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1. INTRODUCTION

In this article I discuss several fragmentary scrolls of the book of Judges found in the caves near Qumran (1QJudg, 4QJudg, 4QJudg) 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. Other linguistic variants in Judges 6 (4QJudg), 9 (1QJudg), and 21 (4QJudg), 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.

I thank Graeme Auld, Julio Trebolle, Ian Young, and several anonymous reviewers for JHS for their corrections and suggestions and for providing me with (references to) several relevant articles of theirs and others. Needless to say, all opinions and errors are my own responsibility.
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 A. Hurvitz, A Linguistic Study of the Relationship Between the Priestly Source and the Book of Ezekiel: A New Approach to an Old Problem (CahRБ, 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 Implications [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


\(^{4}\) 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.

\textit{Toward an Integrated Approach} (expected publication data: SBLANEM/ MACO; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, in preparation; \textit{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 \textit{Iliad} and \textit{Odyssey}, or the \textit{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, \textit{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 (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


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 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, or in Niditch's conceptualization, the epic-bardic voice, the voice of the theologian, and the voice of the humanist. 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. 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.


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.

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.\textsuperscript{13} For example, Noth argued that the story of Samson (13:2–16:31) was a post-Deuteronomistic insertion,\textsuperscript{14} and Auld argued that the story of Gideon (chapters 6–8) was added after the addition of the appendices.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{16}

---

\textsuperscript{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.

\textsuperscript{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).


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. 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^g^, 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

---

18 Fernández Marcos, Judges, 7*–8*.
19 Fernández Marcos, Judges, 8*.
drawing any conclusion on the type of text present in 4QJudg."\(^{20}\)

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 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).


\(^{28}\) E. Tov, “The Biblical Texts from the Judean 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 Judean 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 text also omit verse 7a.29

And: “4QJudg can confidently be seen as an earlier literary form of the book than our traditional texts.”30

4QJudg 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 are very close to MT. The reconstruction of its lines shows, however, that 4QJudg possibly knew a variant shorter text or presented a text arrangement different from that of MT.”32 Furthermore, as discussed below, there are some significant linguistic variants between the MT and 4QJudg (section 4.3.3).

There is an obvious difference of opinion between Fernández and Trebolle regarding the character and significance of 4QJudg and 4QJudg, especially over the plus of 6:7–10 in the MT compared to 4QJudg. 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

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


30 Trebolle Barrera, “4QJudg,” 162.
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, 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 by Boling. It seems that Wellhausen was among the first to publish this view. Most scholars prior to Noth attributed the verses to an Elohistic hand or school. 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, ‘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.’”


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.\textsuperscript{39} And many have followed suit, usually \textit{without} reference to the minus in 4QJudg:\textsuperscript{40} Below I discuss the literary

\textsuperscript{39} Noth, Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien, 51. See n. 10 for Noth’s breakdown of the layers of the story of Gideon.

reasons given for considering 6:7–10 an insertion between vv. 6 and 11. In short, above and beyond the minus in 4QJudg, 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).


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.  

(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).

(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, Ahimelech 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). 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.48 Instead, three scholars in particular have

---

46 Note also שמעתי בקולך in 2:2 and לא שמעתי בקולך in 6:10. The only other similar phrase in the book is לא שמעתי בקולך 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, 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 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 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 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 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 and second on the

---


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.

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, 4QJoshb, 4QJudg, 4QSam, and 4QKgs).


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 4QJudg6. His conclusion is: “Important as the omission by 4QJudg6 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-teleonton. 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) 4QJudg6 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] homoiooteleuton of a similar sentence...or intentional abbreviation” and thus is independent of and unrelated to the minus of 6:7–10 in 4QJudg6. 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) (4QJudg6), 8–15, 16 (points 4–5 in the conclusion) (Old Greek, Codex Vaticanus, Antiochene text).
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. In his view Hess’s hypothesis is “farfetched” and Trebolle’s “peremptory verdict has not been backed up by a minute examination of the style and the contents of the reproach.” 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. 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.” 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

---


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


this happened to us?” 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 [4QJudg].”

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

(3) **Contents**: The concepts in the pericope are not late; rather, they match up with concepts in Joshua 24, 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.

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

---


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: הָעָלָה concerning the exodus, the definition of the Egyptian bondage as בֵּית ﬂבָדִים, and the phrase הֵיכֶם אֲנִי יְהוָה אֱ attached to הֵי הָאֱמֹרִי לֹא תירְאוּ אֶת‑אֱ.

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.

text-critical studies that 4QJudg\textsuperscript{a} 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 4QJudg\textsuperscript{a} (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 4QJudg\textsuperscript{a} does not represent an earlier pre-Deuteronomistic edition than the MT of 6:2–13, is the repeated claim of Trebolle\textsuperscript{74} and
Ulrich\textsuperscript{75} that it does. The arguments in support of their conclusion are literary-critical and text-critical.\textsuperscript{76}


\textsuperscript{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.), \textit{A Farewell to the Yahwist? The Composition of the Pentateuch in Recent European Interpretation} (SBLISS, 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 אֹדוֹת מִדְיָן וַיְהִי כִּי־זָﬠֲקוּ בְּנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל אֶל־יְהוָה
(6:7a) marks a secondary insertion following וַיִּזָﬠֲקוּ בְּנֵי־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

80 See especially L. G. Stone, “From Tribal Confederation to
highlighting device, 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, 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, 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.”

(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.

(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).”


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.


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 “Rettbarbuchs”, 98; Soggin, Judges, 112–113.

(6) Unexpected anonymous prophet. The entrance of an anonymous or unnamed prophet is unexpected before the appearance of the יְהוָה • מַלְאַ in 6:11–12, 21–22 (cf. הִים • הָאֱ • מַלְאַ in 6:20), such prophets are more pronounced in presumably late or later books/passages with more developed ideas about prophecy, and “[t]ypologically these verses may be compared with the warnings of the prophets in the Chronicles.” Furthermore, in contrast with her earlier view on the minus of 6:7–10 in 4QJudg, 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 (4QJudges), 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.

(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),” 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.

---


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 יָמֹרִי 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” (בָּנֵי־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 הָעֲלוּה Concerning the exodus, which “is not typical of the main, relatively late, documents of the Hexateuch: D, H and P. They usually employ קָאָסָר, ‘bring out,’ while הָעֲלוּה features in passages that were attributed in the past to the Elohist 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” הָעֲלוּה 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.


