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1. Introduction. In several studies published in the last fifteen years, the present
author suggested that a group of Qumran texts were copied by a scribal school
active at Qumran and other places.1 This paper presents additional data on the
orthography and morphology of these texts.

Within the Qumran corpus, a group of 167 nonbiblical and biblical texts has
been isolated as reflecting an idiosyncratic practice, the characteristics of which
are visible in peculiarities in orthography, morphology, and scribal features. Two
similar texts were found at Masada (MasShirShabb [Mas lk] and MasUnid-
Qumran-Type Text [Mas ln]).2 This group of texts is closely connected with the
Qumran community since it includes virtually all the commonly agreed upon

---

1 "The Orthography and Language of the Hebrew Scrolls Found at Qumran and the Origin of
These Scrolls," Textus 13 (1986) 31–57; "Hebrew Biblical Manuscripts from the Judean
Reflected in the Documents from the Judean Desert and in the Rabbinic Literature: A
Comparative Study," in Texts, Temples, and Traditions: A Tribute to Menahem Haran (ed. M. V.
from Qumran?” in A Light for Jacob, Studies in the Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls in
Memory of Jacob Shalom Licht (ed. Y. Hoffman and F. H. Polak; Jerusalem/Tel Aviv: Bialik
Institute/Chaim Rosenberg School of Jewish Studies, 1997) 44*–54*; “Further Evidence for
the Existence of a Qumran Scribal School,” in The Dead Sea Scrolls: Fifty Years After Their
199–216. See further the linguistic analyses by M. G. Abegg, Jr., “The Hebrew of the Dead
Sea Scrolls,” in The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment, vol. I
notes 1 and 13) and W. M. Schniedewind, “Qumran Hebrew as an Antilanguage,” JBL 118

2 These texts, as well as other ones, were probably brought to Masada by one of the Qumran
cohenants, fleeing from Qumran. See my study “A Qumran Origin for the Masada Non-
biblical Texts?” DSD 7 (2000) 57–73.
sectarian writings (for seven or eight sectarian texts which do not display these characteristics, see below). The texts found at Qumran can thus be subdivided into texts presumably copied by a sectarian group of scribes, and other texts that were presumably taken there from elsewhere. The evidence in favor of a scribal practice pertains to scribal features, analyzed elsewhere, and to orthography and morphology, analyzed here. The combined evidence shows that the great majority of distinctive scribal features are more or less limited to texts that also display the Qumran orthography and morphology. The texts displaying the Qumran scribal practice could have been penned anywhere in Palestine, but they were probably written mainly at Qumran. Early scrolls, such as 4QpHb (175–150 BCE), must have been copied by similarly oriented scribes elsewhere, as they predate the settlement at Qumran. The main argument for our view pertains to the fact that within the Qumran corpus a group of 167 biblical and nonbiblical texts (see below) display distinctive features, and that most of them are sectarian. Conversely, virtually all the sectarian texts were written in this special practice.

The main argument in favor of the existence of a Qumran scribal practice is orthographic and morphological, however inconsistent, allowing a distinction between a group of texts displaying a distinctive system and texts which do not display these features. However, the evidence is not clear-cut, and seven or eight sectarian texts do not share these features.

---

3 A basic distinction between two groups of texts reflecting different systems of orthography and correction techniques had been pointed out in 1958 by M. Martin, The Scribal Character of the Dead Sea Scrolls, (Bibliothéque du Muséon 44, 45; Louvain 1958) I.393–402, II.710–711 on the basis of a detailed study of the texts from cave I only. The texts written by the Qumran scribal school were named by Martin ‘transitional phonetic,’ ‘phonetic,’ and ‘official phonetic,’ while the other texts were named ‘consonantal.’ This recognition led Martin to posit a Qumran scribal school, but at the same time he voiced his hesitations:

... one can only conclude that if a scribal school existed at Qumran, then all these traits are perfectly reconcilable with such an institution. On the other hand, if no scribal school ever existed there, we can explain most of these facts as arising from the habits of the scribes who transcribed the documents in different localities, but who by a natural process shared a technique that had points of resemblance and points of difference (Martin, Scribal Character, I.392–393; cf. p. 405 and II.710).

