, “they were born.” 4QGen-Exod is still grammatically correct but instead has an active indicative, rendering the verb as Qal 3fs perfect in the phrase hl) wl hdly r#) bq(y ynb, “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 hitpîl 3mpl form of the verb in the phrase hl wrdyt)d bq(yd y) nb Nyl, “these are the sons of Jacob who were born to him.”

809 Here and below (Q76) the spelling of 4QGen c 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 c, 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 יִתְּבִלֵּנָה is relatively common in the MT (appearing about 38 times) but the long form תְּבִלֵּנָה is clearly preferred (appearing some 297 times). Occasionally the afformative (י) 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 afformative before a pronominal suffix, but it is unclear which verb he is referring to. The only possibility is the form יִתְּבִלֵּנָה, which in the present writer’s understanding is best read as a masculine singular form that adheres to the expected grammar.

810 4QGen c harmonises the description of the ears of grain with that of the previous verse in MT Gen 41:6 וַיַּפְתֵּל אֶת הַשְּׁמַלְתָּה, “seven ears of grain, blighted and burned.” The LXX agrees with 4QGen c, 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.

It is possible that 4QGen reflects the interchange of the feminine form תדלח, a *hophal* infinitive construct from דלע, “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 תַּ .” The former interpretation requires that the form דלחל, a 3ms *hiphil* perfect, was viewed as suiting the context: בָּהַ אַלֶּד הָרוֹמָל מִיְּבִא, “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 תדלח plus accusative תַּ אָמַּם in its original ergative sense, where the marked object (Pharaoh) actually functioned grammatically as the subject of the passive verb תדלח. In this sense the phrase תַּ אָמַּם בָּה הָרוֹמָל 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 תדלח הָרוֹמָל for the intransitive infinitive verb תדלח 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 תַּ as marking the subject of a passive verb in an ergative clause see B.K. Waltke and M. O'Connors, *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 אָמַּם תדלח מִיְּבִא 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.
| Q78 | MT Gen 41:3 | וַיְהַסְרוּ | 4QGen e 4 i-5 10 | SV(1) – Lexical interchange.  
813 It is possible that 4QGen e harmonised the readings וַיִּגְדִּיק, “fine, thin,” and וַיִּגְדִּיק, “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 וַיִּגְדִּיק and the ears of grain as וַיִּגְדִּיק (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). |
| Q79 | MT Gen 41:4 | וַיְהַסְרוּ | 4QGen e 4 i-5 11 | SV(1) – Lexical interchange.  
814 See note above. |
| Q80 | MT Gen 41:6 | וַיִּגְדִּיק | 4QGen e 4 i-5 13 | SV(2) – 4QGen e lacks the feminine plural adjective וַיִּגְדִּיק, “fine, thin.”  
815 Cf. Q74 above. The writing of the conjunction before the adjectival phrase וַיִּגְדִּיק, “burned by the east (wind),” in 4QGen e suggests that the first adjectival phrase וַיִּגְדִּיק was omitted erroneously by the scribe. However, a stylistic variant is counted in light of Rule 1. |
| Q81 | MT Gen 41:36 | וַיְהַסְרוּ | 4QGen e 4 ii, 6 4 | SV(1) – Lexical interchange.  
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 וַיִּגְדִּיק, “to be destroyed, effaced,” with a more familiar term וַיִּגְדִּיק, “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 וַיִּגְדִּיק, “it will be rubbed out, destroyed,” often used elsewhere in Genesis to translate וַיִּגְדִּיק, “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. |
| Q82 | MT Gen 43:9 | מְדִירִי | 4QGen e 8 1 | SV(1) – The MT lacks the conjunction.  
817 The form in 4QGen e probably reflects a corruption of the phrase וַיְהַסְרוּ, 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- |
| Q83 | MT Gen 48:6 | וַיַּרְדָּם | 4QGen f 1 10 | OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation. |
| Q84 | MT Gen 48:7 | וַיַּרְדָּם | 4QGen f 1 13 | SV(1) – The MT lacks the locative ה.  
818 The form in 4QGen f probably reflects a corruption of the phrase וַיְהַסְרוּ, 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 4QGen f lacks additional narrative information.\(^{818}\)

Q86 MT Gen 48:7 4QGen f

Q87 MT Gen 48:9 4QGen f omits\(^{820}\)

Q88 MT Gen 48:10 4QGen f

Q89 MT Gen 48:10 4QGen f has a different word order to the MT.\(^{822}\)

Q90 MT Gen 1:5 4QGen g

---

\(^{818}\) The omission from 4QGen f 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: נָבָא אֲבִיהָ. J. Davila, "New Qumran Readings for the Joseph Story," 175, calls the phrase נָבָא אֲבִיהָ 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 4QGen f, although *Tg. Neof.* does appear to have an extra verb: וְתוֹרֵךְ לְדוֹתָהּ לָהֶם, "and he hugged and embraced him, and he kissed him." All of the other witnesses agree with the reading in the MT.

\(^{823}\) 4QGen g uses the abstract noun יָמָם, "daytime," against the absolute יָמָם in the MT, the LXX and the SP. The *Tgs.* have forms equivalent to יָמָם 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 4QGen g 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q91</th>
<th>MT Gen 1:9</th>
<th>ספין האמה</th>
<th>SV(1) – The prepositional phrase lacks the preposition ב in the MT. 824</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4QGen⁸ 1 10</td>
<td>ספין האמה</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q92</td>
<td>MT Gen 1:14</td>
<td>דודי</td>
<td>OV(1) – Difference in grammatical form. 825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4QGen⁸ 2 3</td>
<td>דודי</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q93</td>
<td>MT Gen 1:22</td>
<td>ביב</td>
<td>OV(1) – Possible difference in pronunciation. 826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4QGen⁸ 2 14</td>
<td>ביב</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q94</td>
<td>MT Gen 1:9</td>
<td>מלקה</td>
<td>SV(2) – 4QGen⁹ has a different phrase to the MT. 827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4QGen⁹ 3</td>
<td>מלקה</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

824 The particle `txt` plus preposition ב can be used adverbially when followed by the preposition ב, for which usage see W. Gesenius, E. Kautzsch, and A.E. Cowley, *Hebrew Grammar*, 377-78, §119c, P. Joüon 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. 4QGen⁸ appears to use the particle ספין in this sense, perhaps harmonising with the use in Gen 1:7: יספין ב יאשא א腳ת לרקוע בזנ טפב תמא האלメ אל הרקיע מים בירקיע (Gen 1:7; 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 ספין plus the preposition ב preceding the preposition ב (cf. ב יאשא א רגל in Exod 20:4; Deut 4:18; 5:8; ב יאשא אהל in Gen 35:8; 1 Sam 7:11; and ב יאשא אהל in Exod 30:4; 37:27; etc.). Apparently the MT reflects a usage of the phrase ספין אימLabour that does not utilise the preposition ב to give adverbial force, whereas the use of the preposition ב for adverbial force when pairing the complex preposition ספין plus other nouns is normal. The scribe of 4QGen⁸ apparently treated the noun ספין in the same way as other nouns when constructing the adverbial phrase with the complex preposition ספין plus preposition ב.

825 4QGen⁸ appears to have an imperfect verb plus וָּאוֹ, against the perfect verb plus וָּו in the MT. The force of the וָּו, whether conjunctive or consecutive, in either source is debatable but there appears to be little problem in assuming that the וָּו functions as consecutive in the MT and conjunctive in 4QGen⁸. In this case the difference in aspect between the sources amounts to a variant of type OV(1).

826 The form in each source is presumed to be the jussive masculine singular of וָּו, יִּהְבָּה, “increase” in line with Rule 4 (for this reading see J. Davila, "New Readings for Genesis One," 6). 4QGen⁸ preserves the long form of the jussive with additional final hey, perhaps on analogy with the long Qumran Hebrew cohortative form וָּוָו. Perhaps a better alternative is to read 4QGen⁸ as in agreement with the SP which also has the form with final hey.

827 4QGen⁹ has מַעַקְּחָה, “gathering,” against the reading in MT Gen 1:9 מַעָּקָם, “place.” J. Davila, "New Readings for Genesis One," 9-11, presumes that the original reading in 4QGen⁹ was מַעַקְּחָה אל מַעָּקָם, “And God said let the waters gather into one collection.” According to this reading the Wortbericht is continued in 4QGen³ and 4QGen⁷ (and reflected in the LXX) by the Tathericht that continues the expected format of the creation account: יִּהְבָּה הָאָרֶץ אֵל הָאָרֶץ הָאָרֶץ אֵל הָאָרֶץ, "And God said let the waters gather from under the heavens to their gatherings and the dry land appeared." The Tathericht is lacking from the MT, presumably through haplography.
Q95 MT Gen 41:16  
4QGen\(^1\) 1 2\(\sup\)  
\(\text{לֶאָדוֹתָה} \text{ ראָתָה} \text{ לא} \text{ יְתָה} \)  
SV(2) – The negative particle is lacking in the MT.\(^{828}\)

Q96 MT Gen 41:24  
4QGen\(^2\) 2 i 2\(\sup\)  
\(\text{חֶלֶלֶת} \text{ חַלֶלֶת} \text{ חַלֶלֶת} \)  
SV(2) – 4QGen\(^1\) has a harmonising plus lacking in the MT.\(^{829}\)

Q97 MT Gen 41:30  
4QGen\(^1\) 3-4 2  
\(\text{רְוָאָה} \)  
OV(l) – Difference in grammatical form.\(^{830}\)

Q98 MT Gen 41:40  
4QGen\(^1\) 2 ii 3  
\(\text{סְמִך} \)  
SV(1) – Interchange of prepositions.

Q99 MT Gen 42:19  
4QGen\(^1\) 5 5  
\(\text{רְוָא} \text{ אָמָה} \)  
SV(1) – 4QGen\(^1\) has a definite article lacking in the MT.

Q100 MT Gen 42:22  
4QGen\(^1\) 5 9  
\(\text{רְוָא} \text{ יְרָאוּ} \text{ אָמָה} \)  
SV(3) – The order of the subject and object are reversed in 4QGen\(^1\).\(^{831}\)

Q101 MT Gen 45:17  
\(\text{עָשָה} \)  
SV(2) – 4QGen\(^1\) has a possible

---

\(^{828}\) The reading in 4QGen\(^1\) is supralinear, where the negative particle precedes the passive/reflexive \(niph'al\) verb form \(כָּלְכֵּל \text{ כָּלְכֵּל} \text{ כָּלְכֵּל} \), “it will be answered,” plus its direct object, \(כָּלְכֵּל \text{ כָּלְכֵּל} \text{ כָּלְכֵּל} \), “the wellbeing of Pharaoh.” According to J. Davila, "New Qumran Readings for the Joseph Story," 170-171, the verb, which is passive in 4QGen\(^1\), 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, \(\text{Hebrew Grammar}\), 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 \(וְיָדָה\) 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).

\(^{829}\) 4QGen\(^1\) probably can be restored: \(כָּלְכֵּל \text{ כָּלְכֵּל} \text{ כָּלְכֵּל} \), “and the seven thin ears of grain swallowed,” in agreement with the LXX \(καὶ \text{ κατεπιόν} \text{ επὶ} \text{ σταχύες} \text{ επὶ} \text{ λεπτοῖς}\). The use of the cardinal number harmonises the phrase with other like phrases in this pericope.

\(^{830}\) The verb in 4QGen\(^1\) 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, \(\text{History of the Hebrew Language}\), 45, §67. See also Q91 above.

\(^{831}\) The same order of object and subject as 4QGen\(^1\) is reflected in Tg. Ps.-J., but all other witnesses reflect the order found in the MT.
4QGenj 9 i-10 7

מֵשֶׁר

expansive plus lacking in the MT.832

Q102 MT Gen 45:17

בָּאָה

4QGenj 9 i-10 7

בָּאָה

SV(2) – 4QGenj has a possible expansive plus lacking in the MT.833

Q103 MT Gen 1:9

וֹרְםָא

4QGenk 1 1

וֹרְמָא

OV(l) – Possible difference in grammatical form.834

Q104 MT Gen 1:14

שַׁנְנִים

4QGenk 2 3

ושננים

SV(1) – The MT lacks the preposition ב.

Q105 MT Gen 3:1

אָצָא

4QGenk 5 2

אָצא

SV(1) – The MT lacks the interrogative particle.

Q106 MT Exod 1:5

טְבָעִים

HV – Difference in cardinal num-

---

832 The meaning of the form מֵשֶׁר in 4QGenj is difficult to determine, particularly as the LXX, the SP and the Tgs. all agree with the reading as it appears in the MT, which has a plural imperative verb מָצֵּר, "to do." The phrase in the MT is: מָצֵּר אֲלֵי אַחַר אֲלֵי אַחַר מְעָרֹת מָמֵי אֲרֵי מִדְרֶסֶת, "say to your brothers, ‘do this: load up your cattle.’” The reading in 4QGenj can be restored: מָצֵּר אֲלֵי אַחַר אֲלֵי אַחַר מְעָרֹת מָמֵי אֲרֵי מִדְרֶסֶת, which suggests two possible interpretations. We may read the form מֵשֶׁר as a number, and thus translate the phrase “say to your brothers this: ‘load up a tenth of your cattle.’” Alternatively we may read מֵשֶׁר as a noun, “wealth,” and the object marker as the conjunctive particle לָ, “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 4QGenj 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 מָצֵּר. J. Davila, "New Qumran Readings for the Joseph Story," 173 n. 18, instead reads the form מֵשֶׁר in 4QGenj as “clearly a scribal slip for מְצֵּר... The error arose through a waw-reś confusion.” However, in light of Rule 1 the variant form in 4QGenj is considered here to be a genuine reading.

833 The form in 4QGenj is restored as מְצָרָם, “provisions,” which finds support in some manuscripts of LXX and in the Syriac (see E. Ulrich and F.M. Cross, Qumran Cave 4. VII, 72, and J. Davila, "New Qumran Readings for the Joseph Story," 173-74).

834 The form in 4QGenk is either imperfect or an apocopated jussive form (without final heh). If the form in 4QGenk 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, 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 \(\sqrt{\text{wqw}}\), “to abhor, be disgusted,” refers to the Egyptians in the plural, the verb \(\sqrt{\text{rrm}}\), “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: “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: “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: “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 \(\sqrt{\text{ydm}}\), “to know.” According to W. Gesenius, E. Kautzsch, and A.E. Cowley, *Hebrew Grammar*, 189, §69m, the infinitive construct of primae \(\text{yod}\) roots with the feminine ending \(\text{\-}\) is rare, which raises the possibility that the form in the MT may be read as containing paragogic \(\text{heh}\).
| Q111 | MT Exod 3:8 | ויהיה | SV(1) – 4QGen-Exod⁴ lacks the conjunction. |
| Q112 | MT Exod 3:8 | ויהיה והבוסר | 4QGen-Exod⁴ lacks a list item lacking in the MT.⁸³⁹ |
| Q113 | MT Exod 3:15 | וב החזיר | SV(1) – Interchange of prepositions. |
| Q114 | MT Exod 3:15 | ואלהו יתכן | SV(1) – The MT lacks the conjunction. |
| Q115 | MT Exod 5:8 | נבשה | SV(1) – The MT lacks the conjunction. |
| Q116 | MT Exod 6:8 | ולא עשה שם שפאר ולא דיר | SV(2) – 4QGen-Exod⁴ contains a possible expansion or harmonisation.⁸⁴⁰ |

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-Exod⁴ 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 *לא עשה שם שפאר ולא דיר,* “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: *לא עשה שם שפאר ואל,* “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: *לא עשה שם שפאר ואל,* “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 *לא עשה שם שפאר* as a corruption of *ilmington* “to lift up,” see M. Sokoloff, *A Dictionary of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic of the Byzantine Period* (Ramat-Gan: Bar Ilan University Press, 1990) 519.
| Q117 | MT Exod 7:10 | Interchange of prepositions. |
| Q118 | MT Exod 7:19 | The MT lacks the object marker. |
| Q119 | MT Exod 7:19 | The MT lacks the object marker. |
| Q120 | MT Exod 1:1 | 4QExod\(b\) has an explicating plus. |
| Q121 | MT Exod 1:3 | A possible harmonisation lacking in the MT. |
| Q122 | MT Exod 1:5 | Difference in cardinal number. |
| Q123 | MT Exod 1:5 | The clause in the MT is lacking in 4QExod\(b\). |
| Q124 | MT Exod 1:16 | Difference in expression. |

---

841 So described in E. Ulrich and F.M. Cross, *Qumran Cave 4. VII*, 85. The addition in 4QExod\(b\) adds the description משביעים, “their father,” to the name of Jacob. This agrees with the LXX which reads Ιακωβ τω πατρι αυτων, “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 MT Exod 1:18 omits וביתו PS(2) – 4QExodb has an explicating plus.846
Q126 MT Exod 1:19 אלחלא ואלהי OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.
Q127 MT Exod 2:3 תוארוא לשפתהbabel omits SV(2) – 4QExodb has an explicating plus.847
Q128 MT Exod 2:3 תארואה omits SV(2) – 4QExodb has an explicating plus.848
Q129 MT Exod 2:4 ותרעה תכ[ I] OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.849
Q130 MT Exod 2:6 והוארה סבובותי SV(2) – 4QExodb lacks the cataphoric pronominal object suffix.
Q131 MT Exod 2:6 сообщает ובתרעה omits SV(2) – 4QExodb clarifies the subject of the verb ותרעה, “to have compassion.”850

845 The form of the verb in the MT is יִתְהַנֶּה, read as Qal 3fs perfect plus waw consecutive, יִתְהַנֶּה, “be alive.” The clause in the MT is יִתְהַנֶּהּ לְאִישָׁהּ וַיִּתְהַנֶּהּ, “and if she is a daughter, then she will live.” The verb in 4QExodb is restored יַתֵּנָּהּ וַיַּתֵּנָּהּ, and if read with the LXX περιποιεῖται (2pl present middle imperative), is Pi'el 2fpl imperative of the same root. 4QExodb therefore has a different reading: יַתֵּנָּהּ וַיַּתֵּנָּהּ, “and if she is a daughter, you will preserve (her).” This is a rephrasing of the text.
846 The object of the verb is clarified in 4QExodb with the addition of an adjective, מְדִלְדוֹת הָעָבָרָה, “Hebrew midwives.” The addition in 4QExodb harmonises this phrase with those in Exodus 1:15 and 16.
847 In the MT narrative, the infant Moses is deposited in the river by his mother: והיתה בֵּיתוֹ נַעֲמָה לֵילָּדָה לַעֲבָרָה, “and she put (it) in the reeds upon the bank of the river.” 4QExodb is restored to suggest that it was the maidservant of the mother of Moses: והיתה בֵּיתוֹ נַעֲמָה לֵילָּדָה לֵילָּדָה לַעֲבָרָה, “and she said to her maidservant, ‘Go,’ and she put it in the reeds upon the bank of the river.” The longer text of 4QExodb is not reflected in any of the other witnesses.
848 See note above. The object marker plus pronominal suffix clarifies the object of the (restored) verb לַעֲבָרָה, “and she put.”
849 The form in 4QExodb is restored לָדוּתָּהּ. See Q109 and note above.
850 4QExodb agrees with the LXX which reads: καὶ ἑφείσατο αὐτοῦ ἡ θυγατέρις Φαραώ, “and the daughter of Pharaoh has compassion on it.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q132</th>
<th>MT Exod 2:7</th>
<th>וָתַּגְּדָה</th>
<th>MT Exod 2:7</th>
<th>וֹתֵֽן</th>
<th>OV(I) – Difference in grammatical form.(^{851})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q133</td>
<td>MT Exod 2:11</td>
<td>וָרָבָּא</td>
<td>MT Exod 2:11</td>
<td>וָרָבָּא</td>
<td>SV(2) – 4QExod(^b) has an expansive plus.(^{852})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q134</td>
<td>MT Exod 2:13</td>
<td>וָיָרָא</td>
<td>MT Exod 2:13</td>
<td>וָיָרָא</td>
<td>SV(2) – 4QExod(^b) has an expansive plus.(^{853})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q135</td>
<td>MT Exod 2:13</td>
<td>וֹרֵֽן</td>
<td>MT Exod 2:13</td>
<td>וֹרֵֽן</td>
<td>SV(1) – The MT lacks the object marker.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q136</td>
<td>MT Exod 2:14</td>
<td>וֶל</td>
<td>MT Exod 2:14</td>
<td>וֶל</td>
<td>SV(2) – 4QExod(^b) has an explicating plus.(^{854})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q137</td>
<td>MT Exod 2:14</td>
<td>וָלְשֵׁפֶט</td>
<td>MT Exod 2:14</td>
<td>וָלְשֵׁפֶט</td>
<td>SV(1) – The MT lacks the redundant preposition (^{855}).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q138</td>
<td>MT Exod 2:14</td>
<td>וָמְאָדָה</td>
<td>MT Exod 2:14</td>
<td>וָמְאָדָה</td>
<td>SV(2) – 4QExod(^b) has an additional adverb describing the verb וָרָא, “to fear.”(^{856})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{851}\) The form of נָתַגְּדָה, “to suck,” in 4QExod\(^b\) is Hiph'il 3fs perfect against Hiph'il 3fs imperfect plus הָוָא 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\(^b\), מִיְיָשֶׁף מַיְרָבָּה מַיְיָשֶׁף יָנָֽה מִיְּדֵֽה, seems to reflect the LXX ἐγένετο δὲ εν ταῖς ἡμεραῖς ταῖς πολλαῖς, “and it came to pass in those many days.”

\(^{853}\) An extra verb drives the narrative in 4QExod\(^b\), which is restored: מִיְיָשֶׁף וָלְשֵׁפֶט מִיְּדֵֽה, “and he saw, and behold, two Hebrew men were fighting.” The verb וָרָא, “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 ו plus dative pronominal suffix in 4QExod\(^b\) clarifies the character (Moses) to whom the statement is directed: וָלְשֵׁפֶט וָלְשֵׁפֶט מִיְּדֵֽה, “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 ומְאָדָה, “very,” with final הָוָא see E. Qimron, *Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 69 and 117. The final הָוָא is considered locative in origin but retains no syntactic function in Qumran Hebrew.
Q139 MT Exod 2:16 omits רְשֵׁיתָותָא
4QExod^b 3 i-4 18 SV(2) – 4QExod^b has an expansive plus.\(^{857}\)
Q140 MT Exod 2:16 omits אָמ
4QExod^b 3 i-4 19 SV(1) – The MT lacks the object marker.
Q141 MT Exod 3:13 לָהֶם
4QExod^b 3 ii, 5-6 i 1 SV(1) – Interchange of prepositions.\(^{858}\)
Q142 MT Exod 3:15 נָוֵר אָלָהֵם
4QExod^b 3 ii, 5-6 i 4 SV(3) – 4QExod^b has a different word order to the MT.\(^{859}\)
Q143 MT Exod 3:15 יִשְׁחָטֹן
4QExod^b 3 ii, 5-6 i 5 OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.\(^{860}\)
Q144 MT Exod 3:16 אָסְפָּה
4QExod^b 3 ii, 5-6 i 6 OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.
Q145 MT Exod 3:16 בִּנֵי ynb
4QExod^b 3 ii, 5-6 i 6 SV(2) – The MT lacks the masculine plural construct noun וֹב, "son."\(^{861}\)

\(^{857}\) The feminine plural participle in 4QExod^b describes the daughters of the “Priest of Midian.” The phrase is restored as וֹב מֵאֲשֶׁר בְּנוֹת הַרְשֵׁי הָיָה, "seven daughters (who were) shepherds," and agrees with the feminine plural present participle in the LXX ποιμαινουσαι, “shepherds.”

\(^{858}\) The form in 4QExod^b is restored Mhyl).

\(^{859}\) The adverbial particle dw(, “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 אלָהֵם 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:

יָדֹּל עָזָה הָאָדָם וָגוֹלַּהְוָה אֲלֵהוּ אֶל אֲלֵהוּ. וְגָלוֹת אֲלֵהוּ הַלָּלֶתְוּ הַלָּלֶתְוּ נִוּדַּהו הַלָּלֶתְוּ נוֹדוֹת.

“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 qxcy 108 times, used consistently 98 times in the Pentateuch. In contrast the spelling qx#y 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 | נֹאִים | OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.862 |
| Q147 | MT Exod 3:16 | יַעֲנוּ | SV(2) – The MT lacks the resumptive proper noun in construct.863 |
| Q148 | MT Exod 3:16 | נֶאֶם | OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation. |
| Q149 | MT Exod 3:16 | יַעֲנוּ | SV(2) – The MT lacks the resumptive proper noun in construct.864 |
| Q150 | MT Exod 3:17 | דָּחֲרֵר | SV(1) – 4QExodb lacks the resumptive conjunction.865 |
| Q151 | MT Exod 3:17 | דָּחֲרֵר | SV(1) – 4QExodb lacks the resumptive conjunction. |
| Q152 | MT Exod 3:18 | בֵּן | SV(2) – The MT lacks the masculine plural construct noun ובָּן, “son.”866 |

861 The SP and the LXX agree with the reading in 4QExodb, which has the object of the verb אֹמַר, “collect, gather,” as לְגַרְיָה תַּנְאֵר בְּנֵי אֲבִירֵמָה, “the elders of the sons of Israel.” The MT, Tgs., and a few Greek manuscripts have לְגַרְיָה תַּנְאֵר בָּנֵי אֲבִירֵמָה, “the elders of Israel,” assumed to be a corruption of the longer phrase by homoio teleuton in E. Ulrich and F.M. Cross, *Qumran Cave 4. VII*, 92.

862 The form in 4QExod is restored by אֹמַר בֵּית אִשָּׁה. See note above.

863 There is some variation in this verse between the witnesses. The MT and Tgs. have the shorter phrasing: יַעֲנוּ לְגַרְיָה תַּנְאֵר בָּנֵי אֲבִירֵמָה; the SP has an extra conjunction: יַעֲנוּ לְגַרְיָה תַּנְאֵר בָּנֵי אֲבִירֵמָה וַיַּגְבִּרֵה; and the LXX appears to agree with 4QExod: θεὸς Αβραμκαὶ θεὸς Ισαακκαὶ θεὸς Ιακωβ. The phrase in 4QExod may also be a harmonised reading with Exod 4:5. The addition is treated as an explicating plus.864 4QExod is restored by אֹמַר יִבְּנֵי אֲבִירֵמָה. See note above.

864 See note above.

865 Almost all witnesses lack the addition of the masculine plural construct noun בֵּן, while only a small number of Greek manuscripts and the Peshitta agree with 4QExod. 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).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q153</th>
<th>MT Exod 3:19</th>
<th>הָלַלְךָ</th>
<th>OV(l) – Difference in grammatical form.(^{867})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4QExod(^b) 3 ii, 5-6 i</td>
<td>הָלַלְכָה</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q154</th>
<th>MT Exod 3:19</th>
<th>וִלְאַ בָּד</th>
<th>SV(1) – Interchange of prepositions.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4QExod(^b) 3 ii, 5-6 i</td>
<td>וִלְאַ בָּד</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q155</th>
<th>MT Exod 3:21</th>
<th>וּבַ</th>
<th>SV(1) – The MT lacks the adverbial particle וּבַ, “thus.”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4QExod(^b) 3 ii, 5-6 i</td>
<td>וּבַ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q156</th>
<th>MT Exod 4:3</th>
<th>וּאַ בָּד</th>
<th>SV(1) – The MT lacks the entreat-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4QExod(^b) 3 ii, 5-6 i</td>
<td>וּאַ בָּד</td>
<td>ing particle וּאַ בָּד.(^{868})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q157</th>
<th>MT Exod 4:4</th>
<th>וּהָדְחָ ה</th>
<th>SV(1) – Lexical interchange.(^{869})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4QExod(^b) 3 ii, 5-6 i</td>
<td>וּהָדְחָ ה</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q158</th>
<th>MT Exod 4:6</th>
<th>וּלָ</th>
<th>SV(1) – Interchange of preposi-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ולָ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^{867}\) The form of the infinitive construct of הָלַלְךָ, “to go,” in the MT is rare, whereas the more common form is found in 4QExod\(^b\). According to W. Gesenius, E. Kautzsch, and A.E. Cowley, *Hebrew Grammar*, 192, §69, the forms based on the regular inflexion of הָלַלְךָ 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 לָלַלְךָ a total of 129 times in the MT, 22 occurrences of which appear in the Pentateuch. The spelling in 4QExod\(^b\) is therefore regular and quite possibly secondary. More weight could be given to the consideration that the form in 4QExod\(^b\) 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\(^b\) may have harmonised this form with Exod 4:13.

