

## 4QXII<sup>b</sup> (4Q82) as an Editorial Text

Armin Lange

This paper discusses the textual character of 4QXII<sup>b</sup> (4Q82) as one of the more extensively preserved Minor Prophets manuscripts from Qumran Cave 4. After a brief description of the manuscript itself, I will analyze and describe the textual character of 4QXII<sup>b</sup> by grouping its textual variants into original readings, readings reflecting scribal errors, editorial readings, and unclear readings. For each of these groups I will provide variant lists first and discuss each variant reading in brief comment. At the end of this article I will draw some conclusions arguing that the text attested by 4QXII<sup>b</sup> is an editorial text that is characterized by contextual, linguistic, and stylistic changes which aim at improving the intelligibility of the Minor Prophets.

In arguing so, I understand editorial texts as the result of an editorial process in which one or more scribes alter a parent text intentionally to improve its linguistic and stylistic quality and to achieve coherence. In this approach, editorial texts are similar to harmonizing texts<sup>1</sup> yet different from

\* In my work on this article, I am much obliged to two colleagues. Russel E. Fuller discussed several drafts of this paper with me making many useful suggestions. He also copy edited my English. I am further indebted to the anonymous reader of this article whose stunningly detailed peer review provided extensive constructive criticism.

<sup>1</sup> For the discussion about harmonizing texts, see R. Weiss, "Synonymous Variants in Divergences between the Samaritan and Massoretic Texts of the Pentateuch," in idem, *Studies in the Text and Language of the Bible* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1981), 63-189, esp. 132-58 (Heb.); E. Tov, "The Nature and Background of Harmonizations in Biblical Manuscripts," *JSOT* 31 (1985): 3-29; idem, "Textual Harmonization in the Ancient Texts of Deuteronomy," in idem, *Hebrew Bible, Greek Bible, and Qumran: Collected Essays* (TSAJ 121; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 271-82; idem, *Textual Criticism of the Bible* (3rd ed., rev. and exp.; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2012), 258-59; E. Eshel, "4QDeut<sup>b</sup>—A Text That Has Undergone Harmonistic Editing," *HUCA* 62 (1991): 117-154; S. White Crawford, *Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times*

[*Textus* 26 (2016)]

them in the small extent of their secondary readings as well as in the attention to linguistic and stylistic detail. Often harmonization attempts to adjust two parallel texts in the Torah and elsewhere with each other. These harmonizations result in large-scale textual changes as shown by earlier studies on harmonizing texts mainly concerned with the Torah.<sup>2</sup> Harmonizing texts, such as the Samaritan Pentateuch attest hence to large scale variation. Editorial texts are regularly concerned with smaller textual adjustments such as the adjustment of the verbal number in a given verse. In addition to linguistic and grammatical streamlining, editorial texts can adjust a text to its surrounding context as well as to the stylistic and linguistic standards of the day, i.e. a scribe adjusts a text which was written according to earlier stylistic standards and with an earlier vocabulary in mind to the stylistic standards and the vocabulary of his times. Furthermore, editorial texts can adjust the line of argument of a text as well. While individual editorial readings could also go back to unintentional scribal errors,<sup>3</sup> an editorial text is by definition the result of intentional editorial work. This editorial work concerns mostly small textual changes typical of modern copyediting. Between harmonizing and editorial texts exists of course a gray zone in which texts combine both approaches.

### 1. *The Manuscript 4QXII<sup>s</sup> (4Q82)*

Of a total of 249 preserved fragments of 4QXII<sup>s</sup>, only 105 can still be identified as attesting to remnants of Hos 2:1-5, 14-19, 22-25; 3:1-4; 4:1, 10-11, 13-14; 6:3-4, 8-11; 7:1, 12-16; 8:1; 9:1-4, 9-17; 10:1-14; 11:2-11; 12:1-15; 13:1, 6-8?, 11-13; 14:9-10; Joel 1:12-14; 2:2-13; 4:4-9, 11-14, 17, 19-20; Amos 1:3-15; 2:1, 7-9, 15-16; 3:1-2; 4:4-9; 5:1-2, 9-18; 6:1-4, 6-14; 7:1, 7-12, 14-17; 8:1-5, 11-14; 9:1, 6, 14-15; Ob 1-5, 8-12, 14-15; Jon 1:1-9; 2:3-11; 3:1-3; 4:5-11; Mi 1:7, 12-15; 2:3-4; 3:12; 4:1-2; 5:6-7; 7:2-3, 20; Nah 1:7-9; 2:9-11; 3:1-3, 17; Hab 2:4?;

(*Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature*; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2008), 22-36.

<sup>2</sup> E.g. Eshel, "4QDeut<sup>n</sup>," 121-23; White Crawford, *Rewriting Scripture*, 23.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Tov, "Nature," 5; idem, "Textual Harmonization," 271; idem, *Textual Criticism*, 258.

Zeph 3:3–5 and Zech 10:11–12; 11:1–2; 12:1–3. Originally the scroll contained the whole Minor Prophets collection.<sup>4</sup> Due to the poor preservation of individual fragments today only 916 words can still be attributed to biblical text. The scribe of 4QXII<sup>g</sup> copied his manuscript carefully in an early Herodian bookhand from the last third of the first century B.C.E.<sup>5</sup> and made only a few mistakes, which in nine cases he corrected himself. The orthography of 4QXII<sup>g</sup> is slightly more plene than the one of MT and employs some forms of the so-called Qumran orthography (the suffix of the 2<sup>nd</sup> pers. sing. masc. is spelled כַּ- instead of ך- and the verbal affix indicating the 2<sup>nd</sup> pers. sing. masc. is spelled תַּ- instead of ת-). Not counting reconstructed variants, 69 cases of textual variation between MT, LXX, and 4QXII<sup>g</sup> are preserved. 4QXII<sup>g</sup> goes 15 times with and 54 times against MT, 9 times with and 53 times against LXX, but attests also to 39 non-aligned readings.<sup>6</sup> In addition, 4QXII<sup>g</sup> reads against MT in six cases, for which the Greek translation is indecisive. In total, 54 readings against MT are preserved in 4QXII<sup>g</sup>. Of these, ten unclear readings against MT cannot be included in the calculation as to how much 4QXII<sup>g</sup> deviates from MT because their words cannot be identified anymore. 44 readings against MT among 916 identifiable words results in a textual deviation of 4.80% from MT. If all unclear readings

<sup>4</sup> Cf. G.J. Brooke, “The Twelve Minor Prophets and the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *Congress Volume Leiden 2004* (ed. A. Lemaire; VTSup 109; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 19–43, at 25.

<sup>5</sup> For the material reconstruction, measurements, paleography, and orthography of 4QXII<sup>g</sup>, cf. R.E. Fuller, “82. 4QXII<sup>g</sup>,” in *Qumran Cave 4.X: The Prophets* (Eugene Ulrich et. al.; DJD 15; Oxford: Clarendon, 1997), 271–318, at 271–75. For the orthography of 4QXII<sup>g</sup> see also Barbara Fuß, “Dies ist die Zeit, von der geschrieben ist ...”: Die expliziten Zitate aus dem Buch Hosea in den Handschriften von Qumran und im Neuen Testament (NTAbh Neue Folge 37; Münster: Aschendorff, 2000), 41.

<sup>6</sup> The below in-depth analysis of 4QXII<sup>g</sup> was done in comparison with other textual witnesses from the Second Temple period and led therefore to improved variant statistics and word counts as compared to the numbers I gave in A. Lange, *Handbuch der Textfunde vom Toten Meer*, vol. 1: *Die Handschriften biblischer Bücher von Qumran und den anderen Fundorten* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009), 341. The statistics of my *Handbuch* are based on Fuller, “82. 4QXII<sup>g</sup>,” 276–315, only. In cases of Ketib and Qere readings, my statistics side with the Ketib reading.

against MT are included into my statistics this would result in a textual deviation of 5.90% from MT. Variant statistics classify 4QXII<sup>g</sup> thus as a semi-Masoretic manuscript.<sup>7</sup>

I describe in detail the category of semi-Masoretic manuscripts in the first volume of my *Handbuch der Textfunde zum Toten Meer*.<sup>8</sup> Among the Dead Sea Scrolls, I distinguish semi- from proto-Masoretic biblical manuscripts. The latter were mainly found at Masada, in Wadi Murabba'at, and in Naḥal Hever; the former are prominent in the Qumran library. To distinguish between proto- and semi-Masoretic biblical manuscripts recognizes that scrolls like MurXII vary less than 2 % from the consonantal text of MT while other manuscripts are still close to MT but attest to more variation towards its consonantal text.

The closeness of 4QXII<sup>g</sup> to the consonantal text of MT is also underlined by six cases in which 4QXII<sup>g</sup> reads with MT against 4QXII<sup>a</sup> (4Q76), 4QXII<sup>c</sup> (4Q78), 4QXII<sup>d</sup> (4Q79), and 5QAmos (5Q4) respectively. One further time, 4QXII<sup>g</sup> reads with 4QXII<sup>c</sup> (4Q78) and MT against LXX.<sup>9</sup> Compared with 916 preserved identifiable words of texts, six agreements with MT against other Minor Prophets manuscripts from Qumran might not look like much. But taking into consideration that in 4QXII<sup>g</sup> often only a few words are preserved

<sup>7</sup> Cf. R.E. Fuller, "Minor Prophets," in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (2 vols.; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 1:554-557, at 556; Fuß, *Zeit*, 41; F. García Martínez, "The Text of the XII Prophets at Qumran," *OTE* 17 (2004): 103-19, at 111; against E. Tov, "The Biblical Texts from the Judaean Desert: An Overview and Analysis of the Published Texts," in *The Bible as Book: The Hebrew Bible and the Judaean Desert Discoveries* (ed. E.D. Herbert and E. Tov; London: British Library and Oak Knoll Press, 2002) 139-66, at 156; Brooke, "Twelve," 25, who classify the manuscript as non-aligned.

<sup>8</sup> For the category of semi-Masoretic manuscripts and my textual typology of the biblical Dead Sea Scrolls, see Lange, *Handbuch*, 1-32. There I also discuss alternate textual typologies of these manuscripts.

<sup>9</sup> E. Tov, "New Fragments of Amos," *DSD* 21 (2014): 3-13, at 6-7 proposes that 4QAmos? reads with LXX\* against MT and 4QXII<sup>g</sup> יהוה instead of אדני יהוה. While Tov's observation is of great interest for the textual criticism of Amos 8:1, it remains inconclusive for the study of 4QXII<sup>g</sup> because it preserves only the characters יה[ה] of the beginning of Amos 8:1.

of a given verse and that there is therefore mostly no textual overlap between 4QXII<sup>g</sup> and other Minor Prophets scrolls, six readings with MT mark a tendency of this scroll towards the consonantal text of MT nevertheless. This tendency is further underlined by the fact that the disagreements between 4QXII<sup>g</sup> and MT extend rarely to more than a difference in grammatical form or the use of the preposition.<sup>10</sup>

While 4QXII<sup>g</sup> has hence a tendency to read against Qumran Minor Prophets manuscripts, a comparison with the proto-Masoretic manuscript MurXII shows that 4QXII<sup>g</sup> is nevertheless not as close to the consonantal text of XII-MT as proto-Masoretic manuscripts from the late Second Temple period are. 4QXII<sup>g</sup> reads seven times with and twenty four times against MurXII. This impression is confirmed by the two readings of 4QXII<sup>g</sup> against 8HevXII gr and one reading with this famous Greek Minor Prophets Scroll from Naḥal Hever.

