Emanuel Tov

Scribal Practices and Approaches Revisited[1]

This article includes a response to papers read in an I-SBL session (St. Andrews University, 9 July 2013) that was devoted to the monograph by E. Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert* (STDJ 54; Leiden: Brill, 2004). The conference papers focused on the theory of a special Qumran Scribal Practice.

My book on scribal practices and approaches mainly provides descriptions of data, with little theory. Some of these descriptions offer my personal views, such as my suggestion that certain scrolls were luxury scrolls.[2] I also go into much detail about measurements, *tefillin,* the division into sense units and its background, scribal signs, and writing in paleo-Hebrew.[3] All of these issues have been reviewed in the literature, but one aspect has received far more attention, and perhaps rightly so, because of its significance for understanding of the Qumran scrolls. I refer to my theory about a Qumran Scribal Practice (QSP), summarized in an *Appendix* to this paper.[4] Regarding this theory, I still await an examination of the leather surface and ink of all the scrolls, such as the work carried out by I. Rabin and O. Hahn on the scrolls, in order to stabilize our classifications of the Qumran scrolls. In the meantime, a study by Rabin and Hahn links the Thanksgiving Scroll to the Qumran area.[5] Additional studies of this sort would be greatly helpful for

---

1 This study includes my reactions to the papers read at a session of the I-SBL in St. Andrews on 9 July 2013. The session was dedicated to my monograph *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert* (STDJ 54; Leiden: Brill, 2004). There is also an unchanged paperback edition (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2009). The present article includes further reactions to previously published reviews of the monograph.

2 *Scribal Practices,* 125–129.

3 *Scribal Practices*, 57–104, 125–129, 131–178, 178–218, 238–248, 256–258.

4 More detailed summaries are found in *Scribal Practices*, 261–273 and in my *Textual Criticism of the Bible: An Introduction* (3rd ed., revised and expanded; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2012) = (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 2013), 100–105 (Heb.).

5 "On the Origin of the Ink of the Thanksgiving Scroll (1QHodayotᵃ)," *DSD* 16 (2009): 97–106. See also I. Rabin and O. Hahn, "Characterization of the Dead Sea Scrolls by Advanced Analytical Techniques," *Analytical Methods* 5 (2013): 4648–4654.

either supporting or refuting my views. My book also stresses the independent nature of the external evidence embodied in the *tefillin* written in the QSP. That is, their idiosyncratic content shows that the Qumran community produced them, and that their content may be contrasted with the MT-like *tefillin* that contain rabbinic content.

Theories necessarily start somewhere. Some scholars brainstorm and subsequently develop their ideas. Most of my theories emerged differently, not from abstract ideas but rather from examining texts or data. After examining the orthography of the scrolls, scroll by scroll, my ideas eventually developed into a theory.[6] However, in textual criticism it often suffices to merely describe and analyze the data without developing a theory.

When one proposes a theory it should be viewed as a mere working hypothesis. After all, in our field there are very few solid facts, so that one should accordingly abandon or change one's theory when the need arises. I hope that I have been of the mind not to hold onto something indefensible.

Several scholars have criticized my theory of the QSP,[7] first suggested in 1986.[8] That criticism benefitted my scholarship because I had to change the description and strengthen my views with additional data and arguments.

Most of the criticisms were limited to arguments based on orthography and morphology. This was a natural development as my initial thoughts were limited to those areas, but in due course I also stressed scribal peculiari-

---

6   In other instances, I examined all the transliterations of Hebrew words in the LXX, the minuses of the LXX in Jeremiah and Ezekiel, and the scribal signs in the Dead Sea Scrolls, and eventually my ideas developed into theories.

7   I am aware of the following reviews: F. M. Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran* (3rd ed.; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 174–177; J. Lübbe, "Certain Implications of the Scribal Process of *4QSamᶜ*," *RevQ* 14 (1989–1990): 255–265; J. Cook, "Orthographical Peculiarities in the Dead Sea Biblical Scrolls," *RevQ* 14 (1989–1990): 293–305; E. Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), 111; J. Campbell, "Hebrew and Its Study at Qumran," in *Hebrew Study from Ezra to Ben-Yehuda* (ed. W. Horbury; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1999), 38–52, here 41; A. Lange, "Kriterien essenischer Texte," in *Qumran kontrovers: Beiträge zu den Textfunden vom Toten Meer* (ed. J. Frey and H. Stegemann; Einblicke 6; Paderborn: Bonifatius, 2003), 59–69; E. J. C. Tigchelaar, *DSD* 14 (2007): 368–372; M. Abegg, "The Linguistic Analysis of the Dead Sea Scrolls: More Than (Initially) Meets the Eye," in *How to Read the Dead Sea Scrolls. Methods and Theories in Scrolls Research* (ed. M. Grossman; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 48–68.