\(^{869}\) Both the MT and the SP have וּאַ בָּד, “seize,” against וּהָדְחָ ה, “grow strong,” in 4QExod\(^b\). In the context the exchange of lexemes amounts to an interchange of synonyms, where the *Hiph'il* of וּאַ בָּד is translated as “grasp.” The MT reads: וּאַ בָּד חָרָה אֶת הַחֲרֹשׁ לְשֵׁם ה, “put out your hand and seize (the serpent) by its tail.” 4QExod\(^b\) may be translated similarly: וּאַ בָּד הָדְחָ הָלַלְכָה לְשֵׁם ה, “put out your hand and grasp (the serpent) by its tail.” The verb of the *Wortbericht* in 4QExod\(^b\) is most likely harmonised with the verb in the accompanying *Tatbericht*: וּלָ חָרָה אֶת הַחֲרֹשׁ לְשֵׁם ה.
Q159 MT Exod 4:8 4QExod\textsuperscript{b} 3 ii, 5-6 i
\text{וֹדְהַה} \text{אֶל לַא} \\
\text{לְמַשֵּׁן} 23
SV(1) – Interchange of prepositions.\textsuperscript{870}

Q160 MT Exod 5:4 4QExod\textsuperscript{b} 6 ii 2
\text{תֶּרֶהוּ} \\
\text{תֶּרֶהוּ} 871
SV(1) – Lexical interchange.\textsuperscript{871}

Q161 MT Exod 5:8 4QExod\textsuperscript{b} 6 ii 7
\text{עָנָנִים} \\
\text{זְעָן[מ]} 8
SV(1) – The MT lacks the definite article.

Q162 MT Exod 5:9 4QExod\textsuperscript{b} 6 ii 8
\text{ירוֹנָשׁ} \\
\text{יוֹרָנָשׁ} 873
SV(1) – Lexical interchange.\textsuperscript{873}

Q163 MT Exod 5:10 4QExod\textsuperscript{b} 6 ii 9
\text{יאָמְרֵא} \\
\text{ירָמְרֵא} 874
SV(1) – Lexical interchange.\textsuperscript{874}

Q164 MT Exod 5:11 4QExod\textsuperscript{b} 6 ii 10
\text{עָנָה} \\
\text{עָנָה} 875
SV(1) – The MT lacks the context.

\textsuperscript{870} The form in 4QExod\textsuperscript{b} is possibly harmonised with the expression in Exod 4:2, 11 and 15.

\textsuperscript{871} The compound preposition לְמַשֵּׁן in 4QExod\textsuperscript{b} 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 עָמַר, 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 לְמַשֵּׁן, “so that,” while the latter is introduced by the prepositional phrase הָלָם, “and it will be if not.” 4QExod\textsuperscript{b} 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 4QExod\textsuperscript{b} harmonises the prepositions that introduce the direct speech of Yahweh in Exod 4:5 and 8.

\textsuperscript{872} The verb וּניָרָה, which in Hiph'il has the meaning “to separate,” is unusual in 4QExod\textsuperscript{b}. The verb כָּס, “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 4QExod\textsuperscript{b} against the MT. If the general tendency is for 4QExod\textsuperscript{b} 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 4QExod\textsuperscript{b} appears elsewhere in the Pentateuch only in Genesis and Deuteronomy.

\textsuperscript{873} The reading in 4QExod\textsuperscript{b} is supported by the SP. The LXX has the 3pl present active imperative verb μερίμνατον, “let them be concerned,” twice in this verse, where as the MT has once μερίμνη, “to do,” and once μερίμνη, “to look at, give attention.” It is conceivable that the textual tradition behind the MT has suffered metathesis, or paronomasias as suggested in E. Ulrich and F.M. Cross, \textit{Qumran Cave 4. VII}, 95.

\textsuperscript{874} 4QExod\textsuperscript{b} agrees with the SP against the MT and the Tgs.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q</th>
<th>MT Exod</th>
<th>4QExod⁶</th>
<th>SV(1)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>Exod 7:21</td>
<td>6 i 10</td>
<td>6 i 17</td>
<td>4QExod⁶ lacks the definite article.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>Exod 7:22</td>
<td>4QExod⁶</td>
<td>4QExod⁶</td>
<td>Possible difference in pronunciation.⁸⁷⁵</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>Exod 8:12</td>
<td>4QExod⁶</td>
<td>4QExod⁶</td>
<td>Lexical interchange.⁸⁷⁶</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>Exod 8:17</td>
<td>4QExod⁶</td>
<td>4QExod⁶</td>
<td>Possible difference in pronunciation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>Exod 9:19</td>
<td>4QExod⁶</td>
<td>4QExod⁶</td>
<td>The MT lacks the object marker.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>Exod 9:29</td>
<td>4QExod⁶</td>
<td>4QExod⁶</td>
<td>4QExod⁶ lacks the object marker.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>Exod 9:29</td>
<td>4QExod⁶</td>
<td>4QExod⁶</td>
<td>Difference in grammatical form.⁸⁷⁷</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>Exod 9:30</td>
<td>4QExod⁶</td>
<td>4QExod⁶</td>
<td>Difference in grammatical form.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>Exod 9:30</td>
<td>4QExod⁶</td>
<td>4QExod⁶</td>
<td>Interchange of divine ti-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

⁸⁷⁵ ⁴QExod⁶ is restored מיח, in agreement with the SP. The spelling מיח = מיח, for which see HALOT, 513 and 527. This suggests some confusion of gutturals as per the SP.

⁸⁷⁶ ⁴QExod⁶ is restored מיח מיח, “reach out your hand with your rod,” in agreement with the SP. The LXX would also seem to support this reading: εκτεινον τη χειρι την ραβδον σου, “stretch forth your rod with your hand.” The reading in ⁴QExod⁶ and the supporting witnesses clarifies the instrument of the action that follows: מיח מיח מיח, “and strike the dust of the earth.”

⁸⁷⁷ According to J. Hoftijzer, Imperfect Forms with Nun Paragogicum, 9, the use of paragogic 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 nun see note above. See also Q172, Q187 and Q194 below.
Q174 MT Exod 9:31 | SV(3) – 4QExod\textsuperscript{c} has a different word order to the MT.\textsuperscript{879}

Q175 MT Exod 10:3 | omits

Q176 MT Exod 10:15 | SV(1) – Lexical interchange.\textsuperscript{881}

Q177 MT Exod 10:17 | SV(1) – Difference in number.\textsuperscript{882}

\textsuperscript{878} The phrase \textit{תהלי והיה} occurs much less often than the phrase \textit{יסי והיה} 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\textsuperscript{c} is 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 \textit{ל}, the paragogic \textit{נun, etc.}

\textsuperscript{879} The clause in 4QExod\textsuperscript{c} is restored: \textit{בי השלמה ונשבור כשפיים}, “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\textsuperscript{c}.

\textsuperscript{880} 4QExod\textsuperscript{c} clarifies the secondary object as \textit{במצרים}, “in Egypt,” thus locating the place in which the narrative action occurs. All of the other witnesses agree with the MT.

\textsuperscript{881} The phrase in 4QExod\textsuperscript{c}, \textit{ו=”and the land was ruined,” probably harmonises with the phrasing in Exod 8:20 which reads: \textit{ושהחא ומפי הוארות}, “the land was continually ruined on account of the swarm.” The LXX appears to reflect a similar Vorlage: \textit{καὶ ἐφθαρετη ἡ γῆ, “and the land was ruined,” against the MT, the SP and Tgs. \textit{ושהחא ומפי היאר}, “and the land was darkened.”}

\textsuperscript{882} 4QExod\textsuperscript{c} 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: \textit{אלהי ויאמרו אליהם}, “I have sinned toward Yahweh your God and toward you.” In this context the plural imperative \textit{לא} in 10:17, as reflected in 4QExod\textsuperscript{c}, the SP and the LXX, seems to be the grammatically correct form, against the singular form in the MT: \textit{אלהי הבプレゼント}, “forgive my sin one more time.”
| Q178 | MT Exod 12:34 | וּמָמַלְתָּה | SV(1) – Lexical interchange.  
4QExod $^c$ v 4 | מַעֲלְתָּהּ |
| Q179 | MT Exod 12:35 | וֹמַלְתֵּם | SV(2) – 4QExod $^c$ has an explicating plus.  
4QExod $^c$ v 5 | מַכַּלְתֵּם |
| Q180 | MT Exod 12:40 | וָמַלְתַּה | SV(2) – 4QExod $^c$ has an explicating plus.  
4QExod $^c$ v 10 | בֹּאֶרֶך |
| Q181 | MT Exod 13:22 | וֹמַלְתֵּנָה | SV(1) – 4QExod $^c$ lacks the definite article.  
4QExod $^c$ v 40 | מַכַּלְתֵּנָה |
| Q182 | MT Exod 13:22 | וֹמַלְתֵּנָה | SV(1) – 4QExod $^c$ lacks the definite article.  
4QExod $^c$ v 40 | מַכַּלְתֵּנָה |
| Q183 | MT Exod 14:3 | וֹמַלְתֵּנָה | SV(1) – Interchange of prepositions.  
4QExod $^c$ v 43 | מַכַּלְתֵּנָה |
| Q184 | MT Exod 14:10 | וֹמַלְתֵּנָה | SV(1) – Difference in number.  
4QExod $^c$ vi 7 | מַכַּלְתֵּנָה |
| Q185 | MT Exod 15:11 | וֹמַלְתֵּנָה | 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 וּמָמַלְתָּה and מַעֲלְתָּהּ 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: וֹמַלְתֵּנָה מַכַּלְתֵּנָה וּלָה צְלָע, "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 מַכַּלְתֵּנָה וֹמַלְתֵּנָה. The SP and some Greek manuscripts have an additional expansive plus וֹמַלְתֵּנָה נָמָר מַכַּלְתֵּנָה, 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, מַכַּלְתֵּנָה. The plural participle of וֹמַלְתֵּנָה, "to start out, pull up," indicates that the noun מַכַּלְתֵּנָה, "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."
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>MT Exod 15:12</th>
<th>4QExod(^c) vi 36</th>
<th>Hebrew</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q186</td>
<td>נִשָּׁה</td>
<td>כֵּבָלָה</td>
<td>pronunciation.(^{887})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q187</td>
<td>רָדִימה</td>
<td>רָדִימה</td>
<td>Not Counted – The reading in 4QExod(^c) is uncertain.(^{888})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q188</td>
<td>אֲמוֹתָה</td>
<td>אֲמוֹתָה</td>
<td>OV(I) – Difference in grammatical form.(^{889})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q189</td>
<td>בְּרָאָמָי</td>
<td>בְּרָאָמָי</td>
<td>OV(I) – Difference in grammatical form.(^{890})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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. 4QExod\(^c\) has the common form of the preposition ב 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 קָנַמְי נְתִישׁ, “you reached out your right hand.” A likely but ultimately uncertain reconstruction of the phrase in 4QExod\(^c\) might be קָנַמְי וָנָי, “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, מִת, where the ending with [t], מִת, is appended to “avoid the contact of two stressed syllables” (P. Joulon and T. Muraoka, *Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*, 281, §93j). This accusative form may be based on an ‘old locative,’ of which the form with the termination מִת, 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 4QExod\(^c\).

890 The archaic ending מִת is lacking in 4QExod\(^c\). 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 מִת 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>MT Exod 15:17</th>
<th>4QExod(^c) vi 40</th>
<th>Hebrew</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q190</td>
<td>וְתָתְנָמָא</td>
<td>וְתָתְנָמָא</td>
<td>OV(I) – Difference in grammatical form.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>MT Exod 15:18</th>
<th>4QExod(^c) vi 41</th>
<th>Hebrew</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q191</td>
<td>לְתוֹלֵה</td>
<td>לְתוֹלֵה</td>
<td>SV(1) – 4QExod(^c) lacks the preposition ב.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q192</td>
<td>MT Exod 17:1</td>
<td>סדרה unfit</td>
<td>4QExod in viii 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q193</td>
<td>MT Exod 17:2</td>
<td>מַה</td>
<td>4QExod in viii 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q194</td>
<td>MT Exod 17:2</td>
<td>חָסִית</td>
<td>4QExod in viii 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q195</td>
<td>MT Exod 17:5</td>
<td>נַעַשְׁת</td>
<td>4QExod in viii 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q196</td>
<td>MT Exod 17:7</td>
<td>וְשָׁם</td>
<td>4QExod in viii 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q197</td>
<td>MT Exod 17:12</td>
<td>וּרְחֵי</td>
<td>4QExod in viii 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q198</td>
<td>MT Exod 18:6</td>
<td>נַחֲקְקָה</td>
<td>4QExod in viii 30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

⁸⁹¹ The syntax in 4QExod in agrees with that of 4QpaleoGen-Exod in against the MT, the LXX, the SP and 4QpaleoExod in (see Q251 below). 4QExod in possibly harmonises with Num 10:12 which has the same word order.

⁸⁹² The secondary object is specified in the MT: יְהֹウェָה יִשְׂרָאֵל אֲשֶׁר נִטְבַּשׁ, “And Yahweh said to Moses.” All of the witnesses agree with the MT.

⁸⁹³ The object of the verb is the plural noun plus possessive pronoun suffix יִדְרִי, “his hands.” 4QExod in has the correct form, and is in agreement with 4QpaleoExod in, 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: [וְנִטְבַּשׁ יְהֹウェָה יִשְׂרָאֵל יְדֵי], “and his hands were spread.”

⁸⁹⁴ The noun phrase Knx, “your father-in-law,” precedes the proper noun in the MT but follows it in 4QExod in. Several Latin, Coptic and Ethiopic manuscripts agree with the word order in 4QExod in (see ), though the majority of witnesses seems to agree with the MT. In the majority of cases, when the noun בֵּיתヌ 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 4QExod in harmonises the unusual word order towards the more common phrasing.
Q199 MT Exod 18:7
4QExod viii 32

w)byw

SV(1) – Difference in number. 895

Q200 MT Exod 18:7
4QExod viii 32

w)byw

SV(2) – 4QExod clariﬁes the object.

Q201 MT Exod 13:15
4QExod 2

אֵלֶּה

SV(1) – Lexical interchange. 896

Q202 MT Exod 15:1
4QExod 4

14:31 → 15:1
13:16 → 15:1

SV(3) – Possible difference of verse order. 897

Q203 MT Exod 13:3
4QExod 2

מֵאָרֶד

SV(2) – 4QExod has an expansive plus. 898

Q204 MT Exod 13:3
4QExod 2

מֻבָּלָה הָעָבָדָה

SV(2) – The MT has an explicating plus. 899

Q205 MT Exod 13:5

וְהַאָמָרָה הַוָּדָהָה

SV(3) – Different order of listed

895 The MT reads: רָאָתָה, “and they came to the tent,” where the 3pl ḫal of בָּא, “to come,” refers to the action of each character in the narrative. 4QExod has more speciﬁc phrasing, indicating the agency of one speciﬁc character over another: רָאָתָה, “and he brought him to the tent,” where the verb בָּא is given as Hiph’il, “to bring,” and has its object directly appended as a pronominal sufﬁx.

896 On the different uses of the 1cs independent pronoun נִשְׁתָּב and נִשְׁתָּב 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. Joüon and T. Muraoka, Grammar of Biblical Hebrew, 119-20, §39a). The form in 4QExod 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, 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 is in fact a liturgical scroll (see E. Ulrich and F.M. Cross, Qumran Cave 4. VII, 127-28).

898 4QExod agrees with the LXX and the SP. See also Q180 above.

899 All of the witnesses agree with the MT.
| Q   | MT Exod 13:5 | 4QExod$^6$ 6 | SV(1) – | 4QExod$^6$ lacks the conjunction.  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q206</td>
<td>MT Exod 13:5</td>
<td>4QExod$^6$ 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q207</td>
<td>MT Exod 13:5</td>
<td>4QExod$^6$ 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q208</td>
<td>MT Exod 13:5</td>
<td>4QExod$^6$ 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q209</td>
<td>MT Exod 13:5</td>
<td>4QExod$^6$ 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q210</td>
<td>MT Exod 13:5</td>
<td>4QExod$^6$ 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q211</td>
<td>MT Exod 13:5</td>
<td>4QExod$^6$ 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q212</td>
<td>MT Exod 39:7</td>
<td>4QExod-Lev$^f$ 2 i 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q213</td>
<td>MT Exod 39:17</td>
<td>4QExod-Lev$^f$ 2 i 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q214</td>
<td>MT Exod 39:21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4QExod$^6$ 6 Council of能耗

900 See Q110 and note above.

901 The form in 4QExod$^6$ is restored: יבכיה, “and you shall serve.”

902 The plural pronominal object suffix refers both to a masculine object (בכיה, “carnelian” – a precious red-coloured stone) and to a feminine object (פ יבכיה, “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 יבכיה, “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 \(1\) ii 3 \[ \text{סא אל חנה יוהי יאנה מ}\] pensive plus.\(^{903}\)

Q215 MT Exod 39:21 4QExod-Lev \(1\) ii 4 \[ \text{ביחר} \] omits SV(2) – 4QExod-Lev\(^f\) has an explicating plus.\(^{904}\)

Q216 MT Exod 39:21 4QExod-Lev \(1\) ii 5-6 \[ \text{ורענ את התאורהות [מלשה]} \] omits SV(2) – The MT lacks the expansive plus.\(^{905}\)

Q217 MT Exod 39:22 4QExod-Lev \(1\) ii 6 \[ \text{מאכית} \] SV(1) – The MT lacks the definite article.

Q218 MT Exod 40:10 4QExod-Lev \(2\) ii 5 \[ \text{וקל} \]OV(l) – Difference in grammatical form.\(^{906}\)

Q219 MT Exod 40:12 4QExod-Lev \(2\) ii 6 \[ \text{ועקריהות את ארון [את לאן בטני]} \] SV(3) – 4QExod-Lev\(^f\) has a difference word order to the MT.\(^{907}\)

\(^{903}\) The insertion of the phrase \[ \text{סא אל חנה יוהי יאנה מ}\] , “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, \textit{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: \[ \text{ואם את ארון חנה יוהי א '\} מָסָה} \] , “And he made the \textit{urim} and the \textit{tummim} as Yahweh commanded Moses.” According to E. Ulrich and F.M. Cross, \textit{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, \textit{Qumran Cave 4. VII}, 141). Alternatively the verb could be read as imperative: \[ \text{וקל} \] , “and sanctify the altar.” However, the latter is unlikely given the use of the 2ms perfect \textit{tx#m}, “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, \textit{Hebrew Grammar}, 345-46, §113y-aa). Note also the use of the infinitive absolute as an “emphatic imperative ... followed by a \textit{perfect consecutive}” (W. Gesenius, E. Kautzsch, and A.E. Cowley, \textit{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, \textit{Qumran Cave 4. VII}, 143).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q220</th>
<th>MT Exod 40:12</th>
<th>תְּרָפִים</th>
<th>OV(l) – Difference in grammatical form.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4QExod-Lev.f 2 ii 6</td>
<td>byrqhw</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q221</th>
<th>MT Exod 40:14</th>
<th>omit</th>
<th>SV(1) – The MT lacks the preposition רָשׁ, “with.”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4QExod-Lev.f 2 ii 8</td>
<td>אָס</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q222</th>
<th>MT Exod 40:14</th>
<th>בְּחֵת</th>
<th>SV(1) – The MT lacks the definite article.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4QExod-Lev.f 2 ii 8</td>
<td>סְבָכָה</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q223</th>
<th>MT Exod 40:15</th>
<th>אֲבַרְיֶה</th>
<th>SV(1) – Difference in gender.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4QExod-Lev.f 2 ii 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q224</th>
<th>MT Exod 40:16</th>
<th>אָסֶר</th>
<th>SV(1) – Difference in number.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4QExod-Lev.f 2 ii 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q225</th>
<th>MT Exod 40:16</th>
<th>בָּנ֖ה</th>
<th>SV(2) – The MT has an expansive plus.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4QExod-Lev.f 2 ii 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q226</th>
<th>MT Exod 40:17</th>
<th>omit</th>
<th>SV(2) – 4QExod-Lev.f has an ex-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

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 waw 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 יְשִׁיעַת יִשְׂרָאֵל, “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 יִשָּׁא 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 יִשָּׁא-.

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: יַּעֲכֹב אֵלֶּה יִשְׁרָאֵל בִּסְלֵּמָה, “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 12

לַאֲחָזָה מִלְחָהָה
deciphering plus.912

Q227 MT Exod 40:17
4QExod-Lev f 2 ii 13

הַמָּחֵל
SV(1) – The MT lacks the object marker.913

Q228 MT Exod 40:18
4QExod-Lev f 2 ii 13

וֹכֵחַ מַכַּהַ אֲתָ המָחֵל
SV(2) – The phrase is lacking in 4QExod-Lev f.914

Q229 MT Exod 40:18
4QExod-Lev f 2 ii 13

אַתָּ הָפָּחַ
omits
SV(2) – The phrase is lacking in the MT.915

Q230 MT Exod 40:19

וֹרֵחַ
OV(l) – Possible difference in

912 4QExod-Lev f clarifies the period being discussed as הַמַּחֵל לַאֲחָזָה מִלְחָהָה מִשְׁמַרְשָׁה, “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: τῶι δευτέρω ετει ἐκπορευομενῶν αὐτῶι ἐξ Ἁιγυπτοιω, “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 מַכַּה מְכַה אֲתָ הָפָּחַ, however there does not seem to be any necessity for the verb to be restored מְכַה rather than מְכַה. If the latter is restored the reading in 4QExod-Lev f simply lacks the first phrase. Alternatively, with the verb restored as מְכַה, one may assume a variant textual tradition that has מְכַה in place of מְכַה in the MT. From this 4QExod-Lev f has suffered haplography losing the text between the first occurrence of the verb מְכַה to the second. Of the two phrases, מַכַּה מְכַה אֲתָ הָפָּחַ, “and Moses raised up the tabernacle,” and מַכַּה מְכַה אֲתָ הָפָּחַ, “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: מַכַּה מְכַה אֲתָ הָפָּחַ, “and he placed its boards.” 4QExod-Lev f has an extended phrase, restored: מַכַּה מְכַה אֲתָ הָפָּחַ, מַכַּה מְכַה אֲתָ הָפָּחַ, “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 מְכַה. 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.
4QExod-Lev\(^f\) 2 ii 14 \(\text{יִתְנָה}\) pronunciation.\(^{916}\)

Q231 MT Exod 40:19 \(\text{רַפָּהָה}\) 4QExod-Lev\(^f\) 2 ii 14 \(\text{יִתְנָה}\) SV(1) – Lexical interchange.\(^{917}\)

Q232 MT Exod 40:20 \(\text{רֵיהָה}\) 4QExod-Lev\(^f\) 2 ii 16 \(\text{יִתְנָה}\) OV(I) – Possible difference in pronunciation.

Q233 MT Exod 40:20 \(\text{כַּל}\) 4QExod-Lev\(^f\) 2 ii 17 \(\text{יִתְנָה}\) SV(1) – Interchange of prepositions.

Q234 MT Exod 40:20 \(\text{רֵיהָה}\) 4QExod-Lev\(^f\) 2 ii 17 \(\text{יִתְנָה}\) OV(I) – Possible difference in pronunciation.

Q235 MT Exod 40:20 \(\text{תַּלְמַדָּה}\) 4QExod-Lev\(^f\) 2 ii 17 omits SV(2) – 4QExod-Lev\(^f\) lacks the explicating plus.\(^{918}\)

Q236 MT Exod 40:21 \(\text{אֲרוֹר}\) 4QExod-Lev\(^f\) 2 ii 18 \(\text{דָּרָר}\) SV(1) – The MT lacks the definite article.

Q237 MT Exod 40:22 \(\text{רִיָּה}\) 4QExod-Lev\(^f\) 2 ii 19 \(\text{יִתְנָה}\) OV(I) – Possible difference in pronunciation.

Q238 MT Exod 40:22 \(\text{בָּשָּׂל}\) 4QExod-Lev\(^f\) 2 ii 19 \(\text{אֶל}\) SV(1) – Interchange of prepositions.

---

\(^{916}\) The initial nun is written regularly in 4QExod-Lev\(^f\). 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).

\(^{917}\) The MT reads: \(\text{יִתְנָה} ? \text{אַשְׁרָה} \text{לַע} \text{תְּנָה} \text{לָא} \), “And he spread the tent over the tabernacle,” against the reading in 4QExod-Lev\(^f\): \(\text{יִתְנָה} \text{אַשְׁרָה} \text{לָא} \text{לְע} \text{תְּנָה} \), “And he put the tent over the tabernacle.” While the words are not synonymous the sense of the phrase in both sources is consistent. E. Ulrich and F.M. Cross, *Qumran Cave 4. VII*, 142, reads the form in 4QExod-Lev\(^f\) as “evidently an anticipation of \(\text{יִתְנָה} \) in vv 20 and 22.” All of the other witnesses agree with the MT. On the dissimilation of initial nun in the verb \(\text{לָא} \) see note above.

\(^{918}\) The phrase in the MT includes the adverb \(\text{לָא} \), “above,” in the phrase \(\text{לָא} \text{כָּל} \text{מַלְטֶלָה} \), “and he put the atonement upon the ark above (it).”
| Q239 | MT Exod 40:22 | סַמְךָה | 4QExod-Lev<sup>f</sup> 2 ii 20 | SV(1) – 4QExod-Lev<sup>f</sup> lacks the locative ה. |
| Q240 | MT Exod 40:27 | לָמִית | 4QExod-Lev<sup>f</sup> 2 ii 25 | SV(2) – 4QExod-Lev<sup>f</sup> has an explicating plus.\(^{919}\) |
| Q241 | MT Exod 14:24 | תְנִינָה | 4QExod<sup>g</sup> 5 | Not Counted – 4QExod<sup>g</sup> is too damaged to allow a certain reading.\(^{920}\) |
| Q242 | MT Exod 1:1 | אֶלְהָ | 4QpaleoGen-Exod<sup>d</sup> 1 5 | SV(1) – 4QpaleoGen-Exod<sup>d</sup> lacks the conjunction. |
| Q243 | MT Exod 2:23 | רוּפַק | 4QpaleoGen-Exod<sup>d</sup> 3-4 4 | SV(1) – Interchange of synonyms.\(^{921}\) |
| Q244 | MT Exod 10:3 | מְנִי | 4QpaleoGen-Exod<sup>d</sup> 7 i, 8 11 | SV(1) – The MT lacks the object marker. |
| Q245 | MT Exod 12:3 | בָּנִי | 4QpaleoGen-Exod<sup>d</sup> 7 ii 16 | SV(2) – The MT lacks the plural construct noun √נָב, “son.”\(^{922}\) |

\(^{919}\) The occurrence of the prepositional phrase "לפניו," "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 בְּדִינֶה 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 בְּדִינֶה in Isa 30:33 for a possible parallel to the phrase in 4QExod<sup>g</sup>, but in the context that wording is quite unlikely.

\(^{921}\) The form in 4QpaleoGen-Exod<sup>d</sup> is more common in the Pentateuch. *HALOT*, 277, lists √רָפָק as a by-form of √רֵפָק (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<sup>d</sup> is restored: בְּגֵיאוֹלֵב בֵּית יְשָׁרִיאֵל, “the whole congregation of the sons of Israel,” in agreement with the SP and the LXX.
| Q246 | MT Exod 12:3 | 4QpaleoGen-Exod\(^1\) 7 ii 17 | SV(3) – 4QpaleoGen-Exod\(^1\) has a different word order to the MT.\(^{923}\) |
| Q247 | MT Exod 12:5 | 4QpaleoGen-Exod\(^1\) 7 ii 19 | SV(1) – Lexical interchange.\(^{924}\) |
| Q248 | MT Exod 12:9 | 4QpaleoGen-Exod\(^1\) 7 ii 24 | OV(I) – Possible difference in pronunciation.\(^{925}\) |
| Q249 | MT Exod 14:23 | 4QpaleoGen-Exod\(^1\) 10 ii 13 | SV(1) – The MT lacks the conjunction. |
| Q250 | MT Exod 17:1 | 4QpaleoGen-Exod\(^1\) 17-18 7 | SV(3) – 4QpaleoGen-Exod\(^1\) has a different word order to the MT.\(^{926}\) |
| Q251 | MT Exod 18:20 | 4QpaleoGen-Exod\(^1\) 20 6 | SV(1) – The MT lacks the relative particle. |
| Q252 | MT Exod 18:21 | 4QpaleoGen-Exod\(^1\) 20 7 | SV(1) – Interchange of divine titles. |

---

\(^{923}\) 4QpaleoGen-Exod\(^1\) is restored: "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: "љנפניא ינפניא גשכ, 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$^1$ omits 
20 8 SV(2) – 4QpaleoGen-Exod$^1$ has an object marker plus pronominal suffix clarifying the object.

Q255 MT Exod 23:8
4QpaleoGen-Exod$^1$ 
23 7 SV(2) – 4QpaleoGen-Exod$^1$ has an explicating plus.$^{927}$

Q256 MT Exod 23:9
4QpaleoGen-Exod$^1$ 
23 8 SV(1) – Difference in number.$^{928}$

Q257 MT Exod 23:9
4QpaleoGen-Exod$^1$ omits 
23 8 SV(1) - 4QpaleoGen-Exod$^1$ lacks the object marker.