*The Readings of 4QXII<sup>g</sup> in Comparison with Other Biblical Dead Sea Scrolls*<sup>11</sup>

Hos 2:1 4QXII<sup>g</sup> ספיר [י with MT, cf. LXX || 4QXII<sup>d</sup> יספיר

Hos 3:3 4QXII<sup>g</sup> ת]שבי with MT, cf. LXX || 4QXII<sup>c</sup> יש]בו<sup>12</sup>

Joel 2:11 4QXII<sup>g</sup> ונוֹרָא with 4QXII<sup>c</sup> and MT || LXX μεγάλη και ἐπιφανής

Joel 4:4 4QXII<sup>g</sup> גלילת || MurXII + MT גלילות; LXX Γαλιλαία

<sup>10</sup> See my discussion of the individual variant readings below.

<sup>11</sup> In the lists in this article, the text of 4QXII<sup>g</sup> and all other Minor Prophets manuscripts from the Dead Sea are quoted according to the *Biblia Qumranica* in its volume 3b (B. Ego et al., eds., *Minor Prophets* [Biblia Qumranica 3b; Leiden: Brill, 2005]). The text of 4QAmos? (= DSS F.Amos1) is quoted according to the recent edition of Tov, "New Fragments of Amos," 3-13.

<sup>12</sup> While R.E. Fuller, "78. 4QXII<sup>c</sup>," in *Qumran Cave 4.X: The Prophets* (Eugene Ulrich et. al.; DJD 15; Oxford: Clarendon, 1997), 237-51, at 240, attributes the words ים]רבים in 4QXII<sup>c</sup> 3 2 to Hos 3:4, it is more likely that these words are part of Hos 3:3 because there is not enough space between the words שער]ים ולתכ] and ים]רבים to fit the text of Hos 3:3 as well as the end of Hos 3:2 and the beginning of Hos 3:4 into it. ים]רבים is therefore regarded as part of Hos 3:3 in the *Biblia Qumranica* vol. 3b (Ego et al., *Minor Prophets*, 8).

- Joel 4:4 4QXIIg מ[הָרָה || MurXII + MT מהרה
- Joel 4:9 4QXIIg ו[קִיּוֹא] || MurXII + MT קראו LXX *κηρύξατε*
- Amos 1:3 4QXIIg ל[הַבְּרִי] with MT and LXX (*σιδηροῖς*) || 5QAmos ת[הָרוּן]
- Amos 1:3 4QXIIg ת[א] with MT || > 5QAmos
- Amos 1:12 4QXIIg בּוֹצְרָה with MurXII and MT (*בְּצָרָה*) || LXX *τειχέων αὐτῆς*
- Amos 7:8 4QXIIg וְיִאמַר יְהוָה אֵלַי || MT וְיִאמַר יְהוָה אֵלַי; MurXII וְיִאמַר יְהוָה אֵלַי  
י[אֵל]; LXX *καὶ εἶπε κύριος πρὸς με*
- Amos 7:8 4QXIIg שֶׁם with MT, cf. LXX || 4QXIIc שְׁמִתִּי
- Amos 7:15 4QXIIg הַנְּבִיא || MurXII + MT הַנְּבִיא LXX *προφήτευσον*
- Amos 7:15 4QXIIg אֵל with MT || MurXII על cf. LXX *ἐπί*
- Amos 7:17 4QXIIg אֲדַנִּי יְהוָה || MurXII + MT יְהוָה; LXX *κύριος*
- Amos 8:5 4QXIIg וְנִשְׁבִּים || MurXII + MT וְנִשְׁבִּירָה; LXX *καὶ ἐμπολήσομεν*
- Amos 9:6 4QXIIg מֵעַל־זֵיתִי MT<sup>Qere.Kenn29.93.112.116.224.252.253.258.260.264.271A.650B.659</sup> (cf.  
MT<sup>Kenn72.150.178.210.245</sup> (מעלתי) || MurXII + MT<sup>Ketib.L</sup> מעלותו;  
MT<sup>Kenn17.30.101.126.128.144.168.172.182.195.242.270</sup> מעלתו with LXX *ἀνάβασιν αὐτοῦ*;  
Vulg. *ascensionem suam*; MT<sup>Kenn154</sup> מעלותי; MT<sup>Kenn1.89</sup> מעליותיו
- Ob 1 4QXIIg וְצִיר with MurXII + MT || LXX *καὶ περιοχῆν*
- Ob 4 4QXIIg תְּשִׁים with LXX *θῆξ* || MurXII + MT שִׁים
- Ob 11 4QXIIg וְ[ || MurXII + MT בְּיוֹם; LXX *ἐν ἡμέρα*
- Ob 14 4QXIIg קְ[הַפֵּר] with MurXII + MT || LXX *τὰς διεκβολὰς αὐτῶν*
- Ob 15 4QXIIg שׁוּבוּ || MurXII + MT יִשׁוּב; LXX *ἀνταποδοθήσεται*
- Jonah 1:2 4QXIIg עֲלִיהַ with MurXII and MT || LXX *ἐν αὐτῇ*
- Jonah 1:3 4QXIIg תְּרַשִּׁישׁ (3<sup>rd</sup> occurrence) || MurXII + MT תְּרַשִּׁישָׁה LXX *εἰς  
Θαρσις*
- Jonah 1:8 4QXIIg הַגִּידָה with MurXII and MT || 4QXII<sup>a</sup> הַגִּד
- Jonah 1:8 4QXIIg וְמָה (cf. LXX *καὶ ἐκ ποίας*) || 4QXII<sup>a</sup>, MurXII, MT מַה
- Jonah 2:5 4QXIIg אֲבָ[ה] || MurXII, MT אָךְ cf. LXX *ἄρα*

- Jonah 2:6 4QXII<sup>g</sup> אפפני || MurXII, MT אפפוני, LXX περιεχύθη ... μοι, 8HevXII gr  
π[εριεχύθησάν] με
- Jonah 2:6 4QXII<sup>g</sup> ט<sup>oo</sup> || MurXII + MT דע; LXX + 8HevXII gr ἕως
- Jonah 2:6-7 4QXII<sup>g</sup> ם[י]ה־קצבי לִקְצַבִּי לְרֵאשִׁי 7 חבוֹשׁ חבוֹשׁ לְרֵאשִׁי with MurXII and MT || LXX ἔδυσ  
ή κεφαλή μου εἰς σχισμὰς ὀρέων 7, 8HevXII gr ἔλος περιέσχ[ε]ν τήν  
κεφαλὴν μου 7 ε[ἰς ... ὀρέ]ων
- Jonah 2:7 4QXII<sup>g</sup> נפשי || > MurXII, MT, LXX
- Jonah 2:10 4QXII<sup>g</sup> ] אשם[ || MurXII, MT אשלמה
- Jonah 4:6 4QXII<sup>g</sup> יהוה אדוני יהוה || MurXII, MT יהוה אלהים
- Jonah 4:7 4QXII<sup>g</sup> כעלות || MT בעלות cf. MurXII
- Jonah 4:7 4QXII<sup>g</sup> ם[י]ה־ || > MurXII, MT, LXX
- Micah 2:3 4QXII<sup>g</sup> צוארֹותיהם || MurXII + MT צוארותיכם; LXX τοὺς τραχήλους  
ὕμῶν
- Micah 2:4 4QXII<sup>g</sup> ונ[הו] || MurXII + MT ונהה; LXX καὶ θρηνηθήσεται
- Micah 7:3 4QXII<sup>g</sup> ] דבר הות || MurXII and MT || LXX  
εἰρηνικούς λόγους ἐλάλησεν
- Nahum 2:9 4QXII<sup>g</sup> מימי; cf. MT<sup>Rossi309</sup>; LXX τὰ ὕδατα αὐτῆς and Vulg. *aquae eius* || MurXII + MT מימי

While the above variant statistics determine how close to or removed from MT's consonantal text of the Minor Prophets 4QXII<sup>g</sup> is, they say next to nothing about the characteristics of its variant readings, i.e. whether they preserve an original reading, go back to scribal error, or are editorial in character. A comparison of 4QXII<sup>g</sup>'s textual variants with the consonantal text of MT will shed new light on the textual character of the former. Orthographic variants are excluded from this discussion as they do not contribute to the understanding of the textual character of 4QXII<sup>g</sup>.

## 2. The Unclear Readings of 4QXII<sup>g</sup><sup>13</sup>

4QXII<sup>g</sup> attests to a number of partially preserved readings that are clearly at variance with other textual witnesses to the Minor Prophets but that cannot be reconstructed anymore. These readings are listed below without further comments.

Hos 9:14 4QXII<sup>g</sup> ]צומקים[...] ם[...] || MT ושידים צמקים; LXX και μαστούς ξηρούς

Hos 13:6 4QXII<sup>g</sup> ]קים[ || > MT and LXX

Joel 1:13 4QXII<sup>g</sup> ]משרתי<sup>14</sup> || MT משרתי; LXX οί λειτουργοῦντες

Amos 1:7 4QXII<sup>g</sup> ]ת־ב־ׁ || MT ארמנתיה; LXX θεμέλια αὐτης

Amos 5:11 4QXII<sup>g</sup> ]גםׁׁׁׁׁׁׁ || MT יינם; LXX τὸν οἶνον ἐξ αὐτῶν

Ob 11 4QXII<sup>g</sup> ]ׁ || MurXII + MT ביום; LXX ἐν ἡμέρα

Jonah 2:6 4QXII<sup>g</sup> ]ׁׁ || MurXII + MT עד; LXX + 8HevXII gr ἕως

Micah 1:7 For 4QXII<sup>g</sup> 92 1 Fuller notes: "This line is shorter than the text of 𐤀" <sup>15</sup> (cf. MurXII and LXX).

Next to such partially preserved readings, 4QXII<sup>g</sup> includes some readings which might or might not represent textual variants. In these cases, manuscript deterioration makes a final decision impossible as not enough context is preserved in 4QXII<sup>g</sup> to judge the nature of the readings in question.

Joel 4:9 4QXII<sup>g</sup> ]קיא־ׁ || MurXII + MT קראו LXX κηρύξατε

Amos 7:15 4QXII<sup>g</sup> ]הנב[ || MurXII + MT הנבא LXX προφήτευσον

Jonah 2:9 4QXII<sup>g</sup> ]ׁׁׁׁׁׁׁ || MT חסדם LXX ἔλεος αὐτῶν

<sup>13</sup> Variant readings of textual witnesses which do not go back to the Second Temple period are only mentioned in the below lists when of importance for the evaluation of the variants of 4QXII<sup>g</sup>.

