The Qumran Scrolls of the Book of Judges: Literary Formation, Textual Criticism, and Historical Linguistics

ROBERT REZETKO

THE QUMRAN SCROLLS
OF THE BOOK OF JUDGES:
LITERARY FORMATION, TEXTUAL
CRITICISM, AND HISTORICAL
LINGUISTICS[1]

ROBERT REZETKO

RADBOUD UNIVERSITY NIJMEGEN
& UNIVERSITY OF SYDNEY

1. INTRODUCTION

In this article I discuss several fragmentary scrolls of the book of Judges found in the caves near Qumran (1QJudg, 4QJudg^a, 4QJudg^b) in order to illustrate some of the difficulties which language scholars face when seeking to identify and explain specific linguistic changes in Biblical Hebrew (BH) or trying to formulate and write a general history of the language. The main focus of the article is a discussion of the language of the plus of Judg 6:7–10 in the Masoretic Text (MT) compared to 4QJudg^a. Other linguistic variants in Judges 6 (4QJudg^a), 9 (1QJudg), and 21 (4QJudg^b), and the frequency of language variation in general, are also evaluated. In-depth treatments of the literary and textual issues of the book of Judges precede the analysis of the linguistic data, since historical linguistic conclusions cannot be reached independent of an evaluation of the literary and textual envelopes in which the language phenomena are embedded. The main conclusion of the article is that the integration of literary criticism, textual analysis, and historical linguistics often gives results which are more persuasive than historical linguistic research which is grounded mainly or only on the MT and which discounts or downplays the literary and textual aspects of the formation of the Hebrew Bible.

---

2. BACKGROUND OF THE PRESENT STUDY

In order to fully appreciate the significance of the following discussion it is necessary to have in mind a basic understanding of the predominant approach in the history of research to the general topic at hand. The standard perspective is articulated most clearly by Hurvitz in his book on the relationship between the language of the Priestly source of the Pentateuch and the language of the book of Ezekiel. He says:

> I *Textual Criticism*
>
> Our study is based upon MT (=Massoretic Text) as we have it today. This procedure is not followed out of an axiomatic belief in the supremacy of MT, nor does it imply that it has reached us in exactly the same form in which it left the hands of the ancient writers. On the contrary, we are aware of the fact that MT is far from perfect, and that it was subject to mistakes and corruptions in the long course of its transmission. This is a frequent phenomenon in all ancient literatures affected by the process of constant copying, and it is but natural that even the extreme holiness and outstanding care which accompanied the Book of Books could not completely prevent textual accidents. However, at the same time it seems to us that a linguistic study whose central purpose is to seek facts and avoid conjectures should base itself on *actual* texts—difficult though they may be—rather than depend on *reconstructed* texts. These latter are indeed free of difficulties and easy to work with; but we can never be absolutely certain that they ever existed in reality. Our adherence to MT is not determined, therefore, by a dogmatic position but, rather, by methodological principles to which this study is subject.
>
> II *Source-Critical Analysis*
>
> As in the case of the above reservation, here too we avoid basing our discussion on reconstructed texts, whose late "shell" has been whittled down in an attempt to arrive at the "original" form....
>
> To sum up: *in the framework of this discussion we seek to deal exclusively with biblical texts in the way in which they have crystallized and in the form in which they now stand—regardless of textual alterations, literary developments and editorial activities which they may or may not have undergone during their long transmission....*[2]

---

[2] A. Hurvitz, *A Linguistic Study of the Relationship Between the Priestly Source and the Book of Ezekiel: A New Approach to an Old Problem* (CahRB, 20; Paris: J. Gabalda, 1982), 19–21 (emphasis original). Hurvitz expressed these thoughts more briefly in earlier publications, for example, in *The Transition Period in Biblical Hebrew: A Study in Post-Exilic Hebrew and Its Impilcations* [*sic*]

I could be accused of singling out Hurvitz for criticism if it were not for the fact that his words and ideas have been cited and followed in many other articles, dissertations, and books in the field.[3] And while Hurvitz and other historical linguists of BH make allowance for occasional difficulties, errors, and glosses in the MT, and sometimes even argue that sporadic "late" linguistic elements in "early" writings indicate editorial additions, it is accurate to say that historical linguistic research on BH has been based almost exclusively on medieval manuscripts of the Hebrew Bible (MT).[4]

This approach has not gone uncriticized. In previous publications I and others have discussed how the literary complexity and textual fluidity of biblical writings create difficulties for linguistic dating and historical linguistic arguments and theories which are based mainly or exclusively on the MT.[5] And in a forthcoming book[6] Young and I thoroughly discuss the theoretical

---

for the Dating of Psalms (Hebrew; Jerusalem: Bialik, 1972), 67. Subsequent publications by Hurvitz repeat the same ideas.

[3] The following large-scale contributions are several of many possible examples: R. L. Bergey, "The Book of Esther: Its Place in the Linguistic Milieu of Post-Exilic Biblical Hebrew Prose: A Study in Late Biblical Hebrew" (Ph.D. dissertation, Dropsie College for Hebrew and Cognate Learning, 1983), 21; G. A. Rendsburg, *Linguistic Evidence for the Northern Origin of Selected Psalms* (SBLMS, 43; Atlanta: Scholars, 1990), 16–17; M. F. Rooker, *Biblical Hebrew in Transition: The Language of the Book of Ezekiel* (JSOTSup, 90; Sheffield: JSOT, 1990), 57; R. M. Wright, *Linguistic Evidence for the Pre-exilic Date of the Yahwistic Source* (LHBOTS, 419; London: T&T Clark International, 2005), 13–15.

[4] Rooker's words are unequivocal: "Another premise adopted by modern researchers in diachronic study is the accepted postulate that the Massoretic Text be accepted *in toto* in this kind of linguistic analysis" (Rooker, *Biblical Hebrew in Transition*, 57; he cites Hurvitz, *Transition Period in Biblical Hebrew*, 67).

[5] See especially I. Young, R. Rezetko, and M. Ehrensvärd, *Linguistic Dating of Biblical Texts, Volume 1: An Introduction to Approaches and Problems, Volume 2: A Survey of Scholarship, a New Synthesis and a Comprehensive Bibliography* (BibleWorld; London: Equinox, 2008; *LDBT*), I, 341–360 (cf. many other publications cited in that chapter, and also I, 16–18, 60–64). Other recent publications on the topic by me or Young are listed in a forthcoming book (see n. 6). The significance of the text-critical issues is recognized in the recent monograph by D.-H. Kim, *Early Biblical Hebrew, Late Biblical Hebrew, and Linguistic Variability: A Sociolinguistic Evaluation of the Linguistic Dating of Biblical Texts* (VTSup, 156; Leiden: Brill, 2013), which argues from a sociolinguistic variationist approach that linguistic change and diffusion in Biblical Hebrew are detectable but that linguistic dating is impossible. He admits: "This conclusion of ours, of course, is based on the discussion that has chosen not to consider text-critical issues [i.e. the study is based on the MT only]. Considering them, no doubt, would work further against the validity of linguistic dating" (Kim, *Early Biblical Hebrew*, 157 n. 6). I briefly discuss later (section 5) several recent responses to our arguments in the publications cited above.

[6] R. Rezetko and I. Young, *Historical Linguistics and Biblical Hebrew: Steps*

issues from the angle of general historical linguistic methodology[7] and we illustrate the substantial degree of linguistic fluidity in manuscripts of biblical writings through a comprehensive study of linguistic variants between MT Samuel and the four Qumran scrolls of Samuel. Within this framework, therefore, I suggest that this article is best understood as an *affirmation* of our argument in our previous publications—that it is essential to integrate linguistic, textual, and literary data and approaches in diachronic research on BH—and as a modest *illustration* of what such integration might mean for the linguistic dating of biblical writings and the historical linguistics of BH.

Toward an Integrated Approach (expected publication data: SBLANEM/ MACO; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, in preparation; *HLBH*).

[7] In this context, the following quote, which should be contrasted with the words of Hurvitz cited above, makes the point well enough:

> The hypotheses of the historical linguist depend crucially on the interpretation of the data. It is not just a matter of the amount of data available but primarily of their quality. To evaluate the quality of old texts, we have to find out as much as possible about their extralinguistic context (such as the author, scribe, purpose, and location of a text, etc.), *and about the textual tradition, including the original form and date of composition and copying.* This is the task of the philologist, for whom auxiliary disciplines such as history and paleography, the study of ancient writing, are of major importance.
>
> Only very few old texts are in the author's own hand, and even these may show various kinds of textual errors. Mostly they are the result of multiple copying by different scribes in different regions and over a long period of time. Some texts are compilations by a specific author from linguistically divergent, possibly orally transmitted original sources, as with Homer's *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, or the *Rigveda*, the oldest collection of religious texts written in Sanskrit. *Such textual history may result in linguistically composite texts with a mixed language, full of scribal errors due to negligence or insufficient competence in the language(s) or varieties of the original. These different linguistic layers, whether dialectal or diachronic, must be disentangled and scribal errors detected before the text can be used as data for forming hypotheses about specific stages of a language....* (H. Schendl, *Historical Linguistics* [Oxford Introductions to Language Study; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001], 14–15 [emphasis added]).

In other words, historical linguists of BH go against the grain of general historical linguistic methodology when for motives of objectivity, pragmatism, dogmatism, or other reasons, they base their research and conclusions chiefly or exclusively on the final MT form of the Bible without considering other facets of diachronic change—literary, textual, etc.—in biblical writings. These various sorts of diachrony are inextricably linked.

3. LITERARY AND TEXTUAL ISSUES OF THE BOOK OF JUDGES

3.1. LITERARY CRITICISM OF THE BOOK OF JUDGES

The book of Judges has been a playground of sorts for scholars whose approaches focus on the editorial shaping of biblical writings and also in more recent decades for scholars whose methods center on holistic or final-form readings of biblical books. The different kinds of viewpoints and arguments of those who analyze the book from mainly a diachronic or synchronic standpoint are illustrated later in the discussion of the plus of 6:7–10 in the MT compared to 4QJudg[a] (section 3.3). It is unnecessary to give here a review of the history of scholarship on the book of Judges since a number of in-depth surveys have been published elsewhere.[8] Despite commentaries and monographs which read the MT book of Judges as an authorial or compositional unity,[9] the

---

[8] In addition to introductions and commentaries see, for reviews of scholarship until the early 1990s, R. Bartelmus, "Forschung am Richterbuch seit Martin Noth," *TRu* 56 (1991), 221–259; R. G. Boling, "Judges, Book of," in D. N. Freedman (ed.), *Anchor Bible Dictionary* (6 vols; New York: Doubleday, 1992), III, 1107–1117; M. A. O'Brien, "Judges and the Deuteronomistic History," in S. L. McKenzie and M. P. Graham (eds.), *The History of Israel's Traditions: The Heritage of Martin Noth* (JSOTSup, 182; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 235–259; R. H. O'Connell, *The Rhetoric of the Book of Judges* (VTSup, 63; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1996), 345–368; for surveys of scholarship until the early 2000s see T. K. Beal and D. M. Gunn, "Judges, Book of," in J. H. Hayes (ed.), *Dictionary of Biblical Interpretation* (2 vols; Nashville: Abingdon, 1999), I, 637–647; K. M. Craig, Jr., "Judges in Recent Research," *CBR* 1 (2003), 159–185; K. Spronk, "Het Boek Rechters: Een Overzicht van het Recente Onderzoek," *ACEBT* 19 (2001), 1–36; for reviews of scholarship until the present day see T. C. Butler, *Judges* (WBC, 8; Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2009), xliii-li, 491–495; V. H. Matthews, "Judges, Book of," in K. D. Sakenfeld (ed.), *The New Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible* (5 vols; Nashville: Abingdon, 2008), III, 446–457; G. Mobley, "Judges," in M. D. Coogan (ed.), *The Oxford Encyclopedia of the Books of the Bible* (2 vols; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), I, 516–531; "Book of Judges," *Oxford Bibliographies Online: Biblical Studies*

(http://www.oxfordbibliographies.com/view/document/obo-9780195393361/obo-9780195393361-0115.xml); L. G. Stone, "Judges, Book of," in B. T. Arnold and H. G. M. Williamson (eds.), *Dictionary of the Old Testament: Historical Books* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2005), 592–606 (594–597); B. G. Webb, *The Book of Judges* (NICOT; Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans, 2012), 20–32, 35–53; G. T. K. Wong, *Compositional Strategy of the Book of Judges: An Inductive, Rhetorical Study* (VTSup, 111; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 1–26.

[9] I share Knoppers' general assessment of approaches which read the MT books of Deuteronomy–Kings exclusively as authorial wholes: "To this literary evidence can be added textual evidence. The differences between the Masoretic Text, the Septuagint, the Old Latin, and the Dead Sea Scrolls (where available) in Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings are substantial and should not be ignored....The differences between these

review of the literature substantiates that a considerable majority of biblical scholars understand the book to have been formed through a complex editorial process over an extensive span of time, beginning in the preexilic period, and lasting at least into the exilic period and probably into the postexilic period and possibly even as late as the Hasmonean era.

In the framework of the so-called Deuteronomistic History, the book consists of pre-Deuteronomistic sources, Deuteronomistic editing, and post-Deuteronomistic additions,[10] or in Niditch's conceptualization, the epic-bardic voice, the voice of the theologian, and the voice of the humanist.[11] It is generally held that chapters 3–16 contain the oldest materials in the book, which originally were stories of Israelite deliverers from the northern kingdom (with the exception of the programmatic story of Othniel in 3:7–11, the only southern deliverer in the book), whereas the prologue (chapters 1–2) and "appendices" (chapters 17–21) are widely thought to be the youngest parts of the book.[12] However,

various textual witnesses suggest a certain instability and history of development within the text before the Common Era. In short, ignoring or defying evidence for diachronic development in the Deuteronomistic History can lead to superficial or forced arguments for synchronic unity" (G. N. Knoppers, "Is There a Future for the Deuteronomistic History?," in T. C. Römer [ed.], *The Future of the Deuteronomistic History* [BETL, 147; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2000], 119–134 [125–126]). I have attempted to negotiate the diachronic-synchronic "divide" by way of a "textual-exegetical" approach in R. Rezetko, *Source and Revision in the Narratives of David's Transfer of the Ark: Text, Language and Story in 2 Samuel 6 and 1 Chronicles 13, 15–16* (LHBOTS, 470; London: T&T Clark International, 2007); see especially 43–85 on the theoretical and empirical framework and the methodology.

[10] For example, in Noth's original formulation, most of Judges 3–12 was from two pre-Deuteronomistic complexes of traditions, stories of the tribal heroes and a list of the lesser judges (2:17; 3:15b–30a, 31; 4:1b, 3b–4a; 5:1–31a; 6:2–6a; 6:11–8:27a; 8:29; 9:1–10:5; 10:17–12:15); the exilic Deuteronomist contributed various parts of 2:6–13:1 (2:6–11, 14–16, 18–19; 3.7–15a, 30b; 4.1a, 2–3a, 4b; 5.31b; 6.1, 6b–10; 8.27b–28, 30–35; 10.6–16; 13.1); and most of the prologue, the story of Samson, and the appendices were post-Deuteronomistic additions (1:1–2:5; 2.12–13; 2:20–3:6; 13.2–21:25). See A. F. Campbell, "Martin Noth and the Deuteronomistic History," in S. L. McKenzie and M. P. Graham (eds.), *The History of Israel's Traditions: The Heritage of Martin Noth* (JSOTSup, 182; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 31–62 (59); cf. O'Brien, "Judges and the Deuteronomistic History," 235–239.

[11] S. Niditch, *Judges: A Commentary* (OTL; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2008), 8–13. Niditch's "voices" largely correspond to Noth's ideas, the major difference being that for Niditch the story of Samson (chapters 13–16) is pre-Deuteronomistic.

[12] Some manuscript evidence supports the literary arguments that the "bookends" of Judges were added when the book became a bridge between the separate books of Genesis–Joshua and Samuel–Kings. See J. Trebolle Barrera, "Samuel / Kings and Chronicles: Book Division and

some scholars also assign relatively later dates to other parts of the book.[13] For example, Noth argued that the story of Samson (13:2–16:31) was a post-Deuteronomistic insertion,[14] and Auld argued that the story of Gideon (chapters 6–8) was added after the addition of the appendices.[15] I return later to the literary analysis of the story of Gideon (section 3.3).

3.2. TEXTUAL WITNESSES OF THE BOOK OF JUDGES

Fernández Marcos gives in his recently published *BHQ* edition a concise summary of the textual witnesses of the book of Judges.[16]

Text Composition," in P. W. Flint, E. Tov, and J. C. VanderKam (eds.), *Studies in the Hebrew Bible, Qumran, and the Septuagint Presented to Eugene Ulrich* (VTSup, 101; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 96–108 (97–100; discussion of the book of Judges in the section "Divisions between the Books: Multiple Endings and Beginnings"). See the briefer discussions of the beginning of the book of Judges in E. Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (3rd edn; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2012), 297–298; D. M. Carr, *The Formation of the Hebrew Bible: A New Reconstruction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 282–285; cf. 171–172, 244–245, 290–291, 345–346. In the next section I discuss the textual history of the book of Judges (section 3.2).

[13] In addition to the following two examples, others are discussed in K. Spronk, "The Book of Judges as a Late Construct," in L. Jonker (ed.), *Historiography and Identity: (Re)Formulation in Second Temple Historiographical Literature* (LHBOTS, 534; London: T&T Clark International, 2010), 15–28; *LDBT*, II, 25–27.

[14] M. Noth, *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien. I. Die sammelnden und bearbeitenden Geschichtswerke im Alten Testament* (Schriften der Königsberger Gelehrten Gesellschaft, 18; Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1943), 61. O'Brien shares Noth's view that the story of Samson was added by later editors but in his opinion the story had a preexilic origin (M. A. O'Brien, *The Deuteronomistic History Hypothesis: A Reassessment* [OBO, 92; Freiburg: Universitätsverlag; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989], 287). Finally, Margalith, Nauerth, and Yadin argue that the story of Samson has its setting in a Greek cultural context. See O. Margalith, "Samson's Foxes," *VT* 35 (1985), 224–229; "Samson's Riddle and Samson's Magic Locks," *VT* 36 (1986), 225–234; "More Samson Legends," *VT* 36 (1986), 397–405; "The Legends of Samson/Heracles," *VT* 37 (1987), 63–70; C. Nauerth, "Simsons Taten: Motivgeschichtliche Überlegungen," *DBAT* 21 (1985), 94–120; A. Yadin, "Samson's Ḥîdâ," *VT* 52 (2002), 407–426.

[15] A. G. Auld, "Gideon: Hacking at the Heart of the Old Testament," *VT* 39 (1989), 257–267.

[16] N. Fernández Marcos, *Judges* (Biblia Hebraica Quinta, 7; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2011), 5*–15* (introduction), 123*–141* (bibliography). See also his "The Hebrew and Greek Texts of Judges," in A. Schenker and M. K. H. Peters (eds.), *The Earliest Text of the Hebrew Bible: The Relationship between the Masoretic Text and the Hebrew Base of the Septuagint Reconsidered* (SBLSCS, 52; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003), 1–16; "L'histoire textuelle: les livres historiques (Juges)," in A. Schenker and Ph. Hugo (eds.), *L'enfance de la Bible hébraïque: histoire du texte de l'Ancien Testament à la lumière des recherches récentes* (Le monde de la Bible, 54; Geneva: Labor et Fides, 2005), 148–169; "The Genuine Text of Judges," in Y. A.

He discusses the Hebrew, Greek, Latin, Syriac, and Aramaic texts, and he cites most of the important editions and studies of each one. His overall assessment is that the Hebrew text underlying these versions is closely related to the MT, that is, all the non-MT witnesses of the book of Judges are typologically similar to the MT.[17] I summarize here his views on only the Septuagint and Qumran scrolls, since because of space I cannot interact with the other versions to any substantive degree in this article.

Fernández says the textual history of the Greek book of Judges is extremely complicated, but it can be traced back to a single translation. There are four principal textual groups: G^B (includes manuscript B); G^L (the Antiochene or Lucianic recension); G^M (includes manuscripts M and N); and G^O (includes manuscript A; the Origenian or Hexaplaric recension). He says:

> In Judges it is very difficult to restore the Old Greek. The text history has been exposed to a strong influence of the Origenian or Hexaplaric recension. It can be said that no group of manuscripts is free from this influence....All scholars agree in emphasizing the importance of the group G^L and in particular of the subgroup G^{L1} [K Z 54 59 75 (82) 314] for the restoration of the Old Greek of Judges. The agreements between the Antiochene or Lucianic text and La [Old Latin] take us back to the Old Greek before it was contaminated by Hexaplaric readings. Moreover, in some places La may preserve the Old Greek better than any Greek manuscript.[18]

Following a synopsis of the other three textual groups (G^B, G^O, and G^M) he states the main outcome of his study of the Greek witnesses of the book of Judges: "Only in a few cases...can it be argued that the reading of the *Vorlage* of G was superior to that of M, except in the special case of Judges 5, and the omissions by homoioteleuton in M of 16:13–14 and 19:30."[19]

Fernández summarizes the Qumran fragments of the book of Judges in this way: XJudges "is identical to the Masoretic text, including its orthography"; "1QJudg usually follows M"; "[t]he preserved fragments of 4QJudg^b are very close to M"; and regarding 4QJudg^a, he states that the minus of 6:7–10 compared to the MT could be seen as an earlier literary form of the book, but that the verses could also have been inadvertently lost or intentionally omitted; the other variants can also be explained as omissions; and "the scarcity of the fragments precludes from

---

P. Goldman, A. van der Kooij, and R. D. Weis (eds.), *Sôfer Mahîr: Essays in Honour of Adrian Schenker Offered by Editors of Biblia Hebraica Quinta* (VTSup, 110; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 33–45.

[17] Fernández Marcos, "Hebrew and Greek Texts of Judges," 9, 15–16; "Genuine Text of Judges," 40–41, 43.

[18] Fernández Marcos, *Judges*, 7*–8*.

[19] Fernández Marcos, *Judges*, 8*.

drawing any conclusion on the type of text present in 4QJudg[a]."[20] In summary: "The fragments of Qumran are scarce. Most of them prove to be secondary in relation to M."[21]

XJudges is unimportant for this article since it is identical to the MT with the exception of one orthographic variant.[22] However, the other three Qumran scrolls of Judges are relevant for two reasons: (1) the language of the plus of 6:7–10 in the MT; (2) the linguistic variants between the MT and the Qumran scrolls.[23]

1QJudg (1Q6; first century CE) was published by Barthélemy in *DJD* I.[24] The scroll preserves parts of Judges 6, 8(?), and 9. In Tov's judgment the "text is too short for analysis."[25] Trebolle Barrera remarks that the text "presents two unique readings and agrees three times with the Septuagint against the Masoretic Text, in two of them with support of the Vulgate."[26]

4QJudg[a] (4Q49; c. 50–25 BCE) and 4QJudg[b] (4Q50; c. 30–1 BCE) were published by Trebolle in *DJD* XIV.[27] 4QJudg[a] preserves parts of Judges 6. According to Tov the text is "manifestly non-aligned, and actually independent" and "may reflect a different literary edition."[28] Trebolle says:

---

[20] Fernández Marcos, *Judges*, 6*.

[21] Fernández Marcos, *Judges*, 5*.

[22] See Fernández Marcos, *Judges*, 5*–6*, for the relevant bibliography and a brief discussion. My exclusion of XJudges from the following discussion does not mean to suggest that the scroll is unimportant. At the very least it is an early proto-MT manuscript of the book of Judges which does not have any linguistic or other non-orthographic variants from the MT.

[23] Later I discuss specific linguistic aspects of the scrolls (section 4).

[24] D. Barthélemy, "Juges," in D. Barthélemy and J. T. Milik (eds.), *Qumran Cave 1* (DJD, 1; Oxford: Clarendon, 1955), 62–64 + Plate XI.

[25] E. Tov, "The Significance of the Texts from the Judean Desert for the History of the Text of the Hebrew Bible: A New Synthesis," in F. H. Cryer and T. L. Thompson (eds.), *Qumran Between the Old and New Testaments* (JSOTSup, 290; Copenhagen International Seminar, 6; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 277–309 (305).

[26] J. Trebolle Barrera, "Judges, Book of," in L. H. Schiffman and J. C. VanderKam (eds.), *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (2 vols; New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), I, 455.

[27] J. Trebolle Barrera, "4QJudg[a]" and "4QJudg[b]," in E. C. Ulrich et al. (eds.), *Qumran Cave 4: IX: Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Kings* (DJD, 14; Oxford: Clarendon, 1995), 161–164 + Plate XXXVI (4QJudg[a]), 165–169 + Plate XXXVI (4QJudg[b]). Preliminary publications of the scrolls were made in his "Textual Variants in *4QJudg[a]* and the Textual and Editorial History of the Book of Judges," *RevQ* 14 (1989), 229–245 = "La aportación de 4QJueces[a] al estudio de la historia textual y literaria del libro de los Jueces," *MEAH* 40 (1991), 5–20; "Édition préliminaire de *4QJuges[b]*: contribution des manuscrits qumrâniens des Juges à l'étude textuelle et littéraire du livre," *RevQ* 15 (1991), 79–100.

[28] E. Tov, "The Biblical Texts from the Judaean Desert – An Overview and Analysis of the Published Texts," in E. D. Herbert and E. Tov (eds.), *The Bible as Book: The Hebrew Bible and the Judaean Desert*

> This manuscript offers new data for a better understanding of the textual history and the literary development of *Judges*. It represents a form of the text independent from any other known text type. In six instances of a total of ten variant readings, the manuscript goes its own way, disagreeing with the Masoretic Text and the Greek tradition....It is the only extant witness that does not include Judges 6.7–10, although two Hebrew medieval manuscripts and the Septuagint[B] text also omit verse 7a.[29]

And: "4QJudg[a] can confidently be seen as an earlier literary form of the book than our traditional texts."[30]

4QJudg[b] preserves parts of Judges 19 and 21. Tov notes that the textual character of the scroll is "MT."[31] Trebolle concurs: "The preserved readings of 4QJudg[b] are very close to 𝔐. The reconstruction of its lines shows, however, that 4QJudg[b] possibly knew a variant shorter text or presented a text arrangement different from that of 𝔐."[32] Furthermore, as discussed below, there are some significant linguistic variants between the MT and 4QJudg[b] (section 4.3.3).

There is an obvious difference of opinion between Fernández and Trebolle regarding the character and significance of 4QJudg[a] and 4QJudg[b], especially over the plus of 6:7–10 in the MT compared to 4QJudg[a]. The decisive factor separating between their evaluations is the attention given to literary criticism in the evaluation of the shorter and longer texts.

3.3. EVALUATION OF THE MINUS OF JUDGES 6:7–10 IN 4QJUDG[A]

Biblical scholars have long recognized the story of Gideon in Judges 6–8, like the larger whole in which it is embedded,[33] as a composite story which gradually evolved into its current form.[34]

Discoveries (London: The British Library; New Castle, DE: Oak Knoll, 2002), 139–166 (156); reprinted in his *Hebrew Bible, Greek Bible, and Qumran: Collected Essays* (TSAJ, 121; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 128–154 (149, 152); cf. "Significance of the Texts," 298, 305, 307; E. Tigchelaar, "The Dead Sea Scrolls," in J. J. Collins and D. C. Harlow (eds.), *The Eerdmans Dictionary of Early Judaism* (Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans, 2010), 163–180 (167).