It should be remembered that Martin could not consult many comparative data because the texts from caves 4 and 11 were not yet known to him; furthermore, basing himself on the parallel of the medieval Masoretic tradition, Martin expected too great a unity from a scribal school.

4 See Tov, “Further Evidence” (n. 1 above).

5 To be precise, there are a few exceptions, but our investigations are based on statistical evidence that is not affected by these exceptions. Beyond these exceptions, it should be stressed that most special forms recorded in the table below such as נַחַן simply do not appear outside the group of texts written according to the Qumran practice. On the other hand, נַחַנַן appears elsewhere, and in this case the main argument is statistical. By the same token,
In spite of these exceptions, it remains true to say that practically all Qumran sectarian works were penned according to this scribal practice.\footnote{With the exception of 4Q320 and 4Q434, all texts are dated to the same period, which may be significant.}

A remark on the statistical picture is in order. The analysis is based on the Qumran corpus containing fragments of 930 texts, from which 150 Aramaic (including 17 Nabatean-Aramaic texts) and 27 Greek texts are excluded, since they display no features parallel to the orthographic and morphological peculiarities recognized for the Hebrew texts. By the same token, at least another 150 items should be excluded due to their fragmentary nature. This leaves us with some 600 texts, of which 400–500 are large enough for analysis. Within this group, the list below records 167 texts (including 25 biblical texts and eight tefillin) that in our view reflect the orthographic and morphological features of a Qumran scribal school (of these 167 texts, some 130 are good candidates, while the remainder are probable candidates).

It cannot be coincidental that the great majority of the sectarian texts were copied, admittedly somewhat inconsistently, in a common orthographic and morphological style and with common scribal features,\footnote{I count 107 sectarian compositions and 85 fragments of possible sectarian compositions (see n. 11 below)} the only conclusion

\begin{itemize}
\item 4QPša (4Q162; 50–25 BCE)
\item 4QPh (4Q169; 50–25 BCE)
\item 4QCommGen A (4Q252; sporadic ‘Qumranic’ spellings; 30–1 BCE)
\item 4Qs (4Q258; 30–1 BCE)
\item 4QSI (4Q264; 50–25 BCE)
\item 4QCal Doc/Dec A (4Q320; insufficient data; 125–100 BCE)
\item 4QMMTb (4Q395; 30–1 BCE)
\item 4QBN (4Q434; sporadic ‘Qumranic’ spellings; 1–30 CE)
\end{itemize}
cancellation dots (one of the special scribal habits) occur almost exclusively in this group of texts, even though isolated instances also occur elsewhere.


\footnote{For the data, see Tov, “Further Evidence.”}
seems to be that the sectarian scribes followed special scribal conventions. This group may represent one-third or half of the Qumran corpus if some of the 85 fragmentary sectarian texts are also taken into consideration.

The following arguments in favor of our view should be emphasized:

- The content of idiosyncratic Qumran tefillin written in the orthography and morphology of the Qumran scribal practice is distinct from the content of the Rabbinic-type tefillin written in the MT system. This fact provides an external control supporting our hypothesis.
- Within the Qumran corpus, the writing of the divine names in paleo-Hebrew characters or with four/five dots is documented mainly in texts written in the Qumran orthography and morphology (see n. 5). Since this practice is based on a certain conception of the sanctity of the divine names, and since the approach of the Qumran community to this issue is known also from other indicators, this practice provides an independent control supporting our hypothesis.
- The majority (84) of the 131 Hebrew Qumran texts containing scribal markings of some kind (e.g. the paragraphos sign), also reflect the orthographic and morphological features of the Qumran scribal practice. In some groups this percentage is very high, e.g. for cancellation dots. See further n. 5 above.