Q258 MT Exod 25:11
4QpaleoGen-Exod$^1$ omits 
24-29, 30 i 4 SV(2) - 4QpaleoGen-Exod$^1$ lacks the adverbial particle, “around.”

Q259 MT Exod 26:29
4QpaleoGen-Exod$^1$ 
30 ii, 31-34 2 SV(3) - 4QpaleoGen-Exod$^1$ has a different word order to the MT.$^{929}$

Q260 MT Exod 26:30
4QpaleoGen-Exod$^1$ 
30 ii, 31-34 3 SV(2) – The MT clarifies the object, יִשָּׁתָּה יִתְנָה יָעַל, “the tabernacle,” with a possessive pronominal suffix.$^{930}$

---

$^{927}$ 4QpaleoGen-Exod$^1$ reads: יִפְּרוּ לָהֶם יִתְנָה יָעַל פִּקְדוֹת, “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: יִשָּׁתָּה יִתְנָה יָעַל בְּכֵן. The plural form in 4QpaleoGen-Exod$^1$ may be viewed as harmonising the singular form in the MT with the plural forms in the rest of the verse.

$^{929}$ 4QpaleoGen-Exod$^1$ is restored to have an altered order of verb and object: יִשָּׁתָּה יִתְנָה יָעַל, “you will make gold rings.” All of the other witnesses agree with the MT.

$^{930}$ The phrase in the MT reads: יִשָּׁתָּה יִתְנָה יָעַל, “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$^1$. Both Tg. Ps-J. and Tg. Neof. lack a pronoun between the noun and the relative particle (""דָּדְו" / "הילטבּא נַר הָעַל רֵינָא רֵינָא"). The LXX also lacks a pronoun after the accusative εἶδος, “form, shape.”
Q261 MT Exod 26:33
4QpaleoGen-Exod\(^1\) lacks the locative קָרָה.

Q262 MT Exod 27:9
4QpaleoGen-Exod\(^1\) lacks the locative קָרָה.

Q263 MT Exod 27:11
4QpaleoGen-Exod\(^1\) lacks the conjunction.

Q264 MT Exod 7:10
4QpaleoExod\(^{m}\) I 22
Interchange of prepositions.\(^{931}\)

Q265 MT Exod 7:14
4QpaleoExod\(^{m}\) I 29
4QpaleoExod\(^{m}\) lacks the conjunction.

Q266 MT Exod 7:14
4QpaleoExod\(^{m}\) I 29
Lexical interchange.\(^{932}\)

Q267 MT Exod 7:15
4QpaleoExod\(^{m}\) I 30
The MT lacks the conjunction.

Q268 MT Exod 7:15
4QpaleoExod\(^{m}\) I 30
4QpaleoExod\(^{m}\) has an explicating plus.\(^{933}\)

Q269 MT Exod 7:18
4QpaleoExod\(^{m}\) II 4
Interchange of prepositions.\(^{934}\)

\(^{931}\) 4QpaleoExod\(^{m}\) agrees with the SP. The LXX reads: εναντιον Φαραον, “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: בה נִמְלַא, “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 קָרָה 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 בה נִמְלַא 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 SV(2) – The MT lacks the additional text in 4QpaleoExodm.935
Q271 MT Exod 7:29 omits SV(2) – The MT lacks the addi-

935 The damaged text in 4QpaleoExodm can be restored on the basis of the SP which seems to contain the same additional material:

וַיָּלֶקֶת אֲבֹדַה אָלֶּה בִּשְׁמָה יְהוָה אֶלְוַי הַמָּכָּה נְבָעֵהוּ שְׁלֵיהוּ אַלְכּ
לָאָמַר שֶלֹהַ אֵשֶׁת יָנוּשַי מַעַרְבַּה לָא שֵׁמַעְתָּה נָהֲפָה בִּנְפָּרִי הָזַח בִּנְפָּרִי הָזַח
וַיֵּעַבְרָן שֶלֹהַ אֵשֶׁת יָנוּשַי מַעַרְבַּה מַעַרְבַּה מַעַרְבַּה מַעַרְבַּה
וַיָּלֶקֶת אֲבֹדַה אָלֶּה בִּשְׁמָה יְהוָה אֶלְוַי הַמָּכָּה נְבָעֵהוּ שְׁלֵיהוּ אַלְכּ

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 4QpaleoExodm both contain an additional Tatbericht that compliments the Wortbericht in Exod 7:16-18. Other instances of additional Wortberichte and Tatberichte in 4QpaleoExodm 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.’

The subject of the verb √היה 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).
| Q276 | MT Exod 8:20 | 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} IV 4-9 | omits | SV(2) – 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} has an expansive plus.\textsuperscript{939} |
| Q277 | MT Exod 9:7 | 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} V 5 | יִהְרַאֵל | SV(2) – 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} has an explicating plus.\textsuperscript{940} |
| Q278 | MT Exod 9:8 | 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} V 7 | לְאַמָּודה | SV(2) – The MT lacks the syntactically redundant infinitive.\textsuperscript{941} |
| Q279 | MT Exod 9:8 | 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} V 8 | יָסֹפָה | SV(1) – 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} lacks the locative ה. |
| Q280 | MT Exod 9:9 | 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} V 8 | נְבֵל | SV(2) – 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} has an expansive plus.\textsuperscript{942} |

\textsuperscript{938} The \textit{Tatbericht} in 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} can be restored on the basis of the SP:

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.’’

\textsuperscript{939} The adjective appears in 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} to form the phrase נְבֵל כֶּסֶף מַכֶּרֶת, “very dense (swarms of) horse-flies,” also in the SP.

\textsuperscript{940} The subject of the verb \textit{נָתַן}, “to die,” is clarified in 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m}, the LXX and the SP: הָוָה לֹא מָתָה מַרְאָה, “And behold, none of the cattle of the sons of Israel died.”

\textsuperscript{941} See also Q273 above.

\textsuperscript{942} The adjective describes the construct phrase בַּיָּתָן תָּלָתְשָׁם, “all the land of Egypt.” The LXX and the SP agree with the MT.
4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} VI 27-29

MT Exod 10:2 omits additional text in 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m}.\textsuperscript{943}

Q282 MT Exod 10:5 omits SV(2) – 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} has an expansive plus.\textsuperscript{944}

Q283 MT Exod 10:21 \textsuperscript{945} MT Exod 10:21 omits SV(1) – 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} lacks the conjunction.

Q284 MT Exod 10:21 \textsuperscript{945} MT Exod 10:21 omits SV(1) – Lexical interchange.

Q285 MT Exod 10:21 \textsuperscript{945} MT Exod 10:21 omits SV(2) – The MT has an expansive plus.

\textsuperscript{943} The Wortbericht in 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} can be restored on the basis of the SP:

\textsuperscript{944} 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} and the SP have additional listed items: \textit{אַתָּא סַלְּשֵׁהִים אֲשֶׁר לֹא פָרֵי נַעַר, “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{כִּי וָמֵשֶׁה תָּשֶׁךְ, “and may the darkness be palpable”} is present in all other witnesses.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q286</th>
<th>MT Exod 10:24</th>
<th>4QpaleoExod&lt;sup&gt;III&lt;/sup&gt; VII 32</th>
<th>no transcript provided</th>
<th>SV(1) – Interchange of prepositions.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q287</td>
<td>MT Exod 10:24</td>
<td>4QpaleoExod&lt;sup&gt;III&lt;/sup&gt; VII 32</td>
<td>omitted</td>
<td>SV(2) – 4QpaleoExod&lt;sup&gt;III&lt;/sup&gt; includes Aaron in the narrative. 946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q288</td>
<td>MT Exod 10:24</td>
<td>4QpaleoExod&lt;sup&gt;III&lt;/sup&gt; VII 32</td>
<td>no transcript provided</td>
<td>SV(1) – Difference in number. 947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q289</td>
<td>MT Exod 10:26</td>
<td>4QpaleoExod&lt;sup&gt;III&lt;/sup&gt; VIII 2</td>
<td>no transcript provided</td>
<td>SV(1) – Difference in person. 948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q290</td>
<td>MT Exod 11:9</td>
<td>no transcript provided</td>
<td>no transcript provided</td>
<td>Not Counted – The conjunction in</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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<sup>III</sup> as does the LXX. The Targums are divided, with Tg. Neof, agreeing with 4QpaleoExod<sup>III</sup> 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, *An Exodus Scroll from Qumran*, 277). 947 The verb in 4QpaleoExod<sup>III</sup> is plural due to the plural subject. See Q287 above. 948 The subject of the verb in the MT, the SP and the Tgs. is אֲרָבָא, “hoof,” and the verb קָרָבְתָּי is read as נְפִילָה 3fs of √רֳבָּה, “to be left, remaining.” The reading in 4QpaleoExod<sup>III</sup> may be read as masculine Niph’al 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<sup>III</sup> should probably be read as 1cpl. J.E. Sanderson, *An Exodus Scroll from Qumran*, 296, reads the form as Hip’h’il, presumably because the only 1cpl imperfect form of √רֳבָּה attested in the MT is in Hip’h’il at 1Sam 14:36.
The writing of paleo-Hebrew waw in the margin of the scroll is identified in E. Tov, *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 waw occurs the adjacent verb form typically lacks the waw consecutive that is read in the MT. It is conceivable that the 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, *Qumran Cave 4. IV*, 58.

4QpaleoExod⁹⁸ 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 יָשָׁהוּ הָעֵדֶּר לָשֶׁהַ נֶּבֶר מַלֶּה, “a lamb, pure, male, one year old.”

4QpaleoExod⁹⁸ can be restored יָשָׁהוּ הָעֵדֶּר לָשֶׁהַ נֶּבֶר מַלֶּה, in agreement with the SP and the Tgs. Either reading is acceptable: יָשָׁהוּ הָעֵדֶּר לָשֶׁהַ נֶּבֶר מַלֶּה, “as Yahweh commanded (to) Moses.” The construction with the object marker is used with approximately 75 times in the MT. The construction with יָשָׁהוּ לָשֶׁהַ נֶּבֶר מַלֶּה occurs only seven times. It might be argued that the preposition יָשָׁהוּ should mark the indirect object of the verb לָשֶׁהַ, as in Exod 25:22: יָשָׁהוּ לָשֶׁהַ נֶּבֶר מַלֶּה, “all that I will command you for the sons of Israel.”

The singular verb in the MT refers the plural noun יָשָׁהוּ, “his hands.” 4QpaleoExod⁹⁸ 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 יָשָׁהוּ, “steadfastness, fidelity,” (read as a substantive: “remained steadfast” — *cf*. W. Gesenius, E. Kautzsch, and A.E. Cowley, *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: יָשָׁהוּ לָשֶׁהַ נֶּבֶר מַלֶּה, “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.
4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} XVII 30 explicating plus.\textsuperscript{953}

Q296 MT Exod 17:16 מִדָּר Меָד
4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} יִדְרוֹ הַדָּר
XVIII 1 SV(1) – Interchange of prepositions.

Q297 MT Exod 17:16 דֶּרֶךְ דֶּרֶךְ
4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} רֶרֶךְ
XVIII 1 SV(1) – The MT lacks the conjunction.

Q298 MT Exod 18:2 שָׁמַר שָׁמַר
4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} כֶּנֶן
XVIII 4 OV(I) – Difference in grammatical form.\textsuperscript{954}

Q299 MT Exod 18:6 שָׁמַר שָׁמַר
4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} כָּנָה
XVIII 8 SV(1) – Lexical interchange.\textsuperscript{955}

Q300 MT Exod 18:13 בָּמַלְכֶּךָ בָּמַלְכֶּךָ
4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} בָּמַלְכֶּךָ
XVIII 21 SV(1) – 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} lacks the definite article.

Q301 MT Exod 18:16 בָּמַלְכֶּךָ בָּמַלְכֶּךָ
4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} בָּמַלְכֶּךָ
XVIII 25 SV(1) – The MT lacks the conjunction.

\textsuperscript{953} The verb וָשַׁלְכֶּנָה, “discomfit, defeat,” does double duty in the MT taking both the object אֲמַלְכֵּן וַאֲמַלְכֵּן, “Amaleq and his people,” and the instrument בָּמַלְכֶּנָה, “the edge of the sword.” The MT has the following construction: “And Joshua defeated Amaleq and his people with the edge of the sword.” \textsuperscript{953} 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} and the SP both have the verb וָשַׁלְכֶּנָה, “to strike,” coordinating with the instrument and restate the object as a pronominal suffix attached to the verb, giving the following reading: יָשַׁלְכֶּנָה וָשַׁלְכֶּנָה וָשַׁלְכֶּנָה וָשַׁלְכֶּנָה וָשַׁלְכֶּנָה, “And Joshua defeated Amaleq and his people, and he struck them with the edge of the sword.”

\textsuperscript{954} The form in 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} can be restored כָּנָה, 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.

\textsuperscript{955} J.E. Sanderson, \textit{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 וָשַׁלְכֶּנָה ... 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 וָשַׁלְכֶּנָה.”
| Q302 | MT Exod 18:20 | omits | 4QpaleoExod — XVIII 32 | SV(1) – The MT lacks the relative particle.

956 The relative particle marks the subordinate clause in 4QpaleoExod, in agreement with the SP and the LXX: “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: "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. 4QpaleoExod agrees with the SP in this addition.

958 The SP and the LXX agree with the MT. The preposition introduces the *dativus commodi*: "he got himself to his land” (see W. Gesenius, E. Kautzsch, and A.E. Cowley, *Hebrew Grammar*, 381, §119a). |
Q309 MT Exod 21:13
4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} XXIII 8
\begin{itemize}
\item נמה
\end{itemize}
SV(1) – 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} lacks the locative נ.

Q310 MT Exod 22:3
4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} XXIV 10
\begin{itemize}
\item דים \end{itemize}
SV(2) – 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} has an explicating plus.\textsuperscript{960}

Q311 MT Exod 22:6
4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} XXIV 16
\begin{itemize}
\item נננה \end{itemize}
SV(1) – Lexical interchange.\textsuperscript{961}

Q312 MT Exod 22:4
4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} XXIV 12
\textsuperscript{962} 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: את הפוסח המקאים בים נתים ... דיים והם מביניとなっている. "If the theft (of an animal) is certainly found in his hand ... one alive (is) two restored."

Q313 MT Exod 22:24
4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} XXV 5
\begin{itemize}
\item יאני \end{itemize}
SV(1) – 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} lacks the definite article.

\textsuperscript{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 דיבrah from plural דיבראים in Deut 5:26 to singular ד 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.

\textsuperscript{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: את הפוסח המקאים בים נתים ... דיים והם מביניとなっている, “If the theft (of an animal) is certainly found in his hand ... one alive (is) two restored.”

\textsuperscript{961} The form in the MT is considered \textit{Pu’al} of \textit{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.

\textsuperscript{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 י is doubtful, and though the מ is clear it may be read as part of another word that suits the context of the MT.
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Q314 MT Exod 22:24
4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} XXV 5

Q315 MT Exod 22:26
4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} XXV 7

Q316 MT Exod 22:26
4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} XXV 7

Q317 MT Exod 23:31
4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} XXVI 15

Q318 MT Exod 24:1
4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} XXVI 20

Q319 MT Exod 24:7
4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} XXVI 29

Q320 MT Exod 24:9

\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 \(\text{שִׁמַּשׁ}\), “put, set,” with the better known synonym \(\text{שָׁמַשׁ}\), “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, אַלָּאִים אַחֲרֵיהֶם, 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 \(\text{שָׁמַשׁ}\) 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 \(\text{שִׁמַּשׁ}\) in first position occurs only here in the MT.
4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} 31

Q321 MT Exod 25:20
4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} 31

Q322 MT Exod 25:26
4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} 5

Q323 MT Exod 25:29
4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} 8

Q324 MT Exod 26:10
4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} 3

Q325 MT Exod 26:26

\begin{itemize}
\item SV(2) – 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} has a different expression than the MT.\textsuperscript{967}
\item OV(I) – Possible difference in pronunciation.
\item SV(1) – Difference in gender.\textsuperscript{968}
\item SV(3) – 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} has a different word order to the MT.\textsuperscript{969}
\item OV(I) – Difference in grammatical form.
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{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: סא תול אוחה, “one to the other,” against the phrase in the MT: ויתא חל אוח, “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.

\textsuperscript{968} 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} can be restored on the basis of the SP: בפה. The nouns to which the pronominal suffix refers are feminine, יסא תול יגוס, יבוס, יבוסים וליתא, 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.

\textsuperscript{969} The cardinal number and the object are reversed. 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} and the SP read: הנשה וליתא, “loops (by) 50,” against the MT: תול וליתא, “50 loops.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q326</td>
<td>MT Exod 26:35 - 4QpaleoExod&lt;sup&gt;m&lt;/sup&gt; 12-13</td>
<td>26:35 → 26:36, 26:35 → 30:1-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q327</td>
<td>MT Exod 27:19 - 4QpaleoExod&lt;sup&gt;m&lt;/sup&gt; XXXI 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q328</td>
<td>MT Exod 28:11 - 4QpaleoExod&lt;sup&gt;m&lt;/sup&gt; XXXI 29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q329</td>
<td>MT Exod 28:23 - 4QpaleoExod&lt;sup&gt;m&lt;/sup&gt; XXXII 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q330</td>
<td>MT Exod 28:41 - 4QpaleoExod&lt;sup&gt;m&lt;/sup&gt; XXXII 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

970 The MT has the plural absolute noun בָּרָדִים, בְּרֹדִים in apposition to the construct phrase בְּרֹדִים תֵּשֶׁם, "bars, shittim wood." The noun in 4QpaleoExod<sup>m</sup> and also in the SP is in construct: בְּרֹדִים תֵּשֶׁם, "bars of shittim wood." The form in 4QpaleoExod<sup>m</sup> and the SP possibly harmonise with the form in Exod 36:31, where the MT also has בָּרָדִים תֵּשֶׁם. J.E. Sanderson, *An Exodus Scroll from Qumran*, 118, considers the form in 4QpaleoExod<sup>m</sup> to be a synonymous interchange.

971 The SP agrees with 4QpaleoExod<sup>m</sup> in inserting Exod 30:1-10 between 26:35 and 26:36. The placement of the fragments of 4QpaleoExod<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 4QpaleoExod<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 4QpaleoExod<sup>m</sup> in adding the introductory line concerning the priestly garments. The clause can be restored: מָצַחְתֶּם בִּלְתַנְתֵּם, מְצַחְתֶּם בִּלְתַנְתֵּם, "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 4QpaleoExod<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.
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}
XXXIV 6

29:21 → 29:29
29:21 → 29:29 → 29:23

SV(3) – 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} has a different verse order to the MT.\textsuperscript{976}

Q333 MT Exod 29:22
4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m}
XXXIV 8

ירדה

SV(1) – The MT lacks the definite article.\textsuperscript{977}

Q334 MT Exod 29:22
4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m}
XXXIV 7

ומיא

SV(1) – The MT lacks the object marker.

Q335 MT Exod 30:36
4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m}
XXXVI 22

והדנה

OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.\textsuperscript{978}

Q336 MT Exod 31:4
4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m}
XXXVI 28

למרשה

Not Counted – The reading in 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} is uncertain.\textsuperscript{979}

Q337 MT Exod 31:5
4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m}

מלאכה

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 מַשְׁחַת־בָּשָׂם, "unleavened wafers," which in the versions is described as being מַשְׁחַת־בָּשָׂם, "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: מִרְדָּה, "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 ץ 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: ולישן בהב. ולישן בהב, “to make with gold.” Restoring the correction in 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} gives the identical text: ולישן בהב.
Q338 MT Exod 31:13-14 omits 4QpaleoExodm
XXXVII 7
SV(2) – 4QpaleoExodm lacks the additional text in the MT. 981

Q339 MT Exod 32:7 omits 4QpaleoExodm
XXXVII 27
SV(2) – 4QpaleoExodm has an expansive plus. 982

Q340 MT Exod 32:7 4QpaleoExodm
XXXVII 27
SV(2) – The MT has an expansive plus. 983

Q341 MT Exod 32:10 omits 4QpaleoExodm
XXXVIII 1
SV(2) – The MT lacks the additional text in 4QpaleoExodm. 984

980 The final letter of the word in 4QpaleoExodm is quite damaged. The reading with ה 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 4QpaleoExodm 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 4QpaleoExodm has an additional infinitive construct לָלֵךְ, 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 לָלֵךְ, “go, descend,” is given simply as לָלֵךְ, “descend,” in 4QpaleoExodm. The other witnesses agree with the MT.

984 4QpaleoExodm 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 | נביח | SV(1) – Lexical interchange.985 |
| Q343 | MT Exod 32:13 | הנקרא | SV(2) – The MT lacks the 3fs pronominal object suffix.986 |
| Q344 | MT Exod 32:27 | יבשאר | SV(1) – The MT lacks the conjunction. |
| Q345 | MT Exod 34:1 | והאסנים | SV(2) – The MT has an expansive plus.987 |
| Q346 | MT Exod 34:11 | והרותני | SV(2) – 4QpaleoExodm has an extra listed item lacking in the MT.988 |
| Q347 | MT Exod 34:13 | ואשא | SV(1) – 4QpaleoExodm lacks the object marker. |
| Q348 | MT Exod 34:16 | והנה בראשי שתדים | SV(2) – The MT has an expansive plus.989 |

985 The MT has the phrase נביח בחרות, “and with a strong hand,” against the phrase in 4QpaleoExodm, restored: נביח בחרות, “and with a strong arm.” The SP has בחרות תמה, “and with an outstretched arm,” and the LXX also seems to reflect this reading: και εν τω βραχιονι σου τω υψηλω, “with a high arm.” On the use of υψηλος to translate בחרות in the LXX see Deut 4:34, where the phrase נביח בחרות תמה, “and with a strong hand, and with an outstretched arm,” is rendered και εν χειρι κραταια και εν βραχιονι υψηλος.

986 The form in 4QpaleoExodm is restored on the basis of the SP: נביח, “and they will inherit it.”

987 The MT clarifies the object with an adjective: והאסנים, “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
4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{\textregistered} XLV 8
\textit{לָאוּבֵּן} \textit{טָלָאֵבֵּן}
SV(1) – Interchange of prepositions.

Q350 MT Lev 14:42
4QLev-Num\textsuperscript{\textregistered} 4 3
\textit{יִקְּחָה}
SV(1) – Difference in gender.\textsuperscript{990}

Q351 MT Lev 14:42
4QLev-Num\textsuperscript{\textregistered} 4 3
\textit{יִכְּחָה}
SV(1) – Difference in number.\textsuperscript{991}

Q352 MT Lev 14:43
4QLev-Num\textsuperscript{\textregistered} 4 4
\textit{אָוהָר}
OV(1) – Difference in grammatical form.\textsuperscript{992}

Q353 MT Lev 14:43
4QLev-Num\textsuperscript{\textregistered} 4 4
\textit{ואָוהָרִים} \textit{אָוהָרִים} omits
SV(2) – 4QLev-Num\textsuperscript{\textregistered} lacks the additional text in the MT.\textsuperscript{993}

Q354 MT Lev 14:43
4QLev-Num\textsuperscript{\textregistered} 4 4
\textit{אָוהָרִים} \textit{אָוהָרִים}
OV(1) – Difference in grammatical form.\textsuperscript{994}

Q355 MT Lev 14:44
4QLev-Num\textsuperscript{\textregistered} 4 5
\textit{דָּוִי}
SV(1) – Difference in gender.

Q356 MT Lev 14:45
4QLev-Num\textsuperscript{\textregistered} 4 6\textsuperscript{\textregistered} סְנֹמָה
\textit{סְנֹמָה}
SV(1) – Difference in number.\textsuperscript{995}

Q357 MT Lev 14:45
\textit{סְבּוֹנִים}
SV(1) – Difference in gender or

\textsuperscript{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-Num\textsuperscript{\textregistered}.

\textsuperscript{991} This verb forms part of the same phrase as the previous variant. See note above.

\textsuperscript{992} See note above. The form in 4QLev-Num\textsuperscript{\textregistered} agrees with the SP. The opposite arrangement of forms appears later in the same clause, for which see Q353 below.

\textsuperscript{993} The phrase may have been omitted from 4QLev-Num\textsuperscript{\textregistered} due to parablepsis as the scribe mistook the second instance of the word "יָכַח" for the third. Otherwise 4QLev-Num\textsuperscript{\textregistered} may preserve the more original reading (see E. Ulrich and F.M. Cross, \textit{Qumran Cave 4. VII}, 158, for these suggestions).

\textsuperscript{994} See note above.

\textsuperscript{995} See note above.
Q358 MT Lev 14:46 4QLev-Num a 4 6 sup

Q359 MT Lev 14:49 4QLev-Num a 4 9

Q360 MT Lev 14:50 4QLev-Num a 4 10

Q361 MT Lev 14:51 4QLev-Num a 5 2

Q362 MT Lev 16:23 4QLev-Num a 8-14 i 10

Q363 MT Lev 1:11 4QLev-Num a 6 sup

The possessive pronominal suffix refers to סְדֹר, “the house,” a masculine definite noun. In this case the MT would appear to have the correct form. However, the suffix in 4QLev-Num a 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-Num a 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.

The pronominal object suffix is appended directly to the verb in 4QLev-Num a, which is restored wrygsh, “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 וַתְּרַגְּשֵׁהוּ, “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.

The reading in the MT is supported by the SP, and possibly also by the LXX. The latter has an infinite form of ἀφαλνιζω, “to purify,” which is used more often to translate וַתְּרַגְּשֵׁהוּ than וַתְּרַגְּשֶׁה (for וַתְּרַגְּשֶׁה = ἀφαλνιζω see Lev 14:49, 52; Num 19:12, 13, 19, 20; Num 31:20; for וַתְּרַגְּשֶׁה = ἀφαλνιζω see Num 8:6, 21).

See note above.

The form in 4QLev-Num a is restored here as רָמֵי. In the edition princeps the form in 4QLev-Num a is restored as רָמֵי (see E. Ulrich and F.M. Cross, Qumran Cave 4. VII, 159). That is, the MT has a preposition preceding the infinitive construct, as opposed to the conjunction plus finite verb in 4QLev-Num a. 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.
| Q364 | MT Lev 1:11 | יָדַע | OV(2) – 4QLevb lacks the pronominal suffix. |
| Q365 | MT Lev 1:16 | מָרָאוּ | OV(1) – Possible difference in grammatical form. |
| Q366 | MT Lev 1:17 | לַא | OV(2) – 4QLev b lacks the pronominal suffix. |
| Q367 | MT Lev 1:17 | הָא | OV(1) – The MT lacks the conjunction. |
| Q368 | MT Lev 1:17 | אָסַה | OV(2) – The MT has an explicating plus. |
| Q369 | MT Lev 2:8 | יָדָא | OV(1) – Difference in person. |
| Q370 | MT Lev 2:11 | מָנְתָה | OV(1) – 4QLev b lacks the definite article. |
| Q371 | MT Lev 2:14 | יָבִי | OV(1) – Interchange of prepositions. |

1001 The pronominal suffix in 4QLevb may be 3fs, but see note above for a discussion of the reading of the ב- 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 הָלָה ( "burnt offering," a feminine singular noun. The MT gere has the correct form of the pronoun.

1003 The phrase in the MT reads: יִלֵּדוֹת אַלֶּה אַלֶּה אַלֶּה אַלֶּה יִלֵּדוֹת, “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 | ותֹּרִחת | SV(1) – Lexical interchange. 1005 |
| Q373 | MT Lev 3:1 | יָיִשׁ | SV(2) – 4QLev b has an explicating plus. 1006 |
| Q374 | MT Lev 3:11 | יְכוֹנָן | SV(2) – The MT has an explicating plus. 1007 |
| Q375 | MT Lev 22:11 | יֵילָדוֹ | SV(1) – Difference in number. 1008 |
| Q376 | MT Lev 22:12 | אֵדֶת | SV(1) – Difference in gender. 1009 |
| Q377 | MT Lev 22:18 | יָיִשׁ | SV(2) – 4QLev b has an expansive |

1005 The unusual noun אֹתְרִחת 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 b is not found at all in the MT, so it is unlikely that the scribe of 4QLev b exchanged an unusual lexeme for a more common one here. According to G.R. Driver, “Three Technical Terms in the Pentateuch,” *Journal of Semitic Studies* 1, 2 (1956) 99-100, the term הַרֶּכֶּה, 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 b, who then exchanged it for a term that was closer in appearance to the obvious root √rkz, “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 Mishic Hebrew to use prosthetic aleph as a noun former (apparently as a phonemic modification of preformative h) in M.H. Segal, *Grammar*, 38, 113.