[29] Trebolle Barrera, "Judges, Book of," 455.

[30] Trebolle Barrera, "4QJudg[a]," 162.

[31] Tov, "Biblical Texts from the Judaean Desert" (2002), 158; "Significance of the Texts," 305.

[32] Trebolle Barrera, "4QJudg[b]," 167.

[33] See section 3.1 and the bibliography cited in n. 8.

[34] For example (one of many potential quotes; cf. all the standard critical commentaries): "Judg. 6–9, the story of Gideon's deliverance of Israel from Midian, with the appendix on Abimelech, is the result of a

From the perspective of the so-called Deuteronomistic History, the literary complex is argued to include pre-Deuteronomistic, Deuteronomistic, and post-Deuteronomistic elements. In particular, chapter 6, verses 7–10,[35] were considered an editorial addition to the story, *on the basis of literary-critical arguments only*, long before the discovery of Qumran cave 4 (1952) and the first major published discussion of the minus in 4QJudg[a] by Boling.[36] It seems that Wellhausen was among the first to publish this view.[37] Most scholars prior to Noth attributed the verses to an Elohistic hand or school. [38] Noth himself assigned the insertion to the

---

complex literary history which has brought together into a very uneasy relationship a wide variety of clearly quite independent materials. Some of these represent traditions of varying age and origin, others are compositions intended to unite those traditions....The Gideon tradition in Judg. 6–8 is in itself complex" (A. D. H. Mayes, *Judges* [OTG; Sheffield: JSOT, 1985], 24–25).

[35] Judg 6:1–13 (NRSV): "1 The Israelites did what was evil in the sight of the LORD, and the LORD gave them into the hand of Midian seven years. 2 The hand of Midian prevailed over Israel; and because of Midian the Israelites provided for themselves hiding places in the mountains, caves and strongholds. 3 For whenever the Israelites put in seed, the Midianites and the Amalekites and the people of the east would come up against them. 4 They would encamp against them and destroy the produce of the land, as far as the neighborhood of Gaza, and leave no sustenance in Israel, and no sheep or ox or donkey. 5 For they and their livestock would come up, and they would even bring their tents, as thick as locusts; neither they nor their camels could be counted; so they wasted the land as they came in. 6 Thus Israel was greatly impoverished because of Midian; and the Israelites cried out to the LORD for help. *7 When the Israelites cried to the LORD on account of the Midianites, 8 the LORD sent a prophet to the Israelites; and he said to them, 'Thus says the LORD, the God of Israel: "I led you up from Egypt, and brought you out of the house of slavery; 9 and I delivered you from the hand of the Egyptians, and from the hand of all who oppressed you, and drove them out before you, and gave you their land; 10 and I said to you, 'I am the LORD your God; you shall not pay reverence to the gods of the Amorites, in whose land you live.' But you have not given heed to my voice."'* 11 Now the angel of the LORD came and sat under the oak at Ophrah, which belonged to Joash the Abiezrite, as his son Gideon was beating out wheat in the wine press, to hide it from the Midianites. 12 The angel of the LORD appeared to him and said to him, 'The LORD is with you, you mighty warrior.' 13 Gideon answered him, 'But sir, if the LORD is with us, why then has all this happened to us? And where are all his wonderful deeds that our ancestors recounted to us, saying, "Did not the LORD bring us up from Egypt?" But now the LORD has cast us off, and given us into the hand of Midian.'"

[36] R. G. Boling, *Judges: Introduction, Translation, and Commentary* (AB, 6A; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1975), 39–40, 125.

[37] J. Wellhausen, *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels* (2nd edn; Berlin: G. Reimer, 1883), 244: "...der anonyme Prophet, der in dem Einsätze der letzten Bearbeitung 6,7–10..." I have not seen the first 1878 edition of this book which apparently has the same remark.

[38] E. Bertheau, *Das Buch der Richter und Ruth* (2nd edn; KEHAT, 6;

Deuteronomist.[39] And many have followed suit, usually *without* reference to the minus in 4QJudg^a.[40] Below I discuss the literary

---

Leipzig: S. Herzel, 1883), 133; K. Budde, *Die Bücher Richter und Samuel: Ihre Quellen und ihr Aufbau* (Giessen: J. Ricker, 1890), 107–108, 122; *Das Buch der Richter* (KHAT, 7; Freiburg: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1897), 52–53; C. F. Burney, *The Book of Judges* (London: Rivingtons, 1918), 176–177; G. A. Cooke, *The Book of Judges* (Cambridge Bible; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1913), 69, 72; S. R. Driver, *An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1891), 158; O. Eissfeldt, *Die Quellen des Richterbuches* (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1925), 36; M. J. Lagrange, *Le livre de Juges* (EBib; Victor Lecoffre, 1903), 119–120; G. F. Moore, *Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Judges* (ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1895), 181; *The Book of Judges: A New English Translation Printed in Colors Exhibiting the Composite Structure of the Book* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1898), 67 ("It is ascribed in the text to E, or rather to the secondary stratum of E [E²]; it may, perhaps, equally well be attributed to a post-Deuteronomistic editor [D²]."); cf. A. B. Ehrlich, *Randglossen zur Hebräischen Bibel: Textkritisches, Sprachliches und Sachliches. Dritter Band: Josua, Richter, I. u. II. Samuelis* (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1910), 90 ("Das ganze Stück von hier [v. 7] an bis Ende V. 10, das der Sprache nach von dem Vorherg. und dem Folgenden sich stark abhebt, fliesst aus einer andern Quelle."). Many other early critical scholars recognized that the verses were an editorial addition, e.g. C. H. Cornill, R. Kittel, A. Kuenen, B. Stade.

[39] Noth, *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien*, 51. See n. 10 for Noth's breakdown of the layers of the story of Gideon.

[40] U. Becker, *Richterzeit und Königtum: Redaktionsgeschichtliche Studien zum Richterbuch* (BZAW, 192; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1990), 144–145 (DtrN, perhaps post-Dtr); Boling, *Judges*, 30, 36, *passim* (Dtr¹); A. F. Campbell and M. A. O'Brien, *Unfolding the Deuteronomistic History: Origins, Upgrades, Present Text* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2000), 183 (post-Dtr); W. Dietrich, *Prophetie und Geschichte: Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zum deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerk* (FRLANT, 108; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972), 133 (DtrN); J. Gray, *Joshua, Judges and Ruth* (NCB; Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans, 1986), 206, 283–284 (Dtr); W. Gross, *Richter* (HTKAT; Freiburg: Herder, 2009), 369–370, 389, 396 (post-Dtr); J. D. Martin, *The Book of Judges* (CBC; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975), 81 (Dtr); A. D. H. Mayes, *The Story of Israel between Settlement and Exile: A Redactional Study of the Deuteronomistic History* (London: SCM, 1983), 163 n. 31, 164 n. 41 (DtrG); J. M. Myers, "The Book of Judges: Introduction and Exegesis," in G. A. Buttrick et al. (eds.), *The Interpreter's Bible* (12 vols; Nashville: Abingdon, 1953), II, 675–826 (730) (Dtr); R. D. Nelson, *The Double Redaction of the Deuteronomistic History* (JSOTSup, 18; Sheffield: JSOT, 1981), 43, 47–53 (Dtr²); Niditch, *Judges*, 90 (Dtr); O'Brien, *Deuteronomistic History Hypothesis*, 88 n. 21, 91 n. 34, 93, 282 (DtrN); W. Richter, *Die Bearbeitungen des "Retterbuches" in der Deuteronomischen Epoche* (BBB, 21; Bonn: P. Hanstein, 1964), 97–109 (DtrN); R. Smend, *Die Entstehung des Alten Testaments* (Theologische Wissenschaft, 1; Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1989), 116 (DtrN); J. A. Soggin, *Judges: A Commentary* (OTL; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1981), 112 (Dtr); T. Veijola, *Das Königtum in der Beurteilung der deuteronomistischen Historiographie: eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung* (ASSF, series B, 198; Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1977), 43–48

reasons given for considering 6:7–10 an insertion between vv. 6 and 11. In short, above and beyond the minus in 4QJudgᵃ, there is nearly universal agreement among literary critics that 6:7–10 is a secondary insertion in the introduction of the story of Gideon. Therefore the questions become: when were the verses written and when were they inserted in the book of Judges?

Naturally we expect that the dissenters to the redactional-insertional view of 6:7–10 would generally be synchronic-oriented scholars who interpret the book in its final MT form. Indeed this is the case for some interpreters who give no hint at all that these verses might not be "original" to the story.[41] Yet surprisingly just as many scholars of this persuasion argue that the verses are a well-integrated editorial addition which advances the argument of the book.[42] Only several scholars contend that the verses are not an insertion into pre-existing source material.[43]

(DtrN).

[41] W. Bluedorn, *Yahweh versus Baalism: A Theological Reading of the Gideon-Abimelech Narrative* (JSOTSup, 329; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), 61–70; E. J. Hamlin, *At Risk in the Promised Land: A Commentary on the Book of Judges* (ITC; Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans, 1990), 92; L. R. Klein, *The Triumph of Irony in the Book of Judges* (JSOTSup, 68; Sheffield: Almond, 1989), 49–52; R. Polzin, *Moses and the Deuteronomist: A Literary Study of the Deuteronomic History. Part One: Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges* (Indiana Studies in Biblical Literature; Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1980), 168–176; R. Ryan, *Judges* (Readings: A New Biblical Commentary; Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2007), 46–48; J. T. Tanner, "Textual Patterning in Biblical Hebrew Narrative: A Case Study in Judges 6–8" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Texas at Austin, 1990), 148–149, 165–167, 192–194; B. G. Webb, *The Book of the Judges: An Integrated Reading* (JSOTSup, 46; Sheffield: JSOT, 1987), 144–145; but cf. 213 n. 5; K. L. Younger, Jr., *Judges/Ruth* (The NIV Application Commentary; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2002), 169–171.

[42] Here I would include the following scholars, who usually refer to a redactor, compiler, Deuteronomist, Deuteronomistic Historian, etc.: Y. Amit, *Book of Judges: The Art of Editing* (Biblical Interpretation, 38; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1999), 249–251; D. I. Block, *Judges, Ruth* (NAC, 6; Nashville: Broadman and Holman, 1999), 253–256 (cf. his "Will the Real Gideon Please Stand Up? Narrative Style and Intention in Judges 6–9," *JETS* 40 [1997], 353–366: "Judges 6:7–10 in particular appears to be secondary" [354 n. 3; cf. 355 n. 13]); Butler, *Judges*, 185; J. L. McCann, *Judges* (Interpretation; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2002), 62–63; cf. 8–12; O'Connell, *Rhetoric of the Book of Judges*, 40–43, 147–150; T. J. Schneider, *Judges* (Berit Olam; Collegeville, MN: Liturgical, 2000), 101–102; Webb, *Book of Judges*, 223–226. Martin is aware of the issues but says: "My purpose here is not to employ the intrusive nature of Judges 6:7–10 as an argument either for or against the compositional unity of the Gideon cycle; but rather my goal is to explore the literary theological dimensions of the text in its present form" (L. R. Martin, "The Intrusive Prophet: The Narrative Function of the Nameless Prophet in Judges 6," *Journal for Semitics* 16 [2007]: 113–140 [115]).

[43] This minority view seems to be held by Assis and Wong. E. Assis,

Such final-form readings have been largely successful at making good sense of 6:7–10 in its present location. There are at least seven arguments in support of the authorial or editorial originality of the verses.[44]

(1) *Connection*: 6:7–10 is closely connected to 6:1–6 through causality, sequentiality, and content, and to 6:11–13 especially because the prophet's words in 6:8–10 contextualize and counteract Gideon's words in 6:13.

(2) *Chiasm*: 6:1–6 and 6:7–10 form a chiasm or palistrophe of sorts that has its axis between 6:6 and 6:7 and infidelity to Yahweh at its limits (6:1, 10).

(3) *Concentricity*: There is a concentric or symmetric structure in the story of Gideon in Judges 6–8, including between the prologue (6:1–10) and epilogue (8:22–32), more specifically between 6:7–10 and 8:22–27, and especially between the idolatry in 6:10 and 8:24–27. These passages and others (see point 6, below) emphasize the theme of unfaithfulness to Yahweh.

(4) *Cycles*: There are seven cycles of sin, punishment, crying out, salvation, and quiet in the book of Judges, and the crying out in 6:6–7 has an equivalent in the stories of four of the other deliverers: Othniel (3:9), Ehud (3:15), Deborah and Barak (4:3), and Jephthah (10:10, 12, 14).[45]

(5) *Prophet and prophetess*: The unnamed prophet in 6:7–10 and the prophetess Deborah in 4:3–4 appear at precisely the same point in the plot of their respective stories, immediately after the Israelites cry to Yahweh (4:3; 6:7). Furthermore, only these passages in the Bible share the similar phrases "a woman a prophetess" (אִשָּׁה נְבִיאָה; 4:4) and "a man a prophet" (אִישׁ נָבִיא; 6:8). However, the prophetess Deborah and the unnamed prophet function differently in their respective stories. The prophetess functions within the cyclical pattern, fulfilling the role of deliverer, but the prophet interrupts the cyclical pattern, rebuking Israel and then disappearing.

Self-Interest or Communal Interest: An Ideology of Leadership in the Gideon, Abimelech and Jephthah Narratives (Judg 6–12) (VTSup, 106; Leiden: Brill, 2005), 21–26, especially 22 n. 17: "However, I will show subsequently in this work that there is a strong connection between Gideon's complaint to the Angel of God and the prophecy in vv. 7–10. This connection proves that one author is responsible for the two passages vv. 7–10 and 11–13." Wong, *Compositional Strategy of the Book of Judges*, 181–185, especially 182–183 and n. 118: "Thus, until further evidence can be found to clarify the matter, Judg. 6:7–10, which, after all, does seem to have direct literary connection and relevance to its immediate context..., will be treated as an integral part of the text."

[44] See the literature cited in nn. 41–43, especially Martin, "Intrusive Prophet."

[45] See the table in Amit, *Book of Judges*, 45. There is no "crying out" in the stories of Tola (8:33–10:5) and Samson (13:1–16:31).

(6) *Confrontations*: 6:7–10, together with 2:1–5 and 10:10–16, comprise a series of confrontations between Yahweh and Israel. The passages share the language and themes of deliverance from Egypt and other enemies (2:1; 6:8–9; 10:11–12), the gift of the land (2:1–2; 6:9–10), and cultic disloyalty (2:2–3; 6:10; 10:10, 13).[46] The confrontations also represent a gradual breakdown of the standard cycle (see point 4, above), including Israel's progressive deterioration and Yahweh's increasing frustration. Israel's repentance in 2:4–5 and 10:10, 15–16 is contrasted with her non-response in 6:1–10, but whereas at first the messenger of Yahweh confronts Israel (2:1, 4), and then a prophet confronts her (6:8; and *also* the messenger of Yahweh [6:11–12], unlike the prophetess *alone* earlier [4:4]; see point 5, above), finally Yahweh himself confronts the Israelites (10:11).

(7) *Rhetoric*: The "interruption" created by 6:7–10 plays a rhetorically forceful role in the story of Gideon. There are various perspectives on this issue. The verses are a narrative pause or postponement, a plot-delaying complication, a delaying force, a suspense builder, or a breakdown in the cycle. The verses kindle despair and hopelessness in the storyline, stress Israel's sinfulness and ungratefulness, caution against Israel's presumption that crying to Yahweh always gets a favorable response, highlight the undeservedness of Yahweh's intervention, create doubt about Yahweh's willingness to send another deliverer, and so on.

Consequently, on the basis of these observations concerning context, structure, theme, and rhetoric, it is claimed that 6:7–10 was written by the original author of the story of Gideon or, more likely, it was written and so well integrated in the story/book by the early editor of the book that it could not be a later addition.[47]

Synchronic-oriented scholars have reached this literary conclusion about the early origin of 6:7–10 usually without mentioning or discussing the plus of these verses in the MT compared to 4QJudg^a.[48] Instead, three scholars in particular have

---

[46] Note וְלֹא שְׁמַעְתֶּם בְּקוֹלִי in 2:2 and וְלֹא־שְׁמַעְתֶּם בְּקֹלִי in 6:10. The only other similar phrase in the book is וְלֹא שָׁמְעוּ לְקוֹלִי in 2:20.

[47] For example, Amit concludes: "Therefore, these verses should not be seen as a late insertion, nor as an arbitrary combination of sources, but as part of the systematic and tendentious shaping of the editing of the cycle and its incorporation within the book" (Amit, *Book of Judges*, 251). However, as indicated below, Amit has since changed her mind.

[48] The exceptions are Amit, *Book of Judges*, 224 n. 3; Assis, *Self-Interest or Communal Interest*, 22 n. 17 (citing Hess); Block, *Judges, Ruth*, 72, 254; Butler, *Judges*, xli, 185 (citing Fernández and Hess); Martin, "Intrusive Prophet," 114 n. 2 (citing Hess); O'Connell, *Rhetoric of the Book of Judges*, 147 n. 178, 467 n. 56; Webb, *Book of the Judges*, 213 n. 5; *The Book of Judges*, 69, 223; Wong, *Compositional Strategy of the Book of Judges*, 183 n. 118 (citing Hess). Of these, only O'Connell attempts to argue against the originality of the minus in 4QJudg^a, saying that "[i]t is perhaps not surprising that a scribe may have been motivated deliberately to omit 6:7–10" since "[s]uch

taken up the textual phenomena in support of this literary conclusion, namely Hess, Fernández, and Rofé. Because of space I can only summarize their arguments. I refer the reader to their articles for longer presentations of their views.

Hess's often-cited article is short and straightforward.[49] His objective is to counter Trebolle's claims that 4QJudg[a] is a variant literary edition of the book of Judges (see section 3.2) and that the minus of 6:7–10 in the manuscript represents a late pre-Deuteronomistic form of the story of Gideon, that is, the MT plus is an example of late Deuteronomistic editing. Hess argues that it is unlikely that the minus in 4QJudg[a] is related either to inadvertent loss due to haplography or intentional omission for theological reasons.[50] Then, after stating that "[t]he strongest argument in favour of reserving judgment on this is the [small] size of the fragment,"[51] he suggests that "the omission of 4QJudg[a] follows a tendency to insert, omit and change sections or paragraphs of biblical text at what would become the Masoretic *parashoth* divisions of text,"[52] and, "the fragment is part of a larger manuscript that...may have been a collection of biblical texts serving a particular liturgical purpose for the community who read it."[53]

I summarized above Fernández's views on the Qumran fragments of the book of Judges (section 3.2). He has discussed 4QJudg[a] and its minus of 6:7–10 and argued against Trebolle's claims (see the previous paragraph) in several publications.[54] The first of these, "The Hebrew and Greek Texts of Judges," is the most detailed presentation of his views and he refers back to this article in later publications. Fernández's main objective is to demonstrate that there is not "sufficient textual evidence to postulate two editions or different literary strata for the book of Judges."[55] His arguments focus first on 4QJudg[a] and second on the

---

a prophetic condemnation from YHWH is hardly flattering to the scribe's nation" (O'Connell, *Rhetoric of the Book of Judges*, 147 n. 178).

[49] R. S. Hess, "The Dead Sea Scrolls and Higher Criticism of the Hebrew Bible: The Case of 4QJudg[a]," in S. E. Porter and C. A. Evans (eds.), *The Scrolls and the Scriptures: Qumran Fifty Years After* (JSPSup, 26; Roehampton Institute London Papers, 3; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 122–128.

[50] Hess, "Dead Sea Scrolls and Higher Criticism," 123–124.

[51] Hess, "Dead Sea Scrolls and Higher Criticism," 124; cf. 127.

[52] In MT 6:2–13 there are two *parashoth*, after v. 6 and v. 10, corresponding precisely with the minus of 6:7–10 in 4QJudg[a].

[53] Hess, "Dead Sea Scrolls and Higher Criticism," 124; cf. 125–126. Hess also discusses *parashoth* divisions related to other Qumran scrolls of the Former Prophets (4QJosh[a], 4QJosh[b], 4QJudg[b], 4QSam[a], and 4QKgs).

[54] Fernández Marcos, "Hebrew and Greek Texts of Judges," *passim*; "L'histoire textuelle," 163–165; "Genuine Text of Judges," 33, 39, 42; *Judges*, 5*–6*, 65*–66*.

[55] Fernández Marcos, "Hebrew and Greek Texts of Judges," 16 (point 6 in the conclusion).

Greek translation of the book.[56] Because of space I limit my summary to his views on the minus of 4QJudgª. His conclusion is: "Important as the omission by 4QJudgª of verses 6:7–10 is, it is not proven, in my opinion, that it represents an ancient piece of pre-Deuteronomistic redaction. It may also represent a late, secondary abbreviation for liturgical or other purposes."[57] His arguments in support of this conclusion are:

(1) *Unlikelihood of unintentional omission*: "[T]his omission of four verses cannot be explained by accidental haplography due to *homoio-teleuton*. At most, it could be a slip from blank to blank space (present, as it seems, in the Qumran manuscripts in the place of the later Masoretic *parashiyoth*), though four verses seem too much space to be omitted by this mechanical accident."[58]

(2) *Unlikelihood of intentional omission*: "An intentional omission due to ideological purposes cannot be proved, since the same themes of deliverance from Egypt and guidance by God are found both in the omitted verses 7–10 and in verses 11–13 included in this fragment."[59]

(3) *Reference to the textual arguments of Hess*: Fernández cites Hess regarding the need for caution given the small size of the fragment and the possible explanation based on the Masoretic *parashoth* that the fragment could represent a late rearrangement for some particular purpose.[60]

(4) *Relevance of the Septuagint*: Fernández makes two points: (a) 4QJudgª is dated to c. 50–25 BCE, but "the supposed Deuteronomistic insertion was already present when the Septuagint of Judges was translated at the end of the 3rd or the beginning of the 2nd century B.C.E.," and the rest of the extant witnesses also support the MT[61]; (b) The omission of 6:7a in Codex Vaticanus (manuscript B) is due to "haplography by homoioarcton and [*sic*] homoioteleuton of a similar sentence...or intentional abbreviation" and thus is independent of and unrelated to the minus of 6:7–10 in 4QJudgª.[62]

(5) *Reference to the literary arguments of O'Connell, Amit, and Block*: Some recent literary studies on the book of Judges have shown that 6:7–10 is authentic and essential to the story of Gideon and cannot be a late editorial addition.[63]

---

[56] Fernández Marcos, "Hebrew and Greek Texts of Judges," 4–8, 12–13, 15–16 (points 1–3 in the conclusion) (4QJudgª), 8–15, 16 (points 4–5 in the conclusion) (Old Greek, Codex Vaticanus, Antiochene text).

[57] Fernández Marcos, "Hebrew and Greek Texts of Judges," 16.

[58] Fernández Marcos, "Hebrew and Greek Texts of Judges," 4–5.

[59] Fernández Marcos, "Hebrew and Greek Texts of Judges," 5.

[60] Fernández Marcos, "Hebrew and Greek Texts of Judges," 5–6.

[61] Fernández Marcos, "Hebrew and Greek Texts of Judges," 6.

[62] Fernández Marcos, "Hebrew and Greek Texts of Judges," 12–13.

[63] Fernández Marcos, "Hebrew and Greek Texts of Judges," 6 with nn. 22–23 (citing O'Connell, Amit, and Block), 16 n. 49 (citing the quote from Amit given in n. 47, above).

Rofé's view on the minus of 6:7–10 in 4QJudgᵃ is simple and clear-cut: it is just an accidental omission due to parablepsis.[64] In his view Hess's hypothesis is "farfetched" [65] and Trebolle's "peremptory verdict has not been backed up by a minute examination of the style and the contents of the reproach." [66] Therefore, responding to Trebolle, the brunt of Rofé's article is an argument for the novel view that MT 6:7–10 is not post-Deuteronomistic, or even Deuteronomistic, but actually *pre*-Deuteronomistic, and he believes the verses were written in the eighth century BCE. Rofé begins by acknowledging that Trebolle's thesis that 6:7–10 was a late editorial addition to the story of Gideon is certainly possible since Rofé believes there are other late interpolations in the Former Prophets which did not find their way into all textual witnesses: Josh 20:4–6a and 1 Kgs 6:11–13. [67] However, he then suggests that "[t]he dating of the pericope in Judg 6:7–10 will be established...by an exact scrutiny of this text, not by analogy with comparable passages."[68] The remainder of his article is a detailed analysis of the context, style, and contents of these verses.

(1) *Context*: The pericope is incomplete since it lacks "the ensuing divine reaction" or "the people's repentance." Therefore it is a secondary addition to the story of Gideon, but even so it has a clear function: it answers Gideon's question in 6:13, "why has all

---

[64] A. Rofé, "Studying the Biblical Text in the Light of Historico-Literary Criticism: The Reproach of the Prophet in Judg 6:7–10 and 4QJudgᵃ," in A. Lange, E. Tov, and M. Weigold, in association with B. H. Reynolds III (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Context: Integrating the Dead Sea Scrolls in the Study of Ancient Texts, Languages, and Cultures* (2 vols; VTSup, 140; Leiden: Brill, 2011), I, 111–123 (121–122). This article was published previously in Hebrew and Italian: "The Biblical Text in Light of Historico-Literary Criticism: The Reproach of the Prophet-Man in Judg 6:7–10 and 4QJudgᵃ," in Z. Talshir and D. Amara (eds.), *On the Border Line: Textual Meets Literary Criticism: Proceedings of a Conference in Honor of Alexander Rofé on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday* (Hebrew; Beer-Sheva, 18; Beer-Sheva: Ben Gurion University of the Negev Press, 2005), 33–44; "Lo studio del testo biblico alla luce della critica storico-letteraria: la reprimenda dell'uomo-profeta (*'iš nabi'*) in Gdc 6,7–10," *Hen* 27 (2005), 137–148. In an earlier publication he said: "My view is diametrically to the opposite [of Trebolle]; Judges 6:7–10 belongs to an ancient prae-Dtr [*sic*] edition of Judges; it has been left out by parablepsis" (A. Rofé, "Historico-Literary Aspects of the Qumran Biblical Scrolls," in L. H. Schiffman, E. Tov, and J. C. VanderKam [eds.], *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years After Their Discovery: Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20–25, 1997* [Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2000], 30–39 [36 n. 29]).

[65] Rofé, "Studying the Biblical Text," 113 n. 5. Rofé does not mention Fernández, who also favors the hypothesis of Hess.

[66] Rofé, "Studying the Biblical Text," 114.

[67] Rofé, "Studying the Biblical Text," 114–116.

[68] Rofé, "Studying the Biblical Text," 117.

this happened to us?"[69] He outlines the following sequence of changes: "(a) a given text [e.g. 6:1–6 + 11–13]; (b) its secondary amplification [insertion of 6:7–10]; (c) its undergoing a textual mishap that restored the text to its original shape in one of the textual witnesses [4QJudgᵃ]."[70]

(2) *Style*: The language of the pericope is not late; the phraseology is earlier than the idioms used in D, H, and P.[71]

(3) *Contents*: The concepts in the pericope are not late; rather, they match up with concepts in Joshua 24,[72] and, as Rofé argued previously, Joshua 24 + Judg 3:12–16:31 + 1 Samuel 1–12 constitute a coherent, (northern) Israel-oriented, pre-Deuteronomistic historical work which dates to the eighth century BCE.[73]

To summarize: Hess, Fernández, and Rofé agree that the plus of 6:7–10 in the MT compared to 4QJudgᵃ is not a late editorial addition, and therefore 4QJudgᵃ does not represent a pre-Deuteronomistic edition of the story of Gideon. Hess and Fernández agree that either an accidental or deliberate omission of 6:7–10 is unlikely, and they favor the view that the minus may reflect a late rearrangement by a scribe for some particular purpose. Rofé disagrees with Hess and Fernández, considering their hypothesis implausible, and concluding that the minus in 4QJudgᵃ is simply an accidental omission.