2. Orthographic features. The distinctive orthography and morphology which has been recognized in some 170 Qumran texts has no equal among the documents known from other places. A few features are however reflected in the letters from the period of the Second Jewish Revolt, in Mishna manuscripts, and in the oral tradition behind the Samaritan Pentateuch, but the evidence known to date does not provide a good parallel to the combined features of the Qumran practice. Faute de mieux, we call this practice the ‘Qumran’ scribal practice, but it could have been in vogue also in other places in Israel; note Masada I, inscrip-

---

10 Note that the person who wrote המדריך מסר溝 in the square script on the back of 4Qpap cryptA Midrash Sefer Moshe (4Q249) written in the Cryptic A script also employed the Qumran orthography; cf. col. 13 in the table below.
11 The list of these texts is found in Appendix 1 of my forthcoming monograph Scribal Habits and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert.
12 See Tov, “Tefillin.”
14 The possibility that different spelling systems were used in different localities is strengthened by parallels in Aramaic documents, see M. L. Folmer, The Aramaic Language in the Achaemenid Period: A Study in Linguistic Variation, Ph. D. diss., Amsterdam 1995, 691-768.
tion 449\(^{15}\) (cf. col. 11 in the table below) and b. Meg. 11a where שֶׂרֶף is explained from שָׂרַף.\(^{16}\) It could therefore be called ‘Palestinian’ or ‘contemporary,’ but these terms are less neutral.

The internal inconsistency of the Qumran scribal practice (that is, differences between scrolls) should not be taken as an argument against the very assumption of such a scribal school since each individual scribe was inconsistent within his own scroll (note, e.g. 1Qlsa\(^{a}\) V 26 [Isa 6:5] ... לך דיום ולכח ל'). This inconsistency and the free approach to matters of text seemingly contradict the strict approach of the Qumran covenanters to Scripture, but this contradiction is only apparent, as different aspects of religious life are involved. Apparently within the Weltanschauung of the Qumran community there was room for strictness with regard to halakha and the interpretation of Scripture together with the lack of precision in the copying of the biblical text. A telling example of such imprecision is visible in pesharim such as 1QpHab in which the biblical text is not well represented (imprecision, mistakes, contextual adaptations), but it is still made the base for sectarian exegesis. Among other things, some of the interpretations in 1QpHab are based on readings differing from the biblical text in the lemma.\(^{17}\)

The Qumran orthography\(^{18}\) is characterized by the inclusion of many matres lectionis whose purpose it is to facilitate the reading. Thus /o/ and /u/ are almost always represented by a waw. The waw is also used to indicate the short holoem (e.g. מָשָׂה, הַמָּשָׂה, מָשָׂה יִתְנַשֵּׁף), the qames hatuf (פִּנְסָר), the hatef qames (פִּנְסָר קַמָּשׁ). Because of scribal inconsistency, many words appear in the same text with


\(^{16}\) On the other hand, C. Rabin considered the special orthography of the Qumran writings an innovation of the sectarian scribes: “The Historical Background of Qumran Hebrew,” ScrHier 4 (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1965) 144–161, especially 150. Cross, Ancient Library, 174–177 describes the orthography of these texts as a ‘baroque style’ and he includes the morphological features described below under the heading of orthography.


\(^{18}\) This orthography has been described in various studies, especially in the detailed description of 1Qlsa\(^{a}\) by Kutscher, <i>Language</i> and in analyses of a number of texts by Martin, Scribal Character; E. Qimron, The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls (HSS 29; Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press, 1986); P. Muchowski, Hebrajski Qumrąński jako język mówiony (Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uam, 2001). Further: E. J. C. Tigchelaar, “In Search of the Scribe of 1QS,” in Emanuel, Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov (ed. S. M. Paul, R. A. Kraft, L. H. Schiffman, and W. W. Fields; VTSup 94; Leiden: Brill, 2003) 439–452. The statistical aspects outlined in the studies mentioned in n. 1 are refined in the list below.
different spellings, e.g. נבש/נבש המ and נבש/נבש ח in 1QIṣa and in several other texts. Yod represents not only /i/ (usually not short i), but also /ere/: מֶלֶךְ (1QIṣa 61:2), נֵבֶשׁ (38:1). Unique for certain lexemes is the representation of /i/ in final position by רָכָס, especially in רָכָס (see col. 16 in the table below), and sometimes also in רָכָס (less frequent: רָכָס י, 49:7; רָכָס י, 40:5), apparently by analogy to רָכָס, רָכָס et sim., in which the 'aleph belongs to the root. He as a mater lectionis for /a/ is very frequent at the end of words, such as in q̄l̄h (e.g. מְרָה, see col. 17 in the table below), and the second person masculine singular suffix, e.g. מְלָכָו, מיקָה (see col. 18 in the table below). He in final position for /a/ occurs in an unusual fashion also in מִשָּׁר in 1QIṣa 1:4 (MT שָׁר) and מְשָׁר in 6:4 (MT לָרָכ). 'Aleph denotes /a/ in final position: מִשָּׁר (34:11), מְשָׁר (66:8), and even in medial position: מְשָׁר (1:17), מְשָׁר (30:31).