1006 4QLev b clarifies the beneficiary of the peace offering: יָיִשׁ יָיִשׁ תַּשְׁמֵד הָאָדָם, “If his offering is a sacrifice of peace offering to Yahweh.” The LXX agrees with 4QLev b, as do many Latin manuscripts (see E. Ulrich and F.M. Cross, *Qumran Cave 4. VII*, 180).

1007 The MT clarifies the object of the verb √רָכָז, “to burn,” by appending the pronominal object suffix.

1008 It is possible that 4QLev b has a plural noun with a pronominal suffix appended, restored יִילָדוֹי, “his progeny.” According to E. Ulrich and F.M. Cross, *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 יִילָדוֹי or began to write waw 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 b.

1009 The pronoun refers to נָתַתָה נָתַתָה, “the daughter of a priest.” Clearly the 3fs pronoun in 4QLev b and the MT qere is correct.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>MT Lev</th>
<th>4QLev b</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q378</td>
<td>Lev 22:18</td>
<td>4QLev b 9 i, 10-17</td>
<td>SV(1) – Interchange of prepositions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q379</td>
<td>Lev 22:20</td>
<td>4QLev b 9 i, 10-17</td>
<td>SV(1) – Difference in number.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q380</td>
<td>Lev 22:21</td>
<td>4QLev b 9 i, 10-17</td>
<td>SV(1) – Interchange of prepositions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q381</td>
<td>Lev 22:22</td>
<td>4QLev b 9 i, 10-17</td>
<td>SV(2) – 4QLev b has an expansive plus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q382</td>
<td>Lev 22:22</td>
<td>4QLev b 9 i, 10-17</td>
<td>SV(2) – 4QLev b lacks the demonstrative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q383</td>
<td>Lev 22:22</td>
<td>4QLev b 9 i, 10-17</td>
<td>SV(2) – 4QLev b has an expansive plus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q384</td>
<td>Lev 22:23</td>
<td>4QLev b 9 i, 10-17</td>
<td>SV(1) – Difference in number.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1010 4QLev b has a different phrasing that is found in the MT, with a definite noun followed by a definite participle: "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 definite 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: מֵאָּלָּחַים, "you will not bring (it) near because it shall not be desirable to you."

1012 The MT lacks the addition מֵאָּלָּחַים, "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: מֵאָּלָּחַים גְּרָ הלְּ, "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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>MT</th>
<th>Q385 MT Lev 22:31</th>
<th>SV(2) – The MT has an expansive plus.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4QLev\textsuperscript{b} 9 i, 10-17 38</td>
<td>omit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q386 MT Lev 23:14</td>
<td>SV(1) – 4QLev\textsuperscript{b} lacks the conjunction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4QLev\textsuperscript{b} 9 ii, 11 ii, 18-20 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q387 MT Lev 24:10</td>
<td>SV(1) – The MT lacks the definite article.\textsuperscript{1016}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4QLev\textsuperscript{b} 20 ii, 22-25 16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q388 MT Lev 25:46</td>
<td>SV(1) – Lexical interchange.\textsuperscript{1017}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4QLev\textsuperscript{b} 27-28 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q389 MT Lev 4:14</td>
<td>OV(I) – Possible difference in grammatical form.\textsuperscript{1018}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4QLev\textsuperscript{c} 3 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q390 MT Lev 5:12</td>
<td>SV(1) – Difference in gender.\textsuperscript{1019}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4QLev\textsuperscript{c} 5 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q391 MT Lev 14:36</td>
<td>SV(2) – 4QLev\textsuperscript{d} has an expansive plus.\textsuperscript{1020}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4QLev\textsuperscript{d} 2 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q392 MT Lev 17:3</td>
<td>SV(2) – 4QLev\textsuperscript{d} has an expansive plus.\textsuperscript{1021}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4QLev\textsuperscript{d} 4 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{1016} This may amount to a difference in expression, where the MT has the construct noun phrase אֵלֶּה יִשְׂרָאֵל, “and the man of the Israelites,” against the restored adjectival phrase in 4QLev\textsuperscript{b} יִשְׂרָאֵל יִשְׂרָאֵל יִשְׂרָאֵל, “and the Israelite man.” The same phrasing as 4QLev\textsuperscript{b} is found in the LXX and in 11QpaleoLev\textsuperscript{a}. The SP lacks any definite article in the phrase.

\textsuperscript{1017} The reflexive form in the MT is treated as a different lexeme to the causative form in 4QLev\textsuperscript{b}.

\textsuperscript{1018} See the comments in note above.

\textsuperscript{1019} The pronoun refers to גְּנֵבָה, “a sin offering,” a feminine singular noun, so the form in 4QLev\textsuperscript{c} and the MT qere is correct.

\textsuperscript{1020} The phrase in 4QLev\textsuperscript{d} is probably harmonised with similar forms in Lev 13 and 14.

\textsuperscript{1021} The phrase in the MT reads: גְּנֵבָה יִשְׂרָאֵל יִשְׂרָאֵל יִשְׂרָאֵל, “a man from the house of Israel,” which has some type of expansion in 4QLev\textsuperscript{d}. The Greek manuscripts, including Vatican and Alexandrinus, seem to support the restoration of 4QLev\textsuperscript{d}: גְּנֵבָה יִשְׂרָאֵל יִשְׂרָאֵל יִשְׂרָאֵל, “a man from the house of Israel and the sojourner, the one sojourning in Israel.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variant</th>
<th>MT Lev 17:4</th>
<th>4QLevd 4 4-5</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q394</td>
<td>omits</td>
<td>SV(2) – 4QLevd has an expansive plus.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>אֶת שָׁלְמוֹ הָיוֹת לְאָדוֹנֵהוּ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variant</th>
<th>MT Lev 17:4</th>
<th>4QLevd 4 5</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q395</td>
<td>לָהַפּוֹרָה</td>
<td>SV(2) – The MT lacks the resumptive pronominal suffix that clarifies the object.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variant</th>
<th>MT Lev 17:10</th>
<th>4QLevd 4 15</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q396</td>
<td>omits</td>
<td>SV(1) – The MT lacks the object marker.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>אֹת</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variant</th>
<th>MT Lev 17:11</th>
<th>4QLevd 4 16</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q397</td>
<td>omits</td>
<td>SV(2) – 4QLevd has an explicating plus.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>בֵּל</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variant</th>
<th>MT Lev 17:11</th>
<th>4QLevd 4 16</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q398</td>
<td>הבשׁ</td>
<td>SV(1) – 4QLevd lacks the definite article.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>בֵּשׁ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variant</th>
<th>MT Lev 17:11</th>
<th>4QLevd 4 16</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q399</td>
<td>בְּרֵשׁ</td>
<td>SV(2) – The MT lacks the pronominal suffix that clarifies the object.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>בדֵהוּ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variant</th>
<th>MT Lev 3:6</th>
<th>4QLevd 2 3</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q400</td>
<td>מְשָׁמֶה</td>
<td>SV(1) – The MT lacks the definite article.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>מְשָׁמֶה</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variant</th>
<th>MT Lev 19:36</th>
<th>4QLevd 3 3</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q401</td>
<td>מְפָנְאֵי אְפַח</td>
<td>SV(2) – The MT has an expansive plus.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1022 The plus describes additional sacrifices that are suitable to offer, reflected also in the LXX and the SP.
1023 The pronominal object suffix refers to the masculine noun נְבֶרֶךְ, “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 וַיִּבְרָא אִם, “he shall not bring it.”
1024 The phrase in the MT reads: בֵּן נֶפֶשׁ מַצָּר בַּל בֵּשׁ, “because the soul of the flesh is in the blood.” The LXX agrees with 4QLevd with the addition of the adjective בֵּן, כִּי נֶפֶשׁ מַצָּר בַּל בֵּשׁ, “because the soul of all flesh is in the blood.”
1025 The difference in phrasing accounts for the loss of the article in 4QLevd – see the previous variant.
1026 The form in 4QLevd is harmonized with the form in Lev 17:14, also reflected in the LXX.
1027 4QLevd lacks the reference to הָאָמָן, “correct scales.” E. Ulrich and F.M. Cross, *Qumran Cave 4. VII*, 198, supposes homoioteleuton, on the basis that the LXX also lacks one of the listed items in this verse, מִשְׂמֶה, “a correct ephah.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>וַיֶּהֶם</td>
<td>Q4Lev ² 5 4</td>
<td>וַיֶּהֶם</td>
<td>Q4Lev ² 6 2</td>
<td>וַיֵּלֶדֶת</td>
<td>Q4Lev ² 7 5</td>
<td>וַיֵּלֶדֶת</td>
<td>Q4Lev ² 8 3</td>
<td>קרּבֶן</td>
<td>Q4Exod-Lev ² 4 3</td>
<td>מָנָה</td>
<td>Q4Exod-Lev ² 4 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OV(l) – Possible difference in grammatical form.</td>
<td>SV(2) – 4QLev ² has an expansive plus.</td>
<td>SV(2) – The MT has an expansive plus.</td>
<td>SV(2) – The MT lacks the dative pronominal suffix.</td>
<td>SV(2) – 4QLev ² has an expansive plus.</td>
<td>SV(2) – 4QExod-Lev ² has an expansive plus.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


1029 The phrase in the MT states that the prostituted daughter of a priest is וַיֵּלֶדֶת הַתּוֹרָה, "profaning her father," against the expansive phrase in 4QLev ² which is restored וַיֵּלֶדֶת הַתּוֹרָה, "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 text possibly reflects a different Vorlage: וַיֵּלֶדֶת הַתּוֹרָה, "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 ² reads: וַיֵּלֶדֶת הַתּוֹרָה, "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 ².

1031 The secondary object is specified by the pronominal suffix: וַיֵּלֶדֶת הַתּוֹרָה, "one that will offer his offering." The MT has the same form later in the same verse.

1032 The phrase in 4QExod-Lev ² is restored וַיֵּלֶדֶת הַתּוֹרָה, "a frankincense tribute,” which reflects the similar phrasing וַיֵּלֶדֶת הַתּוֹרָה, "tribute offering,” earlier in the same verse. The SP and the LXX agree with 4QExod-Lev ².
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Q408 MT Lev 7:20
4QLev# 2

אָדָם
390

SV(1) – Difference in gender.1033

Q409 MT Lev 7:21
4QLev# 4

אָדָם

SV(1) – Difference in gender.1034

Q410 MT Lev 7:25
4QLev# 8

נָכֹר

SV(1) – Difference in number.

Q411 MT Lev 7:25
4QLev# 8

אָדָם

SV(1) – Lexical interchange.1035

Q412 MT Num 1:38
4QLev-Num# 2 9 2

לְבֵן רֹק

SV(1) – Difference in number.

Q413 MT Num 3:3
4QLev-Num# 31, 32 1, 33 6

מַלְאָן

SV(1) – Difference in number.1036

Q414 MT Num 3:9

נתְנָה

OV(l) – Possible difference in

1033 The pronoun refers to נְזָה הָאָדָם, an irregular feminine definite noun, so the form in 4QLev# and the MT qere is correct.
1034 The pronoun refers to נְזָה הָאָדָם. See the previous note.
1035 The MT reads: אֲרַיְמָה יְקִיעָה מִמְּלָכְתָא לְיַהוָה, “from which you bring near an offering made by fire to Yahweh,” against the restored reading in 4QLev#: הָאֲרַיְמָה יְקִיעָה מִמְּלָכְתָא לְיַהוָה, “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#.
1036 The verb could refer to either the singular noun דָּי or the plural נְאָרָה. The verse is poorly preserved in 4QLev-Num¹, but the MT reads: נְאָרָה יְנִיבְםָה הָאָדָם וְנָתַנִּים אֶלָּא גַם לִפְדוּת, “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 דָּי, “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-Num¹ may refer instead to נְאָרָה, thus: “the sons of Aaron ... who had filled their hand.” In the MT the verb is intransitive and takes only a secondary object לִפְדוּת, whereas in 4QLev-Num¹ the verb is transitive and takes the noun דָּי 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.
Q415 MT Num 3:12
4QLev-Num\textsuperscript{a} 31, 32
i, 33 14

Q416 MT Num 5:3
4QLev-Num 34 ii,
44-50 17

Q417 MT Num 5:6
4QLev-Num\textsuperscript{a} 34 ii,
44-50 22

Q418 MT Num 9:3
4QLev-Num\textsuperscript{a} 53-54
1

Q419 MT Num 12:3
4QLev-Num\textsuperscript{a} 60-61
1

\begin{itemize}
\item Q4Lev-Num\textsuperscript{a} 31, 32.
\item pronunciation.\textsuperscript{1037}
\item MT Num 3:12
\item Interchange of prepositions.
\item MT Num 5:3
\item MT lacks the conjunction.
\item MT Num 5:6
\item Difference in gender.\textsuperscript{1038}
\item MT Num 9:3
\item Different expression to the MT.\textsuperscript{1039}
\item MT Num 12:3
\item OV(l) – Difference in grammatical form.\textsuperscript{1040}
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{1037} See the comments in note and above.

\textsuperscript{1038} The pronoun refers to טס. See note above.

\textsuperscript{1039} Not enough text is preserved to read a hermeneutic variant here. It is true, though, that the wording in 4QLev-Num\textsuperscript{a} seem difficult to reconcile with the MT if the placement of the fragment is accurate. Where the MT reads: ‘בְּאֶשֶׁר תַּקֵּבְּרֵב, “between the evenings,” 4QLev-Num\textsuperscript{a} has a phrase the begins with תַּקֵּבְּרֵב, “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: ‘כָּלָה, “at twilight,” (see M. Sokoloff, Dictionary of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic, 558-59) but literally means “between the suns.” While the particle תַּקֵּבְּרֵב agrees with the reading in the MT, the use of the term תַּקֵּבְּרֵב may somehow reflect a text like 4QLev-Num\textsuperscript{a}. 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 תַּקֵּבְּרֵב where [the MT and the SP] have תַּקֵּבְּרֵב. What the ensuing text would have read is uncertain.”

\textsuperscript{1040} The form in 4QLev-Num\textsuperscript{a} is restored תַּקֵּבְּרֵב, “very.” This is a form of the regular adverb תַּקֵּבְּרֵב, terminating with a locative ת, which had arguably become part of the spoken dialect reflected in certain scrolls from Qumran (see E. Qimron, Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls, 171-18). The form is identical in meaning the תַּקֵּבְּרֵב, 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 | וַיּוֹמֵרָה | SV(1) – The MT lacks the preposition ב. |
| Q421 | MT Num 11:32 | הֲלֹךְ | SV(2) – The MT lacks the adjective that clarifies the object. |
| Q422 | MT Num 11:32 | וַיִּשָּׁה | SV(1) – The MT lacks the definite article. |
| Q423 | MT Num 11:32 | לְהָמֵה | OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation. |
| Q424 | MT Num 11:33 | מַעֲרָד | OV(l) – Difference in grammatical form. |
| Q425 | MT Num 11:34 | לֵבֶן | OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation. |
| Q426 | MT Num 11:35 | נַעֲנֲה | SV(1) – Difference in number. |
| Q427 | MT Num 11:35 | הָוָה | SV(2) – The MT has an explicating plus. |
| Q428 | MT Num 12:6 | יִזָּהֵר אֶל-נִדְרֵי | SV(2) – 4QNum b has an explicating plus. |

1041 4QNum b is restored: יִרְקוֹא מְלֹא מְסַלְּחָה הָאָמָה, “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 דברים ב in Num 11:11, 12 and 14.

1042 See note above.

1043 The noun נְעֵנה 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 נְעֵנה 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.

1044 In the MT the goal is clarified in the phrase מַעֲרָד הַיָּהָה כִּסְפֵּי הָעָם הָעַרְתָּה, “From Kibroth-hattaavah the people journeyed (to) Hazeroth.” The SP and the LXX support the reading in the MT.

1045 4QNum b clarifies the subject of the verb יִרְדוּ, “to say.” One Greek manuscript agrees with 4QNum b in this regard.
| Q429 | MT Num 12:8 | ותראה | במראה | SV(1) – Interchange of prepositions. \(^{1046}\) |
| Q430 | MT Num 13:17 | אֵן | אֵן | OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation. |
| Q431 | MT Num 13:18 | רַפֵּה | רַפֵּה | SV(1) – 4QNum\(^{b}\) lacks the definite article. |
| Q432 | MT Num 13:18 | רַפֵּה, כַּא | רַפֵּה, כַּא | SV(3) – 4QNum\(^{b}\) has a different word order to the MT. |
| Q433 | MT Num 13:19 | רַפֵּה | רַפֵּה | OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation. |
| Q434 | MT Num 13:19 | רַפֵּה | רַפֵּה | OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation. |
| Q435 | MT Num 13:19 | אָמי | אָמי | SV(1) – The MT lacks the conjunction. |
| Q436 | MT Num 13:20 | וָלַעַז | וָלַעַז | SV(2) – 4QNum\(^{b}\) has an explicating plus. \(^{1047}\) |
| Q437 | MT Num 13:20 | וָלַעַז | וָלַעַז | OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation. |
| Q438 | MT Num 13:20 | וָלַעַז | וָלַעַז | OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation. |

---

\(^{1046}\) The MT reads: וָלַעַז שָׂמַיִל, “and clearly, and not in riddles,” against the restored reading in 4QNum\(^{b}\): וָלַעַז שָׂמַיִל, “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 4QNum\(^{b}\) (see E. Ulrich and F.M. Cross, *Qumran Cave 4. VII*, 217).  

\(^{1047}\) The independent pronoun in 4QNum\(^{b}\) specifies the subject of the phrase וָלַעַז שָׂמַיִל, “and if it (is) impoverished.”
4QNum^b II 3 ii, 5 11 | מַעֲרָה |
| Q440 | MT Num 13:21 | רוּעֵל | SV(2) – Difference in expression.  
4QNum^b II 3 ii, 5 12 | רוּעֵל |
| Q441 | MT Num 13:22 | סֶם | SV(1) – The MT lacks the locative יָם.  
4QNum^b II 3 ii, 5 13 | סֶם |
| Q442 | MT Num 13:24 | מַעֲרָה | OV(I) – Possible difference in pronunciation.  
4QNum^b II 3 ii, 5 16 | מַעֲרָה |
| Q443 | MT Num 13:24 | כָּרָא | SV(1) – Difference in number.  
4QNum^b II 3 ii, 5 16 | כָּרָא |
| Q444 | MT Num 16:1 | מַעֲרָה | SV(1) – Difference in number.  
4QNum^b VI 6-10 13 | מַעֲרָה |
| Q445 | MT Num 16:2 | סֶם | SV(1) – The MT lacks the conjunction.  
4QNum^b VI 6-10 14 | סֶם |
| Q446 | MT Num 16:5 | וּקְרוֹא | SV(1) – 4QNum^b lacks the conjunction.  
4QNum^b VI 6-10 17 | וּקְרוֹא |

---

1048 The masculine noun, "grapes," is constructed with the *nomens regens* מַעֲרָה 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, מַעֲרָה, "his choice sheep," but see the *nomens rectum* in Jer 24:2 מַעֲרָה, "first-ripe figs," and the construction in Neh 10:37 מַעֲרָה, "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 מַעֲרָה in the MT are masculine (at least 13 times).

1049 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).

1050 The grammatical number of the indefinite subject differs between the sources. 4QNum^b agrees with the SP and the LXX.

1051 4QNum^b agrees with the SP and the LXX.

1052 The conjunction could otherwise be read as *waw* consecutive plus perfect verb, for which see note below.
Q447 MT Num 16:5  נביהו יברק OV(I) – Difference in grammatical form.1053
4QNum b VI 6-10 17

Q448 MT Num 16:8 omits על תדועי SV(2) – 4QNum b has an expansive plus.1054
4QNum b VI 6-10 21

Q449 MT Num 16:10 און וננה OV(I) – Possible difference in pronunciation.
4QNum b VI 6-10 23

Q450 MT Num 16:11 תדועי וננה OV(I) – Possible difference in pronunciation.
4QNum b VI 6-10 24

Q451 MT Num 18:26 לבה תבל OV(I) – Possible difference in pronunciation.
4QNum b X 12 2

Q452 MT Num 28:26 omits רגב SV(1) – The MT lacks the object marker.
4QNum b X 12 3

Q453 MT Num 18:26 יהוה SV(2) – The MT has an explicat-

1053 The entire phrase is constructed as a past temporal sequence in 4QNum 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 רגב, indicates that this is indeed the case. The entire phrase can be restored as a series of past temporal clauses thus: נביהו יברק, “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 רגב is translated as פִּ' 3ms perfect √רגב, following E. Ulrich and F.M. Cross, Qumran Cave 4. VII, 222. Against this the MT has the waw consecutive plus perfect verb רבער (see Q446 above) and the imperfect verb רבר, as well as writing רגב 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 b lacks waw 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 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.

1054 The phrase in 4QNum b harmonises with Num 16:5 and 6.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>MT Reading</th>
<th>Qumran Cave 4 Reading</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q454</td>
<td>MT Num 18:28</td>
<td>4QNum b X 12 4</td>
<td>omits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q455</td>
<td>MT Num 18:30</td>
<td>4QNum b X 12 7</td>
<td>לַלָּוֵית</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q456</td>
<td>MT Num 18:30</td>
<td>4QNum b X 12 7</td>
<td>דַּרְשַׁתְמוֹת</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q457</td>
<td>MT Num 18:30</td>
<td>4QNum b X 12 8</td>
<td>מַל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q458</td>
<td>MT Num 18:30</td>
<td>4QNum b 12 8</td>
<td>יַכ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q459</td>
<td>MT Num 18:31</td>
<td>4QNum b X 12 8</td>
<td>אָבֶלַח</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q460</td>
<td>MT Num 18:31</td>
<td>4QNum b X 12 8</td>
<td>אָרָה</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1055 The phrase in 4QNum b has a different construction, restored to read: אַז הַרְוָעָת מַשָּׁר מֵן מְשָׁרָה, “the tribute of tenths from the tenths,” against the MT reading: רַוָעָת יָהָוֶה מַשָּׁר מֵן מְשָׁרָה, “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 tenth 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: יֶכֶּס, “like the produce of the winepress.” The same information is differently phrased in 4QNum b, which is restored: מַכּוֹט אֵלֶּ֞קֶּס, “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 γενήμα απο ληγνον, “as produce from the winepress.”

1059 The pronominal object suffix refers to the singular noun מַלְלָה, “best part,” in the previous verse. The scribe possibly read the objects as מַלְלָה ... מַלְלָה מֵן מֵן יֶכֶֶּכֶּ֝ס ... מַלְלָה מַכּוֹט מַכּוֹט, “the best part ... the produce of the threshing floor ... the produce of the winepress.”
4QNum\textsuperscript{b} X 12 8

\textbf{Q461} MT Num 18:31  \textsuperscript{1060}
4QNum\textsuperscript{b} X 12 8  \textsuperscript{1060}

\begin{tabular}{l}
4QNum\textsuperscript{b} X 12 8  \textsuperscript{1060}
\end{tabular}

OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.

\textbf{Q462} MT Num 19:2  \textsuperscript{1061}
4QNum\textsuperscript{b} X 12 12  \textsuperscript{1061}

\begin{tabular}{l}
4QNum\textsuperscript{b} X 12 12  \textsuperscript{1061}
\end{tabular}

OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.

\textbf{Q463} MT Num 19:3
4QNum\textsuperscript{b} X 12 13

\begin{tabular}{l}
4QNum\textsuperscript{b} X 12 13
\end{tabular}

SV(1) – Difference in number.

\textbf{Q464} MT Num 19:3
4QNum\textsuperscript{b} X 12 14

\begin{tabular}{l}
4QNum\textsuperscript{b} X 12 14
\end{tabular}

SV(1) – Difference in number.

\textbf{Q465} MT Num 19:4
4QNum\textsuperscript{b} X 12 15

\begin{tabular}{l}
4QNum\textsuperscript{b} X 12 15
\end{tabular}

SV(1) – Lexical interchange.

\textbf{Q466} MT Num 20:13
4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XI 13 i-14, 25-30

\begin{tabular}{l}
4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XI 13 i-14, 25-30
\end{tabular}

SV(2) – The MT lacks the additional text in 4QNum\textsuperscript{b}.

\textbf{Q467} MT Num 20:20
4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XII 13 ii, 15-17 i 23

\begin{tabular}{l}
4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XII 13 ii, 15-17 i 23
\end{tabular}

SV(2) – 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} has an expansive plus.

\textbf{Q468} MT Num 20:24
4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XII 13 ii, 15-17 i 23

\begin{tabular}{l}
4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XII 13 ii, 15-17 i 23
\end{tabular}

SV(1) – 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} lacks the object marker.

\textsuperscript{1060} 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} treats the subject of the verb, בְּנֵי ישָׁרַיְא, “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 θυσιάζουσιν, “to scatter,” is given as θυσίας τῷ σκυτλῷ, “before the tent,” in the MT, against θυσιάζουσιν ἐκ τοῦ δυτίκου ἑτερών τοῦ σκυτλοῦ, “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, \textit{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

OV(l) – Difference in grammatical form.\textsuperscript{1065}

Q470 MT Num 21:12
4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XIII 17 ii-18 13-15

omits

SV(2) – The MT lacks the additional text in 4QNum\textsuperscript{b}.\textsuperscript{1066}

Q471 MT Num 21:13
4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XIII 17 ii-18 16-17

omits

SV(2) – The MT lacks the additional text in 4QNum\textsuperscript{b}.\textsuperscript{1067}

Q472 MT Num 21:21
4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XIII 17 i-18 27

omits

SV(2) – The MT lacks the additional text in 4QNum\textsuperscript{b}.\textsuperscript{1068}

Q473 MT Num 22:5
4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XIV 19 27

SV(2) – 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} has an explicat-

Q474 MT Num 22:6
4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XIV 19 29

SV(1) – The MT lacks the object marker.

Q475 MT Num 21:7
4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XV 20-22 1

SV(2) – 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} has an explicat-

---

\textsuperscript{1065} The Hiph\textit{’}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\textsuperscript{b} XV 20-22

3

Q477 MT Num 22:9 \\
4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XV 20-22

3

Q477 MT Num 22:10 \\
4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XV 20-22

4

Q479 MT Num 22:11 \\
4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XV 20-22

4

Q480 MT Num 22:11 \\
4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XV 20-22

4

Q481 MT Num 22:11 \\
4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XV 20-22

4

Q482 MT Num 22:11 \\
4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XV 20-22

5

Q483 MT Num 22:11

SV(1) – 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} lacks the definite article.

SV(2) – 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} has an expansive plus.

Q74 MT Num 22:9

4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XV 20-22

3

Q477 MT Num 22:10

4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XV 20-22

4

Q479 MT Num 22:11

4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XV 20-22

4

Q480 MT Num 22:11

4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XV 20-22

4

Q481 MT Num 22:11

4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XV 20-22

4

Q482 MT Num 22:11

4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XV 20-22

5

Q483 MT Num 22:11

SV(2) – 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} has an expansive plus.

The secondary object is clarified in 4QNum\textsuperscript{b}, restored, "and he said to him." The LXX agrees with the reading in 4QNum\textsuperscript{b}: καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ.

4QNum\textsuperscript{b} includes the infinitive construct dicendo, the ‘of saying’ (see W. Gesenius, E. Kautzsch, and A.E. Cowley, Hebrew Grammar, 351, §114o), 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\textsuperscript{b} may have added the form based on personal preference. The form agrees with the LXX, which has the nominative active present participle λεγων, “saying.”

The phrase in 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} is restored: יָבֵל אָדָם, “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\textsuperscript{b}.

The pronominal suffix יָבֵל in 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} is written as י in the MT.
| Q484 | MT Num 22:12  
| 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XV 20-22 | לֹא | SV(1) – Interchange of prohibitive and negative particles. |
| Q485 | MT Num 22:12  
| 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XV 20-22 | נִמֵּה | SV(2) – 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} has an explicating plus.\textsuperscript{1074} |
| Q486 | MT Num 22:12  
| 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XV 20-22 | לֹא | SV(1) – The MT lacks the conjunction. |
| Q487 | MT Num 22:12  
| 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XV 20-22 | לֹא | SV(1) – Interchange of prohibitive and negative particles. |
| Q488 | MT Num 22:12  
| 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XV 20-22 | דָּבָר | OV(I) – Possible difference in pronunciation. |
| Q489 | MT Num 22:13  
| 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} 20-22 7 | יָדַעְתָּם | SV(1) – Lexical interchange.\textsuperscript{1075} |
| Q490 | MT Num 22:13  
| 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} 20-22 7 | יָדַעְתָּם | OV(I) – Possible difference in pronunciation. |
| Q491 | MT Num 22:13  
| 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} 20-22 7 | לְדָוֶד | OV(I) – Possible difference in pronunciation. |

\textsuperscript{1073} The phrase in 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} is restored: מִן הָאָרֶץ, “from the land,” and harmonises with Num 22:6, cf. note above.

