

## THE QUMRAN SCRIBAL PRACTICE: THE EVIDENCE FROM ORTHOGRAPHY AND MORPHOLOGY

Emanuel Tov

**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.<sup>1</sup> 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 1k] and MasUnid-Qumran-Type Text [Mas 1n]).<sup>2</sup> This group of texts is closely connected with the Qumran community since it includes virtually all the commonly agreed upon

---

<sup>1</sup> "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 Desert: Their Contribution to Textual Criticism," *JJS* 39 (1988) 5–37; "Scribal Practices 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. Fox et al.; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1995) 383–403; "Tefillin of Different Origin 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 Discovery: Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20–25, 1997* (ed. L. Schiffman et al.; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society and The Shrine of the Book, Israel Museum, 2000) 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 (ed. P. W. Flint and J. C. VanderKam; Leiden/Boston/Cologne: Brill, 1998) 325–358 (see notes 1 and 13) and W. M. Schniedewind, "Qumran Hebrew as an Antilanguage," *JBL* 118 (1999) 235–252, especially 247–249.

<sup>2</sup> These texts, as well as other ones, were probably brought to Masada by one of the Qumran covenanters, 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.<sup>3</sup> The evidence in favor of a scribal practice pertains to scribal features, analyzed elsewhere,<sup>4</sup> 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 4QQoh<sup>a</sup> (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.<sup>5</sup> However, the evidence is not clear-cut, and seven or eight sectarian texts do *not* share these features:<sup>6</sup>

<sup>3</sup> 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*, (Bibliothèque du Muséon 44, 45; Louvain 1958) I.393–402, II.710–711 on the basis of a detailed study of the texts from cave 1 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.

<sup>4</sup> See Tov, “Further Evidence” (n. 1 above).

<sup>5</sup> 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 הוֹאֵה simply do not appear outside the group of texts written according to the Qumran practice. On the other hand, הַמָּה appears elsewhere, and in this case the main argument is statistical. By the same token,

- 4QpIsa<sup>b</sup> (4Q162; 50–25 BCE)  
 4QpNah (4Q169; 50–25 BCE)  
 4QCommGen A (4Q252; sporadic ‘Qumranic’ spellings; 30–1 BCE)  
 4QS<sup>d</sup> (4Q258; 30–1 BCE)  
 4QS<sup>j</sup> (4Q264; 50–25 BCE)  
 4QCal Doc/Mish A (4Q320; insufficient data; 125–100 BCE)  
 4QMMT<sup>b</sup> (4Q395; 30–1 BCE)  
 4QBN<sup>a</sup> (4Q434; sporadic ‘Qumranic’ spellings; 1–30 CE)

In spite of these exceptions, it remains true to say that practically all Qumran sectarian works<sup>7</sup> were penned according to this scribal practice.<sup>8</sup>

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;<sup>9</sup> the only conclusion

---

cancellation dots (one of the special scribal habits) occur almost exclusively in this group of texts, even though isolated instances also occur elsewhere.

- 6 With the exception of 4Q320 and 4Q434, all texts are dated to the same period, which may be significant.
- 7 I count 107 sectarian compositions and 85 fragments of possible sectarian compositions (see n. 11 below)
- 8 For criticisms of our views, limited to the arguments based on orthography, see: F. M. Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran* (3rd ed.; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995) 174–177; J. Lübbe, “Certain Implications of the Scribal Process of 4QSam<sup>c</sup>,” *RevQ* 14 (1989–90) 255–265; J. Cook, “Orthographical Peculiarities in the Dead Sea Biblical Scrolls,” *ibid.*, 293–305; E. Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible* (Grand Rapids/Leiden: Eerdmans/E. J. Brill, 1999) 111; J. Campbell, “Hebrew and its Study at Qumran,” in *Hebrew Study from Ezra to Ben-Yehuda* (ed. W. Horbury; Edinburgh: Clark, 1999) 38–52, especially 41; A. Lange, “Kriterien essenischer Texte,” *Qumran kontrovers—Beiträge zu den Textfunden vom Toten Meer* (ed. J. Frey and H. Stegemann; Einblicke—Ergebnisse—Berichte—Reflexionen aus Tagungen der Katholischen Akademie Schwerte 6; Paderborn 2003) 59–69, especially 68.
- 9 For the data, see Tov, “Further Evidence.”

seems to be that the sectarian scribes followed special scribal conventions.<sup>10</sup> 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.<sup>11</sup>

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.<sup>12</sup> 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,<sup>13</sup> 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.<sup>14</sup> *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-

<sup>10</sup> Note that the person who wrote מדרש ספר משה 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.

<sup>11</sup> 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*.

<sup>12</sup> See Tov, “*Tefillin*.”

<sup>13</sup> See E. Y. Kutscher, *The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll (1Q Is<sup>a</sup>)* (STDJ 6; Leiden: Brill, 1974) 20.