Up until now I have tried to relate as thoroughly and accurately as possible the conclusion of mainly synchronic-oriented readings that 6:7–10 is authentic and meaningful in its present location (e.g. Amit, Assis, Bluedorn) and the conclusion of some

---

[69] Rofé, "Studying the Biblical Text," 117.

[70] Rofé, "Studying the Biblical Text," 122. This qualification of Rofé's view, that the accidental omission of 6:7–10 in 4QJudgᵃ inadvertently restored the narrative to an earlier stage of its editorial history, is important to keep in mind in references to him below.

[71] Rofé, "Studying the Biblical Text," 117–118. He briefly discusses three items: העלה concerning the exodus, the definition of the Egyptian bondage as בֵּית עֲבָדִים, and the phrase אֲנִי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם connected to לֹא תִירְאוּ אֶת־אֱלֹהֵי הָאֱמֹרִי.

[72] Rofé, "Studying the Biblical Text," 118–121. He discusses two issues: the representation of the conquest (6:9) is earlier than the descriptions in Deuteronomistic and post-Deuteronomistic writings, and the deity's command against idolatry (v. 10) is depicted as being given while residing in the land (as in Joshua 24) whereas later writers (i.e. D and P) attributed all divine laws to the Mosaic legislation.

[73] A. Rofé, "Ephraimite versus Deuteronomistic History," in D. Garrone and F. Israel (eds.), *Storia e tradizioni di Israel: scritti in onore de J. Alberto Soggin* (Brescia: Paideia, 1991), 221–235; reprinted in G. N. Knoppers and J. G. McConville (eds.), *Reconsidering Israel and Judah: Recent Studies on the Deuteronomistic History* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2000), 462–474. In his view the Ephraimite History is anti-monarchic, quietist, and prophet-oriented, whereas the Deuteronomistic History is pro-monarchic, activist, and torah-oriented.

text-critical studies that 4QJudgᵃ does not reflect an earlier edition of 6:2–13 (the extant fragmentary verses of the manuscript) than does the MT (e.g. Fernández, Hess, Rofé). What are the counterarguments? What evidence supports the majority redactional-insertional view that 6:7–10 is secondary (e.g. Wellhausen, and many others as described above) and the text-critical view that the MT is an expanded edition of the pericope when compared to 4QJudgᵃ (e.g. Trebolle, and many others as described below), and that these considerations together show that the MT plus is a late editorial insertion?

In contrast with the view of Fernández, Hess, and Rofé, that 4QJudgᵃ does not represent an earlier pre-Deuteronomistic edition than the MT of 6:2–13, is the repeated claim of Trebolle[74] and

---

[74] In addition to his official publication of 4QJudgᵃ in *DJD* XIV (Trebolle Barrera, "4QJudgᵃ"), Trebolle's main discussion of the manuscript is Trebolle Barrera, "Textual Variants in *4QJudgᵃ* = "La aportación de 4QJuecesᵃ." For briefer references and discussions see "Historia del texto de los libros históricos e historia de la redacción deuteronomística (Jueces 2,10–3,6)," in D. Muñoz León (ed.), *Salvación en la palabra: targum - derash - berith: en memoria del profesor Alejandro Díez Macho* (Madrid: Ediciones Cristiandad, 1986), 245–255 (246–247); "Édition préliminaire de *4QJugesᵇ*," 94, 99; "Light from 4QJudgᵃ and 4QKgs on the Text of Judges and Kings," in D. Dimant and U. Rappaport (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research* (STDJ, 10; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1992), 315–324 (317–319); "Biblia e interpretación bíblica en Qumrán," in F. García Martínez and J. Trebolle Barrera, *Los Hombres de Qumrán: literatura, estructura social y concepciones religiosas* (Madrid: Editorial Trotta, 1993), 121–144 (132) = "The Bible and Biblical Interpretation in Qumran," in F. García Martínez and J. C. Trebolle Barrera, *The People of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (trans. W. G. E. Watson; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1995), 99–121 (109–110); "Textual Affiliation of the Old Latin Marginal Readings in the Books of Judges and Kings," in G. Braulik, W. Gross, and S. E. McEvenue (eds.), *Biblische Theologie und gesellschaftlicher Wandel: Für Norbert Lohfink SJ* (Freiburg: Herder, 1993), 315–329 (315, 329); *The Jewish Bible and the Christian Bible: An Introduction to the History of the Bible* (trans. W. G. E. Watson; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1998), 287–288, 291; "Judges, Book of"; "Qumran Evidence for a Biblical Standard Text and for Non-Standard and Parabiblical Texts," in T. H. Lim et al. (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls in their Historical Context* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2000), 89–106 (96); "'Israelitización' del texto proto-masorético en los libros históricos (Josué–Reyes)," *MEAH* 53 (2004), 441–472 (462–463); "The Text-Critical Value of the Old Latin and Antiochean Greek Texts in the Books of Judges and Joshua," in F. García Martínez and M. Vervenne with the collaboration of B. Doyle (eds.), *Interpreting Translation: Studies on the LXX and Ezekiel in Honour of Johan Lust* (BETL, 192; Leuven: Leuven University Press and Peeters, 2005), 401–413 (401, 410); "A Combined Textual and Literary Criticism Analysis: Editorial Traces in Joshua and Judges," in H. Ausloos, B. Lemmelijn, and M. Vervenne (eds.), *Florilegium Lovaniense: Studies in Septuagint and Textual Criticism in Honour of Florentino García Martínez* (BETL, 224; Leuven: Peeters, 2008), 437–463 (440); "The Textual History and the Text Critical Value of the Old Latin Version in

Ulrich[75] that it does. The arguments in support of their conclusion are literary-critical and text-critical.[76]

(1) *Unwarranted deduction*: I summarized above seven mainly synchronic-oriented arguments related to the context, structure,

---

the Book of Judges," in W. Kraus and S. Kreuzer, *Die Septuaginta: Text, Wirkung, Rezeption* (WUNT; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), forthcoming; "Yahweh's Spirit of Deceit: Textual Variants that Make a Difference (1 Kgs 22)," *RevQ*, forthcoming.

[75] Ulrich's main discussion of 4QJudg[a] is E. C. Ulrich, "Deuteronomistically Inspired Scribal Insertions into the Developing Biblical Texts: 4QJudg[a] and 4QJer[a]," in J. Pakkala and M. Nissinen (eds.), *Houses Full of All Good Things: Essays in Memory of Timo Veijola* (Publications of the Finnish Exegetical Society, 95; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht; Helsinki: Finnish Exegetical Society, 2008), 489–506 (490–494, 504–506). For briefer references and discussions see "Multiple Literary Editions: Reflections Toward a Theory of the History of the Biblical Text," in D. W. Parry and S. D. Ricks (eds.), *Current Research and Technological Developments on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ, 20; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1996), 78–105 (86–87, 92); reprinted in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible* (Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans, 1999), 99–120 (105–106, 109); "The Qumran Biblical Scrolls – The Scriptures of Late Second Temple Judaism," in T. H. Lim et al. (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Historical Context* (London: T&T Clark International, 2000), 67–87 (76); "The Absence of 'Sectarian Variants' in the Jewish Scriptural Scrolls Found at Qumran," in E. D. Herbert and E. Tov (eds.), *The Bible as Book: The Hebrew Bible and the Judaean Desert Discoveries* (London: The British Library; New Castle, DE: Oak Knoll Press, 2002), 179–195 (182–183); "Our Sharper Focus on the Bible and Theology Thanks to the Dead Sea Scrolls," *CBQ* 66 (2004), 1–24 (6); "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Hebrew Scriptural Texts," in J. H. Charlesworth (ed.), *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls, Volume One: Scripture and the Scrolls: The Second Princeton Symposium on Judaism and Christian Origins* (Waco: Baylor University Press, 2006), 77–99 (87–88; "The Evolutionary Production and Transmission of the Scriptural Books," in S. Metso, H. Najman, and E. Schuller (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Transmission of Traditions and Production of Texts* (STDJ, 92; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 209–225 (222–223); adapted and reprinted in H. von Weissenberg et al. (eds.), *Changes in Scripture: Rewriting and Interpreting Authoritative Traditions in the Second Temple Period* (BZAW, 419; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2011), 47–64 (60); "The Evolutionary Composition of the Hebrew Bible," in J. S. Kloppenborg and J. H. Newman (eds.), *Editing the Bible: Assessing the Task Past and Present* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2012), 23–40 (35–36); "The Old Latin, Mount Gerizim, and 4QJosh[a]," in A. Piquer Otero and P. A. Torijano Morales (eds.), *Textual Criticism and Dead Sea Scrolls Studies in Honour of Julio Trebolle Barrera: Florilegium Complutense* (JSJSup, 158; Leiden: Brill, 2012), 361–375 (364–365).

[76] A good synopsis of many of the arguments is found in E. Blum, "The Literary Connection between the Books of Genesis and Exodus and the End of the Book of Joshua," in T. B. Dozeman and K. Schmid (eds.), *A Farewell to the Yahwist? The Composition of the Pentateuch in Recent European Interpretation* (SBLSS, 34; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006), 89–106 (103 n. 40).

theme, and rhetoric of the story of Gideon which are intended to demonstrate that 6:7–10 was written by the original author or the early editor of the book and therefore could not be a late addition. This view is questionable. It is unsubstantiated that because a word, phrase, clause, sentence, etc. is a "good fit" in its literary context it must therefore be the work of an original author (or: an early editor) and could not derive from an editor (or: a late editor).[77] In this particular case the seven macrolevel arguments show that 6:7–10 indeed works well in context, but paying closer attention to the details of the verses shows that they are an addition and in all likelihood a *late* addition to the story.[78]

(2) *Repetition*: Repetition is a well-known editorial technique in biblical and other ancient Near Eastern literature for marking an addition or insertion.[79] וַיְהִי כִּי־זָעֲקוּ בְנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל אֶל־יְהוָה עַל אֹדוֹת מִדְיָן (6:7a) marks a secondary insertion following וַיִּזְעֲקוּ בְנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל אֶל־יְהוָה (6:6b).[80] It is possible to interpret the repetition as a focusing or

---

[77] See the brief discussion of this issue in Rezetko, *Source and Revision*, 69–70, and also the remarks on "the disappearing redactor" in J. Barton, *Reading the Old Testament: Method in Biblical Study* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1984), 57 (cf. 56–58). This is also the main point of Rofé's comment, "that the passage, even being secondary, has a clear function in the saga of Gideon" (Rofé, "Studying the Biblical Text," 117), although we disagree as to when the passage was written and inserted.

[78] In my opinion Ulrich's remark that it is necessary to consider "literary, source, and redaction criticism" in addition to textual criticism applies to both Fernández and Hess (Ulrich, "Deuteronomistically Inspired Scribal Insertions," 492), but obviously not to Rofé's analysis. Fernández seems not to have carefully engaged the literary discussions since by his references to O'Connell, Amit, and Block he seems to suggest that these verses are "essen[tial]" or "authen[tic]" with the intended meaning "original" (Fernández Marcos, "Hebrew and Greek Texts of Judges," 6 with nn. 22–23), when in fact all three authors think the verses are an *early editorial addition* to original pre-Deuteronomistic source material (see n. 42). Hess seems to argue that literary-critical conclusions should be subordinated to text-critical considerations (Hess, "Dead Sea Scrolls and Higher Criticism," 122–123), whereas I and others have argued that priority should not be given to one or the other, but rather these should be engaged jointly and equally (see Rezetko, *Source and Revision*, 55–57).

[79] See the illustrative and well-documented discussion in B. Peckham, "Writing and Editing," in A. B. Beck et al. (eds.), *Fortunate the Eyes that See: Essays in Honor of David Noel Freedman in Celebration of His Seventieth Birthday* (Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans, 1995), 364–383 (366–367). One of the best known kinds of repetition in biblical literature is the *Wiederaufnahme*, or resumptive repetition, though strictly speaking it is not used here. An excellent treatment of this device is given in B. M. Levinson, "The Hermeneutics of Innovation: The Impact of Centralization upon the Structure, Sequence, and Reformulation of Legal Material in Deuteronomy" (Ph.D. dissertation, Brandeis University, 1991), 142–150; abbreviated treatment in his *Deuteronomy and the Hermeneutics of Legal Innovation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), 18–20.

[80] See especially L. G. Stone, "From Tribal Confederation to

highlighting device,[81] but this seems less likely when considered in conjunction with the following points. The potential relevance of the minus of וַיְהִי כִּי־זָעֲקוּ בְנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל אֶל־יְהוָה (6:7a) or its equivalent in several medieval Hebrew manuscripts, LXX[B], the Peshitta, and the Vulgate is mentioned again below in a different context. More relevant from a literary perspective are the uncharacteristic repetition and structure of the crying formula in these verses of Judges,[82] and the following additional literary considerations.

(3) *Deletion without consequence*: On the basis of the general pattern so far in the book we expect the entrance of a deliverer immediately following the Israelites' cry to Yahweh in 6:6b (cf. 3:9; 3:15; 4:3–4), but this does not happen until 6:11, and as Block observes, "these verses [vv. 7–10] may be deleted without any serious loss of meaning. In fact, vv. 11ff. provide a much more logical sequel to vv. 1–6 than the present paragraph."[83]

(4) *Truncated speech*: The prophet's speech in 6:7–10 is abbreviated or inconclusive, lacking the conclusion of the similar prophetic pronouncements in 2:1–5 and 10:10–16, and this raises suspicions that the verses are an insertion or that there may be some other irregularity in the editorial history of the story.[84]

(5) *Proleptic response to 6:13*: The secondary insertion of 6:7–10 "offers a proper orthodox response to Gideon's otherwise unanswered comment: 'If the Lord is with us, why then has all this befallen us?' (verse 13)."[85]

Monarchic State: The Editorial Perspective of the Book of Judges" (Ph.D. dissertation, Yale University, 1988), 360–361; cf. Blum, "Literary Connection between the Books," 103 n. 40; Gray, *Joshua, Judges and Ruth*, 284; Stone, "Judges, Book of," 596; Ulrich, "Multiple Literary Editions," (1996), 86, (1999), 105.

[81] As suggested by Assis, *Self-Interest or Communal Interest*, 21–22 with n. 16; Butler, *Judges*, 186; Guillaume, *Waiting for Josiah*, 117.

[82] See the layout of texts in O'Connell, *Rhetoric of the Book of Judges*, 39.

[83] Block, *Judges, Ruth*, 254; cf. Blum, "Literary Connection between the Books," 103 n. 40.

[84] This is one of the most frequent observations in discussions of this passage. See Amit, *Book of Judges*, 250 n. 39; M. E. Biddle, *Reading Judges: A Literary and Theological Commentary* (Macon, GA: Smyth & Helwys, 2012), 78; Blum, "Literary Connection between the Books," 103 n. 40; Budde, *Buch der Richter*, 52; Cooke, *Book of Judges*, 72; D. M. Crossan, "Judges," in R. B. Brown et al. (eds.), *The Jerome Biblical Commentary* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1968), 149–162 (155); Moore, *Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Judges*, 181; Myers, "Book of Judges," 730; Richter, *Bearbeitungen des "Retterbuches"*, 98; Soggin, *Judges*, 112–113.

[85] A. G. Auld, *Joshua, Judges, and Ruth* (DSB; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1984), 163; cf. Bertheau, *Buch der Richter und Ruth*, 135; Blum, "Literary Connection between the Books," 103 n. 40; Gray, *Joshua, Judges and Ruth*, 206, 283–284; Gross, *Richter*, 370; Martin, *Book of Judges*, 81; Rofé, "Studying the Biblical Text," 117; Schneider, *Judges*, 101. For a different view see Assis, *Self-Interest or Communal Interest*, 31–33; cf. 26 n. 21.

(6) *Unexpected anonymous prophet*: The entrance of an anonymous or unnamed prophet is unexpected before the appearance of the מַלְאַךְ יְהוָה in 6:11–12, 21–22 (cf. מַלְאַךְ הָאֱלֹהִים in 6:20), such prophets are more pronounced in presumably late or later books/passages with more developed ideas about prophecy,[86] and "[t]ypologically these verses may be compared with the warnings of the prophets in the Chronicles."[87] Furthermore, in contrast with her earlier view on the minus of 6:7–10 in 4QJudgᵃ, Amit has now come to regard this as a decisive argument against the early origin of these verses:

> The one example of a rebuking prophet (6:8–10) is absent from the Qumran version (4QJudgesᵃ), which may therefore be regarded as a late secondary addition. Thus, in contrast to Deuteronomistic literature, the [earlier] book of Judges does not yet know about distancing the deity from the human stage to his heavenly abode and about the role of rebuking prophets.[88]

(7) *Irrelevance of "the gods of the Amorites"*: Blum remarks that "[t]he prophet's words are only very loosely connected with the situation: the scenic background of the speech is never given (such as the place, time, the participating characters, the reason),"[89] and in particular the reference to "the gods of the Amorites" in 6:10 seems incongruous in the context of the Midianite situation throughout Judges 6–8.[90]

---

[86] See especially Rofé, "Studying the Biblical Text," 115–117; cf. Auld, *Joshua, Judges, and Ruth*, 163; Burney, *Book of Judges*, 177; Martin, *Book of Judges*, 81; J. N. Schofield, "Judges," in M. Black and H. H. Rowley (eds.), *Peake's Commentary on the Bible* (London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1962), 304–315 (309). The examples I am aware of are Judg 6:8 ("a man a prophet"), 1 Sam 2:27 ("a man of God"), 1 Kgs 13:1 ("a man of God"), 1 Kgs 13:11 ("a certain old prophet"), 1 Kgs 20:13 ("a certain prophet"), 1 Kgs 20:35 ("a certain man of the sons of the prophets"), 2 Kgs 9:1 ("one of the sons of the prophets"), 2 Chr 25:7 ("a man of God"), 2 Chr 25:15 ("a prophet").

[87] Blum, "Literary Connection between the Books," 103; cf. 103 n. 40. He cites the examples of 2 Chr 11:2–4; 15:1–7; 16:7–10.

[88] Y. Amit, "The Book of Judges: Fruit of 100 Years of Creativity," part of R. F. Person, Jr. (ed.), "In Conversation with Thomas Römer, *The So-Called Deuteronomistic History: A Sociological, Historical and Literary Introduction* (London: T. & T. Clark, 2005)," *JHS*, vol. 9, article 17 (2009), 32; cf. 42 (http://www.jhsonline.org/Articles/article_119.pdf).

[89] Blum, "Literary Connection between the Books," 103 n. 40

[90] Gray, *Joshua, Judges and Ruth*, 284. Given the connection with Joshua 24 which I discuss below it is improbable that הָאֱמֹרִי is an alternative name for "Canaanites" (e.g. Webb, *Book of Judges*, 225) or is intended to retain its etymological meaning "the westerners" in contrast with "the sons of the east" (בְּנֵי־קֶדֶם) in 6:3, 33; 7:12; 8:10 (e.g. Boling, *Judges*, 126).

(8) *Formulaic language*: In contrast with its immediate context the language of 6:7–10 is stereotypical[91] and has associations with a variety of other biblical traditions.[92] In addition to the linguistic similarities between Judg 2:1–5, 6:7–10, and 10:10–16 (see point 6, above, in the synchronic analysis), there are multiple points of contact between the language of 6:7–10 and other passages in the Pentateuch and Former Prophets. The noteworthy examples are Exodus 20 (vv. 2–3), Joshua 24 (discussed below), 1 Samuel 10 (vv. 18–19), and 1 Samuel 12 (vv. 6–11). This is so widely commented on in the secondary literature that it hardly requires extensive documentation.[93] In particular, the idea that Deuteronomistic language must be early can be dismissed.[94] For this reason and others Rofé's arguments for the relative (early) chronology of the language (or "style") of 6:7–10 are problematic. He comments: "The accumulation of recurrent idioms conveys the impression of an imitative pastiche; yet, taken one by one, the idioms are not late."[95] For example, the first of his three illustrations is the use of העלה concerning the exodus, which "is not typical of the main, relatively late, documents of the Hexateuch: D, H and P. They usually employ הוציא, 'bring out,' while העלה features in passages that were attributed in the past to the Elohistic Document (E)."[96] But a close look at all the data suggests that the distinction is not so straightforward; thus both lexemes are used side-by-side in both Joshua 24 (vv. 5, 6, 17, 32) and Judg 6:8, and "early" העלה is found in "late" Neh 9:18.[97] Furthermore, several scholars have observed

---

[91] See the helpful layout of these verses in O'Connell, *Rhetoric of the Book of Judges*, 147.

[92] This familiarity is one reason why Auld argues that the story of Gideon is an example of a late biblical narrative (Auld, "Gideon"). Niditch also discusses links between Gideon and Moses, Joshua, Saul, and David (Niditch, *Judges*, 88–89).

[93] See, for example, Biddle, *Reading Judges*, 78; Blum, "Literary Connection between the Books," 103 n. 40; Ulrich, "Deuteronomistically Inspired Scribal Insertions," 492.

[94] K. L. Noll, "Deuteronomistic History or Deuteronomic Debate? (A Thought Experiment)," *JSOT* 31 (2007), 311–345 (especially 322–327); cf. Auld, "Gideon," 263; T. C. Römer, "Qumran and Biblical Scholarship," in N. Dávid et al. (eds.), *The Hebrew Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (FRLANT, 239; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011), 137–142 (140–141); Ulrich, "Deuteronomistically Inspired Scribal Insertions," 492–494.

[95] Rofé, "Studying the Biblical Text," 117; cf. 117–118.

[96] Rofé, "Studying the Biblical Text," 117.

[97] *Hiphil* of יצא for delivery from "Egypt" (explicit): Pentateuch *passim* (e.g. Exod 20:2), sometimes in vicinity with עלה; Josh 24:6; Judg 2:12; 1 Sam 12:8; 1 Kgs 8:16, 21, 51, 53; 9:9; Jer 7:22; 11:4; 31:32; 32:21; 34:13; Ezek 20:6, 9, 10; Dan 9:15; 2 Chr 6:5 (// 1 Kgs 8:16); 7:22 (// 1 Kgs 9:9). *Hiphil* of עלה for delivery from "Egypt" (explicit): Exod 3:17; 17:3; 32:1, 4, 7, 8, 23; 33:1; Lev 11:45; Num 20:5; 21:5; Deut 20:1; Josh 24:17, 32; Judg 2:1; 6:8; 1 Sam 8:8; 10:18; 12:6; 2 Sam 7:6; 1 Kgs 12:28; 17:7, 36; Jer

that 6:7–10 do indeed have some signs of late language. Niditch comments that "6:7–8 includes interlocking subordinate clauses, evocative of a late style of Hebrew."[98] And Hendel, explicitly in support of Trebolle, cites the linguistic forms וָאֹמְרָה and וָאֶתְּנָה in 6:9–10 as "characteristic of Late Biblical Hebrew, lending further plausibility to the late dating of this passage. Such forms are common in Ezra, Nehemiah, and later texts..."[99] The validity and significance of these linguistic observations are discussed later on in this article (section 4.2).

(9) *Relation of 6:7–10 to Joshua 24*: The close relationship between 6:7–10 and Joshua 24 together with the probable relative chronology between the two passages is one of the strongest arguments for the late date of the plus of these verses in the MT. First, the passages are clearly related by language and themes,[100] some of which occur rarely elsewhere or even nowhere else in the Bible (e.g. "the gods of the Amorites").[101] Second, it is clear that

---

2:6; 11:7 (MT plus); 16:14; 23:7; Hos 12:14; Amos 2:6; 3:1; 9:7; Mic 6:4; Ps 81:11; Neh 9:18. I do not intend this list to be complete. I have only included references to deliverance from "Egypt" explicitly.

[98] Niditch, *Judges*, 87 (followed by a comment on the absence of these verses from 4QJudgᵃ).

[99] R. S. Hendel, "Qumran and a New Edition of the Hebrew Bible," in J. H. Charlesworth (ed.), *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls: Volume One: Scripture and the Scrolls: The Second Princeton Symposium on Judaism and Christian Origins* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2006), 149–165 (160 n. 29).

[100] Yahweh speaks (אמר) (Josh 24:2; Judg 6:8, 10); "thus says Yahweh the God of Israel" (כֹּה־אָמַר יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל) (Josh 24:2; Judg 6:8); the land (of Canaan) (Josh 24:3, 8 [east of the Jordan], 13, 15, 18; Judg 6:9–10); Egypt (Josh 24:4–7, 14, 17, 32; Judg 6:8–9); Yahweh sends (שלח) (Josh 24:5 [Moses]; Judg 6:8 [a prophet]); bring out (הוציא) (from Egypt) (Josh 24:5, 6 [מִמִּצְרָיִם]; Judg 6:8 [מִבֵּית עֲבָדִים]); cry out to Yahweh (זעק / צעק אֶל־יְהוָה) (Josh 24:7 [צעק; because of the Egyptians]; Judg 6:6–7 [זעק; because of the Midianites]); dwell (ישב) in the land (Josh 24:8 [east of the Jordan], 13, 15, 18; Judg 6:10); the Amorites (Josh 24:8, 11, 12, 15, 18; Judg 6:10); deliver (נצל) from the hand (Josh 24:10 [from the hand of Balaam]; Judg 6:9 [from the hand of the Egyptians]); drive out (גרש) the inhabitants of the land (Josh 24:12, 18; Judg 6:9); "drive them out from before you" (גרש אוֹתָם מִפְּנֵיכֶם) (Josh 24:12; Judg 6:9); give (נתן) the land (Josh 24:13; Judg 6:9); fear (ירא) a deity (Josh 24:14 [Yahweh]; Judg 6:10 [the gods of the Amorites]); "the gods of the Amorites" (אֱלֹהֵי הָאֱמֹרִי) (Josh 24:15; Judg 6:10); "which you are dwelling in their land" (אֲשֶׁר אַתֶּם יֹשְׁבִים בְּאַרְצָם) (Josh 24:15; Judg 6:10); bring up (העלה) (from Egypt) (Josh 24:17 [מֵאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם מִבֵּית עֲבָדִים], 32 [מִמִּצְרָיִם]; the bones of Joseph]; Judg 6:8 [מִמִּצְרָיִם]); "the house of slavery" (בֵּית עֲבָדִים) (Josh 24:17; Judg 6:8); listen (שמע) to Yahweh's voice (קוֹל) (Josh 24:24; Judg 6:10); "the sons of Israel" (בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל) (Josh 24:32; Judg 6:7–8).