\(^97\) *Hiphil* of נָשַׁל for delivery from “Egypt” (explicit): Pentateuch *passim* (e.g. Exod 20:2), sometimes in vicinity with מָלַך; 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 הָעֲלוּה 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.” And Hendel, explicitly in support of Trebolle, cites the linguistic forms וָאֶתְּנָה and וָאֹמְרָה 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.” 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, some of which occur rarely elsewhere or even nowhere else in the Bible (e.g., “the gods of the Amorites”). 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 4QJudg).


100 Yahweh speaks (רָמַח) (Josh 24:2; Judg 6:8, 10); “thus says Yahweh the God of Israel” (יהוה אלֵלִי) (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 (לָשֵׁל) (Josh 24:5 [Moses]; Judg 6:8 [a prophet]); bring out (רָטַע) (from Egypt) (Josh 24:5, 6 [מִמַּעַר]: Judg 6:8 [מערה]); cry out to Yahweh (/ תעַבֵּד [because of the Egyptians]; Judg 6:6–7 [ביער because of the Midianites]); dwell (בֵּי) 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 (רָטַע) from the hand (Josh 24:10 [from the hand of Balaam]; Judg 6:9 [from the hand of the Egyptians]); drive out (רָטַע) the inhabitants of the land (Josh 24:12, 18; Judg 6:9); “drive them out from before you” (יהוה אלהיך בָּיִת מִבֵּית ֲבָדִים) (Josh 24:12; Judg 6:9); give (נָתַן) 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” (יהוה אלהיך בָּיִת מִמַּעָר בֵּית ֲבָדִים) (Josh 24:15; Judg 6:10); “which you are dwelling in their land” (יהוה אלהיך בָּיִת מִמַּעָר בֵּית ֲבָדִים) (Josh 24:15; Judg 6:10); bring up (וַעֲלֵיהֶם) (from Egypt) (Josh 24:17 [מִמַּעָר מִמַּעָר מִמַּעָר]: 32 [מִמַּעָר מִמַּעָר מִמַּעָר]; the bones of Joseph; Judg 6:8 [מִמַּעָר מִמַּעָר מִמַּעָר]; “the house of slavery” (בֵּית ֲבָדִים) (Josh 24:17; Judg 6:8); listen (שמעוּ) to Yahweh’s voice (יהוה אלהיך בָּיִת מִמַּעָר) (Josh 24:24; Judg 6:10); “the sons of Israel” (יהוה אלהיך בָּיִת מִמַּעָר) (Josh 24:32; Judg 6:7–8).

101 “The gods of the Amorites” (יהוה אלהיך בָּיִת מִמַּעָר) 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

(106) 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 (אָנֹכִי יֹשֵׁב בְּאַרְצוֹאֲשֶׁר).

102 This is frequently mentioned and otherwise easily deduced from discussions in commentaries and monographs, e.g. Becker, Richterzeit und Königstum, 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.


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 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 homoioteleuton, homoioarcton, 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 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 offers an example of a literary unit either added or perhaps

107 Gray, Joshua, Judges and Ruth, 284; O’Connell, Rhetoric of the Book of Judges, 147 n. 178; 467 n. 56.
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.
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. 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 displays, if not an earlier edition of the entire book of Judges, at least an ‘earlier literary form’ for this passage.” Other text-critical objections raised by Fernández: The small size of 4QJudg may be a relevant consideration for any far-reaching hypothesis regarding the literary formation of the entire book of Judges but it is not an issue with 6:2–13 in particular. The claim that 4QJudg is a carelessly copied manuscript is uncorroborated. The fact that 4QJudg is the sole witness to a shorter text of 6:2–13 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. 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), that is, older is not necessarily better, but contrary to Fernández’s observation that 4QJudg 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.,” it should be

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 4QJudg 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.

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

---

123 Assis, Butler, Fernández, Gray, Hess, O’Connell, Rosè, Webb, Wong; Block and Niditch are noncommittal.
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 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

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...” 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. Another linguistic variety is northern or

---

125 For a previous survey of the language of the book of Judges see LDBT, II, 25–27.
Israelian Hebrew as opposed to southern or Judean Hebrew. Rendsburg has written the most thorough treatments of dialectal variation in BH. 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 שְׁ (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).

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, the best known being אִשָּׁה נשׂא ("to take a wife") in 21:23. And there are other sporadic “late” features elsewhere, such as the pual of נתֵן (Judg 6:28), the object of an infinitive clause before its predicate (Judg 9:24), or the non-use of the imperative infinitive absolute, 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.


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: שְׁ x3 (6:17; 7:12; 8:26) but אֲשֶׁר x41; nun of מִן unassimilated x2 (7:23) but assimilated x30 (excludes four מִפְּנֵי); predicative qatal 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 זו rather than זו/זו (6:13; 7:14; 8:8; cf. 18:4). Additional discussion follows below.

131 C. Edenburg, “The Story of the Outrage at Gibea (Judg. 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.”


chronological styles of preexilic Hebrew in Judges, including for example a “late classical” stratum in Judges 6–8.  

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 הַלְּ, and it even contains a distinctive “early” temporal expression.

MT Judges

וַיְהִי כִּי־זָﬠֲקוּ בְנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל אֶל־יְהוָה ל אֹדוֹת מִדְיָן׃

6:7

וַיִּשְׁלַח יְהוָה אִישׁ נָבִיא אֶל־בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וַיֹּאמֶר לָהֶם כֹּה־אָמַר

6:8

הֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל אָנֹכִי הֶﬠֱלֵיתִי אֶתְכֶם מִמִּצְרַיִם וָאֹצִיא אֶתְכֶם מִבֵּית

6:9

אֱﬠֲבָדִים׃

6:10


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 thanצעק (v. 7), 137 no confusion of את and על (vv. 7, 8), one occurrence of אב (v. 8) and one of:auto volta (v. 10), one instance of unforced non-use of the nota accusativi וַאֲנֹכִי (ַוַּאֲנֹכִי; v. 9) and one unforced use (אוֹתָם; v. 9), 138 rather than -ש (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 צעק 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 צעק in v. 7 was probably used in the addition because it immediately follows צעק in the earlier literary layer in v. 6.