<sup>14</sup> For Joel 1:13, it remains unclear whether the inkstroke represented above by ׁ belongs to the same layer of the combined wads which are now designated as fragments 34 and 35, as the characters משרתי do (cf. Fuller, "82. 4QXII<sup>g</sup>," 289).

<sup>15</sup> Fuller, "82. 4QXII<sup>g</sup>," 313. While material reconstruction of the manuscript 4QXII<sup>g</sup> most certainly allows for Fuller's observation, no indications are preserved as to how the short text of 4QXII<sup>g</sup> might have looked in Micah 1:7.



*Joel 4:9* The mostly likely explanation for the  $\text{קִרְאָו}$  of 4QXII<sub>g</sub> is a plene spelling of the imperative plural masculine  $\text{קראו}$ .<sup>16</sup> But because the preceding and following context of  $\text{קִרְאָו}$  are not preserved in 4QXII<sub>g</sub>, the possibility of a rare Hiphil cannot be excluded with certainty.

*Amos 7:15* The  $\text{הִנְבִּי}$  of 4QXII<sub>g</sub> represents most likely a plene spelling of a singular masculine imperative in the Niphal. *He* is used as a mater lectionis at the end of the word instead of an *'aleph*. Alternatively the *he* could be taken as a suffix. In this case, the text would mean “prophecy it.” A third alternative would be to interpret  $\text{הִנְבִּי}$  as “the prophet” with a *he* at the end instead of an *'aleph*. Because of the lost preceding context of  $\text{הִנְבִּי}$  in 4QXII<sub>g</sub>, the latter two possibilities cannot be excluded with certainty, but a variant spelling of a singular masculine imperative in the Niphal seems the most likely explanation of the evidence.

*Jonah 2:9* In 4QXII<sub>g</sub>,  $\text{חֲסֹדֶם}$  can either be an orthographic variant for MT's  $\text{חֲסֹדֶם}$ <sup>17</sup> or it represents as a textual variant the infinitive of the verb  $\text{חָסַד}$ .

In two further cases manuscript deterioration does not allow for conclusions as to the nature of a variant reading, i.e. if it represents an original variant, or goes back to scribal error or is the result of an intentional textual manipulation by a scribe.

Hos 2:4 4QXII<sub>g</sub> ]  $\text{בְּיָדִי}$  || MT  $\text{רִיבו}$ ; LXX  $\text{κρίθητε}$

Jonah 2:10 4QXII<sub>g</sub> ]  $\text{אֶשְׁלֵמָה}$  || MT  $\text{אֶשְׁלֵמָה}$ <sup>18</sup>

*Hosea 2:4* The 4QXII<sub>g</sub> variant reading  $\text{בְּיָדִי}$  pertains to the second  $\text{רִיבו}$  of Hos 2:4. The textcritical evaluation of 4QXII<sub>g</sub>'s reading  $\text{בְּיָדִי}$  is difficult because the only other word preserved of 4QXII<sub>g</sub> in Hos 2:4 is  $\text{וְנִאֲפֹרְיָהּ}$ . While the textual difference between 4QXII<sub>g</sub> on the one hand and MT as well as LXX on the other hand is clear, the lacking context makes it impossible to decide whether  $\text{בְּיָדִי}$  goes back to scribal error or textual adjustment, or whether it might represent an original reading.

<sup>16</sup> Thus e.g. Fuller, “82. 4QXII<sub>g</sub>,” 273.

<sup>17</sup> Thus Fuller, “82. 4QXII<sub>g</sub>,” 274.

<sup>18</sup> In the LXX,  $\text{ἀποδώσω}$  can translate both the imperfect form of 4QXII<sub>g</sub> and the cohortative form of MT. The LXX reading is hence not listed here.

*Jonah 2:10* In *Jonah 2:10*, 4QXII<sup>g</sup> reads an imperfect form (] שִׁלַּם[) while MT has a cohortative. Without more text of 4QXII<sup>g</sup>, comparative evidence is missing as to whether the 4QXII<sup>g</sup>-text had a tendency to eliminate cohortative or jussive forms or not.

### 3. The Original Readings of 4QXII<sup>g</sup>

Two of the textual variants preserved in 4QXII<sup>g</sup> reflect more original readings than MT.

*Nahum 2:9* 4QXII<sup>g</sup> מִימֵיהָ; cf. MT<sup>Rossi309</sup>; LXX τὰ ὕδατα αὐτῆς and Vulg. *aquae eius* || MurXII + MT מִימֵי

*Zech 10:12* 4QXII<sup>g</sup> יתהללו with MT<sup>Kenn150</sup> cf. LXX (κατακαυχήσονται) and Pesh || MT יתהלכו

*Nahum 2:9* In this verse, the LXX misunderstands the consonants of the 4QXII<sup>g</sup>-text as a construct plural of the Hebrew word for water, מִימֵי, with a suffix of third person singular feminine attached to it. That both the Septuagint and the Vulgate as well MT<sup>DeRossi309</sup> share this reading of 4QXII<sup>g</sup> or attest to a similar text, shows that the 4QXII<sup>g</sup> reading precedes the production of the XII-LXX. In the remaining (proto-)Masoretic textual tradition, the suffix ה- got lost due to a haplography with the following הִיא. Thus מִימֵיהָ הִיא became מִימֵי הִיא. Nah 2:9 should therefore be regarded as one of two cases in which 4QXII<sup>g</sup> preserves an original reading.

*Zech 10:12* That not only a Masoretic manuscript (MT<sup>Kenn150</sup>) but also the Peshitta and the Old Greek text of the Minor Prophets confirm the reading יתהללו in 4QXII<sup>g</sup>, shows that יתהללו is not a late correction in a medieval Masoretic manuscript. The reading goes back to antiquity. The κατακαυχήσονται of Zech-LXX 10:12 puts the reading יתהללו before the production of the Minor Prophets Septuagint and at a place in the textual transmission of the Minor Prophets, before the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the Septuagint and the textual tradition which resulted in the consonantal text of MT went separate ways. Although in 4QXII<sup>g</sup> only the two characters לו are preserved of this reading, the old age of 4QXII<sup>g</sup> makes its antiquity even more

plausible<sup>19</sup> and represents thus important corroborative evidence. The most likely explanation for the distribution of the textual witnesses is that יתהללו is an original reading. That Jerome translates in Zech 10:12 *ambulabunt* shows that at the latest by the fourth cent. C.E. the reading יתהלכו became a part of the Masoretic text tradition.

#### 4. The Readings Reflecting Scribal Errors in 4QXII<sup>g</sup>

4QXII<sup>g</sup> attests to several scribal errors in its variant readings. For these scribal errors either the scribe of 4QXII<sup>g</sup> and/or other scribes, who preceded 4QXII<sup>g</sup> in the scribal tradition of the Minor Prophets, were responsible.

Hos 2:14 4QXII<sup>g</sup> ת[י]א || MT חית; cf. LXX and 4QpHos<sup>a</sup> (4Q166) ת[י]ת

Hos 7:14 4QXII<sup>g</sup> ילילו || MT יילילו LXX ὠλόλυζον

Hos 10:12 4QXII<sup>g</sup> וירו || MT וירה; γενήματα

Hos 11:8 4QXII<sup>g</sup> עֵל לבי || MT עלי; עלי > LXX

Hos 12:9 4QXII<sup>g</sup> יעו[יג] with LXX οἱ πόνοι αὐτοῦ || MT גיעי

Amos 7:15 4QXII<sup>g</sup> ויאמר יהוה || MT<sup>Kenn29</sup> ויאמר אלי יהוה; MT<sup>Kenn 96, 154, 224</sup> ויאמר יהוה אלי; LXX καὶ εἶπε κύριος πρὸς με

Amos 8:5 4QXII<sup>g</sup> ]ו[נשבים || MurXII + MT ונשבירה; LXX καὶ ἐμπολήσομεν

Jonah 4:7 4QXII<sup>g</sup> בעלות || MT בעלות cf. MurXII<sup>20</sup>

Micah 1:13 4QXII<sup>g</sup> לשלך יש || MT לכיש; LXX Λαχίς

Hos 2:14 The reading of the 4QXII<sup>g</sup>-text goes back to a confusion of *'aleph* and *het*.<sup>21</sup>

Hos 7:14 The reading ילילו of 4QXII<sup>g</sup> goes back to a haplography which eliminated one *yod* at the beginning of יילילו. Because 4QXII<sup>g</sup> has a tendency to read more plene than MT, a defective spelling of יילילו as an orthographic variant in 4QXII<sup>g</sup> seems unlikely to me.

<sup>19</sup> For similar uses of הלל in the Hitpael together with בשם, cf. Ps 105:3 par 1Chr 16:10 and 4QWork Containing Prayers A (4Q291) 3 3.

<sup>20</sup> The Septuagint translation σαώλγα could render both בעלות and בעלות.

<sup>21</sup> Cf. M. Abegg, P. Flint, and E. Ulrich, *Dead Sea Scrolls Bible: Translated and with Commentary* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark), 420, n. 4.

*Hos 10:12* MT's וירה is clearly the correct reading because it continues the grammatical form of the preceding יבוא. The scribe responsible for the reading וירו was influenced by the plural forms קצרו, זרעו, and נירו in the first part of verse 12.<sup>22</sup> The Septuagint reading γενηματα, maybe reflecting the Hebrew word פרי, should be understood as an interpretative variant either introduced by the translator or his parent text.<sup>23</sup>

*Hos 11:8* In the case of this 4QXII<sup>g</sup>-reading, the eye of the scribe skipped from the *lamed* in עלי to the *lamed* in לבי thus erroneously omitting the *yod* of עלי.

*Hos 12:9* Fuller<sup>24</sup> and Ulrich<sup>25</sup> read with MT ג[י]עו. Although *waw* and *yod* can only be distinguished with difficulty in the handwriting of 4QXII<sup>g</sup>, the more elongated and pronounced left-hand downstroke of the last character ג[י]עו argues for a *waw* instead of a *yod*. Although the reading of 4QXII<sup>g</sup> is supported by the LXX, the most likely cause for this variant reading is a *waw-yod* confusion. This scribal error occurred probably early in the scribal tradition of the Minor Prophets because both XII-LXX and 4QXII<sup>g</sup> attest to it.

*Amos 7:15* That in phrase ויאמר אלי יהוה the word אלי precedes the Tetragrammaton in the MT text of Amos 7:15 is unusual. As e.g. Amos 8:2 demonstrates, the preposition would normally follow the Tetragrammaton (ויאמר יהוה אלי). Amos 7:15 emphasizes with its unusual syntax that the Lord spoke indeed to Amos. The unusual word sequence of Amos 7:15 led even in Medieval Masoretic manuscripts to scribal confusion. MT<sup>Kenn</sup> 96, 154, 224 read

<sup>22</sup> Against R. E. Fuller, "Textual Traditions in the Book of Hosea and the Minor Prophets," in *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls Madrid 18–21 March 1991* (2 vols.; ed. J. Treballe Barrera and L. Vegas Montaner; STDJ 11; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 2:245–256, at 254–256, who transcribes the text of 4QXII<sup>g</sup> in this early article as יורי instead of וירו and who regards יורי as a participle with a *yod* instead of a *he* at its end. In "82. 4QXII<sup>g</sup>," 282, Fuller abandoned his earlier suggestion and reads וירו instead.