[101] "The gods of the Amorites" (אֱלֹהֵי הָאֱמֹרִי) appear in the Bible only in Josh 24:15 and Judg 6:10. The relation between the occurrences is highlighted further by considering other similar expressions. Generic references to foreign gods of particular peoples or nations (references to particular gods and generic "gods" are excluded) include: gods of Aram

6:7–10 is dependent on Joshua 24 and not vice versa.[102] Third, Joshua 24 was probably written and appended to the book of Joshua in the exilic or, more likely, in the postexilic period.[103] For example, Römer and Brettler have argued that Joshua 24 arose from the attempt to produce a Hexateuch in place of a Pentateuch during the Persian period.[104] The obvious literary implication is that Judg 6:7–10 must be an even later addition to the story of Gideon. We therefore have a remarkable convergence of independent

(Judg 10:6) and gods of the kings of Aram (2 Chr 28:23); gods of Damascus (2 Chr 28:23); gods of Edom (2 Chr 25:20); gods of Egypt (Exod 12:12; Jer 43:12, 13); gods of Hamath (2 Kgs 18:34 // Isa 36:19); gods of Moab (Judg 10:6); gods of Sepharvaim (2 Kgs 18:34 // Isa 36:19); gods of Sidon (Judg 10:6); *gods of the Amorites (Josh 24:15; Judg 6:10)*; gods of the Philistines (Judg 10:6); gods of the sons of Ammon (Judg 10:6); gods of the sons of Seir (2 Chr 25:14). The only other "gods" referred to in the book of Judges are generic "gods" (2:3; 10:13, 14, 16). Note also that the expression "which you are dwelling in their land" (אֲשֶׁר אַתֶּם יֹשְׁבִים בְּאַרְצָם) also appears only in Josh 24:15 and Judg 6:10; cf. the somewhat similar expression in Gen 24:37 (אֲשֶׁר אָנֹכִי יֹשֵׁב בְּאַרְצוֹ).

[102] This is frequently mentioned and otherwise easily deduced from discussions in commentaries and monographs, e.g. Becker, *Richterzeit und Königtum*, 144–145; Gross, *Richter*, 370, 394, 396. Nobody seems to hold the view that Joshua 24 was written on the basis of Judg 6:7–10. In contrast, Rofé believes Joshua 24 and Judg 6:7–10 were written by the same early hand (Rofé, "Studying the Biblical Text," 118–121). That both passages were written by the same person or group is of course possible but it seems highly improbable seeing that the short "imitative pastiche" has multiple links to the longer narrative in Joshua 24 *and also to other writings elsewhere*, as discussed above. For other arguments against Rofé's thesis see Blum, "Literary Connection between the Books," and the works cited in nn. 103–104.

[103] For recent reviews of scholarship on Joshua 24 with references to earlier literature see Carr, *Formation of the Hebrew Bible*, 273–282; cf. 134–138, 216–217; M. Popović, "Conquest of the Land, Loss of the Land: Where Does Joshua 24 Belong?," in J. van Ruiten and J. C. de Vos (eds.), *The Land of Israel in Bible, History, and Theology: Studies in Honour of Ed Noort* (VTSup, 124; Leiden: Brill, 2009), 87–98; cf. *LDBT*, II, 24–25.

[104] T. C. Römer and M. Z. Brettler, "Deuteronomy 34 and the Case for a Persian Hexateuch," *JBL* 119 (2000), 401–419; more recently, see Römer, *So-Called Deuteronomistic History*, 178–183; "Das doppelte Ende des Josuabuches: Einige Anmerkungen zur aktuellen Diskussion um 'deuteronomistisches Geschichtswerk' und 'Hexateuch,'" *ZAW* 118 (2006), 523–548; "Book-Endings in Joshua and the Question of the So-Called Deuteronomistic History," in K. L. Noll and B. Schramm (eds.), *Raising Up a Faithful Exegete: Essays in Honor of Richard D. Nelson* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2010), 85–99. However, there are other possible ways to understand the relationship of (late) Joshua 24 to a Hexateuch (Genesis–Joshua) or Enneateuch (Genesis–Kings). See the brief remarks including citations of other recent discussions in K. Schmid, "Genesis in the Pentateuch," in C. A. Evans, J. N. Lohr, and D. L. Petersen (eds.), *The Book of Genesis: Composition, Reception, and Interpretation* (VTSup, 152; Leiden: Brill, 2012), 27–50 (35–36).

literary assessments of Joshua 24 and Judg 6:7–10. Furthermore, the literary-critical analysis undertaken here suggests that 6:7–10 was inserted relatively late in the story of Gideon which in turn adds weight to the view of Trebolle, Ulrich, and many others (see below) that 4QJudg[a] with its minus of these verses reflects an earlier unexpanded edition of the story compared to the MT.

(10) *Textual criticism*: The remaining text-critical objections do not hold much water: (a) *Unintentional omission*: Only Rofé has argued that the minus of 6:7–10 is due to a textual accident.[105] As observed above, Fernández and Hess find this unlikely, and so do Blum, Hendel, and O'Connell explicitly.[106] I concur. There is no obvious text-critical basis for this claim, whether homoioarcton, homoioteleuton, or any other factor. (b) *Intentional omission*: Only Gray and O'Connell have argued that the minus of 6:7–10 was deliberate, Gray because a scribe recognized the plus as redactional (!) and O'Connell because a scribe was uncomfortable with the rebuke.[107] As noted above, Fernández, Hess, and Rofé find this unlikely,[108] and so does Blum explicitly.[109] I concur. It is far more likely that the pericope was purposefully added. It is impossible to pin down the exact reason. Perhaps there was a purely literary motive. But Auld and Ulrich are probably on track when they suggest that the material was added in order to enhance the prophetic nature of the book in the very late Second Temple period.[110] (c) *Intentional rearrangement*: The view that 4QJudg[a] is a rearranged text for liturgical or other purposes was argued by Hess, and his perspective has received only very minimal support: Fernández, and apparently Assis, Butler, and Wong, who cite Hess and/or Fernández.[111] Rofé and Ulrich explicitly consider this explanation implausible.[112] I concur. Trebolle allows that 4QJudg[a] offers an example of a literary unit either added or perhaps

---

[105] Rofé, "Studying the Biblical Text," 121–122; "Historico-Literary Aspects," 36 n. 29.

[106] Blum, "Literary Connection between the Books," 103; Fernández Marcos, "Hebrew and Greek Texts of Judges," 4–5; Hendel, "Qumran and a New Edition," 160; Hess, "Dead Sea Scrolls and Higher Criticism," 123; O'Connell, *Rhetoric of the Book of Judges*, 467 n. 56.

[107] Gray, *Joshua, Judges and Ruth*, 284; O'Connell, *Rhetoric of the Book of Judges*, 147 n. 178; 467 n. 56.

[108] Fernández Marcos, "Hebrew and Greek Texts of Judges," 5; Hess, "Dead Sea Scrolls and Higher Criticism," 123–124. Rofé obviously agrees since he thinks the omission was unintentional.

[109] Blum, "Literary Connection between the Books," 103.

[110] Auld, *Joshua, Judges, and Ruth*, 163; Ulrich, "Deuteronomistically Inspired Scribal Insertions," 493; "Evolutionary Production and Transmission," (2010), 222–223, (2011), 60.

[111] Assis, *Self-Interest or Communal Interest*, 22 n. 17; Butler, *Judges*, xli, 185; Fernández Marcos, "Hebrew and Greek Texts of Judges," 5–6; Wong, *Compositional Strategy of the Book of Judges*, 183 n. 118.

[112] Rofé, "Studying the Biblical Text," 113 n. 5; Ulrich, "Deuteronomistically Inspired Scribal Insertions," 492 n. 9.

transposed to another place in the composition, but in response to Hess he demonstrates that many literary units marked by the Masoretic signs of division *petuḥah* and *setumah* are to be attributed to the activity of composers or editors of the texts rather than the period of textual transmission or liturgical reading.[113] And Ulrich remarks: "The convergence here of experienced literary-critical methodology applied to the composition and redaction of Judges plus the new manuscript evidence documenting those critical results strongly argues that 4QJudg[a] displays, if not an earlier edition of the entire book of Judges, at least an 'earlier literary form' for this passage."[114] (d) *Other text-critical objections raised by Fernández:* The *small size* of 4QJudg[a] may be a relevant consideration for any far-reaching hypothesis regarding the literary formation of the entire book of Judges[115] but it is not an issue with 6:2–13 in particular. The claim that 4QJudg[a] is a *carelessly copied* manuscript[116] is uncorroborated.[117] The fact that 4QJudg[a] is the *sole witness* to a shorter text of 6:2–13[118] is again relevant to claims regarding the entire book of Judges but because of the limited early textual evidence and other comparable textual situations it is irrelevant to 6:2–13 in particular.[119] It is certainly possible and even common that younger manuscripts (e.g. Codex Vaticanus, Codex Leningrad) are not *ipso facto* worse than older manuscripts (e.g. 4QJudg[a]), that is, older is not necessarily better,[120] but contrary to Fernández's observation that 4QJudg[a] was copied around 50–25 BCE, and his remark that "the supposed Deuteronomistic insertion was already present when the Septuagint of Judges was translated at the end of the 3rd or the beginning of the 2nd century B.C.E.,"[121] it should be

---

[113] Trebolle Barrera, "Textual History and the Text Critical Value," forthcoming.

[114] Ulrich, "Deuteronomistically Inspired Scribal Insertions," 492.

[115] Fernández Marcos, "Hebrew and Greek Texts of Judges," 5–7, 15–16.

[116] Fernández Marcos, "Genuine Text of Judges," 39.

[117] R. Sollamo, "Panegyric on Redaction Criticism," in J. Pakkala and M. Nissinen (eds.), *Houses Full of All Good Things: Essays in Memory of Timo Veijola* (Publications of the Finnish Exegetical Society, 95; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2008), 684–696 (694–695).

[118] Fernández Marcos, "Hebrew and Greek Texts of Judges," 6, 16; cf. O'Connell, *Rhetoric of the Book of Judges*, 147 n. 178.

[119] Rofé, "Studying the Biblical Text," 114–116.

[120] R. Browning, "Recentiores Non Deteriores," *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 7 (1960), 11–21; C. Martone, "'Recentiores non deteriores': A Neglected Philological Rule in the Light of the Qumran Evidence," in F. García Martínez, A. Steudel, and E. J. C. Tigchelaar (eds.), *From 4QMMT to Resurrection: Mélanges qumraniens en hommage à Émile Puech* (STDJ, 61; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 205–215; G. Pasquali, *Storia della tradizione e critica del testo* (2nd edn; Florence: Arnoldo Mondadori Editore, 1952), 41–108; Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 274.

[121] Fernández Marcos, "Hebrew and Greek Texts of Judges," 6; cf. 12–13; *Judges*, 65*–66*.

kept in mind that the *earliest Greek manuscript* of the book of Judges is Codex Vaticanus which dates to the 4th century CE, and is therefore at least 300 years younger than 4QJudgᵃ and at least 500 years posterior to the original Old Greek translation. In other words, Fernández's view is worthy of consideration, but given the limited textual evidence, the extensive lapse of time and within that period many actual and potential textual alterations and developments, including the possibly related minus of the repetitious וַיְהִי כִּי־זָעֲקוּ בְנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל אֶל־יְהוָה (6:7a) or its equivalent in several medieval Hebrew manuscripts, LXXᴮ, the Peshitta, and the Vulgate, my opinion is that the longer text of the majority of witnesses is hardly a decisive consideration.[122]

In conclusion, contrary to the handful of scholars whose arguments I have carefully evaluated,[123] I agree with Trebolle, Ulrich, and the majority of scholars from a variety of perspectives and approaches[124] that the shorter 4QJudgᵃ does indeed represent

---

[122] So also Trebolle Barrera, "Textual Variants in *4QJudgᵃ*," 244–245; Ulrich, "Multiple Literary Editions," (1996), 86, (1999), 105.

[123] Assis, Butler, Fernández, Gray, Hess, O'Connell, Rofé, Webb, Wong; Block and Niditch are noncommittal.

[124] Amit, "Book of Judges"; Auld, "Gideon," 263; Biddle, *Reading Judges*, 16–17, 78–79; Blum, "Literary Connection between the Books," 103; Boling, *Judges*, 39–40, 125; M. Z. Brettler, *The Book of Judges* (London: Routledge, 2002), 41–42; G. J. Brooke, "Some Remarks on the Reconstruction of 4QJudgesᵇ," in D. Minutoli and R. Pintaudi (eds.), *Papyri Graecae Schøyen (PSchøyen II): Essays and Texts in Honour of Martin Schøyen* (Papyrologica Florentina, 40; Florence: Edizioni Gonnelli, 2010), 107–115 (115; "probably"); F. H. Cryer, "Genesis in Qumran," in F. H. Cryer and T. L. Thompson (eds.), *Qumran Between the Old and New Testaments* (JSOTSup, 290; Copenhagen International Seminar, 6; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 98–112 (103–104); H. Debel, "Rewritten Bible, Variant Literary Editions and Original Text(s): Exploring the Implications of a Pluriform Outlook on the Scriptural Tradition," in H. von Weissenberg et al. (eds.), *Changes in Scripture: Rewriting and Interpreting Authoritative Traditions in the Second Temple Period* (BZAW, 419; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2011), 65–91 (81–82); J. M. Engle, "The Redactional Development of the Book of Judges" (Ph.D. dissertation, The Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion, 2002), 64 n. 18; V. Fritz, *The Emergence of Israel in the Twelfth and Eleventh Centuries B.C.E.* (Biblical Encyclopedia, 2; trans. J. W. Barker; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011), 41; Gross, *Richter*, 95, 370; Hendel, "Qumran and a New Edition," 160; K. Latvus, *God, Anger and Ideology: The Anger of God in Joshua and Judges in Relation to Deuteronomy and the Priestly Writings* (JSOTSup, 279; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 46; B. Lucassen, "Josua, Richter und CD," *RevQ* 18 (1998), 373–396 (395); S. L. McKenzie, *Introduction to the Historical Books* (Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans, 2010), 66; G. Mobley, *The Empty Men: The Heroic Tradition of Ancient Israel* (The Anchor Yale Bible Reference Library; New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005), 124–126; T. C. Römer, "Redaction Criticism: 1 Kings 8 and the Deuteronomists," in J. M. LeMon and K. H. Richards (eds.), *Method Matters: Essays on the Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Honor of*

an earlier literary edition of 6:2–13 than does the longer MT, and that the MT reproduces an edition of the passage that was probably created in the very late Second Temple period perhaps in an attempt to enhance the prophetic character of the book. This general text-critical and literary-critical conclusion is evidently the consensus view of mainstream biblical scholarship, and so on the basis of this philological conclusion I will now evaluate the language of 4QJudg[a] in relation to the linguistic dating and historical linguistics of BH.

4. LINGUISTIC ANALYSIS OF THE BOOK OF JUDGES

4.1. SYNOPSIS OF THE LANGUAGE OF THE BOOK OF JUDGES[125]

The language of the book of Judges is usually thought to reflect the type of BH that was written in ancient Israel in the preexilic period (prior to 586 BCE). Thus Judges, together with Samuel and Kings, and the so-called Yahwist Source in the Pentateuch, are considered the best exemplars of Early Biblical Hebrew (EBH; also called Standard or Classical Biblical Hebrew). Thus Driver remarked: "The purest and best Hebrew prose style is that of JE and the earlier narratives incorporated in Jud. Sam. Kings: Dt. (though of a different type) is also thoroughly classical…"[126] However, it is also widely recognized that the language of the book is not monolithic and that it even contains different varieties of "early" Hebrew. One linguistic variety is the Archaic Biblical Hebrew of the Song of Deborah in Judges 5.[127] Another linguistic variety is northern or

David L. Petersen (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2009), 63–76 (68); "Qumran and Biblical Scholarship," 140–141; Sollamo, "Panegyric on Redaction Criticism," 694–695; Stone, "From Tribal Confederation to Monarchic State," 126, 360; Tigchelaar, "Dead Sea Scrolls," 167; Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 313–314; H. von Weissenberg, "'Canon' and Identity At Qumran: An Overview and Challenges for Future Research," in A. Voitila and J. Jokiranta (eds.), *Scripture in Transition: Essays on Septuagint, Hebrew Bible, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honour of Raija Sollamo* (JSJSup, 126; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 629–640 (637–638); M. M. Zahn, "The Problem of Characterizing the Reworked Pentateuch Manuscripts: Bible, Rewritten Bible, or None of the Above?," *DSD* 15 (2008), 315–339 (323).

[125] For a previous survey of the language of the book of Judges see *LDBT*, II, 25–27.

[126] S. R. Driver, *An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament* (rev. edn; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1914), 505; cf. 123–126. A nearly identical remark is found in J. Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Israel* (repr. of 1885 edn; Atlanta: Scholars, 1994), 9.

[127] For recent discussions of the nature and date of this linguistic stratum in Judges see S. Frolov, "How Old is the Song of Deborah?," *JSOT* 36 (2011), 163–184; T. Mayfield, "The Accounts of Deborah (Judges 4–5) in Recent Research," *CBR* 7 (2009), 306–335 (324–325); G. T. K. Wong, "Song of Deborah as Polemic," *Bib* 88 (2007), 1–22 (19–22).

Israelian Hebrew as opposed to southern or Judean Hebrew.[128] Rendsburg has written the most thorough treatments of dialectal variation in BH.[129] His main examples of northern Hebrew in the book of Judges are the stories of Deborah, Gideon, and Jephthah. For example, he pinpoints the following items of northern Hebrew in Judges 6–8: the nouns כַּד ("jug"; 7:16, 16, 19, 20), מִסְפָּר ("interpretation [of a dream]"; 7:15), and סֵפֶל ("bowl"; 6:38); the relative word -שֶׁ (6:17; 7:12; 8:26); the preposition מִן with unassimilated *nun* before an anarthrous noun (7:23, 23); and the infinitive absolute in place of a finite verb (7:19).[130] Contrasting with the overall EBH language of the book and its "early" varieties of Hebrew are some specimens of Late Biblical Hebrew (LBH). Thus Edenburg has identified some characteristic "late" linguistic features in Judges 19–21,[131] the best known being נשׂא אשׁה ("to take a wife") in 21:23. And there are other sporadic "late" features elsewhere, such as the *pual* of נתץ (Judg 6:28),[132] the object of an infinitive clause before its predicate (Judg 9:24),[133] or the non-use of the imperatival infinitive absolute,[134] to mention only a few examples. Finally, Polak has argued that there are various

---

More generally on Archaic Biblical Hebrew see *LDBT*, I, 312–340.

[128] A related matter is the well-known *shibboleth* story in Judg 12:4–6, which, if historical, indicates that there was a difference between the language of two northern groups, Transjordanian Gilead and Cisjordanian Ephraim. See *LDBT*, I, 189–190.

[129] See, for example, G. A. Rendsburg, "A Comprehensive Guide to Israelian Hebrew: Grammar and Lexicon," *Orient* 38 (2003), 5–35; "Northern Hebrew through Time: From the Song of Deborah to the Mishnah," in C. Miller-Naudé and Z. Zevit (eds.), *Diachrony in Biblical Hebrew* (LSAWS, 8; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2012), 339–359.

[130] For a critique of Rendsburg's theory see *LDBT*, I, 173–200. With relation to Judges 6–8: if this is an Israelite composition, and the above mentioned linguistic items are indicative of Israelian Hebrew, one wonders why they appear so sporadically in these chapters, so much so that they are greatly outnumbered by the corresponding Judean Hebrew linguistic features: -שֶׁ x3 (6:17; 7:12; 8:26) but אֲשֶׁר x41; *nun* of מִן unassimilated x2 (7:23) but assimilated x30 (excludes four מִפְּנֵי); predicative *qatol* x1 (7:23) but e.g. *wayyiqtol* x174. Other northern Hebrew features do not appear at all in these chapters, e.g. the feminine demonstrative זֹאת rather than זֹו/זֹה (6:13; 7:14; 8:8; cf. 18:4). Additional discussion follows below.

[131] C. Edenburg, "The Story of the Outrage at Gibeah (Jdg. 19–21): Composition, Sources and Historical Context" (Hebrew; Ph.D. dissertation, Tel Aviv University, 2003), 138–196. In her view Judges 19–21 dates to the early postexilic period and its language represents "transitional late biblical Hebrew."

[132] *LDBT*, I, 116–117.

[133] *LDBT*, II, 127–128.

[134] *LDBT*, II, 128–132; especially 129–130.

chronological styles of preexilic Hebrew in Judges, including for example a "late classical" stratum in Judges 6–8.[135]

4.2. LINGUISTIC CHARACTER OF THE PLUS IN MT JUDGES 6:7–10

4.2.1. INTRODUCTION

The argument above was that scholars have been correct to conclude that MT 6:7–10 is a very late addition to the story of Gideon. Given this conclusion it is remarkable that the passage is written in EBH, with the exception of the "late" paragogic ◌ָה,[136] and it even contains a distinctive "early" temporal expression.

MT Judges

6:7 וַיְהִי כִּי־זָעֲקוּ בְנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל אֶל־יְהוָה עַל אֹדוֹת מִדְיָן:

6:8 וַיִּשְׁלַח יְהוָה אִישׁ נָבִיא אֶל־בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וַיֹּאמֶר לָהֶם כֹּה־אָמַר יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל אָנֹכִי הֶעֱלֵיתִי אֶתְכֶם מִמִּצְרַיִם וָאֹצִיא אֶתְכֶם מִבֵּית עֲבָדִים:

6:9 וָאַצִּל אֶתְכֶם מִיַּד מִצְרַיִם וּמִיַּד כָּל־לֹחֲצֵיכֶם וָאֲגָרֵשׁ אוֹתָם מִפְּנֵיכֶם וָאֶתְּנָה לָכֶם אֶת־אַרְצָם:

6:10 וָאֹמְרָה לָכֶם אֲנִי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם לֹא תִירְאוּ אֶת־אֱלֹהֵי הָאֱמֹרִי אֲשֶׁר אַתֶּם יוֹשְׁבִים בְּאַרְצָם וְלֹא שְׁמַעְתֶּם בְּקוֹלִי:

---

[135] See, for example, F. H. Polak, "The Oral and the Written: Syntax, Stylistics and the Development of Biblical Prose," *JANES* 26 (1998), 59–105 (69–70); "Sociolinguistics: A Key to the Typology and the Social Background of Biblical Hebrew," *HS* 47 (2006), 115–162 (161); cf. "Language Variation, Discourse Typology, and the Sociocultural Background of Biblical Narrative," in C. Miller-Naudé and Z. Zevit (eds.), *Diachrony in Biblical Hebrew* (LSAWS, 8; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2012), 301–338 (303, 324–325). For a critique of Polak's theory see *LDBT*, I, 95–102; II, 80–83. I do not see how Polak's observations regarding style and chronology can relate in a meaningful way to the editorial history of the book of Judges. So also Niditch: "It would be exciting indeed if Polak's linguistic spectrum unequivocally matched a parallel spectrum in thematic orientation in the narratives of Judges, enabling us to reconstruct a redaction history. Unfortunately, such matches are not consistently found" (S. Niditch, "Epic and History in the Hebrew Bible: Definitions, 'Ethnic Genres,' and the Challenges of Cultural Identity in the Biblical Book of Judges," in D. Konstan and K. A. Raaflaub [eds.], *Epic and History* [The Ancient World: Comparative Histories; Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010], 86–102 [91]).

[136] I mentioned above Niditch's remark that "6:7–8 includes interlocking subordinate clauses, evocative of a late style of Hebrew" (Niditch, *Judges*, 87), but lacking additional explanation and comparison with other "early" and "late" clauses I am unable to evaluate the impact of her comment.

4.2.2. MINOR OBSERVATIONS

From a historical linguistic perspective most of the language in the addition is unremarkable: זעק ("to cry") rather than צעק (v. 7),[137] no confusion of אֶל and עַל (vv. 7, 7, 8), one occurrence of אָנֹכִי (v. 8) and one of אֲנִי (v. 10), one instance of unforced non-use of the *nota accusativi* (לְהַצִּיכֶם; v. 9) and one unforced use (וָאֲגָרֵשׁ אוֹתָם; v. 9),[138] אֲשֶׁר rather than -שֶׁ (v. 10), and so on.

4.2.3. PARAGOGIC ◌ָה-

As noted above Hendel cites וָאֶתְּנָה and וָאֹמְרָה in 6:9–10 as evidence for the late date of the MT plus. The *waw* consecutive form with paragogic ◌ָה- is generally thought to increase in frequency in postexilic Hebrew.[139] In addition, Cook makes the interesting observation that the "relatively frequent occurrences of the paragogic [◌ָה-] with אמר 'say' are entirely restricted to late BH literature except for one example in Judges [6:10]." [140] Unfortunately, the difficulties with the standard chronological

---

[137] The verb זעק as opposed to צעק is sometimes considered characteristic of the later stage of BH (e.g. Kim, *Early Biblical Hebrew*, 144–150) but this view does not withstand close inspection. See the comprehensive analysis from a sociolinguistic variationist approach in *HLBH*. Judges, for example, prefers the so-called "late" form over the "early" form, 13 (3:9, 15; 4:10, 13; 6:6, 7, 34, 35; 10:10, 14; 12:2; 18:22, 23) to 6 (4:3; 7:23, 24; 10:12, 17; 12:1), in no distinguishable pattern, though זעק in v. 7 was probably used in the addition because it immediately follows זעק in the earlier literary layer in v. 6.

[138] In the other instances the heavy suffix כֶם- forces the use of the *nota accusativi*.

[139] M. Eskhult, *Studies in Verbal Aspect and Narrative Technique in Biblical Hebrew Prose* (AUUSSU, 12; Uppsala: Uppsala University Press, 1990), 106; R. D. Holmstedt, "Historical Linguistics and Biblical Hebrew," in C. Miller-Naudé and Z. Zevit (eds.), *Diachrony in Biblical Hebrew* (LSAWS, 8; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2012), 96–124 (109–112); J. Joosten, *The Verbal System of Biblical Hebrew: A New Synthesis Elaborated on the Basis of Classical Prose* (Jerusalem Biblical Studies, 10; Jerusalem: Simor, 2012), 321 n. 28; P. Korchin, "Grammaticalization and the Biblical Hebrew Pseudo-Cohortative," in R. Hasselbach and N. Pat-El (eds.), *Language and Nature: Papers Presented to John Huehnergard on the Occasion of his 60th Birthday* (Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization, 67; Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 2012), 269–284 (269, 277, 280); *LDBT*, II, 168 (#32 in table; "Decrease" is an error for "Increase"); references to many other adherents of this view are given in R. Rezetko, "Dating Biblical Hebrew: Evidence from Samuel–Kings and Chronicles," in I. Young (ed.), *Biblical Hebrew: Studies in Chronology and Typology* (JSOTSup, 369; London: T&T Clark International, 2003), 215–250 (227 n. 34).

[140] J. A. Cook, *Time and the Biblical Hebrew Verb: The Expression of Tense, Aspect, and Modality in Biblical Hebrew* (LSAWS, 7; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2012), 239; cf. 239–240. All the other examples are in Daniel, Ezra, and Nehemiah. Cook's list of references mistakenly has Neh 8:13 rather than Neh 5:8 and 5:13.

theory have not been fully appreciated.[141] Furthermore, even if for the sake of argument I grant its validity—which of course would also have the effect of confirming the lateness of the two forms in MT 6:9–10—the distribution in BH is too indistinctive to be valuable for absolute or relative linguistic dating,[142] since there are too many out-of-place occurrences and nonoccurrences, and thus in the framework of a sociolinguistic variationist analysis it is impossible to sort out early adopters ("leaders," "progressives"), in-betweens ("moderates"), and late adopters ("laggards," "conservatives") of the innovation.[143]

---

[141] See Rezetko, "Dating Biblical Hebrew," 227–228, for discussion of some specific problems with this view. Holmstedt's recent assertion that "even without dividing many of the books into the typically accepted components...the general order [of frequency of lengthened *wayyiqtol* forms] accords well with the typical relative chronological order in mainstream Hebrew studies" (Holmstedt, "Historical Linguistics and Biblical Hebrew," 112) is questionable.