138 In the other instances the heavy suffix כ- forces the use of the nota accusativi.


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. 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, 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.

---

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, 21:6; 14:11; Jer 1:6, 11, 13; 3:17, 9; 4:10; 11:5; 14:13; 24:3; 35:5; Ezek 4:14; 9:8; 11:13; 16:6, 10; 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; Ne 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; Ez 8:28; 9:6; Ne 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, 8, 8, 11, 13; Jer 3:8; 8:13; 32:12; 35:5; Ezek 16:12; 20:11; Neb 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 וָאָמַר (x7): Isa 6:5 (1QIsa); 4Q60; 24:16 (1QIsa); 41:9 (1Q8, 4Q56; contrast 1QIsa); Ezek 37:3 (MasId); Amos 7:8 (Mur88); MT וָאֹמְרָה = DSS וָאָמְרָה (x7): Ez 3:17 (4Q13); Isa 6:8 (1QIsa); 11 (1QIsa); 41:9 (1QIsa; contrast 1Q8, 4Q56); Zech 4:4 (4Q80); 5:10 (4Q80); Ps 139:11 (1Q5); MT וָאֶתֵּן = DSS וָאֶתְּנָה: none; MT וָאֶתְּנָה = DSS וָאֶתְּנָה (x1): Dan 10:19 (4Q112); MT וָאֶתְּנָה = DSS וָאֶתְּנָה: none; MT וָאֶתְּנָה = DSS וָאֶתְּנָה: none; MT וָאֶתְּנָה = DSS וָאֶתְּנָה: none; MT וָאֶתְּנָה = DSS וָאֶתְּנָה: none; MT וָאֶתְּנָה = DSS וָאֶתְּנָה: none; MT וָאֶתְּנָה = DSS וָאֶתְּנָה: none. The figures for the Qumran sectarian scrolls are: וָאָמַר (x2): 4Q386:1ii2; 4Q391:36,2; 4Q385:2,9; 4Q385a:15i5; 4Q389:2,4; 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. Regardless of the actual merit of this view, 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. More interesting for the purposes of this article is Joosten’s argument that the temporal construction י כִּיוַּיְהִי 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. 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.

Biblical Hebrew, 85–86, 155, passim.


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 כי וַיֶּהְיֶה 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 4QJudg 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, Style and Language Relating to Persian Israel (Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias, 2009), 237–252 (247–251). Thus Joosten’s examples of temporal expressions with כִּי + וַיְהִי 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 כִּי + 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. כִּי + בּ, כְּ, 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 כִּי + וַיְהִי 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).

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: וְﬠָלוּ ﬠָלָיו 4QJudg: MINUS (6:3)

The Vulgate also lacks this clause. BHK (“addition?”), BHS (“probably addition”), and others, prior to the discovery and publication of 4QJudg, suggested the emendation of the MT by the deletion of this clause. Few recent commentators, however, remark explicitly on the issue. Of those who do, some argue that the MT is primary and others that 4QJudg is primary. 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, “4QJudg,” 164; cf. Fernández Marcos, Judges, 19; Trebolle Barrera, “Textual Variants in 4QJudg,” 232; Ulrich, Biblical Qumran Scrolls, 255.


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

153 Boling, Judges, 125 (haplography in 4QJudg, “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 4QJudg, 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. וְﬠָלוּ ﬠָלָיו in v. 3] were copiest’s [sic] corruptions...makes sense.”); Gross, Richter, 362 (“sowie sie zogen gegen sie herauf: wohl Dittographie bzw. Alternativformulierung zu 3b הָﬠֶזְרִי. Die beiden Wörter fehlen in 4QJudg."

---

MT Judges 4QJudg
6:3 וְﬠָלוּ ﬠָלָיו minus
6:4 וְשֶׂה וָשׁוֹר
6:5 וְלִגְמַלֵּיהֶם minus
6:11 אֲבִי הָﬠֶזְרִי
6:13 יהוה אלוהים
6:13 וְהָﬠְלוּ סִפְרָיו

[Note: The table represents the comparison between MT Judges and 4QJudg, highlighting the differences in the text.]
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. The *weqatal* verb in 6:3 is routinely (without exception that I am aware) read as iterative. This is also Joosten’s interpretation. 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.

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. And according to Hurvitz the Prose Tale of Job is an “exilic/postexilic product” and “*is written in LBH.*” 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 *ו*ְיָהָיִך* and the iterative *weqatal*, that the Prose Tale of Job “should be considered early exilic at the latest” and is “*not written in Late Biblical Hebrew.*” A more reasonable view seems to be that the language of the story has no certain chronological implications. At a minimum the presence of both the “early” iterative *weqatal* (v. 3) and the “early” temporal

---


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


140 Joosten, “Disappearance of Iterative *WEQATAL*,” 146.


construction וַיְהִי כִּי (v. 7) in late MT pluses in Judges 6 suggests that Joosten’s inflexible historical linguistic periodization is problematic. 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 4QSam a paint a sobering picture. The MT has six pluses, 4QSam a has five pluses, and the MT and 4QSam a agree just three times, or a mere 21% of the time. 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.

4.3.1.3. MT: יָשָׁר and -ש (6:13)

The use of the relative words יָשָׁר and -ש is one of the best known issues in historical linguistic studies of ancient Hebrew. There are probably two reasons for this. First, whereas יָשָׁר predominates throughout most of the Bible (x5502), 100 of 139 occurrences of -ש are found in the (widely-thought) late books of Song of Songs (x32) and Qoheleth (x68). Second, speaking very broadly, the relative frequency of -ש compared to יָשָׁר increases from BH (2%) to Qumran Hebrew (QH; 6%) to Mishnaic Hebrew (MH; 100%).

Probably with ideas such as these in mind, Trebolle, in his official editorial remarks on 6:13 of 4QJudg a, says: “This use of -ש is characteristic of Qumran texts between Late Biblical and Mishnaic Hebrew.” He seems to be suggesting that 4QJudg a’s -ש

---

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.
166 The figure for Ben Sira is 27%.
is a linguistic modernization of MT’s רָשָׁא. Others are less certain. Thus Boling believes 4QJudge “preserves the archaic particle [-ש]” which “gave way to the standard prose [אֲשֶׁר]” in the MT. His perspective takes two other issues into consideration: -ש 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).