<sup>23</sup> Cf. E. Bons, "Osee/Hosea," in *Septuaginta Deutsch: Erläuterungen und Kommentare zum griechischen Alten Testament* (2 vols.; ed. M. Karrer and W. Kraus; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2011), 2:2287–2338, at 2326.

<sup>24</sup> Fuller, "82. 4QXII<sup>g</sup>," 286.

<sup>25</sup> E. Ulrich, *The Biblical Qumran Scrolls: Transcriptions and Textual Variants* (VTSup 134; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 586.

ויאמר יהוה אלי instead of יהוה ויאמר אלי and MT<sup>Kenn</sup><sup>29</sup> does not have אלי like 4QXII<sup>g</sup>. The reading of 4QXII<sup>g</sup> goes back to the same kind of confusion. When a scribe copied Amos 7:15, he wrote out of habit ויאמר יהוה instead of the correct wording יהוה אלי ויאמר.

*Amos 8:5* The reading of 4QXII<sup>g</sup> (וְנִשְׂבִּים) “so that they may be satisfied”<sup>26</sup> results in a meaningless text.<sup>27</sup> Amos 8:5 clearly describes the wish of businessmen for the new moon to end so that they can continue to trade. MT’s וְנִשְׂבִּירָה שֶׁבֶר (“that we could sell grain”) is hence the better reading. The reading of 4QXII<sup>g</sup> goes back to a character confusion. In book hands of the late Second Temple period, a ligature between *resh* and *he* can be confused under certain circumstances with a final *mem*: If the right hand downstroke of a *he* faded away or its ink peeled of the leather of a manuscript, taken together both characters could create the impression of damaged final *mem*, in which the ink of the lower horizontal stroke peeled away from the leather.

*Jonah 4:7* The reading of 4QXII<sup>g</sup> goes back to a character confusion of *bet* and *kaph*.

*Micah 1:13* The double *lamed* of the 4QXII<sup>g</sup>-text (לִלְכֹּם יִשְׂרָאֵל) goes back to a diplography.<sup>28</sup>

##### 5. The Editorial Readings of 4QXII<sup>g</sup>

The majority of the readings in 4QXII<sup>g</sup> are editorial in character, i.e. they adjust the text of the *Vorlage* of the 4QXII<sup>g</sup>-text in linguistic, stylistic, contextual, and interpretative ways.

Hos 7:14 4QXII<sup>g</sup> בִּלְבָהֶם (cf. LXX αἱ καρδῶν αὐτῶν) || MT בִּלְבָם

<sup>26</sup> Thus the translation of Abegg, Flint, and Ulrich, *Dead Sea Scrolls Bible*, 439.

<sup>27</sup> Abegg, Flint, and Ulrich, *Dead Sea Scrolls Bible*, 439, n. 53, remark therefore “meaning uncertain.”

<sup>28</sup> That M. Jinbachian finds no differences between 4QXII<sup>g</sup> (4Q82) and MT, is in disregard of both the published transcriptions and photos 4QXII<sup>g</sup> (4Q82) (“A Comparison of Micah 1 in the MT, the LXX, and Key Ancient Versions in Light of the Discoveries in the Judean Desert”, in *Celebrating the Dead Sea Scrolls: A Canadian Collection* [ed. P.W. Flint, J. Duhaime, and K.S. Baek; SBLEJL 30; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011], 135–61, at 155).

Hos 7:15 4QXII<sup>g</sup> אזורעותם || MT זרועתם<sup>29</sup>

Hos 7:16 4QXII<sup>g</sup> הָרוּמִיָּה || MT רמיה; cf. LXX ἐντεταμένον

Hos 11:10 4QXII<sup>g</sup> ילְךָ \ ]יהוה[ א[חריו || MT אחרי יהוה ילכו; LXX ὀπίσω κυρίου  
πορεύσομαι

Hos 11:10 4QXII<sup>g</sup> וּכְאֶרְיָה || MT באריה; LXX ὡς λέων

Hos 11:11 4QXII<sup>g</sup> כְּצַפְרִים || MT כצפור; LXX ὡς ὄρνεον

Hos 12:3 4QXII<sup>g</sup> וכמע[לליו cf. LXX καὶ κατὰ τὰ ἐπιτηδέματα αὐτοῦ || MT  
כמעלליו

Hos 12:10 4QXII<sup>g</sup> מְעַלְכָּה || MT כימי; LXX καθὼς ἡμέρα

*Hos 7:14* The 4QXII<sup>g</sup>-text reads for the suffix of the third person plural masculine a form which is typically attached to nouns in the plural (הם-) while Hos-MT 7:14 reads a suffix form which is typically attached to a noun in the singular (ם-). The suffix indicates thus that the 4QXII<sup>g</sup>-text read not only the suffix but also the noun attached to it in the plural (“their hearts”) while the MT-text reads the noun in the singular (“their heart”). The 4QXII<sup>g</sup>-text adjusted the plural number of the noun לב to the plural number of the preceding verb זעקו. The untypical defective spelling of the construct plural without a *yod* shows that this linguistic adjustment goes back to an earlier copy of the Minor Prophets in the textual tradition of the 4QXII<sup>g</sup>-text, because the scribe of 4QXII<sup>g</sup> favored plene spellings. That Hos-LXX reads also the plural αἱ καρδῖαι could either indicate that the 4QXII<sup>g</sup>-text preserves the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the Septuagint or that the Greek translator inserted the same linguistic adjustment into the text of Hos 7:14 as the 4QXII<sup>g</sup>-text did.

*Hos 7:15* With the reading אזורעותם, the 4QXII<sup>g</sup>-text replaces the Hebrew noun זרוע with the Aramaizing<sup>30</sup> word אזורע. Both can designate the arm or forearm of a human being. The word אזורע is rare in the MT text of the

<sup>29</sup> The Greek word βραχίον translates both אזורע and זרוע (cf. T. Muraoka, *A Greek-Hebrew/Aramaic Two-Way Index to the Septuagint* [Leuven: Peeters, 2010], 23). The LXX reading τοὺς βραχίονας αὐτῶν is therefore listed on neither side of this entry.

<sup>30</sup> Cf. HAL 1:28 and Barbara Schlenke, “זרוע אזורע ‘azrôa’ דרע derā’,” in *Theologisches Wörterbuch zu den Qumrantexten* (3 vols.; ed. H.-J. Fabry and U. Dahmen; Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 2011-), 1:875-77, at 875.

Hebrew Bible (Jer 32:21; Job 31:22), but becomes more prominent in Second Temple Jewish literature (4QT<sup>b</sup> [4Q524] 6–13 6; 11QT<sup>a</sup> [11Q19] XX:16 par 11QT<sup>b</sup> [11Q20] IV:26; V:2, 3; cf. 11QHymns A [11Q15] 4 1). This increased prominence of the word *אזרוע* in extrabiblical Second Temple literature corresponds to the replacement of the *זרוע* with *אזרוע* in the quotation of Ps 37:17 in 4QpPs<sup>a</sup> (4Q171) 1–2 ii 24 as well as in biblical manuscripts from Qumran (Deut 5:15 in 4QPhyl J [4Q137], 4QPhyl L [4Q139], and XQPhyl 3 [XQ3]; Deut 11:2 in 4QPhyl A [4Q128], 4QPhyl K [4Q138], and 8QPhyl [8Q4]; Isa 52:10 in 4QIsa<sup>c</sup> [4Q57]; and Ps 136:12 in 11QPs<sup>a</sup> [11Q5]). The 4QXII<sup>g</sup>-text participates thus in a wider linguistic phenomenon in Second Temple Jewish literature when it replaces *זרועותם* with *אזרועותם* in Hos 7:15. The reading should be understood as a linguistic adjustment.

*Hos 7:16* The spelling *רומיה* as opposed to MT's *רמיה* is an orthographic difference of no textcritical value.<sup>31</sup> But 4QXII<sup>g</sup> adds the definite article *ה* to *רומיה* to adjust MT's indeterminative expression *כקשה רומיה* to the phrase *בחרב שריהם* which has a determinative status due to the use of the suffix *הם*.

*Hos 11:10* In the 4QXII<sup>g</sup>-text, the suffix *ו* is added to the preposition *אחרי* and the singular *ילך* is read instead of the plural form *ילכו*. Furthermore, 4QXII<sup>g</sup> reads *וכארניה* instead of *בארניה*. The suffix of the third person singular masculine in *אחריו* could point to an original text of Hos 11:10 in 4QXII<sup>g</sup> which did not have the Tetragrammaton (*אחריו יהוה* instead of *אחריו*) because the Tetragrammaton is a supralinear correction in 4QXII<sup>g</sup> 27, 29 5. Against such a speculation it needs to be emphasized that all supralinear corrections of 4QXII<sup>g</sup> are by the original scribe.<sup>32</sup> That 4QXII<sup>g</sup> reads *ילך וכארניה* instead of *ילכו בארניה* could go back to a scribal error in which a scribe put the word divider after *kaph* instead of after *waw*. As he employs final and not medial *kaph* regularly at the end of a word, such a scribal error is not very likely though. The three variant readings of 4QXII<sup>g</sup> in Hos 11:10 are best understood as intentional alterations of a scribe. The singular form *ילך* adjusts the number of *ילכו* with the two singular forms of *ישאג* in Hos 11:10. The added *waw*

<sup>31</sup> Cf. Fuller, "82. 4QXII<sup>g</sup>," 273.

<sup>32</sup> Cf. Fuller, "82. 4QXII<sup>g</sup>," 274.

*copulativum* in *וּבְאֵרְיָה* of 4QXII<sup>g</sup> smoothens the asyndesis between *יִלָּךְ* and *בְּאֵרֵיהֶם*. The suffix of *אֲחֵרָיו* links Hos 11:10 with the promises to Ephraim in verses 8–9. In 4QXII<sup>g</sup>, Hos 11:10a means thus: “After him (scil. Ephraim), the Lord will go and like a li[on he will roar.”

*Hos 11:11* When verse 11 prophesies that “they will come trembling like a bird out of Egypt,” *יִחַרְדּוּ* is phrased in the plural while the noun which the plural subject of *יִחַרְדּוּ* is compared with has a singular form (*כַּצְּפוּר*). The plural form of the verb *יִחַרְדּוּ* could lead to a plural number for the comparative noun *כַּצְּפוּר* as well. The 4QXII<sup>g</sup>-text changes hence the singular form *כַּצְּפוּר* to the plural from *כַּצְּפוּרִים*. The 4QXII<sup>g</sup>-text means thus “they shall come trembling like birds out of Egypt” instead of MT’s “they shall come trembling like a bird out of Egypt.”