[142] Consider, for example, the distribution of the regular and lengthened 1cs *wayyiqtol* forms of אמר and נתן in MT (more problematic occurrences in the traditional BH chronological framework are italicized): "early" וָאֹמַר: Gen 20:13; 24:39, 42, 45, 47; 31:11; 41:24; 44:28; Exod 3:17; 4:23; 32:24; Lev 17:14; 20:24; Deut 1:9, 20, 29; 9:26; Judg 2:1; 1 Sam 13:12; 24:11; 2 Sam 1:7, 8 (Q); 1 Kgs 21:6; 2 Kgs. 6:29; Isa. 6:5, 8, 11; 24:16; 41:9; Jer 1:6, 11, 13; 3:7, 19; 4:10; 11:5; 14:13; 24:3; 35:5; Ezek 4:14; 9:8; 11:13; 16:6, 6; 20:7, 8, 13, 18, 21, 29; 21:5; 23:43; 24:20; 37:3; Hos 3:3; Amos 7:2, 5, 8; 8:2; Mic 3:1; *Zech 1:9; 2:2, 4, 6; 3:5; 4:2 (Q), 4, 5, 11, 12, 13; 5:2, 6, 10; 6:4; 11:9, 12*; Ps 55:7; 77:11; 95:10; 139:11; Job 29:18; 38:11; Lam 3:18; *Neh 1:5; 2:3, 5, 7, 17, 20; 4:8, 13; 5:9 (Q); 7:3 (Q)*; "late" וָאֹמְרָה: *Judg 6:10*; Dan 9:4; 10:16, 19; 12:8; Ezra 8:28; 9:6; Neh 5:7, 8, 13; 6:11; 13:9, 11, 17, 19, 19, 21, 22; "early" וָאֶתֵּן: Gen 40:11; Lev 7:34; Deut 1:15; Josh 24:3, 4, 4, 8, 11, 13; Jer 3:8; 8:13; 32:12; 35:5; Ezek 16:12; 20:11; *Neh 5:7*; "late" וָאֶתְּנָה: *Num 8:19; Judg 6:9; 1 Sam 2:28; 2 Sam 12:8, 8*; Ezek 16:11; Ps 69:12; Qoh 1:17; Dan 9:3; Neh 2:1, 6, 9. The figures for the Qumran biblical scrolls are: MT וָאֹמַר = DSS ואמר (x7): Isa 6:5 (1QIsaᵃ, 4Q60); 24:16 (1QIsaᵃ); 41:9 (1Q8, 4Q56; contrast 1QIsaᵃ); Ezek 37:3 (Mas1d); Amos 7:8 (Mur88); MT וָאֹמַר = DSS ואמרה (x7): Exod 3:17 (4Q13); Isa 6:8 (1QIsaᵃ), 11 (1QIsaᵃ); 41:9 (1QIsaᵃ; contrast 1Q8, 4Q56); Zech 4:4 (4Q80); 5:10 (4Q80); Ps 139:11 (11Q5); MT וָאֹמְרָה = DSS ואמרה: none; MT וָאֹמְרָה = DSS ואמר (x1): Dan 10:19 (4Q112); MT וָאֶתֵּן = DSS ואתן: none; MT וָאֶתֵּן = DSS ואתנה: none; MT וָאֶתְּנָה = DSS ואתן (x2): 1 Sam 2:28 (4Q51); Ps 69:12 (4Q83); MT וָאֶתְּנָה = DSS ואתן: none. The figures for the Qumran sectarian scrolls are: ואמר (x2): 4Q386:1ii2; 4Q391:36,2; ואמרה (x3): 4Q385:2,9; 4Q385a:15i5; 4Q389:2,4; ואתן: none; ואתנה (x1): 4Q385a:1a-bii6. All of these examples are in 4QPseudoMoses and 4QPseudoEzekiel which actually have quite a few of the lengthened *wayyiqtol* forms in Qumran Hebrew.

[143] On these sociolinguistic variationist concepts see, for example, T. Nevalainen, H. Raumolin-Brunberg, and H. Mannila, "The Diffusion of Language Change in Real Time: Progressive and Conservative Individuals and the Time Depth of Change," *Language Variation and Change* 23 (2011), 1–43. For a recent application of the approach to BH see Kim, *Early*

4.2.4. VERB SYNTAX

It is widely thought that the *waw* consecutive verb form and the introductory וַיְהִי form in particular declined in frequency in postexilic Hebrew.[144] Regardless of the actual merit of this view,[145] both are used in this late addition in Judges, and Eskhult explicitly verifies that the verb syntax of Judges 6–8 and of chapter 6 in particular represents "Classical" usage.[146] More interesting for the purposes of this article is Joosten's argument that the temporal construction וַיְהִי כִּי is totally absent from Esther–Chronicles and therefore constitutes a decisive historical linguistic proof that the classical corpus (Pentateuch and Former Prophets), in whole or in part, could not have been written in the Persian period.[147] Joosten's argument loses much of its cogency once it is admitted that literary and textual evidence—including empirical manuscript evidence—coincide in showing that the occurrence in Judg 6:7 was created even later than the Persian period in the late Second Temple period.[148]

Biblical Hebrew, 85–86, 155, *passim*.

[144] Eskhult, *Studies in Verbal Aspect*, 108, 110–112, 115–116, 119–120; "Verbal Syntax in Late Biblical Hebrew," in T. Muraoka and J. F. Elwolde (eds.), *Diggers at the Well: Proceedings of a Third International Symposium on the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira* (STDJ, 36; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 84–93 (84, 91–93); *LDBT*, II, 162 (#1 and #2 in table).

[145] Rezetko, "Dating Biblical Hebrew," 233–235; *LDBT*, *passim*, cf. II, 289 (7.4.2.1). Also see the recent remarks on the *wayyiqtol* form in general in LBH and Qumran Hebrew in Joosten, *Verbal System of Biblical Hebrew*, 385–386.

[146] Eskhult, *Studies in Verbal Aspect*, 68–102.

[147] J. Joosten, "Diachronic Aspects of Narrative *Wayhi* in Biblical Hebrew," *JNSL* 35 (2009), 43–61 (51); cf. the brief remark in J. Joosten, "Wilhelm Gesenius and the History of Hebrew in the Biblical Period," in S. Schorch and E.-J. Waschke (eds.), *Biblical Exegesis and Hebrew Lexicography: Context and Impact of Wilhelm Gesenius' "Hebräischen Handwörterbuch"* (BZAW; Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2013), forthcoming (draft retrieved on 22/01/2013 from http://www.academia.edu/1130357/Wilhelm_Gesenius_and_the_history_of_Hebrew_in_the_Biblical_period). This is a succinct statement of his view: "On the syntactical level there is no real difference between the CBH and LBH examples with explicit temporal phrases. Only on one minor point is there a distinction. While in CBH there are 16 cases where *wayhi* is followed by a temporal clause introduced by כי, not even one such example is to be found in LBH" (Joosten, "Diachronic Aspects of Narrative *Wayhi*," 53).

[148] However, this is not the only flaw in Joosten's argument. Another of several examples that are text-critically doubtful is 2 Sam 6:13 where the MT has וַיְהִי כִּי but the LXX has καὶ ἦσαν. For a discussion of these and other variants see Rezetko, *Source and Revision*, 189–196. Other faults relate to Joosten's notion that narrative *wayhi* originated in oral style (relying on Polak's work; see the remarks in section 4.1) and his rather selective use of biblical examples (MT and LXX) and occurrences in synoptic passages. More problematic is the logic of the entire argument

The language of the plus of 6:7–10 in the MT compared to 4QJudgᵃ raises a number of issues that I will discuss in more detail in the final section of this article (section 5). For example, contrary to what is often assumed to be the case, there is no one-to-one correspondence between textual developments and literary layers on the one hand and the standard theory of "early" EBH vs. "late" LBH language on the other. MT Judg 6:7–10 was a very late addition to the story of Gideon, and it was written in so-called early language.

4.3. LINGUISTIC VARIANTS BETWEEN THE MT AND QUMRAN SCROLLS OF THE BOOK OF JUDGES

4.3.1. JUDGES 6

4.3.1.1. INTRODUCTION

In addition to the MT plus of vv. 7–10 there are other variants between the Qumran scroll and the received text in vv. 3–6, 11–13.[149]

---

which depends crucially on talking about two corpora of writings, EBH (Joosten: CBH), or Genesis–Kings, versus LBH, or Esther–Chronicles, rather than individual writers, sources, and books. See my remarks on "overestimation of linguistic uniformity" in R. Rezetko, "What Happened to the Book of Samuel in the Persian Period and Beyond?," in E. Ben Zvi, D. V. Edelman, and F. H. Polak (eds.), *A Palimpsest: Rhetoric, Ideology, Stylistics and Language Relating to Persian Israel* (Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias, 2009), 237–252 (247–251). Thus Joosten's examples of temporal expressions with וַיְהִי + כִּי appear 17 times sporadically in BH, Genesis (x5), Exodus (x2), Joshua (x1), Judges (x4), Samuel (x3), Kings (x1), and Job (x1), but not at all in Leviticus–Deuteronomy. So also his examples of temporal expressions with וַיְהִי + circumstantial clause occur 25 times periodically in BH, Genesis (x4), Joshua (x1), Samuel (x6), Kings (x12), Isaiah (x1), and Jeremiah (x1), but never in Exodus–Deuteronomy and Judges. In other words, in some of these books—and I would emphasize Numbers–Deuteronomy—the complete absence of these two temporal constructions has no more chronological significance than their nonappearance in Esther–Chronicles. These books—Numbers–Deuteronomy and Esther–Chronicles—make regular use of the same temporal constructions, e.g. כְּ, בְּ + וַיְהִי, or כַּאֲשֶׁר. It is also noteworthy that the Priestly source of the Pentateuch only has these non-"early" constructions (15 times). Finally, I return below (section 4.3.1.2) to Joosten's remark on וַיְהִי כִּי in Job 1:5: "Note the instance in Job 1:5. Several other indications show that the prose chapters of the Book of Job are not written in Late Biblical Hebrew. Job is more properly to be regarded as a work of the transitional period" (Joosten, "Diachronic Aspects of Narrative *Wayhi*," 53 n. 26).

[149] For the text and variants see Trebolle Barrera, "4QJudgᵃ," 162–164; E. C. Ulrich, *The Biblical Qumran Scrolls: Transcriptions and Textual Variants* (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 255.

	MT Judges	4QJudgᵃ
6:3	וְעָל֣וּ עָלָ֔יו	minus
6:4	וְשֶׂ֥ה וָשׁ֖וֹר	שה שור
6:5	וְלִגְמַלֵּיהֶ֖ם	minus
6:11	אֲבִ֣י הָעֶזְרִ֔י	האביעזרי
6:13	יְהוָ֤ה	אלהים
6:13	אֲשֶׁ֧ר סִפְּרוּ	שספרו

Several of these variants are interesting, especially when consideration is given to the Old Greek and Old Latin evidence; they may have conceptual and/or literary significance, but since they do not have tangible historical linguistic importance they will not be evaluated or discussed here. It is worth pointing out, however, that even the smallest of differences may constitute linguistic differences between biblical texts (e.g. plus/minus of conjunction, location of definite article). It can be very difficult, if not impossible, to decide with certainty the direction of change with such minor linguistic differences as the conjunctions in "(and) a sheep (and) an ox."

4.3.1.2. MT: וְעָל֣וּ עָלָ֔יו; 4QJUDGᴬ: MINUS (6:3)

The Vulgate also lacks this clause.[150] *BHK* ("add[ition] ?"), *BHS* ("pr[o]b[ably] add[ition]"), and others,[151] prior to the discovery and publication of 4QJudgᵃ, suggested the emendation of the MT by the deletion of this clause.[152] Few recent commentators, however, remark explicitly on the issue. Of those who do, some argue that the MT is primary[153] and others that 4QJudgᵃ is primary.[154] The

---

[150] For additional suggestive evidence from the versions which shows a change or minus of one or the other of MT's elements see Trebolle Barrera, "4QJudgᵃ," 164; cf. Fernández Marcos, *Judges*, 19; Trebolle Barrera, "Textual Variants in *4QJudgᵃ*," 232; Ulrich, *Biblical Qumran Scrolls*, 255.

[151] For example, F. Nötscher, "Das Buch der Richter," in F. Nötscher (ed.), *Die Heilige Schrift in deutscher Übersetzung: Das Alte Testament* (Echter Bibel; Würzburg: Echter, 1950), 27 ("Zusatz?").

[152] This observation is made also in Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 329.

[153] Boling, *Judges*, 125 (haplography in 4QJudgᵃ, "six out of twelve words in sequence begin with the letter *waw*"); Butler, *Judges*, 185 (MT is *lectio difficilior*, "one expects the camping of the next verse to precede attack"); Fernández Marcos, *Judges*, 65* (haplography in 4QJudgᵃ, citing Boling); Webb, *Book of Judges*, 221 n. 4 ("the repetition may be deliberate, to emphasize the certainty and frequency of the raids at harvesttime").

[154] Amit, *Book of Judges*, 249 n. 38 ("Boling's opinion...that these [e.g. וְעָל֣וּ עָלָ֔יו in v. 3] were copiest's [*sic*] corruptions...makes sense."); Gross, *Richter*, 362 ("»und sie zogen gegen sie herauf«: wohl Dittographie bzw. Alternativformulierung zu 3b ועלה. Die beiden Wörter fehlen in 4QJudgᵃ

verb syntax of 6:3–5 is rather awkward and ties in to scholarly intuition about the unoriginality of the plus in MT 6:3.[155] The *weqatal* verb in 6:3 is routinely (without exception that I am aware) read as iterative. This is also Joosten's interpretation.[156] But his novel view adds another dimension to the argument of this article. He says:

> iterative WEQATAL is not only infrequent in LBH…it is not attested at all…What would seem very difficult is to date the passages using iterative WEQATAL after the end of the 6th century. Neither the priestly code, nor the deuteronomistic passage in Judges 2 [iterative *weqatal* in vv. 18–19], nor the prose framework of Job [iterative *weqatal* in 1:4–5] is likely, on the strength of the criterion proposed here, to have been written in the Persian period or later.[157]

But the iterative *weqatal* in Judg 6:3 was written *after* the Persian period. For most biblical scholars the Priestly source of the Pentateuch was written in the exilic and/or postexilic period.[158] And according to Hurvitz the Prose Tale of Job is an "exilic/postexilic product" and "*is written in LBH.*"[159] Hurvitz's evaluation of Job 1–2; 42:7–17 sits in stark contrast to Joosten's assessment, based on his historical linguistic interpretations of the temporal construction וַיְהִי כִּי and the iterative *weqatal*, that the Prose Tale of Job "should be considered early exilic at the latest"[160] and is "*not written in Late Biblical Hebrew.*"[161] A more reasonable view seems to be that the *language* of the story has no certain chronological implications.[162] At a minimum the presence of both the "early" iterative *weqatal* (v. 3) and the "early" temporal

---

und in der Vulgata."). However note that Amit seems to have misunderstood Boling's remarks (cf. n. 153).

[155] Amit, *Book of Judges*, 249 n. 38; Budde, *Buch der Richter*, 52; Burney, *Book of Judges*, 176; Moore, *Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Judges*, 178.

[156] J. Joosten, "The Disappearance of Iterative WEQATAL in the Biblical Hebrew Verbal System," in S. E. Fassberg and A. Hurvitz (eds.), *Biblical Hebrew in Its Northwest Semitic Setting: Typological and Historical Perspectives* (Publication of the Institute for Advanced Studies, 1, Hebrew University of Jerusalem; Jerusalem: Magnes/Hebrew University, 2006), 135–147 (140).

[157] Joosten, "Disappearance of Iterative WEQATAL," 141, 147; cf. *Verbal System of Biblical Hebrew*, 403–404; "Wilhelm Gesenius and the History of Hebrew."

[158] See the survey of views in *LDBT*, II, 11–17; cf. 78–83; and the lengthy discussion in *HLBH*.

[159] A. Hurvitz, "The Date of the Prose-Tale of Job Linguistically Reconsidered," *HTR* 67 (1974), 17–34 (33, 34) (emphasis added).

[160] Joosten, "Disappearance of Iterative WEQATAL," 146.

[161] Joosten, "Diachronic Aspects of Narrative *Wayhi*," 53 n. 26 (emphasis added).

[162] I. Young, "Is the Prose Tale of Job in Late Biblical Hebrew?," *VT* 59 (2009), 606–629; cf. *LDBT*, I, 99, 138; II, 55, 86–88.

construction וַיְהִי כִּי (v. 7) in late MT pluses in Judges 6 suggests that Joosten's inflexible historical linguistic periodization is problematic.[163] And this conclusion is corroborated by another independent avenue of argumentation. In other books and manuscripts there is a considerable degree of fluidity in the presence/absence of iterative *weqatal* forms. For example, the MT book of Samuel has about 52 tokens. However, the extant portions of 4QSamᵃ paint a sobering picture. The MT has six pluses, 4QSamᵃ has five pluses, and the MT and 4QSamᵃ agree just three times, or a mere 21% of the time.[164] In other words, iterative *weqatal* fluctuated in and out during the editorial and transmission processes of biblical writings. The view that it is a mark of early BH language is unsustainable.

My remarks so far have focused mainly on the language of MT pluses in Judg 6:3, 7–10. The preceding remark on the book of Samuel highlights a second issue, already hinted at above in my comment on the plus/minus of the conjunction and the location of the definite article: the fluidity (or changeability) of language in biblical manuscripts. The remainder of this section (4.3) is a cross-textual variable analysis of linguistic variants between the MT and Qumran scrolls of Judges.[165] The first example to be discussed is אֲשֶׁר vs. -שֶׁ in 6:13.

4.3.1.3. MT: אֲשֶׁר סִפְּרוּ; *4QJUDGᴬ:* שספרו *(6:13)*

The use of the relative words אֲשֶׁר and -שֶׁ is one of the best known issues in historical linguistic studies of ancient Hebrew. There are probably two reasons for this. First, whereas אֲשֶׁר predominates throughout most of the Bible (x5502), 100 of 139 occurrences of -שֶׁ are found in the (widely-thought) late books of Song of Songs (x32) and Qoheleth (x68). Second, speaking very broadly, the relative frequency of -שֶׁ compared to אֲשֶׁר increases from BH (2%) to Qumran Hebrew (QH; 6%) to Mishnaic Hebrew (MH; 100%).[166] Probably with ideas such as these in mind, Trebolle, in his official editorial remarks on 6:13 of 4QJudgᵃ, says: "This use of -שֶׁ is characteristic of Qumran texts between Late Biblical and Mishnaic Hebrew."[167] He seems to be suggesting that 4QJudgᵃ's -שֶׁ

---

[163] There are other difficulties with Joosten's analysis of iterative *weqatal* but this is not the place to go deeper. For provisional remarks see Rezetko, "Dating Biblical Hebrew," 233–234.

[164] This issue and all other linguistic variation between the MT and four Qumran scrolls of Samuel are exhaustively studied in *HLBH*.

[165] See the discussion of intra-, inter- and cross-textual data collection and variable analysis in A. Auer and A. Voeste, "Grammatical Variables," in J. M. Hernández Campoy and J. C. Conde Silvestre (eds.), *The Handbook of Historical Sociolinguistics* (Blackwell Handbooks in Linguistics; Chichester, UK: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012), 253–270 (259–261).

[166] The figure for Ben Sira is 27%.

[167] Trebolle Barrera, "4QJudgᵃ," 164; cf. Fernández Marcos, *Judges*,

is a linguistic modernization of MT's אֲשֶׁר.[168] Others are less certain. Thus Boling believes 4QJudgᵃ "preserves the archaic particle [-שֶׁ]" which "gave way to the standard prose [אֲשֶׁר]" in the MT.[169] His perspective takes two other issues into consideration: -שֶׁ and its equivalents are attested early in other Semitic languages, and this relative word is thought to be part of an early northern dialect of Hebrew (see the discussion in section 4.1).[170]

Thus we are presented with at least two possibilities. Either אֲשֶׁר was "original" and was modernized to -שֶׁ because of a diachronic factor,[171] or -שֶׁ was "original" (possible link with northern Hebrew) and was assimilated to the standard BH אֲשֶׁר. It is possible as well that there is some other dialectal or stylistic issue involved and that the change was inadvertently rather than consciously made. I do not think an absolutely certain conclusion is within our reach. My inclination, however, is that an earlier -שֶׁ (4QJudgᵃ) was assimilated (I do not know whether intentionally or unintentionally) to אֲשֶׁר (MT), which predominates 41 to 3 in MT Judges 6–8 and 177 to 5 in the book of Judges. Thus -שֶׁ is in a sense the *lectio difficilior*. On the other hand, I am relatively confident that אֲשֶׁר was not modernized to -שֶׁ because of a diachronic factor, e.g. the view that late -שֶׁ is simply a replacement of early אֲשֶׁר.

First, contrary to popular opinion, the Dead Sea Scrolls (DSS) as a whole do not show an increase of -שֶׁ over אֲשֶׁר, much less a tendency to modernize the language in this regard. Most of the scrolls have the standard form אֲשֶׁר exclusively. Holmstedt makes this point well: "In the Qumran nonbiblical texts, שֶׁ (including של) occurs 145 times, but 124 of these are in just 2 texts: 57 in the *Copper Scroll* [3Q15] and 67 in 4QMMTᴮ·ᶜ [4Q394–399]; the remaining 21 examples are so spread out that no one text uses שֶׁ more than twice."[172] The evidence of the biblical scrolls paints a similar picture. They have 1148 examples of אֲשֶׁר and 27 of -שֶׁ. The scrolls and the MT contrast only three times. Here in Judg 6:13, in Jon 1:8 where the MT has בַּאֲשֶׁר לְמִי and 4Q76 has בשלמי, and in Qoh 7:20 where the MT has אֲשֶׁר יַעֲשֶׂה and 4Q109 has ש[יע]שה.

66*; Trebolle Barrera, "Textual Variants in *4QJudgᵃ*," 236 n. 13; "Judges, Book of," 455.

[168] Soggin leans toward this view as well (Soggin, *Judges*, 115).

[169] Boling, *Judges*, 131. Fernández and Soggin mention this as a possibility (Fernández Marcos, *Judges*, 66*; Soggin, *Judges*, 115).

[170] The general antiquity, early northern dialect connection, and diffusion in late Hebrew of -שֶׁ are well-known and widely documented. See, for example, S. B. Noegel and G. A. Rendsburg, *Solomon's Vineyard: Literary and Linguistic Studies in the Song of Songs* (SBLAIL, 1; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2009), 15–16; A. Schoors, *The Preacher Sought to Find Pleasing Words: A Study of the Language of Qoheleth* (OLA, 41; Leuven: Peeters, 1992), 54–56; *LDBT*, II, 210 (#333 in table).

[171] Nobody seems to have suggested that אֲשֶׁר was changed to -שֶׁ in 4QJudgᵃ for some reason related to dialect.

[172] Holmstedt, "Historical Linguistics and Biblical Hebrew," 115–116.

Thus it is somewhat problematic to speak about -שֶׁ as characteristic of Qumran texts or as an updating of the language.[173]

Second, the first argument against the "late -שֶׁ is simply a replacement of early אֲשֶׁר" theory is reinforced by a similar absence of trajectory in BH. Here I must part company with Holmstedt's otherwise helpful case study.[174] While he is absolutely correct that the best explanation of usage of אֲשֶׁר and -שֶׁ will weave together diachrony, dialect, and stylistics, his concluding statements about "the lack of major surprises," "the relative order of texts falls along familiar lines," and "the pattern of שֶׁ's diffusion supports the traditional [chronological] explanation," are reachable only because he somewhat misrepresents the data of BH. His diffusion (or s-shaped) curve of -שֶׁ is misleading since it only reports on biblical writings that have *at least one* occurrence of -שֶׁ, which is less than one-third of the biblical corpus (11 of 36 books, counting separately the books of the Twelve and Ezra and Nehemiah). What do we find in the other 25 books, early and late alike? Only אֲשֶׁר.[175] Are we really supposed to believe that there was a diffusion of -שֶׁ in BH more or less along the line of Kings, Genesis, Chronicles, (Ezra-)Nehemiah, Job, Judges, Jonah, Lamentations, Qoheleth, Song of Songs, and various Psalms? Are we really supposed to believe that the aforesaid diffusion left a manifest imprint on only two non-narrative books of the Writings, and hardly any mark on most of the books of the Pentateuch, Former Prophets, and Latter Prophets? Are we really supposed to believe that the aforesaid diffusion had no effect whatsoever on probable and/or certain late writings such as III Isaiah, Joel, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, Esther, Daniel, and Nehemiah, and left a mere footprint in the undisputed late books of Ezra (x1) and Chronicles (x2), compared to more than 700 examples of אֲשֶׁר in these ten late books? In conclusion, I see no viable historical linguistic argument for a replacement of אֲשֶׁר by -שֶׁ in 6:13 of 4QJudgᵃ. The simplest explanation is that an "original" -שֶׁ was assimilated to the standard אֲשֶׁר.[176] Finally, I think it is difficult to conclude on the basis of its distribution in BH and QH that a lone -שֶׁ here or there in biblical writings may reflect "the much later language of the scribe-editor who inserted it."[177]

---

[173] For discussion of problems with the general idea of linear development from (L)BH to QH to MH see *LDBT*, I, 173–179, 223–279.

[174] Holmstedt, "Historical Linguistics and Biblical Hebrew," 113–119.

[175] Holmstedt, "Historical Linguistics and Biblical Hebrew," 114–115 (data), 118 (s-shaped curve).

[176] One wonders how many of the other 41 examples of אֲשֶׁר in MT Judges 6–8, or elsewhere in the Bible, were updated from -שֶׁ, or vice versa. Unfortunately, there are no data.

[177] Contra Holmstedt, "Historical Linguistics and Biblical Hebrew," 118–119 n. 29 (referring in context to -שֶׁ in MT Gen 6:4). Holmstedt also considers the data of Ben Sira, Bar Kochba, and the Mishnah, but I mostly see these as irrelevant for discerning what may have happened in

4.3.2. JUDGES 9

4.3.2.1. INTRODUCTION

Judges 9 tells the brief story of the short self-imposed kingship of Abimelech, son of Jerubbaal (Gideon in Judges 6–8; Jerubbaal in Judges 9 and 1 Sam 12:11). At this point we transition from 4QJudg[a] to 1QJudg. Variants between the Qumran manuscript and the received text are given in the following table.[178]

	MT Judges	**1QJudg**
9:3	עָלָיו	אליו
9:29	וַיֹּאמֶר	[ויאמ]רו
9:30	וַיִּחַר אַפּוֹ	[ויחר אפו] מאד
9:31	וְהִנָּם	והמה
9:31	אֶת	על
9:40	וַיִּרְדְּפֵהוּ	וירדפם
9:40	הַשָּׁעַר	ש[ע]ר ה[עיר]
9:42	וַיַּגִּדוּ	ויגד
9:48	רְאִיתֶם	מא]

Most of these variants are related more to language than content (the latter including especially the pluses of מאד and ה[עיר] in 1QJudg), though admittedly it is often difficult or impossible, and even unnecessary, to make a strict distinction. In my opinion the evaluation of individual readings indicates that both the MT and 1QJudg have some claims to "originality." For the purposes of this article I will discuss only the interchanges of prepositions in 9:3 and verb stems in 9:42.[179]

4.3.2.2. MT: עָלָיו *; 1QJUDG:* אליו *(9:3)*

It has long been observed that there is "confusion" or "inconsistency" in the use of the prepositions אֶל and עַל in ancient Hebrew, especially in LBH and QH, and that owing to Aramaic influence עַל gradually became more prominent at the expense of אֶל.[180] There is a "clear diachronic distinction in the employment of

---

specific instances in the writings of the Bible.