3. Morphological features. The biblical and nonbiblical texts presenting the orthography of the Qumran practice also reflect distinctive morphological features. The following six features characterize this morphology, which has a tendency towards lengthened pronominal, verbal, and in one case, adverbial forms:

1. Lengthened independent pronouns: נבש, נבש, נבש, נבש, נבש, נבש, and נבש (the latter form is also found in MT and SP, in MT more in the later than the earlier books): cols. 1–4 below.
2. Lengthened pronominal suffixes for the second and third persons plural in nouns and prepositions, e.g. נבש, נבש, מְלָכָו: cols. 5–6 below.
3. Forms of the Qal imperfect o (w)q̄l̄h and (w)q̄l̄h which serve in MT as pausal forms, but occur in these texts as free forms: col. 7 below.
4. Forms of the Qal imperfect o with pronominal suffixes construed as יq̄l̄h (et sim.) instead of q̄l̄h (et sim.): col. 8 below.
5. The form q̄l̄h for the second person plural in all conjugations: col. 9 below.

Some of these features may have been created by analogy with existing forms, while others may be dialecical. Certain forms are described as archaic by


4. Consistency and statistical analysis. Scribes writing in the Qumran practice adhered to a general system, but there was much room for variation in individual features as becomes clear from a comparison of overlapping texts written in this scribal system, such as the manuscripts of 4QDibreb Hamesorot, 4QMMT, 4QM&-S///IQM, 4Qlsa2-//IQlsa, and 4QapocrJoshb (4Q379) 22 ii 7-15//4QTest (4Q175) 21-30. Furthermore, these divergences are clearly evident when comparing the segments written by scribes A and B of 1Qlsa2 and scribes A and C of 1QHa. For details, see the table below.

The shared spellings which are used most consistently in all scrolls in this group are the plene writings $\text{איהוּהשָׁנָה}$ (col. 11 in the table below), הָֽוָֽו (col. 13), לֹֽו (col. 14), וָֽו (col. 15), and the long spelling of the second person singular suffix רַֽו in nouns and prepositions (col. 18); the most frequently used forms are the lengthened forms of the verb of the type $\text{רַֽוִּיתָֽוָֽוָֽו}$ and $\text{רַֽוִּיתָֽוָֽוָֽו}$ (col. 7) and of $\text{רַֽוִּיתָֽוָֽו}$ (col. 10).

Not all the idiosyncratic spellings and forms recorded in the other columns in the table appear in all the texts. The combined group of features is probably best visible in the following biblical and nonbiblical texts: 4QNumb, 1QDeut\(á\), 4QDeut\(b\), 4QDeut\(c\), 4QSam\(c\), 1Qlsa\(b\) (especially scribe B), 2QJer, 4QXII\(c\), 4QPhyl A, B, J–K, L–N (4Q128, 4Q129, 4Q138, 4Q139), 1QS, 1QSa, 1QM, 1QHa\(a\) scribe C, 4Qpap slsa\(c\) (4Q163), 4QFlor (4Q174), 4QM\(a\) (4Q491), 11QMelch (11Q13), and 11QT\(a\) (11Q19).