\textsuperscript{1074} 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} is restored: עם האנשים, “with the men.” The masculine plural definite noun האנשים 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: הלך או אֲרַמֶם, “go to your master,” against the reading in the MT: הלך או אֲרַמֶם, “go to your land.” There is support for both readings: 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} agrees with the LXX, while the MT agrees with the SP.
Q492  MT Num 22:14  4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XV 20-22 8  omits  
SV(2) – 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} has an explicating plus.\textsuperscript{1077}

Q493  MT Num 22:16  4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XV 20-22 9  omits  
SV(1) – Interchange of prepositions.

Q494  MT Num 22:16  4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XV 20-22 9  omits  
SV(2) – 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} has an expansive plus.\textsuperscript{1078}

Q495  MT Num 22:17  4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XV 20-22 10  omits  
OV(1) – Possible difference in pronunciation.

Q496  MT Num 22:17  4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XV 20-22 10  omits  
SV(2) – 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} has an expansive plus.\textsuperscript{1079}

Q497  MT Num 22:18  omits  
SV(2) – 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} has an expansive plus.

\textsuperscript{1076} The infinitive construct of \(√\text{Ntn} \) 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, §114l, n. 3). According to W. Gesenius, E. Kautzsch, and A.E. Cowley, Hebrew Grammar, 109, §33g, the long form ‘\(\text{yn}^{-}\) is strictly accusative, while the short form ‘\(\text{y}^{-}\) is genitive in function.

\textsuperscript{1077} See note above.

\textsuperscript{1078} 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} is restored to read: \(\text{b)m Klm rwpc Nb qlb}\), “Balak son of Zippor, king of Moab.” The title of Balak son of Zippor in 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} 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.

\textsuperscript{1079} The phrase in 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} includes the preposition plus genitive pronominal suffix, clarifying the beneficiary of the action \(\text{h#(}\). “I shall do.” The clause is restored to read: \(\text{hkl h#(}\text{yl) rm)t r#) lkw}\), “and all that you will say to me I shall do for you.” See the similar addition in Q504 below.
4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XV 20-22

\textsuperscript{1080} In 4QNum\textsuperscript{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, \textit{Qumran Cave 4. VII}, 233). 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} is restored: יְבִלְבִּי הַלָּדִיגָה יְהַנְטִי תָבוֹא, “to do less or more in my mind.”

\textsuperscript{1081} 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} includes an additional phrase that harmonises with Num 22:8. The SP and the LXX agree with the MT. 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} is restored: יָאָשְׁבִי רִי מַסְתַּבָּתָה לָכֵי בָלָאֲמ, “And the princes of Moab dwelt with Balaam.”

\textsuperscript{1082} The MT has Balaam falling “on his face,” against 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} which has Balaam falling “before him.” For the meaning of the form לָכֵי as “before” in the same sense as לָכָה, see L. Koehler and W. Baumgartner, \textit{HALOT}, 77, who point to the use of this form in Gen 48:12 and 1 Sam 20:41.
4QNum⁷b XV 20-22
לבה
29

Q505 MT Num 22:32
ירש
4QNum⁷b XV 20-22
רשמה
29

SV(1) – Lexical interchange.¹⁰⁸⁴

Q506 MT Num 22:33
לפר
4QNum⁷b XV 20-22
לפרים
29

SV(1) – The MT lacks the preposition י.

Q507 MT Num 22:33
תפניר
4QNum⁷b 22 33
תפניר
29

SV(1) – The MT lacks the preposition י.

Q508 MT Num 23:3
עלף
4QNum⁷b XVI 23-26
עלף
12

OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.

Q509 MT Num 23:3
ומנה
4QNum⁷b XVI 23-26
ומנה
12

SV(2) – 4QNum⁷b has an expansive plus.¹⁰⁸⁵

Q510 MT Num 23:3
אלא
OV(l) – Difference in grammar-

¹⁰⁸³ 4QNum⁷b has the addition of the secondary object in the phrase ירה אילה: ירה את נלשם עלבה, “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.

¹⁰⁸⁴ The MT and the SP have the rare form ירש, “to throw down,” which seems to have the sense of implied difficulty in the context: ירשו ידננ לבר, “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 ירש, “push, shove”) prompted the scribe of 4QNum⁷b to replace the lexeme with a more commonly occurring word, ירש, “to be wicked.”

¹⁰⁸⁵ The cohortative form in the MT is written as an imperfect verb preceded by the first person singular independent pronoun in 4QNum⁷b, 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).
4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XVI 23-26 אֲבָלָה
12
cal form.\textsuperscript{1086}

Q511 MT Num 23:3 יְהוָה
4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XVI 23-26 אֶלֹהָיו
12
SV(1) – Interchange of divine titles.

Q512 MT Num 23:3 omit
4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XVI 23-26 יולֵךְ ורָצוּב ... בְּמוֹלֹם
13-14
SV(2) – 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} has an expansive plus.\textsuperscript{1087}

Q513 MT Num 23:4 רְוֵחַ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֶלֹהֶם
4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XVI 23-26 אֶלֹהֵינוּ [אֱלֹהֵינוּ] אֱלֹהֶם
14
SV(2) – Difference in expression.\textsuperscript{1088}

Q514 MT Num 23:27 הָאֱלֹהֵינוּ
4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XVII 24 ii, 27-30, 9
אֶלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֶם
SV(1) – 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} lacks the definite article.

Q515 MT Num 24:1 הָנֹדֵחַ
4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XVII 24 ii, 27-30 13
הָנֹדֵחַ
SV(1) – The MT lacks the definite article.

\textsuperscript{1086} The imperfect form in 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} is in contrast with the cohortative form in the MT. While some Greek manuscripts agree with 4QNum\textsuperscript{b}, the MT finds support in the major editions of the LXX, and in the SP. See note above.

\textsuperscript{1087} 4QNum\textsuperscript{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 יָפַת לָךְ לָאָלֶה and he (Balaam) went to a bare hill” (on the translation of יָפַת 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 εὐθυς, “directly, honestly”), against the restored reading in 4QNum\textsuperscript{b}: יָפַת לָךְ לָאָלֶה וַיַּעַבֵּר בָּאָלֶה וַיִּתְאַבֵּר בֶּאָלֶה 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\textsuperscript{b} is given.

\textsuperscript{1088} The clause in the MT reads: וַיַּעַבֵּר בָּאָלֶה, “And God encountered Balaam,” against the restored reading in 4QNum\textsuperscript{b}: וַיִּתְאַבֵּר בֶּאָלֶה, “And a messenger of God found Balaam.” The divergent reading in 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} finds support in the SP. The theological implications of the variant reading are clear, in that 4QNum\textsuperscript{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 וַיִּתְאַבֵּר, “to find,” in place of the Niphal 3ms וַיַּעַבֵּר, “to encounter, meet.”

404
The clause in the MT reads: הַיָּלָה דָּוִד, “like the aloes planted by Yahweh,” against the restored reading in 4QNum\(^b\): הַיָּלָה דָּוִד, “like the tents spread by Yahweh.” The SP and the LXX both reflect the reading in 4QNum\(^b\). The verb הַיָּלָה, “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 מִלְחָה in the MT as “aloes,” against “tents” in 4QNum\(^b\).

Other possible readings are הַיָּלָה דָּוִד / מִלְחָה, “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 conceivabley in breech of Rule 1, in that the form in 4QNum\(^b\) ‘disrupts the logical flow of the passage.’ Additionally, the agreement between 4QNum\(^b\) 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 הַיָּלָה, therefore an error involving the metathesis of the letters כפ and יָוִין is read.

The variant amounts to an interchange of synonyms. The MT has כָּפֶר, “he crouched, he lay like a lion,” against the reading in 4QNum\(^b\), restored on the basis of the SP: כָּפֶר, “he crouched (sic), he lay down like a lion.”

The additional phrase in 4QNum\(^b\) is in agreement with the LXX, and clarifies the beneficiary of Moses’ address. 4QNum\(^b\) is restored to read: יִדָּעְרֵךְ יִהְוֶה אֲלֵהַי לֵשָׁה רֹבֶם לְמַעְלֶה יְשָׂרֵאֵל, “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
omits
SV(2) – 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} has an explicative plus.\textsuperscript{1093}

Q523 MT Num 26:10
4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XIX 33 ii-40 9
omits
SV(2) – 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} has an expansive plus.\textsuperscript{1094}

Q524 MT Num 26:15
4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XIX 33 ii-40 14
בני
hmm
SV(1) – The MT lacks the conjunction.

Q525 MT Num 26:33
4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XIX 33 ii-40 31
אלה
hmm
SV(2) – 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} has an expansive plus.\textsuperscript{1095}

Q526 MT Num 26:33
4QNum\textsuperscript{b} 33 ii-40 31
שם
hmm
SV(1) – Difference in number.\textsuperscript{1096}

Q527 MT Num 26:62
4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XX 41 29
לוה
lhm
OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.

Q528 MT Num 27:1
4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XXI 42-47 4
כעה
nwh
SV(1) – The MT lacks the conjunction.

Q529 MT Num 27:1
והנה
hnm
SV(1) – 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} lacks the con-

\textsuperscript{1093} 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} has a redundant repetition of the subject of the verb מalez, namely המלאתו, “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: "המשים והמלחים אומרים המופיעה, “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\textsuperscript{b} XXI 42-47 junction.

Q530 MT Num 27:3 דַּרְיָה
4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XXI 42-47 SV(1) – Difference in number.\textsuperscript{1097}

Q531 MT Num 27:18 יִרְדָּה
4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XXI 42-47 OV(1) – Possible difference in pronunciation.

Q532 MT Num 27:21 וְהַבֶּןָּו יְהוָה אָבְרָם לִבְנָה
4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XXI 42-47 27-28 SV(3) – 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} has a different word order to the MT.\textsuperscript{1098}

Q533 MT Num 27:22 omit וָנָּי
4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XXI 42-47 29 SV(2) – 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} has an expansive plus.\textsuperscript{1099}

Q534 MT Num 27:23 omit וְאָלֹיו נְעִירָה ... וְאָלֹיו נְעִירָה
4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XXI 42-47 31 SV(2) – 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} has an expansive plus.\textsuperscript{1100}

Q535 MT Num 28:14 וּרְבָּעָה יְהוָה לָבָשׁ יִי
4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XXI 42-47 SV(4) – 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} has a different

\textsuperscript{1097} The clause in the MT is וַיַּלְכוּ לְאָבְרָם וְלֶלֶת לִבְנָה, “and he had no sons,” against the restored reading in 4QNum\textsuperscript{b}: וַיַּלְכוּ לְאָבְרָם וְלֶלֶת לִבְנָה. The plural noun בְּנֵי, “sons,” is treated a singular in 4QNum\textsuperscript{b}, in agreement with some manuscripts of the SP (so E. Ulrich and F.M. Cross, \textit{Qumran Cave 4. VII}, 245).

\textsuperscript{1098} The remaining letters make it clear that the particle plus pronominal suffix וָנָּי, “with him,” is clause final in 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} against the reading in the MT. 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} is restored: וְהַבֶּןָּו יְהוָה אָבְרָם וָנָּי, “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.”

\textsuperscript{1099} The full name “Joshua ben Nun” is given in 4QNum\textsuperscript{b}, in line with the listing of this name in various other places in Numbers (see E. Ulrich and F.M. Cross, \textit{Qumran Cave 4. VII}, 245, for a list of occurrences). The other witnesses agree with the MT.

\textsuperscript{1100} The interpolation in 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} is harmonised with Deut 3:21-22, and is also reflected in the SP, against the MT and the LXX.
The qualifying term נָיָה, "wine," describes the material that is offered in a drink offering. The noun itself is clause final in the MT, but in 4QNum 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, *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.

The plural possessive pronominal suffix in 4QNum b probably harmonises with the plural possessive pronominal suffix appended to the following form מִשְׂנַה מִשְׂנַה, "their drink offerings." A difference in gender need not be read if the pronominal suffix in the MT is taken as an archaic form (see note above). The noun to which the pronominal suffix refers is not clear, but if it refers to the noun at the beginning of the verse, namely מִשְׂנַה, "a young male goat," then a masculine pronominal suffix would be required. Also in favour of the plural reading in 4QNum b see 11QT XVII 14; XXV 6 and 14.

The description of the offering in Num 29:28 appears to be extended in 4QNum b, though the damaged state of the text makes a certain reconstruction impossible. See E. Ulrich and F.M. Cross, *Qumran Cave 4. VII*, 249, for a suggested reconstruction and the variant readings in the other witnesses.

The reading in 4QNum b is uncertain, with only the lower part of the mem and waw preserved. The bottom horizontal ligature of a medial nun 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, *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 pronominal suffix 3ms מְ - in Num 30:14, so it may be that the form in 4QNum b is harmonised with the form occurring there, giving us the form מְ. 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 pronominal suffix ְ left aside.

The order of the phrases are reversed. 4QNum b agrees with the word sequence in the LXX.

---

1101 The qualifying term נָיָה, “wine,” describes the material that is offered in a drink offering. The noun itself is clause final in the MT, but in 4QNum 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, *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.

1102 The plural possessive pronominal suffix in 4QNum b probably harmonises with the plural possessive pronominal suffix appended to the following form מִשְׂנַה מִשְׂנַה, “their drink offerings.” A difference in gender need not be read if the pronominal suffix in the MT is taken as an archaic form (see note above). The noun to which the pronominal suffix refers is not clear, but if it refers to the noun at the beginning of the verse, namely מִשְׂנַה, “a young male goat,” then a masculine pronominal suffix would be required. Also in favour of the plural reading in 4QNum b see 11QT XVII 14; XXV 6 and 14.

1103 The description of the offering in Num 29:28 appears to be extended in 4QNum b, though the damaged state of the text makes a certain reconstruction impossible. See E. Ulrich and F.M. Cross, *Qumran Cave 4. VII*, 249, for a suggested reconstruction and the variant readings in the other witnesses.

1104 The reading in 4QNum b is uncertain, with only the lower part of the mem and waw preserved. The bottom horizontal ligature of a medial nun 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, *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 pronominal suffix 3ms מְ - in Num 30:14, so it may be that the form in 4QNum b is harmonised with the form occurring there, giving us the form מְ. 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 pronominal suffix מְ - left aside.

1105 The order of the phrases are reversed. 4QNum b agrees with the word sequence in the LXX.
| Q540 | MT Num 30:9 | omissions | 4QNum\(^b\) has an expansive plus.\(^{1106}\) |
| Q541 | MT Num 30:9 | SV(1) - Difference in number.\(^{1107}\) |
| Q542 | MT Num 30:9 | omissions | 4QNum\(^b\) has an expansive plus.\(^{1108}\) |
| Q543 | MT Num 31:2 | omissions | SV(1) - The MT lacks the object marker. |
| Q544 | MT Num 31:3 | SV(2) - 4QNum\(^b\) has an explicating plus.\(^{1109}\) |
| Q545 | MT Num 31:23 | SV(2) - 4QNum\(^b\) has an expansive plus.\(^{1110}\) |
| Q546 | MT Num 31:30 | SV(3) - 4QNum\(^b\) has a different word order to the MT. |
| Q547 | MT Num 31:30 | 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, נוריה, "her vow," against the plural in 4QNum\(^b\), the SP and the LXX.

\(^{1108}\) The phrase "her vows and obligations," in 4QNum\(^b\) harmonises with the same or similar phrase repeatedly in Num 30:5-8.

\(^{1109}\) The audience of Moses’ address is clarified in 4QNum\(^b\) as הנ\(^\#\)י ה\(^\#\)אלים, "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 "the people," in the MT, the SP and the LXX.

\(^{1110}\) 4QNum\(^b\) replaces the absolute noun מים, "waters," with the construct הדר מים, "waters of (purity from) menstruation." This possibly harmonises with the same construction in Num 19:9, 13 and 20.
4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XXVI 55 ii, 57-59 18

Q548 MT Num 31:48 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XXVII 60-64 3

omits 

SV(2) – 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} has an expansive plus.\textsuperscript{1111}

Q549 MT Num 31:48 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XXVII 60-64 3-4

omits 

SV(2) – 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} has an expansive plus.\textsuperscript{1112}

Q550 MT Num 31:49 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XXVII 60-64 4

טֶבֶרֶדְתָה

OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.

Q551 MT Num 31:50 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XXVII 60-64 6

מִינָי

SV(1) – The MT lacks the conjunction.

Q552 MT Num 31:50 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XXVII 60-64 6

לַבָּר

OV(l) – Difference in grammatical forms.\textsuperscript{1113}

Q553 MT Num 31:52 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XXVII 60-64 8

שַׁבֶּשָׁנ

SV(1) – The MT lacks the conjunction.

Q554 MT Num 32:23 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XXVIII 65-71 4

דָּתֵאָכָבָא

OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.

Q555 MT Num 32:24 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XXVIII 65-71 5

לָאָכָבָא

OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.

Q556 MT Num 32:24

כְּפֶלֶבָא

OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.

\textsuperscript{1111} 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} specifies מִלְּחוֹל הַפָּקַדְתָה, “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 לָבָר, “to atone,” is written as a \textit{waw} consecutive plus perfect verb in 4QNum\textsuperscript{b}: (')הָבָר, “and it/they will atone.”
4QNum<sup>b</sup> XXVIII 65-71 5

Q557 MT Num 32:25 בנין נג יארהם [ילקזא] 4QNum<sup>b</sup> XXVIII 65-71 6

Q558 MT Num 32:25 omits [מַזְדַּכַת] 4QNum<sup>b</sup> XXVIII 65-71 6

Q559 MT Num 32:25 [םַבְרֵד] עִבְרֵד 4QNum<sup>b</sup> XXVIII 65-71 6

Q560 MT Num 32:26 פָּקְנָה [ימָקְנָא] 4QNum<sup>b</sup> XXVIII 65-71 7

Q561 MT Num 32:27 וּבְרֵדְכֵּה [עַבְרֵדְכֵּה] 4QNum<sup>b</sup> XXVIII 65-71 7

Q562 MT Num 32:30 omits [טְשִׁידָה] 4QNum<sup>b</sup> XXVIII 65-71 12

Q563 MT Num 32:39 omits [כָּטְרָה] 4QNum<sup>b</sup> XXVIII 65-71 20

---

4QNum<sup>b</sup> XXVIII pron.21 4QNum<sup>b</sup> XXVIII sv.3 – 4QNum<sup>b</sup> has a difference word order to the MT. 1114

4QNum<sup>b</sup> XXVIII 4QNum<sup>b</sup> XXVIII sv.2 – 4QNum<sup>b</sup> has an expansive plus. 1115

4QNum<sup>b</sup> XXVIII 4QNum<sup>b</sup> XXVIII ov.1 – Possible difference in pronunciation.

4QNum<sup>b</sup> XXVIII 4QNum<sup>b</sup> XXVIII sv.1 – The MT lacks the conjunction.

4QNum<sup>b</sup> XXVIII 4QNum<sup>b</sup> XXVIII ov.1 – Possible difference in pronunciation.

4QNum<sup>b</sup> XXVIII 4QNum<sup>b</sup> XXVIII sv.2 – 4QNum<sup>b</sup> has additional text not in the MT. 1116

4QNum<sup>b</sup> XXVIII 4QNum<sup>b</sup> XXVIII sv.2 – 4QNum<sup>b</sup> has an expansive plus. 1117

---

1114 The sequence in 4QNum<sup>b</sup> agrees with the SP and the LXX.

1115 4QNum<sup>b</sup> has an interpolation that harmonises with Num 32:1 and 29, also found in the SP.

1116 The additional text in 4QNum<sup>b</sup> is lacking from the MT and the SP, but can be restored on the basis of the LXX: יָאִיר מִלְךָ נְתַנְתֶּם לָיִלָּה לְיַהֲעָבְרֵה о.צ.א מִלְּכָד מְצַטְיָה וּלְצַעַם אֵין מֶשֶׁכָּה לְאָמַר נֶפֶשׁ אַל אֲמַר מֵאֲמַר כָּל: “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.

1117 The phrase, restored בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל, “the sons of Joseph,” appears to be included in the list in 4QNum<sup>b</sup> against the other witnesses.
Q564 MT Num 34:21
4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XXX 75-79 17

לַמֵּשָׁר

SV(1) – Difference in number.\textsuperscript{1118}

Q565 MT Num 35:5
4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XXX 75-79 27

זֹ

יִמָּה

SV(1) – The MT lacks the locative ב.\textsuperscript{1119}

Q566 MT Num 35:18
4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XXXI 80-84 9

ומִתְמָה הַמֵּלֶך

omits

SV(2) – 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} has an expansive plus.\textsuperscript{1120}

Q567 MT Num 35:20
4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XXXI 80-84 11

עָלָיָה בָּצַרְדָּה יָמוֹת

מֵאִית בָּצַרְדָּה יָמוֹת

SV(3) – 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} has a different word order to the MT.\textsuperscript{1121}

Q568 MT Num 35:21
4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XXXI 80-84 12

ומֶה יַמְתָּרוּת הָיָה

omits

SV(2) – 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} has an expansive plus.\textsuperscript{1122}

Q569 MT Num 35:21
4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XXXI 80-84 12

דָּא

omits

SV(2) – 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} has an expansive plus.\textsuperscript{1123}

Q570 MT Num 35:23
4QNum\textsuperscript{b} XXXI 80-84 14

בָּבֶל

בָּבֶל

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: מֵאִית בָּצַרְדָּה יָמוֹת, “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}: נָאָה הָדָעָה אֲשֶׁר, “he, the redeemer of blood.”

\textsuperscript{1124} The MT, the SP and the LXX are in agreement: בָּבֶל אֶפְשָׂר אֶפֶר, “with any stone,” against the phrase in 4QNum\textsuperscript{b}: מַלֶּה מַלֶּה, “with an instrument of stone.”
Q571 MT Num 35:27
4QNum\(^b\) XXXI 80-84 27
sv(2) – The MT has an expansive plus.\(^ {1125}\)

Q572 MT Num 36:1
4QNum\(^b\) XXXI 80-84 30
sv(2) – 4QNum\(^b\) has an expansive plus.\(^ {1126}\)

Q573 MT Num 36:4
4QNum\(^b\) XXXII 81 ii 15-16
sv(2) – 4QNum\(^b\) has an expansive plus.\(^ {1127}\)

Q574 MT Num 36:6
4QNum\(^b\) XXXII 81 ii 18
sv(2) – 4QNum\(^b\) has an expansive plus.\(^ {1128}\)

Q575 MT Deut 24:2
4QDeut\(^a\) 3
sv(2) – The MT has an expansive plus.\(^ {1129}\)

Q576 MT Deut 24:5
4QDeut\(^a\) 8
sv(1) – 4QDeut\(^b\) lacks the preposition.

Q577 MT Deut 29:24
4QDeut\(^b\) I 1
sv(1) – 4QDeut\(^b\) lacks the relative particle.

---

1125 The object of the verb יָדַע, 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 יִהְיֶה, “being,” harmonising with the form in Num 30:7 which has the phrase יָדַע וְיִהְיֶה לָהַיְהָה יָדַע וְיִהְיֶה לָהַיְהָה, “if they shall certainly be for wives.”
1129 The MT has the expanded phrase concerning the divorced wife: וַיָּצֶא מִמְּרוֹעַ וְיִהְיֶה וְיִהְיֶה לָהַיְהָה לָאֶלְאָה מֶרְוַע, “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\(^a\) omits the phrase יִהְיֶה מֶרְוַע, 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 | מָכַסְתָּן נְפֶרֶתָא אֲדָמְתָּא | SV(3) – 4QDeut\(^b\) has a different word order to the MT.\(^{1130}\) |
| Q579 | MT Deut 30:10 | יָרְפְּבֶתוֹת | SV(1) – Difference in gender and number.\(^{1131}\) |
| Q580 | MT Deut 30:11 | אֵל | SV(1) – Difference in gender.\(^{1132}\) |
| Q581 | MT Deut 30:11 | ommits | SV(2) – 4QDeut\(^b\) has an explicating plus.\(^{1133}\) |
| Q582 | MT Deut 30:13 | אֵל | SV(2) – 4QDeut\(^b\) has an explicating plus.\(^{1134}\) |
| Q583 | MT Deut 30:14 | ommits | SV(2) – The MT lacks the addi-

\(^{1130}\) The word order in 4QDeut\(^b\) is restored on the basis of the SP: מָכַסְתָּן נְפֶרֶתָא אֲדָמְתָּא, “in the fruit of your land, and in the fruit of your cattle.” The LXX also supports the reading in 4QDeut\(^b\): καὶ εν τοῖς γεννημασίᾳ της γῆς σου καὶ εν τοῖς εκγονοῖς τον κτήνων 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 4QDeut\(^b\). The latter form agrees with that required by the context, where the participle מָכַסְתָּן נְפֶרֶתָא אֲדָמְתָּא, “his commandments and statutes.” While the nouns to which the participle refers are feminine in form the use of the masculine plural in 4QDeut\(^b\) 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 תְּמוֹנָת מֵאָמֲרֵי, “and his judgements,” which may account for the masculine form in 4QDeut\(^b\) as suggested by J.A. Duncan, *A Critical Edition of Deuteronomy Manuscripts From Qumran Cave IV: 4QDtb, 4QDtc, 4QDtd, 4QDte, 4QDtf, 4QDtg* (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 אֵלֶּה, “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: אֵל אֲנָא אֲנָא מְקָסָה (!) הֶבַע, “it is not too extraordinary for you.” The additional prepositional phrase is also reflected in the LXX.

\(^{1134}\) The independent pronoun in 4QDeut\(^b\) specifies the subject. The SP also reflects the reading in 4QDeut\(^b\).
| Q584 | MT Deut 31:11 | בכר | SV(1) – Difference in number. | 4QDeut<sup>b</sup> 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 4QDeut<sup>b</sup> 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.”

1136 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 (יְהוּד). It should be noted that *Numeruswechsel* is particularly prevalent in this passage (cf. the singular and plural pronominal suffixes referring to the לְבָנָיִים in Deut 31:3-6, esp. verse 6 which uses both grammatical forms in the same clause). 4QDeut<sup>b</sup> may have harmonised the forms in this pericope to correct obvious grammatical inconsistencies. On *Numeruswechsel* in Deuteronomy in general see note above.

1137 Cf. the comments in note above. The form of the demonstrative pronoun in 4QDeut<sup>b</sup> is grammatically correct.

1138 4QDeut<sup>b</sup> clearly has מַעֵשׂמָכֵם, though the peh is somewhat damaged. Based on the LXX the text can be restored: הַכּוֹרֵי אֶלֶף אַחַת מַעֵשׂמָכֵם מַעֵשׂמָכֵם מַעֵשׂמָכֵם מַעֵשׂמָכֵם מַעֵשׂמָכֵם, “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 πρεσβυτέρος ὡμον καὶ τοὺς κρίτας ὡμον, which would support the reconstruction in 4QDeut<sup>b</sup> that includes the form מַעֵשׂמָכֵם, however only the second term מַעֵשׂמָכֵם (καὶ τοὺς κρίτας ὡμον) is preserved.

1139 If waw is read between dalet and lamed the form in 4QDeut<sup>b</sup> 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

| Q585 | MT Deut 31:15 | וּמְנַהֲג | SV(1) – 4QDeut<sup>b</sup> lacks the preposition. | 1136 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 (יְהוּד). It should be noted that *Numeruswechsel* is particularly prevalent in this passage (cf. the singular and plural pronominal suffixes referring to the לְבָנָיִים in Deut 31:3-6, esp. verse 6 which uses both grammatical forms in the same clause). 4QDeut<sup>b</sup> may have harmonised the forms in this pericope to correct obvious grammatical inconsistencies. On *Numeruswechsel* in Deuteronomy in general see note above.

1137 Cf. the comments in note above. The form of the demonstrative pronoun in 4QDeut<sup>b</sup> is grammatically correct.

1138 4QDeut<sup>b</sup> clearly has מַעֵשׂמָכֵם, though the peh is somewhat damaged. Based on the LXX the text can be restored: הַכּוֹרֵי אֶלֶף אַחַת מַעֵשׂמָכֵם מַעֵשׂמָכֵם מַעֵשׂמָכֵם מַעֵשׂמָכֵם מַעֵשׂמָכֵם, “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 πρεσβυτέρος ὡμον καὶ τοὺς κρίτας ὡμον, which would support the reconstruction in 4QDeut<sup>b</sup> that includes the form מַעֵשׂמָכֵם, however only the second term מַעֵשׂמָכֵם (καὶ τοὺς κρίτας ὡμον) is preserved.

1139 If waw is read between dalet and lamed the form in 4QDeut<sup>b</sup> 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

| Q586 | MT Deut 31:26 | וּסָדֲרוּ | SV(1) – Difference in gender. | 1136 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 (יְהוּד). It should be noted that *Numeruswechsel* is particularly prevalent in this passage (cf. the singular and plural pronominal suffixes referring to the לְבָנָיִים in Deut 31:3-6, esp. verse 6 which uses both grammatical forms in the same clause). 4QDeut<sup>b</sup> may have harmonised the forms in this pericope to correct obvious grammatical inconsistencies. On *Numeruswechsel* in Deuteronomy in general see note above.