<sup>14</sup> 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<sup>15</sup> הוזה (cf. col. 11 in the table below) and *b. Meg.* 11a where אחרשוש is explained from ראש.<sup>16</sup> 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. 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> V 26 [Isa 6:5] ... כִּי וּדְמִיתִי כִּי אֵ). 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.<sup>17</sup>

The Qumran orthography<sup>18</sup> 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 *holem* (e.g. חושך, מושה, פוה), the *qames ḥatuf* (כול, חוכמה), and the *ḥatef qames* (אויה). Because of scribal inconsistency, many words appear in the same text with

<sup>15</sup> Y. Yadin and J. Naveh, *Masada I, The Yigael Yadin Excavations 1963–1965, Final Reports, The Aramaic and Hebrew Ostraca and Jar Inscriptions* (Jerusalem: IES, 1989).

<sup>16</sup> 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 160. 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.

<sup>17</sup> For details, see my paper "The Biblical Texts from the Judaean Desert. An Overview and Analysis of the Published Texts," in *The Bible as Book. The Hebrew Bible and the Judaean Desert Discoveries* (ed. E. D. Herbert and E. Tov; London: British Library & Oak Knoll Press in association with The Scriptorium: Center for Christian Antiquities, 2002) 139–166 and more in detail T. H. Lim, *Holy Scripture in the Qumran Commentaries and Pauline Texts* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997) chapter IV.

<sup>18</sup> This orthography has been described in various studies, especially in the detailed description of 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> by Kutscher, *Language* 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 Qumránski 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. /זוח/זואח/זואו and /רוש/ראוש/רואש/ in 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> and in several other texts. *Yod* represents not only /i/ (usually not short i), but also *ṣere*: אבילים (1QIsa<sup>a</sup> 61:2), מיה (38:1). Unique for certain lexemes is the representation of /i/ in final position by יא-, especially in כיא (see col. 16 in the table below), and sometimes also in מיא (less frequent: נקיא, 49:7; פיא, 40:5), apparently by analogy to הביא, נביא, 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 *qlth* (e.g. שמרה, see col. 17 in the table below), and the second person masculine singular suffix, e.g. מלכה, *mlkhh* (see col. 18 in the table below). *He* in final position for /e/ occurs in an unusual fashion also in חוטה in 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> 1:4 (MT חוטא) and קורה in 6:4 (MT קורא). 'Aleph denotes /a/ in final position: עליהא (34:11), ביהא (66:8), and even in medial position: יאחום (1:17), יאכה (30:31).

**3. Morphological features.** The biblical and nonbiblical texts presenting the orthography of the Qumran practice also reflect distinctive morphological features.<sup>19</sup> The following six features characterize this morphology, which has a tendency towards lengthened pronominal, verbal, and in one case, adverbial forms:<sup>20</sup>

- (1) Lengthened independent pronouns: הואה, היאה, אחמה, and המה (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. במה, בהמה, במלכמה: cols. 5–6 below.
- (3) Forms of the *Qal* imperfect *o* (*w*)*yqt'wlw* and (*w*)*tqt'wlw* 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 *y'qu'lenu* (et sim.) instead of *yiq't'lenu* (et sim.): col. 8 below.
- (5) The form *q'attemah* for the second person plural in all conjugations: col. 9 below.
- (6) Lengthened forms of מאד, viz., מואדה, מאודה, מודה: col. 10 below.

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

<sup>19</sup> For a description, see H. Yalon, *Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls, Philological Essays (1949–1952)* (Heb.; Jerusalem: Shrine of the Book Fund, 1967) 11–28; Kutscher, *Language*; M. H. Goshen-Gottstein, *Text and Language in Bible and Qumran* (Jerusalem/Tel Aviv: Orient Publishing House, 1960); S. Morag, "Qumran Hebrew: Some Typological Observations," *VT* 38 (1988) 148–164; and Qimron, *Hebrew*.

<sup>20</sup> See S. E. Fassberg, "The Preference for Lengthened Forms in Qumran Hebrew," in *Meghillot I, Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. M. Bar-Asher and D. Dimant; Heb. with Eng. summary; Jerusalem 2003) 227–240.

Kutscher, *Language*, 52, 434–440; Qimron, *Hebrew*, 57; F. M. Cross, Jr., “Some Notes on a Generation of Qumran Studies,” in *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Madrid, 18–21 March, 1991* (ed. J. Trebolle Barrera and L. Vegas Montaner; STDJ 11; Leiden/Madrid: Brill, 1992) 1–14. The artificial nature of the lengthened forms was stressed by Fassberg (n. 20).

**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 4QDibre Hame<orot, 4QMMT, 4QM<sup>a-f</sup>//1QM, 4QIsa<sup>c</sup>//1QIsa<sup>a</sup>, and 4QapocrJosh<sup>b</sup> (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 1QIsa<sup>a</sup><sup>21</sup> and scribes A and C of 1QH<sup>a</sup>.<sup>22</sup> For details, see the table below.

The shared spellings which are used most consistently in all scrolls in this group are the *plene* writings וואה/וואה/וואה (ה) (col. 11 in the table below), מושה (col. 13), לוא (col. 14), כול (col. 15), and the long spelling of the second person singular suffix כה- in nouns and prepositions (col. 18); the most frequently used forms are the lengthened forms of the verb of the type (w)qtqlw and (w)qqlw (col. 7) and of מאד (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: 4QNum<sup>b</sup>, 1QDeut<sup>a</sup>, 4QDeut<sup>k2</sup>, 4QDeut<sup>m</sup>, 4QSam<sup>c</sup>, 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> (especially scribe B), 2QJer, 4QXII<sup>c</sup>, 4QPhyl A, B, J–K, L–N (4Q128, 4Q129, 4Q138, 4Q139), 1QS, 1QSa, 1QM, 1QH<sup>a</sup> scribe C, 4Qpap pIsa<sup>c</sup> (4Q163), 4QFlor (4Q174), 4QM<sup>a</sup> (4Q491), 11QMelch (11Q13), and 11QT<sup>a</sup> (11Q19).

