

POTENTIAL SECTARIAN VARIANTS IN PSALM 119 OF 11Q5:
A FURTHER INVESTIGATION IN RESPONSE TO EUGENE ULRICH'S
"THE ABSENCE OF SECTARIAN VARIANTS IN THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS"

by

JEFFREY L. SPENCE

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS

in

THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

Master of Arts in Interdisciplinary Humanities, Biblical Studies Stream

We accept this thesis as conforming to the required standard

.....
Prof. Martin Abegg Jr., PhD; Thesis Supervisor

.....
Prof. Peter W. Flint, Ph.D.; Second Reader

TRINITY WESTERN UNIVERSITY

September, 2013

© Jeffrey L. Spence

This thesis and the degree it represents are dedicated to

Glen Carley

and

Nichole Andrea Spence

ABSTRACT

This essay examines the portions of 11Q5 (The Great Psalms Scroll) that correspond to Psalm 119 and compares them as variants from MT (as representative of Proto-MT, discussed within) with the intention to test Eugene Ulrich's absolute statement that there are no "sectarian variants" in the biblical Dead Sea Scrolls. It employs a comprehensive survey of the variants (morphological, orthographic, phonological, "real" variation and physical variation due to erasure and/or correction) in its search for theologically motivated variation, which it then tests against theological themes as found in 1QS and more general theological themes of broader Second Temple Judaism. As a secondary endeavor, it more clearly defines Ulrich's apparent understanding of what the term "sectarian variant" signifies and seeks to draw attention to the practice of assuming against sectarian variation until proven otherwise; it argues for a more balanced approach of "no designation without scholarly evidence." The essay includes extensive charts of the variants, divided into "variant types" for ease of reference.

CONTENTS

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	vii
I. INTRODUCTION	1
REVIEW OF LITERATURE	3
II. SOME PROBLEMS AND ISSUES WITH A STUDY OF THIS TYPE	20
LACK OF A <i>STATUS QUO</i> HEBREW TEXTUAL TRADITION	20
ASSUMPTIONS AND PRESUPPOSITIONS	23
ULRICH'S RULES OF IDENTIFICATION	25
III. A SURVEY OF THE VARIANTS OF PSALM 119 IN 11Q5	31
EXPLANATION OF STRUCTURE AND METHOD	31
TABLE OF VARIANTS IN 11Q5	33
MASTER VARIANTS CHART	36
A SURVEY DISCUSSION OF THE MINOR VARIANTS	48
THE MORPHOLOGICAL VARIANTS	49
IMPERFECT <i>QAL</i> FORM	54
NOTE TO THE ADDITION OF <i>HE</i> TO THE TERMINUS	55
ADDITIONAL <i>HE</i> (STYLISTIC/UNKNOWN)	57
ALTERNATE FORM OF THE IMPERATIVE	58
ADDITIONAL <i>WAW</i> CONJUNCTION	58
OMMISSION OF <i>WAW</i> CONJUNCTION	58
ADDITIONAL <i>HE</i> , 2 ND PERSON SUFFIX (A-CLASS VOWEL)	61
ADDITIONAL <i>HE</i> , 1 ST PERSON IMPERFECT FORMS	61
THE ORTHOGRAPHIC VARIANTS	62

NOTE FOR THE USE OF <i>YOD</i> TO INDICATE A VOWEL	65
<i>YOD</i> FOR <i>SERE</i> OR <i>SEGHOL</i>	66
<i>YOD</i> FOR <i>HIREQ</i>	66
QUMRAN PLURAL (ALEPH INSERT)	67
NOTE ON OMISSION/ADDITION OF <i>WAW</i>	67
<i>WAW</i> FOR <i>HOLEM</i>	69
<i>WAW</i> FOR <i>QIBBUTS</i>	70
ADDITIONAL <i>WAW</i>	70
<i>WAW</i> FOR <i>QAMUTS-HATUF</i>	70
THE PHONOLOGICAL VARIANTS	71
<i>SIN</i> FOR <i>SAMEK</i>	71
THE GRAPHICAL VARIANTS (ERASURE)	71
SCRIBAL ERROR	71
IV. A DISCUSSION OF THE REAL VARIANTS	72
TYPES 5.1, 5.3 AND 5.6	75
TYPES 5.2, 5.4, AND 5.7	84
TYPES 5.8 AND 5.9	97
TYPES 5.10 AND 5.11	102
TYPES 5.12 AND 5.13	104
TYPES 5.14, 5.15 AND 5.16	107
TYPE 5.17	110
TYPE 5.18	112
DISCUSSION OF NOTABLE VARIANTS IN COOPERATION	113

V. CONCLUSION	115
BIBLIOGRAPHY	118

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

11Q5	Scroll #5 from Cave 11 at Qumran; also 11QPs ^a or “The Great Psalms Scroll”
4Q89	Scroll #89 from Cave 4 at Qumran; also 4QPs ^b
LORD, the LORD	Will be used to express יהוה when in English translation
LXX	Septuagint
MT	Masoretic Text(s)
P-MT	The proposed Proto-Masoretic Text(s)
SP	Samaritan Pentateuch

PART I: INTRODUCTION

In 2002, Eugene Ulrich made the absolute statement that there are no sectarian variants in the biblical Dead Sea Scrolls.¹ This may well have been in reaction to over-zealous theories and unfounded claims proffered early on in DSS research. Ulrich's statement was taken with great import and little seems to have been said of it in the decade following its publication. The effect compliments Ulrich, as a testimony to the high esteem in which we all hold him. The course of scholarship, however, is to hypothesize, test, and hypothesize again. It is therefore – with great respect for Ulrich – that I shall nonetheless endeavour to show that there is the possibility, even a *cautious* probability, that the biblical Dead Sea Scrolls, specifically 11Q5, contain sectarian variants.²

The clearest manner in which to present my goal is to use a courtroom metaphor: Ulrich has brought an indictment against the biblical DSS, accusing them of containing no sectarian variants. My assumed role is as defence attorney. It is not my goal to present definitive proof of sectarian variants, but to present a *reasonable doubt* against Ulrich's indictment. To aid in this endeavour, I shall abide by Ulrich's stated rules and definitions. Rather than changing the playing field by introducing my own preferred definitions of such key terms as "sectarian variant," for example, I shall instead define it based on Ulrich's definition and/or use of it in the primary article in question.

¹ Eugene Ulrich, "The Absence of 'Sectarian Variants' in the Jewish Scriptural Scrolls Found at Qumran" in *The Bible as Book: The Hebrew Bible and the Judaean Desert Discoveries* (Edited by Edward D. Herbert and Emanuel Tov London: The British Library & Oak Knoll Press, 2002), 179.

² This document is also called 11QPS^a, but I shall use the title "11Q5" for the duration of this essay.

I shall attempt to achieve this goal by following several steps to take us from (1) a detailed review of Ulrich's article and portions of other relevant scholarship to (2) a brief summary of archaeological and dating evidence (and presuppositions) as well as a brief discussion of potential problems regarding a study like this – and sectarian variants in general – as proposed by Ulrich to (3) a survey discussion of the morphological, orthographic, non-sectarian and probable-sectarian real variant features of the scrolls to (4) an analysis of the real variants as a group within Psalm 119 of 11Q5, followed by concluding remarks. Ulrich focussed his attention on the *c.* 230 biblical scrolls as a whole – a telescopic/survey view, with a few selected examples. He ignored the subtler variants, such as orthographic and morphological alterations, leaving them for later examination by others. This study picks up that baton. In order to facilitate a more detailed consideration of the issue, this essay will focus on a microscopic view of a sample text, the variants in Psalm 119 of 11Q5 only.³

It is important to remember that the purpose of this essay is not to prove the existence of sectarian variants in the Dead Sea Scrolls, but rather to prove the *possibility* or to suggest a *cautious probability* that such variants might exist, regardless of the difficulties surrounding the gathering of definitive proof. It is not my goal to refute Ulrich's statement outright, but rather to prompt a qualification to it. He states that any argument for the existence of a sectarian variant requires "clear and thorough-going proof."⁴ True enough, but to claim *absence* of such incidents requires an even heavier burden of proof: consideration of the total corpus and demonstration that all variants have a nature *other* than

³ Ulrich, "The Absence," 179.

⁴ Ulrich, "The Absence," 181.

sectarian. Ulrich has not provided this proof (nor, to my knowledge, has anyone else). To prove the *presence* of such variation requires the burden of only one instance. To prove *possible* existence of sectarian variation requires just one variant that cannot be proven to be otherwise. This latter is my goal. I shall explore some candidates in sections II and III below.

At the very least, this essay should serve to explore the selected text portions in a manner that might serve as an example of what is needed throughout the biblical DSS corpus before a statement such as Ulrich's can be made with scholarly validity.

Review of the Literature

This essay will focus on premises, guidelines and conclusions as presented in Eugene Ulrich's article "The Absence of 'Sectarian Variants' in the Jewish Scriptural Scrolls Found at Qumran." Also included in this literature review are several supplementary articles which I will discuss, each in part as the sections pertain to this study.

Ulrich begins with an anecdote that when originally asked to write the article he replied "somewhat ungraciously" that his article would require a single page only, as there were no sectarian variants about which to write.⁵ He went on to suggest a paper on the absence of these variants and his proposal was accepted.

His article focuses on biblical scrolls in order to, in his words, "ensure clarity of focus and usefulness of results."⁶ He then states his focus as being "on individual textual

⁵ Ulrich, "The Absence," 179.

⁶ Ulrich, "The Absence," 179.

variants in the attempt to discover variants that were sectarian in origin or motivation.”⁷ He omits discussion of orthographic differences, variant literary editions and disputed books, routine variants such as initial *waws* and the like, and whether or not disputed books were considered authoritative in certain Jewish parties as opposed to others – though he does consider these topics as “ripe for detailed investigation.”⁸

Ulrich states that the MT and the Pharisaic party are not the principal points of comparison or reference in the Second Temple period.⁹ He states that, since the biblical text at that point in time was pluriform, and that its pluriformity was widely accepted, there is no *status quo* text or reference point from which to compare sectarian variation.¹⁰ He states that there was no P-MT of the *Tanak*, or “at least it remains to be demonstrated that there was a ‘P-MT’” in the late Second Temple period “in the sense of a unified, identifiable collection of texts that together (in contrast to other texts) would move ahead through history and become the Masoretic collection of texts that emerged in the sixth to ninth centuries.”¹¹ He states flatly “There was no standard text.”¹² It is on this basis that he declares the inability to categorize texts from this period as aberrant.¹³ He then places social value on the Pharisees, Sadducees, Essenes and other late Second Temple period Jewish

⁷ Ulrich, “The Absence,” 179.

⁸ Ulrich, “The Absence,” 179.

⁹ Ulrich, “The Absence,” 180.

¹⁰ Ulrich, “The Absence,” 180.

¹¹ Ulrich, “The Absence,” 180.

¹² Ulrich, “The Absence,” 180.

¹³ Ulrich, “The Absence,” 180.

groups as each being more or less equal in authority and impact in the period, that each group is a ‘sect’ inasmuch as is any other.¹⁴

He claims that if one group “tampered” with the text of Scriptures in order to promote its views, it would be open to “immediate, demonstrable refutation.”¹⁵ This is based on drawing a parallel between the dispute regarding the differences in Greek and Hebrew texts which became apparent during religious debates a “short time” after the period in question, when both rabbinic and Christian leaders began the recension process of “‘correcting’ Greek texts ‘back’ toward the ‘original’ Hebrew text,” which he states was soon assumed to be the contemporary rabbinic text traditions that became the Masoretic Text.¹⁶ Ulrich admits that it is entirely possible that an ancient scholar might create a sectarian variant, but that such an action would not be problem-free and so any scholar making such a claim would need “clear and thorough-going” proof.¹⁷

Ulrich’s next section focuses on examples of sectarian variants,¹⁸ which he draws from the Samaritan Pentateuch, specifically the Deuteronomistic phrase in which MT and LXX have “the place where the Lord will choose” and SP has “the place where the Lord has chosen;” the extended SP in which a long commandment is added stipulating the building of an altar on Mount Gerizim; and the use of “Mount Ebal,” in Deuteronomy 27:4,

¹⁴ Ulrich, “The Absence,” 180.

¹⁵ Ulrich, “The Absence,” 180.

¹⁶ Ulrich, “The Absence,” 181.

¹⁷ Ulrich, “The Absence,” 181.

¹⁸ I will discuss the significance of the term “sectarian” in more detail below. It must suffice for now to consider a “sectarian variant” any variant that is theologically driven and unique to a particular sect.

as a “double sectarian variant,” first in SP and again in MT.¹⁹ He notes that each of these readings were 1) Secondary, 2) clearly intentional, 3) particular to the Samaritans (or at least to the “northern worshippers”), except for the Mount Ebal reading, which was “specifically and jarringly anti-Samaritan” and 4) that the specifically Samaritan theme “is found *repeated*.”²⁰ He then includes examples of some non-sectarian variants, such as a theological insertion to 4QJudg^a, and a variant in 4QSam^a and designates each of these as attributable to Judaism in general, and therefore not sectarian.²¹

His next section focuses on the manuscripts of the Jewish Scriptures found at Qumran, for which he states there is “too much to discuss and nothing to report.”²² He states that the prophetic books are most fertile for this sort of variation and lists Deuteronomy, Isaiah, Psalms and Daniel as the most widely attested at Qumran.²³ Of Isaiah, he estimates a thousand variants, all of which he designates as non-sectarian, and discusses a few of them with some detail.²⁴ For the book of Psalms he mentions the existence of over 500 variants, stating that “by far the most instructive” are at the level of literary editions.²⁵ Several examples are given. The others he designates as “often frustratingly small and meaningless,” and all non-sectarian in nature.²⁶ Finally, he discusses

¹⁹ Ulrich, “The Absence,” 181.

²⁰ Ulrich, “The Absence,” 182.

²¹ Ulrich, “The Absence,” 182.

²² Ulrich, “The Absence,” 183.

²³ Ulrich, “The Absence,” 183.

²⁴ Ulrich, “The Absence,” 183.

²⁵ Ulrich, “The Absence,” 185.

Daniel, with its close to seventy variants, as having no variant that “should be considered partisan to any group in Judaism.”²⁷ He states that he has found no other variant in the Dead Sea Scrolls that he would classify as a sectarian variant.²⁸

Ulrich then moves on to manuscripts with the strongest evidence of having been copied at Qumran. He discusses 4QSam^c, using the low level of scribal skill as possible evidence that the copyist was a group leader, rather than a professional or designated copyist.²⁹ Ulrich highlights the many mistakes made by the scribe and yet states that the readings produced are “despite his high rate of errors, corrections, and insertions... still superior to the Masoretic *textus receptus*.”³⁰ He also states that, “when the focus sharpens to specifically sectarian variants, again the indicator falls to zero.”³¹ He determines likewise for 4QTestimonia and for a correction in 1QIsa^a.³²

He then concludes that his article is an “attempt to discover textual variants that were ‘sectarian’ in origin or motivation” and that this question, “so obvious, so instinctual, so needing to be asked,” is nonetheless faced with “evidence and logic” that “point toward a negative answer.”³³

²⁶ Ulrich, “The Absence,” 185.

²⁷ Ulrich, “The Absence,” 187.

²⁸ Ulrich, “The Absence,” 187.

²⁹ Ulrich, “The Absence,” 187.

³⁰ Ulrich, “The Absence,” 187.

³¹ Ulrich, “The Absence,” 187.

³² Ulrich, “The Absence,” 188.

³³ Ulrich, “The Absence,” 191.

To briefly summarize a book like Emanuel Tov's *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* is a difficult task and I will not do it justice here. Rather I will note the aspects in which my study is reliant on Tov's work and where his scholarship informs my conclusions and may conflict with those of Ulrich (as of the date of this writing).

I draw on Tov's work for my understanding of textual traditions in the Second Temple period. Tov discusses the proposed textual tradition,³⁴ the Samaritan Pentateuch and pre-Samaritan Pentateuch,³⁵ and the nature of the texts at Qumran. Most notably in this last category is the proposal of a Qumran Scribal Practice identified by several characteristics, including the occurrence of scribal marks, especially cancellation dots,³⁶ the use of initial-medial letters in final position,³⁷ and the writing of the divine names together with other appellations in Palaeo-Hebrew script.³⁸

Finally, Tov includes a brief discussion of "Theological Exegesis" which outlines appropriate guidelines when considering theological motivations for translation equivalents, harmonisations, expansions/omissions and other redactions.³⁹

Eugene Ulrich's "Multiple Literary Editions: Reflections Toward a Theory of the History of the Biblical Text" includes some interesting insights into Ulrich's scholarly

³⁴ Emanuel Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 2nd Ed. (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001), 22.

³⁵ Tov, *Textual Criticism*, 81, 94.

³⁶ Tov, *Textual Criticism*, 213.

³⁷ Tov, *Textual Criticism*, 210.

³⁸ Tov, *Textual Criticism*, 216, 220.

³⁹ Tov, *Textual Criticism*, 127.

presuppositions. He discusses the implication of lack of extant evidence, calling it “regrettable and daunting,” but stating that it “should not excessively intimidate us” and that discussion of the topic of the history of the biblical text “should not be limited to the evidence that we happen to have available, or we will not succeed in the task of reconstructing that history.”⁴⁰ His exposition of variant literary editions (which follows in the same article) is based on the premise that if conjecture is all we have, then conjecture must be fully employed.⁴¹

He states that prior to the discoveries at Qumran, we had clues as to three major textual traditions: SP, LXX and MT.⁴² He dates the commencement of the translation into Greek to *c.* 280 BCE (Torah) and estimates its completion sometime after the next two hundred years.⁴³ He describes the traditional use of variant versions as “polemical” but more recent use as evidence that multiple forms existed (and were commonly used as functionally interchangeable) in the Second Temple period.⁴⁴ He discusses the example of four lines from 4QPaleoExod^m.⁴⁵

⁴⁰ Eugene Ulrich, “Multiple Literary Editions: Reflections toward a Theory of the Biblical Text” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible* (Boston: Eerdmans, 1999), 100.

⁴¹ This is a potentially dangerous undertaking, even if sometimes necessary for progress in historical reconstruction. There may be a tendency for accepting one’s own conjectures as valid, while dismissing those of others as unfounded, unscholarly, and therefore invalid. In some instances, it might be better to accept that, though a reconstruction is desirable and an accurate one useful, there is simply none to be had based on extant data. Though well beyond the purview of this essay, further study on the impact of such speculation and the potential benefits of maintaining what I will call “conscious ignorance” of certain ancient circumstances must be undertaken.

⁴² Ulrich, “Multiple Literary Editions,” 101.

⁴³ Ulrich, “Multiple Literary Editions,” 101.

⁴⁴ Ulrich, “Multiple Literary Editions,” 101.

⁴⁵ Ulrich, “Multiple Literary Editions,” 102.

Ulrich states that “variant literary editions” are key to understanding the history of the texts.⁴⁶ He encourages two steps: (1) sift out the orthographic differences and minor textual variants⁴⁷ and (2) study the [remaining/major] individual textual variants.⁴⁸

Ulrich’s definitions are also worth consideration. He defines a “literary edition” as “a literary unit – a story, pericope, narrative, poem, book, etc. – appearing in two or more parallel forms (whether by chance extant or no longer extant in our textual witnesses⁴⁹), which one author, major redactor, or major editor completed and which a subsequent redactor or editor intentionally changed to a sufficient extent that the resultant form should be called a revised edition of the text.”⁵⁰ Ulrich does not give guidelines as to what “a sufficient extent” is in his estimation, except to say that a pattern of individual variants – even if introduced over time – might eventually constitute a variant literary edition.⁵¹ He alludes to *Punctuated Evolution* as a means of describing the process of “faithful transmission” and “evolutionary leaps to a new, revised, and expanded edition of biblical books.”⁵²

With respect to orthographic variation, Ulrich downplays the importance and proposes that they should be ignored, at least initially, in order that the major variants might be more easily identified and studied; he rejects the term “Qumran [Scribal] practice” as

⁴⁶ Ulrich, “Multiple Literary Editions,” 106.

⁴⁷ Ulrich, “Multiple Literary Editions,” 106.

⁴⁸ Ulrich, “Multiple Literary Editions,” 107.

⁴⁹ It is not made clear how he would determine a non-extant parallel.

⁵⁰ Ulrich, “Multiple Literary Editions,” 107.

⁵¹ Ulrich, “Multiple Literary Editions,” 109.

⁵² Ulrich, “Multiple Literary Editions,” 108.

misleading.⁵³ In a discussion regarding proposals of a “proto-MT” and the validity of comparisons to it (as to a norm), Ulrich accepts this only as far as it is also understood and accepted that the “proto-MT” in question was a multiform collection of texts with variants among them.⁵⁴

Finally, Ulrich closes with a response to Lawrence Schiffman’s proposal that some scrolls might best *not* be categorized as biblical (in “our sense” of the term⁵⁵) or perhaps should be classified as biblical only to a specific sect.⁵⁶ Ulrich uses 11Q5 – a scroll which Schiffman considered “liturgical” rather than “biblical” – to illustrate this situation.⁵⁷ Ulrich refutes Schiffman’s proposal with several convincing arguments, and concludes that 11Q5 should be classified as a “truly biblical manuscript, though a variation,⁵⁸ of the Psalter.”⁵⁹

The next article, Ulrich’s “Pluriformity of the Biblical Text, Text Groups, and Questions of Canon” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible*, (1999) begins with the identification of “the question dominating the discussion of the biblical text” at the time: how to explain “the pluriformity observable in the biblical manuscripts from Qumran,

⁵³ Ulrich, “Multiple Literary Editions,” 111.

⁵⁴ Ulrich, “Multiple Literary Editions,” 114.

⁵⁵ Ulrich, “Multiple Literary Editions,” 115.

⁵⁶ Ulrich, “Multiple Literary Editions,” 115.

⁵⁷ Ulrich, “Multiple Literary Editions,” 115.

⁵⁸ In light of his previous discussion, this qualification seems mainly due to alterations in ordering and other attributes of the scroll – such as the omitted verses from Psalm 119 – not in relation to included verses of Psalm 119 specifically or to a significant degree. Since this study focuses on the included verses only, this designation should not be problematic to the thesis.

⁵⁹ Ulrich, “Multiple Literary Editions,” 120.

the MT, and the versions.”⁶⁰ Ulrich specifies that this article is not a finished “position paper” but rather an “interim perspective” of the state of research in his mind at the time.⁶¹ He discusses the various versions chosen by each group and states that these particular textual traditions were chosen for “accidental” reasons – such as language preference or polemical considerations – rather than conscious choices based on content.⁶² Ulrich goes on to point out the subsequent conscious and intentional redaction of texts by the groups involved, but maintains that these changes were not confessional or based on particular ideas held by particular groups.⁶³

Ulrich then discusses the process of analyzing these variants, dividing them into three main groups: *Orthographic Readings*, *Individual Variant Readings* and *Variant Editions of Works*.⁶⁴ He concludes his article with some examples from the Book of Daniel and with a call for development of better and more precise terminology in this area of study.⁶⁵

Ulrich’s article “The Bible in the Making” in *The Bible at Qumran: Text, Shape, and Interpretation* (2001) opens with the statement that “we should probably not think of a

⁶⁰ Eugene Ulrich, “Pluriformity of the Biblical Text, Text Groups, and Questions of Canon” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible* Edited by Peter W. Flint. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans and Brill, 1999), 80.

⁶¹ Ulrich, “Pluriformity,” 81.

⁶² Ulrich, “Pluriformity,” 84.

⁶³ Ulrich, “Pluriformity,” 85.

⁶⁴ Ulrich, “Pluriformity,” 86.

⁶⁵ Ulrich, “Pluriformity,” 92-98.

“Bible” in the first century CE at Qumran or elsewhere.”⁶⁶ He describes the state of Scripture at that point as a collection of scrolls, of which the Book of Psalms is the most plentiful extant book at Qumran, with 37 copies.⁶⁷ The later concept of ‘canon,’ by which some books are “in” and others “out” is not clearly represented by extant evidence from Qumran and those books with greater authority varied from group to group.⁶⁸ Ulrich discusses the status of Psalms at Qumran, highlighting their prophetic status and comparing it to the prophetic status given them by the early Christians, which eventually developed into a separate category, called the *Ketubim* or the Hagiographa.⁶⁹ The works comprising the Torah, he states, were firmly set as authoritative, but “those nearer the periphery were still finding their place.”⁷⁰

With regard to variation, Ulrich states that a safe assumption is that no two manuscripts of any book in antiquity were ever exactly alike.⁷¹ Aside from orthographic updating and minor variation, which he posits usually contain no real alteration of meaning, Ulrich discusses the variant literary edition, which he states can teach us a great deal about ancient transmission of the biblical text.⁷² He concedes that there were scribal practices that were intended to copy the texts as accurately as possible, but explains that there were also

⁶⁶ Ulrich, “The Bible in the Making” in *The Bible at Qumran: Text, Shape, and Interpretation* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001), 51-66.

⁶⁷ Ulrich, “The Bible in the Making,” 53.

⁶⁸ Ulrich, “The Bible in the Making,” 54.

⁶⁹ Ulrich, “The Bible in the Making,” 56.

⁷⁰ Ulrich, “The Bible in the Making,” 57.

⁷¹ Ulrich, “The Bible in the Making,” 57.

⁷² Ulrich, “The Bible in the Making,” 57.

scribes who took an active role in developing the texts, seeking to clarify and update meaning during the copying process, often in an effort to make older, less-applicable writings more meaningful to a contemporary readership.⁷³ Ulrich allows for variant literary editions in some places, and yet argues that the ancient readers would not have allowed texts to be altered, especially for theological reasons.⁷⁴ It is evident that, though he considers 11Q5 to have enjoyed authoritative status in the first century, and though he considers it “biblical” (see the article on multiple literary editions, above⁷⁵), Ulrich categorizes 11Q5 as a variant *edition*.⁷⁶

In “The Canonical Process, Textual Criticism, and Latter Stages in the Composition of the Bible” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible* (1999), Ulrich again asserts the creative agency of some first century scribes on the biblical text for the benefit of their specific, contemporary communities.⁷⁷ Ulrich differentiates between a “broad” definition of the canon – which includes texts considered authoritative at a particular time,⁷⁸ but not necessarily with the reflexive elements of the “strict” definition of canon – and the

⁷³ Ulrich, “The Bible in the Making,” 58.

⁷⁴ Ulrich, “The Absence,” 180.

⁷⁵ Ulrich, “Multiple Literary Editions,” 120.

⁷⁶ Ulrich, “The Bible in the Making,” 64.

⁷⁷ Eugene Ulrich, “The Canonical Process, Textual Criticism, and Latter Stages in the Composition of the Bible” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible*. Edited by Eugene Ulrich. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans and Brill, 1999), 51, 75.

