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2 Some examples: a reading in 4QGen\(^k\) that corresponds to a longer LXX text in Genesis 1:9; a reading in 4QExod\(^b\) and 4QGen-Exod\(^a\) of 75 people (agreeing with the LXX and Acts 7:14) rather than MT’s 70 in Exodus 1:5; a large expansion of Exodus 7:18 in 4QpaleoExod\(^m\) (also in the Samaritan Pentateuch) that repeats God’s command given in 7:16-18; and an expansion in 4QDeut\(^a\) of Deuteronomy 5:15 (the fourth commandment) that is similar to Exodus 20:11.


4 The section in 4QJosh\(^a\) that corresponds to Joshua 8:34–35 reads: “[…]the law. There was not a word of all Moses commanded Joshua that Joshua did not read before all […] the Jordan[n], and the women and the children and the stra[n]gers living among them.”


6 This fact makes the chart in VanderKam and Flint ( *Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 114) quite misleading: they list (from the *Dead Sea Scrolls Bible*) Joshua 4:1–3, then 8:34, then 5:X, ...
then 5:2–3. But Joshua 4:1–3 is from a different scroll, 4QJosh\(^b\), which contains nothing past 4:3 and thus has no bearing on the order in 4QJosh\(^a\).

7 Richard S. Hess, *Joshua* (TOTC; Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1996), 20. Hess continues: “Could this be a midrashic style of text or a ‘parabiblical’ text, containing a collection of various biblical quotations along with additional notes and explanations?” (Ibid.)

8 Ulrich notes this face in DJD 14: “It is not certain that 8:30–31 (the building of the altar) preceded, since that would occur at the unpreserved bottom of the preceding column” (Ulrich, “4QJosh\(^a\),” 145).

9 Ulrich himself acknowledges this point (“Dead Sea Scrolls and the Hebrew Scriptural Texts,” 86).

10 Though Ulrich acknowledges this later reference by Josephus, he does not mention that Josephus specifically links the altar to Mount Ebal (ἐπὶ δὲ τῷ Ἑβαλ ἡ παρασκευή ἐν ὦ καὶ οἱ βωμοί [“half on Ebal on which was the altar”] Ant. 5.19 § 69). Ulrich, “4QJosh\(^a\),” 146.

11 So also Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 266: “the probability that Ebal in MT in Deut 27:4 is an anti-Samaritan reading is very slight.”

12 C. J. Goslinga, *Joshua, Judges, Ruth* (Bible Student’s Commentary; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1986), 188.

13 So also Goslinga, *Joshua, Judges, Ruth*, 188.

14 I am speaking in terms of transmission of the text. For example, in 1 Samuel 13:1 the age of Saul has dropped out of the text entirely.

15 According to Cross and Parry, 4QSam\(^a\) contains “just under fifteen percent of the text of Samuel.” Frank Moore Cross et al., *Qumran Cave 4.XII: 1–2 Samuel* (DJD 17; Oxford: Clarendon, 2005), 3.

16 Abegg, Flint, and Ulrich, *Dead Sea Scrolls Bible*, 213.

17 So Frank Moore Cross, “Light on the Bible from the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *Understanding the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. Hershel Shanks; New York: Random House, 1992), 160. He states in DJD 17 that “it is possible that the phrase יְזֵירָה בֵּית הָעָם מִמֶּנָּה occurred in a Hebrew text both there and in 11:1, thereby triggering the haplography of the whole paragraph.” Cross, *Qumran Cave 4.XII*, 66.

18 Cross, “Light on the Bible,” 161.


20 Tov, *Textual Criticism*, 343–44.


Nahash,” 131–32. See also Alexander Rofé, “The Nomistic Corrections in Biblical Manuscripts and its Occurrence in 4QSam”, “RevQ 14 (1989), 254, where he argues that a similar extensive reediting occurs in 4QSam at 2 Samuel 24 (David’s census and the plague).

24 Cross, *Qumran Cave 4.XII*, 66.
25 Parry, “4QSam”, 177.
26 I would therefore probably opt for the way the HCSB, the NLT, and the NET Bible handle the issue: keep the text as it stands in the MT but include the variant in a footnote. Sadly, the ESV does not even have a note here.
30 Ibid.
31 Ibid., 292–93.
36 Jan de Waard concurs with this assessment: he prefers the MT because “the other readings seem to be softening and facilitating.” Jan de Waard, *A Handbook on Isaiah* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1997), 13–14.
39 Klaus Baltzer, *Deutero-Isaiah: A Commentary on Isaiah 40–55* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001), 57–58. For example, Goldingay and Payne note that the use of וְהָלַךְ “is quite in place in Isaiah 40–55 (cf. 45:15; 49:4; 53:4), and rhetorically the clause makes a fitting transition to v. 8.” John Goldingay and David Payne, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Isaiah 40-


43 So de Waard, Handbook on Isaiah, 97: “A rendering of the verb ‘to see’ without object is, of course, quite impossible.”

44 Of those commentaries on Isaiah that I checked, only Baltzer viewed יִשָּׁה as “probably” correct. Baltzer, Deutero-Isaiah, 423.

45 Ulrich, “Absence of ‘Sectarian Variants,’” p. 184. Ironically, despite the popular article in Bible Study Magazine, in his more technical article Peter Flint mentions Ulrich’s view (which sees יִשָּׁה as an addition) as an alternative to seeing יִשָּׁה as genuine, without clearly favoring either. VanderKam and Flint also mention both alternatives without clearly favoring either one. VanderKam and Flint, Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls, p. 133.

46 Martin G. Abegg, Jr., “1Qlsa and 1Qlsa: A Rematch,” in The Bible as Book, 226.


49 John Goldingay and David Payne, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Isaiah 40–55, vol. 2: Commentary on Isaiah 44:24-55:13 (New York: T&T Clark, 2006), 324. Some scholars believe that the Qumran community added יִשָּׁה to this text because it was a favorite term of theirs: they called themselves the “sons of light.” See the discussion in Tov, Textual Criticism, 266 n. 37. While that is possible, it does not seem likely that all three of the scrolls plus the LXX would have had that same sectarian reading.


51 See further Watson, Classical Hebrew Poetry, 190–200.


53 See for example the note in the NET Bible, which translates the phrase “like a lion they pin my hands and feet to the ground”—supplying “they pin” and “to the ground” to the text. The NET Bible (Biblical Studies Press, 2003), 878.

54 Peter Craigie, Psalms 1–50 (WBC 19; Waco, TX: Word, 1983), 195–96.

55 James Charlesworth et. al., Miscellaneous Texts from the Judaean Desert (DJD 38; Oxford: Clarendon, 2000), 160–61 and pl. xxvii. Though often the ג and כ are virtually indistinguishable, Charlesworth notes that in this hand these letters are clearly distinguishable, and thus “this important variant reading is assured” (Ibid., 161).