1137 Cf. the comments in note above. The form of the demonstrative pronoun in 4QDeut<sup>b</sup> is grammatically correct.

1138 4QDeut<sup>b</sup> clearly has מַעֵשׂמָכֵם, though the peh is somewhat damaged. Based on the LXX the text can be restored: הַכּוֹרֵי אֶלֶף אַחַת מַעֵשׂמָכֵם מַעֵשׂמָכֵם מַעֵשׂמָכֵם מַעֵשׂמָכֵם מַעֵשׂמָכֵם, “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 πρεσβυτέρος ὡμον καὶ τοὺς κρίτας ὡμον, which would support the reconstruction in 4QDeut<sup>b</sup> that includes the form מַעֵשׂמָכֵם, however only the second term מַעֵשׂמָכֵם (καὶ τοὺς κρίτας ὡμον) is preserved.

1139 If waw is read between dalet and lamed the form in 4QDeut<sup>b</sup> 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 | SV(2) – 4QDeut c has an expansive plus.\(^{1140}\) |
| Q590 | MT Deut 7:4 | omits | SV(2) – 4QDeut c has an expansive plus.\(^{1141}\) |
| Q591 | MT Deut 8:2 | נַנְסִית | SV(1) – 4QDeut c lacks the preposition ל. |
| Q592 | MT Deut 8:2 | הלעה | SV(1) – The MT lacks the conjunction. |
| Q593 | MT Deut 8:4 | שָׁמַלְתָּךְ | SV(1) – Lexical interchange.\(^{1142}\) |
| Q594 | MT Deut 10:1 | בְּרָסִינָם | SV(1) – 4QDeut c lacks the preposition ב.\(^{1143}\) |
| Q595 | MT Deut 10:2 | omits | SV(2) – 4QDeut c has an expansive plus.\(^{1144}\) |
| Q596 | MT Deut 11:10 | הָא | SV(1) – Difference in gender.\(^{1145}\) |
| Q597 | MT Deut 12:19 | אֶדְמוּת | 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 מַיהוּל הָיָה, “Yahweh your god,” against the other witnesses that have only the Tetragrammaton.

\(^{1142}\) See also Q178 above, and the comments in note . The lexemes מַלְתָּךְ and מַלְתָּֽךְ (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 הָא, “the land,” a feminine singular noun. The MT qere has the correct form of the pronoun.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q598</th>
<th>MT Deut 13:5</th>
<th>תְּלוֹב</th>
<th>OV(l) – Difference in grammatical form.(^{1147})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q599</td>
<td>MT Deut 13:7</td>
<td>omit</td>
<td>SV(2) – 4QDeut(^{c}) has an expansive plus.(^{1148})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q600</td>
<td>MT Deut 13:7</td>
<td>אֲחַר</td>
<td>SV(2) – The MT has an expansive plus.(^{1149})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q601</td>
<td>MT Deut 15:2</td>
<td>אֱלֹהִים אָחָי</td>
<td>SV(2) – The MT has an explicating plus.(^{1150})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q602</td>
<td>MT Deut 16:8</td>
<td>שָׁמַע</td>
<td>HV – Difference in cardinal number.(^{1151})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q603</td>
<td>MT Deut 16:8</td>
<td>מָזוֹן מֹעֵד</td>
<td>SV(3) – 4QDeut(^{c}) has a different word order to the MT.(^{1152})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q604</td>
<td>MT Deut 16:8</td>
<td>חֶסֶל</td>
<td>SV(1) – Difference in number.(^{1153})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q605</td>
<td>MT Deut 16:8</td>
<td>omit</td>
<td>SV(2) – 4QDeut(^{c}) has an expa-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{1146}\) The noun יָדוֹת אָרֵץ, “the earth,” is specified with a possessive pronoun as יָדוֹת אַרְּרַמְס, “your earth.”

\(^{1147}\) See Q14 above, where 1QDeut\(^{a}\) agrees with 4QDeut\(^{c}\). See also the references in note above.

\(^{1148}\) The phrase in 4QDeut\(^{c}\) is restored on the basis of the SP and the LXX: בֵּית אֵבֶן, “or the son of your father.”

\(^{1149}\) The phrase is lacking in 4QDeut\(^{c}\) against the other witnesses. Given the repetition of forms in this verse one may reasonably suspect haplography through homoioteleuton.

\(^{1150}\) All of the other witnesses have the phrase: שָׁמַע מָזוֹן מֹעֵד, “six days you shall eat unleavened bread.” 4QDeut\(^{c}\) seems to have read seven days for this activity during Passover, perhaps harmonised with the similar statement in Deut 16:3, שָׁמַע מָזוֹן מֹעֵד, “seven days you shall eat unleavened bread.” The specification in verse 8 that follows the variant שָׁמַע מָזוֹן מֹעֵד, “and on the seventh day, a celebration,” is not preserved in 4QDeut\(^{c}\).

\(^{1151}\) The objects of the verb ישנה, “exact, require payment,” are specified in the MT.

\(^{1152}\) On Numeruswechsel in Deuteronomy see note above.
4QDeut\textsuperscript{c} 32 i, 33 5

Q606

MT Deut 16:10

4QDeut\textsuperscript{c} 32 i, 33 8

سمות

Not Counted – The text is too damaged to allow a certain reading.\textsuperscript{1155}

Q607

MT Deut 16:11

4QDeut\textsuperscript{c} 32 i, 33 10

ובניך

SV(1) – 4QDeut\textsuperscript{c} lacks the conjunction.

Q608

MT Deut 16:11

4QDeut\textsuperscript{c} 32 i, 33 10-11

והלוים אשמהMessḫērẖ הדות

4QDeut\textsuperscript{c} has a different phraseology to the MT.\textsuperscript{1156}

Q609

MT Deut 16:11

4QDeut\textsuperscript{c} 32 i, 33 10

יחלאמכה

SV(1) – 4QDeut\textsuperscript{c} lacks the conjunction.

Q610

MT Deut 17:19

4QDeut\textsuperscript{c} 36-41 8

ב

SV(1) – Difference in gender.\textsuperscript{1157}

Q611

MT Deut 26:19

4QDeut\textsuperscript{c} 36-41 8

לחקלה ונמשה והמשנה

SV(3) – 4QDeut\textsuperscript{c} has a different

\textsuperscript{1154} The reading in 4QDeut\textsuperscript{c} is supported by the LXX. The phrase in 4QDeut\textsuperscript{c} reads: "you shall not do any work in it (the seventh day)."

\textsuperscript{1155} 4QDeut\textsuperscript{c} would appear to have \( \sqrt{hsm} \), "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 \( \sqrt{ttm} \), but the reading \( \sqrt{hsm} \) is not certain (see E. Ulrich and F.M. Cross, \emph{Qumran Cave 4. IX}, 25).

\textsuperscript{1156} 4QDeut\textsuperscript{c} 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 \emph{Vorlage} underlying Codex Vaticanus. The MT reads: "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 4QDeut\textsuperscript{c}: "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 4QDeut\textsuperscript{c} 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.

\textsuperscript{1157} 4QDeut\textsuperscript{c} has the grammatically correct form. The pronominal suffix refers to \( \sqrt{bhr} \), "this second law." The SP supports the reading in 4QDeut\textsuperscript{c}. 
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4QDeut\(^c\) 42 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q612</th>
<th>MT Deut 27:1</th>
<th>omits</th>
<th>word order to the MT.(^{1158})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q613</td>
<td>MT Deut 27:26</td>
<td>הושע</td>
<td>SV(1) – Difference in number.(^{1159})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q614</td>
<td>MT Deut 28:1</td>
<td>לְשׁוֹן</td>
<td>SV(2) – The MT has an expansive plus or a different phraseology to 4QDeut(^c).(^{1160})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Q615 | MT Deut 28:11| יָבָשָׁה בְּהַמֶּשֶׁך | Not Counted – The text is too

\(^{1158}\) The restored phrase in 4QDeut\(^c\) is: לְשׁוֹן הַמִּתְנַחֲמָה, “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\(^c\) is reflected in Jeremiah 13:11 and 33:9. The LXX supports the reading in 4QDeut\(^c\): ονομαστον και καυχημα και δοξαστον, “renowned, and a boast, and glorious.”

\(^{1159}\) The verb refers to מ, “the people.” On Numeruswechsel in Deuteronomy see note , and on the grammatical number of the term מ 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  ב 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 französischen „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 ב plus infinitive construct are more limited but still recognised: “The object of an infinitive may itself be an infinitive governing an object with 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 לְשׁוֹן הַמִּתְנַחֲמָה 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\(^c\) 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\(^c\) as original.
The remains of the first letter, possibly aleph, are visible in the scroll but are too damaged to give a certain reading. 4QDeutc is restored in E. Ulrich and F.M. Cross, *Qumran Cave 4. IX*, 29, to agree with the word order in Codex Vaticanus: חָרֵם הַמַּעֲשֶׁה שֵׁיָר בָּאָתָן וּמָכַה הַמַּעֲשֶׁה שֵׁיָר בָּאָתָן, “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 4QDeutc agrees with the similar passage in 4QDeutb (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 4QDeutc. 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 רָבָב / רַבָּב, “to lay upon,” against 4QDeutc רַבָּב, “to cleave to.” The phrase is equivalent in each text: רָבָב / רַבָּב וּרְבָּבֵה בָּאָתָן מִבֵּין הַמַּעֲשֶׁה שֵׁיָר, “And every curse that is written in this scroll will lay upon / cleave to him.” Cf. the similar phrase with לָבָּב plus preposition ב in Deut 28:60.

The verb refers to יָהֹדָה, “the people.” See the previous note.

The verb refers to יָהֹדָה, “the people.” See also note 1168 above.

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 1168 and above.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Change/Missing</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q623</td>
<td>Deut 31:18</td>
<td>omits</td>
<td>SV(2) – 4QDeutc has an explicating plus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q624</td>
<td>Deut 31:19</td>
<td>adds</td>
<td>OV(1) – Difference in grammatical form.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q625</td>
<td>Deut 31:19</td>
<td>omits</td>
<td>SV(2) – 4QDeutc has an explicating plus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q626</td>
<td>Deut 31:19</td>
<td>adds</td>
<td>SV(1) – Difference in number.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q627</td>
<td>Deut 2:25</td>
<td>omits</td>
<td>SV(1) – The MT lacks the object marker.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q628</td>
<td>Deut 2:34</td>
<td>adds</td>
<td>SV(1) – Difference in gender.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q629</td>
<td>Deut 3:16</td>
<td>adds</td>
<td>SV(1) – 4QDeutd lacks the conjunction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q630</td>
<td>Deut 3:19</td>
<td>adds</td>
<td>SV(1) – 4QDeutd lacks the conjunction.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1168 4QDeutc includes the Tetragrammaton in the phrase ybrqb yhl) hwhy Ny) yk l( )lh, “Did (it) not come up because Yahweh my god is not in my midst?” The LXX supports this reading.

1169 The phrase in 4QDeutc is restored: wnmm ynp ryts) rtsh ykn)w, “and I will certainly hide my face from them.” The MT lacks the preposition plus the 3mpl dative pronominal suffix בְּבִנְיָם, in agreement with all of the other witnesses.

1170 The form in 4QDeutc is best read as a short form of the adverbial particle hti(, “now, henceforth” (see HALOT, 901), as reading the form as the noun התה, “time” does not fit the context.

1171 The phrase in 4QDeutc is restored on the basis of the LXX: hmtw ybwr hewr hv yhr, “the words of the song.”

1172 The plural imperative agrees with the first imperative in the verse, מַעְלֵה, “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.

1173 The object marker is restored in 4QDeutd on the basis of the SP. See S.A. White, “Three Deuteronomy Manuscripts,” 31.

1174 The pronoun refers to התה, “the time,” a feminine noun. The MT qere has the correct form of the pronoun.
| Q631 | MT Deut 3:22 | וָדָאָה | 4QDeutd II 11 | SV(1) – Difference in number. 1175 |
| Q632 | MT Deut 3:23 | נָדָה | 4QDeutd II 12 | SV(1) – Difference in gender. 1176 |
| Q633 | MT Deut 3:26 | יִתְנַבָּר | 4QDeutd II 15 | Not Counted – Scribal error is assumed. 1177 |
| Q634 | MT Deut 3:27 | omit | 4QDeutd II 17 | SV(1) – The MT lacks the preposition עָלָי |
| Q635 | MT Deut 3:27 | כֹּה | 4QDeutd II 17 | SV(1) – 4QDeutd lacks the locative ב |
| Q636 | MT Deut 3:27 | יִתְנַבָּר | 4QDeutd II 17 | SV(1) – 4QDeutd lacks the conjunction. |
| Q637 | MT Deut 7:23 | לְפָנָי | 4QDeutd 2 ii, 3 i, 4 i, 11 | SV(2) – 4QDeutd has a different phraseology to the MT. 1178 |

1175 The plural form of the verb is expected because the following pronoun, which also refers to the subject, is plural: מַיְלָא, “your god.” Some manuscripts of MT as well as the SP agree with the reading in 4QDeutd (see S.A. White, “Three Deuteronomy Manuscripts,” 34).

1176 The pronoun refers to הָעָה, “the time,” a feminine noun. The MT quere has the correct form of the pronoun.

1177 The MT has the Hitpael of פָּלַה, “to show oneself to be angry, excited,” against the Hitpael of פָּלַה, which does not occur in the MT. Thus the sense of the text as it is in 4QDeutd is difficult, so Rule 1 cannot be applied. E. Ulrich and F.M. Cross, Qumran Cave 4. IX, 38, assumes a scribal error where דאָל was written instead of resh, and this reading is adopted here.

1178 The phrase in 4QDeutd is restored: יִתְנַבָּר יִתְנַבָּר הָעָה מַיְלָא בָּרְכֻּד, “And Yahweh your god has delivered them into your hand,” against the MT: יִתְנַבָּר יִתְנַבָּר הָעָה מַיְלָא בָּרְכֻּד, “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 4QDeutd might be considered to be harmonising the two different expressions. The LXX could reflect a Vorlage like 4QDeutd, where εἰςταςχειρας generally translates בִּֽהֲנָא and προσοπον / ενωπιον generally translates לְפָנָי, but there can be no certainty in this regard (see J.A. Duncan, Deuteronomy Manuscripts, 46).

1178 422
| Q638 | MT Deut 7:22 | הַלָּא | OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.  
 | MT Deut 1 | 4QDeut 2-3 1 | 4QDeut | הַלָּא |
| Q639 | MT Deut 7:24 | בֵּנוֹזָה | SV(1) – Interchange of prepositions. |
| MT Deut 1 | 4QDeut 2-3 4 | 4QDeut | לָל |
| Q640 | MT Deut 8:7 | omisses | SV(2) – 4QDeut 1 has an expansive plus.  
 | MT Deut 1 | 4QDeut 4-6 8 | 4QDeut | רַדְבָּה |
| Q641 | MT Deut 8:9 | omisses | SV(1) – The MT lacks the conjunction. |
| MT Deut 1 | 4QDeut 4-6 10 | 4QDeut | שָא |
| Q642 | MT Deut 8:9 | תְּרוּמָהָה | OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.  
 | MT Deut 1 | 4QDeut 4-6 11 | 4QDeut | יִמְנָה |
| Q643 | MT Deut 9:7 | יָבַע | SV(1) – Interchange of prepositions. |
| MT Deut 1 | 4QDeut 7 3 | 4QDeut | צַע |
| Q644 | MT Deut 19:21 | שָא | SV(1) – 4QDeut 1 lacks the conjunction. |
| MT Deut 1 | 4QDeut 13-16 4 | 4QDeut | שָא |

---

1179 4QDeut 1 has the regular form of the demonstrative pronoun הַל, which appears as the by-form בּ 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 1. 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 1 is כָּל אֶת מֶשֶׁכָּה הָרָב, "to a land good and broad." The MT lacks the second adjective, whereas the SP and the LXX support the reading in 4QDeut 1, as does 4QDeut 1 V 5 and 4QDeut 1 I 3 (see Q694 and Q771 below). The same phrase appears in Exod 3:8 of the MT.

1181 The spelling in 4QDeut 1 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 reš had certainly taken on the characteristics of a guttural consonant in Qumran Hebrew, so the form in 4QDeut 1 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," 136, where it is suggested that the late form in the MT is updated towards the more common (archaic) form in 4QDeut 1. It should be noted, though, that both spellings מִרְרָה and מִרְרַה occur in personal names as early as the mid-second millennium B.C.E., for which see W.F. Albright, "The Names Shaddai and Abram," JBL 54, 4 (1935) 191 n. 59. See also Q695 and Q772 below for the same reading in 4QDeut 1 and 4QDeut 1, and Q847 for the same reading in 5QDeut.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q645</th>
<th>MT Deut 20:1</th>
<th>הָעִם</th>
<th>SV(1) – The MT lacks the conjunction.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4QDeut(^1) 13-16 6</td>
<td>הָעִם</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q646</td>
<td>MT Deut 20:3</td>
<td>שָׁם הָעִם</td>
<td>OV(I) – Possible difference in pronunciation.(^{1182})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4QDeut(^1) 13-16 8</td>
<td>שָׁם הָעִם</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q647</td>
<td>MT Deut 21:4</td>
<td>דָּתָה</td>
<td>SV(1) – Difference in gender.(^{1183})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4QDeut(^1) 17-19 1</td>
<td>דָּתָה</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q648</td>
<td>MT Deut 21:7</td>
<td>שְׁמַה</td>
<td>SV(1) – Difference in number.(^{1184})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4QDeut(^1) 17-19 5</td>
<td>שְׁמַה</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q649</td>
<td>MT Deut 21:9</td>
<td>דָּתַּנ֥ר</td>
<td>SV(2) – Difference in expression.(^{1185})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4QDeut(^1) 17-19 7</td>
<td>דָּתַּנ֥ר</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q650</td>
<td>MT Deut 22:15</td>
<td>הָדֶנֶר</td>
<td>SV(1) – Difference in gender.(^{1186})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4QDeut(^1) 20-23 4</td>
<td>הָדֶנֶר</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q651</td>
<td>MT Deut 26:18</td>
<td>omit</td>
<td>SV(1) – The MT lacks the object marker.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4QDeut(^1) 32-35 1</td>
<td>א</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q652</td>
<td>MT Deut 1:7</td>
<td>בֹּנֶנֶנּ</td>
<td>SV(1) – 4QDeut(^b) lacks the conjunction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4QDeut(^b) 1 6</td>
<td>בֹּנֶנֶנּ</td>
<td></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 *הָדֶנֶר*, “the city,” a feminine noun. The MT *qere* has the correct form of the pronoun.

\(^{1184\) The verb in 4QDeut\(^1\) 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 heh, 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 יִנָּעֶנֶנּ, “innocent blood,” against the construct chain in 4QDeut\(^1\) יִנָּעֶנֶנּ, “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
4QDeut\[b\] 2-4 26
לארזהם
לארזהה
OV(l) – Difference in grammatical form or possible difference in pronunciation. ¹¹⁸⁷

Q654 MT Deut 1:33
4QDeut\[b\] 2-4 26
לארזהם
לארזהה
SV(2) – The MT has an explicating plus. ¹¹⁸⁸

Q655 MT Deut 1:37
4QDeut\[b\] 2-4 29
שת
שנה
SV(1) – The MT lacks the locative ʔ.

Q656 MT Deut 1:39
4QDeut\[b\] 2-4 30
ידני
ידן
SV(1) – Difference in number. ¹¹⁸⁹

Q657 MT Deut 1:44
4QDeut\[b\] 5-6 5
חרפה
חרפה
SV(1) – The MT lacks the definite article.

Q658 MT Deut 2:3
4QDeut\[b\] 5-6 8
לבע
לבע
SV(1) – Difference in number. ¹¹⁹⁰

¹¹⁸⁷ The form in the MT could be Qal, though Hiph’îl better suits the context. The Hiph’îl is clearly written with affirmative heh in 4QDeut\[b\]. On the elision of the affirmative heh on Hiph’îl infinitives in the MT see the examples listed in W. Gesenius, E. Kautzsch, and A.E. Cowley, Hebrew Grammar, 148, §53q.

¹¹⁸⁸ 4QDeut\[b\] 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: לֵבכָּת אֶת רֹשֵׁי מַעּוֹן וְאֵלָה מֵעָלֶה יְהוָה בֵּית אֵלָה מֵעָלֶה יְהוָה מֹשֶׁה "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 לֵבכָּת אֶת רֹשֵׁי מַעּוֹן וְאֵלָה מֵעָלֶה יְהוָה בֵּית אֵלָה מֹשֶׁה, “And your toddler who this day does not know good or evil.” Another alternative is to read the phrase in 4QDeut\[b\] as a rearranged word order of that found in the MT, where the singular מָטָסָס אַתָּה לֹא אָבְיִים יְהוָה מַעּוֹן וְאֵלָה מֵעָלֶה יְהוָה מֹשֶׁה,  “and your toddler who this day does not know good or evil.” Seeing as the preserved text in 4QDeut\[b\] 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 4QDeut\[b\] continues to use the singular. The audience for Yahweh’s speech here is ostensibly the people as is clear in the following verse, though 4QDeut\[b\] 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 | שָׁלַל | SV(2) – 4QDeut has an expansive plus.¹¹⁹¹ |
| Q660 | MT Deut 33:8 | omits | הבְּרוֹחַ לְתוֹלָה | SV(2) – 4QDeut has an expansive plus.¹¹⁹² |
| Q661 | MT Deut 33:9 | רָאִיתָהּ | SV(1) – Difference in person.¹¹⁹³ |
| Q662 | MT Deut 33:9 | שָׁמֶרָה | SV(1) – Difference in number.¹¹⁹⁴ |
| Q663 | MT Deut 33:9 | בָּרָם | SV(1) – 4QDeut lacks the conjunction. |

¹¹⁹¹ 4QDeut is restored on the basis of the LXX: יָרֵאָה יָשָׁבוּ אֶל הָאָרֶץ יָשָׁבוּ אֶל הָאָרֶץ, “And Moses wrote this law upon a scroll.”

¹¹⁹² The phrase in the MT lacks a verb: יָלְדוּ וְאַל תְּשַׁמְּרֵם, “your Tumim and your Umim belong to your faithful man.” 4QDeut provides an imperative verb: יָלְדוּ וְאַל תְּשַׁמְּרֵם, “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) I 14. J.A. Duncan, "New Readings for the 'Blessings of Moses' from Qumran," JBL 114, 2 (1995) 280, suggests that 4QDeut has the original reading with the LXX.

¹¹⁹³ The pronominal object suffix in 4QDeut refers to לִבְרֹאָה יִרְבָּרוּ לְאָב מַתָּתוֹ, “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 4QDeut 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 τοῦ, written as τῶν τῆς πατρὸς ἡμῶν, “I do not know you.” J.A. Duncan, "New Readings," 280, assumes that confusion as to the grammatical function of the preposition on led to the difference between our sources, where the tradition underlying 4QDeut and the LXX read the preposition as nota dativi, while that under-lying 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 4QDeut “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 4QDeut 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 4QDeut. 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).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q664</th>
<th>MT Deut 33:10</th>
<th>יְרֵיחַ</th>
<th>WV</th>
<th>SV(1) – Difference in number.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4QDeut b 11-15 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q665</td>
<td>MT Deut 33:10</td>
<td>שֵׁתִים</td>
<td>WV</td>
<td>SV(1) – Difference in number.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QDeut b 11-15 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q666</td>
<td>MT Deut 33:11</td>
<td>חֶשְׁלוֹת</td>
<td>OV</td>
<td>OV(I) – Difference in grammatical form.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QDeut b 11-15 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q667</td>
<td>MT Deut 33:11</td>
<td>מַלְנוֹת</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not Counted – The reading in 4QDeut b is not certain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QDeut b 11-15 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q668</td>
<td>MT Deut 33:11</td>
<td>נֶפֶל</td>
<td>WV</td>
<td>SV(1) – Lexical interchange.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QDeut b 11-15 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q669</td>
<td>MT Deut 33:12</td>
<td>לְבָנֹית</td>
<td>OV</td>
<td>SV(1) – The MT lacks the conjunction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QDeut b 11-15 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q670</td>
<td>MT Deut 33:12</td>
<td>נָלָל</td>
<td>OV</td>
<td>SV(1) – Lexical interchange.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QDeut b 11-15 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1195 The form in 4QDeut b is read as a defective writing for 3ms imperfect *Hiph'îl* ṣḥây, “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, §47a-b: “The jussive tends to take a form shorter than that of the indicative ... In "hverbs 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 חֳלֵּלֶה, “work,” in the phrase חֲלֵלֶה יְדוֹי, “the work of his hands.” The possibility of reading the form as a defective feminine plural noun in 4QDeut b 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 יְזִּז was changed to the adverbial particle יִבְּר, “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>פסה</th>
<th>מוהס</th>
<th>SV(1) – Lexical interchange.(^{1201})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q672</td>
<td>MT Deut 33:13</td>
<td>סמע</td>
<td>רמשל</td>
<td>SV(1) – The MT lacks the conjunction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q673</td>
<td>MT Deut 33:15</td>
<td>ומשנה</td>
<td>דמנד</td>
<td>SV(1) – Lexical interchange.(^{1202})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q674</td>
<td>MT Deut 33:19</td>
<td>דר</td>
<td>דר</td>
<td>SV(2) – 4QDeut¹ has a different expression to the MT.(^{1203})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q675</td>
<td>MT Deut 33:20</td>
<td>צך</td>
<td>צך</td>
<td>SV(1) – The MT lacks the conjunction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q676</td>
<td>MT Deut 22:5</td>
<td>שמלה</td>
<td>שלמה</td>
<td>SV(1) – Lexical interchange.(^{1204})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q678</td>
<td>MT Deut 5:11</td>
<td>שמקר</td>
<td>שמקר</td>
<td>OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation or grammatical form.(^{1205})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q679</td>
<td>MT Deut 5:12</td>
<td>omit</td>
<td>מַהוּ</td>
<td>SV(2) – 4QDeut¹ have an expansive plus.(^{1206})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q680</td>
<td>MT Deut 5:22</td>
<td>והרשן</td>
<td>והרשן</td>
<td>SV(1) – 4QDeut¹ lacks the definite article.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{1201}\) 4QDeut⁵ appears to have the *Polel* participle מוהס 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 4QDeut⁵ 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: תָּמִם הָרָא, “they shall call people to (the) mountain.” The phrase in 4QDeut⁵ is more readily understood syntactically and also has parallels elsewhere in the MT (see J.A. Duncan, "New Readings," 286 n. 49), restored: תָּמִם הָרָא, “people offered thanksgiving.”

\(^{1204}\) See Q178 and Q593 above and the comments in note above.

\(^{1205}\) See Q754 and Q812 below for the same reading, and the comments in note above.

\(^{1206}\) 4QDeut¹ clarifies, "this day."
| Q681 | MT Deut 5:24 | דָּהָנָא | OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation. |
| Q682 | MT Deut 5:25 | תָּסָיָא | SV(1) – Lexical interchange. |
| Q683 | MT Deut 5:27 | אָלָה | SV(2) – 4QDeut has an expansive plus. |
| Q684 | MT Deut 5:27 | אָלָה | OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation. |
| Q685 | MT Deut 5:31 | דָּהָנָא | SV(1) – 4QDeut lacks the conjunction. |
| Q686 | MT Deut 5:33 | הָלָה | OV(l) – Difference in grammatical form. |
| Q687 | MT Deut 8:5 | לָבָבָא | OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation. |
| Q688 | MT Deut 8:5 | לָבָבָא | SV(2) – 4QDeut has an expansive plus. |
| Q689 | MT Deut 8:5 | אָלָה | OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation. |

1207 The lexeme in MT is a Qal participle of בָּשֵׁם, “to continue, add.” The form in 4QDeut is reconstructed on the basis of the supralinear yod, and the parallel form in 4QPhyl (see E. Ulrich and F.M. Cross, *Qumran Cave 4. IX, 83*, and J.A. Duncan, *Deuteronomy Manuscripts, 98 n. 2*), as a Hiphil masculine plural participle בָּשֵׁם, “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 includes a preposition plus dative pronominal suffix clarifying the secondary object in the phrase, יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם, “everything that Yahweh our god said to you.” A similar phrase, with the verb יִמָּשֵׂר replacing יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם, appears in the second part of the verse in the MT. The reading in 4QDeut is supported by Codex Alexandrinus.