[178] For the text and variants see Barthélemy, "Juges," 62–64; Ulrich, *Biblical Qumran Scrolls*, 256–257; cf. Trebolle Barrera, "Édition préliminaire de *4QJuges*[b]," 95.

[179] For helpful observations on several of the other variants and their textual/literary significance see Trebolle Barrera, "Édition préliminaire de *4QJuges*[b]," 95.

[180] See, for example, Rooker, *Biblical Hebrew in Transition*, 127–131; cf. *LDBT*, II, 203 (#255 in table).

these two prepositions."[181] Thus the present example of עַל vs. אֶל provides an interesting illustration for briefly discussing the fluidity of language in manuscripts of the Bible and the complexity of the intersection between textual criticism and historical linguistics. Given standard usage, דבר עַל as "speak about" and דבר אֶל as "speak to," it seems natural to interpret the two prepositions in the following ways:

And his mother's brothers spoke all these words

| MT | עָלָיו | *about him* |
| 1QJudg | אליו | *to him* |

in the ears of all the citizens of Shechem.

Read this way the MT makes good sense in the context, in which Jerubbaal asks his mother's brothers to argue on his behalf before the citizens of Shechem, to support him as ruler (9:1–3; cf. LXX περί in v. 3). This is supported also by the standard use of דבר אֶל in the immediate context (v. 1). In contrast, 1QJudg's אל with the meaning "to him" is certainly possible, and is the *lectio difficilior*,[182] even if its meaning seems less preferable. What are some other possible explanations for the variation? Perhaps the *aleph* of 1QJudg's אל is an auditory error by a copyist for *ayin* since the two consonants fell together in pronunciation with the weakening of the laryngeals. Unfortunately the only other instance of these prepositions which is preserved in 1QJudg (אל in 9:31 = MT) cannot help us with identifying any such scribal tendency in the manuscript. [183] Or perhaps 1QJudg's וידברו...אל in 9:3 is a thoughtless assimilation to וידבר...אל in 9:1. Another possibility is that 1QJudg's אליו intends to convey "about him." Indeed there are many other cases in the MT where אֶל, like עַל, means "with

---

[181] Rooker, *Biblical Hebrew in Transition*, 128 n. 7.

[182] Butler's comment that "the MT is the more difficult reading here" does not make sense to me (Butler, *Judges*, 229).

[183] Similarly, 4QJudgᵃ = MT: אֶל: 1:10; 4:8; 6:12; 9:31; 19:5; עַל: 6:4; 4QJudgᵇ = MT: אֶל: 19:5. In contrast the interchange of אֶל and עַל is very frequent in manuscripts of the book of Samuel. Indeed this is probably the single most frequent observation about the MT and Qumran scrolls of Samuel in the official publication of the scrolls. See F. M. Cross, D. W. Parry, R. J. Saley, and E. C. Ulrich (eds.), *Qumran Cave 4. Vol. 12, 1–2 Samuel* (DJD, 17; Oxford: Clarendon, 2005), 36, 46, 49, 74, 94, 101, 114–115, 128, 142, 177, 185, 187, 230, 234, 252–253, 262–263. There are a total of 15 attested variations of אֶל/עַל: x11 in 4QSamᵃ (1 Sam 14:32; 27:10, 10; 31:3; 2 Sam 3:29, 33; 6:3; 12:17; 13:39; 20:10; 23:1); x2 in 4QSamᵇ (1 Sam 20:27, 40); x2 in 4QSamᶜ (2 Sam 14:30, 30). There is one K/Q example in 1 Sam 20:24 (cf. Isa 65:7; Ezek 9:5). For a comprehensive discussion of these variants see *HLBH*. Furthermore, looking beyond the Qumran scrolls, comparison of the MT with the Septuagint and other versions, synoptic 2 Samuel and 1 Chronicles, 2 Samuel 22//Psalm 18, and even medieval Hebrew manuscripts of the book of Samuel, compounds the severity of the problem in this book.

reference to, on account of' or "concerning" especially after verbs of speaking, hearing, etc.[184] Some of these involve the expression דבר אֶל.[185] Related to this, Rendsburg signals another facet of this issue. He believes the use of אֶל for עַל is a characteristic of northern or Israelian Hebrew, and he cites examples in MT Judges (6:39) and examples elsewhere with verbs of speech (e.g. צעק in 2 Kgs 8:3).[186] Several other examples of אֶל for עַל in MT Judges are 6:20 (אֶל־הַסֶּלַע); 6:40 (אֶל־הַגִּזָּה...וְעַל־כָּל־הָאָרֶץ as also in v. 39); 9:57 (אֲלֵיהֶם קִלֲלַת).[187] This raises the question whether in context 1QJudg's *lectio difficilior* וידברו...אל was revised to MT's *lectio facilior* דבר עַל.[188] This also underlines the difficulty of determining what language is early or late, and authorial or editorial, and cautions against basing historical linguistic and linguistic dating arguments

---

[184] The fullest list of examples I have seen is H. G. Mitchell, "The Preposition אֶל," *Journal of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis* 8 (1888), 43–120 (44; categories A2c and A2d; total of 79 examples). Briefer lists are given in *BDB*, 40 (§6), 41 n. 2; *DCH*, I, 268–269 (§7).

[185] The examples cited in the literature for this use of אֶל (excluding other uses, e.g. spatial) in Genesis–Kings *only* are: Gen 20:2 (אמר); Exod 6:13 (צוה), 13 (צוה); 25:22 (צוה); Lev 27:34 (צוה); Judg 21:6 (נחם); 1 Sam 1:27 (פלל); 3:12 (דבר); 4:19 (שמע), 21 (אמר), 21 (אמר); 15:35 (אבל); 16:1 (אבל); 20:34 (עצב); 31:11 (שמע); 2 Sam 1:24 (בכה); 3:33 (קין); 7:19 (דבר); 10:2 (נחם); 24:16 (נחם); 1 Kgs 14:5 (דרש); 16:13 (שמד); 19:3 (הלך); 21:22 (אמר), 32 (פלל), 20 (שמע); 19:9 (צעק), 3 (צעק); 8:3 (צעק); 2 Kgs 7:7 (נוס); (נתן). Outside Genesis–Kings there are some other examples with דבר: Isa 16:13; Jer 30:4, 4; 33:14; 36:31; 40:16; 50:1, 1; 51:12, 62. Without going into much more detail four observations are interesting with regard to the examples cited in Genesis–Kings: (1) some of these example could be construed as "against" but not all or even most of them; (2) in some of these passages אֶל and עַל alternate in immediate context with one another thus further strengthening the עַל-like interpretation of אֶל; (3) in synoptic Samuel and Chronicles, when MT Samuel has this use of אֶל, Chronicles *always* has עַל (2 Sam 7:19//1 Chr 17:17; 2 Sam 10:2//1 Chr 19:2; 2 Sam 24:16//1 Chr 21:15); in synoptic Kings and Isaiah, once Kings has this use of אֶל parallel to עַל in Isaiah (2 Kgs 19:9//Isa 37:9) and twice אֶל is shared (2 Kgs 19:20//Isa 37:21; 2 Kgs 19:32//Isa 37:33); (4) in the Septuagint sometimes these examples of אֶל are parallel to εἰς or πρός, and sometimes they are parallel to ἐπί, περί, or ὑπέρ, rarely another preposition.

[186] G. A. Rendsburg, *Israelian Hebrew in the Book of Kings* (Occasional Publications of the Department of Near Eastern Studies and the Program of Jewish Studies, Cornell University, 5; Bethesda, MD: CDL, 2002), 32–36, 109. Rendsburg's general theory is discussed in section 4.1.

[187] Modern translations correctly construe אֲלֵיהֶם as "upon them" given that elsewhere קִלְלָה is usually joined to עַל (Gen 27:12, 13; Deut 11:29; 28:15, 45; 29:26) and several times with *beth* or *lamed* in the Latter Prophets, but never אֶל.

[188] For the latter see Gen 18:19; Num 10:29; Josh 23:14; Judg 9:3; 1 Sam 25:30; 2 Sam 7:25, 25; many times in Kings; etc. See *BDB*, 754 (§1f[g], 1f[h]); *DCH*, VI, 394–395 (§15); *HALOT*, II, 826 (§3).

on small details like אֶל vs. עַל which were frequently changed as biblical writings were edited and transmitted.[189]

4.3.2.3. MT: וַיֻּגַּד; 1QJUDG: ויגד (9:42)

The most likely explanation for this variant is that 1QJudg's ויגד represents the *hophal* 3ms וַיֻּגַּד (not the *hiphil* 3ms וַיַּגֵּד) which is revised to the *hiphil* 3mp וַיַּגִּדוּ in the MT. Thus Fernández comments:

> Instead of the 3 pl. act. verb 1QJudg reads a 3 sg. impersonal pass. (*hofal*), see v. 47. This variant is also reflected in G (καὶ ἀπηγγέλη), La (*renuntiatum est*), and V (*cum nuntiatum esset*). The reading of 1QJudg G V is the *lectio difficilior* and must be preferred, while M represents a linguistic facilitation which does, however, not affect the meaning of the phrase.[190]

I agree, but contrary to Fernández's final suggestion, the MT's verb form is probably more than just a "linguistic facilitation." One or several issues might be at play here. Historical linguists have observed that LBH and QH have a preference for active (personal) over passive (impersonal) verb constructions[191] and for collective

---

[189] *BDB*, 41 n. 2: "There is a tendency in Hebrew, esp. manifest in S K Je Ez, to use אֶל in the sense of עַל; sometimes אֶל being used exceptionally in a phrase or construction which regularly, and in acc. with analogy, has עַל; sometimes, the two preps. interchanging, apparently without discrimination, in the same or parallel sentences...*It is prob. that this interchange, at least in many cases, is not original, but due to transcribers*" (emphasis added). It is unsurprising (cf. the discussion of the MT in section 2) that Rendsburg cites the first part of *BDB*'s paragraph, and the examples, but omits the concluding sentence ("It is prob...") (Rendsburg, *Israelian Hebrew in the Book of Kings*, 33). Likewise Rooker gives no indication whatsoever that the distribution of these prepositions in BH often reflects *scribal* efforts. In his view: "In conclusion, it is readily apparent that the inconsistent usage of the prepositions אל and על in the book of Ezekiel reflects a period of transition" (Rooker, *Biblical Hebrew in Transition*, 131). This is a precarious historical linguistic conclusion given the text-critical issues of the book of Ezekiel, as demonstrated in J. Lust, "The Ezekiel Text," in Y. A. P. Goldman, A. van der Kooij, and R. D. Weis (eds.), *Sôfer Mahîr: Essays in Honour of Adrian Schenker by the Editors of Biblia Hebraica Quinta* (VTSup, 110; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 153–167 (163–165). The view expressed in BDB is seen also in Mitchell, "Preposition אֶל," 47; Schoors, *Preacher Sought to Find Pleasing Words*, 200–201. For more detailed discussion of this particular issue see *LDBT*, I, 71–72 105, 356–357; Rezetko, *Source and Revision*, 93–95 with n. 38, 123–124 with n. 25, 152–153; *HLBH*.

[190] Fernández Marcos, *Judges*, 80*; cf. Soggin, *Judges*, 190. Butler claims that 1QJudg and LXX^B are "both efforts at clarifying the generalized 'they' of MT" but this makes sense only in the framework of his persistent attempts to defend the MT (Butler, *Judges*, 232).

[191] See *LDBT*, II, 166 (#22 in table); cf. E. Y. Kutscher, *The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll (1QIsaᵃ)* (STDJ, 6; Leiden: E. J.

nouns (here הָעָם) construed as plurals rather than singulars.[192] In this case the issue seems to be the decisive one. First, the *hiphil* of נגד is found 335 times in BH, in all books and sources, "late" and "early" alike, except seven of the Twelve[193] and Lamentations (in e.g. non-P *and* P; I, II, *and* III Isaiah; poetry *and* prose of Job; Song of Songs, Qoheleth, and Esther–Chronicles). In contrast the *hophal* of נגד appears only 35 times in BH with the following distribution: x6 in Genesis–Exodus (all non-P), x22 in Deuteronomy–Kings, x3 in I–II Isaiah, x2 in Ruth, and x2 in Chronicles (both synoptic).[194] Similarly, in QH the *hiphil* occurs 45 times but the *hophal* only once (1Q30). Second, a change motivated by a preference for active over passive verb constructions would also explain the same development in Judg 9:7, where there is no collective noun involved, and where a passive verb (cf. LXX[B] καὶ ἀνηγγέλη; Old Latin *et nuntiatum est*; Vulgate *cum nuntiatum esset*) was also revised to an active one (MT וַיַּגִּדוּ). The changes from וַיֻּגַּד to וַיַּגִּדוּ in MT 9:7, 42 were facilitated by plural contextual elements (כָּל־בַּעֲלֵי שְׁכֶם in v. 6, בַּעֲלֵי שְׁכֶם in v. 7, הָעָם [construed as plural] in v. 42). Why wasn't the change made in 9:25, 47 where the MT still has וַיֻּגַּד? Because "the citizens (of the Tower) of Shechem," who by this point in the story have become Abimelech's enemies, would have become in both cases the grammatical subject of the verb, and this would be nonsensical in the literary flow of the story. This then is a good illustration of how textual and literary factors may combine to inform the (historical) linguistic contours of BH writings. It also illustrates the fluidity of language in biblical texts and how "early" language could easily disappear from "early" (and of course "late") biblical writings.[195]

Brill, 1974), 401–403. A related issue is the preference for transitive over intransitive verb constructions (cf. *LDBT*, II, 166 [#23 in table]).

[192] See *LDBT*, II, 169 (#40 in table). However, Young has demonstrated that the current patterns of grammatical concord with עַם in BH are often the result of the scribal transmission of the texts rather than "original" authorial intention (I. Young, "'*Am* Construed as Singular and Plural in Hebrew Biblical Texts: Diachronic and Textual Perspectives," *ZAH* 12 [1999], 48–82).

[193] Joel, Obadiah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Malachi.

[194] Gen 22:20; 27:42; 31:22; 38:13, 24; Exod 14:5; Deut 17:4; Josh 9:24; 10:17; Judg 9:25, 47; 1 Sam 15:12; 19:19; 23:7, 13; 27:4; 2 Sam 6:12; 10:17; 19:2; 21:11; 1 Kgs 1:51; 2:29, 41; 10:7; 18:13; 2 Kgs 6:13; 8:7; Isa 7:2; 21:2; 40:21; Ruth 2:11; 1 Chr 19:17 (//2 Sam 10:17); 2 Chr 9:6 (//1 Kgs 10:7; but cf. n. 195). All the references in Genesis and Exodus are non-P. There are no occurrences of the *hophal* in Leviticus and Numbers. Note therefore that P exhibits opposite trends with regard to "early" iterative *weqatal* which it uses (see section 4.3.1.2) and "early" *hophal* נגד which it does not have. See the lengthy discussion of P in *HLBH*.

[195] Additional study of the versions will probably reveal other cases of revision in the MT. Also, opposite to the introduction of וַיַּגִּדוּ in MT Judg 9:7, 42, I have argued on completely independent text-critical and literary-critical grounds that the plus with the messenger's report (including the

4.3.3. JUDGES 21

4.3.3.1. INTRODUCTION

The final chapter of the book of Judges tells the story of how the Israelites secured wives from the cities of Jabesh-gilead and Shiloh for 600 surviving Benjaminite soldiers in order to save the Benjaminite tribe from extinction (chapter 21). This follows the brutal rape and murder of a Levite's concubine in Gibeah of Benjamin by the citizens of Gibeah (chapter 19) and the destruction of the Benjaminite people, livestock, and cities in civil war (chapter 20). Scholars have long regarded Judges 19–21 as an exilic or (more probably) postexilic (Persian or Hellenistic) addition or "appendix" to the book, and in the minds of most literary critics this assessment remains true.[196] At this point we transition from 1QJudg to 4QJudgᵇ. Variants between the Qumran manuscript and the received text are given in the following table.[197]

	MT Judges	4QJudgᵇ
21:19	מִזְרְחָה הַשֶּׁמֶשׁ	ש[שמ]ה זרח[מ]
21:22	אֲבוֹתָם	[ם]אבותיה
21:23	מִן־הַמְּחֹלְלוֹת	[ות]מהמחלל

As noted already (section 3.2) the preserved readings of 4QJudgᵇ are very close to the MT, but their linguistic significance has gone unappreciated. The three linguistic variants given here are found near the end of the book in the final seven verses.

4.3.3.2. MT: מִזְרְחָה הַשֶּׁמֶשׁ; 4QJUDGᴮ: ש[שמ]ה זרח[מ] (21:19)

The difference between the MT and 4QJudgᵇ is the presence of the directive (locative, etc.) ‑ָה in the MT. The predominant uses of this afformative are to express movement toward a place, location

---

initial וַיַּגֵּד) in 2 Sam 6:12 (cf. 1 Chr 15:24–25) was absent from the *Vorlage* of Chronicles and constitutes a late Second Temple period addition to the story in Samuel (Rezetko, *Source and Revision*, 171–176). Is וַיַּגֵּד secondary as well in MT 1 Kgs 10:7; 2 Kgs 6:13; 8:7? I would also be cautious about establishing a precise linguistic chronology of the *hiphil* and *hophal* of נגד since the latter is relatively rare, and in addition to its absence from P it does not occur in other biblical writings that are often considered preexilic or exilic in origin (e.g. Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Hosea, Amos, Micah, some Psalms).

[196] For example, Niditch, *Judges*, 12; cf. 11–13. See the discussion and bibliography in section 3.1 on the literary formation and section 4.1 on the language of the book.

[197] For the text and variants see Trebolle Barrera, "4QJudgᵇ," 166–169; Ulrich, *Biblical Qumran Scrolls*, 257–258; cf. Trebolle Barrera, "Édition préliminaire de *4QJugesᵇ*," 88–89.

at a place, and movement through time.[198] In BH it appears primarily on nouns, both common and proper, and on adverbs, whereas in QH the situation is reversed, first on adverbs and second on nouns. The traditional chronological view says directive הָ◌- changed in both frequency and function from EBH to LBH to QH (and Ben Sira and the Samaritan Pentateuch [SP]) to MH.[199] Frequently used words are "enfeebled," "weakened," "meaningless," "otiose," "fossilized," "ornate," etc. The suggested differences of usage include a higher frequency of frozen forms and forms with adverbial meaning, a progressively marginal sense of direction, more regular combination with prepositions, and a different ratio of usage in particular syntactic situations. Regarding syntax specifically, Joosten has argued that the directive הָ◌- attached to a noun in the construct state, as here in MT's מִזְרְחָה הַשֶּׁמֶשׁ, occurs 25 times in EBH (Joosten: CBH), and never in LBH or QH, and therefore it is a notable criterion of antiquity.[200] It has also been suggested that the Septuagint

---

[198] *GKC*, 248–251 (§90a-i); *JM*, 256–258 (§93c-f); B. K. Waltke and M. O'Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990), 185–186 (§10.5).

[199] Discussions with a focus especially on QH are found in S. E. Fassberg, "The Syntax of the Biblical Documents from the Judean Desert as Reflected in a Comparison of Multiple Copies of Biblical Texts," in T. Muraoka and J. F. Elwolde (eds.), *Diggers at the Well: Proceedings of a Third International Symposium on the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira* (STDJ, 36; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 94–109 (103, 106–107); Kutscher, *Language and Linguistic Background*, 413–414; T. Muraoka, "An Approach to the Morphosyntax and Syntax of Qumran Hebrew," in T. Muraoka and J. F. Elwolde (eds.), *Diggers at the Well: Proceedings of a Third International Symposium on the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira* (STDJ, 36; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 193–214 (206–208); E. Qimron, *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (HSM, 29; Atlanta: Scholars, 1986), 69 (§340), 90–91 (§500.1, חוֹצָה); E. Qimron and J. Strugnell, *Qumran Cave 4: V: Miqṣat Maʿaśe Ha-Torah* (DJD, 10; Oxford: Clarendon, 1994), 90–91 (§3.5.2.8). For brief statements on the SP see Z. Ben-Ḥayyim, *A Grammar of Samaritan Hebrew: Based on the Recitation of the Law in Comparison with the Tiberian and Other Jewish Traditions* (rev. edn. in English; Jerusalem: Magnes/Hebrew University, and Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2000), 326 (§7.2); Waltke and O'Connor, *Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*, 185 n. 46 (§10.5a).

[200] J. Joosten, "The Distinction Between Classical and Late Biblical Hebrew as Reflected in Syntax," *HS* 46 (2005), 327–339 (337–338); "La vérité philologique dans les débats sur la datation des textes bibliques," in P. Hummel and F. Gabriel (eds.),*Vérité(s) philologique(s). Études sur les notions de vérité et de fausseté en matière de philologie* (Paris: Philologicum, 2008), 19–29 (27–28); "Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek in the Qumran Scrolls," in T. H. Lim and J. J. Collins (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Oxford Handbooks in Religion and Theology; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 351–374 (357); "The Operation of a Syntactic Rule in Classical Biblical Hebrew and in Hebrew Inscriptions of the Monarchic Period," in J. K. Aitken, K. J. Dell, and B. A Mastin (eds.), *On Stone and Scroll: Essays in Honour of Graham Ivor Davies* (BZAW, 420; Berlin:

translators in their Hellenistic linguistic milieu frequently misunderstood and mistranslated BH forms with the directive הָ-.[201]

Given these considerations some will suggest that the absence of the directive הָ- in 4QJudgᵇ is a scribe's attempt to update the language of the biblical text. This possibility must be considered. But the suggestion is less persuasive once the above-mentioned arguments are carefully examined.

Evidence in support of the traditional view may include QH and MH.[202] In QH the particle occurs predominantly in the fixed adverbial expressions מואדה, למעלה, שמה (unknown in BH), and סביבה (unknown in BH) (about 104 times total, including variant forms; 85%). QH shows other distinctive characteristics compared to BH in regard to nouns: infrequent occurrence (about 18 times total; 15%), including a large number of occurrences in unclear fragmentary contexts and "Bible"-related writings (e.g. Reworked Pentateuch). The predominant repeated form is חוצה (חוצה, וחוצה, ולחוצה, מחוצה—all in BH with varied EBH/LBH distributions). Several of the more interesting examples are מביתה (4Q405:15ii–16,6; cf. מִבַּיְתָה in 1 Kgs 6:15), אל עיתה (4Q161:5–6,5; cf. עַל־עַיַּת in Isa 10:28), and עד שאולה (4Q200:6,6). In MH the directive הָ- occurs only rarely outside the frequent fixed expressions לְמַעְלָה, לְמַטָּה (unknown in BH), and חוּצָה (about 109 times total; sometimes with prepositions, especially מִן). It is evident that the directive הָ- occurs less frequently with nouns and functions differently in QH (and MH) compared to BH. However, without considering zero-instances in QH, that is, situations in which the directive הָ- could have been used but was avoided, it is difficult to judge its overall frequency of occurrence. Another issue which has not been considered is genre. In BH the frequency and function of the directive הָ- is "completely different" in prose and non-narrative (poetic and prophetic material),[203] and that may relate to the situation in QH (and MH) as well.[204]

In a previous publication we have discussed various problems with some of the arguments for the traditional chronological view of the directive הָ- in EBH and LBH.[205] Here I will restate some of those conclusions, but bypassing the previous arguments and instead giving some additional corroborating data. (1) *Septuagint*

Walter de Gruyter, 2011), 493–505 (498–499); "Wilhelm Gesenius and the History of Hebrew."

[201] See the publications by Joosten cited in n. 200.

[202] Accordance reports only three instances of the directive הָ- in Ben Sira, once מעלה (48:9) and twice ("proper") uses of ארצה (47:22; 50:17).

[203] J. Hoftijzer, *A Search for Method: A Study in the Syntactic Use of the H-Locale in Classical Hebrew* (Studies in Semitic Languages and Linguistics, 12; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1981), 154–185; cf. 2, 167, 176–177, 246–248.

[204] For example, the frequency and function of directive הָ- in the Psalms hardly compare to Genesis–Kings!

[205] *LDBT*, I, 78–80, 169–170, 350–351.

translators. It is untrue that the Old Greek translators frequently misunderstood and mistranslated BH forms with the directive הָ-.[206] (2) *Statistics in EBH and LBH*: The rates of occurrence of the directive הָ- in Genesis–Kings and Esther–Chronicles, or Samuel–Kings vs. Chronicles, are less divergent than we are often led to believe.[207] The gross numbers are impressive—there are about 1095 examples in BH,[208] 766 in Genesis–Kings and only 93 in Esther–Chronicles[209]—but the figures are deceptive when no account is taken of actual occurrences relative to total possible occurrences (zero-instances).[210] For example, the most frequent common noun with directive הָ- in BH is אֶרֶץ (x87; אַרְצָה). It is used 26 times in MT Samuel but only five times in MT Chronicles. The only synoptic (shared) example is 2 Sam 24:20//1 Chr 21:21. Thus the other four examples in Chronicles were presumably not taken from the *Vorlage* (1 Chr 22:8; 2 Chr 7:3; 20:18, 24). But the most interesting observation is that while there are eight other places in Samuel where אַרְצָה could have been used, there are only two other such places in Chronicles.[211] Thus EBH Samuel and LBH Chronicles have nearly identical ratios of usage of אַרְצָה.[212] In my opinion it is highly questionable whether the directive הָ- is greatly reduced in LBH. And it is certainly not the case that LBH is similar to QH in the frequency and function of the afformative.[213]

---

[206] See the detailed discussion of this claim in *LDBT*, I, 79 n. 71.

[207] *LDBT*, I, 78–80. The comments there also address the problem of Ezekiel (so-called transitional BH) and the Twelve which do not meet chronological expectations, and the unexpected finding that there are more pluses of the directive הָ- in synoptic MT Chronicles than in synoptic MT Samuel–Kings. It should be pointed out that the pluses in Chronicles all reflect normal EBH usage. Even the infrequent construction וְעַד־גְּזְרָה in LBH 1 Chr 14:16 has a parallel in עַד־אָפֵקָה in EBH Josh 13:4. Note however that the example given of 1 Kgs 7:46 (וּבֵין צָרְתָן)//2 Chr 4:17 (וּבֵין צְרֵדָתָה) is probably erroneous. The form in Chronicles is probably not intended to be a proper noun with directive הָ- but instead reflects confusion of similar geographic place names (cf. צָרְתָנָה/צָרְתָן in Josh 3:16; 1 Kgs 4:12; 7:46; צְרֵדָה/צְרֵדָתָה in 1 Kgs 11:26; 2 Chr 4:17).

[208] This total includes שָׁמָּה ("thither, there") but not אָנָה ("whither, where") and הֵנָּה ("hither, here") given that they are fixed forms.