⁷⁸ It is this sense in which proposed allusions to texts such as 1QS should be considered equivalent to proposed allusions to “biblical” texts within the works from Qumran. If the authority of such texts was not differentiated by the Community from those later labelled “biblical,” then the presence in a “biblical” scroll of an allusion to a sectarian scroll is worthy of similar study and carries with it implications of sectarian variation. More study is needed in this area with this dynamic in mind.

“strict” definition which includes an element of looking into the past to determine which books have already been used as authoritative texts.⁷⁹ Ulrich tends toward the latter,⁸⁰ even going so far as to restrict considerations of canon to the “biblical” books.⁸¹ The question of the existence of a P-MT tradition is answered in the affirmative here, but with a caveat that any argument as to it having been the *status quo* text is an *argumentum e silentio*.⁸²

With regard to variant literary editions of biblical texts, Ulrich places the line between “set of textual variants” and “literary edition” as somewhere between an alteration smaller than a single pericope and the rewriting of an entire book, such as Jeremiah.⁸³ His discussion on the example of Exodus states that “it is probable that the Samaritans used the text type . . . without conscious reflection on the different available text types.”⁸⁴ He gives no evidence in defence of this assumption. His discussion of the Book of Jeremiah highlights the fact that the variations are not “relatively infrequent, large-scale harmonization” but “routine minor explicitation, clarification,” etc.⁸⁵ Ulrich asserts that

⁷⁹ Ulrich, “The Canonical Process,” 54.

⁸⁰ Ulrich, “The Canonical Process,” 55.

⁸¹ Ulrich, “The Canonical Process,” 56. This arbitrary decision is a mistake, and colors his assessment of the situation in a way that reflects modern (perhaps confessional) values rather than the state of affairs at the time of the writing of the scrolls at Qumran. He places upon the corpus a boundary of categorization that does not exist in the evidence from the time. It would be better to categorize texts based on their apparent use in antiquity, at Qumran, rather than their eventual status elsewhere. He comes close to such a position himself, when he differentiates between “authoritativeness” and “canon” (57), but does not go so far as to throw the second out when seeking the contemporary attitude toward books at Qumran.

⁸² Ulrich, “The Canonical Process,” 60.

⁸³ Ulrich, “The Canonical Process,” 63. (This is no more useful than defining the size of a “medium sized state” as somewhere between that of the Vatican and Russia. More study in this area and perhaps a combination qualitative/quantitative definition of what constitutes a variant edition is needed.)

⁸⁴ Ulrich, “The Canonical Process,” 65.

⁸⁵ Ulrich, “The Canonical Process,” 69.

each of the variants in the Qumran manuscripts are secondary *vis à vis* MT and that “the general *edition* of each of the scrolls appears to be that of the MT.”⁸⁶ By this he seems to mean that the text of the Qumran manuscripts, devoid of variants, is equivalent to that of MT.

The final article by Ulrich that will be briefly mentioned here is “The Community of Israel and the Composition of the Scriptures” (1999).⁸⁷ Of note to my purpose in this article is that Ulrich again asserts the lack of a *status quo* textual tradition in the first century, and writes against any assumption that variance from P-MT would have been seen as “aberrant or substandard.”⁸⁸ For Ulrich, the proposed pluriform nature of the text in the first century seems to negate the *possibility* of sectarian variation.⁸⁹ He does, however, state again that creative scribes would “explicitly” and knowingly insert clarifications based on the contemporary⁹⁰ needs of their congregation(s).⁹¹ Ulrich states that then, as now, the text was not subject to polemics – except for SP – and that he has not found any evidence for a textual tradition being chosen by a sectarian group on “the basis of textual comparison”⁹² –

⁸⁶ Ulrich, “The Canonical Process,” 70.

⁸⁷ Eugene Ulrich, “The Community of Israel and the Composition of the Scriptures” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible*. Edited by Eugene Ulrich. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans and Brill, 1999), 3-16.

⁸⁸ Ulrich, “The Community,” 8. This seems to be in conflict with Ulrich, “The Absence,” 180.

⁸⁹ Ulrich, “The Community,” 9. (This is problematic in the face of his acceptance of some SP readings as sectarian variants. I propose that his apparent inconsistency in this regard is due to a slight failure of Ulrich’s logic, as discussed in this essay.)

⁹⁰ And *theologically influenced*? Ulrich does not address this.

⁹¹ Ulrich, “The Community,” 11.

⁹² Ulrich, “The Community,” 15.

though he also does not show evidence for the alternative. Most notably in this article, Ulrich states “the בני ישראל were composing a wide library of religious literature, some of which was undoubtedly considered as serious, as holy, as some of those books that subsequently were included in the canons to the various heirs to the בני ישראל.”⁹³ He explicitly includes in the possibilities much of the Apocryphal corpus, but mentions none of the sectarian works from Qumran.⁹⁴ This reveals more modern canonical thinking influencing judgments and descriptions of the Second Temple mindset, which, as has been asserted by Ulrich himself (above), is not accurate.

Finally, the sometimes subtle nature of the proposed connections I make between the variants in 11Q5 and the theological themes of 1QS require some explanation and support. For this reason I include a short article by Robert W. Wall entitled “The Intertextuality⁹⁵ of Scripture: The Example of Rahab (James 2:25).”⁹⁶ Wall cautions that allusions are often not explicit, but that “more often than not they are merely echoed (or alluded to) by the author’s reference to common words or narrative elements.”⁹⁷ The “anticipated result” of these echoes, according to Wall, is “a reflexive, mutually informing

⁹³ Ulrich, “The Community,” 16.

⁹⁴ Ulrich, “The Community,” 16.

⁹⁵ The term “Intertextuality” here is used in the sense of “conversation between literary texts” rather than in the postmodern sense. This misuse is common when the term is appropriated by Bible scholars. I will therefore use terms such as “conversation between texts” or “textual allusions” where Wall and others might use “Intertextuality.” For more on this, see Thomas R. Hatina, “Intertextuality and Historical Criticism in New Testament Studies: Is There a Relationship?” in *Biblical Interpretation 7, no.1* (January 1, 1999), 28-43.

⁹⁶ Robert W. Wall, “The Intertextuality of Scripture: The Example of Rahab (James 2:25)” in *The Bible at Qumran: Text, Shape, and Interpretation*. (Edited by Peter W. Flint, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001), 218.

⁹⁷ Wall, “The Intertextuality,” 218.

conversation” between the alluding text and the text to which it alludes.⁹⁸ Wall explains that this back-and-forth dynamic between the texts

“adds layers of information to the interpretive matrix within which a fuller, richer meaning unfolds for the careful reader . . . the full meaning of a theme unfolds within the entire composition, when the repetition of key words or phrases, used at different points of the author’s argument, articulate different aspects of the whole theme.”⁹⁹

Wall explains that the limit to this expanding theme is (he implies) not in the text itself:

“What limits and restricts the full meaning of a biblical tradition . . . is . . . *the core theological convictions of a biblical people* . . . The multivalency of a tradition must never exceed what we confess to be true about God and God’s covenant with the faith community” (emphasis mine).¹⁰⁰ My proposed interplay of the altered wording in Psalm 119 of 11Q5 with the theological themes of 1QS relies on this kind of understanding of textual conversation and allusion.

⁹⁸ Wall, “The Intertextuality,” 218.

⁹⁹ Wall, “The Intertextuality,” 218.

¹⁰⁰ Robert Wall, “The Intertextuality of Scripture . . .” 219. (Though Wall is speaking in the context of a New Testament allusion to an Old Testament story, the elements of relationship between texts is applicable to the interplay between sectarian and “biblical” texts at Qumran. The limiting theology, in that case, would not be the biblical theology of later faith groups, nor those of other contemporary sects, but the specific theological understandings and foci of the Community at Qumran.)

With this foundational scholarship in mind, I shall now transition into my application of it in relation to the goal of testing textual variants in Psalm 119 for sectarian elements.

PART II: SOME PROBLEMS AND ISSUES WITH A STUDY OF THIS TYPE

Ulrich highlights several issues and problems in relation to this kind of study, including two “predictable assumptions”¹⁰¹ which he attempts to debunk, but does so with some problematic lines of reasoning. I shall critique his arguments and conclusions here, in an attempt to highlight and to overcome the problems associated with these assumptions.

Lack of a *Status Quo* Hebrew Textual Tradition

His first point is that more recent research has indicated that the Pharisaic sect did not represent mainstream Judaism in the late Second Temple period.¹⁰² This assumption of their dominance has led to the further assumption that MT, more or less as we have it today, was the *status quo* Hebrew text of the late Second Temple period. His interpretation of the more recent scholarship is that the acceptable textual tradition(s) (throughout Judaism in general in the Second Temple period) was pluriform, varied comparatively widely, and was not a source of conflict among the sects of the day.¹⁰³ Put another way, Ulrich proposes that there

¹⁰¹ Ulrich “The Absence,” 180.

¹⁰² Ulrich “The Absence,” 180.

¹⁰³ Ulrich “The Absence,” 180.

were many forms of the texts, that each was accepted widely, and that none of them was considered to be generally superior to the others.

He moves from that point to a rejection of the validity of the concept of “sectarian” variants on the basis that all groups of the time should be considered “sects,” and none more or less so than each of the others.¹⁰⁴ If there is no normative Judaism, he concludes, then all groups are sects and there is no norm from which to deviate.

For Ulrich, the argument would seem to have been solved at this early point – except his next action argues against this. After proving by (flawed) logic that there can be no sectarian variants, he includes a section in which he identifies several from the Samaritan Pentateuch.¹⁰⁵ Before examining the sectarian variants themselves, we must identify the flaw in his train of thought.

The problem lies in the assumption that the proposed lack of a normative Judaism negates the possibility of a sectarian variant. Based on this premise, variants may be considered “theological” – that is, based on or motivated by religious beliefs – but not “sectarian.” Ulrich himself includes some examples of sectarian variants from SP and so he cannot be entirely opposed to the conclusion that such variants exist. The flaw in his logic is that lack of sectarian variation necessarily follows lack of *status quo*.

This is further complicated by his argument against the possibility that a scribe of a certain sect could alter the scriptures to suit (or highlight) the sect’s theology.¹⁰⁶ As

¹⁰⁴ Ulrich “The Absence,” 181.

¹⁰⁵ Ulrich “The Absence,” 181.

¹⁰⁶ In addition to this, one must consider the compound impact of a series of decisions in favour of pre-existing variants, which together make up evidence of a sectarian nature of the document as a whole. This will be further discussed in the Conclusion section.

mentioned above, Ulrich states that such tampering would not have been tolerated.¹⁰⁷ This seems incongruous with his depiction of the pluriform and multifaceted understanding of text tradition. Either the general tendency was toward many and varied texts, or it was toward an authoritative tradition or pool of traditions – one cannot validly choose one argument or the other depending on the question. Perhaps we do not yet have a full enough grasp on the situation in first century Judaism to judge the nature of this tension between reverence for scriptures-as-written and freedom to vary, clarify and expand the texts. Let us leave that for the moment and return to an examination of his accepted sectarian variants.

The examples provided are from SP and, in one instance, a third-layer variation over a sectarian variant within SP.¹⁰⁸ What he seems to be doing is using the consensus that the Samaritan variations are not only theological, but *unique*, as a basis for sectarian status. He is allowing sectarian status for these variants because they are different from the *entirety* of other readings. His argument implies a definition of sectarian variance that allows a reading to be considered “sectarian” if it is (along with some other attributes to be discussed below) not found in the texts of any other group.

This makes perfect sense. A sect is designated as such based on unique characteristics, attributes that are different from all other sects – regardless of how much those other sects might vary from, or resemble, each other. Though I (at least thus far in my studies) tend to disagree with Ulrich regarding the absence of a *status quo* Hebrew textual tradition in the period in question, the point is moot if we limit identification of sectarian

¹⁰⁷ Ulrich, “The Absence,” 180.

¹⁰⁸ Ulrich “The Absence,” 181.

variants to those that are unique to the theology of a single, particular sect of Judaism. Such a move is both expedient and practical to this study.

One must be cautious, however. *Absence of evidence is not evidence of absence*, and there is always the possibility that readings identical to the variants in the Dead Sea Scrolls have been lost. We can safely assume, however, that if a source contains the only known instance(s) of a theological reading, that the *possibility* of a sectarian nature remains. Determining the presence or absence of this *possibility* is the purpose of this essay – not the presentation of definitive proof of existence. This absence is therefore not to any degree prohibitive to my thesis.

Based on this reasoning, as demonstrated by Ulrich himself, a reading that is (or appears to be) unique and can be shown to have some conversation (thematic or otherwise)¹⁰⁹ with a representative sectarian document is a candidate for sectarian variant status, pursuant to other factors as discussed in the section on Ulrich's Rules of Identification.

Assumptions and Presuppositions

The second point that may be at issue is my assumption of the connection between 11Q5 and 1QS. There has been a large number of works produced already on the nature of the ruins at Khirbet Qumran, the degree of connection between the ruins and the contents of the various caves, and even the plausible degree of connection (and nature of relationship) between the recovered texts themselves. It is impractical for this study to encompass even

¹⁰⁹ See: Wall, "The Intertextuality," 218.

the mainstream theories and data so-far developed in those branches of the field, and so for the purpose of this essay I shall operate under certain assumptions. They are as follows.

First, I will assume that 11Q5 (as well as those few supporting texts mentioned) were collected or copied at Qumran by a group whom I shall refer to as the “Community,” the “*Yahad*” or the “Qumranites.”

Second, I shall assume that this same group either authored or accepted the authority of 1QS and other texts categorized as “sectarian” by most scholars. For this essay, I will maintain focus on 1QS in an effort to avoid invalid support from other sectarian works that might have been authored by other groups or in other geographical areas. These first two assumptions are further supported by orthographic and morphological similarities (what Tov refers to as “Qumran Scribal Practice” and Abegg refers to as “Second Temple Scribal Practice”), which will be discussed in more detail in Parts II and III of this essay.

Third, I accept that this group is similar to the Essene tradition, but also that it is not reliably synonymous with Essenes in general. I will be cautious regarding any evidence or implication based on what is known of the Essenes from other sources, and will avoid using it. What is of primary importance to this thesis is not the corpus surrounding 11Q5 and 1QS, nor even an identification of the sect behind the two texts, but rather the *relationship* between the two texts specifically with regard to unique readings in 11Q5. The only sense in which I go beyond this limitation is that I will assume that 1QS and 11Q5 are both included in the body of texts referred to by Ulrich as “the Dead Sea Scrolls.”¹¹⁰ I foresee no argument on this point.

¹¹⁰ Ulrich “The Absence,” 179.

Finally, there are several sections of Psalm 119 that are not extant or are omitted from 11Q5.¹¹¹ A useful discussion of the potential reasons for the particular inclusions and omissions and their subsequent implications may well reveal or imply much, but is beyond this essay. Likewise for the chosen content and placement of the non-biblical sections of 11Q5 as related to the biblical sections included – this study must be left for another time. I shall therefore limit my discussion to the variants present in those (extant) verses of Psalm 119 included in the 11Q5 scroll.

With these parameters in place, I shall continue with an examination of Ulrich's criteria for the identification of sectarian variants.

Ulrich's Rules of Identification

Ulrich lists four rules by which sectarian variants can be identified. If a variant fulfills all four, he proposes, then it can be considered sectarian; if even one is not fulfilled, it can not.

I would criticize this foundation in only one aspect: I agree that conformity to all four rules indicates a sectarian nature to the variant. However, a *non*-sectarian nature is only proved if the variant contravenes the rules in such a way to definitively disqualify it. There are instances in which there is insufficient evidence for a strong ruling either way. In such instances, the variant must be classified as either "indeterminate," or as "a possible sectarian variant." To call it "non-sectarian" is to *assume* a non-sectarian nature unless a sectarian nature is proven; we have no indication that such an assumption is more valid than its opposite. Recalling my courtroom metaphor, this would be the equivalent of "guilty until

¹¹¹ Psalm 119:7-14, 29-36, 50-58, 74-81, 97-104, 121-127, 143-149 and 169-170.

proven innocent.” It is better practice to withhold a decision until there is a full review of all available data upon which to base judgment. If sufficient data is not available, we are not able to claim “guilty” nor “innocent” and must designate something less concrete until necessary data is presented. The courtroom expresses this principle by the declaration or plea of “*not guilty*,” rather than “innocent.” In the context of DSS research, we may express it by maintaining a designation of “possible” until such possibility has been proven unreasonable. I shall now list Ulrich’s rules, by which he proposes to structure consideration of variants and their suitability for designation as “sectarian.” My critique and discussion of them will follow the list.

Ulrich’s rules of identification are: (1) A sectarian variant must be clearly *secondary* (or later); it cannot be either an original (or earlier) reading, nor can it be a synonymous variant.¹¹² (2) The variant must be *intentional*; it must be clear that the scribe was concerned to change one natural, sound reading into a reading important to his particular group.¹¹³ (3) The variant must be *specific to one group or sect* versus that of Jews in general.¹¹⁴ (4) The variant ought to be *repeated* or consistently made or accompanied by other sectarian variants in the same manuscript – not a single, isolated variant.¹¹⁵

Rule #1 – a sectarian variant must be clearly *secondary* – is sound. An original writing is not a variant reading, despite similarities it may have to other writings. Because this essay is concerned with Psalm 119 as extant in 11Q5, the issue of originality of the

¹¹² Ulrich “The Absence,” 192.

¹¹³ Ulrich “The Absence,” 192.

¹¹⁴ Ulrich “The Absence,” 192.

¹¹⁵ Ulrich “The Absence,” 187.

work as a whole is not in question. The following assessment shall therefore abide fully with Rule #1 without need for modification.

Rule #2 – the variant must be *intentional* – is likewise sound. Not only will this eliminate from consideration scribal mistakes, but the added stipulation that the variant should be against a “natural, sound reading” further ensures a purely sectarian motivation. If a scribe corrected a difficult passage with a sectarian-seeming variant, we would have an interesting point of insight to the underlying beliefs of the scribe. However, the variation would not necessarily indicate sufficient sectarian impetus to alter the original had it been sound in the first place.

These modifications of ambiguous or problematic readings should not be discounted entirely, however. The presence of variations of problematic readings may lend support to the presence of sectarian variant readings that *do* fulfill all four requirements. That is, one weak indicator of sectarian variation becomes more influential if a stronger indication can be proven also to be present. For this reason I will discuss interesting solutions to problematic readings – and their possible theological/sectarian motivations – but I will abide by Ulrich’s rule and not consider individual variants of this kind for probable sectarian variant status at this time.

Rule #3 – the variant must be *specific to one group or sect* versus that of Jews in general – is also acceptable. Any variant that can be demonstrated to suit a Jewish group other than the Community may arguably have been developed by another group or may have been extant in another textual tradition that influenced the development of either group. Such variants may be theological in nature and elicit meaningful questions as such,

but they are not necessarily sectarian. For the purpose of this essay, therefore, I will submit to Rule #3.

Finally, with regard to Rule #4 – the variant ought to be *repeated* or consistently made or accompanied by other sectarian variants in the same manuscript, not a single, isolated variant – I must apply some modification. I agree that the repetition of a variant increases the impact of the evidence, but I do not believe that this is necessary. Perhaps that is the reason that Ulrich uses “must” for the first three rules and “ought” for the fourth.¹¹⁶ It is very possible that a sectarian reading in a particular instance may stand out, even if that particular textual situation does not occur again to allow for multiple attestations. I suspect that his example of the use of Mount Gerizim in SP would have been accepted as a sectarian variant, considering their cultic use of the location to this day, even had it been used only once in the text.¹¹⁷ In fact, a careful consideration of the nature of this variant reveals that it is, in many respects, a single variant¹¹⁸ that is subsequently quoted in other instances.¹¹⁹

There is a caveat, however: if the textual *situation* occurs more than once, but only in the one instance is the *variant* present, then it cannot be considered a reliable sectarian variant. This situation would call into play Rule #2 by raising doubts as to the intentionality of the reading. At best it would be indeterminate. In summary, it would be useful to see the variant in multiple instances, but it is not necessary, so long as there are no contradictory instances in the same document.

¹¹⁶ I have adjusted his spelling in each case from “aught” to “ought” for reasons of consistency.

¹¹⁷ Ulrich “The Absence,” 181.

¹¹⁸ SP Exod. 20:14 (MT 20:17)

¹¹⁹ SP Deut. 5:18; 27:4

A final note with regard to Rule #4 is that conversation between texts should be considered both as a potential positive and as a potential negative indicator of a sectarian, theological motivation. If the text in question appears to be in conversation with a sectarian text and agrees in its themes, then the probability of sectarian variation is increased. If the text in question appears to be in conversation with a sectarian text but does *not* agree in some aspects, then the probability of a sectarian nature to the variants is sharply decreased. There must be some sense of unified agreement of theme if a sectarian motivation is used as an explanation of variants in the text.

Just as sectarian variation can be indicated by a unity of theme between a modified text and a sectarian text, geographical, societal or authorial ties can also be useful considerations. It is for this reason that the connection between 11Q5 and the Community at Qumran is so important. The Community copied or collected 11Q5 and 1QS. The archaeology of Qumran, to which they have been reasonably linked, supports this theory and no compelling evidence has been posited to the contrary. It is this probable relationship between the texts that allows us to compare even the more subtle variant readings in 11Q5 with theological tenets and foci in 1QS.

In this study, I am not looking exclusively for identical variant readings in other texts (which would contravene Rule #4, repetition in the same text), but for supporting thematic or text-critical evidence from similar content in a sectarian original (1QS), which may then be used to indicate a possible sectarian nature to even a single variant reading. By limiting my source of sectarian theology to one work (almost exclusively), I hope to eliminate undue proof-texting. This should also avoid the problematic practice of speculation regarding the use of different “sectarian” scrolls that potentially originate from

different geographic and/or sectarian sources – potentially causing a technique of mix-and-match to suit each purpose. Therefore a proposed allusion must not only appear to be in conversation with a particular theme of 1QS, but it must not conflict with any of the other themes in 1QS. This limitation of scope allows for careful consideration of a set of sectarian themes from a single source. Further expansion of this study must be left for a later date.

PART III: A SURVEY OF THE VARIANTS OF PSALM 119 IN 11Q5

Explanation of Structure and Method

The 11Q5 variants shall therefore be discussed in the following manner. They will be identified as differing from MT (as our closest extant representative of the P-MT tradition). They will be considered *secondary*, as discussed above, and therefore conforming to Rule #1.¹²⁰ Any variants that alter a problematic reading will be discounted from sectarian variant status in accordance with Rule #2, though interesting aspects of the new reading may be discussed. As per Rule #3, any variant that may be applicable to another contemporary (or earlier) Jewish group will be discounted – these may be theological, but our working criteria for sectarian status is more narrow.¹²¹ Finally, in accordance to Rule #4, repeated instances will be sought after, but in their absence the variant will be judged on its own strength of probability alone. If conflicting readings exist in the same manuscript or conflicting theology exists in the comparison manuscript (1QS), the variant will be ruled out.

¹²⁰ Obvious 11Q5 corrections of the P-MT text indicate that 11Q5 was copied from this tradition or from a common source tradition that is not corrected in the MT, but is in 11Q5. Examples of these corrections may be found in 11Q5 9:4, 10:16, 11:4, and 12:10.

¹²¹ If one could prove that the variants as a group existed in an identifiable *combination* different than any other single Jewish group, then the implications of the evidence would be toward a sectarian reading. Such a method, however, would not carry much impact on its own and is overshadowed by other evidence. For these reasons, it is beyond the scope of this study.

Each variant type can be described by one (in rare cases more than one) of six descriptors – (1) Morphological; (2) Orthographic (or its subgroup: phonological); (3) Non-Sectarian; (4) Possible Sectarian; (5) Indeterminate or (6) as a Scribal Error.

Morphological variants are those that occur due to changes in form. In English, this includes some archaic forms such as “sayest” versus the more modern “say” which produce no real change in meaning, but do usually alter the sound of the word. An example of morphological variation comes from the fact that in DSS Hebrew, as in other Hebrew traditions, the imperative and infinitive with suffixes have two possible morphologies: *קטלני* (slay) and *קטולני* (slay); and *לקטלני* (to slay) and *לקטולני* (to slay). This usage has been expanded to apply to the imperfect as well: the earlier form, *יקטלני* (he will slay), is rendered *יקטולני* (he will slay) in a style parallel to the imperative and infinitive forms.¹²²

Orthographic variants, however, are those that occur due to regional or gradual (over time) changes in spelling. Examples in English include regional differences in spelling, such as “tire” or “honor” (American) versus “tyre” or “honour” (British). Hebrew examples include *הַהֹלְכִים* (the walkers) versus *הַהוֹלְכִים*¹²³ (the walkers), the latter of which demonstrates the use of *plene* spelling. Orthographic differences do not alter the pronunciation, meaning or implications of a word.

Neither Morphological nor Orthographic variants are considered “real” variants, because they do not alter the meaning of the phrase in which they occur.

¹²² Qimron, *The Hebrew of*, §311.13

¹²³ Un-pointed samples are, unless otherwise specified, from the Qumran corpus.

Non-Sectarian variants are those that alter the meaning of the phrase, but are not theologically motivated or are motivated by a theological consideration held by Judaism in general.

Possible Sectarian variants are those that alter the meaning of the phrase and might have theological motivation particular to the beliefs or foci of a single sect.

Any variants that change the meaning of the phrase (non-sectarian, sectarian and sometimes scribal errors or indeterminate variants) are considered “real” variants, because they alter the meaning of the phrase in which they occur.

Scribal errors are those variations that can be reasonably explained by a common type of scribal error. Examples in Hebrew include *resh* for *dalet* errors that occur due to misreading of a previous scribe’s handwriting. These will be discussed in detail below as they occur.

I shall now review each of the variants and apply Ulrich’s rules of identification, with the slight modifications as discussed above, to each of them.

Table of Variants in 11Q5

The Master Variant Chart is a summary of the variants present in Psalm 119 in MT as compared to the Psalm 119 sections of 11Q5. Each has been classified according to the following key. The more detailed discussions of each variant category include an additional, refined chart which filters out potentially distracting data.