<sup>21</sup> 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 (כה-) in the second part, as described in detail by M. Martin, “The Use of the Second Person Singular Suffixes in 1QIs<sup>a</sup>,” *Le Muséon* 70 (1957) 127–144. Furthermore, scribe B consistently wrote כא *plene*, but scribe A did so only in 20 percent of the instances. Scribe A consistently wrote כה defectively, while scribe B wrote כה. These differences are also felt in morphology: Scribe A consistently used the forms הוא and היא, as opposed to הוואה and היאה in the second part of the scroll. Scribe A employed forms of the type q<sup>e</sup>taltem, while scribe B used q<sup>e</sup>taltemah. See the table below.

<sup>22</sup> Scribe C of this scroll (col. XIX 27ff.) adopted a fuller orthography than scribe A (cols. I–XIX 21). Scribe A usually wrote לא and כי, while scribe C wrote לוא and כיא. By the same token, scribe A wrote almost exclusively the pronominal suffix of the second person masculine singular as -k (except for his last two columns), while scribe C used *plene* forms, e.g. מלככה. 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 כִּיָּא, used in most texts belonging to this group (col. 16), does not appear in 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> (scribe A), 1QpHab, 1QH<sup>a</sup> (scribe A, usually), 4QXII<sup>c</sup>, the *tefillin*, most copies of D, 4QRP<sup>c</sup> (4Q365), 11QPs<sup>a</sup>, and 11QT<sup>a</sup> (11Q19). By the same token, the following texts lack spellings of the type of מלכמ and מלכמה (col. 5): 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> (scribe A, usually), 1QS, 1QM, 1QH<sup>a</sup> (both scribes), 1QpHab, most copies of D and ShirShabb, 4QRP<sup>c</sup> (4Q365), and 11QPs<sup>a</sup>. The lengthened forms הוואה, היאה, אחמה are not found in 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> (scribe A), 4QIsa<sup>c</sup>, 1QpHab, 1QH<sup>a</sup> (scribe A), most copies of D, and 11QT<sup>a</sup> (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).<sup>23</sup> 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.<sup>24</sup>

Orthographic and morphological corrections such as כִּיָּא (supralinear *'aleph*) in 1QH<sup>a</sup> IV (XIII) 5 and הוֹאֵה (supralinear *waw*) in 11QT<sup>a</sup> (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.<sup>25</sup>

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 כול (with the exception of Jer 33:8), while לוא occurs only rarely.<sup>26</sup> Also, the forms recorded in the other columns do not occur in MT, with the exception of *qtlth* (77 instances as opposed to *qtl* in 1995 instances, the former not necessarily in the 'late' biblical books) and of המה which occurs with equal frequency to המ. However, eight sporadic 'typical Qumran' forms are encountered in all of MT: אחנה (Gen 31:6, Ezek 13:11, 20, 34:17), זמחמה (Ezek 40:16), זמחמה (Ezek 23:48, 49), מהנה (Isa 34:17), השלכתנה (Amos 4:3), ידכה (Exod 13:16), בשמכה (Jer 29:25). In whatever way these exceptions are explained, it cannot be said that

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

<sup>24</sup> See my study "Further Evidence."

<sup>25</sup> For additional examples of this type, see Tov, "Orthography," 34.

<sup>26</sup> I counted 19 occurrences in Jeremiah (compared with 480 occurrences of לוא) as well as 14 cases elsewhere in the Bible. These figures do not include הלוא, which is the usual spelling of that word in MT, and a few instances of בלוא and ללוא.



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.<sup>27</sup>

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. כִּי, presented for each text in the second position after the negative evidence, that is יִ, 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 כִּי, its frequency in 1QpHab is recorded as 3/18, referring to 3 instances of יִ (negative evidence) and 18 instances of כִּי (positive evidence). Evidence of more than four occurrences is recorded as 'all,' while in rare cases it is spelled out.<sup>28</sup>

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.<sup>29</sup> 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<sup>g</sup> (4Q222), 4QBer<sup>d</sup> (4Q289), 4QMMT<sup>c</sup> (4Q396) and the paleo-Hebrew Tetragrammata in 1QpMic (1Q14), 2QExod<sup>b</sup>, and 4QExod<sup>j</sup> 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

<sup>27</sup> 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 Stegemann zum 65. Geburtstag* (ed. B. Kolbmann et al.; BZNT 97; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1999) 73–83.

<sup>28</sup> Lengthened forms of the types 'eq<sup>l</sup>lah and 'eqtolah 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 imperatives of the types q<sup>t</sup>oli and q<sup>t</sup>olu for qitli and qitl.