*Hos 12:3* The additional *waw* in *וּבְמַעַן לָלוּ* dissolves an asyndesis between *כַּדְרֵכֶיךָ* and *כַּמַּעַלְלוּ*. That the Old Greek has a *καὶ* which corresponds to 4QXII<sup>g</sup>’s *ו*, does not necessarily point to a dependency of the 4QXII<sup>g</sup>-text by the Hebrew parent text of XII-LXX. It is as likely that XII-LXX smoothed out this asyndesis independent of the 4QXII<sup>g</sup>-text.

*Hos 12:10* The *מַעַלְכָּה מַעַד* of 4QXII<sup>g</sup> is difficult to assess. Tigchelaar wants to read against Fuller *מַאֲרָן* instead of *מַעַד*. Tigchelaar views *מַעַלְכָּה* as a verb added to the first part of Hos 12:10 (*וְאִנְכִי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ הַמַּעַלְכָּה מֵאֲרָץ מִצְרַיִם*) and finds support for his reconstruction with Hos-LXX 12:10 (*ἐγὼ δὲ ἄνθρωπος ὁ θεός σου ἀνῆγαγόν σε ἐκ ἧς Αἰγύπτου*). Tigchelaar argues further that his reconstruction would also better fit into the text gaps of 4QXII<sup>g</sup> which surround the two words *מַעַלְכָּה מַעַד*. These text gaps include for Tigchelaar two empty lines following the words *מַעַלְכָּה מַעַד*<sup>33</sup> as opposed to one empty line in Fuller’s edition.<sup>34</sup> Tigchelaar’s proposal might sound convincing. It nevertheless does not agree with the character remnants of the word following *מַעַלְכָּה* in 4QXII<sup>g</sup>. *Mem* is clearly preserved and only slightly damaged. Against Tigchelaar, the next character cannot be an *’aleph*.

<sup>33</sup> E. J. C. Tigchelaar, “Hosea xii 10[9] in 4Q82,” *VT* 56 (2006): 558–60.

<sup>34</sup> Fuller, “82. 4QXII<sup>g</sup>,” 286.



Although the facsimile published in DJD 15<sup>35</sup> creates the impression of an *'aleph* a look at the scan of PAM 41.998 on the new IAA webpage<sup>36</sup> leaves no doubt that what looks like remnants of an *'aleph* on the printed photo are only shadows cast by the upper layer of leather which dissolved from the skin's surface. The two diagonal down strokes still preserved favor an *'ayin* instead of an *'aleph*. Fuller's transcription מְעַלְכָּה מְעַד is therefore correct. Whether the *lacuna* following the מְעַלְכָּה מְעַד in 4QXII<sup>g</sup> extends to one or two lines<sup>37</sup> is impossible to decide because the text of Hos 12:10 is preserved as part of a mirror writing on the verso of fragment 31. The mirrorwriting in question occurred when moist air made the ink of 4QXII<sup>g</sup> fluid again. Because of this fluid ink, the text of Hos 12:10 adhered to the winding of the scroll 4QXII<sup>g</sup> which was above the text of Hos 12:10. Such mirrorwriting does not need to preserve the precise distances of the lines attested by it. The rolling of a scroll can bend its leather slightly if the scroll is not rolled tightly. Mirrorwriting is therefore not an exact copy of the column whose ink it lifted of the winding below it. Furthermore, when Tigchelaar emphasizes that there is too little space for the text of Hos-MT 12:10 in 4QXII<sup>g</sup> this is certainly correct.<sup>38</sup> But that the running text of Hos-MT 12:9–10 does not fit into the text gaps of 4QXII<sup>g</sup> does not mean that the manuscript read differently from MT. Although 4QXII<sup>g</sup> is a carefully executed manuscript with only nine corrections (all by the original scribe)<sup>39</sup> it cannot be excluded that the scribe of 4QXII<sup>g</sup> accidentally forgot to copy a part of Hos-MT 12:10 and corrected himself later by way of a supralinear or marginal correction. This possibility becomes all the more likely as four out of the nine scribal corrections still preserved in 4QXII<sup>g</sup> occur in Hosea 10–12 (Hosea 10:8; 11:10; 12:3, 8). That two scribal

<sup>35</sup> E. Ulrich et al., *Qumran Cave 4.X: The Prophets* (DJD 15; Oxford: Clarendon, 1997), plate lv.

<sup>36</sup> <http://www.deadseascrolls.org.il/explore-the-archive/image/B-280448>.

<sup>37</sup> Thus Tigchelaar, "Hosea xii 10[9]," 559, n. 7.

<sup>38</sup> Fuller states: "There appears to be too little space for the complete text of M" ("82. 4QXII<sup>g</sup>," 287).

<sup>39</sup> See Fuller, "82. 4QXII<sup>g</sup>," 274–75

corrections occur in Hosea 12 alone points all the more to a lack of concentration when the scribe of 4QXII<sub>g</sub> copied Hosea 12.

While Tigchelaar's reconstruction does hence not agree with what is preserved of Hos 12:10 on the verso of fragment 4QXII<sub>g</sub> 31, his observation that Ps 81:11 has a textual parallel to Hos 12:10 which includes the word *המעלך* is important nevertheless. The 4QXII<sub>g</sub>-text was most probably influenced by Ps 81:11 in reading *מְעַלְכָּה*. The MT-text of Hos 12:10 was difficult to understand in late Second Temple period. The phrase *כימי מועד* is relatively disconnected from the rest of the verse. Hos 12:10 threatens its addressees that because of their crimes they will live in tents again, i.e. they will suffer the same punishment as the desert generation did for its apostasy. The adverbial addition "as in the days of the appointed festival" (*כימי מועד*) makes no sense in this context. Therefore the text of 4QXII<sub>g</sub> substituted *כימי* with *מְעַלְכָּה* in light of Ps 81:11. By way of the addition of *מְעַלְכָּה*, the 4QXII<sub>g</sub>-text changes the meaning of the word *מועד*. Two meanings are possible: 1) *מועד* carries now the more general signification of an "appointed time" instead of referring to the specific time of an "appointed festival." Syntactically one would expect though that the word *מועד* would be preceded by a preposition in this case. But such a preposition cannot be found in 4QXII<sub>g</sub>. 2) *מועד* means "assembly" and describes the people of the Exodus as such an assembly. It remains puzzling though that the verb *עלה* never has *מועד* as its object in pre-Rabbinic Hebrew literature. According to the (reconstructed) text of 4QXII<sub>g</sub>, Hos 12:10 can thus either be translated "But I am the Lord your God out of the land of Egypt, I will let you dwell in tents again, having brought you up at the appointed time"<sup>40</sup> or "But I am the Lord your God out of the land of Egypt, I will let you dwell in tents again, having brought you up as an assembly". Be that as it may, by way of the word *מְעַלְכָּה*, the 4QXII<sub>g</sub>-text

<sup>40</sup> Abegg, Flint and Ulrich, *Dead Sea Scrolls Bible*, 426, understand *מְעַלְכָּה* as additional text which follows *כימי* ("as in the days that I] brought you up for the appointed feast"). This reconstruction is unlikely though as Fuller notes "There appears to be too little space for the complete text of א" ("82. 4QXII<sub>g</sub>," 287). If there is hardly enough space for the complete text of MT, it is unlikely that 4QXII<sub>g</sub> inserted an additional word.

connects the second part of Hos 12:10 with the Exodus tradition mentioned in its first part. In this adjustment, the 4QXII<sup>g</sup>-text was influenced by the parallel in Ps 81:11. Ps 81:11 gave the 4QXII<sup>g</sup>-text guidance in how to make sense of a cryptic passage in the MT-text of Hosea.

Joel 2:5 4QXII<sup>g</sup> הַמְּלִיחַ לְמַלְחָמָה / LXX εἰς πόλεμον || MT מלחמה

Joel 2:8 4QXII<sup>g</sup> וְיִחַח אֶת אֶתְּמֵי אֶתְּמֵי || MT וְיִחַח אֶתְּמֵי אֶתְּמֵי; LXX καὶ ἕκαστος ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ

Joel 4:4 4QXII<sup>g</sup> גלילת || MurXII + MT גלילות; LXX Γαλιλαία

Joel 4:4 4QXII<sup>g</sup> מַהֲרָה || MurXII + MT מהרה

*Joel 2:5* The original scribe of 4QXII<sup>g</sup> inserted a supralinear *lamed*<sup>41</sup> and changed thus MT's מלחמה to למלחמה. The text of Joel 2:5 is difficult to understand in MT. מלחמה ערוך means "to array battle." The addition of the preposition ל results in the easier meaning "to array for battle." The LXX has a similar text. The parallel reading of 4QXII<sup>g</sup> and XII-LXX goes either back to a similar stylistic improvement by the translator of the XII-LXX and 4QXII<sup>g</sup> or the XII-LXX and 4QXII<sup>g</sup> share a common textual ancestor.

*Joel 2:8* By way of the addition of a *waw copulativum* in וְיִחַח, the 4QXII<sup>g</sup>-text smoothens an asyndesis which went against the stylistic taste of a scribe.

*Joel 4:4* Given the preference of 4QXII<sup>g</sup> for plene spellings, גלילת should be understood as a singular. Lacking accurate historical knowledge, the 4QXII<sup>g</sup>-text could only think of one region of the Philistines (גלילת פלשת) and changed thus the plural form of MT (גלילות) into a singular. The LXX translator did not understand the word גלילות in its original meaning anymore either and mistook it as referring to the Galilee.

*Joel 4:4* In Joel 4:4, the 4QXII<sup>g</sup>-text changes the adverb מהרה into an absolute infinitive in the Pi'el stem, מהר.<sup>42</sup> Clines'<sup>43</sup> dictionary shows that the adverb מהרה was not used in late Second Temple Hebrew while the absolute

<sup>41</sup> Cf. Fuller, "82. 4QXII<sup>g</sup>," 290.

<sup>42</sup> The LXX has ταχέως which renders both מהרה and מהר (cf. Muraoka, *Two Way Index*, 116).

<sup>43</sup> *DCH* 5:167.



*Amos 4:6* The book of Amos uses regularly the personal pronoun אֲנִי<sup>45</sup> but only in Amos 4:6 the alternate pronoun אָנִי. As Amos 4:7 begins with the phrase וְגַם אֲנִי, the author of the book of Amos decided for the sake of variation to begin Amos 4:6 with וְגַם אָנִי. But the 4QXII<sup>g</sup>-text adjusts וְגַם אָנִי at the beginning of Amos 4:6 to the וְגַם אֲנִי in Amos 4:7. The same reading is attested in MT<sup>Kenn154</sup> which could mean that either some scribe in the Masoretic tradition inserted the same adjustment or that MT<sup>Kenn154</sup> goes back to an ancient variant reading.