Variant Key	
MORPHOLOGICAL	
1.1	Imperfect <i>Qal</i> form
1.2	Additional <i>he</i> , stylistic
1.3	Alternate form of the imperative
1.4	Addition of a (<i>waw</i>) conjunction
1.5	Omission of a (<i>waw</i>) conjunction
1.6	Additional <i>he</i> , 2nd person suffix (A-class vowel)
1.7	Additional <i>he</i> , first person imperfect forms
ORTHOGRAPHIC	
2.1	<i>Yod</i> for <i>sere</i>
2.2	<i>Yod</i> for <i>hireq</i>
2.3	<i>Yod</i> for <i>seghol</i>
2.4	Qumran plural <i>aleph</i> insert
2.5	<i>Waw</i> for <i>holem</i>
2.6	<i>Waw</i> for <i>qibbutz</i>
2.7	Additional <i>waw</i>
2.8	<i>Waw</i> for <i>qamets-hatuf</i>
PHONOLOGICAL	
3.0	Phonological
GRAPHICAL	
4.1	Possible scribal error
REAL VARIANTS	
5.1	Change of vocabulary word for one of similar meaning
5.2	Change of vocabulary word for one of different meaning
5.3	Addition of a vocabulary word that does not significantly alter meaning
5.4	Addition of a vocabulary word or phrase that significantly alters meaning
5.6	Omission of a vocabulary word that does not significantly alter meaning
5.7	Omission of a vocabulary word that significantly alters meaning
5.8	Addition of pronominal suffix
5.9	Change in pronominal suffix
5.10	Change in prepositional prefix
5.11	Omission of prepositional prefix
5.12	Pluralisation
5.13	Singularisation
5.14	Shift in mood of verb (active/passive)
5.15	Change in aspect of a verb
5.16	Change in part of speech of a word
5.17	Erasure
5.18	Correction/Insert

The charts are organized in six columns. The first column contains verse references from MT and the second contains the corresponding column and line references for 11Q5. Column three lists the variant types as listed in the key (above). In some instances, more than one classification has been listed due to ambiguity or general disagreement as to the nature of the variant; if I did not come to a conclusion with which I was satisfied, I included both of the possibilities. Columns four and five list the words or phrases in which the variants occur, in MT and 11Q5 respectively, with the specific variant element in grey, for ease of identification. In instances where there are more than one variant in a single word, the word is listed an additional time for each variant, but translated only once. Column six contains translations of the words and phrases. As mentioned above, the translation is provided only once for each occurrence of a word. If an identical word is translated on two adjacent lines, this indicates two occurrences of the same word. An example of this is in verse 128, in which כּוֹל/כָּל (all) is listed three times: once in conjunction with “precepts” and twice more as free-standing words. Compare this to verse 119 in which the noun phrase כּוֹל עֲדוּוֹתֶיכָה (all of your testimonies/decrees) is listed five times, but only translated once – this indicates a single occurrence of the phrase, with five variants present. Each of the more focussed charts is presented in the same manner as the Master Variants Chart.

Master Variants Chart

Verse	Col/Line	Variant Type	MT	11Q5	English
1	6:11	2.5	הַהֹלְכִים	הַהֹלְכִים	"walkers/goers"
2	6:12	5.2	לֵב	עַת	"heart"; "time"
		1.1	יִדְרְשׁוּהוּ	יִדְרְשׁוּהוּ	"who seek him"; "who seek it" <i>fem</i>
		5.9	יִדְרְשׁוּהוּ	יִדְרְשׁוּהוּ	
3	6:13		No variation in this verse		
4	6:14	1.2	אַתָּה	אַתָּה	"you"
		2.5	לְשֹׁמֵר	לְשֹׁמֵר	"to keep"
		2.5	מְאֹד	מְאֹדָה	"very"
		1.2	מְאֹד	מְאֹדָה	
5	6:15	5.2	חֻקֶיךָ	אֲמִתּוֹתֶיךָ	"statutes"; "truth"
		1.6	חֻקֶיךָ	אֲמִתּוֹתֶיךָ	
6	6:16	2.5	מִצְוֹתֶיךָ	מִצְוֹתֶיךָ	"your commandments"
		1.6	מִצְוֹתֶיךָ	מִצְוֹתֶיךָ	
7-14			Not extant in 11Q5		
15	7:1	2.6	בְּפִקּוּדֶיךָ	בְּפִקּוּדֶיךָ	"on your precepts"
		1.6	בְּפִקּוּדֶיךָ	בְּפִקּוּדֶיךָ	
		2.5	אֲרֻחֹתֶיךָ	אֲרֻחֹתֶיךָ	"your ways"
		2.5	אֲרֻחֹתֶיךָ	אֲרֻחֹתֶיךָ	
		1.6	אֲרֻחֹתֶיךָ	אֲרֻחֹתֶיךָ	
16	7:2	2.6	בְּחֻקֶיךָ	בְּחֻקֶיךָ	"in your statutes"
		5.1	בְּחֻקֶיךָ	בְּחֻקֶיךָ	
		1.6	בְּחֻקֶיךָ	בְּחֻקֶיךָ	
		2.5	לֹא	לֹא	"not"
		5.12	דְּבָרֶיךָ	דְּבָרֶיךָ	"your word"; "your words"
		1.6	דְּבָרֶיךָ	דְּבָרֶיךָ	
17	7:3	2.5	גְּמֹל	גְּמֹר	"to reward"; "to complete"
		5.1	גְּמֹל	גְּמֹר	
		5.12	דְּבָרֶיךָ	דְּבָרֶיךָ	"your word"; "your words"
		1.6	דְּבָרֶיךָ	דְּבָרֶיךָ	
18	7:4	5.12	מִתּוֹרֹתֶיךָ	מִתּוֹרֹתֶיךָ	"from your law"; "from your laws"
		1.6	מִתּוֹרֹתֶיךָ	מִתּוֹרֹתֶיךָ	

Verse	Col/Line	Variant		English	
		Type	MT		11Q5
19	7:5	2.5	אָנְכִי	אנוכי	"I"
		2.5	מִצְוֹתֶיךָ	מצוותיכה	"your commandments"
	1.6	מִצְוֹתֶיךָ	מצוותיכה		
20	7:6	3.0	גָּרְסָה	גרשה	"she is consumed"
		1.6	מִשְׁפָּטֶיךָ	משפטיכה	"your judgments"
		2.8	בְּכֹל	בכול	"in all"
21	7:7	1.2	גְּעַרְתָּ	גערתה	"you rebuke"
		2.5	הַשְּׂגִיִּים	השוגים	"the straying ones"
		2.5	מִמִּצְוֹתֶיךָ	ממצוותיכה	"from your commandments"
		1.6	מִמִּצְוֹתֶיךָ	ממצוותיכה	
22	7:8	1.3	גֹּל	גול	"roll" <i>imperative</i>
		2.5	עֲדוּתֶיךָ	עדותיכה	"your testimonies/ decrees"
		2.7	עֲדוּתֶיךָ	עדותיכה	
		1.6	עֲדוּתֶיךָ	עדותיכה	
23	7:9	1.6	עֲבָדְךָ	עבדכה	"your servant"
		2.6	בְּחֻקֶיךָ	בחוקיכה	"on your statutes"
		1.6	בְּחֻקֶיךָ	בחוקיכה	
24	7:10	2.5	עֲדוּתֶיךָ	עדותיכה	"your decrees"
		2.7	עֲדוּתֶיךָ	עדותיכה	
		1.6	עֲדוּתֶיךָ	עדותיכה	
		2.6	שְׂעִשְׂעֵי	שעשׂע׳	"my delights"
25	7:11	No variants in extant portion of 11Q5			
26	7:12	1.6	חֻקֶיךָ	חוקיכה	"your statutes"
27	7:13	1.6	פְּקוּדוֹתֶיךָ	פקודיכה	"your precepts"
		1.6	בְּנִפְלְאוֹתֶיךָ	בנפלאותיכה	"on your wonders"
28	7:14	1.6	כְּדַבְרְךָ	כדברכה	"according to your word"
29-36		Not extant in 11Q5			
37	8:1	5.10	בְּדַרְכֶיךָ תִּנְיֵי	כדברכה חונני	"give me life in your ways"; "show me favour according to your word"
		1.6	בְּדַרְכֶיךָ תִּנְיֵי	כדברכה חונני	
		5.2	בְּדַרְכֶיךָ תִּנְיֵי	כדברכה חונני	
38	8:2	1.6	לְעַבְדְּךָ	לעבדכה	"to your servant"
		1.6	אִמְרָתְךָ	אמרתכה	"your promise"
		1.6	לִירְאָתְךָ	ליראתכה	"to your fearers"
39	8:3	1.6	מִשְׁפָּטֶיךָ	משפטיכה	"your judgments"

Verse	Col/Line	Variant		English	
		Type	MT		11Q5
40	8:4	2.6	לְפַקְדֵיךָ	לפקודיכה	"to your precepts"
		1.6	לְפַקְדֵיךָ	לפקודיכה	
		1.6	בְּצַדְקָתְךָ תִּנְיֵי	בצדקתכה חונני	"in your righteousness, give me life"; "in your righteousness show me favour"
		5.2	בְּצַדְקָתְךָ תִּנְיֵי	בצדקתכה חונני	
41	8:5	2.5	וַיְבֹאֵנִי	ויבואוני	"and let come to me"
		2.6	וַיְבֹאֵנִי	ויבואוני	
		5.8	חֶסְדְּךָ	חסד	"your lovingkindness"; "lovingkindness"
		1.6	תְּשׁוּעָתְךָ	תשועתכה	"your salvation"
		1.6	כְּאִמְרָתְךָ	כאמרתכה	"according to your word"
42	8:6	5.18	וְאֶעֱנֶה	ואענה	"I will answer"
		2.5	חֹרְפִי	חורפי	"the reproacher"
		1.6	בְּדַבְרֶךָ	בדברכה	"in your word"
43	8:7	2.5	מְאֹד	מואדה	"very"
		1.2	מְאֹד	מואדה	
		5.1	לְמִשְׁפָּטֶיךָ	לדבריכה	"in your judgments"/"in your words"
		1.6	לְמִשְׁפָּטֶיךָ	לדבריכה	
44	8:8	1.1	וְאֶשְׁמְרָהּ	ואשמורה	"and I will keep"
		1.6	תּוֹרָתְךָ	תורתכה	"your instruction/law"
		5.3	לְעוֹלָם וָעֶד	ועד	"forever and ever"; "forever"
45	8:8	5.2	בְּרַחֲבֶיהָ	ברחוביה	"in the street [free space]"; "in the streets [free spaces]" (MT has the feminine adjective and 11Q5 has the noun plus pronominal suffix)
		5.12	בְּרַחֲבֶיהָ	ברחוביה	
46	8:10	2.5	בְּעֲדוּתֶיךָ	בעדוותיכה	"of your decrees"
		2.7	בְּעֲדוּתֶיךָ	בעדוותיכה	
		1.6	בְּעֲדוּתֶיךָ	בעדוותיכה	
47	8:11	1.7	וְאֶשְׂתַּעֲשֶׂה	ואשתעשה	"and I will delight [in]"
48	8:12	2.5	מִצְוֹתֶיךָ	מצוותיכה	"your commandments"
		5.2	וְאֶשְׂיַחֲמֶהָ	ואשישה	"and I will meditate"; "and I will rejoice"
		2.6	בְּחֻקֶיךָ	בחוקיכה	"on your statutes"
		1.6	בְּחֻקֶיךָ	בחוקיכה	

Verse	Col/Line	Variant		English	
		Type	MT		11Q5
49	8:13	2.5	זָכַר	זְכוּרָה	"remember" <i>imperative</i>
		1.2	זָכַר	זְכוּרָה	
		5.12	דְּבַר	דְּבָרִיכָה	"word"; "your words"
		5.8	דְּבַר	דְּבָרִיכָה	
		1.6	דְּבַר	דְּבָרִיכָה	
50-58			Not extant in 11Q5		
59	9:1	2.5	עֲדוּתֵיךָ	עֲדוּתֵיכָה	"your testimonies/ decrees"
		2.7	עֲדוּתֵיךָ	עֲדוּתֵיכָה	
		1.6	עֲדוּתֵיךָ	עֲדוּתֵיכָה	
60	9:2	2.5	וְלֹא	וְלֹא	"and not"
		2.5	לְשָׁמֹר	לְשָׁמֹר	"to keep"
		2.5	מִצְוֹתֵיךָ	מִצְוֹתֵיכָה	"your commandments"
		1.6	מִצְוֹתֵיךָ	מִצְוֹתֵיכָה	
61	9:3	2.6	עֲדוּנִי	עֲדוּנִי	"surround me"
		1.6	תּוֹרַתְךָ	תּוֹרַתְכָה	"your instruction/law"
		2.5	לֹא	לֹא	"not"
62	9:4	1.6	לְךָ	לְכָה	"to you"
		1.6	צְדָקָךָ	צְדָקְכָה	"[of] your righteousness"
63	9:5	2.8	לְכֹל	לְכֹל	"to all"
		1.6	יִרְאוּךָ	יִרְאוּכָה	"your fearers"
		2.5	וְלְשֹׁמְרֵי	וְלְשֹׁמְרֵי	"and to keepers"
		1.6	פְּקוּדֵיךָ	פְּקוּדֵיכָה	"your precepts"
		64	9:6	1.6	חֲסֵדְךָ
2.6	חֻקֵיךָ			חֻקְכָה	"your statutes"; "your statute"
5.13	חֻקֵיךָ			חֻקְכָה	
1.6	חֻקֵיךָ			חֻקְכָה	
65	9:7	1.2	עָשִׂיתָ	עָשִׂיתָה	"you did" [you dealt]
		1.6	עַבְדְּךָ	עַבְדְּכָה	"your servant"
		1.6	כְּדְבָרְךָ	כְּדְבָרְכָה	"according to your word"
66	9:8	2.5	בְּמִצְוֹתֵיךָ	בְּמִצְוֹתֵיכָה	"in your commandments"
		1.6	בְּמִצְוֹתֵיךָ	בְּמִצְוֹתֵיכָה	
67	9:9	2.5	שָׁגַג	שָׁגַג	"[was] a staggerer" [one who went astray]
		1.6	אִמְרַתְךָ	אִמְרַתְכָה	"your word"

Verse	Col/Line	Variant		English	
		Type	MT		11Q5
68	9:10	5.3	טוב־אתה	טוב אתה אדוני	"you are good"; "you are good, Lord"
		2.6	חֲקִיךָ	חוקיכה	"your statutes"
		1.6	חֲקִיךָ	חוקיכה	
69	9:11	2.8	בְּכֹל	בְּכֹל	"with all"
		2.5	אֶצֶר	אצורה	"I keep"
69	9:11	1.2	אֶצֶר	אצורה	
		1.6	פְּקוּדֵיךָ	פקודיכה	"your precepts"
70	9:12	1.6	תּוֹרַתְךָ	תורתכ[ה]	"your instruction/law"
		5.2	שֶׁשָּׂשְׂתִי	שֶׁשְׁ[ש]יעי	"I delight" [pilpel]; "my delights" [noun]
		5.16	שֶׁשָּׂשְׂתִי	שֶׁשְׁ[ש]יעי	
71	9:13	5.14	עֲנִיתִי	עניתי	"I was afflicted"; "you afflicted me"
		1.6	חֲקִיךָ	חוק[י]כה	"your statutes"
72	9:14	1.6	פִּיךָ	פיכה	"[of] your mouth"
		5.13	מֵאלֵפִי	מאל[פ]י	"than thousands"; "than a thousand"
73	9:15	1.6	מִצְוֹתֶיךָ	מצותי כ"ה	"your commandments"
74-81			Not extant in 11Q5		
82	10:1	5.13	פָּלוּ	כלתה	"they failed (completed/destroyed)"; "it failed (completed/destroyed)"
		1.6	לְאִמְרַתְךָ	לאמרתכה	"for your promise"
		2.5	לְאֹמֵר	לאמור	"to say"
83	10:2	5.14	הֵיִתִי	עשיתי	"I have become"; "you have made me"
		2.5	כְּנֹאֵד	כנאוד	"like a [wine]skin"
		5.2	חֲקִיךָ	חסדכה	"your statutes"; "your lovingkindness"
		1.6	חֲקִיךָ	חסדכה	
		2.5	לֹא	לוא	"not"
84	10:3	1.6	עֲבָדְךָ	עבדכה	"your servant"
		2.5	בְּרֹדְפֵי	ברודפי	"those in pursuit of me"
85	10:4	2.1	זָרִים	זידים	"proud"
		5.2	שִׁחֹת	שחת	"pits"; "pit [hell/perdition]"
		2.5	לֹא	לוא	"not"
		1.6	כְּתוֹרַתְךָ	כתורתכה	"according to your instruction/law"
86	10:5	2.8	כָּל	כול	"all"
		2.5	מִצְוֹתֶיךָ	מצותיכה	"your commandments"
		1.6	מִצְוֹתֶיךָ	מצותיכה	
		2.8	עֲזֹרֵנִי	עוזרני	"help me!"

Verse	Col/Line	Variant		English	
		Type	MT		11Q5
87	10:6	5.10	בְּאֶרֶץ	מֵאֶרֶץ	"in the earth"; "from the earth"
		2.5	לֹא	לֹא	"not"
		1.6	פְּקוּדֵיךָ	פְּקוּדֵיכָה	"your precepts"
88	10:7	1.6	כַּחֲסִדְךָ	כַּחֲסִדְכָה	"according to your lovingkindness"
		5.2	חַיִּי	חֹנְנִי	"give me life"; "show me favour"
		1.1	וְאֶשְׁמְרָהּ	וְאֶשְׁמֹרָה	"and I will keep"
		2.7	עֲדוּת	עֲדוּת	"[the] testimonies/ decrees"
		1.6	פִּיךָ	פִּיכָה	"your mouth"
89	10:8	1.6	דְּבַרְךָ	דְּבַרְכָה	"your word"
90	10:9	2.5	לְדֹר	לְדוֹר	"to generation"
		2.5	וְדֹר	וְדוֹר	"and generation"
		1.6	אֱמוּנָתְךָ	אֱמוּנַתְכָה	"your faithfulness"
		1.6	כֹּונֵנֶתָ	כֹּונֵנַתָּה	"you have established" <i>polel</i>
		1.6	לְמִשְׁפָּטֶיךָ	לְמִשְׁפָּטֵיכָה	"by your judgments"
91	10:10	2.5	הַכֹּל	הַכּוֹל	"(the) all"
		1.6	עֲבָדֶיךָ	עֲבָדֵיכָה	"your servants"
		1.6	תּוֹרָתְךָ	תּוֹרַתְכָה	"your instruction/law"
92	10:11	2.6	שְׂשׂוּעֵי	שְׂשׂוּעֵי	"my delights"
		5.2	בְּעֲוֹנֵי	בְּעוֹנֵי	"in my affliction/ misery"; "in my guilt"
					עֵינַי עוֹן
93	10:12	2.5	לֹא	לֹא	"not"
		1.6	פְּקוּדֵיךָ	פְּקוּדֵיכָה	"your precepts"
		1.2	בָּם	בֵּמָה	"in/by them"
94	10:13	1.6	לְךָ	לְכָה	"to you" [yours]
		1.6	פְּקוּדֵיךָ	פְּקוּדֵיכָה	"your precepts"
95	10:14	2.7	עֲדוּתֶיךָ	עֲדוּתֵיכָה	"your testimonies/ decrees"
		1.6	עֲדוּתֶיךָ	עֲדוּתֵיכָה	
96	10:15	2.8	לְכֹל	לְכוֹל	"to all"
		1.6	מִצְוַתְךָ	מִצְוַתְכָה [ה]	"your commandment"
		1.1	מְאֹד	מְאוּדָה	"very" [great]
		1.2	מְאֹד	מְאוּדָה	
97-104			Not extant in 11Q5		

Verse	Col/Line	Variant		English	
		Type	MT		11Q5
105	11:1	2.3	דְּבַרְךָ	דבריכה	"your word"; "your words"
		1.6	דְּבַרְךָ	דבריכה	
		1.4	אֹר	אור	"and a light"; "a light"
		5.12	לְנַתִּיבֹתַי	לנתיבותי	"to my path"; "to my paths"
106	11:2	5.1 or 5.2	לְשָׁמֵר	לעשות	"to keep"; "to do/make"
		5.13	מִשְׁפָּטִים	משפט	"judgments"; "judgment"
		1.6	צְדָקָה	צדקה	"[of] your righteousness"
		5.1 or 4.1	נֶעֱנִיתִי	נעויתי	נעויתי
5.2	תִּנְנֵי כִדְבָרְךָ				
108	11:4	1.6	תִּנְנֵי כִדְבָרְךָ	כאמרתכה חונני	
		5.3	רְצֵה־נָּא	רצה	"accept now"; "accept" [both imperative]
		1.5	וּמִשְׁפָּטֶיךָ לְמַדְנִי	ממשפטיכה למדני	"and teach me your judgments"; "teach me from your judgments"
109	11:5	1.6	וּמִשְׁפָּטֶיךָ לְמַדְנִי	ממשפטיכה למדני	
		1.5	וְתוֹרָתְךָ	תורתכה	"(but) your instruction/law"; "your instruction/law"
		1.6	וְתוֹרָתְךָ	תורתכה	
110	11:6	2.5	לֹא	לוא	"not"
		5.4	וּמִפְקוּדֶיךָ	אני פקודיכה	"but from your precepts"; "I, your precepts"
		1.5	וּמִפְקוּדֶיךָ	אני פקודיכה	
		5.11	וּמִפְקוּדֶיךָ	אני פקודיכה	
		1.6	וּמִפְקוּדֶיךָ	אני פקודיכה	
111	11:7	2.5	לֹא	לוא	"not"
		2.7	עֲדוּתֶיךָ	עדותיכה	"your testimonies/ decrees"
		1.6	עֲדוּתֶיךָ	עדותיכה	
112	11:8	5.17	כִּי־שִׂשׂוֹן לִבִּי	כי ששון לבי	"because/for they are the joy of my heart"; "they are the joy of my heart"
		2.6	חֻקֶּיךָ	חוקיכה	"your statutes"
113	11:9	1.6	חֻקֶּיךָ	חוקיכה	
		1.5	וְתוֹרָתְךָ	תורתכה	"but/and your instruction/law"; "your instruction/law"
		1.6	וְתוֹרָתְךָ	תורתכה	

Verse	Col/Line	Variant		MT	11Q5	English
		Type				
114	11:10	5.12		לְדַבְרֶךָ	לְדַבְרִיכָה	"in your way/word"; "in your ways/words"
		1.6		לְדַבְרֶךָ	לְדַבְרִיכָה	
115	11:11	1.1		וְאֶצְרָהּ	וּאֶצְרָהּ	"[that] I may keep"
		2.5		אֱלֹהֵי	אֱלֹהֵי	"my god/God"
116	11:12	1.6		כְּאִמְרֶתְךָ	כְּאִמְרֶתְכָה	"according to your word"
		5.2		מִשְׁבְּרֵי	מִמְשַׁבְּרֵי	"from my hope"; "from my breaking wave/torment"
117	11:13	5.2		וְאֶשְׁעָה	וּאֶשְׂאָה	"that I may gaze"; "that I may lift/carry"
		5.11		בְּחֻקֶיךָ	בְּחֻקֵיכָה	"on your statutes"; "your statutes"
		2.6		בְּחֻקֶיךָ	בְּחֻקֵיכָה	
		1.6		בְּחֻקֶיךָ	בְּחֻקֵיכָה	
118	11:14	1.6		סָלִיתָ	סָלִיתָה	"you rejected"
		2.8		כָּל	כֹּל	"all"
		2.6		מִחֻקֶיךָ	מִחֻקֵיכָה	"from your statutes"
		1.6		מִחֻקֶיךָ	מִחֻקֵיכָה	
119	11:15	2.2		סָגִים	סִיגִים	"[pieces of] dross"
		5.2		הַשְּׁבֵתָה	חֲשַׁבְתִּי	"you determine/ designate [as]"; "I count [as]"
		2.8		כָּל	כֹּל	"all"
		5.3		לְכֵן	עַל כֵּן	"to thus" [therefore]; "on thus" [therefore]
		5.3		עֲדוּתֶיךָ	כֹּל עֲדוּתֵיכָה	"your testimonies/ decrees"; "all [of] your testimonies/ decrees"
		2.8		עֲדוּתֶיךָ	כֹּל עֲדוּתֵיכָה	
		2.5		עֲדוּתֶיךָ	כֹּל עֲדוּתֵיכָה	
		2.7		עֲדוּתֶיךָ	כֹּל עֲדוּתֵיכָה	
		1.6		עֲדוּתֶיךָ	כֹּל עֲדוּתֵיכָה	
120	11:16	1.6		וּמִמְשַׁפְּטֶיךָ	וּמִמְשַׁפְּטֵיכָה	"and from/of your judgments"
121-127				Not extant in 11Q5		
128	12:1	5.6		כָּל-פְּקוּדֵי	פְּקוּדֵי	"all precepts"; "precepts"
		2.8		כָּל	כֹּל	"all"
		2.8		כָּל	כֹּל	"all"
		2.5		אֶרֶץ	אֶרֶץ	"way/path"
129	12:2	5.2		פְּלִאוֹת	פְּלִגֵי נֶפֶת	"wonderful"; "streams of honey"
		2.7		עֲדוּתֶיךָ	עֲדוּתֵיכָה	"your testimonies/ decrees"
		1.6		עֲדוּתֶיךָ	עֲדוּתֵיכָה	

Verse	Col/Line	Variant		English	
		Type	MT		11Q5
130	12:3	1.6	דְּבָרֶיךָ	דבריכה	"your words"
		1.4	יְאִיר	והאר	"(he/it) will enlighten" <i>imperfect</i> ; "and enlighten" <i>imperative</i>
		5.15	יְאִיר	והאר	
		1.1	פְּתוּיִם	פוחאים	"simple [ones]"
		2.4	פְּתוּיִם	פותאים	
131	12:4	5.3 or 5.4	וְאִשְׁאֵפָה כִּי	ואשאפה	"(and) I pant, because"; "(and) I pant"
		2.5	לְמִצְוֹתֶיךָ	למצוותיכה	"for your commandments"
		1.6	לְמִצְוֹתֶיךָ	למצוותיכה	
		5.1	וְאֶבְתִּי	חאבתי	"I long for" [yab]; "I long for" [tab]
		132	12:5	2.8	וְחִנְנֵי
133	12:6	5.10	בְּאִמְרַתְךָ	לאמרתכה	"in/by your word/ promise"; "to your word/promise"
		1.6	בְּאִמְרַתְךָ	לאמרתכה	
		2.8	כָּל	כול	"all"
134	12:7	1.1	וְאִשְׁמְרָהּ	ואשמורה	"and/that I may keep"
		1.6	פְּקוּדֶיךָ	פקודיכה	"your precepts"
135	12:8	1.6	פְּנֵיךָ	פניכה	"your face"
		1.6	בְּעַבְדְּךָ	בעבדכה	"at [upon] your servant"
		2.6	חֻקֶיךָ	חוקיכה	"your statutes"
		1.6	חֻקֶיךָ	חוקיכה	
136	12:9	5.3	אֵל	על כי	"over" [possibly meaning "because of"]; "over when" [possibly meaning "because of"]
		2.5	לֹא	לוא	"not"
		1.6	תּוֹרַתְךָ	תורתכה	"your instruction/law"
137	12:10	5.12	וְיִשָּׁר	וישרים	"and right/straight" <i>singular</i> ; "and right/straight" <i>plural</i>
		1.6	מִשְׁפָּטֶיךָ	משפטיכה	"your judgments"
138	12:11	1.6	צִוִּיתָ	צויתח	"you commanded"
		2.5	עֲדוּתֶיךָ	עדותיכה	"your testimonies/ decrees"
		2.7	עֲדוּתֶיךָ	עדותיכה	
		1.6	עֲדוּתֶיךָ	עדותיכה	
		2.5	מְאֹד	מואדה	"very"
139	12:12	1.2	מְאֹד	מואדה	
		1.6	דְּבָרֶיךָ	דבריכה	"your words"