Thus we are presented with at least two possibilities. Either רָשָׁא was “original” and was modernized to -ש because of a diachronic factor, or -ש was “original” (possible link with northern Hebrew) and was assimilated to the standard BH רָשָׁא. 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 -ש (4QJudge) was assimilated (I do not know whether intentionally or unintentionally) to רָשָׁא (MT), which predominates 41 to 3 in MT Judges 6–8 and 177 to 5 in the book of Judges. Thus -ש is in a sense the lectio difficilior. On the other hand, I am relatively confident that רָשָׁא was not modernized to -ש because of a diachronic factor, e.g. the view that late -ש is simply a replacement of early רָשָׁא.

First, contrary to popular opinion, the Dead Sea Scrolls (DSS) as a whole do not show an increase of -ש over רָשָׁא, much less a tendency to modernize the language in this regard. Most of the scrolls have the standard form רָשָׁא exclusively. Holmstedt makes this point well: “In the Qumran nonbiblical texts, ש (including לת) occurs 145 times, but 124 of these are in just 2 texts: 57 in the Copper Scroll [3Q15] and 67 in 4QMTB [4Q394–399]; the remaining 21 examples are so spread out that no one text uses ש more than twice.” The evidence of the biblical scrolls paints a similar picture. They have 1148 examples of רָשָׁא and 27 of -ש. The scrolls and the MT contrast only three times. Here in Judg 6:13, in Jon 1:8 where the MT has בֵאָשֶׁר לְמִי and 4Q76 has בשלמי, and in Qoh 7:20 where the MT has אֲשֶׁר יַﬠֲשֶׂה and 4Q109 has שֶׁה יִﬠֶשֶׂה.[166*; Trebolle Barrera, “Textual Variants in 4QJudge,” 236 n. 13; “Judges, Book of,” 455.

166 Soggin leans toward this view as well (Soggin, Judges, 115).

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


169 Nobody seems to have suggested that רָשָׁא was changed to -ש in 4QJudge for some reason related to dialect.

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

Second, the first argument against the “late -י is simply a replacement of early רשק” theory is reinforced by a similar absence of trajectory in BH. Here I must part company with Holmstedt’s otherwise helpful case study. While he is absolutely correct that the best explanation of usage of רשק and -י 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 ה’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 -י is misleading since it only reports on biblical writings that have at least one occurrence of -י, 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 רשק.  

Are we really supposed to believe that there was a diffusion of -י in BH more or less along the line of Kings, Genesis, Chronicles, (Ezra-)Nehemiah, Job, Judges, Jonah, Lamentations, Qohelet, 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 רשק in these ten late books? In conclusion, I see no viable historical linguistic argument for a replacement of רשק by -י in 6:13 of 4QJudg. The simplest explanation is that an “original” -י was assimilated to the standard אֲשֶׁר.

Finally, I think it is difficult to conclude on the basis of its distribution in BH and QH that a lone -י here or there in biblical writings may reflect “the much later language of the scribe-editor who inserted it.”

---

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.
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 רשק in MT Judges 6–8, or elsewhere in the Bible, were updated from -י, or vice versa. Unfortunately, there are no data.
177 Contra Holmstedt, “Historical Linguistics and Biblical Hebrew,” 118–119 n. 29 (referring in context to -י 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 4QJudga to 1QJudg. Variants between the Qumran manuscript and the received text are given in the following table.178

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT Judges</th>
<th>1QJudg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:3</td>
<td>אלי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:29</td>
<td>יאמ[ת]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30</td>
<td>ויהר אופ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:31</td>
<td>והמה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:31</td>
<td>על</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:40</td>
<td>וירדפ[ה]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:40</td>
<td>והימ[ל]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:42</td>
<td>ו[ל]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:48</td>
<td>[..]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most of these variants are related more to language than content (the latter including especially the pluses of ויהר and המא 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: [על]; 1QJudg: [אל] (9:3)

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

specific instances in the writings of the Bible.


179 For helpful observations on several of the other variants and their textual/literary significance see Trebolle Barrera, “Édition préliminaire de 4QJuges,” 95.

180 See, for example, Rooker, Biblical Hebrew in Transition, 127–131; cf. LDBT, II, 203 (#255 in table).
these two prepositions.” Thus the present example of לָלַי 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, לָלַי as “speak about” and 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>1QJudg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>לָלַי about him</td>
<td>אֶל to him</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 אֶל in the immediate context (v. 1). In contrast, 1QJudg’s אֶל with the meaning “to him” is certainly possible, and is the lectio difficilior, even if its meaning seems less preferable. What are some other possible explanations for the variation? Perhaps the aleph of 1QJudg’s אֶל is an auditory error by a copyist for ה in 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 (אֶל in 9:31 = MT) cannot help us with identifying any such scribal tendency in the manuscript. Or perhaps 1QJudg’s וִידבר... אֶל in 9:3 is a thoughtless assimilation to וִידבר...אֶל in 9:1. Another possibility is that 1QJudg’s וַיִּבְרְאָל intends to convey “about him.” Indeed there are many other cases in the MT where לָלַי, like לָלַי, 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, 4QJudg אֶל = MT: אֶל: 1:10; 4:8; 6:12; 9:31; 19:5; בְּלָל: 6:4; 4QJudg בְּלָל = MT: בְּלָל: 19:5. In contrast the interchange of בְּלָל and לָלַי 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), 56, 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 בְּלָל/לָל: x11 in 4QSamא 1 Sam 14:32; 27:10; 10:31; 3 Sam 2:29, 33; 6:3; 4:17; 13:39; 20:10; 23:1); x2 in 4QSamב 1 Sam 20:27, 40; x2 in 4QSamג 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/ Psalms 18, and even medieval Hebrew manuscripts of the book of Samuel, compounds the severity of the problem in this book.
related to, on account of” or “concerning” especially after verbs of speaking, hearing, etc. 184 Some of these involve the expression אֶל. Related to this, Rendsburg signals another facet of this issue. He believes the use of אֶל for על 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. צָעַק in 2 Kgs 8:3). 185 Several other examples of אֶל forupal in MT Judges are 6:20 (אֶל הַשָּׁלֹם); 6:40 (אֶל הַגִּזָּה...וְﬠַל כָּל הָאָרֶץ as also in v. 39); 9:57 (אֲלֵיהֶם קִלְלַת). 186 This raises the question whether in context 1QJudg’s lectio difficilior וידברו...אל was revised to MT’s lectio facilior עלדבר.

