

Dear reader,

This is an author-produced version of an article published in Christian Frevel, Benjamin Kilchör, Craig Evans (eds.), *The Book of Numbers*. It agrees with the manuscript submitted by the author for publication but does not include the final publisher's layout or pagination.

Original publication:

Schäfers, Kirsten

The Materiality and Textuality of Numbers in Qumran and the Judaean Desert Sites

in: Christian Frevel, Benjamin Kilchör, Craig Evans (eds.), *The Book of Numbers - Composition, Reception, and Interpretation*, pp. 13–59

Leiden: Brill 2026 (Formation and Interpretation of Old Testament Literature 202)

<https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004754270-003>

Access to the published version may require subscription.

Published in accordance with the policy of Brill Publishers:

<https://brill.com/page/selfarchiving/sharing-your-work-selfarchiving>

Your IxTheo team

Liebe*r Leser*in,

dies ist eine von dem/der Autor*in zur Verfügung gestellte Manuskriptversion eines Aufsatzes, der in Christian Frevel, Benjamin Kilchör, Craig Evans (Hrsg.), *The Book of Numbers* erschienen ist. Der Text stimmt mit dem Manuskript überein, das der/die Autor*in zur Veröffentlichung eingereicht hat, enthält jedoch *nicht* das Layout des Verlags oder die endgültige Seitenzählung.

Originalpublikation:

Schäfers, Kirsten

The Materiality and Textuality of Numbers in Qumran and the Judaean Desert Sites

in: Christian Frevel, Benjamin Kilchör, Craig Evans (Hrsg.), *The Book of Numbers - Composition, Reception, and Interpretation*, S. 13–59

Leiden: Brill 2026 (Formation and Interpretation of Old Testament Literature 202)

<https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004754270-003>

Die Verlagsversion ist möglicherweise nur gegen Bezahlung zugänglich.

Diese Manuskriptversion wird im Einklang mit der Policy des Verlags Brill publiziert:

<https://brill.com/page/selfarchiving/sharing-your-work-selfarchiving>

Ihr IxTheo-Team

[13] **The Materiality and Textuality of Numbers in Qumran and the Judaean Desert Sites**

Kirsten M. Schäfers, University of Bonn

From a statistical perspective, the book of Numbers is the least often preserved book of the Pentateuch in Qumran and the fragmentary state of the evidence poses severe problems for any evaluation.¹ At the same time, the evidence contains numerous variants and alternative versions when compared to the Numbers compositions known from MT, SP, and LXX. Even though available since the 1990ies, this corpus has never been analyzed comprehensively and the focus of research has often been limited to special aspects, esp. in 4QNum^b, 4QRP and 4QLXXNum.² Recently, new insights into the characteristics of textual production and textual transmission alike have taken up the double perspective of materiality and textuality. Taking into account non-linear processes, variance as a quality of textuality and densification of *Sinnbezügen* in the course of production and transmission have proven to develop the outcomes of textual history and literary history. When not only guided by the search for the “*Urtext*”, when not only aiming at eliminating errors and discriminating original and secondary readings, a deeper understanding of the variant textuality of the 3rd cent BCE–1st cent CE (and beyond) can be achieved.³

This article will review the extant evidence with special attention to the interplay of material and textual features in the analysis of the scrolls. The first part will provide an overview of the preserved evidence. The second part will present a synoptic analysis of the preserved overlaps between the MSS. The last part will discuss 4QLev–Num^a, 4QNum^b, 4QRP^{b-d}, and 4QLXXNum in greater detail.

* I am indebted to Luis Lütkehellweg (Leuven/Bonn) and Dominik Schlauß (Bonn) for their meticulous proof reading. All remaining errors are mine, of course.

¹ The article treats the MSS considered to be textual witnesses for the book of Numbers and excludes the reception and citation of Numbers in the rest of the Dead Sea Scrolls as well as the evidence of 4QTest (4Q175). For a list of cases, see Lange and Weigold, *Biblical Quotations*, esp. 88–95. For a less recent overview, see Pike, “Book of Numbers,” 175–93.

² See the discussion below § 3.

³ Cf. Schäfers, *Textentstehung*; Schäfers, “Evidence.”

[14]1. The Evidence for the Book of Numbers in the MSS from Qumran and the Other Judaeian Desert Sites

Text from the book of Numbers is attested in 15 fragmentary manuscripts (MSS) from the caves near Ḥirbet Qumrān, Wadi Murabbaʿat, Naḥal Ḥever, and Naḥal Šeʿelim.⁴ The evidence covers (partial) text from all chapters of Numbers except for ch. 6. This evidence has been listed and evaluated by D. M. Pike, N. Jastram, A. Lange, and K. Schäfers.⁵ The following overview summarizes and updates the information and results contained in these publications.