		Variant				
Verse	Col/Line	Type	MT	11Q5		English
140	12:13	1.6	אִמְרָתְךָ	אמרתכה		"your word"
		1.1	מְאֹד	מואדה		"very"
		1.2	מְאֹד	מואדה		
		1.6	וְעַבְדְּךָ	ועבדך		"and your servant"
141	12:14	2.5	אֲנֹכִי	אנוכי		"I" [poetic]
		2.6	פְּקֻדֹתֶיךָ	פקודיכה		"your precepts"
		1.6	פְּקֻדֹתֶיךָ	פקודיכה		
		2.5	לֹא	לוא		"not"
142	12:15	5.2	צְדָקָתְךָ	צדק[ות]		"your righteousness"; "righteous (acts)"
		5.12	צְדָקָה	[צ]דקות		"righteousness"; "righteous (acts)"
		5.11	לְעוֹלָם	עולם		"to forever"; "forever"
143-149			Not extant in 11Q5			
150	13:1	2.5	רֹדְפֵי	רודפי		"pursuers"
		1.6	מִתּוֹרַתְךָ	מתורתכה		"from your instruction/law"
151	13:2	2.8	וְכֹל	וכל		"and all"
		2.5	מִצְוֹתֶיךָ	מצוותיכה		"your commandments"
152	13:3	1.6	מִצְוֹתֶיךָ	מצוותיכה		
		5.2	מֵעֵדוּתֶיךָ	מדעתכה		"from your testimonies/decrees"; from your knowledge"
		1.6	מֵעֵדוּתֶיךָ	מדעתכה		
153	13:4	5.8	יִסְדַּתָּם	יסדתני		"you have established them"; "you have established me"
		2.8	עֲנִי	עוניי		"my affliction"
		5.6 or 5.7	כִּי־תוֹרַתְךָ	תורתכה		"because/for your instruction/law"; "your instruction/law"
154	13:5	1.6	כִּי־תוֹרַתְךָ	תורתכה		
		2.5	לֹא	לוא		"not"
154	13:5	1.6	לְאִמְרָתְךָ	לאמרתכה		"to your word/promise"
155	13:6	2.6	חֻקֶיךָ	חוקיכה		"your statutes"
		1.6	חֻקֶיךָ	חוקיכה		
		2.5	לֹא	לוא		"not"
156	13:7	1.6	רַחֲמֶיךָ	רחמיכה		"your mercies"
		1.6	כְּמִשְׁפָּטֶיךָ	כמשפטיכה		"according to your judgments"
		5.2	חַיֵּי	חונני		"give me life"; "show me favour"

		Variant			
Verse	Col/Line	Type	MT	11Q5	English
157	13:8	2.5	רודפִּי	רודפי	"my pursuers"
		2.7	מֵעֲדוּתֶיךָ	מעדותיכה	"from your testimonies/ decrees"
		1.6	מֵעֲדוּתֶיךָ	מעדותיכה	
		2.5	לֹא	לוא	"not"
158	13:9	2.5	בִּגְדִים	בוגדים	"treacherous/ faithless [ones]"
		1.6	אִמְרָתְךָ	אמרתכה	"your word"
		2.5	לֹא	לוא	"not"
159	13:11	1.6	פְּקוּדֶיךָ	פקודיכה	"your precepts"
		5.2	כְּחֶסְדְּךָ	כאמרתכה	"according to your lovingkindness"; "according to your word"
		1.6	כְּחֶסְדְּךָ	כאמרתכה	
		5.2	חַיִּי	חונני	"give me life"; "show me favour"
160	13:12	2.5	רֵאשׁ	רו[אש]	"head/sum"
		5.12	דְּבָרֶיךָ	דבריכה	"your word"/"your words"
		1.6	דְּבָרֶיךָ	דבריכה	
		2.8	כָּל	כול	"all"
		5.8	צְדָקָה	צדק	"your righteousness"; "righteousness"
161	13:13	2.8	חֲנֹם	חנום	"for nothing"
		1.6	וּמִדְּבָרֶיךָ	ומדבריכה	"(and) from your words"
162	13:14	2.5	אֲנֹכִי	אנוכי	"I" [poetic]
		1.6	אִמְרָתְךָ	אמרתכה	"your word"
		5.10	כְּמוֹצֵא	ממוצא	"like one who finds"; "from one who finds"
163	13:15	1.4	תּוֹרָתְךָ	ותורתכה	"your instruction/law"; "and your instruction/law"
		1.6	תּוֹרָתְךָ	ותורתכה	
164	13:16, 17	5.15	הֵלַלְתִּיךָ	אה[ללכה]	"I have praised you" [I praise you] <i>perfect</i> ; "I praise you" <i>imperfect</i>
		1.6	הֵלַלְתִּיךָ	אה[ללכה]	
165-170			Not extant in 11Q5		
171	14:1	5.3	תְּהִלָּה פִּי	תהלה לכה כי	"praise, because"; "praise to you, because"
		2.6	חֻקֶיךָ	חוקיכה	"your statutes"
		1.6	חֻקֶיךָ	חוקיכה	

Verse	Col/Line	Variant		English	
		Type			
172	14:2	1.2	תָּעַן	תענה	"she will sing" (normal form in 11Q5, shortened form in MT)
		1.6	אִמְרָתְךָ	אמרתכה	"your word"
		2.8	כָּל	כול	"all"
		2.5	מִצְוֹתֶיךָ	מצוותיכה	"your commandments"
		1.6	מִצְוֹתֶיךָ	מצוותיכה	
173	14:3	1.6	יָדְךָ	ידכה	"your hand"
		2.8	לְעֹזְרִי	לעוזרני	"to help me"
		1.6	פְּקוּדֹתֶיךָ	פקודיכה	"your precepts"
174	14:4	1.6	לִישׁוּעָתְךָ	לישועתכה	
		1.5	אִתְּךָ	תורתכה	"and your instruction/law"; your instruction/law"
		1.6	אִתְּךָ	תורתכה	
		2.6	שְׂשׂוּעֵי	ששועי	"my delights"
175	14:5	1.6	וְתִהְיֶה לְלֹדְךָ	ותהללכה	"that I may praise you"
		5.17	וּמִשְׁפָּטֶיךָ	ומשפטיכה	"and your judgment"; your judgments"
		5.12	וּמִשְׁפָּטֶיךָ	ומשפטיכה	
		1.6	וּמִשְׁפָּטֶיךָ	ומשפטיכה	
176	14:6	1.1	יְעֹזְרֵנִי	יעוזרני	"may they help me"
		2.5	אָבַד	איבד	"a perished/lost [one]"
		1.6	עַבְדְּךָ	עבדכה	"your servant"
		5.1	מִצְוֹתֶיךָ	עדותיכה	"your commandments"; "your testimonies"
		2.5	מִצְוֹתֶיךָ	עדותיכה	
		1.6	מִצְוֹתֶיךָ	עדותיכה	
		2.5	לֹא	לוא	"not"

A Survey Discussion of the Minor Variants

A discussion of the variant forms follows the chart. I shall first discuss the variants according to variant type (as listed in the key). All instances of the particular variant form will be discussed as a group, with more individualized discussion on noteworthy cases. I shall then move to a detailed discussion of noteworthy non-sectarian and possible-sectarian variants.

Morphological Variants

Morphological Variants Chart						
Verse	Col/Line	Variant		MT	11Q5	English
		Type				
2	6:12	1.1		יִדְרְשׁוּהוּ	יִדְרֹשׁוּהוּ	"who seek him"; "who seek it" <i>fem</i>
4	6:14	1.2		אַתָּה	אַתָּה	"you"
		1.2		מְאֹד	מְאֹדָה	"very"
5	6:15	1.6		חֲקִיךָ	אַחֲמַתְכָּה	"statutes"; "truth"
6	6:16	1.6		מִצְוֹתֶיךָ	מִצְוֹתֶיכָה	"your commandments"
7-14				Not extant in 11Q5		
15	7:1	1.6		בְּפִקְדֵיךָ	בְּפִקְדֵיכָה	"on your precepts"
		1.6		אַחֲרֵתֶיךָ	אַחֲרֵתֵיכָה	"your ways"
16	7:2	1.6		בְּחֻקֵיךָ	בְּחֻקֵיכָה	"in your statutes"
		1.6		דְּבָרֶיךָ	דְּבָרֵיכָה	"your word"; "your words"
17	7:3	1.6		דְּבָרֶיךָ	דְּבָרֵיכָה	"your word"; "your words"
18	7:4	1.6		מִתּוֹרַתְךָ	מִתּוֹרַתֵיכָה	"from your law"; "from your laws"
19	7:5	1.6		מִצְוֹתֶיךָ	מִצְוֹתֶיכָה	"your commandments"
20	7:6	1.6		מִשְׁפָּטֶיךָ	מִשְׁפָּטֵיכָה	"your judgments"
21	7:7	1.2		גְּעִרְתָּ	גְּעִרְתָּה	"you rebuke"
		1.6		מִמִּצְוֹתֶיךָ	מִמִּצְוֹתֵיכָה	"from your commandments"
22	7:8	1.3		גֹּל	גֹּל	"roll" <i>imperative</i>
		1.6		עֲדוּתֶיךָ	עֲדוּתֵיכָה	"your testimonies/ decrees"
23	7:9	1.6		עֲבָדְךָ	עֲבָדְכָה	"your servant"
		1.6		בְּחֻקֵיךָ	בְּחֻקֵיכָה	"on your statutes"
24	7:10	1.6		עֲדוּתֶיךָ	עֲדוּתֵיכָה	"your decrees"
25	7:11			No variants in extant portion of 11Q5		
26	7:12	1.6		חֲקִיךָ	חֻקֵיכָה	"your statutes"
27	7:13	1.6		פִּקְדֵיךָ	פִּקְדֵיכָה	"your precepts"
		1.6		בְּנִפְלְאוֹתֶיךָ	בְּנִפְלְאוֹתֵיכָה	"on your wonders"
28	7:14	1.6		כְּדְבָרֶיךָ	כְּדְבָרֵיכָה	"according to your word"
29-36				Not extant in 11Q5		
37	8:1	1.6		בְּדְרָכֶיךָ תִּינֵנִי	כְּדְבָרְכָה חוֹנְנִי	"give me life in your ways"; "show me favour according to your word"
38	8:2	1.6		לְעַבְדְּךָ	לְעַבְדְּכָה	"to your servant"
		1.6		אֲמַרְתָּךָ	אֲמַרְתְּכָה	"your promise"
		1.6		לְיִרְאַתְךָ	לְיִרְאַתְכָה	"to your fearers"
39	8:3	1.6		מִשְׁפָּטֶיךָ	מִשְׁפָּטֵיכָה	"your judgments"

Morphological Variants Chart					
Variant					
40	8:4	1.6	לְפַקְדֵיךָ	לפקודיכה	"to your precepts"
		1.6	בְּצַדִּיקְתֶּךָ תִּינֵנִי	בצדקתכה חונני	"in your righteousness, give me life"; "in your righteousness show me favour"
41	8:5	1.6	תְּשׁוּעַתְךָ	תשועתכה	"your salvation"
		1.6	כְּאִמְרַתְךָ	כאמרתכה	"according to your word"
42	8:6	1.6	בְּדַבְרֶיךָ	בדברכה	"in your word"
43	8:7	1.2	מְאֹד	מואדה	"very"
		1.6	לְמִשְׁפָּטֶיךָ	לדבריכה	"in your judgments"/"in your words"
44	8:8	1.1	וְאֶשְׁמְרָהּ	ואשמורה	"and I will keep"
		1.6	תּוֹרַתְךָ	תורתכה	"your instruction/law"
46	8:10	1.6	בְּעֲדֵיךָ	בערוותיכה	"of your decrees"
47	8:11	1.7	וְאֶשְׂתַּעֲשַׂע	ואשתעשעה	"and I will delight [in]"
48	8:12	1.6	בְּחֻקֶיךָ	בחוקיכה	"on your statutes"
49	8:13	1.2	זָכֵר	זכורה	"remember" <i>imperative</i>
		1.6	דְּבָרֶיךָ	דבריכה	"word"; "your words"
50-58			Not extant in 11Q5		
59	9:1	1.6	עֲדוּתֶיךָ	ערוותיכה	"your testimonies/ decrees"
60	9:2	1.6	מִצְוֹתֶיךָ	מצוותיכה	"your commandments"
61	9:3	1.6	תּוֹרַתְךָ	תורתכה	"your instruction/law"
62	9:4	1.6	לְךָ	לכה	"to you"
		1.6	צִדְקָתְךָ	צדקכה	"[of] your righteousness"
63	9:5	1.6	יִרְאוּךָ	יראוכה	"your fearers"
		1.6	פְּקוּדֵיךָ	פקודיכה	"your precepts"
64	9:6	1.6	חַסְדֶּיךָ	חסדכה	"your lovingkindness"
		1.6	חֻקֶיךָ	חוקכה	"your statutes"; "your statute"
65	9:7	1.2	עָשִׂיתָ	עשיתה	"you did" [you dealt]
		1.6	עַבְדְּךָ	עבדכה	"your servant"
		1.6	כְּדַבְרֶיךָ	כדברכה	"according to your word"
66	9:8	1.6	בְּמִצְוֹתֶיךָ	במצוותיכה	"in your commandments"
67	9:9	1.6	אִמְרַתְךָ	אמרתכה	"your word"
68	9:10	1.6	חֻקֶיךָ	חוקיכה	"your statutes"
69	9:11	1.2	אֲצִיר	אצורה	
		1.6	פְּקוּדֵיךָ	פקודיכה	"your precepts"
70	9:12	1.6	תּוֹרַתְךָ	תורתכ[ה]	"your instruction/law"

Morphological Variants Chart					
Variant					
71	9:13	1.6	חֻקֶיךָ	חוק[י]כה	"your statutes"
72	9:14	1.6	פִּיֶךָ	פיכה	"[of] your mouth"
73	9:15	1.6	מִצְוֹתֶיךָ	מצותי[כה]	"your commandments"
74-81			Not extant in 11Q5		
82	10:1	1.6	לְאַמְרֹתֶיךָ	לאמרתכה	"for your promise"
83	10:2	1.6	חֻקֶיךָ	חסדכה	"your statutes"; "your lovingkindness"
84	10:3	1.6	עֲבָדֶיךָ	עבדכה	"your servant"
85	10:4	1.6	כְּתוּרֹתֶיךָ	כתורתכה	"according to your instruction/law"
86	10:5	1.6	מִצְוֹתֶיךָ	מצוותיכה	"your commandments"
87	10:6	1.6	פְּקוּדֵיךָ	פקודיכה	"your precepts"
88	10:7	1.6	כְּחֶסְדֶּךָ	כחסדכה	"according to your lovingkindness"
		1.1	וְאֶשְׁמְרָהּ	ואשמורה	"and I will keep"
		1.6	פִּיֶךָ	פיכה	"your mouth"
89	10:8	1.6	דְּבָרְךָ	דברכה	"your word"
90	10:9	1.6	אֱמוּנָתֶיךָ	אמונתכה	"your faithfulness"
		1.6	כּוֹנְנָתָהּ	כוננתה	"you have established" <i>polel</i>
91	10:10	1.6	לְמִשְׁפָּטֶיךָ	למשפטיכה	"by your judgments"
		1.6	עֲבָדֶיךָ	עבדִיכה	"your servants"
92	10:11	1.6	תּוֹרֹתֶיךָ	תורתכה	"your instruction/law"
93	10:12	1.6	פְּקוּדֵיךָ	פקודיכה	"your precepts"
		1.2	בָּם	במה	"in/by them"
94	10:13	1.6	לָךְ	לכה	"to you" [yours]
		1.6	פְּקוּדֵיךָ	פקודיכה	"your precepts"
95	10:14	1.6	עֲדוּתֶיךָ	עדותיכה	"your testimonies/ decrees"
96	10:15	1.6	מִצְוַתְּךָ	מצותכ[ה]	"your commandment"
		1.1	מְאֹד	מואדה	"very" [great]
		1.2	מְאֹד	מואדה	
105	11:1	1.6	דְּבָרְךָ	דבריכה	"your word"; "your words"
		1.4	וְאוֹר	אור	"and a light"; "a light"
106	11:2	1.6	צְדָקָתְךָ	צדקכה	"[of] your righteousness"
107	11:3	1.6	תִּנְנֵי כִדְבָרְךָ	כאמרתכה תונני	"give me life according to your way/word"; "show me favour according to your word"

Morphological Variants Chart						
Variant						
108	11:4	1.5	וּמִשְׁפָּטֶיךָ לְמַדְנִי	מִמִּשְׁפָּטֶיכָה לְמַדְנִי	"and teach me your judgments"; "teach me from your judgments"	
		1.6	וּמִשְׁפָּטֶיךָ לְמַדְנִי	מִמִּשְׁפָּטֶיכָה לְמַדְנִי		
109	11:5	1.5	וְתוֹרָתְךָ	תּוֹרַתְכָה	"(but) your instruction/law"; "your instruction/law"	
		1.6	וְתוֹרָתְךָ	תּוֹרַתְכָה		
110	11:6	1.5	וּמִפְקוּדֶיךָ	אֲנִי פְקוּדִיכָה	"but from your precepts"; "I, your precepts"	
		1.6	וּמִפְקוּדֶיךָ	אֲנִי פְקוּדִיכָה		
111	11:7	1.6	עֲדוּתֶיךָ	עֲדוּוֹתֶיכָה	"your testimonies/ decrees"	
112	11:8	1.6	חֻקֶיךָ	חֻקֵיכָה	"your statutes"	
113	11:9	1.5	וְתוֹרָתְךָ	תּוֹרַתְכָה	"but/and your instruction/law"; "your instruction/law"	
		1.6	וְתוֹרָתְךָ	תּוֹרַתְכָה		
114	11:10	1.6	לְדַבָּרְךָ	לְדַבְרִיכָה	"in your way/word"; "in your ways/words"	
115	11:11	1.1	וְאֶצְרָהּ	וְאֶצְוֶרָהּ	"[that] I may keep"	
116	11:12	1.6	כְּאִמְרַתְךָ	כְּאִמְרַתְכָה	"according to your word"	
117	11:13	1.6	בְּחֻקֶיךָ	בְּחֻקֵיכָה	"on your statutes"; "your statutes"	
118	11:14	1.6	סָלִיתָ	סָלִיתְכָה	"you rejected"	
		1.6	מִחֻקֶיךָ	מִחֻקֵיכָה	"from your statutes"	
119	11:15	1.6	עֲדוּתֶיךָ	כּוֹל עֲדוּוֹתֶיכָה	"your testimonies/ decrees"; "all [of] your testimonies/ decrees"	
120	11:16	1.6	וּמִמִּשְׁפָּטֶיךָ	וּמִמִּשְׁפָּטֶיכָה	"and from/of your judgments"	
121-127			Not extant in 11Q5			
129	12:2	1.6	עֲדוּתֶיךָ	עֲדוּוֹתֶיכָה	"your testimonies/ decrees"	
130	12:3	1.6	דְּבָרֶיךָ	דְּבָרֵיכָה	"your words"	
		1.4	יְאִיר	וְהֵאִיר	"(he/it) will enlighten" <i>imperfect</i> ; "and enlighten" <i>imperative</i>	
		1.1	פְּתוּיִם	פּוֹתְאִים	"simple [ones]"	
131	12:4	1.6	לְמִצְוֹתֶיךָ	לְמִצְוֹתֶיכָה	"for your commandments"	
133	12:6	1.6	בְּאִמְרַתְךָ	בְּאִמְרַתְכָה	"in/by your word/ promise"; "to your word/promise"	
134	12:7	1.1	וְאֶשְׁמְרָהּ	וְאֶשְׁמֹרָהּ	"and/that I may keep"	
		1.6	פְּקוּדֶיךָ	פְּקוּדֵיכָה	"your precepts"	
135	12:8	1.6	פָּנֶיךָ	פְּנֵיכָה	"your face"	
		1.6	בְּעַבְדְּךָ	בְּעַבְדְּכָה	"at [upon] your servant"	
		1.6	חֻקֶיךָ	חֻקֵיכָה	"your statutes"	

Morphological Variants Chart					
		Variant			
136	12:9	1.6	תּוֹרַתְךָ	תורתכה	"your instruction/law"
137	12:10	1.6	מִשְׁפָּטֶיךָ	משפטיכה	"your judgments"
138	12:11	1.6	צִוִּיתָ	צויתח	"you commanded"
		1.6	עֲדוּתֶיךָ	עדרותיכה	"your testimonies/ decrees"
		1.2	מְאֹד	מואדה	"very"
139	12:12	1.6	דְּבָרֶיךָ	דבריכה	"your words"
140	12:13	1.6	אִמְרָתְךָ	אמרתכה	"your word"
		1.1	מְאֹד	מואדה	"very"
		1.2	מְאֹד	מואדה	
		1.6	וְעַבְדְּךָ	ועבדך	"and your servant"
141	12:14	1.6	פְּקֻדֹתֶיךָ	פקודיכה	"your precepts"
143-149			Not extant in 11Q5		
150	13:1	1.6	מִתּוֹרַתְךָ	מתורתכה	"from your instruction/law"
151	13:2	1.6	מִצְוֹתֶיךָ	מצוותיכה	"your commandments"
152	13:3	1.6	מֵעֲדוּתֶיךָ	מעדתכה	"from your testimonies/decrees"; from your knowledge"
153	13:4	1.6	בִּיְהִי תּוֹרַתְךָ	תורתכה	"because/for your instruction/law"; "your instruction/law"
154	13:5	1.6	לְאִמְרָתְךָ	לאמרתכה	"to your word/promise"
155	13:6	1.6	חֻקֶיךָ	חוקיכה	"your statutes"
156	13:7	1.6	רַחֲמֶיךָ	רחמיכה	"your mercies"
		1.6	כְּמִשְׁפָּטֶיךָ	כמשפטיכה	"according to your judgments"
157	13:8	1.6	מֵעֲדוּתֶיךָ	מעדרותיכה	"from your testimonies/ decrees"
158	13:9	1.6	אִמְרָתְךָ	אמרתכה	"your word"
159	13:11	1.6	פְּקֻדֹתֶיךָ	פקודיכה	"your precepts"
		1.6	כְּאִמְרָתְךָ	כאמרתכה	
160	13:12	1.6	דְּבָרֶיךָ	דבריכה	"your word"/"your words"
161	13:13	1.6	וּמִדְּבָרֶיךָ	ומדבריכה	"(and) from your words"
162	13:14	1.6	אִמְרָתְךָ	אמרתכה	"your word"
163	13:15	1.4	תּוֹרַתְךָ	ותורתכה	"your instruction/law"; "and your instruction/law"
		1.6	תּוֹרַתְךָ	ותורתכה	
164	13:16	1.6	הִלְלֶיךָ	אהללכה	
165-170			Not extant in 11Q5		

Morphological Variants Chart					
		Variant			
171	14:1	1.6	חֻקֶיךָ	חוקיכה	"your statutes"
172	14:2	1.2	תִּשְׁעַן	תענה	"she will sing" (normal form in 11Q5, shortened form in MT)
		1.6	אִמְרָתְךָ	אמרתכה	"your word"
		1.6	מִצְוֹתֶיךָ	מצוותיכה	"your commandments"
173	14:3	1.6	יָדְךָ	ידכה	"your hand"
		1.6	פְּקוּדֵיךָ	פקודיכה	"your precepts"
174	14:4	1.6	לִישׁוּעָתְךָ	לישועתכה	
		1.5	יְהוֹרָתְךָ	תורתכה	"and your instruction/law"; your instruction/law"
		1.6	יְהוֹרָתְךָ	תורתכה	
175	14:5	1.6	וְהִתְהַלַּלְתָּ	ותהללכה	"that I may praise you"
		1.6	וְכִמְשַׁפְּטֶיךָ	וכשפטיכה	"and your judgment"; your judgments"
		1.1	יַעֲזֹרֵנִי	יעזורני	"may they help me"
176	14:6	1.6	עַבְדְּךָ	עבדכה	"your servant"
		1.6	מִצְוֹתֶיךָ	עדותיכה	"your commandments"; "your testimonies"

1.1 Imperfect Forms

The addition of a *waw* in the imperfect Qal form has, according to Elisha Qimron, “no parallel in any other Hebrew tradition, and Hebraists disagree as to [its] origin.”¹²⁴

Speculation has included the influence of Akkadian (*yeqattel*) or that the *waw* is a helping vowel “arising under purely phonological conditioning,” but Qimron rejects both of these.¹²⁵ In Qimron’s view, the difference is morphological. Since there are two possibilities for the Hebrew infinitive and imperative with suffixes – קטלני and קטולני in the imperative and לקטלני and לקטולני in the infinitive, for example – and the imperfect

¹²⁴ Qimron, *The Hebrew of*, §113.11g

¹²⁵ Qimron, *The Hebrew of*, §113.11g

(with suffixes) corresponds with this, it likely follows that the imperfect ידורר שויה in 11Q5 is an analogical extension of the same form. He supports this position with the observations that these doublets only occur in forms with pronominal suffixes and that the vowel *holem* is replaced by *pathach* in instances where the imperfect does not have the suffix.

Abegg produced a quantitative study of the phenomenon with regard to “the so-called ‘pausal’ forms” of the *qal* imperfect.¹²⁶ According to Abegg, 27 percent of possible cases in the non-biblical Qumran texts are *plene* pausal forms. Similarly, this form explains 88 out of 752 possibilities (12%) in the biblical DSS, compared to 11 of 2829 possibilities (0.04%) in MT.¹²⁷ Abegg sees this as a clear example of the influence of the Second Temple scribal style¹²⁸ on the DSS.¹²⁹ It is noteworthy that this occurs in our 11Q5 sample only once (See the Master Variants Chart).

A Note on the Addition of *he* to the Terminus of Words

The Dead Sea Scrolls exhibit a frequent usage of a *he* at the terminus of words that MT does not. These additions are for a number of reasons.

As in the Bible, a final *he* may represent a-class and e-class vowels.¹³⁰ In addition to this, Qumran employs this *plene* spelling for the second person pronominal suffix.¹³¹ As

¹²⁶ Abegg, “The Linguistic Analysis,” 61.

¹²⁷ Abegg, “The Linguistic Analysis,” 62.

¹²⁸ What Tov refers to as “Qumran Scribal Practice”

¹²⁹ Abegg, “The Linguistic Analysis,” 62.