8   One review criticized my theory on the basis of my earliest work from 1986, without taking into consideration later developments: D.-Hyuk Kim, "Free Orthography in a Strict Society: Reconsidering Tov's 'Qumran Orthography'," *DSD* 11 (2004): 72–81. I was allowed to publish a brief defense: "Reply to Dong-Hyuk Kim's Paper on "Tov's Qumran Orthography'," *DSD* 11 (2004): 359–360.

ties and the combination of the three sets of data. For the latest formulations of my thoughts, see the references in footnote 4 above.

Justice can be done to the theory only by considering the complete picture. This has been done especially by E. Tigchelaar and M. Abegg in their long review articles[9] as well as by Molly Zahn in her paper at the St. Andrews meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature.[10] Tigchelaar described my thinking in detail and, when a view on a certain scroll was not spelled out, he extracted my thoughts from the information in the tables. His main argument against my views is summed up in his remark at the beginning of his analysis: "The question that concerns us is to what extent we can really discern a distinctive *system* and whether inconsistencies are compatible or not with the system."[11]

The argument concerning inconsistency guided Tigchelaar in a detailed analysis of some of the criteria exemplified in my tables. He showed that no manuscript presumably written in the QSP is consistent, a conclusion with which I agree. One might claim that this point marks the major weakness of my theory, but, importantly, I describe a practice and a pattern, not a system per se. Tigchelaar takes the combined list of criteria for identifying the QSP as a yardstick, noting that manuscripts that display one criterion, e. g. כיא, do not always reflect one or more of the others.[12] Again, I agree. Every scribe acted according to his own internal dynamics. Tigchelaar notes that some manuscripts have the Qumran *qataltah* forms, but nevertheless use the defective forms of לא, which are not characteristic of the QSP. While Tigchelaar's approach of comparing criteria is appropriate, his point of departure should have been not the frequently used לא in which archaizing tendencies may have played a role, but rather the more idiosyncratic spellings like כיא, רוש/ראוש/רואש, זות/זואת/זאות or the idiosyncratic lengthened forms הואה, מאודה, מלכמה, etc.

In his review of the QSP, Tigchelaar also discusses my primary thesis of a connection between the orthographic-morphological features on the one hand and scribal features on the other. He corrects several details in my description and finds fault with my use of cancellation dots as a criterion for the QSP, claiming it would have been preferable to contrast this practice

---

9 E. J. C. Tigchelaar, "Assessing Emanuel Tov's 'Qumran Scribal Practice,'" in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Transmission of Traditions and Production of Texts* (ed. S. Metso *et al.*; STDJ 92; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 173–207; Abegg, "Linguistic Analysis" (see n. 5), 48–68.

10 M. Zahn, "Hermeneutics, Authority, and Scribal Practice: The Case of the Temple Scroll" (paper presented at the international meeting of the SBL, St. Andrews, Scotland, 2013).

11 Tigchelaar, "Tov's 'Qumran Scribal Practice,'" (see n. 9), 182.

12 Ibid. (see n. 9), 191.

with another correction practice such as crossing out with lines.[13] However, to assume such an opposition is inappropriate inasmuch as other texts simply do not use correction systems by virtue of their including fewer corrections. The quantity of the signs used is often more significant than the sign itself. Even the medieval MT on very rare occasions uses cancellation dots, known as the *puncta extraordinaria*, but these dots do not render the MT an exponent of the QSP. Tigchelaar does agree that the use of paleo-Hebrew characters for the divine names is limited to texts written in the QSP. At the same time, he notes, as I also did, that many scrolls written in the QSP do not use these paleo-Hebrew characters. However, this fact does not undermine the theory, since the group is not of one kind.