---

21 Scribe B of this scroll (Isaiah 34–66) adopted a fuller orthography than scribe A (Isaiah 1–33). Note, for example, the preponderance of the short form of the second person singular masculine suffix in the first part of the scroll compared with the longer form (הָֽו) in the second part, as described in detail by M. Martin, “The Use of the Second Person Singular Suffixes in 1Qha,” Le Muséon 70 (1957) 127–144. Furthermore, scribe B consistently wrote $\text{רַֽוִּיתָֽוָֽוָֽו}$, but scribe A did so only in 20 percent of the instances. Scribe A consistently wrote $\text{רַֽוִּיתָֽוָֽוָֽו}$ defectively, while scribe B wrote $\text{רַֽוִּיתָֽוָֽוָֽו}$. These differences are also felt in morphology: Scribe A consistently used the forms $\text{רַֽוִּיתָֽוָֽוָֽו}$ and $\text{רַֽוִּיתָֽוָֽו}$, as opposed to $\text{רַֽוִּיתָֽוָֽוָֽו}$ and $\text{רַֽוִּיתָֽוָֽו}$, in the second part of the scroll. Scribe A employed forms of the type $\text{רַֽוִּיתָֽוָֽו}$, while scribe B used $\text{רַֽוִּיתָֽוָֽו}$ See the table below.

22 Scribe C of this scroll (col. XIX 27ff.) adopted a fuller orthography than scribe A (cols. I–XIX 21). Scribe A usually wrote $\text{רַֽוִּיתָֽוָֽו}$ and $\text{רַֽוִּיתָֽוָֽו}$, while scribe C wrote $\text{רַֽוִּיתָֽוָֽו}$ and $\text{רַֽוִּיתָֽוָֽו}$. By the same token, scribe A wrote almost exclusively the pronominal suffix of the second person masculine singular as $\text{k}$ (except for his last two columns), while scribe C used plene forms, e.g. $\text{רַֽוִּיתָֽוָֽו}$. See the table below.
At the same time, some features are absent from some texts which otherwise display most of the idiosyncrasies of the Qumran scribal practice. Thus א, used in most texts belonging to this group (col. 16), does not appear in 1QIsa (scribe A), 1QpHab, 1QH (scribe A, usually), 4QXII, the tefillin, most copies of D, 4QRPe (4Q365), 11QPs, and 11QT (11Q19). By the same token, the following texts lack spellings of the type מִלְכֵּות מִלְכֵּות and מִלְכֵּות מִלְכֵּות (col. 5): 1QIsa (scribe A, usually), 1QS, 1QM, 1QH (both scribes), 1QpHab, most copies of D and ShirShabb, 4QRPe (4Q365), and 11QPs. The lengthened forms מִלְכֵּות מִלְכֵּות are not found in 1QIsa (scribe A), 4QIsa, 1QpHab, 1QH (scribe A), most copies of D, and 11QT (11Q19). There is no recognizable pattern for the lack of these features in the various texts, neither regarding their content, scribes, or date, nor when combining these data with the distribution of scribal features such as cancellation dots (indicated in the table by asterisks after the names of the compositions) and the special writing of the divine names (indicated by % in the table). These internal differences probably reflect varying personal preferences within a group of scribes, just as the divine names are not represented with paleo-Hebrew letters in all documents written according to the Qumran practice.

Orthographic and morphological corrections such as מ (supralinear aleph) in 1QH 4 IV (XIII) 5 and מ (supralinear waw) in 11QT (11Q19) LX 15 show that the scribes followed a certain set of conventions which they sometimes forgot in the initial writing. Often, they subsequently corrected these oversights or later readers or scribes did so.

It is probably relevant to say that MT, in sharp contrast to the mentioned Qumran texts, does not reflect the features described here as characteristic of the Qumran scribal practice. None of the spellings recorded in cols. 11–16 occurs in MT, not even מ (with the exception of Jer 33:8), while מ occurs only rarely. Also, the forms recorded in the other columns do not occur in MT, with the exception of qalilh (77 instances as opposed to qalil in 1995 instances, the former not necessarily in the ‘late’ biblical books) and מ (which occurs with equal frequency as מ). However, eight sporadic ‘typical Qumran’ forms are encountered in all of MT: מִלְכּות מִלְכּות (Gen 31:6, Ezek 13:11, 20, 34:17), מִלְכּות מִלְכּות (Ezek 40:16), מִלְכּות מִלְכּות (Ezek 23:48, 49), מִלְכּות מִלְכּות (Isa 34:17), מִלְכּות מִלְכּות (Amos 4:3), מִלְכּות מִלְכּות (Exod 13:16), מִלְכּות מִלְכּות (Jer 29:25). In whatever way these exceptions are explained, it cannot be said that

---

23 This indication pertains to the representation of the divine names, especially the Tetragrammaton, with paleo-Hebrew letters or four/five dots.