<sup>29</sup> 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.<sup>30</sup> 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 כִּי/אִי, כִּי־אִי and [כִּי־אִי] are not recorded, while [כִּי־אִי], אִי־כִּי, and [כִּי־אִי] are included depending on the context. מִלְכָּם is not included as evidence for מִלְכָּם, since forms like מִלְכָּם־הֵאֱרָא 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. הוֹאֵה instead of הוּא), the data are presented in **boldface**. Although even a single occurrence of הוֹאֵה against two occurrences of הוּא is meaningful (as in 4QInstr<sup>b</sup> [4Q416])<sup>31</sup>, for the sake of objectivity, such 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<sup>a</sup> (4/4) 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 הוֹאֵה (col. 1). Although the information below is almost exhaustive, some additional occurrences of that particular feature are listed elsewhere.<sup>32</sup> 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 כִּי־אִי, הוֹאֵה, מִלְכָּמָה, etc.

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

#### a. Morphology

- (1) Regular/lengthened independent pronoun: הוֹאֵה/הוּא.
- (2) Regular/lengthened independent pronoun: הִיאֵה/הִיא.
- (3) Regular/lengthened independent pronoun: אֲתָמָה/אֲתָמָה־אֲתָמָה.
- (4) Regular/lengthened independent pronoun: הִמָּה/הִמָּה־הִמָּה.

<sup>30</sup> Full bibliographical references are provided in the 'readme' file for the Qumran module in the Accordance program.

<sup>31</sup> הוֹאֵה and similar forms are not found in texts not written according to the Qumran scribal practice.

<sup>32</sup> 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. מלכמה/מלכם.
- (6) Regular/lengthened pronominal suffixes of the second and third persons plural in prepositions, e.g. בהמה/בהם.<sup>33</sup>
- (7) Forms of the *Qal* imperfect *o* (*w*)*yqṭw/w* and (*w*)*tqṭw/w* (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 *yiqṭ<sup>e</sup>lenu* (*et sim.*)/*y<sup>e</sup>q<sup>u</sup>ṭlenu* (*et sim.*).
- (9) The form *q<sup>e</sup>ṭaltem/q<sup>e</sup>ṭaltemah* for the second person plural in all conjugations.
- (10) Regular<sup>34</sup>/lengthened forms of מודה, מאודה, מואדה, מאד.

### b. Orthography

- (11) (ה)זאה as opposed to (ה)זוח/זואח/זאוח.
- (12) כה/כה.
- (13) מושה/משה.
- (14) לוא (rarely לו<sup>35</sup>) לא.
- (15) כול/כל (without suffixes).
- (16) כיא/כי.
- (17) The verbal form *qṭlt/qṭlth*.<sup>36</sup>
- (18) Suffix כה-/ך- 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.

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

<sup>34</sup> Including in rare cases מואד (Isa 16:6 and 56:12 in 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>).

<sup>35</sup> Thus often or sometimes in 4QJub<sup>d</sup> (4Q219), 4QD<sup>a</sup> (4Q266), 4QNarrative and Poetical Composition<sup>a</sup> (4Q371), 4QH<sup>c</sup> (4Q429).

<sup>36</sup> Scribes normally writing *qṭlth* will sometimes use the defective forms in חייח and חייח (see 4QBN<sup>d</sup> [4Q437]).