[209] There are also two examples in K/Q readings in Samuel: 1 Sam 9:26 (K: הַגָּג; Q: הַגָּגָה); 2 Sam 21:12 (K: שָׁם; Q: שָׁמָּה).

[210] I was alerted to the significance of this issue by Simon Holloway, a Ph.D. candidate at the University of Sydney. His B.A. honors thesis, "On the Supposed Diminishment of Locative-*Heh* Forms in Chronicles: A Fresh Look at the Evidence" (2006), deals with dozens of examples besides the one given here. He discusses examples of particular lexemes carrying directive הָ- and specific verbs taking objects with directive הָ-.

[211] 1 Sam 13:7; 22:5; 25:23; 27:1, 8; 29:11; 2 Sam 10:2; 24:6; 1 Chr 19:2; 2 Chr 6:36.

[212] Samuel: 76%; Chronicles: 71%.

[213] Other chronological claims are just as problematic but the quantity

(3) *Samaritan Pentateuch*: The supposed obsolescence of the directive הָ- hardly left any traces in SP. The MT and SP agree 350 times on the directive הָ- (nearly 90%).[214] Strikingly the SP has 59 pluses of the afformative (only 7 are שמה) and the MT has 48 pluses (18 are שָׁמָּה). The SP shows a broader spectrum of usage in its pluses (e.g. on proper nouns) than does the MT and only a small number (perhaps five) of those could be labeled "improper" uses. I return below to the SP. (4) *Biblical Dead Sea Scrolls*: The biblical DSS have about 212 occurrences of (non-restored) examples of the directive הָ-. More often than not the MT and the DSS agree, as for example in Judges (MT = 1QJudg 9:5 [עָפְרָתָה], 31 [שְׁכֶמָה]). But some may be surprised to find out that against 23 minuses (e.g. מזרח in 4QJudgᵇ 21:19) there are 75 pluses of the directive הָ- in the biblical scrolls.[215] Most of these pluses reflect "normal" (E)BH usage.[216] This is an excellent illustration of the fluidity of linguistic elements in biblical manuscripts. What would we find if the scrolls had survived for the other 80% of the MT's examples (and unknown non-examples) of directive הָ-? (5) *Preliminary conclusion*: The first thought of many historical linguists—especially those who base their linguistic analysis mainly or only on the MT—will be that the minus of MT's directive הָ- in 4QJudgᵇ 21:19 is a case of linguistic modernization. The survey of data given here, especially

---

of data prevents me from giving a thorough account here. I will publish my complete study some other time, including full data and examples for the SP and DSS (summarized in the next two points, above). In summary: It has been claimed that the directional meaning is weakened in LBH compared to EBH, the construction article + noun + directive הָ- is less common in LBH than EBH, and there are more examples of directive הָ- combined with prepositions in LBH than EBH. All of these claims are questionable. For example, Qimron remarks: "Originally, this *he* expressed the direction, but in post-exilic Hebrew, it became meaningless and prepositions were added to the adverb, e.g. מחוצה *4Q491 1–3: 9*, ולחוצה TS 42: 4" (Qimron, *Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 90–91 [§500.1]). A problem with this thesis is that there are *no* examples of מִן + noun + directive הָ- in undisputed postexilic BH, but there are a number of examples in EBH and elsewhere: וּמִן־הַגִּדְגָּדָה (Deut 10:17); מֵעֶגְלוֹנָה (Josh 10:36); מִצָּפוֹנָה (Josh 15:10; Judg 21:19); מִיָּנוֹחָה (Josh 16:7); מִבֵּיתָה (1 Kgs 6:15); מִכּוּתָה (2 Kgs 17:24); מִבָּבֶלָה (Jer 27:16); מֵחוּצָה (Ezek 40:40); וּמֵחוּצָה (Ezek 40:44); perhaps וּמִמַּעֲרָבָה (Isa 45:6; cf. *GKC*, 250 [§90e]). Examples with other prepositions (בְּ, אֶל, לְ, עַד) give equally interesting results.

[214] The figures are from Accordance which is based on A. Tal, *The Samaritan Pentateuch: Edited according to MS 6(C) of the Shekhem Synagogue* (Texts and Studies in the Hebrew Language and Related Subjects, 7; Tel Aviv: Chaim Rosenberg School of Jewish Studies, Tel Aviv University, 1994).

[215] 47 excluding the QH innovation מואדה, mainly in Isaiah and Psalms, usually compared to MT's מְאֹד.

[216] See, for example, the discussion of the MT and Samuel scrolls in *LDBT*, I, 350–351, and the fuller discussion in *HLBH*.

the text-critical perspective provided by the SP and DSS, suggests strongly that such a suggestion would have very minimal empirical evidence in its favor.[217]

I noted above that for Joosten a directive הָ- attached to a noun in the construct state, as here in MT Judg 21:19 (מִזְרְחָה הַשֶּׁמֶשׁ), is a noteworthy proof of the antiquity of EBH writings (mainly Genesis–Kings).[218] The example at hand is one of 25 which he cites in the MT Bible, all in Genesis–Isaiah. Adding five examples (italicized) to Joosten's there are 30 examples in the MT Bible[219]:

Book	Tokens	References
Genesis	17	11:31; 12:5, *5*; 20:1; *24:67*; 28:2; 29:1; 31:18; 32:4; 42:29; 43:17, 24; 44:14; 45:17; 46:28; 47:14; 50:13
Exodus	3	4:20; 8:20; *10:19*
Leviticus	0	—
Numbers	2	34:5; 35:10
Deuteronomy	1	4:41
Joshua	2	*12:1*; *15:12*; 18:12
Judges	1	21:19
Samuel	0	—
Kings	1	1 Kgs 19:15
Isaiah	2	8:23, 23
Jeremiah–Chronicles	0	—

One possible example in the inscriptions can be added to this list: ביתה אלישב (Arad 17:2).[220]

---

[217] The text-critical perspective is also a corrective to some of the conclusions in Hoftijzer's otherwise helpful study which admittedly is based solely on the MT (Hoftijzer, *A Search for Method*, 18).

[218] A previous and shorter critique of this theory is found in *LDBT*, I, 79–80, 169–170.

[219] Gen 24:67 (וַיְבִאֶהָ יִצְחָק הָאֹהֱלָה שָׂרָה אִמּוֹ) and Josh 15:12 (וּגְבוּל יָם הַיָּמָה הַגָּדוֹל) are problematic ("ungrammatical"). שָׂרָה אִמּוֹ is perhaps an addition to an "original" הָאֹהֱלָה. In any case, as they sit in the MT, these examples fit here. Some other interesting biblical constructions are compound proper names in which the directive הָ- appears, uncharacteristically, and on the first element: בְּאֵרָה שֶׁבַע (Gen 46:1; SP: באר שבע); דָּנָה יַּעַן (2 Sam 24:6; LXX^B: εἰς Δανειδαν καὶ Ουδαν; LXX^L: ἕως Δαν; many other variants); פַּדֶּנָה אֲרָם (Gen 28:2, 5, 6, 7; MT and SP); cf. בְּאָבֵלָה בֵּית הַמַּעֲכָה (2 Sam 20:15). One wonders whether some or all of these examples are textually corrupt.

[220] Note that although Dobbs-Allsopp et al. state that the *he* in this form "is most likely the *he*-directive" they add "but one may also take it as an anticipatory suffix" (F. W. Dobbs-Allsopp et al., *Hebrew Inscriptions: Texts from the Biblical Period of the Monarchy with Concordance* [New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005], 36). See the discussion in *LDBT*, I, 169–170.

Observations: (1) This infrequent construction could be considered a characteristic linguistic feature of Genesis alone. Elsewhere the construction is extremely rare or unknown. (2) The EBH books of Leviticus and Samuel, like the LBH books of Esther–Chronicles, indeed most of the rest of the books of the Bible (Jeremiah–Chronicles), have no examples of this construction. (3) In his comments on this construction (his "NhxN" type[221]) Hoftijzer wonders whether it "was used at all in a prose type like Chr."[222] What has gone unnoticed, however, is that there are very few zero-instances in LBH writings.[223] According to my preliminary study the only occasions where this rare construction could easily have been used in Esther–Chronicles are in Dan 1:2 (וַיְבִיאֵם אֶרֶץ־שִׁנְעָר) and Neh 6:10 (וַאֲנִי־בָאתִי בֵּית שְׁמַעְיָה)—not in Esther, Ezra, or Chronicles. (4) I have not found any prospective zero-instances in Leviticus either. But there are at least five in Samuel: 1 Sam 13:7 (עָבְרוּ אֶת־הַיַּרְדֵּן אֶרֶץ גָּד); 1 Sam 22:5 (לֵךְ וּבָאתָ־לְּךָ אֶרֶץ יְהוּדָה); 2 Sam 6:10 (וַיַּטֵּהוּ דָוִד בֵּית עֹבֵד־אֱדֹום הַגִּתִּי); 2 Sam 13:7 (לְכִי נָא בֵּית אַמְנוֹן אָחִיךְ); 2 Sam 13:8 (וַתֵּלֶךְ תָּמָר בֵּית אַמְנוֹן אָחִיהָ); cf. 2 Sam 2:24 (עַל־פְּנֵי־גִיחַ דֶּרֶךְ מִדְבַּר גִּבְעֹון). Surely there are many other zero-instances throughout the entire Bible, in "early" and "late" writings alike. The main point is that if one chooses to stress the absence of this construction from Esther–Chronicles, then one should stress even more its absence from a book like Samuel. (5) Given that 23 of the 30 appearances of this construction in BH are in the Torah, it is interesting to compare the MT and SP. Ten of the MT's 23 examples are pluses compared to the SP.[224] On the other hand the SP has five pluses compared to the MT.[225] This evidence suggests, I believe, that this "early" directive הָ- construction was subject to insertion and

---

Other examples of the directive הָ- in the inscriptions include שמה (Arad 24:20; Lachish 4:8; 8:7); מצרימה (Lachish 3:16); העירה (Lachish 4:7).

[221] His remark is specifically on the *regens* בֵּית with a personal or divine name as *rectum*. Note that בֵּית is the second most common *regens* in this construction after אֶרֶץ ("to the house of...," "to the land of...," etc.).

[222] Hoftijzer, *A Search for Method*, 236; cf. 63–80, 239, 242, 249–250 for his main remarks on this construction.

[223] The data are omitted due to space limitations. I have considered a large selection of elements which could function as *regens* (e.g. אֶרֶץ) or *rectum* (e.g. כְּנַעַן) in the construction (e.g. אַרְצָה כְּנַעַן). I have excluded constructions with prepositions (e.g. כִּי תָבֹאוּ אֶל־אֶרֶץ כְּנַעַן [Lev 14:34]) since they are common throughout BH in both EBH and LBH alike. I have also excluded examples of בֵּית יְהוָה and the houses of other deities since constructions with בֵּית preceded by e.g. verbs of movement do not attest the directive הָ-.

[224] Gen 20:1 (אַרְצָה הַנֶּגֶב); 28:2 (בֵּיתָה בְתוּאֵל); 29:1 (אַרְצָה בְנֵי־קֶדֶם); 10:19 (אַרְצָה מִצְרָיִם); 46:28 (אַרְצָה גֹּשֶׁן); Exod 4:20 (אַרְצָה שֵׂעִיר); 32:4 (אַרְצָה כְּנַעַן); 35:10 (נַחְלָה מִצְרָיִם); Num 34:5 (אַרְצָה כְּנַעַן); Deut 4:41 (יָמָּה סוּף); (מִזְרְחָה שֶׁמֶשׁ).

[225] Gen 12:15 (בֵיתה פרעה); 43:18 (ביתה יוסף); Exod 23:19 (בֵיתה יהוה); 34:26 (ביתה יהוה); Deut 23:5 (פתרה ארם; MT has מִן, but cf. Num 22:5).

deletion in the transmission of biblical manuscripts, and therefore it can hardly be a criterion for the antiquity of biblical writings. (6) The DSS have survived for only three of these passages. Remarkably the MT and the DSS agree once and disagree three times on the directive ◌ָה-. (One naturally wonders about the textual history of the other 26 MT examples of this construction.) The MT and 4Q22 both have the affirmative in Exod 8:20 (בֵּיתָה פַרְעֹה). The phrases אַרְצָה זְבֻלוּן and וְאַרְצָה נַפְתָּלִי in MT Isa 8:23 are notoriously difficult (cf. translations and commentaries). The *he*s have been interpreted as directive ◌ָה-, accusative marker, emphatic state (Aramaism), and poetic/rhythmic. 1QIsaiah^a offers והארץ נפתלי and ארץ זבולון which seem to have their parallels in the Septuagint's χώρα Ζαβουλων and ἡ γῆ Νεφθαλιμ.[226] It is uncertain what is going on in the text of MT Isa 8:23, and it is also uncertain that the two directive ◌ָה- forms are original elements of the text.

I have argued that chronological claims about the general decline of the directive ◌ָה- and about the antiquity of the special construct formation are problematic at best and unfounded at worst, and that the manuscript traditions of the Bible (MT, SP, DSS) attest a substantial degree of fluidity in the presence/absence of the affirmative. The available evidence does not support the view that the minus of MT's directive ◌ָה- in 4QJudg^b 21:19 is a case of linguistic modernization. What are the other possibilities?[227] (1) The minus in 4QJudg^b is a case of haplography given the sequence *het, he, he*: מזרח השמש → מזרחה השמש. (2) The minus in 4QJudg^b is an assimilation to the more common BH phrase מִזְרַח הַשָּׁמֶשׁ.[228] (3) The plus in the MT is an example of dittography: מזרחה השמש → מזרח השמש. (4) The directive ◌ָה- in the MT was consciously, or perhaps somewhat unconsciously, written in the text under the influence of the large number of final *he*s in 21:19 (on 9 of 20 graphic units in total) or, more probably, because the directive ◌ָה- appears also on the preceding temporal construction (מִיָּמִים יָמִימָה) and on the other nearby geographical phrases (שְׁכֶמָה, מִצְפוֹנָה; cf. לִלְבוֹנָה). In other words, the addition of the directive ◌ָה- to an earlier מזרח השמש may seek to "round out" the text. The absence of the directive ◌ָה- on בֵּית־אֵל is no obstacle to this possibility since it is preceded by לְ and because in any case בֵּית־אֵל (x73) never occurs with the affirmative even when it easily

---

[226] 1QIsaiah^a's והארץ נפתלי is also difficult. Compare הָאָרֶץ כְּנָעַן (Num 34:2) and הָאָרֶץ לַיִשׁ (Judg 18:14). It is possible that the proper nouns in these two examples are additions.

[227] Trebolle discusses the paleographical issues and the possibilities of either a variant reading or a haplography (Trebolle Barrera, "Édition préliminaire de *4QJuges^b*," 84, 88; "4QJudg^b," 168–169).

[228] The "normal" phrase in BH is מִזְרַח הַשָּׁמֶשׁ (x16; Num 21:11; Deut 4:47; Josh 1:15; 13:5; 19:12, 27, 34; Judg 11:18; 20:43; 2 Kgs 10:33; Isa 41:25; 45:6; 59:19; Mal 1:11; Ps 50:1; 113:3). The phrase מִזְרְחָה שָׁמֶשׁ is much rarer (x3; Deut 4:41; Josh 12:1; [MT] Judg 21:19).

could have had it (e.g. אַחַת עֹלָה בֵית־אֵל וְאַחַת גִּבְעָתָה [Judg 20:31]).
Another element of this verse may support the hypothesis that the
directive הָ- was added to מזרח: מִצְפוֹנָה לְבֵית־אֵל (immediately
before מִזְרְחָה הַשֶּׁמֶשׁ), "on the north of Beth-el." [229] MT's
מִצְפוֹנָה לְבֵית־אֵל is strikingly odd for several reasons. The form
מִצְפוֹנָה occurs only twice in BH (Josh 15:10; Judg 21:19).[230] The
preposition מִן on a word with directive הָ- is uncommon.[231] In
particular, the sequence מִן + noun + directive הָ- + לְ- appears
only here and in Ezek 40:40, 44. What is expected in 21:19 is
מִצְפוֹן לְ- (Josh 8:11, 13; 15:6; 17:9; 24:30; Judg 2:9; Ezek 8:5). It
seems then that the directive הָ- may have been added to *both*
מצפון and מזרח for aesthetic reasons.[232]

4.3.3.3. MT: אֲבוֹתָם; *4QJUDG*[B]: אבותיה[ם] *(21:22)*

BH has two different third masculine plural pronominal suffixes
for feminine plural nouns ending in ות- and masculine plural nouns
which take the feminine plural ending ות-: וֹתָם- and וֹתֵיהֶם-.[233]
Hurvitz gives the traditional diachronic view of the distribution of
these forms in ancient Hebrew writings:

> Now the interchange of the two morphemes involved is not
> simply a free stylistic variation. Underlying this shift is a
> gradual—but consistent—linguistic process, in which one
> grammatical form [e.g. אֲבוֹתָם] is replaced by another [e.g.
> אֲבוֹתֵיהֶם]....the distribution of the *-ōtēyhēm* [*sic*] ending clearly
> characterizes the late literature, both in the Bible and outside
> it.[234]

With this idea in mind some will immediately suggest that the
"later" form in 4QJudgᵃ is merely a linguistic updating of the
"earlier" form in the MT. But such a suggestion is unpersuasive
when the complete data for all וֹתָם- and וֹתֵיהֶם- forms are
evaluated.[235] For example, contrary to common opinion, in QH

---

[229] 4QJudgᵇ has unfortunately not been preserved here.

[230] MT Josh 15:10 has its own problems, including the obvious gloss
הִיא כְסָלוֹן after מִצְפוֹנָה. Contrast 34 examples of מִצְפוֹן: Joshua x12; Judges
x2 (2:9; 7:1); Samuel x1; Isaiah x3; Jeremiah x10; Ezekiel x2; Amos x1;
Psalms x1; Job x1; Daniel x1.

[231] See the examples cited in n. 213.

[232] Hoftijzer also highlights the "remarkable" concentration of "some
instances of what could be called a less common use of *-h*-morphemes,"
referring to מִצְפוֹנָה (his "pNh") and מִזְרְחָה (his "NhxN") in MT Judg
21:19 (Hoftijzer, *A Search for Method*, 245; cf. 225, 231).

[233] *LDBT*, II, 173 (#63 in table).

[234] Hurvitz, *Linguistic Study of the Relationship*, 25; cf. 24–27.

[235] Owing to the large quantity of data it is impossible to give all the
details here. I will publish my full study some other time. However here
are a few other preliminary remarks in addition to those that follow
above. The consensus seems to be that וֹתָם- is the older form whereas the
double plural form וֹתֵיהֶם- is younger (against the suggestion in *LDBT*, II,

"forms like אבותם occur some 70 times, as opposed to 15 times for forms like אבותיהם. This is somewhat surprising, since the short form is older."[236] In particular, the specific noun plus suffix form

156). In Blau's thinking, for example, "[t]he form אֲבוֹתָם 'their fathers' stems from < *ʾaḇōṯahum. It alternates with the secondary formation אֲבוֹתֵיהֶם < *ʾaḇōṯayhum, which was influenced by מַרְאֵיהֶם < *marʾayihim" (J. Blau, *Phonology and Morphology of Biblical Hebrew: An Introduction* [LSAWS, 2; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2010], 175 [§4.2.3.8.1n]). However, this *does not have to be* a chronologically late form considering the double pluralization of feminine plural nouns with suffixes in general, and according to some it *could not be* a chronologically late form given מְכֵרֹתֵיהֶם in Gen 49:5 which is usually classified as Archaic Biblical Hebrew. (Of course the assumptions are that the poem is ancient and that the word and its form are original.) Moving to the other end of the continuum, past the DSS, Bar-Asher states that "[a]lmost all who have dealt with this question have erred, some more some less, in presenting and analyzing the data" (citing Hurvitz and others, and Qimron as the exception) and he gives his own impression of the evidence: "I believe, however, that ותן- never ceased to exist in Hebrew and survived through the Mishnaic period" (M. Bar-Asher, "The Study of Mishnaic Hebrew Based on Written Sources: Achievements, Problems, and Tasks', in M. Bar-Asher and S. E. Fassberg [eds.], *Studies in Mishnaic Hebrew* [ScrHier, 37; Jerusalem: Magnes/Hebrew University, 1998], 9–42 [18–19]). BH lies between these early and late endpoints. There is clearly a different ratio of occurrence of these forms in core EBH and core LBH writings, Genesis–Kings preferring וֹתָם- forms and Esther–Chronicles preferring וֹתֵיהֶם-forms (*LDBT*, I, 76). But this observation has been used in historical linguistic discussions is misleading ways. What is needed—and I will eventually get around to publishing it—is a full study that pays attention to at least the following factors: (1) consideration of non-chronological linguistic issues such as euphony (cf. *JM*, 265 [§94g]); (2) a full sociolinguistic variationist analysis that accurately and clearly displays all c. 582 total occurrences of the c. 118 distinct lexemes with these suffixes; all published discussions tend to rely heavily on occurrences of the single lexeme אָב!; (3) attention to patterns of particular lexemes and expressions with one or the other or both suffixes; (4) attention to individual sources and books rather than broad sweeping statements about large groups of books, usually Genesis–Kings vs. Esther–Chronicles, which characterize all published discussions; for example, all published studies neglect to point out facts such as 2 lexemes/2 occurrences of וֹתָם- compared to 4 lexemes/4 occurrences of וֹתֵיהֶם- in MT Samuel. These criticisms and others apply as well to the sociolinguistic variationist analysis in Kim, *Early Biblical Hebrew*, 99–107. When all is said and done the traditional historical linguistic view—and even more so the use of these variants in linguistic dating discussions—will have to be severely modified or completely abandoned.

[236] Qimron, *Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 63 (§322.182). He adds: "The fact, unnoticed by Hurvitz, that the short form predominates in DSS Hebrew and is not absent from MH (contra Hurvitz), shows that both forms were in use in pre-exilic Hebrew, in post-exilic Hebrew and perhaps in MH as well" (Qimron, *Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 63 n. 81 [§322.182]).

אבותיהם is found *less frequently* in QH than אבותם. The biblical scrolls have אבותיהם for MT's אֲבוֹתָם only twice and elsewhere both the scrolls and the MT have אבותם five times.[237] The sectarian scrolls have אבותם five times and אבותיהם four times.[238] The absence of a trend in the direction of replacement weakens any claim that 4QJudgᵃ's אבותיהם is simply a linguistic modernization. It has also gone unnoticed that MT Judges has comparable numbers of examples of both "early" -וֹתָם and "late" -וֹתֵיהֶם.

-וֹתָם	-וֹתֵיהֶם
אֲבוֹתָם ("their fathers"): 2:12, 17, 19, 20, 22; 3:4; 21:22 מִמְּסִלּוֹתָם ("their courses"): 5:20 חֲלִיצוֹתָם ("their equipment" [?]): 14:19 מִקְצוֹתָם ("their ends"): 18:2	מִזְבְּחוֹתֵיהֶם ("their altars"): 2:2 בְּנוֹתֵיהֶם ("their daughters"): 3:6, 6 שׁוֹפְרֹתֵיהֶם ("their horns"): 7:8
4 distinct lexemes with 10 occurrences	3 distinct lexemes with 4 occurrences

Given the pattern of distribution of אֲבוֹתֵיהֶם and אֲבוֹתָם in the current received text of the Bible (MT),[239] including six occurrences of אֲבוֹתָם elsewhere in MT Judges, and with no substantiated motive to avoid -וֹתֵיהֶם in Judges or אֲבוֹתָם in the DSS, it seems likely to me that MT's אֲבוֹתָם in Judg 21:22 is an assimilation of 4QJudgᵃ's אבותיהם to the standard usage in the MT book of Judges. This cannot be proved, or disproved, but it makes more sense than an inference based on a broad sweeping historical linguistic generalization which in any case is ill-conceived.[240]

---

[237] אבותיהם for אֲבוֹתָם: Deut 10:11 (2Q12); Judg 21:22 (4QJudgᵇ); אבותם in both: Num 4:2 (4Q23), 46 (4Q23); 17:17 (4Q27); Deut 29:24 (4Q29); Isa 14:21 (1QIsaᵃ).

[238] אבותם: 4Q177:1–4,11; 4Q365:35ii4; 4Q368:5,3; 4Q383:A,3; 4Q434:1ii3; אבותיהם: 4Q385a:18ia-b,9; 4Q390:1,7; 11Q19:59,12; PAM43.679:7,4.

[239] The general MT figures are: אֲבוֹתָם (x107): Exodus x2; Leviticus x2; Numbers x38; Deuteronomy x3; Joshua x6; Judges x7; Kings x9; I Isaiah x1; Jeremiah x11; Ezekiel x4; Amos x1; Malachi x1; Psalms x3; Proverbs x1; Job x3; Ezra x2; Nehemiah x1; synoptic Chronicles x1; non-synoptic Chronicles x11; אֲבוֹתֵיהֶם (x32): Kings x1 (MT plus); Jeremiah x3 (MT plus x1); Ezra x1; Nehemiah x2; non-synoptic Chronicles x23; synoptic Chronicles (= אֲבוֹתָם in Kings) x2.

[240] Trebolle seems to suggest that 4QJudgᵇ's אבותיהם has been assimilated to the *following* אחיהם when he says "the same form of the pronoun is found in the noun that follows, או אחיהם" (Trebolle Barrera, "4QJudgᵇ," 169; cf. "Édition préliminaire de *4QJugesᵇ*," 88), but in my mind this suggestion, if that is what it is, moves (literally) in the wrong direction. Burney brings another issue to bear when he mentions the

4.3.3.4. MT: מִן־הַמְּחֹלְלוֹת *; 4QJ*UDG*ᴮ:* מהמחלל[ות] *(21:23)*

The difference here is the assimilation of the *nun* of מִן before the noun [241] with the definite article in 4QJudgᵇ versus its non-assimilation in the MT. [242] There is no obvious chronological explanation for the distribution of these assimilated and unassimilated forms in the MT Bible.[243] Against this disagreement between the MT and 4QJudgᵇ the received and Qumran texts of the book agree twice elsewhere on מִן הַ-: MT/1QJudg 9:43; MT/4QJudgᵇ 21:21. In this case of disagreement it is much more likely that the MT's unassimilated *nun* of מִן in מִן־הַמְּחֹלְלוֹת was revised from the assimilated form attested in 4QJudgᵇ. These are the reasons: (1) מִן הַ- appears just several verses earlier (21:21), and all things being equal scribes tend to assimilate rather than dissimilate linguistic forms; (2) מִן הַ- (x32) is preferred over מֵהַ- (x6) in MT Judges,[244] and this is an additional motivation for the

---

problem of gender incongruence (I return to this below) and suggests emending the MT to אֲבוֹתָן and אֲחֵיהֶן "in place of the erroneous masc. suffixes" (Burney, *Book of Judges*, 293). Another view is offered by Boling who says "[t]he pronouns are masculine, and probably originated in misunderstood dual forms, as in 19:24" (Boling, *Judges*, 293), but Webb rightly points out that in 21:22, unlike 19:24, more than 200 women are in view (Webb, *Book of Judges*, 504). In any case, whatever the relationship between MT's אֲבוֹתָם and 4QJudgᵇ's אבותיהם, it is not clear that either reading represents the "original" text.

[241] The article plus participle הַמְּחֹלְלוֹת is functioning as a noun.