24 See my study “Further Evidence.”

25 For additional examples of this type, see Tov, “Orthography,” 34.

26 I counted 19 occurrences in Jeremiah (compared with 480 occurrences of מ) as well as 14 cases elsewhere in the Bible. These figures do not include מ, which is the usual spelling of that word in MT, and a few instances of מ and מ.
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MT reflects some of the special forms of the Qumran scribal practice. The fact that very few forms occur in MT or that one or two forms are shared with the oral tradition of SP (see above) does not render our statistics for the Qumran texts less meaningful. A similar argument pertains to the occurrence of 15 instances of cancellation dots in MT.27

The table below provides negative and positive data (in this order) concerning the orthographic and morphological features characterizing the Qumran scribal practice. The special forms are named positive, e.g. רֹא, presented for each text in the second position after the negative evidence, that is ר, presented in the first position. An analysis of the positive and negative data for the individual features allows us to suggest that the texts included in the table are probably written in the Qumran scribal practice. This table thus enables a distinction between these texts and the other Hebrew texts in the Qumran corpus.

The individual features are tabulated in eighteen columns presenting the characteristic features of the Qumran scribal practice separated by a diagonal line. Thus in the case of the spelling רֹא, its frequency in 1QpHab is recorded as 3/18, referring to 3 instances of ר (negative evidence) and 18 instances of רֹא (positive evidence). Evidence of more than four occurrences is recorded as ‘all,’ while in rare cases it is spelled out.28

The features of some texts listed below should be viewed in conjunction with scribal features such as cancellation dots and paragraph signs that occur almost exclusively in the texts displaying the Qumran features.29 For example, in some texts in which the orthographic and morphological evidence is limited, these scribal features ought to be consulted: Thus, the cancellation dots in 4QJub (4Q222), 4QBer (4Q289), 4QMT (4Q396) and the paleo-Hebrew Tetragrammata in 1QpMic (1Q14), 2QExod, and 4QExod should be taken into consideration together with the scanty orthographic/morphological evidence for these texts.

The data (including linguistic data) for the nonbiblical texts were culled from the Qumran module (June 2003) within the Accordance computer program.

---

27 The fifteen puncta extraordinaria in MT constitute a negligible minority in such a long text as MT, as opposed to the relative frequency in some of the Qumran texts. See my study “Paratextual Elements in the Masoretic Manuscripts of the Bible Compared with the Qumran Evidence,” in Antikes Judentum und Frühes Christentum, Festschrift für Hartmut Stegmann zum 65. Geburtstag (ed. B. Kolbmann et al.; BZNT 97; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1999) 73–83.

28 Lengthened forms of the types 'eqtol and 'eqtolh instead of 'eqtol have not been recorded because of the complex conditions of their occurrence, but they probably also serve as a good criterion for the Qumran scribal practice. The same pertains to impertatives of the types q'toli and q'tolu for qitli and qilt.

29 Listed in Tov, “Further Evidence.”
(I used version 5.6, Gramcord 2002). These texts have been recorded and analyzed by M. G. Abegg on the basis of the DJD editions and, in the absence of such editions, of other ones. The biblical texts are recorded on the basis of the official editions, mainly in DJD.

Completely reconstructed words in these editions are not included in the statistics. Partial reconstructions are included only when the significant elements have been preserved. Thus for ḫ ל and ק י are not recorded, while מ מ is included depending on the context. מ מ is not included as evidence for מ מ, since forms like מ מ are evidenced as well.

The recording of both negative and positive evidence allows for a balanced judgment, since the positive evidence alone does not suffice for this purpose. For the sake of convenience, when the positive evidence for a certain feature prevails (e.g. מ מ instead of מ מ), the data are presented in boldface. Although even a single occurrence of מ מ against two occurrences of מ מ is meaningful (as in 4QInstr [4Q416]), the cases are nevertheless not presented in boldface. In important categories, such information should thus be taken into consideration. For example, the information in col. 5 regarding the noncanonical segments of 11QPs 41 corroborates the assumption that this scroll was written according to the Qumran scribal practice.