	1 /ראו הראו	2 /ראו הראו	3 /אמם אממה	4 /מם ממה	5 suff. 2d and 3rd p. plur in nouns and verbs	6 suff. 2d and 3rd p. plur in nouns and verbs	7 yiq'l/yiq'l- /yiq' tolu	8 yiq'l/yiq'l- /yiq' tolu	9 yiq'l/yiq'l- /yiq' tolu	10 yiq'l/yiq'l- /yiq' tolu	11 yiq'l/yiq'l- /yiq' tolu	12 yiq'l/yiq'l- /yiq' tolu	13 yiq'l/yiq'l- /yiq' tolu	14 yiq'l/yiq'l- /yiq' tolu	15 yiq'l/yiq'l- /yiq' tolu	16 yiq'l/yiq'l- /yiq' tolu	17 yiq'l/yiq'l- /yiq' tolu	18 yiq'l/yiq'l- /yiq' tolu	Qumr. Scrib. Prac- tice	
1QDeut <sup>a</sup>	0/2	1/0			0/1	0/1													y	
1QIsa <sup>a</sup> scribe A <sup>37*</sup>	all/0	all/0	0/2	1/1	80%/ 20%	80%/ 20%	1/all	2/2	13/4	1/1	0/all	13/1		0/all	1/all	80%/ 20%	7/21	90%/ 10%	y	
1QIsa <sup>a</sup> scribe B <sup>*</sup>	1/all	3/all	0/all	0/6	30%/ 70%	30%/ 70%	1/all	4/11	0/10	1/all	0/all	0/all	0/2	0/all	0/all	5%/ 95%	11/ 41	20%/ 80%	y	
2QExod <sup>b</sup>													0/1		0/2				y?	
2QNum <sup>b</sup>						0/1							0/1		1/0				y?	
2QDeut <sup>c</sup>		0/1																	y?	
2QJer	0/1	0/1			0/1							0/1		0/1	0/2	0/2			0/3	y
4QExod <sup>b</sup>	1/0			3/0	all/0	3/1				0/1		1/0	0/all	2/0	1/0	3/0	0/2	3/0	y?	
4QExod <sup>j</sup>													0/1		1/0				y?	
4QNum <sup>b</sup>	2/all	0/1	1/1	2/all	3/all		4/3	0/2					0/all	0/all	0/all	0/all	0/1	0/all	y	
4QDeut <sup>l</sup> cols. I-V* <sup>38</sup>		1/0			4/0	5/0		2/0		1/0			0/1	1/3	0/6	3/0		6/1	y?	
4QDeut <sup>l</sup> cols. V-XII*			0/1		2/0	0/1		0/1					0/1	0/1	0/2	1/0	0/4	0/6	y	
4QDeut <sup>k1</sup>		0/1	0/1		1/0	3/0		2/1					0/1	0/4	0/1	0/1	0/1	0/3	y	
4QDeut <sup>k2</sup>					0/2	0/1							0/2	0/3	0/3	0/2	0/2	0/8	y	
4QDeut <sup>m</sup>		0/1		0/1	0/5	0/1							0/1	0/2	0/1		0/1	0/4	y	
4QSam <sup>c</sup>	0/1	0/1							0/1	0/1			0/all	0/2	0/1			0/all	y	
4QIsa <sup>c</sup>	all/0				all/0	1/1	0/2	0/1		0/2	0/3		0/all	0/all	0/all	0/1		50%/ 50%	y	
4QXII <sup>c*</sup>					0/all	0/2		0/2	0/1		0/2		0/all	0/all	all/0			0/all	y	
4QXII <sup>e*</sup>	1/0	1/0			1/0			0/1			0/1		0/4	0/2					y	
4QXII <sup>g</sup>	3/0	1/0			all/0	4/0		2/0			2/0		4/7	0/all	all/0	0/1	3/3	y?		
4QPs <sup>o</sup>													0/1	0/2					y?	
4QLam	1/0	0/1			0/1								0/4	1/4	0/3				y	
4QQoh <sup>a</sup>													0/all	0/4	1/1				y	
11QPs <sup>a</sup> canon. (includ. Frg. E)*	2/0				11/4	6/1	0/3	0/2		0/all	0/1			0/all	0/all	all/0	0/all	0/all	y	
11QPs <sup>a</sup> noncanon.*	1/2				4/4	1/3	1/1	0/1					0/all	0/all	all/0	0/1	33/34 39		y	

37 See Kutscher, *Isaiah*, passim for some statistical data (often incomplete) and an analysis. In col. 3 only interchanges of MT *hem/hemah* 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> were calculated, disregarding two instances of *hemah* MT = 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> 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<sup>l</sup>, 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*.

11QPs <sup>b</sup> canon.						0/1												0/1							0/2	y
11QPs <sup>b</sup> noncanon.							2/0													0/1	1/0				0/all	y
11QPs <sup>c</sup>																				0/1			0/2	0/all	y?	
11QPs <sup>d</sup>						1/0												0/1			1/1		1/0		0/1	y?
4Q128 Phyl A	0/4					0/all	0/all			0/4	0/1	0/1		0/1	0/all	0/all	all/0						0/2	0/all	y	
4Q129 Phyl B			0/1		0/all	0/4		0/1	0/2		0/2				0/all	0/all	4/0	0/all				0/all	0/all	0/all	y	
4Q137 Phyl G-I			1/0		all/0	all/0				3/0					0/3	1/all	0/all	all/1				2/0	80%/20%	0/all	y?	
4Q138 Phyl J-K	0/3	0/2	0/1		0/all	0/all	0/1		0/all	0/1	0/1				0/all	0/all	all/0					0/4	0/all	y		
4Q139 Phyl L-N	0/1		0/1		0/all	0/4			0/2	0/1	0/3			0/1	3/all	0/3	2/0	0/all				0/all	0/all	0/all	y	
4Q142 Phyl O					0/1					0/3				0/1		0/1								0/all	y	
4Q143 Phyl P						2/0				1/0							0/1						0/1	0/3	y	
4Q144 Phyl Q			0/1		0/2					0/1														0/1	y	
1Q14 1QpMic	0/1					1/0										1/0	0/all	0/1							y	
1QpHab*	all/0	1/1		0/all	all/0	all/1	0/2	1/1							0/all		3/18	0/all	1/8				0/all	1/8	y	
1Q22 1QDM*	1/0			0/1	3/0	all/0				0/2					0/all	0/all	4/0	0/all	5/2				0/all	5/2	y?	
1Q26 1QInstr																	1/0	0/1	0/all				0/all	0/all	y?	
1Q27 1QMyst	3/0				0/2	1/1	0/1								0/all	0/all	all/0								y	
1Q28 1QS*	0/14	0/5			all/0	all/1	1/5	0/3		0/1	0/4		0/4	0/all	0/all	1/34	0/1	0/all					0/all	0/all	y	
1Q28a 1QSa*	1/0			0/1	0/2	0/1									0/all	0/all	0/3								y	
1Q28b 1Qsb					1/0	2/0		0/1							0/all	0/all	0/4	0/all	0/all				0/all	0/all	y	
1Q33 1QM	1/4	0/4	2/2	1/7	all/0	19/4	1/39	0/0		2/1	0/2			0/1	0/all	0/all	0/all	0/all	4/96						y	
1Q34 1QH <sup>a</sup> scribe A*	13/0	1/1		4/7	all/0	all/0	2/7	1/4		0/3	2/0			0/1	most/few	0/all	91/25	0/all	95%/5%				0/all	95%/5%	y	
1Q34 1QH <sup>a</sup> scribe C	0/1	0/1		1/0	all/0		1/2				0/4				few/most	0/all	5/26	0/all	0/all				0/all	0/all	y	
1Q35 1QH <sup>b</sup>																								0/all	y?	
1Q36 1QHymns																							0/2	0/all	y	
4Q158 4QRP <sup>a</sup>	1/2			0/1	0/2	2/6		0/1	0/1		0/1		0/3	0/all	0/all	3/4							0/all	0/all	y	
4Q159 4QOrdin		1/0					0/1							0/3	0/all	0/all	1/1								y	
4Q160 4QVisSam	0/2					0/2				0/1					0/1	0/all	0/all	0/all	0/2				0/all	0/all	y	
4Q161 4QPlsa <sup>a</sup>		0/1		0/1			0/1								0/2	0/all	0/1								y	
4Q163 4Qpap plsa <sup>c</sup>	2/8	1/1		0/3	0/1	1/2		0/2		1/3	0/2			1/all	0/all	3/10		1/all					1/all	1/all	y	
4Q165 4QPlsa <sup>c</sup>															1/0	1/0									y?	
4Q166 4QpHos <sup>a</sup>				2/1	all/0	4/0									0/3	0/all	0/2								y?	
4Q171 4QpPs <sup>a</sup>				0/5	all/0	2/0	1/0								0/all	0/all	0/12						0/1	0/1	y	
4Q174 4QFlor	1/4	0/4		0/4	0/3	0/all								0/1	0/all	0/all	0/all						0/all	0/all	y	
4Q175 4QTest					2/1	0/2					0/2		0/1	0/all	0/all	1/0								5/4	y	
4Q176 4QTanh <sup>≥*</sup>	1/1				2/0	1/1		1/0		0/1				0/all	0/all	2/13	0/2						4/10	y		
4Q177 Catena A*	0/3	1/0		0/all	2/2	8/3			0/1					0/1	0/all	0/all							0/all	0/all	y	
4Q180 AgesCreat A	2/0			0/1	1/1	1/0				2/1						0/1									y	
4Q181 AgesCreat B					2/0	0/1										0/2									y?	
4Q184 4QWiles		1/1			1/0									0/1	0/all	0/1							0/all	0/all	y?	