¹³⁰ Qimron, *The Hebrew of*, §100.7

¹³¹ Qimron, *The Hebrew of*, §100.7

demonstrated in the charts below, the latter is very common, comprising 129 of 144 (90%) total incidents of an additional *he* in the pertinent portions of 11Q5. DSS Hebrew in general employs this *plene* spelling about 900 times (85%), compared to 160 times defective (15%).¹³² It occurs 28 times in 1QS alone (97%), with only one defective instance (3%). This statistical similarity is consistent with 11Q5's proposed designation as a scroll highly influenced by Qumran style and, as I shall argue, variants in conversation with the thematic content of 1QS. In addition, defective spelling is only prevalent in DSS Hebrew with regard to the third person feminine,¹³³ which does not occur in the text under scrutiny. This final *he* also occurs in all first person conjugations, in both strong and weak verbs (for a list of instances, see variant 1.7 on the Master Variant Chart). This creates a clear distinction between first person and both second and third person forms. This is also found in later Biblical Hebrew, but to a significantly lesser degree;¹³⁴ it seems to be the culmination of a developmental process begun long before DSS Hebrew standardized it. This variant occurs in verse 47 (11Q5 8:11). Verses 48 (11Q5 8:12), 88 (11Q5 10:7) 131 (11Q5 12:4) etc. also contain this element, but MT also uses the *plene* spelling in this case, and so no variant is present. Finally, there are instances for which no compelling explanation has been found. In some cases, but not all, "*he* of direction" is a *possible* explanation, but in light of other, unexplained instances, not a compelling one. According to Qimron, the *he* of direction had lost its meaning by DSS Hebrew, but he proposes that it could be functioning as a non-syntactical locative, as it sometimes does in Biblical Hebrew, Mishnaic Hebrew (of the

¹³² Qimron, *The Hebrew of*, §100.7

¹³³ Qimron, *The Hebrew of*, §100.7

¹³⁴ Qimron, *The Hebrew of*, §310.129

Tannaitic literature), and Aramaic.¹³⁵ There are no instances of variation in the pertinent verses, however, in which this might apply. Where no preference is apparent, I shall categorize the variant under “stylistic” reasons. All incidents of final *he* addition or omission are listed below.

There is one incident of omission of a *he* at the end of a word in 11Q5 that is present in MT. This is in verse 4 (11Q5 6:14) and is an instance of a form of the masculine second person (הָהוּא) in which there is no final vowel (thus, הָהוּא) or the feminine form (also הָהוּא), the latter of which only occurs in the biblical scrolls at Qumran.¹³⁶ 11Q5 6:14 is partially reconstructed, and so there is no (extant) sure way of knowing that the pronoun does not refer to something feminine, but the context strongly indicates that this is meant as a masculine.¹³⁷

1.2 Additional *He*, Stylistic (or Unknown)

In addition to those instances mentioned above, *he* occurs at the end of four other words in 11Q5, apparently for merely stylistic (or unknown) reasons. These occur in verses 4 (11Q5 6:14), 21 (11Q5 7:7), 65 (11Q5 9:7), and 93 (11Q5 10:12). In the case of הָהוּא, especially, this would seem to be morphological. In the scrolls where הָהוּא is used in 2ms contexts, in

¹³⁵ Qimron, *The Hebrew of*, §340

¹³⁶ Qimron, *The Hebrew of*, §321.12

¹³⁷ Qimron also points out several instances in which always masculine forms in Biblical Hebrew are found in the feminine in DSS Hebrew. This may be a parallel, though its lack of repetition, at least in the documents studied, do not strengthen this argument. See Qimron, *The Hebrew of*, §330.4

every other case the next word begins with an aleph. See 4Q266 f11:9 and 4Q512 f40_41:3 and notes at 1QHa 13:34 and Psa 89:27 and HDSS §321.12. See also INSNWS KAI214 1:33; KAI222 C:11; KAI222 C:20 et al, and often in the Mishna (Taan. 4:8, et al), and in the MT (Num 11:15 et al).

1.3 Alternate form of the Imperative

This variant (verse 22, column 7:8) is probably an alternative form of the imperative – in this case, of רָלַל, to roll.¹³⁸

1.4, 1.5 Addition and Omission of *Waw* Conjunction

The addition or omission of a *waw* conjunction may, at first glance, seem inconsequential. Indeed, depending upon what the difference meant to the writers and readers of the Second Temple period, it might not have been a substantial variant. To the English ear, however, this change does have potential impact, and for that reason it is worth taking a closer look, since it is possible (thought by no means certain) that Second Temple readers may have reacted to it in a similar manner.

Of the eight instances in which *waw* conjunctions have been altered in 11Q5, six of them have been the omission of the conjunction, and five of these are clustered in the same column, between verses 105 (11Q5 11:1) and 113 (11Q5 11:9). Four of the column 11 instances refer directly to instruction or judgments, as does the sixth incidence, in verse 174

¹³⁸ HALOT, Accordance electronic version, n.p.

(11Q5 14:4). The remaining incidence, verse 105 (11Q5 11:1) refers to light, which is metaphorically related to instruction. The instances of omission of the *waw* conjunction, verses 130 (11Q5 12:3) and 163 (11Q5 13:15) refer to being enlightened and to instruction/law, respectively. There appears to be some consistent, intentional changes going on in this regard, especially in column 11.

In English, the omission of a conjunction in this instance would entail the insertion of a semicolon, a multi-purpose punctuation mark which would, in this instance, indicate that the first phrase was roughly equivalent in import to the second, or that the two are tied together more closely than a full stop between them would imply. In other words, it is possible that the removal of this conjunction might serve to clarify the relationship between the first and second phrase, removing any implied sequence, causality or ambiguity¹³⁹ and thereby indicating that each is valid because the other is so. But does this hold up in these contexts?

Verses 113 (11Q5 11:9) and 174 (11Q5 14:4) seem to fit this theory. Verses 110 (11Q5 11:6) *could* support it, providing a degree of metaphorical acrobatics were applied, but this would require a degree of explanation and speculation with which I am not comfortable. For example, 110 (11Q5 11:6) *could* support it if the snare metaphor implied a

¹³⁹ Ambiguity is removed thus: Consider verse 113 (11Q5 11:9) “I hate the double-minded, but [or and] I love your instruction/law.” With this verse in mind, there are two senses that this potential relationship could be understood. As well as the view expressed in the verse, one might infer from this that some (other) people could hate the double minded *and* hate God’s instruction/law. The implication of a semicolon in this same situation, as it is potentially expressed in 11Q5 11:9, is “I hate the double-minded; I love your instruction/law” would be that the one phrase indicates the other – it would not be possible to hate the double-minded unless the God’s instruction/law was loved, nor could one love the double-minded and also love God’s instruction/law. A similar usage can be found in another sample in which, interestingly, the conjunction has been *added* in 11Q5, verse 130 (11Q5 12:3). This is a subtle difference, but one worth exploring in context.

snare somewhere off of God’s path, presumably since God’s path would not contain such a snare, the danger being in leaving his way. This is too far a reach to have scholarly validity.

Verse 130 (11Q5 12:3) is a change in response to the shift in verb aspect (imperfect to imperative) and is therefore a unique situation, neither supporting nor refuting the theory. Likewise, verses 105 (11Q5 11:1) and 108 (11Q5 11:4) are list situations that could be expressed either with or without the conjunction to no great change in meaning. Verse 109 (11Q5 11:5) is difficult to categorize. It seems that “I hold my life in my hand continually” (נִפְשִׁי בְּכַפִּי תָמִיד) could mean that the author is in danger, or that he has the power over his own life. The Anchor Bible ties this to the hands of God, as it translates Psalm 31:6b “Into your hands I entrust my life,”¹⁴⁰ whereas the Word Bible Commentary interprets this as “the readiness to put one’s life in danger of one’s own accord.”¹⁴¹ In any case, it seems that no strong argument can be made that supports the English-style semicolon theory.

Finally, verse 163 (11Q5 13:15) – the addition of a *waw* conjunction in 11Q5 – is almost the exact opposite of the variant found in 113 (11Q5 11:9). This verse seems to soundly refute the semicolon theory. I have no other possible explanations at hand, other than to suggest a possible style preference with no impact on meaning.

¹⁴⁰ Anchor Bible, Vol. 17A, 185.

¹⁴¹ Word Biblical Commentary, Vol. 21, 190.

1.6 Addition of *He* to Second Masculine Pronominal Suffix

According to Qimron and Abegg, the addition of a *he* to the second masculine singular suffix has been noted for its prevalence in the non-biblical manuscripts.¹⁴² In the singular, this form does not alter the sound of the word, but the same form occurs in the plural – as in 11Q5 18:1 (נפשהכמה) – and in such instances the pronunciation *is* changed if we can assume that there is a vowel sound to correspond with the *he* (*mem* closes the syllable and does not have a vowel). This is a very probable assumption. Because this variant changes pronunciation in the plural, I group the related singular form with the plural, as a *morphological* variant, rather than orthographic (as Qimron does).

1.7 Additional *He*, first person imperfect forms

First person imperfect forms often take an additional *he* at the terminus of the word. In the texts in question, this occurs only once, in verse 47 (11Q5 8:11).

¹⁴² Qimron *The Hebrew of*, §322.12 and Abegg, “The Linguistic Analysis,” 62.

Orthographic

Orthographic Variants Chart						
Verse	Col/Line	Variant		MT	11Q5	English
		Type				
1	6:11	2.5		הַהֹלְכִים	ה[הולכים	"walkers/goers"
4	6:14	2.5		לְשֹׁמֵר	לשמ[ור	"to keep"
		2.5		מְאֹד	מואדה	"very"
6	6:16	2.5		מִצְוֹתַיִךְ	מצוותיכה	"your commandments"
7-14				Not extant in 11Q5		
15	7:1	2.6		בְּפִקְדֵיךָ	בפקודיכה	"on your precepts"
		2.5		אֲדָרְחֶיךָ	אורחותיכה	"your ways"
		2.5		אֲדָרְחֶיךָ	אורחותיכה	
16	7:2	2.6		בְּחֻקֵיךָ	בחוקיכה	"in your statutes"
		2.5		לֹא	לוא	"not"
17	7:3	2.5		גָּמַל	גמור	"to reward"; "to complete"
19	7:5	2.5		אֲנֹכִי	אנוכי	"I"
	7:5	2.5		מִצְוֹתַיִךְ	מצוותיכה	"your commandments"
20	7:6	2.8		בְּכֹל	בכול	"in all"
21	7:7	2.5		הַשֹּׁגְגִים	השוגים	"the straying ones"
		2.5		מִמִּצְוֹתַיִךְ	ממצוותיכה	"from your commandments"
22	7:8	2.5		עֲדֹתַיִךְ	עדותיכה	"your testimonies/ decrees"
		2.7		עֲדֹתַיִךְ	עדותיכה	
23	7:9	2.6		בְּחֻקֵיךָ	בחוקיכה	"on your statutes"
24	7:10	2.5		עֲדֹתַיִךְ	עדותיכה	"your decrees"
		2.7		עֲדֹתַיִךְ	עדותיכה	
		2.6		שְׂעִשְׂעֵי	שעשועי	"my delights"
25	7:11			No variants in extant portion of 11Q5		
40	8:4	2.6		לְפִקְדֵיךָ	לפקודיכה	"to your precepts"
41	8:5	2.5		וַיְבֹאֵנִי	ויבואוני	"and let come to me"
		2.6		וַיְבֹאֵנִי	ויבואוני	
42	8:6	2.5		חֹרְפִי	חורפי	"the reproacher"
43	8:7	2.5		מְאֹד	מואדה	"very"
46	8:10	2.5		בְּעֲדֹתַיִךְ	בעדותיכה	"of your decrees"
		2.7		בְּעֲדֹתַיִךְ	בעדותיכה	
48	8:12	2.5		מִצְוֹתַיִךְ	מצוותיכה	"your commandments"
		2.6		בְּחֻקֵיךָ	בחוקיכה	"on your statutes"

Orthographic Variants Chart					
		Variant			
49	8:13	2.5	זָכַר	זְכוּרָה	"remember" <i>imperative</i>
50-58			Not extant in 11Q5		
59	9:1	2.5	עֲדוּתֵיךָ	עֲדוּתִיכָה	"your testimonies/ decrees"
		2.7	עֲדוּתֵיךָ	עֲדוּתִיכָה	
60	9:2	2.5	וְלֹא	וְלֹא	"and not"
		2.5	לְשֹׁמֵר	לְשֹׁמֵר	"to keep"
		2.5	מִצְוֹתֵיךָ	מִצְוֹתִיכָה	"your commandments"
61	9:3	2.6	עֹדֵנִי	עוֹדוֹנִי	"surround me"
		2.5	לֹא	לֹא	"not"
63	9:5	2.8	לְכֹל	לְכֹל	"to all"
		2.5	וְלְשֹׁמְרֵי	וְלְשֹׁמְרֵי	"and to keepers"
64	9:6	2.6	חֻקֶּיךָ	חֻקִּיכָה	"your statutes"; "your statute"
66	9:8	2.5	בְּמִצְוֹתֵיךָ	בְּמִצְוֹתִיכָה	"in your commandments"
67	9:9	2.5	שֹׁגֵג	שׁוֹגֵג	"[was] a staggerer" [one who went astray]
68	9:10	2.6	חֻקֶּיךָ	חֻקִּיכָה	"your statutes"
69	9:11	2.8	בְּכֹל	בְּכֹל	"with all"
		2.5	אֲצַר	אֲצוּרָה	"I keep"
82	10:1	2.5	לְאֹמֵר	לְאֹמֵר	"to say"
83	10:2	2.5	כְּנֹאֵד	כְּנֹאֹד	"like a [wine]skin"
		2.5	לֹא	לֹא	"not"
84	10:3	2.5	בְּרֹדְפֵי	בְּרֹדְפֵי	"those in pursuit of me"
85	10:4	2.1	זֹדִים	זֹדִים	"proud"
		2.5	לֹא	לֹא	"not"
86	10:5	2.8	כָּל	כֹּל	"all"
		2.5	מִצְוֹתֵיךָ	מִצְוֹתִיכָה	"your commandments"
		2.8	עֹזְרֵנִי	עוֹזְרֵנִי	"help me!"
87	10:6	2.5	לֹא	לֹא	"not"
88	10:7	2.7	עֲדוּת	עֲדוּת	"[the] testimonies/ decrees"
90	10:9	2.5	לְדוֹר	לְדוֹר	"to generation"
		2.5	וְדוֹר	וְדוֹר	"and generation"
91	10:10	2.5	הַכֹּל	הַכֹּל	"(the) all"
92	10:11	2.6	שְׂשׂוּעֵי	שְׂשׂוּעֵי	"my delights"

Orthographic Variants Chart					
Variant					
93	10:12	2.5	לא	לוא	"not"
95	10:14	2.7	עֲדוֹתֶיךָ	ערוותיכה	"your testimonies/ decrees"
96	10:15	2.8	לְכֹל	לכול	"to all"
97-104 Not extant in 11Q5					
105	11:1	2.3	דְּבַרְךָ	דבריכה	"your word"; "your words"
109	11:5	2.5	לא	לוא	"not"
110	11:6	2.5	לא	לוא	"not"
111	11:7	2.7	עֲדוֹתֶיךָ	ערוותיכה	"your testimonies/ decrees"
112	11:8	2.6	חֻקֶיךָ	חוקיכה	"your statutes"
115	11:11	2.5	אֱלֹהֵי	אלוהי	"my god/God"
117	11:13	2.6	בְּחֻקֶיךָ	חוקיכה	"on your statutes"; "your statutes"
118	11:14	2.8	כָּל	כול	"all"
		2.6	מִחֻקֶיךָ	מחוקיכה	"from your statutes"
119	11:15	2.2	סָגִים	סיגים	"[pieces of] dross"
		2.8	כָּל	כול	"all"
		2.8	עֲדוֹתֶיךָ	כול ערוותיכה	"your testimonies/ decrees"; "all [of] your testimonies/ decrees"
		2.5	עֲדוֹתֶיךָ	כול ערוותיכה	
		2.7	עֲדוֹתֶיךָ	כול ערוותיכה	
121-127 Not extant in 11Q5					
128	12:1	2.8	כָּל	כול	"all"
		2.8	כָּל	כול	"all"
		2.5	אֶרֶח	אורח	"way/path"
129	12:2	2.7	עֲדוֹתֶיךָ	ערוותיכה	"your testimonies/ decrees"
130	12:3	2.4	פְּתָיִים	פותאים	"simple [ones]"
131	12:4	2.5	לְמִצְוֹתֶיךָ	למצוותיכה	"for your commandments"
132	12:5	2.8	וְחֹנְנֵי	וחונני	"and show me favour"
133	12:6	2.8	כָּל	כול	"all"
135	12:8	2.6	חֻקֶיךָ	חוקיכה	"your statutes"
136	12:9	2.5	לא	לוא	"not"
138	12:11	2.5	עֲדוֹתֶיךָ	ערוותיכה	"your testimonies/ decrees"
		2.7	עֲדוֹתֶיךָ	ערוותיכה	
		2.5	מְאֹד	מואדה	"very"
141	12:14	2.5	אֲנִכִּי	אנוכי	"I" [poetic]

Orthographic Variants Chart					
		Variant			
141	12:14	2.6	פְּקֻדֹתַיִךְ	פקודיכה	"your precepts"
		2.5	לֹא	לוא	"not"
143-149			Not extant in 11Q5		
150	13:1	2.5	רֹדְפֵי	רודפי	"pursuers"
151	13:2	2.8	וְכֹל	וכול	"and all"
		2.5	מִצְוֹתַיִךְ	מצוותיכה	"your commandments"
153	13:4	2.8	עֲנִי	עוניי	"my affliction"
		2.5	לֹא	לוא	"not"
155	13:6	2.6	חֻקֶיךָ	חוקיכה	"your statutes"
		2.5	לֹא	לוא	"not"
157	13:8	2.5	רֹדְפָיִם	רודפי	"my pursuers"
		2.7	מִעֲדוּתֶיךָ	מעדרותיכה	"from your testimonies/ decrees"
		2.5	לֹא	לוא	"not"
158	13:9	2.5	בֹּגְדִים	בוגדים	"treacherous/ faithless [ones]"
		2.5	לֹא	לוא	"not"
160	13:12	2.5	רֹאשׁ	רו[אש]	"head/sum"
		2.8	כָּל	כול	"all"
161	13:13	2.8	חֵנֶם	חננם	"for nothing"
162	13:14	2.5	אֲנִי	אנוכי	"I" [poetic]
165-170			Not extant in 11Q5		
171	14:1	2.6	חֻקֶיךָ	חוקיכה	"your statutes"
172	14:2	2.8	כָּל	כול	"all"
		2.5	מִצְוֹתַיִךְ	מצוותיכה	"your commandments"
173	14:3	2.8	לְעֹזְרֵנִי	לעוזרני	"to help me"
174	14:4	2.6	שְׂשׂוּעֵי	שעשועי	"my delights"
176	14:6	2.5	אֶבֶד	אובד	"a perished/lost [one]"
		2.5	מִצְוֹתַיִךְ	עדרותיכה	"your commandments"; "your testimonies"
		2.5	לֹא	לוא	"not"

A Note on the Use of *Yod* to Indicate a Vowel

It becomes apparent upon reading through 11Q5 alongside MT that there is a greater frequency of *yod* in the former than in the latter. One of the reasons for this is that this letter functions, similar to *waw* but with less frequency, as an indicator of certain vowels in addition to those mentioned above.¹⁴³

2.1, 2.3 *Yod* for *Tsere* or *Seghol*

The use of *yod* to indicate a *tsere* is not consistent.¹⁴⁴ The style of the Dead Sea Scrolls often deviates from biblical style – sometimes dropping a radical *yod*, sometimes adding a non-radical *yod* to represent *tsere* (variant 2.1) or even *seghol* (2.3).¹⁴⁵ Qimron designates this variation as orthographic, based on the suggestion of S. Morag that the inconsistency might indicate that both the *plene* and defective *tsere* were pronounced alike.¹⁴⁶ This seems to be a reasonably solid designation.

2.2 *Yod* for *Hireq*

The use of *yod* to indicate the *hireq* (11Q5 11:15) is much less common than the corresponding use of *waw* for *holem*, mostly because *yod* is used to indicate the long vowel,

¹⁴³ For additional information on this variant, see the discussion on variant 1.8.

¹⁴⁴ Qimron *The Hebrew of*, §100.33

¹⁴⁵ Qimron *The Hebrew of*, §100.33

¹⁴⁶ Qimron *The Hebrew of*, §100.33

but not the short.¹⁴⁷ It is unknown whether the orthographic distinction reflects a difference in length alone, or if there is some qualitative difference as well.¹⁴⁸ I shall therefore list this as an orthographic variant, pending possible advances in this area of study.

2.4 The “Qumran Plural” *Aleph* Insert

In addition to cases of *plene* spelling of vowels and the insertion of the *waw* in the imperfect (discussed above), texts from Qumran sometimes take an *aleph* in the plural before the sounds *i* and *e*, mainly in words ending in the gentilic suffix. This occurs in the DSS as a whole quite often, though it is not consistent, even varying sometimes within individual scrolls.¹⁴⁹ It occurs once in the verses in question, in 11Q5 12:3 (Verse 130). According to Qimron, the pronunciation of these forms is not clear. For further discussion of the arguments surrounding pronunciation, see Qimron §200.17 *Assimilation of Yod (and Waw)*.

A Note on the Addition and Omission of *Waw*

According to Elisha Qimron, the extensive use of *waw* as a vowel letter (*mater lectionis*) is the most characteristic feature of the orthography of the Dead Sea Scrolls.¹⁵⁰ This letter is used to indicate the *o/u* sounds of the Tiberian tradition, such as the long *holem* and the

¹⁴⁷ Qimron *The Hebrew of*, §100.32

¹⁴⁸ Qimron *The Hebrew of*, §100.32

¹⁴⁹ Qimron *The Hebrew of*, §100.32

¹⁵⁰ Qimron, *The Hebrew of*, §100.2 and; Martin Abegg Jr., “The Linguistic Analysis...” 66.

shureq, as well as the short vowel sounds such as *qibbut*s, *qamets hatuf*, *hatuf*, *qamets* and sometimes occurs in place of the Tiberian *shewa*.¹⁵¹ This usage occurs almost without exception. The 230 instances in which apparent defective spelling occurs include many instances which, according to Qimron, “apparently represent special Qumran linguistic features” rather than true defective spellings.¹⁵² In some of these cases, a particular word (such as טמאָה) is always found in the defective spelling of the Babylonian tradition.¹⁵³ In some scrolls, defective spellings are rare; in others they are common – 11Q5 is among those in which *plene* spelling is common.

This preference for *plene* forms is part of what Tov refers to as “Qumran Scribal Practice.”¹⁵⁴ There is significant debate, especially between Ulrich and Tov, as to the validity of this theory. Interestingly, a slow-motion study undertaken by Abegg lists the instances of sectarian jargon throughout the non-biblical scrolls and somewhat accidentally reveals some fascinating parallels between Tov’s list of documents that exhibit Qumran Scribal Practice and the one generated by the study. The scrolls are ranked by highest incidence of sectarian jargon per one thousand words.¹⁵⁵ Not only does 1QS rank third on

¹⁵¹ Qimron, *The Hebrew of*, §100.2

¹⁵² Qimron, *The Hebrew of*, §100.2

¹⁵³ Qimron, *The Hebrew of*, §100.2

¹⁵⁴ Abegg, “The Linguistic Analysis,” 62. Abegg prefers the term “Second Temple Scribal Practice” because it is elastic enough to allow for other possible instances of its use in the Second Temple period. This is tricky nomenclature, given present data, because even Abegg’s term is not without its implications – it suggests that this was a widespread or normative practice in the time period. I am not convinced that either term is ideal.

¹⁵⁵ Though an indicator that further study along these lines may be fruitful, Abegg’s preliminary study has notable limitations. Abegg used Accordance software for this study. He combined the User Note File tool and consistent highlighting to generate his statistics. This software is, at the time of this writing, limited by the fact that Accordance highlight searches reflect the entire line in which a highlight is found – not

the list, but a parallel document, 4Q249^h, is in the first position (out of 229). This establishes 1QS as an ideal sectarian comparison document for this study and increases the importance of any variants, “real” or otherwise, that link 11Q5 to 1QS. The implications of this link include the possibility that the Qumran Scribal Practice present in 11Q5 is only one aspect of an overall sectarian modification of the document. As a consistent, document-pervasive sectarian element, this gains importance in conjunction with other thematic and lexical variants. The latter will be discussed in more detail in Chapter IV.

2.5 *Waw for Holem*

In the cases of *waw* for *holem* and *waw* for *qibbutz*, the additional *waw* is an orthographic variant because neither the sound nor the meaning of the word is changed. As mentioned above, there are certain scrolls from Qumran that exhibit predominantly defective spelling and others that demonstrate predominantly *plene* spelling – with only a couple of them showing a nearly even distribution.¹⁵⁶ 11Q5 is included very clearly in the *plene* group, largely due to this variant type.

the single words – and so the other words present in a line are recorded as “hits” alongside the highlighted portions. This results in varying degrees of inflation of results. The broader the line (i.e., the more words per line), the greater the potential inflation. Also worth noting is the statistical impact of smaller samples being compared with larger samples, yet recorded as “hits per 1000 words.” In this case, a very small fragment, such as 4Q440^b at 31 words total, can appear on the chart at either an invalidly high, or low position. In the case of 4Q440^b, two popular sectarian terms (צַדִּיקִים and רַבִּיִּים) in this small sample result in its rank of 18th out of 229, despite the fact that it is, as Abegg asserts, “almost certainly not sectarian.” The major scrolls and larger fragments, including 1QS with a total word count of about 6398, are not in this invalid category. Only one smaller document precedes 1QS on the list – 4Q249^h – and since this is another copy of the same sectarian document exemplified by 1QS, the position of the latter as a prime example of sectarian literature is secure.

¹⁵⁶ Abegg, “The Linguistic Analysis,” 55.

2.6 *Waw (Shurek) for Qibbutz*

For a discussion on possible origins of this variant, see the section on *Waw* for *Holem* (above).

2.7 Additional *Waw*

This is the regular plural of עֲדוּת in 11QPs^a, occurring 13 times. Qimron suggests that this form would have been pronounced just as עֲדוּת in the MT, rather than עֲדוּת or something like it. See also CD 20:31; 1Q22 f1ii:1; 4Q364 f17:3; 4Q471 f2:2.¹⁵⁷

2.8 *Waw for Qamets-Hatuf*

As Abegg explains, the *waw* regularly represents o-class and often the u-class vowels of Biblical Hebrew.¹⁵⁸ This variant does not indicate a change in the meaning of the word and may or may not indicate a different pronunciation. There is much dispute over the classification of these forms— or even how to explain them.¹⁵⁹

¹⁵⁷ Qimron, *The Hebrew of*, §330.3c

¹⁵⁸ Abegg, “The Linguistic Analysis,” 66.

¹⁵⁹ Qimron, *The Hebrew of*, §200.26

Phonological

Phonological Variants Chart					
Verse	Col/Line	Variant Type	MT	11Q5	English
20	7:6	3.0	גְּרִשָּׁה	גְּרִשָּׁה	"she is consumed"

3.0 *Sin* for *Samek*

In the case of **Psalm 119:20 (11Q5 7:6)**, there is an apparent similarity in sound between the *sin* and the *samek* at Qumran which made the letters functionally interchangeable.¹⁶⁰

This variant is more common than its opposite, the substitution of *samek* for *sin*.¹⁶¹

Graphical

The single instance of what may be a scribal error (verse 107, col. 11:3) is discussed in the Real Variants sections below.