Next, Tigchelaar says, "No one will challenge the view that most of the orthographic and morphological peculiarities are found in those texts that traditionally have most closely been connected to the Qumran Community, like the Cave 1 texts 1QS, 1QHᵃ, 1QpHab, and 1QM, as well as most of the pesharim. Also many other texts that are closely related to those compositions, exhibit many of the same features. Tov, however, goes one step further …."[14] This further step in my work should be discussed, but I could not have wished for a better endorsement of my views than this statement by Tigchelaar.[15] The papers by Zahn and Lange likewise endorsed the general correctness of the theory.[16]

Tigchelaar notes, "Tov, however, goes one step further and sees the spelling and morphology as *characteristic* [my emphasis] of the sectarian writings, and the lack of those features as indicating that those scrolls had been brought from elsewhere, even though he acknowledges [that] there are seven or eight sectarian texts [that] do *not* share those features."[17] To the contrary: I neither said nor meant to imply that these features are *characteristic* of the sectarian writings. I only pointed out a statistical feature, namely that within the Qumran corpus there is a link between the sectarian writings and the scribal features. Other sectarian writings that have not been preserved could

---

13 Ibid. (see n. 9), 198.

14 Ibid. (see n. 9), 200.

15 In his "preliminary assessment" (ibid., 202), Tigchelaar repeats this general endorsement.

16 Tigchelaar probably overstated his point when he said that "no one will challenge" the central message of my theory, namely the connection between the scribal peculiarities and the Qumran community. After all, several scholars who found fault with this or that aspect of my description did not review the data as a whole, but instead rejected the whole theory, as was done by my esteemed teacher F. M. Cross; Cross, *Ancient Library* (see n. 7).

17 Tigchelaar, "Tov's 'Qumran Scribal Practice," (see n. 9), 201.

very well have been written differently. After all, among the preserved texts there are a few exceptions – probably fewer than I assumed[18] – that show that there must have been sectarian writing that differed from the mainstream.

M. Abegg examined my theory with computer investigations based on his database.[19] Although Abegg notes problems regarding some scrolls, he agrees that "Dead Sea Scrolls documents distinguish themselves … as either *plene* or defective. This appears broadly reflective of two distinct approaches to the text."[20] He concludes that the *plene* texts "might well point to a unique writing system among the Qumran sectarians."[21]

Molly Zahn starts off by pointing out that a large amount of data remains unexplained and notes the inconsistency of scribes, considering these features a weakness in my theory. I agree on both points, but would still claim that no alternative theory can better explain the data. Zahn attempts to identify sociological or ideological factors that may have determined the use or non-use of the QSP. I have not identified any such factors myself and Zahn has not succeeded in doing so. She also compared 11Q20, 11QTemple[b], and 1QpHab, possibly written by the same scribe and within the QSP, yet with internal differences. This examination aimed to see whether the same scribe had adapted his style to the different genres, but it yielded negative results. Finally, Zahn also suggests that the differences between scribes may be due to the influence of the different masters who trained them.

Before reacting to the paper by A. Lange, who describes the Qumran orthography as "baroque," I want to take a minute to comment on that term. It was F. M. Cross who introduced this term in 1966 ("the extreme, or baroque phase of the style")[22] and later in his contribution to the Madrid Congress in 1991 (published 1992).[23] He first described the system of 4QSam[b], which is the most defective source among the Qumran scrolls, as "archaic." Based on the long spelling of the *qataltah* type and the long pronouns of the *hu'ah* type, he then described the full Qumran orthography,

---

18 Ibid. (see n. 9), 201, points out that 4Q252, 4Q320, and 4Q395 should not be considered "exceptions."

19 The modules of the biblical and non-biblical Dead Sea Scrolls incorporated in the Accordance, BibleWorks and Logos programs.

20 Abegg, "Linguistic Analysis" (see n. 5), 57.

21 Ibid. (see n. 5), 65.

22 F. M. Cross, "The Contribution of the Qumran Discoveries to the Study of the Biblical Text," *IEJ* 16 (1966): 81–95, here 89.

23 Idem, "Some Notes on a Generation of Qumran Studies," in *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Madrid, 18–21 March, 1991* (ed. J. Trebolle Barrera and L. Vegas Montaner; STDJ 11, 1–2; Leiden: Brill, 1992) 1.1–14, here 2.

parallel to my QSP, as "baroque." He notes that "The baroque orthography was devised as an attempt to preserve *archaic* [my italics] elevated or poetic speech, lost in vernacular or prosaic Hebrew. The devisers of the baroque orthography overstepped themselves, and leveled through long forms in *āh* in biblical prose where such forms are probably artificial."[24] The logic of this description for Cross is that two seventh century B.C.E. inscriptions from Beit Lei and Hirbet Uzza have the *qataltah* form with a *he*. However, I do not know whether we should characterize a whole group of spellings as archaizing on the basis of a single form. To call this style "baroque" is equally difficult. When using the term "baroque," Cross probably referred to the irregularly shaped, decorative and curved details of the Baroque style in art and architecture, which contrasted sharply with the clear and sober rationality of the Renaissance. There is an abundance of detail in the Qumran orthography, but I think that its fullness and analogy to other forms in the nominal and verbal paradigms better describe it. Furthermore, there is no proof that this orthography was in any way archaizing.