[242] This issue as a whole has received relatively little attention compared to the assimilation/non-assimilation of the *nun* of מִן before a noun *without* the definite article. The anarthrous form with the unassimilated *nun* (e.g. מִן־בְּנֵי vs. מִבְּנֵי) is commonly considered LBH (*LDBT*, II, 176 [#76 in table]), but this view has its own problems, text-critical and otherwise. See Rezetko, "Dating Biblical Hebrew," 230–231; I. Young, "Notes on the Language of 4QCantᵇ," *JJS* 52 (2001), 122–131 (122–123); "Late Biblical Hebrew and Hebrew Inscriptions," in I. Young (ed.), *Biblical Hebrew: Studies in Chronology and Typology* (JSOTSup, 369; London: T&T Clark International, 2003), 276–311 (289, 295, 310); "Late Biblical Hebrew and the Qumran Pesher Habakkuk," *JHS*, vol. 8, article 25 (2008), 9–10, 31, 34 (http://www.jhsonline.org/Articles/article_102.pdf); "Patterns of Linguistic Forms in the Masoretic Text: The Preposition מן 'From,'" forthcoming; *LDBT*, I, 349, *passim.*

[243] For a thorough study including references, statistics, and text-critical observations with a focus on the manuscripts of the book of Samuel, see Young, "Patterns of Linguistic Forms in the Masoretic Text." MT Samuel has more than a third of all מֵ הַ- + noun forms in the Bible (34 of 94), and the most even distribution of the two forms of any biblical book, 38 מִן הַ- + noun vs. 34 מֵ הַ- + noun. Young argues that these peculiarities of the book of Samuel are best explained by scribal intervention in textual transmission.

[244] מִן הַ- (x32): 1:24; 2:1, 17, 21; 3:19, 27; 6:21, 38; 7:3, 5; 8:13, 26, 26; 9:15, 35, 43; 10:11; 11:22; 12:9; 13:5, 7; 15:13; 19:16; 20:14, 21, 25, 31, 32, 38, 40; 21:21, 23; מֵ הַ- (x6): 1:36; 14:14; 17:8; 20:15, 31, 42.

revision in the MT[245]; cf. the discussion above of MT's אֲבוֹתָם; (3) the Qumran sectarian scrolls greatly prefer the unassimilated form,[246] as here in the MT, which makes it highly unlikely that a Qumran scribe would adjust the text to the assimilated form; (4) remarkably, only here in the Qumran biblical scrolls is -מֶה parallel to -מִן הַ in the MT. [247] In conclusion, this example illustrates linguistic fluidity in biblical manuscripts and linguistic revision in the MT, and it also adds momentum to my arguments above that MT's מִזְרְחָה and אֲבוֹתָם are also revised forms.

On the preceding pages I have argued that the variants between 4QJudg[b] and the MT of 21:19, 22, 23 arose due to linguistic revisions in the tradition represented by the MT. These adjustments were the final polishing touches in a text which evidently experienced a complex editorial and transmission history. This process began in the exilic or, more probably, postexilic period when this chapter, as part of the framework or bookends of the book (chapters 1–2, 17–21)—introductions and conclusions are often written last, or at least their final form is written last, to tie together and round out a story—was first composed by the anonymous author(s) of the book. That process continued over the centuries as the book was read and reread, written and rewritten, and so on. The differences between 4QJudg[b] and the MT give us a brief glimpse into the final stages of this production process. Some would explain from the outlook of this same editorial-transmission perspective other LBH or "late" linguistic features in these chapters, including the closing verses of the book[248]: multiple

---

[245] Of course we do not know how many of these unassimilated forms are revisions in the MT given that, unfortunately, the Qumran scrolls of the book give us access only to the three forms mentioned above.

[246] There are 296 *min + ha* forms in the sectarian scrolls, of which 285 have the unassimilated *nun* and only 11 have the assimilated *nun*: CD13,3; 3Q15:10,3; 4Q396:1–2iii11; 4Q397:14–21,12; 11Q19:31,11, 12, 12, 13; 37,2; 66,5 (vs. 32 unassimilated forms in 11Q19); KhQ1,5.

[247] There is a total of 194 *min + ha* in the biblical scrolls, 186 with unassimilated *nun* and 8 with assimilated *nun*: Deut 11:12 (4Q138); Judg 21:23 (4QJudg[b]); Isa 1:24 (1QIsa[a]), 29 (1QIsa[a]); 14:12 (1QIsa[a]); 19:5 (1QIsa[a], 4Q56); 58:13 (4Q67); Ps 36:6 (4Q83). In these eight cases the MT and scrolls agree twice and disagree six times. Altogether there are 181 agreements and 13 disagreements between the MT and the scrolls: MT has unassimilated *nun* of *min* (x1): Judg 21:23 (4QJudg[b]); MT has minus of *min* (x1): Deut 19:11 (4Q38a); MT has minus of *ha* (x6): Deut 11:12 (4Q138); 2 Sam 13:15 (4Q51); Isa 1:24 (1QIsa[a]); 14:12 (1QIsa[a]); 58:13 (4Q67); 63:15 (1QIsa[a]); MT has minus of *min + ha* (x1): Num 18:30 (4Q27); MT has something other than *min* (x2): 2 Sam 12:16 (4Q51; אֶת); Ps 36:6 (4Q83; בְּ); scroll has a plus with *min + ha* (x2): Exod 9:19 (4Q22; cf. MT 9:18); 2 Sam 10:6 (4Q51). Note that these figures are from the perspective of the Qumran scrolls, i.e. minuses of MT's *min + ha* are excluded from the discussion, and no reconstructed readings are included.

[248] See especially Edenburg, "Story of the Outrage at Gibeah," 138–196.

instances of gender incongruence in vv. 21–23,[249] נָשָׂא אִשָּׁה (vs. לָקַח אִשָּׁה) in v. 23,[250] and בָּהֶם (vs. בָּם—or בָּהֶן!) in v. 23.[251] Finally, Trebolle and Brooke have argued—independent of the linguistic issues I have discussed—that other text-critical evidence in this chapter suggests that the MT is a (late) variant literary edition of the story.[252] At any rate any historical linguistic assessment of the language of Judges 21 that is based mainly or only on the MT is plainly unjustified.

5. IMPLICATIONS OF THE QUMRAN SCROLLS OF JUDGES FOR THE LINGUISTIC DATING AND HISTORICAL LINGUISTICS OF BIBLICAL HEBREW

5.1. REPRISE AND LOOKING AHEAD

Up until now I have discussed a wide range of issues related to the literary, textual, and (historical) linguistic contours of the book of Judges, mainly parts of chapters 6, 9, and 21, in the MT and three fragmentary DSS manuscripts. I have also treated in varying degrees of detail ten linguistic features in MT additions (6:3, 7, 9–10) and variants between the MT and DSS (6:13; 9:3, 42; 21:19, 22, 23): paragogic הֿ-; issues of verb syntax: *wayyiqtol*, temporal construction וַיְהִי כִּי, and iterative *weqatal*; אֲשֶׁר vs. -שֶׁ; עַל vs. אֶל; *hiphil* vs. *hophal* of נגד; directive הֿ-, specifically attached to a noun in the construct state; third masculine plural pronominal suffixes וֹתָם- vs. וֹתֵיהֶם-; and non-assimilated vs. assimilated *nun* of מִן before an arthrous noun. *My main argument has been that the MT is essentially characterized by so-called early language in additions and variants which are derivative and late when compared to the readings in the DSS fragments of Judges.* These results challenge some interpretations of BH language which have arrived at an opposite diachronic linguistic conclusion but without paying attention to *equally*

---

[249] *LDBT*, II, 178 (#86 in table).

[250] *LDBT*, II, 201 (#231 in table).

[251] *LDBT*, II, 183 (#41 in table); cf. Rezetko, "Dating Biblical Hebrew," 226.

[252] Brooke, "Some Remarks on the Reconstruction of 4QJudgsᵇ," 115; Trebolle Barrera, "4QJudgᵇ," 167; cf. "Édition préliminaire de *4QJugesᵇ*," 82–83. In addition to the publications cited in nn. 12, 26–27, 74, other relevant discussions by Trebolle of the literary and textual formation of the book of Judges are "El símbolo de los dones (2 Re 8,7–15; Jue 3,15–29): de la crítica textual a la estilística," in V. Collado and E. Zurr (eds.), *El misterio de la palabra: homenaje de sus alumnos al profesor D. Luis Alonso Schökel al cumplir veinticinco años de magisterio en el Instituto Bíblico Pontificio* (Madrid: Ediciones Cristiandad, 1983), 161–176; "Mestizaje textual de la Biblia en el Mediterráneo," in A. Borrell, A. de la Fuente, and A. Puig (eds.), *La Bíblia i el Mediterrani: Actes del Congrés de Barcelona, 18–22 de Setembre de 1995* (2 vols; Scripta bíblica, 1–2; Barcelona: Associació Bíblica de Catalunya, Publicacions de l'Abadia de Montserrat, 1997), I, 11–40.

diachronic literary and textual factors. With these thoughts in mind I want to step away from the multitude of details and highlight several important implications for the historical linguistic study of BH.[253]

The publication of our *Linguistic Dating of Biblical Texts*, especially the chapter on textual criticism,[254] has provoked something of a debate among Hebraists over the relationship between historical linguistic research and studies of the literary and textual formation of the Bible.[255] In the light of what I have written above it hardly needs to be said that I consider any rigorous *separation* between these disciplines or any dogmatic *prioritization* of one approach over the other as obstacles to explaining many specific details and even the broad contours of language change in ancient Hebrew.[256] Historical linguists argue that ancient spoken Hebrew changed through time and inevitably left diachronic marks

---

[253] These issues and others are discussed in much more detail in *HLBH*.

[254] *LDBT*, I, 341–360, and often elsewhere in both volumes.

[255] The debate has even spilled over the internet: R. S. Hendel, "Unhistorical Hebrew Linguistics: A Cautionary Tale" http://www.bibleinterp.com/opeds/hen358022.shtml (*The Bible and Interpretation*, September 2011); and our response in R. Rezetko, I. Young, and M. Ehrensvärd, "A Very Tall 'Cautionary Tale': A Response to Ron Hendel" http://www.bibleinterp.com/articles/rez358028.shtml (*The Bible and Interpretation*, September 2011). We and Hendel may disagree on some matters, but we all agree that historical linguistic research on BH should "embrace the full panoply of critical scholarship" (historical, literary, textual, etc.). Other recent attempts by Hebraists to deal with some of the philological issues we raised in *LDBT* are J. A. Cook, "Detecting Development in Biblical Hebrew Using Diachronic Typology," in C. Miller-Naudé and Z. Zevit (eds.), *Diachrony in Biblical Hebrew* (LSAWS, 8; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2012), 83–95 (83–85); Holmstedt, "Historical Linguistics and Biblical Hebrew," 98–101; R. D. Holmstedt, "The Nexus between Text Criticism and Linguistics: A Case Study from Leviticus," *JBL*, forthcoming (draft retrieved on 24/01/2013 from http://ancienthebrewgrammar.files.wordpress.com/2012/11/holmstedt_lingtextcrit_jbldraft2012.pdf); J. Joosten, "Textual Developments and Historical Linguistics," in H. Ausloos, B. Lemmelijn, and J. Trebolle Barrera (eds.), *After Qumran: Old and Modern Editions of the Biblical Texts – The Historical Books* (BETL, 246; Leuven: Peeters 2012), 21–31; "Textual History and Linguistic Developments: The Doublet in 2 Kgs 8:28–29 // 9:15–16 in Light of 2 Chr 22:5–6," in A. Piquer Otero and P. Torijano Morales (eds.), *Textual Criticism and Dead Sea Scrolls Studies in Honour of Julio Trebolle Barrera: Florilegium Complutensis* (JSJS, 157; Leiden: Brill, 2012), 133–145; Z. Zevit, "Not-So-Random Thoughts on Linguistic Dating and Diachrony in Biblical Hebrew," in C. Miller-Naudé and Z. Zevit (eds.), *Diachrony in Biblical Hebrew* (LSAWS, 8; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2012), 455–489 (460–461, 465–476).

[256] Thus any claim that language is a more objective, independent, or conclusive criterion for the absolute or relative dating of biblical writings should throw up red flags.

in the written Hebrew of the Bible. Text critics argue that the manuscripts of the Bible in Hebrew, Greek, and other languages, reflect corruptions of various kinds and also different points in the development of the biblical writings. Literary critics argue that the sources and books of the Bible, like many other Ancient Near Eastern writings, and many specimens of religious literature in general, were reinterpreted and rewritten through time. The Bible has multiple overlapping chronologies. Language changed. Texts changed. Stories changed. The Bible is long-duration literature, the final product of a complex history of production and transmission, whose content including language is authorial, editorial, and scribal. Consequently, just as "it should not be postulated that 𝔐 better or more frequently reflects the original text of the biblical books than any other text,"[257] so also it should not be postulated that the language of the MT better or more frequently reflects the "original" language of the biblical authors than any other text. For two hundred years historical linguistic research on BH has been grounded almost exclusively on the MT.[258] It is time to shift gears and talk about language change in BH from a more well-rounded all-inclusive perspective.[259]

Clearing the way forward will require careful thought about some very basic yet highly complex issues such as the relationship between historical linguistics and "extra-linguistic" textual and literary matters, the aims and methodologies of historical linguistics, the notions of language periodization, states, and transitions, and so on. But here I will limit my remarks to two misunderstandings which my study of the MT and Qumran scrolls of Judges can, I hope, help to correct, or at least provoke further thought.

5.2. THE "FLUIDITY" (OR "CHANGEABILITY") OF LANGUAGE IN BIBLICAL MANUSCRIPTS

The linguistic fluidity of biblical texts is a concrete historical phenomenon. It is evident in manuscripts of biblical writings simply by comparing them word by word: an article here, not there, a conjunction here, not there, אֶל here, עַל there, אֲשֶׁר here, -שֶׁ there, *wayyiqtol* here, *weqatal* there, and so on. The linguistic

---

[257] Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 11–12.

[258] See the remarks in section 2.

[259] What I am advocating could be described as a "philological" approach, understanding philology as the broader historical discipline that includes also literary and textual scholarship (e.g. D. C. Greetham, *Textual Scholarship: An Introduction* [Garland Reference Library of the Humanities, 1417; New York/London: Garland, 1994], 9–10), or "concern with what linguistic information can be acquired from written documents, with how we can get it and with what we can make of the information once we have it" (L. Campbell and M. J. Mixco, *A Glossary of Historical Linguistics* [Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2007], 152). The relationship between "linguistics" and "philology" is treated *in extenso* in *HLBH*.

changeability of biblical texts in ancient times is hardly surprising since the surviving manuscripts of the Bible—documents written in *language*!—are described by textual critics as diverse and fluid until early in the Common Era.[260] The linguistic variants between the MT and Qumran scrolls of Judges which were cited and discussed above are real evidence for linguistic modifications of biblical writings, and so are the linguistic variants between the MT, SP, and DSS of other books which were mentioned at various points in the case studies.[261]

How common are linguistic variants between biblical manuscripts? Each manuscript has unique linguistic characteristics and a separate linguistic profile but overall linguistic variants are quite common. [262] Nonetheless one might have the impression based on the quantity of data cited above that linguistic variants between the manuscripts of Judges are not all that frequent. That would be a wrong conclusion. The following table gives statistical details for the Qumran scrolls of Judges and linguistic variants between the scrolls and the MT (L; Codex Leningrad).[263]

---

[260] For example: "Since the centuries preceding the extant evidence presumably were marked by great textual fluidity, all statements about the pristine state of the biblical text must necessarily remain hypothetical. The textual diversity visible in the Qumran evidence from the 3rd century BCE onwards is probably not representative of the textual situation in earlier periods, when the text must have been much more fluid" (Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 166 n. 24). See *LDBT*, I, 343–348, and the thorough documentation of this phenomenon and related issues in *HLBH*.

[261] Many other instances of linguistic variation are discussed in *LDBT*, I, 348–358, in earlier publications (cf. *LDBT*, I, 348 n. 18), and in publications subsequent to *LDBT* which are listed in *HLBH*, where also we identify, organize, and discuss the multitude of linguistic variants between the MT and four Qumran scrolls of Samuel.

[262] The frequency of textual variation in biblical manuscripts is tabulated and discussed in I. Young, "The Biblical Scrolls from Qumran and the Masoretic Text: A Statistical Approach," in M. Dacy, J. Dowling, and S. Faigan (eds.), *Feasts and Fasts: A Festschrift in Honour of Alan David Crown* (Mandelbaum Studies in Judaica, 11; Sydney: Mandelbaum Publishing, University of Sydney, 2005), 81–139. Not all textual variants are linguistic variants but many of them are.

[263] Words = graphic units. For the methodology see the article by Young cited in n. 262.

Text	Complete Words	Incomplete Words	Total Words	Linguistic Variants from L	Proportion of Words per Linguistic Variant
XJudges	37	18	55	0	—
1QJudg	33	48	81	6	13.5
4QJudg[a]	35	9	44	4	11.0
4QJudg[b]	22	46	68	3	22.7
Total	127	121	248	13	19.0

The late and fragmentary DSS of Judges combined contain about 2% of the book. The MT book of Judges has 9885 words. Given the combined frequency of linguistic variants we might expect to find *hundreds* (400? 700? 1000? etc.) of linguistic variants between the MT and the scrolls, and between the scrolls themselves, if they had survived completely.[264] We are dealing here with likelihood rather than certainty, but such numbers evidently back the general notion of "linguistic fluidity." And the connection between textual fluidity and linguistic fluidity is more than an assumption. It is clearly evident in the surviving manuscript evidence.

As a result some of Zevit's remarks in a recent first attempt by a historical linguist of BH to deal with this issue are surprising.[265] In his conclusions he refers to "the vague notion of 'linguistic fluidity' as a historical phenomenon."[266] Earlier in his article Zevit offers a lengthy discussion of the relationship between the MT and other texts.[267] His objective is to guard the special significance and reliability of the MT as the textual basis of historical linguistic research on Biblical Hebrew—against the normal posture of

---

[264] In our forthcoming book we develop the illustration of 4QSam[a]. 4QSam[a] represents 10–12% of the MT book of Samuel. A staggering 20–25% of the words in 4QSam[a] are variant non-orthographically from the MT (L). There are more than 130 linguistic variants between the MT and 4QSam[a]. If 4QSam[a] had survived for the entire book we might expect to find well over a *thousand* linguistic variants between the MT and 4QSam[a]. This figure increases when the other Qumran scrolls of Samuel are factored into the equation. See *HLBH*.

[265] Only Zevit among historical linguists has attempted to contend with this problem in a serious way. Hurvitz's brief reply to Young, using the phrases "drastically changed," "extensively modified," and "unlimited 'fluidity,'" apparently seeks to dismiss the issue via hyperbole rather than deal straight on with the seriousness of the problem (A. Hurvitz, "The Recent Debate on Late Biblical Hebrew: Solid Data, Experts' Opinions, and Inconclusive Arguments," *HS* 47 [2006]: 191–210 [210 n. 69]; cf. I. Young, "Biblical Texts Cannot be Dated Linguistically," *HS* 46 [2005], 341–351 [349–351]).

[266] Zevit, "Not-So-Random Thoughts," 483.

[267] Zevit, "Not-So-Random Thoughts," 460–461, 465–476.

contemporary textual critics *not* to privilege the MT when evaluating variant readings in the texts of the Bible.[268] Zevit's view rests on his repeated assertion that no one has provided "examples" or "evidence" for the connection of linguistic fluidity to textual fluidity[269] or for the randomness of linguistic changes.[270] In response, this article has argued that empirical manuscript data clearly support the idea of substantial and coincidental linguistic fluidity in the transmission of biblical writings. Linguistic fluidity (or changeability) may be unclear in the sense that linguistic changes are unpredictable (section 5.3), but the concept is not unclear in the sense that it was not a historical phenomenon. It was.

5.3. THE "NON-DIRECTIONALITY" (OR "PATTERNLESSNESS") OF LINGUISTIC VARIANTS IN BIBLICAL TEXTS

I have argued that a textual and literary analysis of several parts of the book of Judges leads to the realization that (the directions of) many linguistic changes in biblical manuscripts frequently stand at odds with traditional views on the chronology of linguistic forms and uses in BH. The addition as a whole in MT 6:7–10 and other secondary readings in the MT are written in standard "Classical" BH. At the same time we find the "chance" appearance in the very late Second Temple period addition to Judges 6 of both the "late" paragogic הֲ◌- (section 4.2.3) and the "early" וַיְהִי כִּי (section 4.2.4). These findings may come as a surprise to some who are accustomed to thinking that later writing specimens will typically contain later linguistic forms and uses. In the past it has been common to illustrate this idea by comparing the language of the MT Pentateuch vs. the SP, or MT Isaiah vs. 1QIsaᵃ, or MT Samuel–Kings vs. MT Chronicles, or by comparing the language of

---

[268] Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 11–12; Ulrich, "Evolutionary Composition of the Hebrew Bible," 23–24.

[269] For example, "The chapter [*LDBT*, I, chapter 13], however, does not use textual fluidity directly to construct a case for linguistic fluidity. It assumes the connection..." (Zevit, "Not-So-Random Thoughts," 467).

[270] For example, "They [the authors of *LDBT*] provide no evidence, however, to indicate that what could have happened in theory, did occur in fact" (466); "...LDBT does not present evidence that the scrolls illustrate *random* linguistic changes..." (469 n. 9); "Data supporting this sort of an assertion are required. They could have been sought...examples could have been culled..." (469 n. 9); "...no evidence has been presented illustrating that the language in the texts reflecting these different editions differs linguistically in significant ways from the proto-Masoretic texts" (471); "Even chap. 13 [of *LDBT*], arguing for textual fluidity, does not undertake to bolster its claim with irrefutable examples based on Qumran data" (Zevit, "Not-So-Random Thoughts," 472). In contrast, the selection of examples cited in *LDBT*, I, 348–358, combined with the extensive list of other case studies in the literature cited in *LDBT*, I, 348 n. 18, cannot be so easily dismissed as an absence of examples or evidence.

some editorial additions in biblical writings with the "original" sources, such as the additions in MT 1 Samuel 17 or MT Jeremiah compared to the LXX of these books. Yet closer investigation has shown that most of these comparisons are laden with flaws,[271] often because they overlook the complexity of the textual issues by focusing on only MT samples (e.g. Samuel–Kings vs. Chronicles) or because they extrapolate from several examples to an overall wave of change with regard to a particular linguistic issue without realizing or indicating that the examples cited are arbitrary and uncommon. For example, the feminine demonstrative pronoun הַזֹּאתָה in an MT plus in Jer 26:6 (MT: וְאֶת־הָעִיר הַזֹּאתָה [K: הַזֹּאתָה; Q: הַזֹּאת]; LXX: οὖσαι τῇ πόλει) is probably a typologically later form of הַזֹּאת,[272] but this single occurrence has extremely little substance in linguistic dating or historical linguistic discussions when it is realized that (1) זֹאתָה occurs nowhere else—that I know—in all of ancient Hebrew (MT, DSS, Ben Sira, SP, MH), and (2) זֹאת—not זֹאתָה!—appears in a dozen other MT pluses relative to the LXX of Jeremiah.[273] In other words, there is predominantly a random and sporadic connection between a potentially (in this example: typologically) later linguistic feature and a later literary stratum.[274] Or, said differently, the traditional "early" to "late" linguistic chronology of BH is *usually not* enhanced or underscored by the textual variation in the versions of the Bible. The case of הַזֹּאתָה is not a one-time exception. It is the rule of thumb and it applies to the majority of variant lexical, morphological, and syntactical phenomena in biblical manuscripts.[275]

---

[271] See, for example, the discussion of MT Samuel–Kings vs. MT Chronicles in *LDBT*, I, 353–358. The *prima donna* example of MT Isaiah vs. 1QIsaᵃ is discussed in greater depth in *HLBH*; cf. *LDBT*, I, 341–343.

[272] M. Bar-Asher, "On Several Linguistic Features of Qumran Hebrew," in M. F. J. Baasten and W. Th. van Peursen (eds.), *Hamlet on a Hill: Semitic and Greek Studies Presented to Professor T. Muraoka on the Occasion of his Sixty-Fifth Birthday* (OLA, 118; Leuven: Peeters, 2003), 73–93 (80). For alternative explanations of this form which emphasize its antiquity see G. R. Driver, "Hebrew Notes," *VT* 1 (1951), 241–250 (244–245); J. G. Janzen, *Studies in the Text of Jeremiah* (HSM, 6; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1973), 45.

[273] MT Jer 8:3; 11:8; 16:6; 25:11; 26:20; 27:17, 19; 29:16; 32:36, 43; 33:5; 38:4. זֹאת appears 95 times in total in MT Jeremiah.

[274] Contrast J. Joosten, "L'excédent massorétique du livre de Jérémie et l'hébreu post-classique", in J. Joosten and J.-S. Rey (eds.), *Conservatism and Innovation in the Hebrew Language of the Hellenistic Period: Proceedings of a Fourth International Symposium on the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira* (STDJ, 73; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 93–108 (98; on הַזֹּאתָה). For some other thoughts on the linguistic data cited in Joosten's article see *LDBT*, II, 158.

[275] I am *not* saying that there are *no* likely *patterns* of linguistic change in biblical writings or manuscripts. However, they are not the norm. This is an important observation since, in a cross-textual variable analysis in a sociolinguistic variationist framework, "[i]f corresponding alterations were made repeatedly, one can reasonably assume that the internal or external

Holmstedt has advanced the discussion in several recent contributions to the ongoing debates. He acknowledges the complex composition, editorial, and transmission histories of the biblical writings. He proposes that the necessary next stage in studies of BH diachrony will need to involve investigating the inextricably linked histories of the text and the language. And he is absolutely spot on to suggest that if it is possible to organize the literary and textual strata of BH writings into relative diachronic relationships then it may also be possible that the linguistic features themselves in those sequential strata also stand in a chronological relationship. [276] However, it is becoming increasingly clear that some and perhaps many of those linguistic features will probably not be the same forms and uses which the traditional linguistic dating and historical linguistic approaches have claimed to have detected. We need to retreat, rethink, and restart, considering also other kinds of linguistic features and language changes, utilizing more sophisticated historical linguistic methods, and, above all, engaging in interdisciplinary dialogue with full awareness and openness to considering potential *diachronic literary*, *diachronic textual* (MT/non-MT), and *diachronic linguistic* factors in the analysis.[277] No doubt the history of Hebrew is reflected in the Bible. But so far, we have isolated very little of it with any degree of certainty.

---

constraints for this variable must have changed" (Auer and Voeste, "Grammatical Variables," 261). However, given that these patterns often do not emerge, it is also incumbent on the biblical researcher to consider other possible explanations for linguistic variants.

[276] Holmstedt, "Historical Linguistics and Biblical Hebrew," 100–101; "Nexus between Text Criticism and Linguistics." Zevit remarks that "close investigation of the language of proposed literary layers within a book *may be worthwhile*" (Zevit, "Not-So-Random Thoughts," 481; emphasis added), whereas I would emphasize more the necessity of doing this as part of a well-rounded historical linguistic methodology. See the brief remarks and quotation in n. 7 and the extensive treatment of this issue in *HLBH*.

[277] Elaboration and illustrations are given in *HLBH*. I am thinking, for example, of matters such as grammaticalization, lexicalization, typology, a sociolinguistic variationist approach, diffusion (s-shaped) curves, a database of linguistic variants in biblical manuscripts, and so on.