- 39 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).
- 40 Mainly יעמודו and יכחורו.

4Q186 4QHorosc	1/1	0/1			0/2											0/3			0/1	y	
4Q200 4QTobit <sup>c</sup>	4/3	0/1	0/1	0/1		0/2										0/2	0/all	2/1		5/9	y
4Q215 4QTNaph		0/1														0/1		1/0			y
4Q215a 4QTimes*	0/1				all/0	1/0	0/1			0/1							0/all	0/3			y
4Q219 4QJub <sup>d</sup>	0/1				1/2	2/0										all/0	0/all	1/0		1/9	y?
4Q221 4QJub <sup>f</sup>	0/1				0/2	all/0	2/0									0/all	0/all	2/1	0/1	all/0	y
4Q222 4QJub <sup>g</sup> *	0/1															2/1		1/0			y?
4Q223-224 4QpapJub <sup>h</sup> *	2/0			2/0		2/2	1/2									0/all	0/all	2/1	0/all	0/all	y?
4Q225 4QpsJub <sup>a</sup> *	0/2	1/0				2/0		0/1							0/1	2/0		1/0	0/1	0/all	y
4Q227 4QpsJub <sup>c</sup>						2/0									0/1	0/1	0/all				y
4Q251 Halakha A	4/2	2/0		1/0	1/0											3/0	5/2	all/0		0/all	y?
4Q254 ComGen C	1/0	0/1				1/0												0/4		0/all	y
4Q256 4QS <sup>b</sup>	0/1				5/2		0/1		0/1						0/1	0/all	0/all	1/0		0/all	y
4Q257 4QpapS <sup>c</sup>																0/all	0/all	0/1			y
4Q259 4QS <sup>e</sup>	0/1	0/2			2/1	1/0									0/1	0/all	0/all				y
4Q260 4QS <sup>f</sup>					1/0				0/1							0/all	0/all				y?
4Q265 Misc Rules	1/1	2/0				2/1										all/0	0/all	1/0			y?
4Q266 4QD <sup>a</sup> *	6/4	2/3		3/3	all/1	all/0	1/1								0/all	all/0	0/all	all/0	0/all	2/4	y
4Q267 4QD <sup>b</sup>	1/0	0/1		0/2	all/0											0/all	0/all	6/1	0/2	0/all	y
4Q268 4QD <sup>c</sup>	1/0				0/2	0/2										0/2	0/all	2/0			y
4Q269 4QD <sup>d</sup>	2/0	1/0		0/1	all/0										0/1		0/2		0/1		y?
4Q271 4QD <sup>f</sup> *	3/0	3/0				1/0									0/2	0/all	1/10	all/0	2/1		y
4Q273 4QpapD <sup>h</sup>	1/1	2/0		0/1		1/0									3/0		1/0				y?
4Q274 4QToh A*	2/0	1/0			2/2	0/1			0/1	0/1					0/all	0/all	4/0				y?
4Q277 4QToh B	1/0					3/0											1/2	0/2			y
4Q280 4QCurses					1/0											0/2	0/all			0/all	y?
4Q285 Sefer ha-Mil		0/1				2/0		1/0								0/3	0/all	0/1		0/1	y
4Q286 4QBer <sup>a</sup> *	1/0			0/3	0/all										0/3	0/all	0/2			0/all	y
4Q287 4QBer <sup>b</sup> *				0/3	0/all											0/all	0/1	0/1	0/all		y
4Q289 4QBer <sup>d</sup> *					0/2											2/0		0/1			y?
4Q292 4QWork Cont. Prayers B						2/0										0/1	0/1				y
4Q299 4QMyst <sup>a</sup>	15/2	1/1	1/0		all/0	all/0		1/0	0/2			1/0	1/all	4/38	5/7		0/1	2/1			y
4Q301 4QMyst <sup>c</sup> ?	2/8				3/1	2/1									0/all	1/2	0/2				y
4Q303 MedCrea A					2/0	1/0										0/2	0/2				y?
4Q364 4QRP <sup>bb</sup> *	1/1		1/0		7/4	3/6		1/2	0/1		0/1	0/all	0/all	8/2	0/all	0/all					y
4Q365 4QRP <sup>c</sup> *	1/all	1/2	0/1	0/2	13/5	3/6		5/1		0/1	0/all	1/all	0/all	8/2	0/all	0/all					y
4Q365a 4QT <sup>a</sup> ?					0/3	1/1				0/1					0/2			0/1			y
4Q369 4QPrayer Enosh*		0/1			3/0	3/0									0/all	3/0	0/all	0/all			y
4Q375 apocrMos <sup>a</sup>	0/4												0/1	0/all	0/2		0/3	0/all			y
4Q377 apocPent B													0/3	0/2	0/all	0/4			0/1		y
4Q382 pap paraKgs	0/1			1/0	2/0	3/0		1/0				0/1	0/all	0/all	1/0/0	0/all	1/all				y
4Q384 4Qpap apocr Jer B?			0/2		2/0	1/0									0/1						y?