We now return to Lange's paper, which has two points of focus.[25] As the title indicates, it deals with the Severus Scroll and Qumran orthography, but it also focuses on the relationship between the orthography of Qumran and that of MT. We do not know which period the readings of the Severus Scroll reflect, but we assume that it was either the first century B.C.E. or the first century C.E. I agree with Lange that the QSP has several elements in common with the variants that, according to rabbinic tradition, were included in the Severus scroll.[26] Among these variants are ten cases of phonetic spellings and usages of non-final forms of *mem* in final position, for which Lange presents many parallels among the Qumran scrolls, both scrolls ascribed to the QSP and other ones.

In the second part of the paper and through a novel type of investigation, Lange compared the "baroque spellings" (in my terminology, the QSP) with the medieval MT, for which codex L serves as representative. The spellings searched are נתתה, הלוא, לוא and "other baroque spellings." I return to the distinctive form הלוא below. Equally distinctive is the form נתתה (64x), which is unmatched by other *qataltah* forms. Impressive graphs in Lange's paper show that these features need to be studied book by book, since some books contain more than others. I agree with him that it is difficult to find parallels between the Severus Scroll and the QSP, but I maintain that both

---

24 Ibid. (see n. 23), 4.

25 A. Lange, "The Question of Qumran Orthography and the Severus Scroll."

26 See the analysis in *Textual Criticism of the Bible*, 112–113.

are exponents of a non-conservative approach to orthography as well as of imprecision across the board.

Lange further examined the occurrence of some MT forms that were previously seen as typical of the QSP. Considering these forms typical of the "baroque style," Lange uses terminology that differs from mine, but the study of the data seems separable from the terminology. The most striking cases of the QSP spellings in MT are the second and third person feminine plural suffixes in nouns such as זמתכנה in Ezek 23:48, 49. By my count, there are eight such instances in the Hebrew Bible of the lengthened third person[27] as opposed to 121 regular ones, and three instances of the lengthened second person[28] as opposed to 13 regular ones. There are four cases of the lengthened third person feminine suffix to the verb[29] as opposed to 15 regular ones.[30] These forms are truly surprising, though they are very rare. MT also contains other spellings that I find less convincing as examples of the QSP: the form נתתה (64x)[31] is an exception in MT. Surprisingly, נתת is actually the minority spelling (28x). This word must have been singled out by the Masoretes from among the *qataltah* forms, for which I count 62 *qataltah* spellings in all conjugations as opposed to 1,674 short spellings.[32] The statistics for לא and הלוא are equally unconvincing, since most of the full spellings of לא occur in the combination הלוא,[33] since the Masoretes preferred the *plene* form הלוא, setting it off against the defective לא.

I note that the MT does not contain any of the other characteristic QSP spellings such as זות, רוש, כיא, מושה, כוהן, etc. nor any of the lengthened pronouns such as הואה, etc., the only exceptions being three cases of אתנה.[34] I would consequently suggest qualifying Lange's conclusion "that the baroque orthography today mainly known from the Qumran Dead Sea Scrolls was more widespread in ancient Judaism."[35]

I first point out that the given examples point to both orthography (spelling) and morphology, that is, words pronounced differently. The agreement

---

27 Gen 21:29; 41:21 (2x); 42:36; 1 Kgs 7:37; Ezek 1:11; 16:53; Prov 31:29.

28 Ezek 13:20; 23:48, 49.

29 Jer 8:7; Job 39:2; Ruth 1:19 (2x).

30 Gen 30:38; Exod 2:17; 2 Sam 20:3; 2 Kgs 19:26; Isa 34:16; 37:27; 48:7; Ezek 1:9, 12, 17; 42:12; Hab 2:17; Zech 11:5 (3x).