Table 2.1 presents an overview of the manuscripts, their paleographical dating, the number of fragments, the word count (fully preserved and partial), and the covered (partial) text passages.⁶ The word count given by Jastram (J) and Lange (L) is different for several reasons. Jastram specifies the word count for Numbers only in those MSS which include more books than Numbers (1Q3; 4QLev–Num^a; MurGen–Ex.Num^a), but their counting differs in other cases (4QLXXNum; 4QNum^b), too.

Even though material from all chapters but Num 6 is attested, there are not many overlaps between the frags., esp. when compared to the situation for the other books of the Pentateuch.⁷ Table 2.2 lists the passages in which overlapping text (parts of words or words) has been preserved.⁸

Many preserved overlaps concern only scattered words or parts thereof, while others do help to further contextualize variant readings in the scrolls as the following overview will show. The scarcity of preserved overlaps is one reason why textual research on Numbers has mostly dealt with the single

⁴ For the five unprovenanced Numbers MSS, most of which were deemed forgeries, see the list with bibliography in Kjeldsberg, Justnes, and Deborah, “Database;” Tigchelaar, “Provisional List,” and the discussion in Elgvin and Langlois, “Looking Back.”

⁵ Pike, “Book of Numbers,” esp. 168–75; Jastram, “Numbers, book of;” Lange, *Handschriften*, 37–42, 55, 66–69, 79–83, on which Lange, “2.2.1 Manuscript Evidence,” 23–52, is also based; Schäfers, *Textentstehung*, esp. 141–176; Schäfers, “Evidence,” esp. 173–88, 231–6. For Numbers in the lists of manuscripts, see DJD 39 and Tov, *Revised Lists*. For a less recent overview in the textual history of Numbers, see also Rösel, “Textüberlieferung.”

⁶ Larger text ranges have been summarized and marked with an asterisk *. The data is compiled from Jastram, “Numbers, book of;” Lange, *Handschriften*, 37–42, 55, 66–69, 79–83, and the (re-)editions listed in the bibliography at the end of the article. All information was updated to the latest status quo to the best of my knowledge by February 2025.

⁷ See the lists in Lange, *Handschriften*, 561–65.

⁸ The list has been compiled from a review of all overlaps by the author. To my knowledge, there is no comprehensive list of the overlaps available for Numbers. The list in Lange, *Handschriften*, 565, mentions only the four overlaps between 4QNum^b and 5/6ḤevNum^a; XḤev/SeNum^b and is thus incomplete.

[15]

MS	Date (J/L)	Frag.	Word count J	Word count L	(partial) text from Numbers
1QpaleoLev–Num^a (1Q3)ⁱ	150–100 BCE	13	8	108	1:48–50; 36:7–8?
2QNum^a (2Q6)	ca. 40–60 CE	2	24	24	3:38–41, 51; 4:1–3
2QNum^b (2Q7) (+ 2Q29 1, 3?)ⁱⁱ	30–1 BCE	1	19	19	33:47, 49, 51–53 (23:5–7[8])
2QNum^c (2Q8)	ca. 20–50 CE?	1	4	4	7:88
2QNum^{d?} (2Q9)	---	1	3	3	18:8–19?
4QLev–Num^a (4Q23)ⁱⁱⁱ	150–100 BCE	104	710	1073	1:1–5:9*; 8:7– 13:22*; 18:26?; 22:5–6, 22–24; 26:5– 7; 30:5–6 or 8–9?; 12–13; 32:8–33:54*; 35:4–5
4QNum^b (4Q27)	30 BCE–20 CE	105	1528	1517	11:31–13:24*; 15:41–36:7*
4QLXXNum (4Q121)/Ra 803	25 BCE–25 CE	23	134	185	3:39?, 40–43, 50– 51?; 4:1?, 5–9, 11–16
4QRP^b (4Q364)^{iv}	75–50 BCE	67	---	792	14:16–20, X; 33:31– 33, 38–39, 41–42, 44–49 (20:14a, 17– 18 before Deut 2:8)
4QRP^c (4Q365) + 4QT? (4Q365a)	75–50 BCE	67	---	1204	1:1–5; 3:26–30; 4:47–49+7:1; 7:78– 10:3*; 13:12–30*; 15:26–28; X; 17:20– 24; 27:11+36:1–2
4QRP^d (4Q366)	75–50 BCE	5	---	123	29:14, 16–24, 32–39; 30:1+Deut 16:13–14
5/6HevNum^a (5/6Hev1a)^v	1–30 CE/50–68 CE	4	16	16	19:2–4; 20:7–8
XHev/SeNum^b (XHev/Se2)	1–30 CE/50–100 CE	1	95	95	27:2–13; 28:11–12
MurGen–Ex.Num^a (Mur 1)^{vi}	75–125 CE	7	31	260	34:10; 36:7–11
34SeNum (34Se2)	---	2	---	4	18:21; 19:11?