4Q393 ComConf*	2/0				1/0	0/1									0/1	1/0	0/1	0/1	1/2	all/2	y
4Q394 4QMMT <sup>a</sup>	1/0	4/1	2/0	4/1	all/0	all/0									1/all	1/1	6/0				y? 41
4Q396 4QMMT <sup>c</sup> *	3/1	1/0	2/0	4/2	2/0	3/1									1/all	2/1	3/0				y?
4Q397 4QMMT*	0/1	1/2	1/1			1/0								0/2	0/1	0/all	3/0			0/all	y
4Q398 papMMT <sup>c</sup>	1/0				1/0	0/1	1/0								0/1	0/1	1/0	1/0		all/0	y?
4Q400 ShirShabb <sup>a</sup> *					0/2	all/0	3/0								0/1	0/all	0/1			0/2	y?
4Q401 ShirShabb <sup>b</sup>					0/1	2/0									0/1	0/all				0/3	y
4Q402 ShirShabb <sup>c</sup>					0/1	1/0									0/3	0/all	0/2				y
4Q403 ShirShabb <sup>d</sup> *						all/0	1/0									0/all	1/2				y
4Q405 ShirShabb <sup>e</sup> *						all/0		0/2							0/all	0/all	0/1				y
4Q410 Vision Int*							0/1								0/3	0/2					0/all y?
4Q414 RitPur A	0/1															0/3	2/1	0/2	0/all		y
4Q415 4QInstr <sup>a</sup> *		0/1			1/1				0/1						0/all	0/all	1/3			2/all	y
4Q416 4QInstr <sup>b</sup>	2/1	1/0		0/1	3/3	0/1			0/1						7/3	all/0	all/0	1/3	0/all		y
4Q417 4QInstr <sup>c</sup>	1/7	0/1			6/4				0/1						5/6	0/all	5/12	1/0	0/all		y
4Q418 4QInstr <sup>d</sup> *	6/1	2/0	1/0	2/2	19/9	4/0	4/0	4/1	1/3	1/1	1/0	5/44	0/all	18/21	0/all	0/1			0/all		y
4Q418a 4QInstr <sup>e</sup>	0/1				1/1										0/all	1/4			0/all		y
4Q419 4QInstr-like Composition A	3/0			0/2	3/0	2/0					1/0	1/2	0/all	0/1							y?
4Q420 4QWays <sup>a</sup>					2/0				0/1				0/all	0/2							y?
4Q421 4QWays <sup>b</sup>		0/1											0/2	1/0	0/2						y
4Q422 4QParaGen- Exod	0/1				6/3	1/1							0/1	0/1	0/all	0/1					y
4Q423 4QInstr <sup>e</sup>	3/0				0/2	0/1			0/1		1/0	5/1	16/5	4/1	0/1	0/all					y
4Q426 4Q Sap-Hym Work A*						0/1							0/all	0/all							y?
4Q427 4QH <sup>a</sup> *					1/6								2/all	0/all	0/7	0/all	0/all				y
4Q428 4QH <sup>b</sup>					all/0		0/1		0/1				0/all	0/all	1/5	0/all	0/all				y
4Q429 4QH <sup>c</sup>					1/2								2/0	2/0	2/0	0/1	0/all				y?
4Q432 4QpapH <sup>f</sup>					1/1		0/1							0/all	1/0	0/1	0/all				y?
4Q433a papH-like													0/1	0/2							
4Q435 4QBN <sup>b</sup>														0/1		1/3	0/1				y?
4Q436 4QBN <sup>c</sup>					0/1											0/all	0/all				y
4Q437 4QBN <sup>d</sup>					2/0		0/1						0/2	0/all		3/4	all/1				y
4Q438 4QBN <sup>e</sup> *					1/0								0/1	0/1			6/3				y?
4Q440 H-like C*													0/2	0/all			0/2	0/all			y
4Q443 Pers Pray.*						0/1								0/1	1/0	1/0	2/all				y
4Q460 Narr Work	1/0				3/0								0/3	0/3	0/all	0/3	0/all				y
4Q462 4QNarr C*						1/0	0/1							0/1	2/0						y
4Q464 4QExp Patr	1/1												1/1		1/2		0/1				y?
4Q471 WarText B					2/0									0/all	0/1						y
4Q473 Two Ways	0/1													0/2			0/1			0/4	y
4Q474 4QRachJos					2/1				0/1					0/all	0/1		0/1				y
4Q477 4QRebukes	0/3				1/1																y?
4Q491 4QM <sup>a</sup> *	0/3			0/1	1/all	1/6	1/0	1/0	0/2				0/all	0/all	0/all	0/2	0/all				y