1209 4QDeut 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 has an adverbial particle appended to the phrase, restored: בַּעֲרָתָא אֱלֹהֵיכֶם מָרֹם, “thus Yahweh your god disciplines you.”
| MT Deut 8:6 | 4QDeut V 2 | OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.
| MT Deut 8:6 | 4QDeut V 3 | OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.
| MT Deut 8:7 | 4QDeut V 4 | OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.
| MT Deut 8:7 | 4QDeut V 5 | SV(2) – 4QDeut has an expansive plus.
| MT Deut 8:9 | 4QDeut V 9 | OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.
| MT Deut 8:10 | 4QDeut V 10 | OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.
| MT Deut 8:10 | 4QDeut V 10 | OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.
| MT Deut 11:6 | 4QDeut VIII 2 | SV(1) – Interchange of prepositions.

---

1212 4QDeut has an additional construct noun that is lacking in the MT and the other witnesses, excepting the Lucianic text. The phrase is restored מֹרֶֽבֶּה in all of his ways.”
1213 See also Q640 above, where the same adjective appears in 4QDeut, and the references in note . See also Q771 below for the same variant in 4QDeut.
1214 See Q642 above for the same spelling in 4QDeut, and the reference in note .
| Q700 | MT Deut 11:8 | omits | SV(2) – 4QDeut\textsuperscript{1} has an expansive plus.\textsuperscript{1216} |
| Q701 | MT Deut 11:11 | | OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation. |
| Q702 | MT Exod 12:46 | | SV(1) – Interchange of preposition and postposition locative. |
| Q703 | MT Exod 12:48 | | SV(1) – Difference in number.\textsuperscript{1217} |
| Q704 | MT Exod 13:4 | | OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation. |
| Q705 | MT Exod 13:5 | | SV(1) – The MT lacks the definite article. |
| Q706 | MT Exod 13:5 | omits | SV(2) – Difference in listed items.\textsuperscript{1218} |

\textsuperscript{1215} 4QDeut\textsuperscript{1} is supported by the reading in 4QDeut\textsuperscript{k1}, which has defective (see Q712 below). The verse in 4QDeut\textsuperscript{1} is restored: “Because your eyes see all of Yahweh’s greats works that he did,” where the noun “work,” is taken as the plural construct “works.” E. Qimron, Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls, 20 n. 9, notes the infrequent occurrence of the phonetic spelling for plural “works,” and the same phonetic reading may underly the forms in 4QDeut\textsuperscript{1} and 4QDeut\textsuperscript{k1}. See further E. Ulrich and F.M. Cross, Qumran Cave 4. IX, 87.

\textsuperscript{1216} 4QDeut\textsuperscript{1} is supported by the reading in 4QDeut\textsuperscript{k1} (see Q713 below). The phrase is reconstructed on the basis of the parallel in 4QDeut\textsuperscript{k1} 2:4: “every commandment, the statutes and the judgements.” According to E. Ulrich and F.M. Cross, Qumran Cave 4. IX, 87, the expansion in 4QDeut\textsuperscript{1} and 4QDeut\textsuperscript{k1} “is influenced by parallel passages such as Deut 5:31; 6:1; 7:11.”

\textsuperscript{1217} The pronominal suffix refers to Moses and Aaron, so the plural form in 4QDeut\textsuperscript{1} 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).

\textsuperscript{1218} The list of nations in 4QDeut\textsuperscript{1} includes the Girgashites against the other other witnesses. See the comments in note above.
The phrase in the MT reads: "he set up the borders of the peoples according to the number of the sons of Israel." The reading in 4QDeut\textsuperscript{t} is supported by the LXX and is restored on that basis: מַיְמַע אלְוַיָּם מַיְמַע הַבָּשָׁם הָגִיאָנָאָל, "he set up the borders of the peoples according to the number of the sons of god" (the LXX has ἄγγελων 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 מַיְמַע אלְוַיָּם מַיְמַע הַבָּשָׁם הָגִיאָנָאָל, "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).

The phrase in the MT reads: "to keep all of my commandments." The SP has the object marker but lacks the construct noun בְּ.

See Q700 above, and the comments in note .

See Q700 above, and the comments in note .
Q715 MT Deut 11:8 omits ובתים
4QDeut\textsuperscript{k1} 2 5
SV(2) – 4QDeut\textsuperscript{k1} has an expansive plus.\textsuperscript{1223}

Q716 MT Deut 11:8 Yiirmes\textsuperscript{t}
4QDeut\textsuperscript{k1} 2 5
OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.

Q717 MT Deut 11:8 omits נ הדר
4QDeut\textsuperscript{k1} 2 6
SV(2) – 4QDeut\textsuperscript{k1} has an expansive plus.\textsuperscript{1224}

Q718 MT Deut 11:9 מוייר\textsuperscript{v} הר
4QDeut\textsuperscript{k1} 2 6
OV(l) – Difference in grammatical form.\textsuperscript{1225}

Q719 MT Deut 11:10 אשה
4QDeut\textsuperscript{k1} 2 8
SV(1) – Difference in number.\textsuperscript{1226}

Q720 MT Deut 11:10 בת
4QDeut\textsuperscript{k1} 2 8
SV(1) – Difference in number.\textsuperscript{1227}

Q721 MT Deut 11:10 דאה
4QDeut\textsuperscript{k1} 2 9
SV(1) – Difference in gender.\textsuperscript{1228}

Q722 MT Deut 11:10 והשלכית
4QDeut\textsuperscript{k1} 2 10
OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.

Q723 MT Deut 11:10 בִּרְנֵלך
4QDeut\textsuperscript{k1} 2 10
OV(l) – Possible difference in

\textsuperscript{1223} The phrase in 4QDeut\textsuperscript{k1} echoes Deut 8:1, יתֵרַזְתָה, “you will live and be increased.” The reading in 4QDeut\textsuperscript{k1} is supported by the LXX, ἵνα ζήτε καὶ πολύπλασιασθῆτε, “that you may live and be multiplied.”

\textsuperscript{1224} The phrase in 4QDeut\textsuperscript{k1} is restored: מַתְיַה נָי רְחַד, “(the land) which you cross over the Jordan towards (in order) to possess it.” The MT lacks the direct object of the verb מָעַרְתִּי, “to cross over,” namely the Jordan river, but the LXX supports the reading in 4QDeut\textsuperscript{k1}. According to J.A. Duncan, Deuteronomy Manuscripts, 144, the plus in 4QDeut\textsuperscript{k1} is an expansion influenced by parallel passages in Deut 30:18 and 31:13.

\textsuperscript{1225} See note above on verbal forms with paragogic nun in Qumran Hebrew.

\textsuperscript{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, יתֵרַזְתָה, “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\textsuperscript{k1}.

\textsuperscript{1227} The subject in this section is treated consistently as plural in 4QDeut\textsuperscript{k1}. See note above.

\textsuperscript{1228} The pronoun refers to נַהֲרָיָה, “the land,” a feminine noun. The MT qere has the correct form of the pronoun.
4QDeut k1 2 10 ならばihu pronunciation.

Q724 MT Deut 11:12 4QDeut k1 2 12 4000ES – Possible difference in pronunciation.

Q725 MT Deut 11:12 4QDeut k1 2 13 שנה 4QDeut k1 lacks the conjunction.

Q726 MT Deut 19:9 4QDeut k2 1 3 מֹצֶרֶךְ 4QDeut k2 lacks the conjunction.

Q727 MT Deut 19:10 4QDeut k2 1 5 עִלְיָדָה OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.

Q728 MT Deut 19:11 4QDeut k2 1 6 omits מ 4QDeut k2 lacks the preposition מ.

Q729 MT Deut 19:11 4QDeut k2 1 6 דַּלְוָה 4QDeut k2 lacks the conjunction.

Q730 MT Deut 19:14 4QDeut k2 1 8 בֶּן-חֹלֶתֶחֶה 4QDeut k2 lacks the conjunction.

Q731 MT Deut 20:8 4QDeut k2 2-3 3 סֵפֶרִים OV(2) – 4QDeut k2 has a clarifying plus.

Q732 MT Deut 20:11 4QDeut k2 2-3 6 רַנְכָּה 4QDeut k2 lacks the conjunction.

Q733 MT Deut 20:11 4QDeut k2 2-3 6 לָה 4QDeut k2 lacks the conjunction.

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 See Q638 above, and the comments in note .

1231 The form in 4QDeut k2 either replaces the term ספֵּרִים, “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 k2.
| Q734 | MT Deut 20:13 | ו },{ה | OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation. |
| 4QDeut$^k_2$ 2-3 8 | \( \text{וֹרֵחָה} \) | |
| Q735 | MT Deut 20:16 | ל \( \text{ד} \) | OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation. |
| 4QDeut$^k_2$ 2-3 11 | \( \text{הוֹרֵחָה} \) | |
| Q736 | MT Deut 20:17 | הדוה | SV(1) – The MT lacks the conjunction. |
| 4QDeut$^k_2$ 2-3 12 | \( \text{דֹּהָה} \) | |
| Q737 | MT Deut 23:24 | בָּפֶּר \( \text{ה} \) | OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation. |
| 4QDeut$^k_2$ 4 3 | \( \text{בָּפֶּר} \) | |
| Q738 | MT Deut 23:25 | הַלְּכָּה \( \text{ה} \) | OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation. |
| 4QDeut$^k_2$ 4 4 | \( \text{הַלְּכָּה} \) | |
| Q739 | MT Deut 24:3 | omissions \( \text{לָו} \) | SV(2) – 4QDeut$^k_2$ has an expansive plus. \footnote{1232} |
| 4QDeut$^k_2$ 4 8 | \( \text{לָו} \) | |
| Q740 | MT Deut 26:1 | אָלְדָּךְ \( \text{ה} \) | OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation. |
| 4QDeut$^k_2$ 5 2 | \( \text{אָלְדָּךְ} \) | |
| Q741 | MT Deut 26:2 | וֹלְכָּה \( \text{ו} \) | OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation. |
| 4QDeut$^k_2$ 5 4 | \( \text{וֹלְכָּה} \) | |
| Q742 | MT Deut 26:2 | שָׁמָּה \( \text{מ} \) | SV(1) – The MT lacks the locative \( \text{ל} \). \footnote{1233} |
| 4QDeut$^k_2$ 5 5 | \( \text{שָׁמָּה} \) | |
| Q743 | MT Deut 26:3 | לַחֲמָה \( \text{י} \) | SV(1) – Interchange of prepositions. |
| 4QDeut$^k_2$ 5 6 | \( \text{לַחֲמָה} \) | |

\footnote{1232} The phrase in 4QDeut$^k_2$ 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. 

\footnote{1233} The phrase in 4QDeut$^k_2$ is restored: \( \text{אָלְדָּךְ} \) \( \text{לָו} \) \( \text{אָלְדָּךְ} \) \( \text{לָו} \) \( \text{אָלְדָּךְ} \) \( \text{לָו} \), literally “to the place that Yahweh your god will choose to put his name there.” The locative marker in 4QDeut$^k_2$ 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 4QDeut$^k_2$ is noted as an orthographic variant, but the reasons for this are unclear.
Q744 MT Deut 26:4 omits
4QDeut k2 5 7
אַל
SV(1) – The MT lacks the object marker.

Q745 MT Deut 26:18
4QDeut k2 6-7 1
לְ
OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.

Q746 MT Deut 31:12
4QDeut l 6-7 1
אֶלְהָהָי
SV(1) – Difference in person.1234

Q747 MT Deut 34:6
4QDeut l 10 3
רֶה
SV(1) – 4QDeut l lacks the object marker.1235

Q748 MT Deut 3:19
4QDeut m 1-3 2
נִשְׂבְּכָה
OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.

Q749 MT Deut 3:19
4QDeut m 1-3 2
נְפִסְכָה
OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.

Q750 MT Deut 3:19
4QDeut m 1-3 2 su
נְפִיסְכָה
OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.

Q751 MT Deut 3:30 omits
4QDeut m 1-3 3
לִבָּה
OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.

Q752 MT Deut 3:20 omits
SV(2) – 4QDeut m has an expa-

1234 The reading in 4QDeut l is restored אַלְּהָהָי 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 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 l is restored אַלְּהָהָי רֶה חֹבָה מִשְׂבְּכָה נְפִסְכָה לִבָּה מִשְׂבְּכָה וְִתְכֹּה וְִתְכֹּה לִבָּה מִשְׂבְּכָה וְִתְכֹּה לִבָּה מִשְׂבְּכָה וְִתְכֹּה לִבָּה מִשְׂבְּכָה וְִתְכֹּה לִבָּה מִשְׂבְּכָה וְִתְכֹּה לִבָּה מִשְׂבְּכָה וְִתְכֹּה לִבָּה מִשְׂבְּכָה וְִתְכֹּה לִבָּה מִשְׂבְּכָה וְִתְכֹּה לִבָּה מִשְׂבְּכָה וְִתְכֹּה לִבָּה מִשְׂבְּכָה וְִתְכֹּה לִבָּה מִשְׂבְּכָה וְִתְכֹּה לִבָּה מִשְׂבְּכָה וְִתְכֹּה לִבָּה מִשְׂבְּכָה וְִתְכֹּה לִבָּה מִשְׂבְּכָה וְִתְכֹּה לִבָּה מִשְׂבְּכָה וְִתְכֹּה LXX has καὶ ἐθαψαν αὐτον, “And they buried him,” which would support reading the form in 4QDeut 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 בַּרְאよ אָחי מְלֹא אֵל מְלֹא אָחי מְלֹא אֵל מְלֹא אֵל מְלֹא אֵל מְלֹא אֵל מְלֹא אֵל מְלֹא אֵל מְלֹא אֵל מְלֹא אֵל מְלֹא אֵל מְלֹא אֵל מְלֹא אֵל מְלֹא אֵל מְלֹא אֵל מְלֹא אֵל מְלֹא אֵל מְלֹא אֵל מְלֹא אֵל מְלֹא אֵל מְלֹא אֵל מְלֹא אֵל מְלֹא אֵל
4QDeut\textsuperscript{m} 1-3 3\textsuperscript{sup} אל הרותה

Q753 MT Deut 3:20 לא אהתם OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.
4QDeut\textsuperscript{m} 1-3 3 לא אהתם

Q754 MT Deut 3:20 בקם OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.
4QDeut\textsuperscript{m} 1-3 3 בקם

Q755 MT Deut 3:20 אה OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.
4QDeut\textsuperscript{m} 1-3 4 אה

Q756 MT Deut 3:20 אלהים אלוהים OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.
4QDeut\textsuperscript{m} 1-3 4 אלהים אלהים

Q757 MT Deut 3:20 לא OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.
4QDeut\textsuperscript{m} 1-3 4 לא

Q758 MT Deut 3:21 הדוהי OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.
4QDeut\textsuperscript{m} 1-3 5 הדוהי

Q759 MT Deut 3:21 שמה OV(l) – 4QDeut\textsuperscript{m} lacks the locative יי.\textsuperscript{1238}
4QDeut\textsuperscript{m} 1-3 7 שמה

Q760 MT Deut 3:22 לא ולחOV(l) – The MT lacks the conjunction.
4QDeut\textsuperscript{m} 1-3 7 לא ולח

Q761 MT Deut 4:32 לא יב OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.
4QDeut\textsuperscript{m} 4 1 לא יב

Q762 MT Deut 4:33 سمחה OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{1236} 4QDeut\textsuperscript{m} has the supralinear addition of the noun plus possessive pronominal suffix, אהלְהָּ, “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, אהלְהָּ, “Yahweh your god,” appears in the following clause in the MT.
\item \textsuperscript{1237} The pronoun refers to הָּ, “time,” read here as a feminine noun. The MT qere has the correct form of the pronoun.
\item \textsuperscript{1238} The omission of the locative הה 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.
\item \textsuperscript{1239} The verb refers to הם, “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.
\end{itemize}
4QDeut\textsuperscript{m} 4 3

\begin{tabular}{lll}
Q763 & MT Deut 7:18 & שָׁמַעְתָּם \end{tabular}

4QDeut\textsuperscript{m} 5 1

\begin{tabular}{lll}
Q764 & MT Deut 7:19 & אַלֶּדֶךָ \end{tabular}

4QDeut\textsuperscript{m} 5 3

\begin{tabular}{lll}
Q765 & MT Deut 7:20 & בָּהְמָה \end{tabular}

4QDeut\textsuperscript{m} 5 4

\begin{tabular}{lll}
Q766 & MT Deut 7:21 & בָּקִרְבָּה \end{tabular}

4QDeut\textsuperscript{m} 5 5

\begin{tabular}{lll}
Q767 & MT Deut 7:22 & לֹקְחָה \end{tabular}

4QDeut\textsuperscript{m} 5 6

\begin{tabular}{lll}
Q768 & MT Deut 7:22 & לַלְּכָּה \end{tabular}

4QDeut\textsuperscript{m} 5 6

\begin{tabular}{lll}
Q769 & MT Deut 8:6 & שָׁמְרָה \end{tabular}

4QDeut\textsuperscript{a} I 1

\begin{tabular}{lll}
Q770 & MT Deut 8:6 & לֶאָרְאָה \end{tabular}

4QDeut\textsuperscript{a} I 3

\begin{tabular}{lll}
Q771 & MT Deut 8:7 & אוּרֶבָּה \end{tabular}

4QDeut\textsuperscript{a} I 3

\begin{tabular}{lll}
Q772 & MT Deut 8:9 & וְתֶהֵרִיתָה \end{tabular}

4QDeut\textsuperscript{n} I 3

Q763-772

OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.

\begin{tabular}{ll}
Q763 & MT Deut 7:18 & שָׁמַעְתָּם \end{tabular}

4QDeut\textsuperscript{m} 4 3

Q770 & MT Deut 8:6 & לֶאָרְאָה \end{tabular}

4QDeut\textsuperscript{a} I 3

SV(1) – The MT lacks the preposition ל.

Q768 & MT Deut 7:22 & לַלְּכָּה \end{tabular}

4QDeut\textsuperscript{m} 5 6

Q769-772

OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.

Q769 & MT Deut 8:6 & שָׁמְרָה \end{tabular}

4QDeut\textsuperscript{a} I 1

Q770 & MT Deut 8:6 & לֶאָרְאָה \end{tabular}

4QDeut\textsuperscript{a} I 3

SV(2) – 4QDeut\textsuperscript{a} has a different phraseology to the MT.\textsuperscript{1240}

Q771 & MT Deut 8:7 & אוּרֶבָּה \end{tabular}

4QDeut\textsuperscript{a} I 3

SV(2) – 4QDeut\textsuperscript{a} has an expansive plus.\textsuperscript{1241}

\begin{tabular}{ll}
Q772 & MT Deut 8:9 & וְתֶהֵרִיתָה \end{tabular}

4QDeut\textsuperscript{n} I 3

\begin{tabular}{ll}
1240 & The phrase in the MT reads: “to walk in his ways, and to fear him,” against the phrase in 4QDeut\textsuperscript{a}: “to walk in his ways, and to love him.” All of the other witnesses support the reading in the MT, against 4QDeut\textsuperscript{a} which reflects the language of Deut 11:13, 22; 19:9; 30:6, 16, 20, for which see S.A. White, "4QDT\textsuperscript{a}: Biblical Manuscript or Excerpted Text?," 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) 18, and E. Ulrich and F.M. Cross, Qumran Cave 4. IX, 122.

1241 & See Q640 and Q694 above for the same reading in 4QDeut\textsuperscript{f} and 4QDeut\textsuperscript{j}. See also the references in note above.
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The text appears to be a page from a document discussing differences in pronunciation and grammatical form between two versions of Deuteronomy, 4QDeutn and MT. It highlights how 4QDeutn sometimes includes additional words or changes the number of words compared to MT.

1242 See Q642 and Q695 above for the same reading in 4QDeutf and 4QDeutj, and the references in note 1.

1243 See Q678 and Q812 for the same reading in 4QDeutj and 4QDeuto, and the references in note 2 above.

1244 The phrase in 4QDeutn reads: Mwy plus the article: אָנֵהוּ מָיְהוּ הָעָם מָיְהוּ מָיְהוּ מָיְהוּ, “those of us here today, all of us alive today.” The MT lacks the second instance of the noun מָיְהוּ while the LXX lacks the first instance of the noun.

1245 The phrase in 4QDeutn reads: בְּךָ, “the words of Yahweh your god.” All of the other witnesses, excepting the Peshitta, agree with the reading in the MT: בְּךָ, “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 nomens regens: בְּךָ, “the words of Yahweh” (see Exod 24:3-4).

1246 4QDeutn is possibly influenced by the phrase מָיְהוּ מָיְ�
Q782 MT Deut 5:10 4QDeut\(^n\) III 7  
**Not Counted** – The distinction between the graphemes is not certain.\(^{1247}\)

Q783 MT Deut 5:13 omits 4QDeut\(^n\) III 10  
SV(1) – The MT lacks the object marker.

Q784 MT Deut 5:14 4QDeut\(^n\) III 11  
**SV(1)** – The MT lacks the preposition ב.

Q785 MT Deut 5:14 omits 4QDeut\(^n\) III 11  
SV(2) – 4QDeut\(^n\) has an expansive plus.\(^{1248}\)

Q786 MT Deut 5:14 4QDeut\(^n\) III 12  
**SV(1)** – 4QDeut\(^n\) lacks the conjunction.

Q787 MT Deut 5:14 4QDeut\(^n\) III 12  
**SV(1)** – 4QDeut\(^n\) lacks the conjunction.

Q788 MT Deut 5:14 4QDeut\(^n\) III 12  
**SV(1)** – 4QDeut\(^n\) lacks the conjunction.

Q789 MT Deut 5:14 4QDeut\(^n\) IV 1 omits  
SV(2) – The MT has an expansive plus.\(^{1249}\)

Q790 MT Deut 5:14 4QDeut\(^n\) IV 1  
**SV(1)** – 4QDeut\(^n\) lacks the conjunction.

Q791 MT Deut 5:15  
**OV(I)** – Possible difference in

---

\(^{1247}\) Although the text is transliterated in E. Ulrich and F.M. Cross, *Qumran Cave 4. IX*, 124, as יִתְנְךָא, the note to the text there states that ""waw and yod are indistinguishable in this script, therefore the 4QDeut\(^n\) reading is materially uncertain."

\(^{1248}\) The phrase in 4QDeut\(^n\) reads: פֹּלֶל לָא אֲשֶׁר יִפְעַשֶּׁה, "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 4QDeut\(^n\), both in terms of the use of the conjunction waw (see Q786, Q787 and Q788 above) and in the omission of the construct noun לָא. 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 | 4QDeut® IV 4 | לְשׁוֹנָה | SV(2) – 4QDeut® has a different phraseology to the MT. ①250 |
| Q793 | MT Deut 5:15 | omit | 4QDeut® IV 5-7 | כִּיְִהְשַׁתְּ יָמִים | SV(2) – 4QDeut® has an expansive plus. ①251 |
| Q794 | MT Deut 5:18 | לֶא | 4QDeut® IV 9 | לֶא | SV(1) – 4QDeut® lacks the conjunction. |
| Q795 | MT Deut 5:19 | לֶא | 4QDeut® IV 10 | לֶא | SV(1) – 4QDeut® lacks the conjunction. |
| Q796 | MT Deut 5:20 | לֶא | 4QDeut® IV 10 | לֶא | SV(1) – 4QDeut® lacks the conjunction. |
| Q797 | MT Deut 5:21 | לֶא | 4QDeut® IV 10 | לֶא | SV(1) – 4QDeut® lacks the conjunction. |
| Q798 | MT Deut 5:21 | לֶא | 4QDeut® IV 11 | לֶא | SV(1) – 4QDeut® lacks the conjunction. |

①250 See the comments in note above concerning the phrase with both לְשׁוֹנָה and לְשׁוֹנָה in the infinitive construct. In Deuteronomy the two terms are generally used in combination when referring to the proper observation of לְשׁוֹנָה, “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 לְשׁוֹנָה 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 לְשׁוֹנָה in 4QDeut® is “reminiscent of the first word of 5:12.”

①251 4QDeut® has additional text that is harmonised with the end of the fourth commandment in Exod 20:11, with minor differences. It is possible that 4QDeut® contains the more original reading, but this view does give rise to problems concerning the mechanics of such haplography. Instead, the addition in 4QDeut® 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, "4QDeut®," 146, regarding the placement of this plus in Codex Vaticanus and its relationship to the plus in 4QDeut®.
| Q799 | MT Deut 5:21 | 4QDeut\(^a\) IV 11 | ס"ת (1) – Lexical interchange.\(^{1252}\) |
| Q800 | MT Deut 5:21 | 4QDeut\(^a\) IV 11 | ס"ת (1) – 4QDeut\(^a\) lacks the conjunction. |
| Q801 | MT Deut 5:21 | 4QDeut\(^a\) IV 11 | ס"ת (1) – 4QDeut\(^a\) lacks the conjunction. |
| Q802 | MT Deut 5:21 | 4QDeut\(^a\) IV 12 | ס"ת (1) – 4QDeut\(^a\) lacks the conjunction. |
| Q803 | MT Deut 5:22 | 4QDeut\(^a\) V 2 | ס"ת (2) – 4QDeut\(^c\) has an expansive plus.\(^{1253}\) |
| Q804 | MT Deut 5:22 | 4QDeut\(^a\) V 2 | ס"ת (1) – 4QDeut\(^c\) lacks the definite article. |
| Q805 | MT Deut 5:22 | 4QDeut\(^a\) V 2 | ס"ת (1) – 4QDeut\(^c\) lacks the definite article. |
| Q806 | MT Deut 5:24 | 4QDeut\(^a\) V 6 | ס"ת (1) – The MT lacks the preposition ב. |
| Q807 | MT Deut 5:24 | 4QDeut\(^a\) V 6 | ס"ת (1) – Interchange of divine titles. |

\(^{1252}\) The consistent use of the verb $\text{dmx}$, “desire passionately,” in 4QDeut\(^a\) contrasts with the use of $\text{dmx}$ followed by $\text{hw}$, “crave, long for,” in the MT. The tenth commandment in Exodus 20:17 uses $\text{dmx}$ throughout, and it may be that 4QDeut\(^a\) is harmonised with that text (see E. Eshel, "4QDeut\(^a\)," 143). S.A. White, "All Souls Deuteronomy," 203-5, suggests that the difficult verb $\text{hw}$ in the MT was replaced with the more well known form in 4QDeut\(^c\). 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\(^a\).

\(^{1253}\) 4QDeut\(^c\) has an extra noun in the description of the delivery of the commandments on Sinai, which reads: $\text{mwr}$ $\text{hw}$ $\text{Nn}$ $\text{K#wx} \text{Kwtm}$, “from the midst of the fire, darkness, cloud and murkiness.” The reading in 4QDeut\(^c\) 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
4QDeut\textsuperscript{\textdegree} V 9
\textit{זיווה} vs. \textit{זיווה}.
SV(1) – Difference in number.\textsuperscript{1254}

Q809 MT Deut 5:27
4QDeut\textsuperscript{\textdegree} V 10
\textit{אפר} vs. \textit{אפר}.
SV(1) – Lexical interchange.\textsuperscript{1255}

Q810 MT Deut 5:27
4QDeut\textsuperscript{\textdegree} V 10
\textit{אתא} vs. \textit{אתא}.
OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.\textsuperscript{1256}

Q811 MT Deut 5:27
4QDeut\textsuperscript{\textdegree} VI 3
\textit{למה} vs. \textit{למה}.
OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.

Q812 MT Deut 5:1
4QDeut\textsuperscript{\textdegree} 5 1
\textit{שמה} vs. \textit{שמה}.
OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation or grammatical form.\textsuperscript{1257}

Q813 MT Deut 5:9
4QDeut\textsuperscript{\textdegree} 6-7 2
\textit{תנברש} vs. \textit{תנברש}.
Not Counted – The placement of the fragment is uncertain.\textsuperscript{1258}

Q814 MT Deut 32:37 omits
4QDeut\textsuperscript{\textdegree} I 1
\textit{ידיה}.
SV(2) – 4QDeut\textsuperscript{\textdegree} has an expansive plus.\textsuperscript{1259}

Q815 MT Deut 32:37 omits
4QDeut\textsuperscript{\textdegree} I 2
\textit{אשה}.
SV(1) – The MT lacks the relative pronoun.

\textsuperscript{1254} The phrase translated as “the living god” appears with both the singular and plural adjective \textit{זיווה}, “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, “4QDeut\textsuperscript{\textdegree},” 141-42, the change from a plural adjective to a singular adjective is exegetical.

\textsuperscript{1255} The use of the verb \textit{רבד} in 4QDeut\textsuperscript{\textdegree} harmonises with the same verb in the next clause. All of the other witnesses support the reading in the MT.

\textsuperscript{1256} See note above.

\textsuperscript{1257} See the comments in note above, and the same reading in Q678 and Q775.