*Amos 5:15* The preceding verse (Amos 5:14) ends with כְּאִשֶׁר אָמַרְתֶּם (“as you have said”). Both the 4QXII<sup>g</sup>-text and XII-LXX understand this brief clause as an introduction to a quotation of the admonished addressees of Amos 5:14–15. They therefore change the plural imperatives שְׂנֹאוּ and וְאָהַבּוּ to two perfect forms of the first person plural, שָׂנֵאנוּ and וְאָהַבְנוּ.<sup>46</sup> The latter perfect form is reconstructed for 4QXII<sup>g</sup> but is reflected in the ἠγάπηκαμεν of the LXX. Instead of MT’s “Hate evil and love good,” the 4QXII<sup>g</sup>-text reads “we hated evil and [loved good.” Different from the XII-LXX, the 4QXII<sup>g</sup>-text continues the direct speech of Amos 5:15a though also in 5:15b. For this purpose, it adds a suffix of the first person plural to the verb יִחַן and reads יִחַנְנוּ. Instead of MT’s “it may be that the Lord the God of Hosts will be gracious with the rest of Jacob,” the 4QXII<sup>g</sup>-text runs “it may be that the Lord the God of Hosts will be gracious with us, the rest of Jacob.” As the 4QXII<sup>g</sup>-text continues its first person plural forms into verse 15b, it is rather likely that it also read וְהִצִּיגְנוּ (“and we have established”) as opposed to MT’s וְהִצִּיגּוּ (“and he will establish”). That 4QXII<sup>g</sup>’s editorial reading יִחַנְנוּ is not reflected in the LXX shows that the 4QXII<sup>g</sup>-text and the LXX do not depend on each other in their editorial readings of Amos 5:15.

*Amos 7:8 and 17* In Amos 7:8, the 4QXII<sup>g</sup>-text disagrees three times with the divine names used in the MT text. When the 4QXII<sup>g</sup>-text adds at the

<sup>45</sup> *The Dead Sea Scrolls Electronic Library* (rev. ed.; ed. E. Tov; Leiden: Brill, 2006) lists Amos 2:9, 10, 13; 4:7; 5:1; 6:8; 7:14 (3x); 9:9.

<sup>46</sup> Against Fuller, “82. 4QXII<sup>g</sup>,” 300–01, and Ulrich, *Biblical Qumran Scrolls*, 606, it is more likely that 4QXII<sup>g</sup> continued this grammatical editing. The text following the word רַע should therefore be reconstructed as וְאָהַבְנוּ.

beginning of verses 8 and 17 the word אֲדֹנָי in front of the Tetragrammaton against MT, MurXII, and LXX, it imitates not only a combination of divine names which occurs often in Amos 7 but one which is prominent in the whole book of Amos (Amos 1:8; 3:7, 8, 11, 13; 4:2, 5; 5:3; 6:8; 7:1, 2, 4, 5, 6; 8:1, 3, 9, 11; 9:5, 8). The two readings are evidently an adjustment to a prominent way to write the name of the God in the book of Amos. The textual fluidity of the divine names used in Amos 7–8 and the need of even medieval scribes to adjust them to each other, is impressively illustrated by the variant readings noted in Kennicott's famous edition.<sup>47</sup>

To understand why the 4QXII<sup>g</sup>-text replaces the word אֲדֹנָי in Amos 7:8 with the Tetragrammaton is more difficult. Most of the attestations of divine names in Amos 7 are missing in 4QXII<sup>g</sup> due to manuscript deterioration. Except for Amos 7:8, 17, in 4QXII<sup>g</sup> the only other partly preserved attestations of divine names can be found in Amos 1:5, 11; 2:8; 5:15, 16; 6:10; 9:15. In all of these cases, no textual variants to MT are extant. But in almost all of these cases not enough context is preserved to know if the 4QXII<sup>g</sup>-text added another divine name to what is still readable. Manuscript deterioration does hence not allow for overall conclusions as to how the 4QXII<sup>g</sup>-text read divine names elsewhere in the book of Amos, i.e. if the 4QXII<sup>g</sup>-text manipulated divine names elsewhere as well. Except for Amos 7:8, in the book of Amos, אֲדֹנָי is used only Amos 7:7 and 9:1 as a divine name without further epithets. Both references are not preserved in 4QXII<sup>g</sup>. It seems likely to me to that the 4QXII<sup>g</sup>-text replaced the word אֲדֹנָי not only in Amos 7:8 but also in Amos 7:7 and 9:1 with the Tetragrammaton. This adjustment brought the three references in question in line with the overall employment of divine names in the MT-text of the book of Amos because it uses the Tetragrammaton often without adding further divine epithets (Amos 1:2, 3, 5, 6, 9, 11, 13, 15; 2:1, 3, 4, 6, 11, 16; 3:1, 6, 10, 12, 15; 4:3, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11; 5:4, 6, 8, 17, 18, 20; 6:10, 11; 7:3, 6, 8, 15, 16, 17; 8:2, 7, 11, 12; 9:6, 7, 8, 12, 13).

<sup>47</sup> B. Kennicott, *Vetus Testamentum Hebraicum cum variis lectionibus* (2 vols.; Oxford: Clarendon, 1776–80), 2:267–68.

*Amos 9:6* The Masoretic textual tradition is divided in *Amos 9:6*. Many manuscripts side with 4QXII<sup>g</sup> in reading מעלותיו מעלותו. מעלותו is attested by only a few, but the best, witnesses to MT: MurXII + MT<sup>Ketib.L</sup>. Most interesting is that not only the Vulgate whose parent text stands in the (proto)Masoretic textual tradition but also a large number of MT manuscripts (MT<sup>Kenn</sup>17.30.101.126.128.144.168.172.182.195.242.270) support the Septuagint reading ἀνάβασιν αὐτοῦ. The most likely explanation for the evidence is that the textual tradition which led to the consonantal text of MT was divided already in antiquity. The original reading is מעלתו (LXX; Vulg.; MT<sup>Kenn</sup>17.30.101.126.128.144.168.172.182.195.242.270). A scribe read this as a plural form and added the plene spelling: מעלותו (MurXII; MT<sup>Ketib.L</sup>). The 4QXII<sup>g</sup>-text adjusted the archaic spelling מעלותו to the grammatically more current morphology מעלותיו (MT<sup>Qere.Kenn</sup>29.93.112.116.224.252.253.258.260.264.271A.650B.659), because a suffix which is added to the feminine plural construct requests the additional plural masculine ending *yod*.

Ob 4 4QXII<sup>g</sup> שים\ת/ with LXX θῆς || MurXII + MT שים

Ob 15 4QXII<sup>g</sup> שובו || MurXII + MT ישוב; LXX ἀνταποδοθήσεται

*Obadiah 4* In 4QXII<sup>g</sup> 70–75 10 the original scribe of 4QXII<sup>g</sup> added a *taw* in the right column margin to read תשים instead of שים.<sup>48</sup> With this imperfect of the second person masculine singular the 4QXII<sup>g</sup>-text adjusts MT's original infinitive to the grammatical form of the first verb in verse 4: תגביה. With its reading θῆς, the LXX agrees in grammatical form with 4QXII<sup>g</sup> although a free rendering of MT's שים as θῆς cannot be excluded with absolute certainty. The agreement between 4QXII<sup>g</sup> and LXX could go back to a shared ancestor of both texts or to a parallel stylistic adjustment of the LXX translator.

*Obadiah 15* In this verse, the 4QXII<sup>g</sup>-text reads the perfect plural שובו against MT's imperfect singular ישוב (cf. LXX).<sup>49</sup> The 4QXII<sup>g</sup> variant shows, that the

<sup>48</sup> Fuller, "82. 4QXII<sup>g</sup>," 309.

<sup>49</sup> שובו represents an irregular way to form the perfect of the third person plural masculinum. To be expected would be שבו while שובו would normally be classified as an imperative of the second person plural masculinum. Because such an

4QXII<sup>g</sup>-text understands the preceding גמולכ[ה] as summarizing those crimes of Edom against Judah which are described in verses 11–14. The 4QXII<sup>g</sup>-text understood גמול therefore in a plural sense and construed the verb שוב in the plural accordingly. That the 4QXII<sup>g</sup>-text used a perfect as opposed to an imperfect form should be understood as a *perfectum propheticum*.

Jonah 1:3 4QXII<sup>g</sup> תרשיש (3<sup>rd</sup> occurrence) || MurXII + MT תרשישה LXX εἰς  
Θαρσους

Jonah 1:8 4QXII<sup>g</sup> ומה (cf. LXX καὶ ἐκ ποίας) || 4QXII<sup>a</sup>, MurXII, MT מה

Jonah 2:5 4QXII<sup>g</sup> אכ[ה] || MurXII, MT אך cf. LXX ἄρα<sup>50</sup>

Jonah 2:6 4QXII<sup>g</sup> אפפני || MurXII, MT אפפוני, LXX περιεχύθη ... μοι, 8HevXII gr  
π[εριεχύθησάν] με

Jonah 2:7 4QXII<sup>g</sup> נפשי || > MurXII, MT, LXX

Jonah 4:6 4QXII<sup>g</sup> יהוה אדוני יהוה || MurXII, MT יהוה אלהים

Jonah 4:7 4QXII<sup>g</sup> הי[ם] || > MurXII, MT, LXX

*Jonah 1:3* The word תרשיש (“Tarsus”) occurs three times in the MT text of *Jonah 1:3*. For the first and third occurrence the MT reads תרשישה (“to Tarsus”) but for the second occurrence תרשיש. This inconsistency led to various adjustments. The LXX reads e.g. in all three cases εἰς Θαρσους and Kennicott<sup>51</sup> as well as De Rossi<sup>52</sup> know of several Masoretic manuscripts (MT<sup>Kenn</sup>99, 151, 172, 180, MT<sup>DeRossi</sup>24, 211, 388, 419, 440, 476, 486, 594, 654, 663, 721, 814, 825) which change the second occurrence of the word from תרשיש to תרשישה. The same

imperative results in a meaningless text, the שובו of 4QXII<sup>g</sup> is interpreted above as a perfect form for contextual reasons (cf. also the translation of Ob 15 in 4QXII<sup>g</sup> in Abegg, Flint and Ulrich, *Dead Sea Scrolls Bible*, 442). A similarly irregular form is the construct masculine plural participle שובי in Micah 2:8.

<sup>50</sup> For ἄρα as translating אך but not אכה, see Muraoka, *Two Way Index*, 17.

<sup>51</sup> Kennicott, *Vetus Testamentum*, 2:271.

<sup>52</sup> J. H. De Rossi, *Variae Lectiones Veteris Testamenti: Ex immensa manuscriptorum editorumque codicum congerie haustae et ad Samaritanum textum, ad vetustissimas versiones, ad accuratiores sacrae criticae fontes ac leges examinatae* (5 vols.; Parma: Bodoni, 1786–98) 3:194.



is true for the first hand of codex MT<sup>L</sup>.<sup>53</sup> Similarly 4QXII<sup>a</sup> (4Q76) changes the first occurrence of the word from תרשישה to תרשיש. When 4QXII<sup>g</sup> reads the third occurrence of תרשיש not as תרשישה but as תרשיש, this is yet one more adjustment of the two different uses of תרשיש in Jonah 1:3.