¹⁶⁰ Qimron *The Hebrew of*, §200.15

¹⁶¹ Qimron *The Hebrew of*, §200.15

PART IV: A DISCUSSION OF THE REAL VARIANTS

Real Variants Chart						
Verse	Col/Line	Variant		MT	11Q5	English
		Type				
2	6:12	5.2		לֵב	עַת	"heart"; "time"
		5.9		יִדְרְשׁוּהוּ	יִדְרְשׁוּהוּ	"who seek him"; "who seek it" <i>fem</i>
5	6:15	5.2		חֻקֶיךָ	אִמְתָּכָה	"statutes"; "truth"
7-14				Not extant in 11Q5		
16	7:2	5.1		בְּחֻקֶיךָ	בְּחֻקֶיכָה	"in your statutes"
		5.12		דְּבָרֶיךָ	דְּבָרֶיכָה	"your word"; "your words"
17	7:3	5.1		גָּמַל	גָּמֹר	"to reward"; "to complete"
		5.12		דְּבָרֶיךָ	דְּבָרֶיכָה	"your word"; "your words"
18	7:4	5.12		מִתּוֹרַתְךָ	מִתּוֹרוֹתֶיכָה	"from your law"; "from your laws"
29-36				Not extant in 11Q5		
37	8:1	5.10		בְּדַרְכֶיךָ תִּינֵנִי	כְּדַבְּרֶיכָה חוֹנְנִי	"give me life in your ways"; "show me favour according to your word"
		5.2		בְּדַרְכֶיךָ תִּינֵנִי	כְּדַבְּרֶיכָה חוֹנְנִי	
40	8:4	5.2		בְּצַדִּיקוֹתַי תִּינֵנִי	בְּצַדִּיקוֹתֶיכָה חוֹנְנִי	"in your righteousness, give me life"; "in your righteousness show me favour"
41	8:5	5.8		חַסְדֶּךָ	חֶסֶד	"your lovingkindness"; "lovingkindness"
42	8:6	5.18		וְאֶעֱנֶה	וְאֶעֱנֶה	"I will answer"
43	8:7	5.1		לְמִשְׁפָּטֶיךָ	לְדַבְּרֶיכָה	"in your judgments"/"in your words"
44	8:8	5.3		לְעוֹלָם וָעֶד	וְעַד	"forever and ever"; "forever"
45	8:8	5.2		בְּרַחֲבֶיהָ	בְּרַחוּבֶיהָ	"in the street [free space]"; "in the streets [free spaces]" (MT has the feminine adjective and 11Q5 has the noun plus pronominal suffix)
		5.12		בְּרַחֲבֶיהָ	בְּרַחוּבֶיהָ	
48	8:12	5.2		וְאֶשְׂיַחֲהָ	וְאֶשְׂיִישָׁהּ	"and I will meditate"; "and I will rejoice"
49	8:13	5.12		דְּבָרֶךָ	דְּבָרֶיכָה	"word"; "your words"
		5.8		דְּבָרֶךָ	דְּבָרֶיכָה	
50-58				Not extant in 11Q5		
64	9:6	5.13		חֻקֶיךָ	חֻקֶיכָה	"your statutes"; "your statute"
68	9:10	5.3		טוֹב־אַתָּה	טוֹב אַתָּה אֲדוֹנָי	"you are good"; "you are good, Lord"
70	9:12	5.2		שְׂשַׁעְתִּי	שְׂשַׁע[ש]וֹעִי	"I delight" [pilpel]; "my delights" [noun]
		5.16		שְׂשַׁעְתִּי	שְׂשַׁע[ש]וֹעִי	
71	9:13	5.14		עֲנִיתִי	עֲנִיתָנִי	"I was afflicted"; "you afflicted me"
72	9:14	5.13		מֵאֲלָפִי	מֵאֲלָפָי]	"than thousands"; "than a thousand"
73	9:15	1.6		מִצְוֹתֶיךָ	מִצְוֹתֶיכָה	"your commandments"

Real Variants Chart						
		Variant				
74-81		Not extant in 11Q5				
82	10:1	5.13	כָּלָה	כִּלְתָּה	"they failed (completed/destroyed)"; "it failed (completed/destroyed)"	
83	10:2	5.14	הָיִיתִי	עֲשִׂיתָנִי	"I have become"; "you have made me"	
85	10:4	5.2	שִׁחֹת	שַׁחַת	"pits"; "pit [hell/perdition]"	
87	10:6	5.10	בְּאֶרֶץ	מֵאֶרֶץ	"in the earth"; "from the earth"	
88	10:7	5.2	חַיִּי	חֹנְנִי	"give me life"; "show me favour"	
92	10:11	5.2	בְּעָנְיִי	בְּעוֹנִי	"in my affliction/ misery"; "in my guilt" עני for עון	
97-104		Not extant in 11Q5				
105	11:1	5.12	לְנַתִּיבֹתַי	לְנַתִּיבוֹתַי	"to my path"; "to my paths"	
106	11:2	5.1 or 5.2	לְשָׁמֹר	לַעֲשׂוֹת	"to keep"; "to do/make"	
		5.13	מִשְׁפָּטִים	מִשְׁפָּט	"judgments"; "judgment"	
107	11:3	5.1 or 4.1	נִעַנְיִיתִי	נִעֲוִיתִי	"I have been afflicted"; "I have been answered" (ענה for ענה)	
		5.2	חַיִּי כִּדְבָרְךָ	כְּאִמְרַתְּכָה חֹנְנִי	"give me life according to your way/word"; "show me favour according to your word"	
108	11:4	5.3	רְצֵה-נָא	רְצֵה	"accept now"; "accept" [both imperative]	
110	11:6	5.4	וּמִפְקוּדֶיךָ	אֲנִי פְקוּדֵיכָה	"but from your precepts"; "I, your precepts"	
		5.11	וּמִפְקוּדֶיךָ	אֲנִי פְקוּדֵיכָה		
111	11:7	5.17	כִּי-שִׂשׂוֹן לִבִּי	שִׂשׂוֹן לִבִּי	"because/for they are the joy of my heart"; "they are the joy of my heart"	
114	11:10	5.12	לְדַבְּרֶךָ	לְדַבְּרֵיכָה	"in your way/word"; "in your ways/words"	
116	11:12	5.2	מִשְׁבְּרִי	מִמְשַׁבְּרֵי	"from my hope"; "from my breaking wave/torment"	
117	11:13	5.2	וְאֶשְׂעָה	וְאֶשֵׂא	"that I may gaze"; "that I may lift/carry"	
		5.11	בְּחֻקֶיךָ	בְּחֻקֵיכָה	"on your statutes"; "your statutes"	
119	11:15	5.2	הַשְׁבֵּתָה	חֲשַׁבְתִּי	"you determine/ designate [as]"; "I count [as]"	
		5.3	לְכֵן	עַל כֵּן	"to thus" [therefore]; "on thus" [therefore]	
		5.3	עֲדוּתֶיךָ	כּוֹל עֲדוּוֹתֵיכָה	"your testimonies/ decrees"; "all [of] your testimonies/ decrees"	
121-127		Not extant in 11Q5				
128	12:1	5.6	כָּל-פְּקוּדֵי	פְּקוּדֵי	"all precepts"; "precepts"	

Real Variants Chart					
		Variant			
129	12:2	5.2	פְּלֹאֹת	פְּלֹגֵי נֶפֶת	"wonderful"; "streams of honey"
130	12:3	5.15	וְאִיר	וְהֵאָר	"(he/it) will enlighten" <i>imperfect</i> ; "and enlighten" <i>imperative</i>
131	12:4	5.3 or 5.4	וְאִשְׁאָפָה כִּי	וְאִשְׁאָפָה	"(and) I pant, because"; "(and) I pant"
		5.1	וְאִבְתִּי	וְאִבְתִּי	"I long for" [yab]; "I long for" [tab]
133	12:6	5.10	בְּאִמְרַתְךָ	לְאִמְרַתְךָ	"in/by your word/ promise"; "to your word/promise"
136	12:9	5.3	אֵל	עַל כִּי	"over" [possibly meaning "because of"]; "over when" [possibly meaning "because of"]
137	12:10	5.12	וְיִשָּׁר	וְיִשְׂרִים	"and right/straight" <i>singular</i> ; "and right/straight" <i>plural</i>
142	12:15	5.2	צְדָקְתְּךָ	צְדָקָה	"your righteousness"; "righteous (acts)"
		5.12	צְדָקָה	צְדָקָה	"righteousness"; "righteous (acts)"
		5.11	לְעוֹלָם	עוֹלָם	"to forever"; "forever"
143-149			Not extant in 11Q5		
152	13:3	5.2	מִשְׁדַּתֶּיךָ	מִדְעַתְכָּה	"from your testimonies/decrees"; "from your knowledge"
		5.8	יִסְדָּתְךָ	יִסְדַּתִּי	"you have established them"; "you have established me"
153	13:4	5.6 or 5.7	כִּי־תוֹרַתְךָ	תוֹרַתְכָה	"because/for your instruction/law"; "your instruction/law"
156	13:7	5.2	חַיִּי	חַוֵּנִי	"give me life"; "show me favour"
159	13:11	5.2	כְּחַסְדֶּךָ	כְּאִמְרַתְכָה	"according to your lovingkindness"; "according to your word"
		5.2	חַיִּי	חַוֵּנִי	"give me life"; "show me favour"
160	13:12	5.12	דְּבַרְךָ	דְּבַרֵּיכָה	"your word"/"your words"
		5.8	צְדָקְךָ	צְדָקָה	"your righteousness"; "righteousness"
162	13:14	5.10	כְּמוֹצֵא	מִמוֹצֵא	"like one who finds"; "from one who finds"
164	13:16, 17	5.15	הֵלַלְתִּיךָ	אֵהֵלְלֶכָה	"I have praised you" [I praise you] <i>perfect</i> ; "I praise you" <i>imperfect</i>
165-170			Not extant in 11Q5		
171	14:1	5.3	תְּהַלֵּלְךָ כִּי	תְּהַלֵּלְךָ לְכָה כִּי	"praise, because"; "praise to you, because"
175	14:5	5.17	וּמִשְׁפָּטֶיךָ	וּמִשְׁפָּטֵיכָה	"and your judgment"; "your judgments"
		5.12	וּמִשְׁפָּטֶיךָ	וּמִשְׁפָּטֵיכָה	"and your judgment"; "your judgments"
176	14:6	5.1	מִצְוֹתֶיךָ	עֲדוּוֹתֵיכָה	"your commandments"; "your testimonies"

“Real variants” are those that produce a difference in the meaning of a phrase. This can be as subtle as a change in gender of a word or as clear as the alteration of a word or phrase

using entirely different terms. Inclusions and exclusions of terms and phrases are also included in this group. Those that also fit into other categories have already been discussed, such as the implication of added or omitted conjunction *waws*, but may be referred to again in the present section. The other real variants present in the pertinent sections of 11Q5 are discussed in groups according to type, as presented in the variant key.

The number of variations is also of note, especially when considering the concept of a “variant edition” alongside that of a non-variant edition which nonetheless contains several variants. As mentioned above, some systemization of this differentiation must be developed before such discussions can be meaningful to scholarship.

Initial reference numbers are presented in bold type to aid in scanning for particular verses, though some repeating variants will only be discussed in the context of their first occurrence – see the charts for assistance in finding other instances of a given variant type.

Types 5.1, 5.3 and 5.6

Psalm 119:16 (11Q5 7:2) MT reads בְּחֻקֵי־יְהוָה אֲשַׁתְּעֶשֶׂע לֹא אֲשַׁכַּח דְּבַר־יְהוָה (“I will delight in your statutes; I will not forget your word”) versus the 11Q5 reading of בְּחֻקֵיכָה אֲשַׁתְּעֶשֶׂע לֹא אֲשַׁכַּח דְּבַר־יְהוָה (“I will delight in your statutes; I will not forget your *words*”) (emphasis mine).

One variant is the absence of the *taw* in בְּחֻקֵיכָה (your statutes – *masculine*) in 11Q5 versus its presence in בְּחֻקֵי־יְהוָה (your statutes – *feminine*). The BHS suggests that בְּחֻקֵי־יְהוָה should be read בְּחֻקֵי־יְהוָה in consideration of חֻקֵי־יְהוָה (your statutes – *masculine*) from verse twelve. The portion containing Psalm 119:12 is non-extant in 11Q5 and so no

comparison can be made there. The masculine form occurs seventeen times in 11Q5,¹⁶² with thirteen of those in Psalm 119. The feminine form is never used in 11Q5 and occurs only 45 times in the Qumran corpus as a whole. This variant fulfills the requirement to be secondary, the requirement to be intentional, and is repeated consistently throughout the text with no counterexamples. Though it does not alter a translation into English, it would do so if translated into a language with a gender component – such as Spanish or French – and is therefore a real variant of sorts. It does not, however, carry with it discernable theological impact and so it is non-sectarian in and of itself.

It is worth noting, however, that this variant also occurs in DSS renderings of Deuteronomy 10:13 (8Q3 f17_25:5 and XQ1 1:20) and Deut 11:1 (8Q3 f26_29:10), both of which occur in conflict *tefillin*.¹⁶³ These *tefillin* contain biblical sections that are against (in conflict with) the rabbinic teaching for *tefillin* contents. This indicates a possible sectarian nature to the *tefillin*, the variant type itself, and therefore the specific instance of it in 11Q5. Taking the nexus of factors into account, then, there is a definite “sectarian feel” to this variant, even if no more concrete evidence is yet to be found.

Psalm 119:17 (11Q5 7:3) The full verse reads גַּמְלֵ עַל־עַבְדֶּךָ אֶת־חַיִּיךָ וְאֶשְׁמְרָה דְּבָרֶיךָ (“[Heap] reward upon your servant; may I live and keep your word”) in MT documents and גַּמְלֵ עַל־עַבְדֶּךָ וְאֶת־חַיִּיךָ וְאֶשְׁמְרָה דְּבָרֶיךָ (“[fulfill your purpose for?] your servant and may I live and keep your words” or “[Avenge?] your servant and may I live and keep your words”) in 11Q5.

¹⁶² This includes 3 reconstructions, one in Psalm 119:71 (11Q5 14:1), one in Psalm 147:20 (11Q5 fEiii:6) and one in Psalm 105:10 (11Q5 fEiii:15).

¹⁶³ Small scrolls placed in boxes, strapped to the arm or forehead for use in prayer

The first variant is in גמור (end – *imperative*) versus גמל (reward - *imperative*). The similarity between the two words (orthographic variant aside) is broken only by the presence of a *resh* rather than a *lamed*. There is some similarity between the two letters; one could postulate that this is a “*resh* for *lamed*” scribal error, except that the same variant is present in Psalm 119:17 (4Q90 f1_2:17), [גמור על עבדך ואחיה] ואשמר דברך ([Heap] reward on your servant, that I may live and keep your word.”) It is possible that the 11Q5 scribe copied from 4Q90 f1_2:17 (or perhaps from the same source text) and thereby copied an error in good faith. However, though *resh* for *dalet* is a fairly common error, *resh* for *lamed* is much rarer – some other explanation for both 11Q5 and 4Q90 is more likely.

This may be the case of confusion between the two letters as sounding very much alike. Internal/mental monologue as one writes creates many of the same mistakes as oral dictation might, and so we need not demand a situation of one scribe dictating to another to consider phonological factors. Put another way, our internal voice dictates and we listen, much the same as when one person dictates to another. I have been unable to find supporting documentation of this *resh/lamed* phenomenon, or of r/l confusion in a strictly Biblical or DSS Hebrew context, but logic dictates that this is a possibility. Consider examples in 1QIsa^a 18:10, 1QIsa^a 53:7, Isa 23:6, 40:8 (in the correction), 50:6 and Song of Songs 2:14.

It is also possible that this is a variant meant for clarification of meaning, possibly motivated by theological preferences, which highlight the vengeance of God against those who do not walk according to his ways (see my second possible translation of the 11Q5 reading, above). Such language and sentiment is rife in 1QS, though this specific word only

occurs once.¹⁶⁴ It is possible that the Qumranite scribe preferred the specific mention of revenge against enemies to that of (the more generic) reward, which did not mention the fate of any who stand in opposition of the Qumranite and, by implication, in opposition to God himself.

This variant therefore may fulfil Rules #1 (secondary), #2 (intentional) and #4 (repeated), and though it may agree with a particular focus in the theology at Qumran, it cannot be said that this sentiment is specific to the Community, and so Rule #3 becomes a problem. Just because it is not unique to Qumran, however, does not mean that this was not a theologically motivated variant.

A further possibility is that the variant is a result of weakening of the *resh*. According to Qimron, there are over twenty instances of spelling irregularities surrounding or involving *resh* in “our” [*sic*] corpus and around fifteen in the biblical, apocryphal and Aramaic texts from Qumran.¹⁶⁵ It is therefore also possible that this is an instance in which the weakening of the *resh* has led to an alteration of the spelling. We are left with a choice between a possible (but not likely) recopied scribal error, a non-sectarian theological variant, or an orthographic/phonological shift due to weakening of the *resh*. None of these explanations carries with it a reasonable degree of certainty. I shall therefore defer to Qimron and categorize this as a phonological variant due to weakening of the *resh*.

Psalm 119:43 (11Q5 8:7) The first real variant is לְמִשְׁפָּטַי (in your ordinances) as opposed to לְדַבְרֵיכָה (in your words). This variant is likely one of increasing the level of

¹⁶⁴ 1QS 1:10, 11, 2:5-18, etc.

¹⁶⁵ Qimron, *The Hebrew of*, §200.14

agreement between 119:43a and 119:43b. My translation of the MT reads “And [do] not utterly take away from my mouth the word of truth, for I hope in your ordinances.” My translation of 11Q5 reads “And [do] not utterly take away from my mouth the *word* of truth, for I hope in your *words*” (emphasis also mine). The closer relationship between the plea for retention of the “word of truth” and the location of the hope “in your words” may be the impetus for this variant. The MT reading is supported by LXX, **Σ** and **τ** (though in plural form in multiple manuscripts of each) and by 4Q89 f1i:8 also in the plural form. This indicates the 11Q5 reading is probably an intentional variant developed for logical, poetic or theological reasons. The resulting focus or clarification, however, is not anything unique to the Community or to any other individual sect of Judaism. For this reason, I classify this as a non-sectarian variant.

Psalm 119:44 (11Q5 8:8a) The first real variant in verse 44 is the omission of לְעוֹלָם (‘‘to distant times’’ or ‘‘forever’’) from the 11Q5 text. However, the following word, וְעַד (‘‘and ever’’ or ‘‘and forever’’), serves much the same function on its own. This part of the verse is non-extant in 4Q89 and there are no variant notes in the BHS apparatus. I can propose no theological reasons for the omission as the meaning is not compromised. It would seem that this is a simple non-sectarian variant.

Psalm 119:68 (11Q5 9:10) The variant is the addition of the word אֲדֹנָי (Lord – *proper noun*). This variant is also attested by the LXX usage of κύριε. Since the variant is not unique to 11Q5, and since it does not seem to carry theological meaning, this vocative is a non-sectarian variant.

Psalm 119:106 (11Q5 11:2) See the discussion on Psalm 119:48 (11Q5 8:12), in the next section.

Psalm 119:108 (11Q5 11:4) The variant is in אָנָה־הַנְּיָ (accept, now) and הַנְּיָ (accept). There is no apparent theological motivation for this removal of “now” and it appears to be either a preference in phrasing or a scribal error of omission. There is nothing to indicate that this is theological or sectarian.

Psalm 119:119 (11Q5 11:15) has הַשָּׁבְתָהּ (you cease - *hifil*) and הַשְׁבַּתִּי (I have thought/accounted - *piel*) and appears to be a correction on the part of 11Q5. LXX supports the 11Q5 reading in this instance (ἐλογισάμην). This would be a clear-cut case were it not for the other variant elements with regard to the pronominal suffix (as discussed below), but in light of the word as a whole it seems that more than simple correction is evident here. Because the variant discussed below could function as classified with either הַשָּׁב as utilized in 11Q5 or with הַשְׁבַּת as utilized in the MT, classification of this *het/he* variant is problematic. In the absence of solid evidence for one particular explanation, I shall categorize this variant as indeterminate.

The next real variant is the use of עַל כֵּן (over/upon thus) in the 11Q5 reading as opposed to לְכֵן (to thus). The theological meaning of this phrase is not altered by this variant; there is therefore no compelling evidence to indicate an intentional variation for clarity or sectarian reasons. Thus, I shall classify this variant as non-sectarian.

The next variant is the addition of כֹּל (all) to 11Q5. The Qumranite scribe, perhaps motivated by religious zeal, specified the implication of the MT reading to read “all of your decrees.” Regardless of the motivation however, the sentiment of love for even “all” of God’s decrees is not specific to the Community (even if members might perhaps think so) as evidenced by LXX (διὰ τοῦτο ἠγάπησα τὰ μαρτύριά σου διὰ παντός). Also, Psalm 119:128 (11Q5 12:1) contains a variant which *removes* כֹּל from a reading, exhibiting inconsistency and thereby contravening Rule #4. This must therefore be classified as a non-sectarian variant, probably for the purpose of cleaning up the parallelism.

Psalm 119:128 (11Q5 12:1) has the omission of כֹּל (all) from 11Q5. In this instance, the scribe of 11Q5 did not see this specification as necessary – the opposite choice as evident in Psalm 119:119 (11Q5 11:15). The inconsistency demonstrated with regard to this variant prompts its classification as a non-sectarian variant.

Psalm 119:131 (11Q5 12:4) The second real variant is in אֶרְצֶנָּה (I long for) from אֶרְצֶנָּה, and אֶרְצֶנָּה (I long for) from אֶרְצֶנָּה. In this case, both verbs are functionally synonymous and the difference is one of form or vocabulary. The meaning is congruent with Second Temple period Judaism in general. Since אֶרְצֶנָּה is a *hapax legomenon*, it is also possible that this is not a different word at all, but rather a scribal error that has since been interpreted as a different term. Examination of the plate leads me to believe that it is at least *remotely* possible. For example, removal of the left stroke of the *tav* would leave a stroke broadly similar to a *yod* according to the palaeography of this scroll. Perhaps the scribe made the

stroke just prior to having to re-ink his pen and returned with a slightly different frame of mind, adding the second stroke to a *yod* that, due to a longer than usual upper tab, appeared to be the beginning of a *tav*. The thickness of the second stroke may support this theory. Nonetheless, this solution requires too much conjecture for my comfort.

Alternately, this variant could also represent the substitution of an easier lexeme in place of a difficult one. Again, however, this requires more speculation than is prudent in my mind, and so I shall categorize this as a non-sectarian variant utilizing a *hapax legomenon*.

Psalm 119:136 (11Q5 12:9) has the addition of כִּי (because/when) and does not alter the meaning in a theological manner. Though the nuance changes with interpretation – “because,” “when” and “that” all convey a slightly different sense – there is not one of the various choices that would be particular to a single sect as per Rule #3. This is a non-sectarian variant.

Psalm 119:153 (11Q5 13:4) has the omission of כִּי (because) in 11Q5. 11Q5 therefore uses a structure that might best be translated into English through use of a semicolon. This does not sufficiently alter the theological meaning to warrant inclusion as a possible sectarian reading and is therefore a non-sectarian variant.

Psalm 119:171 (11Q5 14:1) has the addition of לְכֶה (to you) to 11Q5. This is an instance of clarification of implied information and – though it is common in Qumran

literature – it does not constitute a sectarian variant as it is simply drawing out already expressed sentiment. This is therefore a non-sectarian variant as per Rule #3.

Psalm 119:176 (11Q5 14:6) has מְצוֹתֶיךָ (your commandments) and עֲדוּתֵיכָה (your testimony). It is difficult to identify a defensible theological motivation for this change in term. There are no variants listed in the BHS apparatus and so no insight is available from that quarter. Since the subtle change in theological meaning cannot be linked to Qumran to the exclusion of other sects, it contravenes Rule #3 and is therefore not a sectarian variant. The repeated use of this עֲדוּת in place of מְצוֹת may simply represent a desire on the part of a scribe to harmonize the text, creating more consistency in the use of certain terms.

Section Summary

The preceding variants, though causing changes in the way these verses might be translated in most instances, do not alter the meaning of the texts to a significant degree, amounting to several instances of synonym use or style preference. Though an exhaustive examination of their usage in other contexts and documents might prove insightful to some areas of study, such a study is beyond the scope of this essay as I do not think the results would indicate sectarian motivations on a theological level or *vice versa*. I shall therefore transition now to those variants that significantly alter meaning, and have a greater chance of exhibiting theological – and possibly sectarian – features or implications.

Type 5.2, 5.4, and 5.7

Psalm 119:2 (11Q5 6:12) reads אֲשֶׁרִי נִצְרִי עֲדֹתָיו בְּכָל-לֵב יְדֹרְשׁוּהוּ in MT (“Happy are those who keep his decrees, who seek him with their whole heart”), whereas 11Q5 reads אֲשֶׁרִי [נוצרי עדותו בכול] עת ידורשוהו (“Happy are those who keep his decrees, who seek him at all times”). The first real variant present is the change to עת (time) from לֵב (heart) – type 5.2. This variant is intentional as עת and לֵב are too different to be interchangeable by accident. There is also no indication that the alteration from a heart-related seeking to a time-related seeking would be objectionable to any segment of Second Temple period Judaism and so this does not seem to be motivated to conform to a particular sect as opposed to others. The BHS records no variants for this verse and an Accordance search for עת ידורשוהו reveals nothing in the Dead Sea Scrolls and so it appears to be unique. This variant fulfills only Rule #2 for “intentionality” (though it does not *violate* Rule #4 for “consistency/repetition”) and is therefore most likely a non-sectarian variant.

Psalm 119:5 (11Q5 6:15) reads אֲחֵלִי יִכְנֹו דְרָכַי לְשִׁמֹר תְּקִיף (“O that my ways may be steadfast in keeping your statutes!”) and אֲחֵלִי יִכְנֹו דְרָכַי לְשִׁמֹר א[מתכה (“O that my ways may be steadfast to preserve your truth!”). Though a significant portion of this sample is reconstructed, the final word of the line is obviously a variation and the minor degree of reconstruction of the word is reasonably certain. MT uses the term תְּקִיף (statutes) whereas 11Q5 uses א[מתכה (truth). If we rely on evidence presented earlier in this essay we can conclude that this reading is secondary and varies from a natural, sound reading. Due to the lack of similar-looking letters and the length of the words, there can be

little doubt that the variant is intentional. There are no variants for this verse listed in the BHS. Forms of **תָּנַח** are also found in Psalm 119:43, 142, 151 and 160 (11Q5 8:7, 12:15, 13:2 13:12). In these instances 11Q5 does not vary the term, and so any argument for this variation based on theology would be defeated by repeated instances of conformity later in the text – though these might argue for an understanding of the words as synonyms. It also does not seem to avoid or produce a theological tenet particular to any individual Jewish sect. Though it is possible that some nuance in either word created enough difference in meaning to the ear of the Second Temple scribe, we have no access to this phenomenon with present data, and so it must remain an unknown. The very presence of this variant against a sound reading might argue that the word was seen as having a different meaning – why change it if the result is the same? – but due to the similar signification of these terms in this context (as far as present scholarship is aware) and the use of the MT term elsewhere in the same context in 11Q5, an argument could be made for similar meaning as well. In the absence of better data, I shall categorize it as a change to a word of a different meaning – type 5.2.