41 The statistical evidence does not allow for the inclusion of 4QMMT<sup>a</sup> (4Q394) and 4QMMT<sup>c</sup> (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 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>, and these texts may, by extension, be included here.

4Q496 4QpapM <sup>f</sup>		0/1						0/4						0/1	0/2					y
4Q501 apocrLamB*					0/3	0/3								0/1		0/1			0/all	y
4Q502 papRitMar	0/2				4/0	1/0									0/all				0/all	y
4Q503 papPrQuot	0/1														0/1	0/all	0/2	0/1	0/all	y
4Q504 papDM <sup>a</sup>	0/1	0/2			11/2	3/2			0/1	0/1		0/all	0/all	0/all	1/20	0/all	0/all		0/all	y
4Q505 4QpapDM <sup>b</sup>												0/1	0/1	0/1		0/all	0/all		y?	
4Q506 4QpapDM <sup>c</sup>															0/all	0/1	0/all	0/all		y
4Q509 4QpapPrFêt <sup>c</sup>					3/0				1/0	0/1		0/1	0/all	0/all	7/1	0/all	0/all		0/all	y
4Q511 4QShir <sup>b</sup>	0/2			0/1	all/0	all/0	0/1							0/all	0/all	1/21	0/all	0/all		y
4Q512 papRitPurB					2/0	1/0								0/3	0/all	1/3	0/1	0/all		y
4Q513 4QOrd <sup>b*</sup>				0/all	2/0	0/1						1/0	0/3	0/all	1/2					y
4Q522 Proph Josh*	1/1				1/0	1/0								0/all	1/1	1/0				y?
4Q524 4QT <sup>b</sup>	0/1	0/1		0/1	3/1	1/1			0/1					0/all	0/all				0/2	y
4Q525 Beatitudes					3/2	1/0	0/1	0/1		0/2				0/all	0/all	4/0	0/all	4/all		y
5Q13 5QRule					1/2									0/all	0/3		0/all	0/3		y?
6Q18 papHymn							1/0							0/3	1/1	0/2		0/3		y
11Q11 11QapocPs				1/0		1/0			0/1	0/2				0/all	0/all		0/2	all/1		y
11Q12 11QJub + XQText A	1/1				3/0										0/all	0/3		0/2		y
11Q13 11QMelch	0/all			0/2	1/1	0/all	0/1	0/1	0/1	0/1				0/all	0/1		3/0			y
11Q14 11QSefer ha-Milhamah					4/1	all/0								0/1	0/2	0/1				y
11Q16 11QHymns <sup>b</sup>															0/1	0/1	0/1	0/1		42
11Q19 11QT <sup>a*</sup>	34/1	12/1	0/2	0/all	1/all	1/74	0/all	0/4	1/18	0/2	1/all			0/all	0/all	67/2	0/all	0/all		y
11Q20 11QT <sup>b</sup>	0/1	1/0			0/all	0/all	0/1		0/1		0/all			0/all	0/all	3/1		0/all		y
11Q27 11QUnid C																0/1		0/1		y?
Mas 1k ShirShabb					2/0									1/0	0/all	0/1				y?
Mas 1n MasUnid. Qumran-Type Frg	0/1																			y?

**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 take the scribal peculiarities of these texts into consideration as well.

<sup>42</sup> See especially XQText B identified as part of the same manuscript by H. Eshel, 'Three New Fragments from Cave 11,' *Tarbiz* 68 (1999) 273-278 (Hebr.).