*Jonah 1:8* As both וּמֵאֵין and וְאֵין מוֹזָה are introduced with a *waw copulativum*, the LXX and the 4QXII<sup>g</sup>-text add such a *waw* or *καί* respectively also to מָה. The LXX could be inspired by the 4QXII<sup>g</sup>-text but the translator could have inserted his *καί* without such an inspiration from the 4QXII<sup>g</sup>-text as well.

*Jonah 2:5* The variant in 4QXII<sup>g</sup> is reconstructed, because the last *he* of the אַבְנֵה is not preserved. The medial *kaph* does suggest at least one more character though because 4QXII<sup>g</sup> is not known to use *medial* characters in final position. Fuller's<sup>54</sup> transcription אַבְנֵה is the most plausible reconstruction. If Fuller's reconstruction is correct, the 4QXII<sup>g</sup>-text replaced the more difficult to understand affirmative אָךְ ("surely") in Jonah 2:5 with the interrogative אַכֵּה ("how").

*Jonah 2:6* The 4QXII<sup>g</sup>-text understands the word מִים as a singular and reads thus the singular verbal form אֶפְפְּנֵי instead of the plural form אֶפְפְּנֵי ("the water closed in over me") in the (proto)-Masoretic textual tradition. That the LXX reads a singular verbal form is demanded by the Greek noun ὑδωρ and thus of no text-critical value but a matter of translation technique. The plural forms of 8HēvXII gr are due to the very literal character of the recension attested by this manuscript.

*Jonah 2:7* The 4QXII<sup>g</sup>-text found the use of חַי ("my life") in Jonah 2:7 inconsistent in comparison with the use of נַפְשִׁי ("my life force") in Jonah 2:8 and added the word נַפְשִׁי to Jonah 2:7 resulting in the unique locution חַי נַפְשִׁי ("the life of my soul").

<sup>53</sup> Cf. A. Gelston, ed., תרי עשר *The Twelve Minor Prophets* (BHQ 13; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2010), 92\*: "The first hand of M<sup>L</sup> wrote this word with a final ה, most likely assimilating to the other two occurrences of this place name in this verse. A later hand removed this final ה, leaving only a tiny part of the original letter remaining as well as the space in which it stood."

<sup>54</sup> Fuller, "82. 4QXII<sup>g</sup>," 310.

*Jonah 4:6* When 4QXII<sup>s</sup> reads יהוה אדוני יהוה instead of MT's יהוה אלהים, this should be seen as connected with the changes of divine names attested in the 4QXII<sup>s</sup>-text in Amos 7:8, 17.

*Jonah 4:7* The word מחרת is attested in ancient Hebrew texts only until the third century B.C.E. The single exception to this rule is *Jub 21:10* (4QJub<sup>d</sup> [4Q219] 1 38 par 4QJub<sup>e</sup> [4Q220] 1 10). A scribe in the scribal tradition of the 4QXII<sup>s</sup>-text added היום to explain the word מחרת which was difficult to understand in his time as it was no longer in use. In this addition, the scribe in question might have been guided by 1Chr 29:21.

Micah 2:3 4QXII<sup>s</sup> צוא[רותיהם || MurXII + MT צוארותיכם; LXX τοὺς τραχῆλους  
ὕμῶν

Micah 2:4 4QXII<sup>s</sup> ונ[הו || MurXII + MT ונהה; LXX καὶ θρηνηθήσεται

*Micah 2:3 and 2:4* Both readings in 4QXII<sup>s</sup> adjust the number of verbal and suffix forms to their context. Micah 2:1-2 are phrased in the third person plural. They describe misdeeds of a group addressed as “they.” Micah 2:3-5 represents the doom prophecy corresponding to the misdeeds of this group. Grammatical forms are mixed in the doom prophecy of Micah 2:3-5: second person plural forms occur together with second person singular, third person singular form, and even first person plural forms. This mix of grammatical forms is partly a rhetorical device and partly due to the summary description of the attacked group as המשפחה (“the family” Micah 2:3). Both in adjustment with Micah 2:1-2 and in adjustment with the collective singular המשפחה, the 4QXII<sup>s</sup>-text changes in Micah 2:3 the suffix of the second person plural כם- (צוארותכם) to a suffix of the third person plural הם- (צוארותהם). In Micah 2:4, a similar grammatical adjustment occurs in 4QXII<sup>s</sup>: A *waw*-perfect of the third person singular is changed to a *waw*-perfect of the third person plural as MT's third person singular form ונהה contradicts the first person plural form נשדנו. In the MT, the relevant part of Micah 2:4 reads: “In that day, one shall recite a saying (משל) against you, and he shall utter a bitter lament (ונהה נהי נהיה): it says: ‘we are utterly ruined (שדוד נשדנו)...’” In 4QXII<sup>s</sup>, the same text reads “In that day, one shall recite a saying (משל) against you, and] they [shall u]tter a

bitter l[ament (היה) נהי נהי]: it says: ‘we are utterly ruined (שדוד נשדנו)...’ In Micah 2:4, the LXX-translator recognized the same need for grammatical improvement but chose to employ passive forms to achieve it. In 4QXII<sup>g</sup>, the grammatical editing of Micah 2:3–4 is not systematic though. Although much text is lost beyond reconstruction in this part of 4QXII<sup>g</sup>, the manuscript preserves in Micah 2:3b a verbal form of the second person plural (תלכְוּ).

### 6. Conclusions

With a textual variation of 4.80–5.90%, 4QXII<sup>g</sup> is close to the consonantal text of MT but nevertheless at some variance with it. The manuscript should thus be described as semi-Masoretic. Not including reconstructed variants, I have discussed above a total of 75 readings in 4QXII<sup>g</sup>. Twelve of these readings remain unclear due to damages of the manuscript 4QXII<sup>g</sup> or other reasons. Nine variant readings of 4QXII<sup>g</sup> reflect scribal errors. Two of the variant readings which are preserved in 4QXII<sup>g</sup> preserve the original text of Nah 2:8 and Zech 10:12. In both cases, 4QXII<sup>g</sup> reads with LXX against MT. The importance of the 4QXII<sup>g</sup>-text lies therefore not in its value for the reconstruction of the original text of the Minor Prophets. The bulk of 4QXII<sup>g</sup> variants towards MT attests to editorial readings, i.e. 31 out of a total of 54 variants. 4QXII<sup>g</sup> can thus be classified as a witness to an editorial text of the Minor Prophets. The editorial changes of the 4QXII<sup>g</sup>-text reference the context of individual verses (Hos 11:10; Ob 15) and achieve linguistic adjustments to the immediate and/or more distant contexts of a given reading (Hos 7:14, 16; 11:10, 11; Amos 4:6; 7:8<sup>x</sup>, 17; Ob 4; Jonah 1:3, 8; 4:6; Micah 2:3, 4). Further linguistic adjustments include stylistic and linguistic improvements (Joel 2:5; 4:4; Amos 1:14; Jonah 2:6). Among the stylistic improvements, the 4QXII<sup>g</sup>-text dissolves an asyndesis several times (Hos 11:10; 12:3; Joel 2:8, Jonah 1:8). For the purpose of linguistic improvement, the 4QXII<sup>g</sup>-text adjusts the Hebrew of various verses to contemporary usage (Hos 7:15; Joel 4:4; Amos 9:6). In addition, interpretative changes occur which allow for a better understanding of the text (Hos 12:10; Am 5:15<sup>2x</sup>). For this purpose, the 4QXII<sup>g</sup>-

text can rewrite passages slightly to make them more comprehensible (Jonah 2:5, 7; 4:7).

On the whole the main interests of the 4QXII<sup>b</sup>-text are contextual, linguistic, and stylistic adjustments, as well as improvements of its parent text. As such, the 4QXII<sup>b</sup>-text should be understood as a scholarly work which wants to improve the linguistic accuracy and stylistic quality of the Hebrew text of the Minor Prophets. As an editorial text, 4QXII<sup>b</sup> is not interested in a reinterpretation of the Minor Prophets but in their intelligibility.

Manuscript deterioration makes it impossible to decide whether the 4QXII<sup>b</sup>-text was comprehensive and coherent in its editorial readings or not. As least in some verses not all grammatical forms were adjusted (see e.g. Micah 2:3–4). It also remains unclear if all editorial changes go back to one scribe or if they were introduced into the 4QXII<sup>b</sup>-text subsequently by several scribes. That some of the editorial readings of the 4QXII<sup>b</sup>-text agree with XII-LXX, does not necessarily imply an intertextual relationship between these two witnesses. Texts like Amos 5:15 and Micah 2:4 demonstrate that the LXX translator and the 4QXII<sup>b</sup>-text were able to apply similar adjustments independent of each other.

Another interesting feature is the distribution of variant readings in 4QXII<sup>b</sup>. After the book of Micah, i.e. roughly in the middle of the Minor Prophets, only two variant readings towards MT are preserved. These two variant readings in Nah 2:9 and Zech 10:12 reflect original readings. This could mean that the manuscript 4QXII<sup>b</sup> preserves two different text forms of the Minor Prophets. A semi-Masoretic editorial text in the first set of six books in the Minor Prophets collection and a conservative text without such editorial tendencies which was rather close to the consonantal text of MT in the second set of six books in the Minor Prophets collection. Such mixed texts are not unusual in antiquity. Examples include the extant Septuagint text of 1Samuel–2Kings which mixes the Old Greek text with a *kaige*-type revision, or the Septuagint text of Jeremiah which combines two Greek texts of different

character.<sup>55</sup> Mixed texts developed when, in the case of longer books or book collections, a scribe copied from two scrolls to produce one new manuscript. In some cases, ancient scribes had only a very limited amount of scrolls at their disposal to use as *Vorlagen*. A given library might have contained only an editorial semi-Masoretic text for Hosea–Micah and a conservative proto-Masoretic text for Nahum–Malachi. When a scribe copied both scrolls to produce a new copy of all twelve books of the Minor Prophets the result was a mixed text.

It needs to be emphasized though that in 4QXII<sup>g</sup> only 41 fully or partially preserved words are still extant from the books Nahum–Malachi with Zech 12:1–3 being the last identifiable passage. The two variant readings towards MT result for 4QXII<sup>g</sup> in a deviation of 4.88% from the text of MT in its extant text of Nahum–Malachi. But 4.88% of textual deviation are comparable with the overall ratio of textual deviation 4QXII<sup>g</sup> displays towards the consonantal text of MT. My observation regarding the mixed textual character of 4QXII<sup>g</sup> remains therefore a speculation and depends on my classification of מִימִיָּהּ in Nah 2:9 and יתהלל[לו] in Zech 10:12 as original readings.

#### *Appendix 1: Textual Differences Which Are Not Regarded as Variants*

For Jonah 3:2 and 4:10, Fuller and Ulrich note variant readings towards MT which were disregarded in the above discussion.