31 Lange: 66x.

32 Lange, "Severus Scroll," (see n. 25), 10, counts 87. Note the pair סלחת ונתתה in 2 Chr 6:30.

33 Of the 5,180 instances of לא, 188 are spelled לוא, 149 of which are instances of הלוא. The remaining 39 instances of the full spelling constitute less than one percent of the occurrences of לא.

34 Gen 31:6; Ezek 13:11, 20; 34:17.

35 Lange, "Severus Scroll," (see n. 25), 12.

with the MT system refers to both areas. The Masoretes preferred נתתה and הלוא, which does not bring them closer to the QSP. However, the occurrence of special forms such as זמתכנה shows that these forms circulated in ancient Israel, especially in Ezekiel, which calls for further scrutiny. I thus suggest a more minimal formulation than that of Lange regarding the agreement between MT and the QSP. I agree with much of what he says and am grateful to him for enabling me to refine my own thoughts. I will return to this issue in my general remarks below.

My concluding remarks pertain to my formulations in light of the papers and reviews by Tigchelaar and Abegg.

1. The scribal procedure that I detected is not a "system" and the attentive reader will note that, for this very reason, I chose to use the term "practice." I therefore suggest that my theory should not be criticized using the argument that what we see is not a system because of its inconsistency. At the same time, to detect a scribal practice yet to note its inconsistency from the outset is not free of problems. The reader will wonder why one should bother making such a suggestion in the first place if the practice is so inconsistent. I admit that this aspect is problematic, but this problem is inherent in the data itself. The data – in other words, the nature of the scribal activity and textual transmission – is itself inconsistent.

I should further note that I have not been speaking about *the* Qumran Scribal Practice, but *a* Qumran Scribal Practice. I have nothing against calling it a "Second Temple Scribal Practice" or a "Palestinian" scribal practice, as suggested by some colleagues. Such nomenclature would be logical, but it does not solve the issue, since it is not the only "Second Temple Scribal Practice" or "Palestinian" scribal practice.

2. After writing my book on scribal practices, I devoted two studies to the issue of inconsistency, illuminating the problem from different angles,[36] and one study to the different scribes of 1QIsaᵃ and 1QHᵃ.[37]

---

36 E. Tov, "Some Reflections on Consistency in the Activity of Scribes and Translators," in *Juda und Jerusalem in der Seleukidenzeit. Herrschaft – Widerstand – Identität: Festschrift für Heinz-Josef Fabry* (ed. U. Dahmen and J. Schnocks; BBB 159; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 2010), 325–337; idem, "The Coincidental Textual Nature of the Collections of Ancient Scriptures," in *Congress Volume Ljubljana 2007* (ed. A. Lemaire; VTSup 133; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 153–169.

37 E. Tov, "Scribal Features of Two Qumran Scrolls," in *Hebrew in the Second Temple Period: The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and of Other Contemporary Sources* (ed. S. E. Fassberg, M. Bar-Asher, and R. A. Clements; STDJ 108; Leiden: Brill, 2013), 241–258.

Beyond the general inconsistency inherent in scribal activity, these particular scribes were even more inconsistent. It seems to me that they often copied from a scroll that was written using a different scribal practice. In other words, the scribe who wrote כי with an *aleph* may have copied from a manuscript that was written without such an *aleph*. While copying, such a scribe adapted the spelling to the new practice, and this situation inevitably led to mistakes. We can still see how such spelling mistakes were corrected; for example, a corrective, raised *aleph* was written in 1QH[a] above the space between the words (4x) as well as in the line in the space between the words (3x), and once in 4QD[b] (4Q267). These letters were thus added after the writing of these words had been completed.[38] By the same token, the scribes sometimes added the final *he* of the long forms above the line, but more frequently in the space between the words, e. g. עליהמה (Isa 14:22), with some space left after the *he*. This happens 53 times in the Qumran scrolls, mainly in the second part of 1QIsa[a] (scribe B). It is well known that the distinction between the final and non-final *mem* was still fluid in this scroll, and for that reason there are forms like לכרסל on several occasions in 1QIsa[a] 26:26 (Isa 32:15). However, these instances are rare compared with the large number of corrective spellings such as the addition of the *he* after the pronominal suffix of such forms as עליהמה. In these cases, the scribe presumably copied his *Vorlage* עליהם as such, and then was reminded that he should have written עליהמה. In cases like this one, the scribe added the *he* without bothering to change the final *mem* to a non-final letter. These details are included in my study "Scribal Features" (see n. 36).