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). Brief er 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 (אמר); 13 (אמר); 25:22 (אמר); Lev 27:34 (אמר); Judg 21:6 (אמר); 1 Sam 1:27 (לֹא); 3:12 (לֹא); 4:19 (שָׁמַע); 21 (אמר); 15:35 (אָמַר); 16:1 (לֹא); 20:34 ( ++) 31:11 ( ++) 2 Sam 1:24 ( ++) 3:33 ( ++); 7:19 (לֹא); 10:2 (_BUS); 24:16 (Bushim); 1 Kgs 14:5 (שָׁדַי); 16:13 ( ++); 19:3 (לַכְּ); 21:22 ( ++); 2 Kgs 7:7 ( ++) 8:3 ( ++) 3 ( ++) 19:9 ( ++) 20 ( ++) 32 ( ++). 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 על alternate in immediate context with one another thus further strengthening the על- like interpretation of אֶל; (3) in synoptic Samuel and Chronicles, when MT Samuel has this use of אֶל, Chronicles always has על (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 על parallel to על in Isaiah (2 Kgs 19:9//Isa 37:9) and twice על is shared (2 Kgs 19:20//Isa 37:21; 2 Kgs 19:32//Isa 37:33); (4) in the Septuagint sometimes these examples of על are parallel to εἰς or πρός, and sometimes they are parallel to ἐν, περί, or ύπερ, rarely another preposition.


187 Modern translations correctly construe אֶל as “upon them” given that elsewhere מִמֶּנְה is usually joined to על (Gen 27:12, 13; Deut 11:29; 28:15, 45; 29:26) and several times with both or lamed in the Latter Prophets, but never על.

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 (§1H[e], 1H[h]); DCH, VI, 394–395 (§15); HALOT, II, 826 (§3).
on small details like אֶל vs._fu which were frequently changed as biblical writings were edited and transmitted. 189

4.3.2.3. MT: regelmäßig; 1QJudg: ירבד (9:42)

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

Instead of the 3 pl. act. verb 1QJudg reads a 3 sg. impersonal pass. (hophal), 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 יְלַע in the sense of יָלַע; sometimes יְלַע being used exceptionally in a phrase or construction which regularly, and in acc. with analogy, has יָלַע; 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, Israeli 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.), Söfer Mahir: 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 יְלַע,” 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 9 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 (1QIsa) (STDJ, 6; Leiden: E. J.
nouns (here יָם) construed as plurals rather than singulars. In this case the first issue seems to be the decisive one. First, the hiphil of יָהַבָּה is found 335 times in BH, in all books and sources, “late” and “early” alike, except seven of the Twelve 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 יָהַבָּה 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). Similarly, in QH the hiphil occurs 45 times but the hophal only once (IQ30). 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 καὶ ἀνηγγέλη; Old Latin et nuntiatum est; Vulgate cum nuntiatum esset) was also revised to an active one (MT וַיַּגִּדוּ). The changes from יָהַבָּה to יָהַבָּה in MT 9:7, 42 were facilitated by plural contextual elements (יהָם בָּלִים שְׁכֶם in v. 6, בָּלִים שְׁכֶם in v. 7, הָהָם [construed as plural] in v. 42). Why wasn’t the change made in 9:25, 47 where the MT still has יָהַבָּה? 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.

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 יָם in BH are often the result of the scribal transmission of the texts rather than “original” authorial intention (I. Young, ‘Aָם 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 יָהַבָּה 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 יָאוֹר 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. At this point we transition from 1QJudg to 4QJudg. Variants between the Qumran manuscript and the received text are given in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT Judges</th>
<th>4QJudgb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21:19</td>
<td>מזרחה השמש שזארה השמש</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21:22</td>
<td>אבותי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21:23</td>
<td>ממחולות</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As noted already (section 3.2) the preserved readings of 4QJudg 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: מזרחה השמש: 4QJudg: שזארה השמש (21:19)
The difference between the MT and 4QJudg is the presence of the directive (locative, etc.) מזרחה in the MT. The predominant uses of this affirmative are to express movement toward a place, location

---

initial מזרחים 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 מזרחה 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 מזרחה 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.

at a place, and movement through time.\textsuperscript{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 הָיִדּוּ- changed in both frequency and function from EBH to LBH to QH (and Ben Sira and the Samaritan Pentateuch [SP]) to MH.\textsuperscript{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 הָיִדּוּ- 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.\textsuperscript{200} It has also been suggested that the Septuagint

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


translators in their Hellenistic linguistic milieu frequently misunderstood and mistranslated BH forms with the directive הָה.

Given these considerations some will suggest that the absence of the directive הָה 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. In QH the particle occurs predominantly in the fixed adverbial expressions ההוב, הלְּמָה, וְלָמָּה (unknown in BH), and ההוב (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, חוצה, חוצה—all in BH with varied EBH/LBH distributions). Several of the more interesting examples are מִבַּיְתָה (4Q405:15ii–16,6; cf. מִבַּיְתָה in 1 Kgs 6:15), וְלָעָה (4Q161:5–6,5; cf. וְלָעָה in Isa 10:28), and רַע שָאֵל (4Q200:6,6). In MH the directive הָה occurs only rarely outside the frequent fixed expressions לְמַﬠְלָה, לְמַטָּה (unknown in BH), and חוצה (about 109 times total; sometimes with prepositions, especially מִן). It is evident that the directive הָה 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 הָה 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 הָה is “completely different” in prose and non-narrative (poetic and prophetic material), and that may relate to the situation in QH (and MH) as well.

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


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

202 Accordance reports only three instances of the directive הָה in Ben Sira, once מִבַּיְתָה (48:9) and twice (“proper”) uses of ראש (47:22; 50:17).