Jonah 3:2 4QXII<sup>g</sup> הַ[ב]ִּי || MurXII and MT לִי

<sup>55</sup> For the accidental ways how mixed texts developed in antiquity, see E. Tov, “The Coincidental Textual Nature of the Collections of Ancient Scriptures,” in *Congress Volume Ljubljana 2007* (ed. A. Lemaire; VTSup 133; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 153–69, esp. 157–59. For the mixed nature of the Greek texts of 1Samuel–2Kings and Jeremiah, see H. St. J. Thackeray, “The Greek Translators of the Four Books of Kings,” *JTS* 8 (1906–07): 262–78; D. Barthélemy, *Les devanciers d’Aquila: première publication intégrale du texte des fragments du Dodécaprophéton; trouvés dans le désert de Juda, précédée d’une étude sur les traductions et recensions grecques de la bible réalisées au premier siècle de notre ère sous l’influence du rabbinat palestinien* (VTSup 10; Leiden: Brill, 1963), 91–143; E. Tov, *The Septuagint Translation of Jeremiah and Baruch: A Discussion of an Early Jewish Revision of Jeremiah 29–52 and Baruch 1:1–3:8* (HSM 8; Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1976).

Jonah 4:10 4QXIIg לילי ... [לי]ל[י] || MT לילה ... לילה cf. MurXII

Jonah 3:2 The forms ל[כ]ה and לך are two different morphological realizations of the imperative of the second singular masculine. ל[כ]ה is therefore not regarded as a textual variant.<sup>56</sup>

Jonah 4:10 When 4QXIIg reads in Jonah 4:7 the Aramaic equivalent לילי of the Hebrew word לילה, this should not be regarded as a textual variant<sup>57</sup> but as an orthographic confusion due to a bilingual Aramaic-Hebrew scribe who mixed an Aramaic spelling with a Hebrew one.

*Appendix 2: List of Textual Variants in 4QXIIg<sup>58</sup>*

Hos 2:1 4QXIIg ספר[י] with MT, cf. LXX || 4QXII<sup>d</sup> ספיר

Hos 2:4 4QXIIg ]ב[י]ב[ || MT ריבו; LXX κρίθητε

Hos 2:14 4QXIIg א[י]ת[ || MT חית; cf. LXX and 4QpHos<sup>a</sup> (4Q166) ח[ית]

Hos 3:3 4QXIIg שבי[ת] with MT, cf. LXX || 4QXII<sup>c</sup> יש[בו]

Hos 7:14 4QXIIg בלבהם (cf. LXX αἱ καρδίαι αὐτῶν) || MT בלבם

Hos 7:14 4QXIIg ילילו || MT יילילו LXX ὠλόλυζον

Hos 7:15 4QXIIg יסרתי with MT || > LXX

Hos 7:15 4QXIIg אזרועותם || MT זרועתם

Hos 7:16 4QXIIg הרומיה || MT רמיה; cf. LXX ἐντεταμένον

Hos 9:10 4QXIIg כבכורה with MT || LXX καὶ ὡς σκοπόν

Hos 9:14 4QXIIg ]צומקים[... ]י[... ] || MT ושדים צמקים; LXX καὶ μαστούς ξηρούς

Hos 10:9 4QXIIg חטאת with MT || LXX ἤμαρτεν

<sup>56</sup> Cf. Ego et al., *Biblia Qumranica*, 83. Against Fuller, "82. 4QXIIg," 311, and Ulrich, *Biblical Qumran Scrolls*, 613.

<sup>57</sup> Cf. Ego et al., *Biblia Qumranica*, 87. Against Fuller, "82. 4QXIIg," 313, and Ulrich, *Biblical Qumran Scrolls*, 614.

<sup>58</sup> In the list below, only textual witnesses which go back to the Second Temple period are mentioned consistently. Medieval Masoretic manuscripts as well as any other textual witness which developed after 70 C. E. are included only when they are important for my arguments.

- Hos 10:10 4QXII<sub>g</sub> ם[סר]בא with MT || LXX ἐν τῷ παιδεύεσθαι αὐτούς  
Hos 10:12 4QXII<sub>g</sub> וירו || MT וירה; > LXX  
Hos 11:4 4QXII<sub>g</sub> לחיהם with MT || LXX τὰς σιαγόνας αὐτοῦ  
Hos 11:8 4QXII<sub>g</sub> על לבי || MT עלי לבי; עלי > LXX  
Hos 11:10 4QXII<sub>g</sub> ילך / יהוה / אחריו || MT אחריו יהוה ילכו; LXX ὀπίσω κυρίου πορεύσομαι  
Hos 11:10 4QXII<sub>g</sub> וכאַר־יה || MT כאריה; LXX ὡς λέων  
Hos 11:11 4QXII<sub>g</sub> כַּצְפּוֹרִים || MT כצפור; LXX ὡς ὄρνεον  
Hos 12:3 4QXII<sub>g</sub> וכמעלליו cf. LXX καὶ κατὰ τὰ ἐπιτηδεύματα αὐτοῦ || MT כמעלליו  
Hos 12:9 4QXII<sub>g</sub> יעו[ג] with LXX οἱ πόνοι αὐτοῦ || MT גיעי  
Hos 12:10 4QXII<sub>g</sub> מַעֲלֵכָה || MT כימי; LXX καθὼς ἡμέρα  
Hos 13:6 4QXII<sub>g</sub> קים[ ] || > MT and LXX  
Joel 1:13 4QXII<sub>g</sub> משרתי || MT משרתי; LXX οἱ λειτουργοῦντες  
Joel 2:5 4QXII<sub>g</sub> ל[מלח] / LXX εἰς πόλεμον || MT מלחמה  
Joel 2:8 4QXII<sub>g</sub> ו[אי]ש אחיו || MT ואיש אחיו; LXX καὶ ἕκαστος ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ  
Joel 2:11 4QXII<sub>g</sub> ונוא־א with 4QXII<sup>c</sup> and MT || LXX μεγάλη καὶ ἐπιφανής  
Joel 4:4 4QXII<sub>g</sub> גלילת || MurXII + MT גלילות; LXX Γαλιλαία  
Joel 4:4 4QXII<sub>g</sub> מ[ה]ה || MurXII + MT מהרה  
Joel 4:9 4QXII<sub>g</sub> ו[קיא] || MurXII + MT קראו LXX κηρύξατε  
Amos 1:3 4QXII<sub>g</sub> ל[הברז] with MT and LXX (σιδηροῖς) || 5QAmos ת[הרו]  
Amos 1:3 4QXII<sub>g</sub> ת[א] with MT || > 5QAmos  
Amos 1:7 4QXII<sub>g</sub> ת[ב] || MT ארמנתיה; LXX θεμέλια αὐτης  
Amos 1:12 4QXII<sub>g</sub> בוצרה with MurXII and MT (בְּצָרָה) || LXX τειχέων αὐτῆς  
Amos 1:14 4QXII<sub>g</sub> מלחמה / || MT מלחמה LXX πολέμου  
Amos 4:6 4QXII<sub>g</sub> אנוכי with MT<sup>Kenn154</sup> || MT אני  
Amos 5:11 4QXII<sub>g</sub> נם[ ] || MT יינם; LXX τὸν οἶνον ἐξ αὐτῶν  
Amos 5:15 4QXII<sub>g</sub> שנאו with LXX Μεμισήκαμεν || MT שנאו

- Amos 5:15 4QXIIg יחננו || MT יחנן LXX ἐλεήσῃ
- Amos 6:8 4QXIIg ה[יהו]נ[י] אֲדוֹנָי with MT || MT<sup>Kenn4, 17</sup> יהוה אדני, MT<sup>Kenn29</sup> יהוה,  
LXX κύριος
- Amos 7:1 4QXIIg אֲדוֹנָי with MT || > MT<sup>Kenn96, 180, 270</sup>, MT<sup>deRossi20, 545</sup> and LXX
- Amos 7:8 4QXIIg וְיִאמַר יְהוָה אֵלַי || MT ויאמר יהוה אלי; MurXII ה[יהו]נ[י] ויאמר יהוה  
י[אל]; LXX καὶ εἶπε κύριος πρὸς με
- Amos 7:8 4QXIIg וְיִאמַר יְהוָה הַנְּנִי || MT ויאמר אדני הנני LXX καὶ εἶπε κύριος πρὸς  
με Ἴδού
- Amos 7:8 4QXIIg שם with MT, cf. LXX || 4QXIIc שְׁמִתִּי
- Amos 7:15 4 QXIIg וְיִאמַר יְהוָה 4 || MT ויאמר אלי יהוה; MT<sup>Kenn29</sup> || MT יהוה אלי יהוה; MT<sup>Kenn96, 154, 224</sup>  
LXX καὶ εἶπε κύριος πρὸς με ויאמר יהוה אלי
- Amos 7:15 4QXIIg יְהוָה הַנְּבִיא || MurXII + MT הנבא LXX προφήτευσον
- Amos 7:15 4QXIIg אֵל with MT || MurXII על cf. LXX ἐπί
- Amos 7:17 4QXIIg אֲדוֹנָי יְהוָה || MurXII + MT יהוה; LXX κύριος
- Amos 8:5 4QXIIg וְנִשְׁבִּירָה || MurXII + MT ונשבירה; LXX καὶ ἐμπολήσομεν
- Amos 9:6 4QXIIg מֵעַל־וְתִיזוּ MT<sup>Qere.Kenn29.93.112.116.224.252.253.258.260.264.271A.650B.659</sup> (cf.  
MT<sup>Kenn72.150.178.210.245</sup> מֵעַלְתִּי) || MurXII + MT<sup>Ketib.L</sup> מעלותו;  
MT<sup>Kenn17.30.101.126.128.144.168.172.182.195.242.270</sup> מעלותו with LXX ἀνάβασιν αὐτοῦ;  
Vulg. *ascensionem suam*; MT<sup>Kenn154</sup> מעלותי; MT<sup>Kenn1.89</sup> מעליותיו
- Ob 1 4QXIIg וְצִיר with MurXII + MT || LXX καὶ περιοχῆν
- Ob 4 4QXIIg שִׁים ת/שִׁים with LXX θῆς || MurXII + MT שים
- Ob 11 4QXIIg יֶ[ || MurXII + MT ביום; LXX ἐν ἡμέρα
- Ob 14 4QXIIg קְ[הַפֵּר with MurXII + MT || LXX τὰς διεκβολὰς αὐτῶν
- Ob 15 4QXIIg שׁוּבוּ || MurXII + MT ישוב; LXX ἀνταποδοθήσεται
- Jonah 1:2 4QXIIg עֲלִיהַ with MurXII and MT || LXX ἐν αὐτῇ
- Jonah 1:3 4QXIIg תְּרַשִּׁישׁ (3<sup>rd</sup> occurrence) || MurXII + MT תרשישה LXX εἰς  
Θαρσις
- Jonah 1:8 4QXIIg הַגִּידָהּ with MurXII and MT || 4QXIIa הגד
- Jonah 1:8 4QXIIg וּמָה (cf. LXX καὶ ἐκ ποίας) || 4QXIIa, MurXII, MT מה