3. I attach much importance to the dichotomy of orthographical and morphological practices in the scrolls, inconsistent as they may be, and to their correlation with the sectarian nature of texts, imperfect as that may be. If I hear a better explanation of the evidence, I may give up my views.

4. I do not and have never claimed that the Qumran scribes invented this practice. We find parallels elsewhere, such as certain agreements with the Samaritan pronunciation of some pronouns, the spelling רוש המחניה in a Bar Kochba letter,[39] and some MT forms. Our strongest argument is statistical, imperfect as that may be.

---

38 For details, see Tov, "Scribal Features" (see n. 37).
39 Mur 42.

Appendix: Summary Statement on a Qumran Scribal Practice[40]

Numbering between 210 and 212, the Hebrew–Aramaic biblical texts found at Qumran do not share any major textual, linguistic, or scribal characteristics, since they were written in different periods and different places. However, one group of texts is idiosyncratic and is closely related to the scribes who copied the Qumran sectarian scrolls.

Within the Qumran corpus, a group of 167 non-biblical and biblical texts has been isolated as reflecting an idiosyncratic practice, the characteristics of which are visible in peculiarities of their orthography, morphology, and scribal features. These texts do not share a common textual typology. But they are closely connected with the Qumran community, since it includes *virtually all commonly agreed upon sectarian writings*. The texts written in the Qumran scribal practice (QSP) could have been penned anywhere in Palestine, but probably originated mainly at Qumran. Early scrolls written in the QSP, such as 4QQoh[a] (175–150 B.C.E.), must have been copied elsewhere by scribes with a similar orientation, and a few other texts predate the settlement at Qumran.

The QSP is characterized by orthographic, morphological, and scribal features. It is not a system, but a practice and pattern exhibiting some inconsistency.

a. Orthographic Features

Many Qumran texts are characterized by a distinctive orthography that is unequaled among known documents from other places, while a few features are reflected in letters from the period of the Second Jewish Revolt, in Mishna manuscripts, and in the orally transmitted reading tradition of SP, but the evidence known to date does not provide any close parallels to the combined features of the QSP. In addition to the very full orthography, it has some special orthographic features, which occur in conjunction with a series of morphological and scribal features (see below).

The orthography of the QSP has been described in various studies. It is characterized by the addition of many *matres lectionis* whose purpose it is to facilitate the reading. Below are several examples:

In the orthography of the QSP, /o/ and /u/ are almost always represented by a *waw*, including *ḥolem* (e. g. חושך, פוה, מושה), *qameṣ ḥatuph* (כול, חוכמה, אצורכה), and *ḥateph qameṣ* (e. g. אוניה). Because of scribal varia-

---

tion, many words appear in the same text with different spellings, e. g. ‏זות‎/‏זאות‏/‏זאת‎ and ‏ראוש‎/‏רואש‎/‏רוש‎ in 1QIsaᵃ and in several other texts. *Yod* represents not only /i/ (usually: not short i), but also *ṣere*: ‏אבילים‎ (1QIsaᵃ 61:2), ‏מית‎ (38:1). Unique for certain lexemes is the representation of /i/ especially in final position by ‏יא‎–, mainly in ‏כיא‎, sometimes also in ‏מיא‎. Less frequent examples include ‏נקיא‎ 59:7; ‏פיא‎ 40:5, apparently analogous to ‏הביא‎, ‏נביא‎, etc. in which the *ʾaleph* belongs to the root. *He* as a *mater lectionis* for /a/ is very frequent at the end of words, such as in *qṭlth* (e. g. ‏שמרתה‎) and the second person masculine singular suffix, e. g. ‏מלככה‎, *mlkkh*, etc. *He* in final position for /e/ occurs unexpectedly in ‏חוטה‎ in 1QIsaᵃ 1:4 (MT ‏חוטא‎) and ‏הקורה‎ in 6:4 (MT ‏הקורא‎). *ʾAleph* denotes /a/ in final position: ‏עליהא‎ 34:11 (MT ‏עליה‎), ‏יאכה‎ (MT ‏יתום‎), ‏בניהא‎ 66:8 (MT ‏בניה‎), and even in medial position: ‏יאתום‎ 1:17 (MT ‏יכה‎) 30:31 (MT ‏יכה‎).

b. Morphological Features

The following six features characterize the QSP morphology, which has a tendency towards lengthened pronominal, verbal, and in one case adverbial forms:

  – Lengthened independent pronouns: *huʾah*, *hiʾah, ʾatemah*, *hemah* (the latter form is also found in SP and the later books of MT);

  – Lengthened pronominal suffixes for the second and third persons plural on nouns and prepositions, e. g. *bmh*, *bhmh*, *mlkmh*;

  – Forms of the *Qal* imperfect *(w)tqṭwlw* and *(w)yqṭwlw* that serve in MT as pausal forms, but occur in these texts as free forms;

  – Forms of the *Qal* imperfect *o* with pronominal suffixes construed as *yequṭlenu* (*et sim.*) instead of the Tiberian forms *yiqṭelenu* (*et sim.*);

  – The form *qeṭaltemah* for the second person plural in all conjugations;

  – Lengthened forms of ‏מאד‎, viz., ‏מודה‎, ‏מאודה‎, ‏מואדה‎.

  Some of these features may have been created by analogy with existing forms, while others may be dialectical.

c. Scribal Features

The orthographic and morphological features, however inconsistent, allow for a distinction between a group of texts displaying an idiosyncratic practice and texts that do not display these features. These features are accompanied by objective scribal features.

  – Writing of the divine names, especially the Tetragrammaton, in paleo-Hebrew characters or *Tetrapuncta* in texts written in the square script.

Within the Qumran corpus, this practice is documented mainly in texts written in the Qumran orthography and morphology. Since this practice is based on a certain conception of the sanctity of the divine names, and since the approach of the Qumran community to this issue is also known from other indicators, this practice provides an independent control supporting the hypothesis of a QSP.

– Scribal markings. The majority (84) of the 131 Hebrew Qumran texts containing scribal markings of some kind (e. g. the *paragraphos* sign), also reflect the orthographic and morphological features of the QSP. In some signs, this percentage is very high, e. g. for cancellation dots, parenthesis signs, the X-sign, and guide dots for drawing horizontal lines.

– Frequent use of non-final letter forms in final position and final letter forms in non-final position.

– Crossing out of letters and words with a line.

d. Contextual Adaptations

The scribes of the texts written in the QSP often adapted seemingly irregular forms to the context. These changes reflect a free approach to the biblical text.

e. Consistency and Statistical Analysis

The scribes writing in this scribal practice followed certain principles but, at the same time, each scribe maintained a degree of independence. This fact is clear from a comparison of overlapping texts written in this scribal practice, such as 4QIsa^c//1QIsa^a. These divergences are also evident when one compares the two segments written by scribes A (cols. I–XXVII, Isa 1:1–33:24) and B (cols. XXVIII–LIV, Isa 34:1–66:24) of 1QIsa^a. The two segments of that scroll must therefore be taken as two separate units.

Not all of the idiosyncratic spellings and forms recorded above appear in every text. The combined group of features is probably most clearly visible in the following 12 biblical texts and *tefillin*: 4QNum^b, 1QDeut^a, 4QDeut^k2, 4QDeut^m, 4QSam^c, 1QIsa^a (especially scribe B), 2QJer, 4QXII^c, 4QPhyl A, B, J–K, L–N. At the same time, certain features are absent from some texts that otherwise display most of the idiosyncrasies of the QSP. Thus כיא occurs in most texts belonging to this group, but not in 1QIsa^a scribe A.

The following 28 biblical texts may be considered to have been written in the QSP: 1QDeut^a; 1QIsa^a; 2QExod^b (?); 2QNum^b (?); 2QDeut^c (?); 2QJer; 4QExod^b,j(?); 4QNum^b; 4QDeut^j,k1,k2,m; 4QRP^a,b,c (4Q158, 364, 365); 4QSam^c;

4QIsa^c; 4QXII^{c,e,g}; 4QPs^o (?); 4QLam; 4QQoh^a; 11QPs$^{a,b,c(?),d(?)}$; and 4QPhyl A, B, G–I, J–K, L–N, O, P, Q. Also belonging to this group are virtually *all* of the sectarian compositions written by the Qumran covenanters (such as 1QH^a, 1QM, 1QS, and the *pesharim*). Although this group has no characteristic representative, 1QIsa^a, which contains the longest Qumran text of a biblical book, is a good example of the QSP.

Emanuel Tov
J. L. Magnes Professor Emeritus of Bible
The Hebrew University of Jerusalem
Faculty of Humanities
Jerusalem
emanuel.tov@mail.huji.ac.il