204 For example, the frequency and function of directive הָה in the Psalms hardly compare to Genesis–Kings!

THE QUMRAN SCROLLS OF THE BOOK OF JUDGES

translators. It is untrue that the Old Greek translators frequently misunderstood and mistranslated BH forms with the directive רָאָה. 206 (2) Statistics in EBH and LBH: The rates of occurrence of the directive רָאָה- 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 רָאָה- in BH is אֶרֶץ (אִרְצָה). 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־אִרְצָה 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־אִרְצָה. 212 In my opinion it is highly questionable whether the directive רָאָה- 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 affirmative. 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 רָאָה- 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 ץָהאָה in LBH 1 Chr 14:16 has a parallel in EBH Josh 13:4. Note however that the example given of 1 Kgs 7:46 (ץָהאָה נַחַר) is probably erroneous. The form in Chronicles is probably not intended to be a proper noun with directive רָאָה- but instead reflects confusion of similar geographic place names (cf. נַחַר in Josh 3:16; 1 Kgs 4:12; 7:46; דָּרָה/נָהָה in 1 Kgs 11:26; 2 Chr 4:17).
208 This total includes הָעָשׁ (“thither, there”) but not הָאַנ (“whither, where”) and הָנַה (“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: הָעָשׁ; Q: הָאַנ); 2 Sam 21:12 (K: הָעָשׁ; Q: הָאַנ).
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-Heb 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 רָאָה- and specific verbs taking objects with directive רָאָה-.
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 ָה◌ hardly left any traces in SP. The MT and SP agree 350 times on the directive ָה◌ (nearly 90%). Strikingly the SP has 59 pluses of the affirmative (only 7 are ָה◌) and the MT has 48 pluses (18 are ָה◌). 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 ָה◌. More often than not the MT and the DSS agree, as for example in Judges (MT = 1QJudg 9:5 [ﬠָפְרָתָה], 31 [שָׁמָּה]). But some may be surprised to find out that against 23 minuses (e.g. מִן in 4QJudg 21:19) there are 75 pluses of the directive ָה◌ in the biblical scrolls. Most of these pluses reflect “normal” (E)BH usage. 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 ָה◌? (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 ָה◌ in 4QJudg b 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 ָה◌ is less common in LBH than EBH, and there are more examples of directive ָה◌ combined with prepositions in LBH than EBH. All of these claims are questionable. For example, Qimron remarks: “Originally, this ḫ expressed the direction, but in post-exilic Hebrew, it became meaningless and prepositions were added to the adverb, e.g. מִן+noun+directive (Deut 10:17); מִן+noun+directive (Josh 10:36); מִן+noun+directive (Josh 15:10; Judg 21:19); מִן+noun+directive (Josh 16:7); מִן+noun+directive (1 Kgs 6:15); מִן+noun+directive (2 Kgs 17:24); מִן+noun+directive (Jer 27:16); מִן+noun+directive (Ezek 40:40); מִן+noun+directive (Ezek 40:44); perhaps מִן+noun+directive (Isa 45:6; cf. GKC, 250 [§90e]). Examples with other prepositions (ב, אֶל, ל, 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 מְאֹד, mainly in Isaiah and Psalms, usually compared to MT’s מִן.

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.\footnote{217}

I noted above that for Joosten a directive \(\text{-ם} \) attached to a noun in the construct state, as here in MT Judg 21:19 (מִזְרְחָה 하ָשָׁם), is a noteworthy proof of the antiquity of EBH writings (mainly Genesis—Kings).\footnote{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:\footnote{219}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book</th>
<th>Tokens</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exodus</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4:20; 8:20; 10:19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leviticus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34:5; 35:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deuteronomy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4:41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12:1; 15:12; 18:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judges</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21:19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 Kgs 19:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaiah</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8:23; 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremiah—Chronicles</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One possible example in the inscriptions can be added to this list: הביה אלישב (Arad 17:2).\footnote{220}

\footnote{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, \textit{A Search for Method}, 18).

\footnote{218} A previous and shorter critique of this theory is found in \textit{LDBT}, I, 79–80, 169–170.

\footnote{219} Gen 24:67 (בְּאֵרָה שָׁבַע), and Josh 15:12 (בְּאֵרָה שָׁבַע), are problematic (“ungrammatical”). The \(\text{-ם} \) is perhaps an addition to an “original” \(\text{-ם} \). 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 \(\text{-ם} \) appears, uncharacteristically, and on the first element: בָּאָרָה שָׁבַע (Gen 46:1; SP: בָּאָרָה שָׁבַע; 2 Sam 24:6; IXX: אָרָה שָׁבַע; many other variants); מֵשָׁרֶה אֲרָם (Gen 28:2, 5, 6, 7; MT and SP); cf. בָּאָרָה שָׁבַע (2 Sam 20:15). One wonders whether some or all of these examples are textually corrupt.

\footnote{220} Note that although Dobbs-Allsopp et al. state that the \textit{be} in this form “is most likely the \textit{be}-directive” they add “but one may also take it as an anticipatory suffix” (F. W. Dobbs-Allsopp et al., \textit{Hebrew Inscriptions: Texts from the Biblical Period of the Monarchy with Concordance} [New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005], 36). See the discussion in \textit{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) Hoftijzer wonders whether it “was used at all in a prose type like Chr.” What has gone unnoticed, however, is that there are very few zero-instances in LBH writings. 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 (וַיִּשְׁמַעֵם אֶרֶץ שַׁמְתּוֹ)—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 (וַיְבִיא אֶרֶץ גָּד), 1 Sam 22:5 (וַאֲנִי־בָאתִי בֵּית שְׁמַﬠְיָה), 2 Sam 6:10 (וַיַּטֵּהוּ דָוִד בֵּית עֹבֵד־אֱדוֹם הַגִּתִּי), 2 Sam 13:7 (לְכִי נָא בֵּית אַמְנוֹן אָחִי), 2 Sam 13:8 (תָּמָר בֵּית אַמְנוֹן אָחִיהָ) and 2 Sam 13:9 (וַתֵּלֶךְ). 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. On the other hand the SP has five pluses compared to the MT. 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 (Arad 24:20; Lachish 4:8; 8:7); מִרְמָא (Lachish 3:16); מִרְמָא (Lachish 4:7).

221 His remark is specifically on the regens בַּיִת with a personal or divine name as rectum. Note that בַּיִת 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. יָלָד) or rectum (e.g. כֹּעַס) in the construction (e.g. כֹּעַס). I have excluded constructions with prepositions (e.g. כֹּעַס אֶרֶץ נַחֲלָה) since they are common throughout BH in both EBH and LBH alike. I have also excluded examples of הָ- בַּיִת and the houses of other deities since constructions with בַּיִת preceded by e.g. verbs of movement do not attest the directive הָ-.