Psalm 119:37 (11Q5 8:1) The MT phrase, **בְּדַרְכֶיךָ תֵּינִי** (“let me live in your ways” or “give me life in your ways”) differs from 11Q5’s **כִּדְבַרְכֶּךָ הוֹנְנִי** (“show me favour according to your word”). This is repeated in verses 40 (11Q5 8:4), 107 (11Q5 11:3), 156 (11Q5 13:7) and 159 (11Q5 13:11). If one accepts the first translation offered (mine) – “let me live in your ways” – then one could understand the petitioner as already having the confidence of eternal life, while asking for a daily expression of that in his life. In this sense, there is none of what Ulrich described as a “jarring” effect desired for identification

of sectarian variants¹⁶⁶ – that is, the Qumranite reader would not have read the text and understood its theology to be markedly different from his own. If this was the case for the scribe, there would be little impetus for altering the text and some other explanation would be needed, such as the employment of a different source text than P-MT – which is unlikely considering the high degree of similarity present between the two texts.

However, “Give me life in your ways” (as the NRSV translates it) *does* seem incongruous with Qumranite theology (see below), and the Sectarian scribe who read it thus would probably feel compelled to alter it in a manner much like that present in 11Q5. In the context of the theology apparent in 1QS (as discussed in the next paragraph) this translation would have been jarring enough to warrant further investigation.

The Community at Qumran already saw themselves as possessing eternal life, demonstrated by continued good standing in the fellowship of the *Yahad*; they did not need to ask for it continually or multiple times – their very presence in the *Yahad* would have been an outward sign of eternal election.¹⁶⁷ Such men believed that God had ordained every person (1QS 2:2) and every thing (1QS 3:15, 16), great or small, from the very beginning. Each man was to know his place in the “eternal society” (1QS 2:23). It would seem strange that these men would ask for “life,” much as it would seem strange for a fervent, practicing Calvinist in good standing and confidence to ask again and again for salvation. Though not

¹⁶⁶ Ulrich, “The Absence,” 182.

¹⁶⁷ It is also true that some members of the *Yahad* were thrown out for nonconformist behaviour with regard to the Law as interpreted by the Teacher of Righteousness and other leaders. These were, however, considered men who were “initiated into the covenant with unrepentant heart” (1QS 2:11) and not true holders of eternal life. Such men are believed to be self-conscious and aware of this lack of repentance even at the point of (insincere) entrance into the covenant (1QS 2:13, 14). It is implied, then, that the Qumranite who is in good outward standing, and is confident in his own election, *knows* that he has been chosen and has been given eternal life. This dynamic would have enabled the group to expel a member for entering insincerely, considering any protestations to the contrary as further dishonesty.

impossible, this does seem unlikely and would be an odd wording to include in a sacred text of this context.

Instead I propose that the Qumranites would be more inclined to ask for graciousness, for a lack of hardships. They knew that hardships might come to them and that it was their responsibility to bear up under them in obedience, according to the covenant of the *Yahad* (1QS1:17, 18). 1QS details a situation in which each person's eternal destination/result is predetermined, but the degree of blessing, "good thing[s]," wisdom, etc. is juxtaposed with potential trouble (1QS 2:1-10). The writer asks that the non-covenant person receive no help when he cries out and he wishes calamity even upon the offspring of such people. With ultimate results predetermined, what is left is the day-to-day challenges of life: "favour" through God's loving-kindness or a lack thereof through God's hatred of evil, evil actions, and evildoers (1QS 2:15-17). In God's mystery, 1QS tells us, evil is allowed to endure for a time, even seeming to prosper (1QS 3:23), but this is not the whole picture.

God, according to his loving-kindness (1QS 10:16) has chosen some to represent him as Children of Light. It is this reliance on God's loving-kindness, I propose, that triggers the scribe's desire to use "show me favour" rather than "give me life." "Life", the writer already has; only "favour" comes and goes as either the Children of Light or the Children of Darkness gain the upper hand. Since God's "ways" include the mystery of allowing the evil to prosper for a time, alongside his chosen ones, perhaps "according to your word" is an appeal to verses like Jeremiah 29:11, God's plans "for welfare and not for harm." A sectarian nature may be more probable for this than is any other known motivation, and the intention involved is bolstered by the consistent repetition of its use:

This variant is repeated in Psalm 119:40, 88, 107, 132, 156 and 159 (11Q5 8.4, 10.7, 11.3, 13.7, and 13.11) – seven occurrences in total even in this relatively short selection of text.

A sectarian interpretation must be taken with some caution, however, for two reasons. First, this form does not occur in any of the non-biblical texts. Though the theme and concept can be expressed without the verbatim phraseology, it is nonetheless peculiar that there is not a single instance of it in the sectarian literature. However, though *הַיָּה* is found in Isaiah 33:2 (הַיָּה), Psalm 4:1 (הַיָּה) and 6:2 (הַיָּה) of MT, it is not as variation away from *הַיָּה*, as is the case in 11Q5 – *הַיָּה* would have represented, presumably, the original intended meaning.

The MT Isaiah *הַיָּה* reading is the same as that of 1QIsa^a 27:2 (הַיָּה) and 4Q57 f21_22:2 (הַיָּה). Psalm 4:2 is not represented in the DSS. Psalm 6:2 is damaged in 4Q83 f1:7 and not represented by most other scrolls, but enough survives in 11Q8 f1:1 (הַיָּה) to determine that this Qumran text matches MT in this instance. In all of these other situations, “favour” would agree with the *Yahad* theology as revealed by 1QS as per the discussion above. The Qumranites would not have had a problem with these other instances, because the wording coincided with their own theology; the readings would have had no “jarring” effect from the Qumranite point of view. It is only when faced with the term *הַיָּה* in this context in the Psalm that, I propose, the scribe of 11Q5 felt the need to make a change.

The second caution is due to possible inconsistency within the Qumran corpus: another of the Dead Sea Scrolls, 4Q89, supports the MT reading over that of 11Q5. Though uniqueness is a virtue if coupled with regularity and agreement within a sect, it becomes problematic if there are contradicting texts held as authoritative by the same group. Such

contradictions exist (in the modern canon of the Bible for example)¹⁶⁸ and are not insurmountable, but they do elicit increased care. There are no variations listed in the BHS that coincide with the 11Q5 reading, but 4Q89 agrees in its reading with both MT and with supporting language from LXX. 4Q89 f1i:1 reads בדרכך חיני (“let me live in your ways” or “give me life in your ways”). In Psalm 119:40 (4Q89 f1i:4) we find the similar phrase בצדקתך חיני (“let me live in your righteousness” or “give me life in your righteousness”). Though largely reconstructed, Psalm 119:50 (4Q89 f1ii_3:8) reads [כי אמנ]רתך חית[ני] (“let me live according to your truth” or “give me life according to your truth”). The other Psalm 119 verses in question are not extant in 4Q89.

Though these instances would seem to support the MT reading and undermine the argument for a sectarian reading of this phrase in 11Q5, it should be noted that the second person pronominal suffixes in 4Q89 *also* follow the tradition of MT, indicating a closer textual relationship – a general style more akin to MT than to 11Q5. Considering the similarity in proposed dates of the two scrolls – the first century CE for both 11Q5 and 4Q89 – this may be explained in a number of ways. Such differences could be explained by development of the group (and, presumably, nuances of its theological perspective and foci) over a relatively short period of time, by the presence of collected works alongside more authoritative ones, or by scribal activity by two scribes: one with insufficient authority or too little confidence to alter an existing reading contained in the source material, and another who had such authority or confidence. A more conservative scribe may retain readings statically while a contemporary might alter them to better suit his purpose and/or

¹⁶⁸ In the Gospels, for example, with regard to the night of the “Last Supper” (Matthew 26, Mark 14, Luke 22, John 13) or with regard to differing accounts of creation in the book of Genesis (Chapters 1, 2).

understanding. These propositions, however, are mainly based on conjecture. We may posit various explanations for these five instances of this particular variant, but one cannot definitively discount sectarian theology from the motivation.

In summary, the variant is likely *secondary*, it is seemingly *intentional*, the best explanation for its existence is a one of *sectarian theology*, and it is *repeated*. Rules #1-4 are all feasibly fulfilled by this variant. My argument for its nature is not definitive or necessarily compelling, but it does what it is meant to do: demonstrate the *possibility* of a sectarian variant in the biblical Dead Sea Scrolls. This set of variants is a candidate for *reasonable doubt* against Ulrich's statement.

Psalm 119:48 (11Q5 8:12) The first real variant is וְאֶשְׂיָחָה (and I will meditate) and וְאֶשְׂשִׂיחָה (and I will rejoice). The motivation behind this word choice is worthy of some conjecture (especially when considered in concert with the two instances discussed after this one). Gabrielle Boccaccini highlights the active, hands-on lifestyle of the Essenes in contrast to the contemplative life of other Jewish sects of the Second Temple period, citing Philo's description of the two groups as evidence for his theory.¹⁶⁹ Perhaps this variant is a result of that active nature, the Qumran Community expressing the preference for words denoting action over words denoting contemplation. The expression of a desire to rejoice in the statutes of God, however, is not one peculiar to the Community or even to Essenes in general. For this reason, Rule #3 is not satisfactorily fulfilled and this is categorized as a non-sectarian variant.

¹⁶⁹ Boccaccini, *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis*, (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1998), 26.

Likewise, in Psalm 119:106 (11Q5 11:12), the first real variant is לְיָשֹׁבֵר (to keep/confirm) and לַעֲשׂוֹת (to do/make). This case might be similar to that above, in which the more active nuance to the 11Q5 verb better suits the reported nature of the sectarian scribe. In any case, the verbs are too close in meaning – virtually synonymous – and such speculation is too subjective to be of much use here and I shall therefore also categorize this variant as non-sectarian.

Psalm 119:110 (11Q5 11:6) has the addition of אֲנִי (I) to 11Q5. This alters the translation slightly, but does not convey any theological meaning. This is therefore a non-sectarian variant.

Psalm 119:117 (11Q5 11:13) has וְאֶשְׁעָה (and may I gaze/have regard for) and וְאֶשֶׂא (and may I carry). The 11Q5 phrase וְאֶשֶׂא חֻקֶיכָה (“and may I carry your statutes”) occurs only in this instance, and the vague similarity to וְאֶשְׁעָה might explain this peculiarity, as would the weakening of the *ayin*, as Qimron discusses,¹⁷⁰ but the removal of the preposition from the following term would argue against scribal error. It is also feasible that the Qumran scribe preferred the more active sense of “carrying” the statutes as opposed to “gazing” upon or “having regard” for them, as discussed above. This is classified as non-sectarian.

¹⁷⁰ Qimron, *The Hebrew of*, §200.11 See also Isa 28:15, 48:14; Lam 5:10; 3Q15 1:4; 4Q524 fl_4:5.

The next, different real variant is in **Psalm 119:83 (11Q5 10:2)**, in **תְּנִינֶיךָ** (your statutes) and **הַסְדַּכָּה** (your loving-kindness). Though 11Q5 uses “loving-kindness” thirty-four times, only four of these are in Psalm 119. Of those four, MT uses it three times, in verses 41, 64 and 88. Only here in verse 83 is there a discrepancy. For this reason, this must be categorized as a non-sectarian variant as per Rules #3 (*specific to one group or sect*) and #4 (*repeated – and without contradiction*).

Psalm 119:85 (11Q5 10:4) The variant is in **שִׁיחָוֶה** (pits) and **שָׁחָה** ([a] pit) and is one of two possible situations. The first is the singularisation of the MT reading. This does not appear to have theological significance, nor are there other variants in the BHS apparatus to indicate any problematic aspects to the text. This would therefore be a non-sectarian variant. There is a second possibility though. The word occurs in the Qumran corpus eighty seven times. Twenty four of those are the singular form of the noun, the other sixty three are verb forms (to destroy/corrupt). This does not occur as a plural noun at all in the Qumran texts. It occurs twenty three times as a singular noun in the MT and one hundred forty five times as a verb. Preliminary searches of other third-**ה** words indicate that they are probably rare in the plural. MT uses **שִׁיחָוֶה** (pits) – the plural form of **שָׁחָה** (pit) – to communicate plural traps. It seems that the Qumran scribe saw the singular as preferable in this case, which would have been noteworthy on its own (admittedly to a small degree), but what is more he chose to alter the root term. Of the instances of this new root occurring in the Qumran corpus, nine of them are in Psalms. Considering that this same word appears in the much-larger MT corpus only twenty four times, there appears to be a definite impetus for its use by the sectarians. An explanation for this might be found in the suggestion that

the term was used to signify perdition or hell. If this is accurate, then it is of note that the scribe employed a term so pregnant in meaning and so common at Qumran.

My hesitation in accepting this proposal is not in the high frequency of its use, but rather in the *complete* absence of the use of the MT term – if there were some use of the MT term in instances when a physical pit was indicated, then the change in term in other situations where perdition or hell better suited would support the theory of that meaning. Without any such examples, it is difficult to prove differences in meaning as a better explanation than differences in form. This is an intriguing case, but there is insufficient data for a firm decision.

In **Psalm 119:92 (11Q5 10:11)** the real variant is in **בְּעִנְיִי** (in my misery/affliction) and **בְּעוֹנוֹי** (in my guilt). This variant does not occur in 4Q89 nor does the BHS have any apparatus for this verse. This variant appears to be another development in 11Q5 by a scribe willing to make sectarian modifications. In this case, the alteration of the idea of “misery” to one of “guilt” seems to highlight sentiment apparent in the induction ceremony of 1QS. The Levites, we are told, recite the wicked acts and guilty transgressions (**עוֹנוֹתָם**) of the sons of Israel.¹⁷¹ The initiates also confess their guilt and the guilt of their fathers – in which they would have perished were it not for the loving-kindness of God.¹⁷² This concept, though not unique to Qumran, is seemingly more in focus in 1QS than it is in Psalm 119 in general. This reading fulfills Rule #1 (*secondary*); Rule #2 (*intentional*), as it is obviously not an error; fulfills Rule #3 in the sense of a unique degree of focus; and does

¹⁷¹ 1QS 1:22, 23

¹⁷² 1QS 1:24-2:1

not contravene Rule #4 by being contradicted by other variants. Though not provable, this must be considered a possible sectarian variant.¹⁷³ Here, too, we may find support for the *reasonable doubt* we seek.

Psalm 119:116 (11Q5 11:12) has מִשְׁבְּרִי (from my hope) and מִמִּשְׁבְּרִי (from my wave). At first glance, it would seem that 11Q5 has added a superfluous *mem*, resulting in a change in the term from “hope” to “wave.” However, the spelling with the additional *mem* (מִמִּשְׁבְּרִי) occurs in 1QHa 11:9-13, 17; 14:26; 16:32; 17:4, 7; 19:35; 4Q428 f4:2; 4Q429 f4ii:2; and 4Q432 f5:3, whereas the MT term (שִׁבְרִי) occurs only in Psalm 119:116 and 146:5 – and *never* in the literature from Qumran. This seems to be a case in which “wave” is an idiom that made sense to the original author and readers, but for which we have lost the definite meaning. Its usage in 1QHa suggests that it signified something like “torment” or “labour pains” and that it was used in some contexts as a pun on the “mouth of the cervix.” The translation “Do not shame me because of my torments” is intriguing in light of the 1QS oath not to fall away due to trials, but its sentiment is not unique to Qumran, and so is not sectarian.¹⁷⁴

Psalm 119:129 (11Q5 12:2) has פְּלִאָזוֹת (wonders) altered to פְּלִגֵי נֶפֶת (streams of honey). The phrase is, as a pair, *hapax legomenon* and the single word used here for “honey” or “honeycomb” (נֶפֶת) is found in only five other places in the Hebrew Bible:

¹⁷³ DJD IV notes 1ms Ken with the same/similar reading. My study did not encompass this document, though it might be useful to further study in this area.

¹⁷⁴ 1QS 1:17, 18

Psalm 19:11, Proverbs 5:3, 24:13, 27:7 and Song of Songs 4:11. Psalms 19:11 uses it, alongside the more common שִׁבְעָה, in comparison to the sweetness of the words of God. Proverbs 5:3 uses it to describe the words of a loose woman; 24:13 compares it to wisdom. 27:7 states that “a sated appetite spurns honey,” metaphorically using it to signify anything normally highly desirable. Finally, Song of Songs uses it, along with שִׁבְעָה, to describe the words of the bride. It is therefore used three of five times in reference to words, once in reference to wisdom, and once to signify a highly desirable thing. As these instances illustrate, the usage is – with metaphorical inferences considered – quite consistent.

Nothing about the meaning of this variant is unique to Qumran and, for that reason, this intriguing variant must be classified as non-sectarian.

Psalm 119:131 (11Q5 12:4) has the omission of כִּי (because) from 11Q5. See the discussion on variant types 1.4 and 1.5 for details on the implications of added/omitted conjunctions. This is a non-sectarian variant.

Psalm 119:142 (11Q5 12:15) has three variants that work to develop one variant meaning. The first is in צְדָקָתְךָ (your righteousness – *singular*) and צְדָקוֹת (righteousness – *plural*) and is the shift to the plural form and the loss of the pronominal suffix in 11Q5. This combines with the second variant – צְדָקָה (a righteousness) and the plural צְדָקוֹת (righteousness) – and the third variant – לְעוֹלָם (to forever) and עוֹלָם (forever) – to generate

two different meanings. MT reads “Your righteousness [is] everlasting righteousness”¹⁷⁵ whereas 11Q5 reads “Righteousness [is] righteousness forever.” The Community believed that each person had a certain level of standing (בית מעמדו)¹⁷⁶ and that the righteousness demonstrated in this life was due to – and a sign of – each person’s predetermined standing before God.¹⁷⁷ Perhaps this variant is meant to refer to the righteous deeds and lives of the Community members – through God’s decree – and not to the righteousness of God alone. Interesting as such speculation may be, the evidence is not strong enough to classify this as sectarian; I shall list this entire shift in meaning as a single non-sectarian variant.

Psalm 119:152 (11Q5 13:3) has מִעֲדֹתַיִךְ (from your decrees) and מִדַּעַתְכֶּךָ (from knowledge of you) and represents a shift in term from עֲדוּת (decree) to דַּעַת (knowledge [of]). These two terms have related meanings in that knowledge of God is gleaned – at least partially – through knowledge of his decrees. Perhaps this is an implication by the 11Q5 scribe that his instruction is on a more intimate level than that delivered through decrees alone. In the Book of Job, for example, Job exclaims that he had heard of God before, but now has “seen” him first hand¹⁷⁸ – perhaps metaphorically through the events that had occurred, or during the questioning of Job 38. It is also possible that this variant occurred through metathesis and the resulting variation in meaning made sufficient sense that no

¹⁷⁵ This is also supported by LXX, as translated in *The Septuagint with Apocrypha (in Greek and English)*, Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1972 and in Albert Pietersma and Benjamin G. Wright, *A New English Translation of the Septuagint*, New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.

¹⁷⁶ 1QS 2:22-3

¹⁷⁷ 1QS 3:6; 4:6, 7, 22, 24, 25; etc.

¹⁷⁸ Job 42:5

need for correction was identified. In either case, since knowledge of God is not a claim made by the Community alone and metathesis would have been a simple error, it does not fulfill Rule #3 and/or is not intentional and is therefore a non-sectarian variant.

Psalm 119:153 (11Q5 13:4) has the omission of כִּי (because) from 11Q5. See the discussion on variant types 1.4 and 1.5 for details on the implications of added/omitted conjunctions. This is a non-sectarian variant.

Psalm 119:159 (11Q5 13:11) has כְּחַסְדֶּיךָ תִּינֵנִי (“according to your kindness, [give] me life”) and כְּאִמְרַתְּכָה תוֹנֵנִי (“according to your word, [show] me favour”). These two variations (“kindness” to “word” and “life” to “favour”) alter the meaning of the phrase and may constitute a sectarian variant as discussed in relation to Psalm 119:37 (11Q5 8:1). I shall list the two of them as a single possible sectarian variant.

Variant Types 5.8 and 5.9

This variant type is the alteration, addition or omission of a pronominal suffix.

Psalm 119:2 (11Q5 6:12) The second real variation is in יִדְרֹךְ שִׁירָה (they will seek him/it) versus יִדְרֹר שִׁירָה (they will seek her/it). The absence of the *waw* at the terminus of the word in 11Q5 creates some possible ambiguity with regard to identification of the subject in the second clause. This comes down to whether or not this is a real variant or an error in orthography.

If this is a real variant, the scribe has intentionally altered the pronominal suffix from masculine singular to feminine singular. 11Q5, if this is the case, must contain some variant in the non-extant portion, most likely an alternate word for עֲרֻתָּיו (his decrees), or perhaps a singularisation of it, though that would not conform well to the trend of pluralisation found in most of the studied sections. For illustrative purposes, consider a substitution of תּוֹרָתוֹ (his instruction/law) for עֲרֻתָּיו (his decrees). In this case, the pronominal suffix of יִדְוּרָהּ (they will seek her/it) would be feminine, and would refer to the law. The whole sentence might then read “Blesses are the keepers of his law; at all times they will seek it” (my translation). This solution does, however, require substantial conjecture, assuming that a solid MT reading had been altered in the non-extant portion and reconstructed (mistakenly) identical to the MT reading.

The second possibility is much simpler in that it only requires that the missing *waw* be considered a scribal error. If this is the case, the reconstructed portion may be left to stand as-is and the final pronominal suffix altered to read in the masculine, as does its MT parallel. One might even hypothesize that the substantially greater frequency of *he* ending in the *plene*-inclined Qumran texts might explain why a scribe could leave off the *waw* and not notice immediately that he had made a mistake. Only the absence of one small letter (and next to a very common ending letter) is to blame.

I reject the second explanation, however, despite its simplicity. Though it may seem the smoothest explanation, it requires the assumption that the reconstructed portion is accurate at the expense of the extant portion. That is, we must use our assumption that 11Q5 matches MT in the reconstructed case in order to defend the missing *waw* as a mistake in the extant portion. I see the appeal of this, but cannot, on principle, give

precedent to a non-extant portion over the extant without further supporting data. The frequent variations in vocabulary, especially with regard to words pertaining to truth and law, lead me to conclude that it is just as likely – perhaps more so – that the missing portion contains a change in number and (perhaps) vocabulary as compared to MT. For example, verse 5 (11Q5 6:16) exhibits a change from קִיְנוֹתֶיךָ (your statutes) to אמתכה (your truth). Despite the minor degree of reconstruction, this is clearly a shift from one plural, masculine lexeme to a singular feminine one. This is just the kind of variant that, if once present in the portion of the verse 2 (11Q5 6:12) text that is now missing, would explain the difference without argument. I shall assume a type 5.1 or 5.2 variant in the reconstructed portion and designate the extant variant as an alteration of pronominal suffix – type 5.9.

Psalm 119:41 (11Q5 8:5) This verse is problematic on several levels. In the MT reading, the consonantal orthography looks singular (and *The Anchor Bible* proposes that parallelism with the singular “your salvation” supports singular vocalization),¹⁷⁹ but it is pointed as a plural. The *qal* form taking a pronominal suffix is unique to this situation and so is also potentially problematic. I translate this as “And let your kindness, LORD, come to me; your salvation according to your word.” This is an understandable reading, though perhaps not entirely smooth or unproblematic. The 11Q5 reading translates as “And let the kindness of the LORD come to me, your salvation according to your word” (mine). The variant is a shift from the second person singular pronominal suffix in קִיְנוֹתֶיךָ (your loving-kindness) to the lack of it in חסד (loving-kindness). In MT, יהוה is vocative, but with the removal of the second person singular pronominal suffix, חסד is now in construct with

¹⁷⁹ Dahood, *The Anchor Bible*, 179.

יהוה, which creates possible ambiguity with regard to the subject. If the subject of the sentence were “the LORD,” it would be awkward to use “the LORD” as a third person reference immediately followed by “your salvation” with the second person pronominal suffix. The 11Q5 reading does not have a clear subject. We are faced with the difficulty of the removal of the vocative, and the subsequent shifts from the second person (“you”) to the third (the LORD) and back to the second person (“you”).

The best explanation with present data is that the scribes of both 4Q89 and 11Q5 attempted to fix the difficulties in the MT – with 4Q89 having more success than 11Q5 – but with neither creating a reading without issues. None of the solutions here are theological in nature, and so a sectarian variant is off of the table – we shall leave it here as an interest for further study elsewhere.

Psalm 119:49 (11Q5 8:13) The next real variant is in the same word, and is the inclusion of the second person singular pronominal suffix. The 11Q5 reading is supported by the LXX and S and may therefore simply reflect one of these other traditions in this instance. The function of the pronoun is implied in the MT reading, but perhaps due to the *possibility* of ambiguity – it could be someone else’s word the scribe wants God to remember – the 11Q5 scribe chose the clearer tradition. Since misunderstanding the implication is unlikely at best, this is listed as a non-sectarian variant, added for reasons of clarity.

Psalm 119:119 (11Q5 11:15) The second real variant in this verse is in יהשבת (you cease - *hifil*) and השבתי (I have thought/accounted - *piel*) and is the shift in person as it

works in relation to the meaning of the verb. In the MT reading, it is God who is said to reject the wicked as dross. In 11Q5, it is the author who accounts them as such. LXX supports this Qumranite reading and so it appears that this is a wider-spread alternative textual tradition, and not tied to any particular sect.

Psalm 119:152 (11Q5 13:3) The second real variant in this verse is in יִסְדָּתָם (you have established them) and יִסְדָּתֵנִי (you have established me) and is much more compelling. The Qumranites believed that each of the members have been chosen to inhabit a predestined place (בֵּית מְעֻדָּר) ¹⁸⁰ and that the leaders in particular were appointed to the highest levels of honour. ¹⁸¹ This may indicate that the establishment of the individual is a more pressing matter than the establishment of God's decrees, perhaps because the latter is a forgone conclusion throughout Second Temple period Judaism and the former was of particular focus at Qumran. It is tempting to include this variant among the possible sectarian examples, but pending a more exhaustive search of Jewish literature of the time period I am hesitant to do so. Rules #1, #2 and #4 do not pose a problem, but #3 may not be fulfilled. For now I shall categorize this as a non-sectarian variant, but worthy of further research and possibly deserving of a change in category.