For each text listed here the recording is meant to be precise, but conversely in each column one should not expect to find all the relevant references to a certain feature, such as מ מ (col. 1). Although the information below is almost exhaustive, some additional occurrences of that particular feature are listed elsewhere. The distinction between texts written in the Qumran scribal practice and other texts is based on the assumption that texts which otherwise reflect an orthography and morphology similar to that of MT do not contain a single occurrence of מ מ, מ מ, or מ מ, etc.

5. Table. The table refers to the following categories:

a. Morphology

(1) Regular/lengthened independent pronoun: מ מ.
(2) Regular/lengthened independent pronoun: מ מ.
(3) Regular/lengthened independent pronoun: מ מ.
(4) Regular/lengthened independent pronoun: מ מ.

30 Full bibliographical references are provided in the ‘readme’ file for the Qumran module in the Accordance program.
31 מ מ and similar forms are not found in texts not written according to the Qumran scribal practice.
32 Appendix 1c in the monograph mentioned in n. 7.
(5) Regular/lengthened pronominal suffixes of the second and third persons plural in nouns, e.g. מָלְכֵּם/מלכם.

(6) Regular/lengthened pronominal suffixes of the second and third persons plural in prepositions, e.g. אֲבָרָם/ברם.

(7) Forms of the Qal imperfect o (w)yqtwlw and (w)qtwlw (without suffixes) which serve in MT as pausal forms, but occur in these texts as free forms.

(8) Forms of the Qal imperfect o with pronominal suffixes (in all persons) construed as yiqt'lenu (et sim.). yqqt'lenu (et sim.).

(9) The form qe'altem/qe'altemah for the second person plural in all conjugations.

(10) Regular/lengthened forms of מַשְׂא/משה, מְדִיר, מְדִיר, מְדִיר.

b. Orthography

(11) טה rins as opposed to טה/ה/תא/תא (תא).

(12) טה/ה.

(13) טה/המשה.

(14) ל (rarely ל). ל (רarely ל).

(15) טה/ה (without suffixes).

(16) טה/ה.

(17) The verbal form qtil/qtilth.

(18) Suffix י- in nouns and prepositions.

The asterisk sign after the name of the composition indicates the occurrence of cancellation dots and the percentage sign (%) indicates the special writing of the divine names.

33 Among the texts using at least some long forms, there is a tendency to always write מַשְׂא instead of מַשְׂא. On the other hand, in virtually all texts, the short form מַשְׂא is not lengthened to מַשְׂא except for 4QMiscellaneous Rules (4Q265) 4 i 10 and several times in 11QPh (11Q19). In other texts, מַשְׂא is used instead.

34 Including in rare cases סָד (Isa 16:6 and 56:12 in QIsa).

35 Thus often or sometimes in 4QJub (4Q219), 4QD (4Q266), 4QNarrative and Poetical Composition (4Q371), 4QH (4Q429).

36 Scribes normally writing qtilth will sometimes use the defective forms in הָעֲנֵה and הָעֲנֵה (see 4QBN (4Q437)).
37 See Kutscher, Isaiah, passim for some statistical data (often incomplete) and an analysis. In col. 3 only interchanges of MT hem/hemah 1QIsa* were calculated, disregarding two instances of hemah MT = 1QIsa in the section of scribe A and ten such cases in the segment of scribe B. By the same token, in col. 7 defective pausal forms in MT were disregarded for the statistics.

38 The fragments of 4QDeut, published as a single scroll, should probably be separated into two entities since only cols. V-XII reflect the orthographic and morphological features of the Qumran scribal practice. Scribal dots are found only in that section (VIII 8 [Deut 11:10]). Since the script and column size are identical in both segments, possibly they were copied from different Vorlagen.
In this feature, the whole scroll is written *plene* with the exception of the ‘Apostrophe to Zion’ (col. XXII) written defectively. Immediately after this hymn, in the same column, the scribe continued to write the second person singular suffixes defectively (XX 16 = Ps 93:2).