224 Gen 20:1 (ארץ הארץ, יָבֵשׁ; 28:2 (ארץ הארץ, יָבֵשׁ; 29:1 (ארץ הארץ, יָבֵשׁ); 32:4 (ארץ הארץ, יָבֵשׁ; 46:28 (ארץ הארץ, יָבֵשׁ; Exod 4:20 (ארץ הארץ, יָבֵשׁ; 10:19 (ארץ הארץ, יָבֵשׁ; Num 35:5 (ארץ הארץ, יָבֵשׁ; 35:10 (ארץ הארץ, יָבֵשׁ; Deut 4:41 (ארץ הארץ, יָבֵשׁ).

225 Gen 12:15 (ה יָד הַנֶּגֶד; 43:18 (ה יָד הַנֶּגֶד; 46:28 (ה יָד הַנֶּגֶד; Exod 23:19 (ה יָד הַנֶּגֶד; 34:26 (ה יָד הַנֶּגֶד; Deut 23:5 (ה יָד הַנֶּגֶד; MT has מ, 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 \( נֶאֶה \). (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 שָׁלָם. The phrases \( לוּנָאַרְצָה \) and \( וְאַרְצָה \) in MT Isa 8:23 are notoriously difficult (cf. translations and commentaries).

The MT and 4Q22 both have the affirmative in Exod 8:20 שָׁלָם. The phrases \( לוּנָאַרְצָה \) and \( וְאַרְצָה \) in MT Isa 8:23 are notoriously difficult (cf. translations and commentaries).

I have argued that chronological claims about the general decline of the directive \( נֶאֶה \) 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 \( נֶאֶה \) in 4QJudg t 21:19 is a case of linguistic modernization. What are the other possibilities?

(1) The minus in 4QJudg t 21:19 is a case of haplography given the sequence \( הָט \), \( הָט \), \( מֶרֶד הָט הָט \). (2) The minus in 4QJudg t 21:19 is an assimilation to the more common BH phrase \( מִזְרַח הַשָּׁמֶשׁ \). (3) The plus in the MT is an example of dittography: \( מֶרֶד הָט הָט \). (4) The directive \( נֶאֶה \) in the MT was consciously, or perhaps somewhat unconsciously, written in the text under the influence of the large number of final \( הָט \) in 21:19 (on 9 of 20 graphic units in total) or, more probably, because the directive \( נֶאֶה \) appears also on the preceding temporal construction \( מִיָּמִים יָמִימָה \) and on the other nearby geographical phrases \( מִצְּפּוֹנָה \), \( שְׁכֶמָה \), \( לִלְבוֹנָה \). In other words, the addition of the directive \( נֶאֶה \) to an earlier \( מֶרֶד הָט הָט \) may seek to “round out” the text. The absence of the directive \( נֶאֶה \) on \( בֵּית־אֵל \) is no obstacle to this possibility since it is preceded by \( ה \) and because in any case \( בֵּית־אֵל \) never occurs with the affirmative even when it easily

---

226 1QIsaiah's והארץ נפתלי is also difficult. Compare נֶאֶה הָאָרֶץ כְּנָﬠַן (Num 34:2) and נֶאֶה 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 4QJudg,” 84, 88; “4QJudg,” 168–169).

228 The “normal” phrase in BH is \( מִזְרְחָה שָׁמֶשׁ \) (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 בֵּית־אֵל וְאַחַת גִּבְﬠָת [Judg 20:31]). Another element of this verse may support the hypothesis that the directive מָה- was added to מִצְּפוֹנָה לְבֵית־אֵל (immediately before מִזְרְחָה הַשֶּׁמֶשׁ "כִּיּוֹם הַבָּש אָלָם וְאֵלֶּה תִּפְדֵּי", "on the north of Beth-el.") 229 MT's מִצְּפוֹנָה is strikingly odd for several reasons. The form מִצָּפוֹנָה occurs only twice in BH (Josh 15:10; Judg 21:19). 230 The preposition מִן on a word with directive מָה- is uncommon. 231 In particular, the sequence מִן + noun + directive מָה- + ל appears only here and in Ezek 40:40, 44. What is expected in 21:19 is מִצָּפוֹן לְ (Josh 8:11, 13; 15:6; 17:9; 24:30; Judg 2:9; Ezek 8:5). It seems then that the directive מָה- may have been added to both מִצָּפוֹן and מִזְרְחָה for aesthetic reasons. 232

4.3.3.3. MT: אבות (21:22)
BH has two different third masculine plural pronominal suffixes for feminine plural nouns ending in מִ and masculine plural nouns which take the feminine plural ending מִ - וֹתָם and מִזְרְחָה - וֹתֵיהֶם. 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 -וֹתֵיהֶם [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 4QJudg is merely a linguistic updating of the "earlier" form in the MT. But such a suggestion is unpersuasive when the complete data for all מִ and מִזְרְחָה- forms are evaluated. 235 For example, contrary to common opinion, in QH

---

229 4QJudg has unfortunately not been preserved here.
230 MT Josh 15:10 has its own problems, including the obvious gloss after מִצָּפוֹנָה כִּיּוֹם אָלָם. Contrast 34 examples of מִצָּפוֹנָה: 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 -ו- morphemes,” referring to מִצָּפוֹנ (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).
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 מִ and מִזְרְחָה- is the older form whereas the double plural form מִזְרְחָה- 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.”

In particular, the specific noun plus suffix form אבותם stems from < *ʾaḇōṯahum. It alternates with the secondary formation אבותיהם a shorter plural form from < *ʾaḇōṯayhum, which was influenced by מראתיהם. In Blau’s thinking, for example, “[t]he form אבותם ‘their fathers’ stems from < *ʾaḇōṯahum. It alternates with the secondary formation אבותיהם * < ʾaḇōṯayhum, which was influenced by מראתיהם” (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 מראתיהם 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 יהו- 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 ותמים-forms and Esther–Chronicles preferring ותיהם-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 יהו; (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 יהו- compared to 4 lexemes/4 occurrences of מראתיה 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.