Psalm 119:160 (11Q5 13:12) has the omission of the second person pronominal suffix from צְדִקָּתְךָ (your righteousness), leaving צְדָקָה (righteousness). This is another instance where the Qumran focus on their own righteousness and election may have

¹⁸⁰ 1QS 2:22-3

¹⁸¹ 1QS 2:20

motivated this slight alteration of the text, but for which there is not enough evidence to demonstrate sectarian uniqueness. This must be classified, therefore, as a non-sectarian variant in accordance with Rule #3.

Variant Type 5.10 and 5.11

Psalm 119:37 (11Q5 8:1) is the alteration of the inseparable prefix in the midst of an important variant discussed in relation to variant type 5.2 as it occurs in verse 37 and similar variants. I will not repeat the discussion here. The shift in inseparable prefix does not carry much impact here and does not significantly alter the meaning on its own.

Psalm 119:87 (11Q5 10:6) The real variant is in בְּאֶרֶץ (in/on the earth) and מֵאֶרֶץ (from the earth). The 11Q5 reading seems to be dealing with problematic wording extant in the MT. This theory is supported by the note in the BHS apparatus, suggesting a similar reading to that found in 11Q5. Rather than rendering the meaning something like “They have almost made an end of me on earth,” as the NRSV does, 11Q5 could be translated “They have almost eliminated me from the earth” or something similar. This seems more motivated by awkward wording than theological interests and so I will classify this as a non-sectarian reading.

Psalm 119:110 (11Q5 11:6) The third variant is in the same word and is the omission of the preposition (בְּ prefix) in 11Q5. This omission is implied in the 11Q5 reading and must be supplied in the English translation, or the root of the final word of the

line (תעה) be translated by the transitive form of the English word “transgress” rather than the intransitive “err.” This is a non-sectarian variant.

Psalm 119:117 The second real variant is in בְּהִקְיֶיךָ (at your statutes) and הוֹקִיכָה (your statutes) and is explained by the alteration of the previous word; the MT reading requires it, whereas the 11Q5 reading requires its absence. This is therefore a non-sectarian variant working in cooperation with the previous variant.

Psalm 119:133 (11Q5 12:6) has בְּאִמְרֹתֶיךָ (in your word) and לְאִמְרֹתֶיךָ (to your word) and is an alteration of the preposition prefix. Either suffix is able to convey the necessary meaning and there is no conceivable theological motivation for choosing one over the other. The variant is more than simple spelling as it produces a change in the sound. This is a non-sectarian variant.

Psalm 119:142 (11Q5 12:15) has the addition of a *lamed* preposition. This is simply an alternate way to express distant time, a long time, or perhaps eternity. This is therefore a minor change that does not require further discussion for our purpose.

Psalm 119:162 (11Q5 13:14) has כְּמִנְיָן (like one who finds) and מִמְּנִיָּן (more than one who finds) and is a מִן for כּ variation of preposition which utilizes the מִן in the comparative sense.¹⁸² This may indicate that the 11Q5 scribe desired to communicate the

¹⁸² Williams, *William's Hebrew Syntax*, §317

comparative worthlessness of spoil and value of God's word. There are no variants in the BHS apparatus to indicate that this is a problematic verse to any other sect, and yet it is difficult to defend any statement to the effect that the Qumranites could lay claim to this sentiment as unique to themselves. For this reason, this is another intriguing reading which must be categorized as non-sectarian in accordance with Rule #3.

Types 5.12 and 5.13

Psalm 119:16 (11Q5 7:2) The final word of the verse, דְּבַרְיָךְ (your word) reads דְּבַרְיֹכָה (your words - *plural*) in 11Q5. The BHS states that some MT manuscripts read דְּבַרְיָךְ (your words), a reading supported by LXX and S. 11Q5 uses the plural form (with the second person singular pronominal suffix) ten times and the singular form (with the second person singular pronominal suffix) four times¹⁸³ in Psalm 119 alone. Likewise, in Psalm 119 of the MT the plural form (with the second person singular pronominal suffix) is used five times and the singular form (with the second person singular pronominal suffix) sixteen times. It is not a difference based on the indicated source of the words; in each of these cases the word(s) referred to are that/those of God. The plural is used far less in the MT than is the singular, but we find the plural more than twice as much as the singular in the same (extant) section of 11Q5. There is a marked quantitative difference in incidences. This variant nonetheless comes up against Rule #4 – it is not consistent. Therefore this 11Q5 variant fulfills Rule #1 (secondary) and possibly Rule #2 (intentional), but does not

¹⁸³ This does not include reconstructed singular usages in Psalm 119:25 (11Q5 7:11) and Psalm 119:28 (11Q5 7:14).

fulfil Rule #3 (specific to one group) or #4 (consistent usage). It is therefore a non-sectarian variant of type 5.12.

For **Psalm 119:17 (11Q5 7:3), 119:18 (11Q5 7:4), 119:49 (11Q5 8:13), 119:114 (11Q5 11:10) and 119:160 (11Q5 13:12)** see the note above.

Psalm 119:45 (11Q5 8:8b, 9) The first is in בְּרָחֶב־בָּיָהּ (in the wide/spacious – *noun*) and בְּרָחֹב־בַּיָּהּ (in the wide/spacious (plural) – functions as an *adjective*): the shift to the plural form in 11Q5. There are no notes on this in the BHS apparatus, no extant example in 4Q89, and no apparent theological motivation for the pluralizing of this word. For these reasons I categorize it as a non-sectarian variant. See the notes on Psalm 119:16 (above) for further discussion.

Psalm 119:64 (11Q5 9:6) has the singularisation of “statute” in חֻקֶּיךָ (your statutes) and חֻקְכָה (your statute). This goes against the general trend of pluralisation in 11Q5 as it is the only incident involving the law that is singularized. Other singularizations are in different contexts and are therefore not parallel examples. There is no apparent theological motivation for this change and no BHS variation list from which to draw insight. It is possible, but by no means conclusive, that the scribe simply missed the *yod* and consequent pluralisation.

Psalm 119:72 (11Q5 9:14) The first real variant is in מֵאֲלָפִים (thousands) and]מֵאֲלָפִי ([a] thousand). Though the portion immediately following the *pe* in 11Q5 is non-

extant, the final form of the letter indicated a space and so the pertinent portion of the reconstruction is sound. In this case, the plural MT form is made singular in 11Q5. There is no BHS apparatus evidence to support the 11Q5 variant. The motivation for a variant like this is difficult to ascertain. Perhaps it is a Qumranite aversion to hyperbole or a desire for precision, but neither conjecture seems very compelling. This therefore does not fulfill Rule #3 and is therefore a non-sectarian variant.

Psalm 119:82 (11Q5 10:1) The real variant is כָּלְךָ אֵינִי (my eyes fail) and עֵינִי כִלְתָהּ (my eye fails). There is no apparent theological aspect to this variant. It seems to be merely the difference between a more physical, plural metaphor of the author's eyes looking out for the promise and the (perhaps) more symbolic, singular form. In both cases, the "eye(s)" in question is not literal and connotes perception and interpretation of events. This is therefore a non-sectarian variant.

Psalm 119:137 (11Q5 12:10) has וְיֵשֶׁר ("and straight" - *singular*) and וְיֵשְׁרִים ("and straight" - *plural*). The 11Q5 reading seems to be correcting a number non-agreement in the MT, and so this does not fulfill Rule #1 in altering a natural, sound reading. Similar (corrective?) readings occur in a few LXX manuscripts and in Hieronymus. It is a non-sectarian variant.

Types 5.14, 5.15 and 5.16

Psalm 119:70 (11Q5 9:12) There is a shift in **שֶׁשֶׁשֶׁעָתִי** (I delight) and **שֶׁ[ש]יָעִי** ([is] my delight) from the *pilpel* perfect of the MT reading to the noun form of 11Q5. There is nothing in the BHS apparatus to suggest an alternate tradition from which it may have been drawn. Though there is a slight shift in meaning it does not appear to carry any theological variance and is simply a change in style. This is a non-sectarian variant.

Psalm 119:71 (11Q5 9:13) The variant is in **עָנִיתִי** (I was afflicted) and **עָנִיתַנִּי** (you afflicted me) and signifies a shift from the passive *pual* of the MT to the active *piel* of 11Q5.¹⁸⁴ This carries with it implications with regard to the part God plays in the sufferings of human kind. Qumran theology presents God as the creator of not only the Spirit of Truth (רוּחַת הָאֱמֶת), but also of the Spirit of Falsehood (רוּחַת הָעוֹל).¹⁸⁵ This latter spirit is appointed to afflict not only the wicked, but also the righteous.¹⁸⁶ 1QS 3:23 states plainly that “all of the afflictions of the righteous, and every trial in its season, occur because of this Angel’s diabolic rule” (וְכֹל נִגְיַעֵיהֶם וּמוֹעֲדֵי צָרוֹתָם בַּמַּמְשֶׁלֶת מִשְׁטָמְתוֹ). For the Qumranite, God “in his mystery” created this being for the sole purpose of doing evil and creating suffering and sin. This concept is problematic because the purposeful creation of one who does evil is usually considered tantamount to doing evil one’s self – not so at Qumran. Is this statement, then, an instance of a sectarian variant in 11Q5? It must be considered as at least *possible*, especially when considered alongside the first variant in

¹⁸⁴ 4Q89 is not extant in this section, and so no comparison with it can be made.

¹⁸⁵ 1QS 3:18, 19

¹⁸⁶ 1QS 3:21, 22

Psalm 119:83 (11Q5 10:2) which exemplifies a similar dynamic. 11Q5 9:13 fulfills the requirements of Rule #1 (*secondary*), fulfills Rule #2 (*intentional; alters a natural, sound reading*), is jarring enough to prompt consideration of Rule #3 (*specific to one group*)¹⁸⁷ and though it is not *repeated*, as Ulrich suggested it *ought* to be, it is in a non-repeated phrase and plainly written. It is, however, also found in LXX. This must, for these reasons, be considered theological, but not necessarily a sectarian variant.¹⁸⁸

Psalm 119:83 (11Q5 10:2) אֶהְיֶה לְךָ (I have become) and עָשִׂיתָנִי (you have made me).

In considering this psalm, we should place it alongside Psalm 119:71 (11Q5 9:13) as discussed above. The metaphor “like a wineskin in the smoke” (כְּפִנְיֹאֵר בְּקִיטּוֹר) is common to both readings and signifies struggle and persecution to an end of improving the character, just as the trial and curing effect of smoke improves the function of a wineskin. In the MT reading, however, it is implied that God is making use of trial and trouble, whereas 11Q5 explicitly designates God as the active agent. For these reasons and those expressed in the first variant of Psalm 119:71 (11Q5 9:13) as discussed above, 11Q5 10:2 must be considered a possible sectarian variant.

¹⁸⁷ The LXX evidence, though useful in some instances to demonstrate alternate traditions, is not reliable with regard to a study of Second Temple period traditions of Psalms. Due to difficulty in dating the development of Psalms in the Greek, the Greek reading cannot be reliably considered either a source or a copy. ἔταπεινώσάς με may be the source from which 11Q5 draws this reading, but it is more likely that 11Q5 was written earlier, and may therefore be the source from which the LXX draws. It is therefore not sufficient to invoke Rule #3. For information on issues of dating the LXX Psalms, see Pietersma, Albert. "Greek Psalter : a question of methodology and syntax." *Vetus Testamentum* 26, no. 1 (January 1, 1976): 60-69. *ATLA Religion Database with ATLASerials, EBSCOhost* (accessed September 21, 2012).

¹⁸⁸ At least when taken on its own. See the previous footnote and the discussion at the end of this section for consideration of theological variants working as a group.

Psalm 119:130 (11Q5 12:3) has a possible reading of the 11Q5 פתח as the imperative “open,” as opposed to the MT reading of פתח (the opening) as a masculine singular noun construct. This reading is prompted by the second real variant of this verse (below), also an imperative but with graphic evidence to aid interpretation. Due to the cooperative effect of these two readings, I will classify this one as a non-sectarian variant. The reasons against an identification as a possible sectarian variant will be discussed with regard to the second variant.

The second real variant is יאיר (it will enlighten) and ויהאר (and enlighten - *imperative*). Any verse pertaining to “light” or light/dark imagery is rife with sectarian possibility, but this imagery is not unique to any particular sect of Judaism; it is common in scripture. Perhaps the adversarial nature that is the focus of Qumranic light/dark imagery prompted the scribe to vary the reading to a plea – “Unfold your words and give the light of understanding to the simple” – rather than the descriptive nature of the MT reading. Such musings cannot go beyond speculation with extant evidence, however, and so this reading does not fulfil the requirements of Rule #3. It is non-sectarian.

Psalm 119:164 (11Q5 13:16) has הִלַּלְתִּיךָ (I have praised you – *piel perfect*) and אה[ללכה (I will praise you – *piel imperfect*). The real variant is the seeming discrepancy in aspect. The perfect likely functions as a complete-action perfect.¹⁸⁹ The imperfect, however, may be understood as a habitual (or “iterative”) imperfect, signifying an action

¹⁸⁹ Williams, *William's Hebrew Syntax*, §162

done regularly over time – as a habit.¹⁹⁰ When analyzed with these possibilities in mind, the simplest explanation is that this difference in aspect is negligible with regard to practical meaning and causes no difference in theological message. It is therefore a non-sectarian variant.

5.17 Erasures of Letters and Words

Determining the motivation behind certain erasures is difficult for several reasons. First, there are few, if any, clues as to who made the erasure. Unlike handwriting, which can be compared to the rest of the document, to other documents, and to redactive elements in the written text, erasures do not give an indication, as handwriting might, of who modified the text; they have no known identifying attributes. Without knowing *who* erased the letters (The initial author? A later copyist/redactor?) or *when* they were erased (during the initial copying? Much later?), it is doubly difficult to determine *why* they were erased. The underlying letter(s) can be identified, so we know *what* was removed – that is at least something with which to begin.

The first incident, verse 111 (11Q5 11:7) not only relates to the discussion on the *waw* conjunction, but highlights the importance potentially placed upon these small but influential words. The difference is subtle, but potentially meaningful. In this case, it is a causal relationship that is at stake. The MT version places a causal relationship between having joy in the decrees, and the decrees being a heritage forever. It implies that this heritage belongs to the author *because* he finds joy in them, and may further imply that it is

¹⁹⁰ Williams, *William's Hebrew Syntax*, §168

the author who has somehow gained this heritage through action or merit within himself. This may well have been an uncomfortable implication to the Qumranite reader, who would have seen these phrases as mutually existent, paired but not in causal relationship.¹⁹¹ 1QS tells us that, to the Qumranite, all things are predestined and every detail is according to the prepared plan of God.¹⁹²

The second incident gives even less insight. In this instance there is not only the removal of a *waw* conjunction (see above) but also the removal of the *mem*. Though the *waw* removal is intriguing for reasons already discussed, the *mem* seems at first to be best explained as a mistake, an over-erasure occurring at the time the *waw* was removed. One must ask, however, why the *mem* was not replaced at the time of the modification. Was it a case of different lexemes, for example? Speculation requires too much distance from the data. This variant must remain, at least for now, an interesting mystery.

5.18 Insertion/Correction

Psalm 119:42 (11Q5 8:6) The 11Q5 text has a correction, written above the line, in which an *aleph* is inserted to change ענה from a third person masculine perfect form to a first person (common) imperfect. The MT reading is not problematic and translates fairly statically as “And I shall answer my reproachers [with] a word, for I trust in your word” (mine).

¹⁹¹ See footnote 139 on the implications of syntax similar to the English use of the semicolon.

¹⁹² 1QS 3:15 etc.

11Q5 is less difficult – if one ignores the correction. Without the *aleph* it would translate, again fairly statically, as “And he answered my reproachers [with] a word, for I trust in your word” (mine). At first glance, it would seem that the scribe was attempting to put the answer in God’s mouth. However, the references to God in the second person in the clauses preceding and following refute this – or at least refute the success of it. The scribe would have to have written ענה as a second person singular (either the perfect or imperfect would have worked). It would then have read ענתה חורפי דבר כי בטחתני “And you answered my reproachers [with] a word, for I trust[ed] in your word” or דבר כי בטחתני “And you will answer my reproachers [with] a word, for I trust in your word.”

It is unlikely, in my opinion, that the scribe would have begun such an alteration of the subject (to third person) and then not carried it through with agreement later in the same verse – especially when the variant in question is sandwiched between frequent examples of references to God in the *second* person. In addition to that consideration, the palaeographic elements of the *aleph* in question are congruent with those surrounding it. If one compares it to its counterparts four lines down (second letter in) or two lines up (fifth letter in), for example, it appears very much the same with regard to style.¹⁹³ Its slightly diminutive size is easily explained by its nature as an inserted correction, between the lines, and therefore reduced in size corresponding to the more limited blank space.

This correction was therefore most likely inserted by the original scribe, at or very near the time of original scribing. It is not meant to create any variation in meaning from

¹⁹³ James Sanders, *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert*, Vol. IV, New York: Oxford University Press, 1965. Plate VII.

the source text, but is rather meant to remove a mistake and bring the 11Q5 text back into agreement with P-MT.

Discussion of Notable Variants in Cooperation

There is a nexus of elements occurring between 11Q5, several of the sectarian writings (represented here by 1QS) and other biblical scrolls from Qumran, especially 1QIsa^a. Varying degrees of a tendency toward orthography described by Qimron as “Qumran scribal practice” or by Abegg as “Second Temple scribal practice” imply a connection between these manuscripts. The presence of this orthography in the conflict *tefillin*, together with the designation of such *tefillin* as rejected by later rabbinic (and *perhaps* contemporary establishment) authorities – hence the descriptive term “conflict” – may serve to strengthen the theory that these are the products of a self-segregated sect, such as that proposed at Qumran. It is upon this foundation – or in front of this backdrop – that the so-called “real” variants are placed and, I would argue, strengthened by this context.

For example, let us examine a small grouping of interesting real variants in light of the fact that their textual tradition context is closely tied to the sect at Qumran.

Psalm 119:83 (11Q5 10:2) alters the passive form “I have become” to the active, “you [God] have made me.” This puts the responsibility for the presence and power of evil on God’s shoulders, in agreement with the theology of 1QS and its description of the two opposing angels (1QS 3:18-4:11). Verse 85 (11Q5 10:4) follows closely after and utilizes a form of the word “pit” that occurs in the plural nowhere in extant scripture, and is believed to be a Qumranite term for “hell” or “perdition.” Verse 92 (11Q5 10:11) comes not long

after these and stresses guilt over misery, also commensurate with 1QS and the major part played in the covenant oath by the admission of the guilt of the petitioner and his forefathers (1QS 1:24-26; 2:5). Add to this the noteworthy language of Psalm 119:116 (11Q5 11:12) in which we seem to encounter a metaphorical term meaning “torment” – like the verse just mentioned, this plea for strength to bear up under trial is thematically tied to the theology that trials will come, but the covenant member is not to fall away because of them (1QS 1:17). Qumranite theology holds individual wealth to be a potential danger (1QS 5:2) and ties ideas of purity to the morality of the holder of such wealth (1QS 1:11-13; 3:2). It is therefore intriguing that verse 162 (11Q5 13:14) alters the simile from an equivalency (“like one who finds great spoil”) to a comparative in the word of God is worthy of greater rejoicing than the finding of “great spoil.”

There is no holy grail here, no elephant hiding behind a bicycle, but what we do have is a consistent, sometimes-subtle alteration of a text which – due to factors unknown at this time – prevailed to become the representative Hebrew textual tradition of the Bible. These alterations are sometimes indicative of non-theological trends and preferences, but also seem to represent changes that have theological implications. These changes, though not found in every verse, are nonetheless too numerous to ignore or to discount without some scholarly reason to do so.

PART V: CONCLUSION

As mentioned in the introduction, it is my goal to provide “reasonable doubt” with regard to Ulrich’s absolute statement that there are no sectarian variants in the biblical DSS. Due to the nature and paucity of the data available, current research tools are not able to determine definitive proof of sectarian variance in the section studied. This is further complicated by the ambiguity of dating the post-Pentateuch portions of LXX. The ambiguity opens up the possibility that LXX used something like 11Q5 as a source text or the alternative possibility that they each reflect a tradition that was used as a common source by 11Q5 and LXX.

However, there is a nexus of elements that strongly indicates the practice of theologically-motivated variation in 11Q5. So-called “Qumran Scribal Practice,” present in conflict *tefillin* as well as 11QIsa^a and 11Q5 is closely aligned with the Hebrew utilized at Qumran as evidenced in 1QS (as a representative sectarian text). These elements act as a backdrop to the real variants in question – specifically the Type 5.2 variants represented in verse 37 (and like variants), verse 48 (and like variants), verse 92 and verse 116 as well as Type 5.14 variant of verse 71 (and 83) and Type 5.8 of verse 152. These elements *may* even provide a sectarian context within which to seek theological variation. If these two factors collide – the sectarian backdrop and the theological variation – then one must concede the *possibility* that they are working in tandem to reveal the presence of one or more sectarian

variants in 11Q5. Even if future study disproves the presence of the *development* of sectarian variation in the biblical DSS,¹⁹⁴ the practice of choosing certain theologically-relevant variants over other available traditions is worthy of further study, especially when there is possible (specifically and uniquely Qumran) sectarian theology behind certain interpretations of the chosen variant – and even more so when considered as part of a set. As even this small representative of the biblical DSS (11Q5) indicates, there is the possibility, even a cautious probability, that there are elements of alteration in the biblical texts at Qumran with sectarian implications. It is a small step from identifying sectarian implication to implying sectarian intention.

It has not been my goal with this essay to disprove Ulrich's statement on the whole, nor has it been my intention to prove the presence of sectarian variants in the Dead Sea Scrolls – that endeavour is needed, but will demand much broader study over a larger body of work than is practical here. What I hope to have accomplished, however, is the framing of an argument that demands the removal of the element of certainty and/or the absolute in Ulrich's statement – to cast “reasonable doubt” upon his indictment. I hope also to have put forth a simple and compelling argument for the cessation of the practice of assuming non-sectarian status of unique readings unless proven otherwise. A reading must be judged based upon its attributes – and only then categorized. In these instances the burden of proof lies with those who would propose *either* designation with any absolute statement. The burden of proving non-existence of sectarian variants in the scrolls may be a great deal more difficult due to the sheer number of texts and readings that must be covered, but it is no less necessary than for the other extreme; academic principle demands it.

¹⁹⁴ This might be determined, for example, by the discovery of a text containing these variants that pre-dates the specific texts under study or the sectarian habitation of Qumran in general.

Until such comprehensive studies are carried out, the verdict must remain unpronounced – the possibility, even cautious probability, of theological, sectarian motivation in redactive activities demonstrated in these writings must be acknowledged until definitively identified or refuted. As Ulrich himself states, “Qumran has begun to teach us a great deal about the Bible and the history of its text. There is a great deal left to be learned.”¹⁹⁵

¹⁹⁵ Ulrich, “The Bible in the Making,” 54.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Allen, Leslie C. (revisor). *Word Biblical Commentary*. Vol 21. Bruce M. Metzger, David A. Hubbard, and Glenn W. Barker (General Editors). Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 2002.
- Boccaccini, Gabrielle. *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1998.
- Carr, David M. *The Formation of the Hebrew Bible*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Cross, Frank Moore. "Palaeography and the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 379-402 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years*. Edited by Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- Cross, Frank Moore and Shemaryahu Talmon, eds. *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text*. London: Harvard University Press, 1975.
- Dahood, Mitchell. *The Anchor Bible*. New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1970.
- Dimant, Devorah. "Qumran Sectarian Literature." Pages 483-550 in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period*. Edited by Michael E. Stone. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984.
- Dimant, Devorah. "Between Sectarian and Non-Sectarian: The Case of the Apocryphon of Joshua." Pages 105-134 in *Reworking the Bible: Apocryphal and Related Texts at Qumran. Proceedings of a Joint Symposium by the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature and the Hebrew University Institute for Advanced Studies Research Group on Qumran, 15-17 January, 2002*. Edited by Devorah Dimant, Esther G. Chazon, and Ruth A. Clements. Leiden: Brill, 2005.
- Dimant, Devorah. "Sectarian and Non-Sectarian Texts from Qumran: The Pertinence and Usage of a Taxonomy." *Revue de Qumran* 24, no.1 (2009): 7-18.
- Evans, Craig A. "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Canon of Scripture." Pages 67-79 in *The Bible at Qumran: Text, Shape, and Interpretation*. Edited by Peter W. Flint. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001.

- Flint, Peter, & James VanderKam. *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. San Francisco: Harper, 2002.
- Hatina, Thomas R. "Intertextuality and Historical Criticism in New Testament Studies: Is There a Relationship?" in *Biblical Interpretation* 7, no.1 (January 1, 1999): P28-43.
- Pietersma, Albert, and Benjamin G. Wright. *A New Translation of the Septuagint*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Sanders, James A. "Canon as Dialogue." Pages 7-26 in *The Bible at Qumran: Text, Shape, and Interpretation*. Edited by Peter W. Flint. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001.
- Tov, Emanuel. *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*. 2nd Ed. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001.
- Ulrich, Eugene. "Multiple Literary Editions: Reflections Toward a Theory of the History of the Biblical Text." Pages 99-120 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible*. Edited by Eugene Ulrich. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, and Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- Ulrich, Eugene. "Pluriformity of the Biblical Text, Text Groups, and Questions of Canon." Pages 79-98 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible*. Edited by Eugene Ulrich. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, and Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- Ulrich, Eugene. "The Absence of 'Sectarian Variants' in the Jewish Scriptural Scrolls Found at Qumran." Pages 179-95 in *The Bible as Book: The Hebrew Bible and the Judean Desert Discoveries*. Edited by Edward D. Herbert and Emanuel Tov. London: The British Library & Oak Knoll Press, 2002.
- Ulrich, Eugene. "The Bible in the Making" Pages 51-66 in *The Bible at Qumran: Text, Shape, and Interpretation*. Edited by Peter W. Flint. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001.
- Ulrich, Eugene. "The Canonical Process, Textual Criticism, and Latter Stages in the Composition of the Bible." Pages 51-78 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible*. Edited by Eugene Ulrich. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, and Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- Ulrich, Eugene. "The Community of Israel and the Composition of the Scriptures." Pages 3-16 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible*. Edited by Eugene Ulrich. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, and Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- Wall, Robert W. "The Intertextuality of Scripture." Pages 217-236 in *The Bible at Qumran: Text, Shape, and Interpretation*. Edited by Peter W. Flint. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001.
- Sanders, J. A. *Discoveries in the Judean Desert, Vol. IV*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1965.

_____. *The Septuagint with Apocrypha*, Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1972.

Talmon, Shemaryahu. "A Further Link between the Judean Covenanters and the Essenes." *Harvard Theological Review* 56, no. 4. (October 1, 1963): 313-319. *ATLA Religion Database with ATLASerials*, EBSCOhost (12 June 2012).

Vermes, Geza. *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English*. New York: Penguin Classics, 2004.

Williams, Ronald J. *William's Hebrew Syntax, 3rd Edition*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2007.

Wise, Michael, Martin Abegg Jr., and Edward Cook. *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Translation*. New York: HarperOne, 2005.