\textsuperscript{1258} 4QDeuto may be restored: \textit{וילא תשביך לאו} \textit{ידיה}, “and you shall not serve them,” against the reading in the MT \textit{וילא תשביך לאו} \textit{ידיה}, “and you shall not serve them.” In this reading the dative pronominal object suffix is marked with \textit{nota dativi} \textsuperscript{7} in 4QDeut\textsuperscript{\textdegree} against being appended directly to the verbal predicate in the MT. However, as noted in E. Ulrich and F.M. Cross, \textit{Qumran Cave 4. IX}, 131-32, the placement of fragments 6 and 7 of 4QDeut\textsuperscript{\textdegree} is not certain, and it remains a possibility that the fragments preserve a text or texts that agree with the MT here.

\textsuperscript{1259} The subject is clarified in 4QDeut\textsuperscript{\textdegree}: \textit{אמר אליהו} \textit{ידיה}, “And Yahweh will say.”
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Q816 MT Deut 32:42
4QDeut⁴ II 2
סְדֶּרֶךְ
OV(1) – Difference in grammatical form.¹²⁶⁰

Q817 MT Deut 32:42
4QDeut⁴ II 5
מַרְאֶה
SV(1) – The MT lacks the conjunction.

Q818 MT Deut 32:43
4QDeut⁴ II 6
ניָרָה
SV(2) – 4QDeut⁴ has a different expression to the MT.¹²⁶¹

Q819 MT Deut 32:43
omits
SV(2) – 4QDeut⁴ has an expan-

¹²⁶⁰ The form in 4QDeut⁴ is restored: סְדֶּרֶךְ. On the long form of the 1cs imperfect סְדֶּרֶךְ 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 סְדֶּרֶךְ denote the indicative alongside the forms hl+q, 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 ה in Qumran Hebrew see note above.

¹²⁶¹ The colon in 4QDeut⁴ reads: מַרְאֶה, “Rejoice, o heavens, (in) his people” (or “with him”). The LXX seems to have translated a similar Vorlage: εὐφρανθητε οὐρανοι αμα αυτω, “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: מַרְאֶה, מַרְאֶה, רְאֵהוּ נATIONS נְסָפוּ, “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 Perllt (eds R.G. Kratz and H. Spiekermann; Göttingen: Vandenhoek & Ruprecht, 2000) 167. Such a view would demand that the variant is read as a difference in hermeneutic, where the term מַרְאֶה, 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Scroll</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q820</td>
<td>MT Deut 32:43</td>
<td>4QDeut² II 8</td>
<td>מֵעַבֵּדִים</td>
<td>SV(2) – 4QDeut² has a different expression to the MT.¹²⁶³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q821</td>
<td>MT Deut 32:43</td>
<td>4QDeut² II 10</td>
<td>מֵעַבֵּדִים</td>
<td>SV(2) – 4QDeut² has an expansive plus.¹²⁶⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q822</td>
<td>MT Deut 32:43</td>
<td>4QDeut² II 11</td>
<td>מֵעַבֵּדִים</td>
<td>OV(I) – Difference in grammatical form.¹²⁶⁵</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q823</td>
<td>MT Deut 32:43</td>
<td>4QDeut² II 11</td>
<td>מֵעַבֵּדִים</td>
<td>SV(2) – The MT has an expansive plus.¹²⁶⁶</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q824</td>
<td>MT Deut 12:3</td>
<td>4QpaleoDeut¹ 15 2</td>
<td>מַעֲבַדְתָּם</td>
<td>OV(I) – Possible difference in pronunciation.¹²⁶⁷</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q825</td>
<td>MT Deut 7:4</td>
<td>4QpaleoDeut¹ 5-6 6</td>
<td>מַעֲבַדְתָּם</td>
<td>SV(1) – Difference in number.¹²⁶⁸</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 4QDeut².  
¹²⁶³ The phrase in the MT is harmonised with the phrase in verse 36 (see W.F. Albright, "Some Remarks," 341).  
¹²⁶⁴ 4QDeut² is again supported by the reading in the LXX. See the references in note above.  
¹²⁶⁵ The waw consecutive plus perfect in the MT is written as waw conjunctive plus imperfect in 4QDeut².  
¹²⁶⁶ The object is specified in the MT as מַעֲבַדְתָּם, "his land." The reading in 4QDeut², which lacks the possessive pronominal suffix, is supported by the SP and the LXX (see E. Ulrich and F.M. Cross, *Qumran Cave 4. IX*, 142). The reading in 4QDeut² renders the final phrase as a construct chain מַעֲבַדְתָּם, "the land of his people," against the difficult reading in the MT מַעֲבַדְתָּם, "his land (and) his people." The LXX has an expansive plus not reflected in 4QDeut², 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 4QDeut² is to read the final waw on the 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 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 *The Relevance of Linguistic Evidence*, 11:1-24.  
¹²⁶⁷ According to E. Qimron, *Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 63 n. 81, the short form of the 3mpl pronominal suffix following the fpl marker‰ 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."  
¹²⁶⁸ The verb refers to the masculine singular noun יַעֲבַד, so the form in 4QpaleoDeut¹ is grammatically correct and is supported by the reading in the SP. On *Numeruswechsel* in Deuteronomy see note above.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q826</th>
<th>MT Deut 7:19</th>
<th>סָרַת סָרַת</th>
<th>SV(1) – 4QpaleoDeut lacks the conjunction.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q827</td>
<td>MT Deut 7:24</td>
<td>תְנִינָה לְפִינָה</td>
<td>SV(1) – Interchange of prepositions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q828</td>
<td>MT Deut 7:25</td>
<td>הָתֹם הָתֹם</td>
<td>SV(1) – Difference in number.1269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q829</td>
<td>MT Deut 12:1</td>
<td>אֵלָה אֵלָה</td>
<td>SV(1) – The MT lacks the conjunction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q830</td>
<td>MT Deut 13:19</td>
<td>חַיֵּר [קְיָב]</td>
<td>SV(2) – 4QpaleoDeut has an expansive plus.1270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q831</td>
<td>MT Deut 14:19</td>
<td>אֶתְכָּלָה</td>
<td>SV(2) – Difference in expression.1271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q832</td>
<td>MT Deut 15:8</td>
<td>אֲנָה</td>
<td>SV(1) – 4QpaleoDeut lacks the object marker.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q833</td>
<td>MT Deut 23:14</td>
<td>הָיָה</td>
<td>SV(1) – The MT lacks the definite article.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1269 In the MT the first verb in the verse is the 2mpl form בָּרַשׁ, “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: לְשׁוֹן חֹשֶׁם מָתַח בְּעָזַי יִהוָה, “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 רַצֶּנֶנּוּ (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: מִמָּשָׁה הָא לֹא אַחֲרֵי מְדִינָה, “it is unclean to you, you shall not eat (it).” In contrast the MT constructs the phrase thus: מִמָּשָׁה הָא לֹא אַחֲרֵי מְדִינָה, “it is unclean to you, they shall not be eaten.” The form in 4QpaleoDeut is read as a Qal 2ms of לָבֵן, “to eat,” against the Niphal 3mpl in the MT.
| Q834 | MT Deut 23:14 | נפשי | וָבָּת | 4QpaleoDeut 31-32 | הַשְׂפָּה | SV(1) – Lexical interchange.  
1272 The Qal of √בָּת, “to return,” is written as Hiph’il 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’il of √בָּת cf. Ps 85:4. |
| Q835 | MT Deut 28:15 | תְּפִלֵיהּ | וָבָּת | 4QpaleoDeut 33 2 | הַשְׂפָּה | SV(1) – Difference in number.  
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. |
| Q836 | MT Deut 28:15 | אֲלָה | וָבָּת | 4QpaleoDeut 33 3-4 | אֲלָה | SV(1) – 4QpaleoDeut lacks the definite article. |
| Q837 | MT Deut 28:19 | אֶחָד אֶתְהֹדָה בֶּן־בָּתֵא | וָבָּת | 4QpaleoDeut 33 6 | בֶּן־בָּתֵא | omits | SV(2) – The MT has an expansive plus.  
1274 The phrase in the MT is אָכְרָד אֶתְהֹדָה בֶּן־בָּתֵא ... בֶּן־בָּתֵא, “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: ... בֶּן־בָּתֵא. The lack of the fourth repetition of this curse formula may be due to haplography in 4QpaleoDeut. |
| Q838 | MT Deut 33:3 | וֹהָר | וֹהָר | 4QpaleoDeut 42-43 | וֹהָר | OV(l) – Difference in grammatical form.  
1275 See the comments on the forms with paragogic nun in note above. |
| Q839 | MT Deut 33:7 | לַמַּלְתָּה | לַמַּלְתָּה | 4QpaleoDeut 42-43 | לַמַּלְתָּה | SV(1) – The MT lacks the preposition ב. |
| Q840 | MT Deut 33:7 | וֹל | וֹל | 4QpaleoDeut 42-43 | וֹל | omits | SV(2) – 4QpaleoDeut has an explicating plus.  
1276 4QpaleoDeut clarifies the subject by adding the nota dativi plus pronominal suffix, perhaps to harmonise the phrase with the phrase preceding: ... (with) his hands he has contended for him, and you will be a help for him from his enemies.” |
| Q842 | MT Deut 7:15 | 5QDeut 1 i 1 | omits | ấparris vətəsəm | SV(2) – 5QDeut has an expansive plus.1277 |
| Q843 | MT Deut 7:17 | 5QDeut 1 i 3 | conjunction. | 蔼əh | OV(I) – Possible difference in pronunciation.1278 |
| Q844 | MT Deut 7:19 | 5QDeut 1 i 4 | omits | ǐm | SV(2) – 5QDeut has an expansive plus.1279 |
| Q845 | MT Deut 7:19 | 5QDeut 1 i 4 | conjunction. | ǐdən | SV(1) – 5QDeut lacks the conjunction. |
| Q846 | MT Deut 7:19 | 5QDeut 1 i 4 | pronunciation. | ǐdən | OV(I) – Possible difference in pronunciation.1280 |
| Q847 | MT Deut 8:9 | 5QDeut 1 ii 4 | conjunction. | ǚnəhərəId | OV(I) – Possible difference in pronunciation.1281 |
| Q848 | MT Deut 8:12 | 5QDeut 1 ii 6 | omits | ǐm | SV(2) – 5QDeut has an expansive plus.1282 |
| Q849 | MT Deut 8:13 | 5QDeut 1 ii 6 | conjunction. | ǐbkər | 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: και πᾶσας νοσούς Ἀιγυπτοῦ 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: “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(I).

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: εν αυταις, “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>Q850</th>
<th>MT Deut 8:17</th>
<th>בְּלַמֵּךְ</th>
<th>SV(1) – Difference in number.1283</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5QDeut 1 ii 9</td>
<td>בְּלַמֵּךְ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q851</th>
<th>MT Deut 8:19</th>
<th>אֶזָּה</th>
<th>SV(1) – The MT lacks the conjunction plus object marker.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5QDeut 1 ii 12</td>
<td>אֶזָּה</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q852</th>
<th>MT Gen 6:19</th>
<th>אַךְ</th>
<th>OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6QpaleoGen 8</td>
<td>אַךְ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q853</th>
<th>MT Gen 6:20</th>
<th>לָמֵיה</th>
<th>SV(1) – Difference in number.1284</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6QpaleoGen 9</td>
<td>לָמֵיה</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q854</th>
<th>MT Lev 4:25</th>
<th>אֱלֹהֵי הָא</th>
<th>SV(1) – The MT has an expansive plus.1285</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11QpaleoLev⁵ frg. A</td>
<td>אֱלֹהֵי הָא</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q855</th>
<th>MT Lev 4:26</th>
<th>בְּהֵלַת הָבִית הֶלְמִית</th>
<th>SV(1) – The MT has an expansive plus.1286</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11QpaleoLev⁵ frg. A</td>
<td>בְּהֵלַת הָבִית הֶלְמִית</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q856</th>
<th>MT Lev 10:7</th>
<th>בְּשֵׁשָּה</th>
<th>SV(1) – 11QpaleoLev⁵ lacks the preposition ב.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11QpaleoLev⁵ frg. B</td>
<td>בְּשֵׁשָּה</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1283 5QDeut reads: יָדִידָה בְּלַמֵּךְ, “[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: יַאֲמַרְתָּ יִדְיָדָה בְּלַמֵּךְ / יַאֲמַרְתָּ יִדְיָדָה בְּלַמֵּךְ. 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 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).

1285 The precise placement of fragment A of 11QpaleoLev⁵ 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 כְּאֶזְרַע יָמֵה, “he shall pour out its blood,” in the MT is written as יָמֵה כְּאֶזְרַע, “its blood,” which is lacking in 11QpaleoLev⁵. 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 כְּאֶזְרַע יָמֵה, “its blood,” which is lacking in 11QpaleoLev⁵.

1286 See the reference in the note above. The most likely reading is that the phrase בְּהֵלַת הָבִית הֶלְמִית, “like the fat of the sacrifice of the peace offering,” is lacking in 11QpaleoLev⁵.
Q857 MT Lev 11:27  
11QpaleoLev\(^a\) frg. C 1  
על הבחי  
SV(2) – 11QpaleoLev\(^a\) has a different expression to the MT.\(^{1287}\)

Q858 MT Lev 13:42  
11QpaleoLev\(^a\) frg. E 3  
בקרחת  
SV(2) – 11QpaleoLev\(^a\) has an expansive plus.\(^{1288}\)

Q859 MT Lev 14:16  
11QpaleoLev\(^a\) frg. F 2  
מגיסים  
SV(2) – The MT has an expansive plus.\(^{1289}\)

Q860 MT Lev 14:17  
11QpaleoLev\(^a\) frg. F 3  
והנה דא  
SV(2) – 11QpaleoLev\(^a\) has a different expression to the MT.\(^{1290}\)

Q861 MT Lev 14:20  
11QpaleoLev\(^a\) frg. F 7  
עלי ב  
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: בֵל הוֹלָלֵל שִׁל מַיִן, “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 וּבְקַרְחָת, “dip,” and the instrument of the verb וּבְקַרְחָת, “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 יָקָפָר, “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 יָלַי for יָלְי 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 יָלַי is the most likely explanation of this variant (so D.N. Freedman and K.A. Mathews, 31).
11QpaleoLev\textsuperscript{a} frg. G

7

ב יהי גז

pansive plus.\textsuperscript{1292}

Q863

MT Lev 17:2

11QpaleoLev\textsuperscript{a} frg. H

omits

 المصر

SV(2) – The MT has an expansive plus.\textsuperscript{1293}

Q864

MT Lev 17:5

11QpaleoLev\textsuperscript{a} frg. H

omits

[ך]ז

OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.\textsuperscript{1294}

Q865

MT Lev 18:27

11QpaleoLev\textsuperscript{a} frg. I

omits

ברא

OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.\textsuperscript{1295}

Q866

MT Lev 18:27

11QpaleoLev\textsuperscript{a} frg. I

omits

סח ורס[ת] לא א[הל]ך

SV(2) – 11QpaleoLev\textsuperscript{a} has an expansive plus.\textsuperscript{1296}

Q867

MT Lev 18:30

11QpaleoLev\textsuperscript{a} frg. I

omits

בי

SV(1) – The MT lacks the conjunctive particle ב.

Q868

MT Lev 20:2

11QpaleoLev\textsuperscript{a}

ומני ישראל

SV(2) – Difference in expres-

\textsuperscript{1292} The final phrase of Lev 15:3 in the MT reads: "ממה המת מת בת, "it (is) his uncleanness." 11QpaleoLev\textsuperscript{a} has the longer phrase, restored: "ממה המת מת בת בת בת בת, "It (is) his uncleanness all the days that it flows." The reading in the LXX agrees with the reading in 11QpaleoLev\textsuperscript{a}, for which see D.N. Freedman and K.A. Mathews, 32-33.

\textsuperscript{1293} The sons of Aaron are not mentioned in 11QpaleoLev\textsuperscript{a}, 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).

\textsuperscript{1294} The scribe of 11QpaleoLev\textsuperscript{a} appears to confuse the phones [ח] and [ך]. There is some evidence for the commutation of certain laryngeals in this scroll, for which see D.N. Freedman and K.A. Mathews, 80.

\textsuperscript{1295} See the comments in note above.

\textsuperscript{1296} The reading in 11QpaleoLev\textsuperscript{a} is restored: "אתו והרשה ארבעת". "you shall inherit their land." Both the SP and the LXX support the shorted reading in the MT. 11QpaleoLev\textsuperscript{a} may be influenced by the similar phrase in Lev 20:24 (see D.N. Freedman and K.A. Mathews, 36).
The phrase in 11QpaleoLev\(^a\) reads: "אש אבס מבית ישראל," “any man from among the house Israel,” against the MT: "אש אבס מבית ישראל," “any man from among the sons of Israel.” The idiom selected in 11QpaleoLev\(^a\) is semantically identical but stylistically different from that selected in the MT. That in 11QpaleoLev\(^a\) 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\(^a\) may then have harmonised the idiom in Lev 20:2 with that which was more familiar.

11QpaleoLev\(^a\) is restored: "בר כתרת אש יתיה מקריסת," “because I, Yahweh, am holy (who) sanctifies them,” against the MT: "בר כתרת אש יתיה מקריסת," “because I, Yahweh, am holy (who) sanctifies you.” The LXX supports the reading in 11QpaleoLev\(^a\).

On the list of defects that render offering unsuitable, the fourth and sixth items are reversed in 11QpaleoLev\(^a\). 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: "םש photoshop גבם," “they (are) corruptions.” This is against the reading in the MT that has the the pronominal subject suffix appended to the singular noun followed by the preposition ב plus 3mpl pronominal suffix: "םש photoshop גבם," “their corruption (is) in them.”
| Q875 | MT Lev 24:10 | אֵשׁ | וַדַּעְתָּם | SV(1) – The MT lacks the definite article.  
11QpaleoLev^a III 5 |  |
| Q876 | MT Lev 24:12 | יִנְיֵהוּ | וְיֵשִׁיכְתָּם | SV(1) – The MT lacks the object marker.  
11QpaleoLev^a III 7-8 |  |
| Q877 | MT Lev 25:30 | אָשֶׁר | omit | SV(1) – 11QpaleoLev^a lacks the relative pronoun.  
11QpaleoLev^a IV 3 |  |
| Q878 | MT Lev 25:31 | יַדְתָּר | יֵשִׁיכְתָּר | SV(1) – Difference in number.  
11QpaleoLev^a IV 5 |  |
| Q879 | MT Lev 25:31 | בֹּנְבֵל | בָּלָבָל | SV(1) – 11QpaleoLev^a lacks the conjunction.  
11QpaleoLev^a IV 5 |  |
| Q880 | MT Lev 25:32 | אָוָהָה | אָוָהָה | OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.  
11QpaleoLev^a IV 6 |  |
| Q881 | MT Lev 25:34 | מְרֹה | מְסָר | OV(l) – Possible difference in pronunciation.  
11QpaleoLev^a IV 7 |  |
| Q882 | MT Lev 26:19 | אֵשַׁת | omit | SV(1) – 11QpaleoLev^a lacks the object marker.  
11QpaleoLev^a V 2 |  |
| Q883 | MT Lev 26:22 | וִיהֵשׁ לָהֵר | SV(1) – Lexical interchange.  
11QpaleoLev^a |  |

---

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, חֵיוֹן הָעָרִים, “village houses,” so the form in 11QpaleoLev^a is grammatically correct. The SP and the LXX support the reading in 11QpaleoLev^a.

1303 On the elision of הֶה in 11QpaleoLev^a see D.N. Freedman and K.A. Mathews, 45, 55, and E. Qimron, Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls, 25-26. See also Q864 and note above.

1304 On the weakening of רֵשׁ in pronunciation in Qumran Hebrew E. Qimron, Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls, 26-27.

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.
11QpaleoLev\textsuperscript{a} V 7

Q884 MT Lev 26:22 アリ omitSV(2) – The MT has an expansive plus.\textsuperscript{1306}

Q885 MT Lev 26:24 omitSV(2) – 11QpaleoLev\textsuperscript{a} has an expansive plus.\textsuperscript{1307}

Q886 MT Lev 27:19 omitSV(1) – The MT lacks the object marker.

Q887 MT Lev 9:23 omitSV(2) – 11QLev\textsuperscript{b} has an expansive plus.\textsuperscript{1308}

Q888 MT Lev 9:24 omitSV(2) – 11QLev\textsuperscript{b} has a different direct object to the MT.\textsuperscript{1309}

Q889 MT Lev 10:1 omitSV(2) – 11QLev\textsuperscript{b} has an expansive plus.\textsuperscript{1310}

Q901 MT Lev 13:59 omitSV(1) – 11QLev\textsuperscript{b} lacks the definite article.

Q890 MT Lev 10:1 omitSV(2) – 11QLev\textsuperscript{b} has an expansive plus.\textsuperscript{1311}

Q901 MT Lev 13:59 insertSV(1) – 11QLev\textsuperscript{b} lacks the definite article.

\textsuperscript{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 11QpaleoLev\textsuperscript{a}. In the SP the phrase contains a different emphatic construction: "I, also I, shall walk with you in hostility" while the LXX has: πορεύσαμαι καγώ μεθ ὑμῶν θυμω πλαγιω, "I shall walk, even with you, with crooked wrath". See the following variant for the full phrase in 11QpaleoLev\textsuperscript{a}.

\textsuperscript{1307} The phrase in 11QpaleoLev\textsuperscript{a} reads: "and I shall walk with you in fierce hostility." The phrase is possibly influenced by the same construction in Lev 26:28.

\textsuperscript{1308} 11QLev\textsuperscript{b} specifies מ( lk, "all the people."

\textsuperscript{1309} 11QLev\textsuperscript{b} has the phrase restored as: יהלימס מ( לך הום פלא, "the peace offering fat," or perhaps "the fat, the peace offering." The MT lacks the second term, having only the noun יהלימה, "the fat."

\textsuperscript{1310} 11QLev\textsuperscript{b} clarifies the number of sons of Aaron, restored on the basis of the LXX: ות ברי אורות, "the two sons of Aaron."

\textsuperscript{1311} The reading in 11QLev\textsuperscript{b} clarifies the subject, namely Yahweh.
Q893 MT Lev 13:59
11QLev\(^b\) 3 4
ולמרות

Q894 MT Lev 25:33
11QLev\(^b\) 3 5
ביח נל

Q895 MT Gen 46:7
MasGen 1
תֵּאָה הָרֵם

Q896 MT Gen 46:8
MasGen 2
תֵּאָה הָרֵמָה

Q897 MT Gen 46:8
MasGen 2
תֵּאָה הָרֵמָה יִּכְבּ

11QLev\(^b\) 3 5
מלככ

1312 The form in the MT is read as a preposition l plus Pi’el infinitive construct with an appended pronominal object suffix: ולמרות, “to pronounce it clean,” against the preposition plus feminine noun with appended pronominal object suffix in 11QLev\(^b\): למדכת, “for its cleanness.” 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.\footnote{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.} By far the most common variations between the orthography of the sources and that of the MT involve the use of \textit{matres lectionis} to represent the long and short 'i' and 'o' class vowels. Also relatively frequent is the writing of the digraph  snapchat to represent [i]; the defective writing of some suffixes, such as the marker of mpl nouns  , and the marker of fpl nouns  . In general it is fair to state that the majority of Torah scrolls from Qumran reflect a \textit{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.\footnote{On the use of the terms 'plene' and 'defective' see the useful description in W. Weinberg, \textit{The History of Hebrew Plene Spelling} (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1985) 3-7. Weinberg designates as \textit{plene} an orthographic style that employs \textit{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 \textit{plene} never means that every long vowel is rendered by a \textit{mater lectionis}, nor does defective mean that no \textit{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," \textit{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," \textit{Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text} (eds F.M. Cross and S. Talmon; Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1975) 196-211.} By contrast the scrolls from find-sites other than Qumran show a distinct alignment with the orthographic style of the MT.
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 ʕ- on various forms, such as on pronominal suffixes, independent pronouns, 2ms, 2mpl and 2fpl verbal affirmatives, 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[^5]), and the elision of III heh in 4QGen[^8] and 4QGen[^k] (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\textsuperscript{b}, which has a total of six such interchanges (Q489, Q465, Q501, Q505, Q517, Q519), and 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{1318} Another of the pre-Samaritan scrolls, 4QDeut\textsuperscript{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\textsuperscript{m} has the highest concentration of variations, totalling six (Q264, Q269, Q286, Q292, Q296, Q305). 4QExod\textsuperscript{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,

\textsuperscript{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]).

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 adver-
bial 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 exten-
sive 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 expres-
sion 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 (4QExod\textsuperscript{d}, for which see note above). The two remaining instances, however, occur in the well preserved Exodus scroll 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m}, 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 4QDeut\textsuperscript{c}, 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-Exod⁵) and Q122 (4QExod⁶) 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 4QDeut⁴ and the reading in MT Deut 32:43 which mentions “sons of God” and “sons of Israel” respectively. The reading in 4QDeut⁴ is supported by the LXX, and it is possible that 4QDeut⁴ 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 4QDeut⁴ 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 from 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**
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**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, Astrol ogical Reports to Assyrian Kings (Helsinki: Helsinki University Press, 1992). Minor changes in these texts include reference to Venus as m\textsuperscript{in}Dili-ba in text nos. 51, 145, 156, 175, 338, 451, 538 and 539, against the title 9Ninsiana in the tablets; additional phonetic complements in text no. 51 (BM 81-2-4, 86) 5, which has ŠE-am (še’a\textsuperscript{m}) 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 “LÜ.KÜR,” nukurtu, 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 1\textsuperscript{st} and the 30\textsuperscript{th} 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.

\textit{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).

*Mīs 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 transmis-
sion 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 sty-
listic variants exist in 4QNum$^b$ and 4QExod$^m$, both of which may be tentatively associ-
ated with the same tradition that eventually produced the SP. Another scroll that has a
significant number of major stylistic variations is 4QExod$^b$, which has close associations
with the textual tradition underlying the LXX. In this way scrolls that show major stylis-
tic variations or hermeneutic variations relative to the MT are close, in terms of these ma-
jor stylistic and hermeneutic differences, to known textual editions, and do not 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 sig-
nificant 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, 11QpaleoLev⁴ 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. 4QDeut⁶ 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 4QNum⁵, 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 has a total of 156 SU preserved in exact agreement with the MT, while 4QGen b disagrees with the MT in the writing of a single vowel letter by employing mater lectionis in a total of 447 SU. 4QLev c 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 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, Nahal Hever and Wadi Sdeir all have a much closer textual affiliation with
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the MT than do the vast majority of scrolls from Qumran.\textsuperscript{1324} 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, Naḥal Ḫever 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.\textsuperscript{1325}

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.

\textsuperscript{1324} See above, page 288-90.

\textsuperscript{1325} See Q895, Q896 and Q897, all occurring in scrolls from Masada. This number may be extended to four
if 4QGen\textsuperscript{b} 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 4QGen\textsuperscript{b} 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
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 mīš pî stem from copies of the ritual that have been classed as Late Babylonian school texts. The copies of mīš 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 mīš 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 pī 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.’\textsuperscript{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 memorisa-

\textsuperscript{1326} D.M. Carr, \textit{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.” 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.

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.” Such evidence indicates that written texts had begun to serve as “authoritative reference points for the checking of scribal memory.” The ongoing training of scribes under this pro-
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1327 See the description in D.M. Carr, *Writing on the Tablet of the Heart*, 12.
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 Vorlagen, and the extent of such damage. Occasionally variants are noted, or the older script of the 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, *Catalogue*, 5.xxvi-xxix.
1330 D.M. Carr, *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.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.1332 Beneath these generally standardised forms of

1331 D.M. Carr, *Writing on the Tablet of the Heart*, 46.

1332 Rochberg-Halton notes that by the seventh century B.C.E. some cuneiform ‘scientific’ series (particular 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. 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 mīš pî 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.

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," 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 mīṣ pī 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 Assy-
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.
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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. 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.”

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
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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.” 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.

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.” 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. 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 ritualization. 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-
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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-perpetuaing process of textual ritualisation Watts proposes leaves unans-
swered 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 pro-
posed by Watts. While the process of education-enculturation in pre-exilic Israel is envi-
sioned 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 posi-
tions 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.” 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.

1346 D.M. Carr, *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. 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.

---

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 Xth 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, Nahal 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.

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.”

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.\textsuperscript{1351} 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.\textsuperscript{1352} 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.\textsuperscript{1353} 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.”\textsuperscript{1354}

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.

\textsuperscript{1351} See primarily M. Greenberg, "The Stabilization of the Text of the Hebrew Bible," 165-66.


\textsuperscript{1353} F. Garcia-Martinez and A.S. van der Woude, "A 'Gröningen' Hypothesis,'" 525.

\textsuperscript{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. 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

---

1355 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, *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-Martínez 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, *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis: The Parting of the Ways Between Qumran and Enochic Judaism* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998] 53-67).
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 pertain to the ritual and legal cuneiform texts examined from the first millennium B.C.E. In
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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