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 אבותם for MT's אבותיהם only twice and elsewhere both the scrolls and the MT have אבותם five times. The sectarian scrolls have אבותם five times and אבותיהם four times. The absence of a trend in the direction of replacement weakens any claim that 4QJudg'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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>אבותם</th>
<th>נבואותם</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>אבותם</td>
<td>(&quot;their fathers&quot;): 2:12, 17, 19, 20, 22; 3:4; 21:22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נבואותם</td>
<td>(&quot;their altars&quot;): 2:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מִמְּסִלּוֹתָם</td>
<td>(&quot;their courses&quot;): 5:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בְּנוֹתֵיהֶם</td>
<td>(&quot;their daughters&quot;): 3:6, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מִקְצוֹתָם</td>
<td>(&quot;their equipment&quot; [?]): 14:19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>שׁוֹפְרֹתֵיהֶם</td>
<td>(&quot;their horns&quot;): 7:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מִזְבְּחוֹתֵיהֶם</td>
<td>(&quot;their altars&quot;): 2:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בְּנוֹתֵיהֶם</td>
<td>(&quot;their daughters&quot;): 3:6, 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 distinct lexemes with 10 occurrences

3 distinct lexemes with 4 occurrences

Given the pattern of distribution of אבותם and נבואותם in the current received text of the Bible (MT), including six occurrences of אבותם elsewhere in MT Judges, and with no substantiated motive to avoid נבואותם in Judges or אבותם in the DSS, it seems likely to me that MT's אבותם in Judg 21:22 is an assimilation of 4QJudg'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.

237 The general MT figures are: 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; אבותם (x32): Kings x1 (MT plus); Jeremiah x3 (MT plus x1); Ezra x1; Nehemiah x2; non-synoptic Chronicles x2; synoptic Chronicles (= אבותם in Kings) x2.

238 Trebolle seems to suggest that 4QJudg’s אבותיהם has been assimilated to the following נבואותם when he says “the same form of the pronoun is found in the noun that follows, נבואותם” (Trebolle Barrera, “4QJudg,” 169; cf. “Édition préliminaire de 4QJuges,” 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; 4QJudg b: [ות]מהמחלל (21:23)

The difference here is the assimilation of the nun of מִן before the noun 241 with the definite article in 4QJudg b 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 4QJudg b the received and Qumran texts of the book agree twice elsewhere on מִן: 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 4QJudg b. These are the reasons: (1) מִן מַהמחלל appears just several verses earlier (21:21), and all things being equal scribes tend to assimilate rather than dissociate linguistic forms; (2) מִן מַהמחלל (x32) is preferred over מֵהַמחלל (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 אֲבֹתָן 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 אֲבֹתָם and 4QJudg b’s אבותיהם, it is not clear that either reading represents the “original” text.

241 The article plus participle מִן—מַהמחלל 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. מֵבָנֵי) 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 4QCant,” 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 מִן ‘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 הַnoun forms in the Bible (34 of 94), and the most even distribution of the two forms of any biblical book, 38 מֵ הַnoun vs. 34 מִן noun. Young argues that these peculiarities of the book of Samuel are best explained by scribal intervention in textual transmission.

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 -ן מ 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\(^ {\text{b}}\) 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\(^ {\text{b}}\) 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: 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; 4Q396:1–2;ii11; 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\(^ {\text{b}}\)); Isa 1:24 (1QIsa\(^ {\text{a}}\)); 29 (1QIsa\(^ {\text{a}}\)); 14:12 (1QIsa\(^ {\text{a}}\)); 19:5 (1QIsa\(^ {\text{a}}\), 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 scrolls. MT has unassimilated nun of min (x1): Judg 21:23 (4QJudg\(^ {\text{b}}\)); 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\(^ {\text{a}}\)); 14:12 (1QIsa\(^ {\text{a}}\)); 58:13 (4Q67); 63:15 (1QIsa\(^ {\text{a}}\)); MT has minus of min + ha (x1): Num 18:30 (4Q27); MT has something other than min (x2): 2 Sam 12:16 (4Q51); Ps 36:6 (4Q83); 2 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.

instances of gender incongruence in vv. 21–23, 249 נִשְׂא אִשָּׁה (vs. לְהַעֲרָבָה אִשָּׁה in v. 23), 250 and בָּהֶם (vs. בָּם) 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 רָאָשׁ; issues of verb syntax: wayyiqtol, temporal construction וַיְהִי כִּי, and iterative weqatal; נִשְׂא אִשָּׁה vs. -שׁ; בָּהֶם vs. בָּם; biphil vs. bophal of מֵעָד; directive רָאָשׁ, 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).


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.\textsuperscript{253}

The publication of our \textit{Linguistic Dating of Biblical Texts}, especially the chapter on textual criticism,\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{255} In the light of what I have written above it hardly needs to be said that I consider any rigorous \textit{separation} between these disciplines or any dogmatic \textit{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.\textsuperscript{256} Historical linguists argue that ancient spoken Hebrew changed through time and inevitably left diachronic marks

\textsuperscript{253} These issues and others are discussed in much more detail in \textit{HLBH}.

\textsuperscript{254} \textit{LDBT}, I, 341–360, and often elsewhere in both volumes.


\textsuperscript{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. 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 \( \text{MT} \) 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, \( \text{אֶל} \) here, \( \text{ﬠַל} \) there, \( \text{אֲשֶׁר} \) here, \( \text{שְׁ} \) there, \( \text{wayyiqtol} \) here, \( \text{weqatal} \) 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. 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.

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. 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).

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.


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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Complete Words</th>
<th>Incomplete Words</th>
<th>Total Words</th>
<th>Linguistic Variants from L</th>
<th>Proportion of Words per Linguistic Variant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XJudges</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1QJudg</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QJudgā</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4QJudgā</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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


266 Zevit, “Not-So-Random Thoughts,” 483.

contemporary textual critics not to privilege the MT when evaluating variant readings in the texts of the Bible. 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 or for the randomness of linguistic changes. 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 נַוֶּה (section 4.2.3) and the “early” נַוֵּיה (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. 1QIsa, or MT Samuel–Kings vs. MT Chronicles, or by comparing the language of

---


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: הֶזָּאתָה; Q: הֶזָּאת; LXX: καὶ τὴν πόλιν) is probably a typologically later form of הֶזָּאת, 272 but this single occurrence has extremely little substance in linguistic dating or historical linguistic discussions when it is realized that (1) הֶזָּאת occurs nowhere else—that I know—in all of ancient Hebrew (MT, DSS, Ben Sira, SP, MH), and (2) הֶזָּאת—not הֶזָּאת!—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.


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. הֶזָּאת appears 95 times in total in MT Jeremiah.


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.

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.