Mainly כּוֹסָפ and וֹדְעַפ.
| 4Q186 4QHose | 1/1 | 0/1 | 0/0 | 0/1 | 0/0 | 0/1 | 0/3 | 0/1 | y |
| 4Q209 4QTobitc | 0/3 | 0/1 | 0/0 | 1/0 | 0/2 | 0/2 | 0/2 | 0/0 | y |
| 4Q215 4QTNaph | 0/1 | 0/0 | 0/3 | 0/1 | 0/0 | 1/0 | 0/3 | 0/0 | y |
| 4Q215a 4QTimes* | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | y |
| 4Q219 4QJubd | 0/1 | 1/0 | 0/0 | 1/0 | 0/0 | 0/0 | 0/0 | 0/0 | y |
| 4Q221 4QJubb | 0/1 | 0/0 | 0/0 | 0/0 | 0/0 | 0/0 | 0/0 | 0/0 | y |
| 4Q222 4QJub4* | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | y |
| 4Q223-224 4Qpap* | 0/0 | 0/0 | 0/0 | 0/0 | 0/0 | 0/0 | 0/0 | 0/0 | y |
| 4Q225 4Qpap* | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | y |
| 4Q227 4Qpap* | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | y |
| 4Q251 Halakh A | 0/2 | 0/0 | 0/0 | 0/0 | 0/0 | 0/0 | 0/0 | 0/0 | y |
| 4Q254 ComGen C | 0/1 | 0/0 | 0/0 | 0/0 | 0/0 | 0/0 | 0/0 | 0/0 | y |
| 4Q256 4QSp | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | y |
| 4Q257 4QSp | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | y |
| 4Q260 4QSp | 0/1 | 0/0 | 0/0 | 0/0 | 0/0 | 0/0 | 0/0 | 0/0 | y |
| 4Q265 Misc Rules | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | y |
| 4Q266 4QD* | 0/0 | 0/0 | 0/0 | 0/0 | 0/0 | 0/0 | 0/0 | 0/0 | y |
| 4Q267 4QD | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | y |
| 4Q268 4QD | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | y |
| 4Q269 4QD | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | y |
| 4Q271 4QD | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | y |
| 4Q273 4QD | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | y |
| 4Q274 4QD | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | y |
| 4Q275 4QD | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | y |
| 4Q280 4QCurves | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | y |
| 4Q285 Sefer ha-Mil | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | y |
| 4Q286 4QBen* | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | y |
| 4Q287 4QBen* | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | y |
| 4Q289 4QBen* | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | y |
| 4Q292 4QWork | 0/1 | 0/0 | 0/0 | 0/0 | 0/0 | 0/0 | 0/0 | 0/0 | y |
| 4Q299 4QMyst* | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | y |
| 4Q301 4QMyst | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | y |
| 4Q303 MedCren A | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | y |
| 4Q334 4QPrf* | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | y |
| 4Q355 4QPrf | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | y |
| 4Q356 4QPrf | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | y |
| 4Q369 4QPrayer | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | y |
| 4Q375 apocrMoss* | 0/4 | 0/4 | 0/4 | 0/4 | 0/4 | 0/4 | 0/4 | 0/4 | y |
| 4Q377 apocrPent B | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | y |
| 4Q382 apocrParakgs | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | y |
| 4Q394 4Qapocr | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | 0/1 | y |

*These numbers may not be accurate and are intended for reference only. Please refer to the original document for correct values.
The statistical evidence does not allow for the inclusion of 4QMMT\(a\) (4Q394) and 4QMMT\(c\) (4Q396) in this group, although these two texts contain a few 'Qumran spellings' as minority readings. Nevertheless, the whole system of orthography of these two texts, with their 'vulgarisms and other oddities' (Qimron–Strugnell, *DJD* X, 6), is very similar to 1Qtsa\(a\), and these texts may, by extension, be included here.
6. Conclusions. By presenting both negative and positive data regarding the idiosyncratic orthographic and morphological features of a group of Qumran texts, the table allows us to determine that some 170 Qumran texts reflect a special practice. Although much remains unknown, it is clear that virtually all the sectarian texts were written in this way. The table in this study provides detailed information regarding the idiosyncratic orthographic and morphological features of these texts that probably were copied by a special scribal school. For completing the picture one has to take the scribal peculiarities of these texts into consideration as well.

---

42 See especially XQText B identified as part of the same manuscript by H. Eshel, ‘Three New Fragments from Cave 11,’ Tarbiq 68 (1999) 273–278 (Hebr).