Table 2.1: Numbers MSS from the Sites in the Judaean Desert

Notes for table 2.1:

ⁱ There is disagreement on how to assign the fragments of 1Q3: The editor of in DJD 1, M. Baillet thought of three or four MSS in frags. 1–15, 16–21, 22–23, 24. Ulrich, “Revised Edition,” reassigned frags. 1–11, 12?, 15? to 1QpaleoLev–Num^a and frags. 16–19, 22–23 and possibly 12, 15, 20 to 1QpaleoLev^b (1QpaleoLev–Num^b) with leaving uncertain frags. 12–15, 20–21, 24. Tov, “D. Biblical Texts,” 169, has two MSS (1QpaleoLev: frags. 1–7, 22–24 and 1QpaleoNum: frags. 8–21). Tov, *Revised Lists*, 6, distinguishes three scrolls: 1QpaleoLev–Num^a (frags. 1–15), 1QpaleoNum^b (frags. 16–21), and 1QpaleoLev^b (frags. 22–23) and thus affirms the initial hypothesis of Baillet but disregards frag. 24. For frag. 16, an identification with text from Num 1 or 4 is discussed and thus leads to the shifting names of the proposed MSS. For an overview on the older history of research, see Lange, *Handschriften*, 66–67.

ⁱⁱ The 2QNum MSS are differentiated paleographically, while 2QNum^{d?} could also belong to 2QNum^b. A reassignment of 2Q29 (Unidentified frags.) 1, 3 with 2QNum^b for has been proposed by Tigchelaar, “Qumran Cave 2 Fragment.” He identifies 2Q29 1 with partial text from Num 23:5–7[8] and lists several possibilities of identification for the partial text in frag. 3 with Num 32:4–5; 13:22–23; 15:25–26 or 15:28–29.

ⁱⁱⁱ Pike, “Book of Numbers,” 167, identified a new join for a small frag. to frag. 35, which confirmed Ulrich’s reconstruction וְעַל־בִּן וְעַל־בִּן of Num 4:3a in line 8 in DJD 12, 165. The frag. was not mentioned in DJD 12, and cannot be seen on plate XXVII and the older 1959 photograph of PAM 43.035 (<https://www.deadseascrolls.org.il/explore-the-archive/image/B-284276>), but is now present on the 2012 infrared image of Plate 419, frag. 2 (<https://www.deadseascrolls.org.il/explore-the-archive/image/B-363023>). New joins and identifications have been proposed for fourteen frags. in 4QLev–Num^a for the hitherto unidentified frags. 75–104, joining six of them to frags. already in place, cf. Tigchelaar, “Identifying.” Among other matches, frag. 88 was joined to frag. 67 thus identifying the hitherto unsure text as Num 30:13. A reidentification was also proposed for frag. 66 (Num 13:20–21 not 30:3). No variant readings for Numbers have emerged in the process, except for the defective spelling מִצָּע instead of מִצָּע (MT SP) in Num 30:13.

[16]

^{iv} Due to a long debate about classifying 4QRP texts as “Rewritten Bible” or as “Pentateuch MSS,” they have not always been counted into the lists as Pentateuch MSS, cf. DJD 39, 165–70, but see their later inclusion in Tov, *Revised Lists*, 112–13, and cf. Tov, “Forms,” 17–8; Tov, “4QReworked Pentateuch,” 77. For the history of research, see Zahn, “Problem;” Zahn, “Talking,” and the articles collected in Crawford, *Text*, 195–281.

^v 5/6HevNum^a frag. 3 was initially named 5/6Hev41. The older XHev/SeNum^a (XHev/Se1) has undergone reassignment and was included into 5/6HevNum^a as frags. 1–2, 4, cf. DJD 38, 133–35, 137.

^{vi} In DJD 39, 97, the seven frags. of Mur 1 are attributed to three MSS (Mur Gen^a; MurExod; MurNum). Lange, *Handschriften*, 55, hints to the paleographical similarities and the reconstructable large measurements of the columns and therefore advocates for assigning them to one large MS, as was already proposed by Milik in DJD 2, 75. See also the adjusted presentation in Tov, *Revised Lists*, 90.

[17]

Num			
1:1–5a	4QLev–Num ^a	4QRP ^c	
3:40–41	2QNum ^a		4QLXXNum
3:51–4:3, 5–9, 11–12	2QNum ^a 3:51–4:3	4QLev–Num ^a	4QLXXNum 3:51?, 4:?, 4:5–9, 11–12
4:47– 5:1[7:1]	4QLev–Num ^a	4QRP ^c	
8:11–12	4QLev–Num ^a	4QRP ^c	
12:3–11	4QLev–Num ^a	4QNum ^b	

13:12–24	4QLev–Num ^a (v. 21)	4QNum ^b	4QRP ^c	
19:2–4(?)		4QNum ^b		5/6HevNum ^a
22:5–6	4QLev–Num ^a	4QNum ^b		
26:5–7	4QLev–Num ^a	4QNum ^b		
27:2–10		4QNum ^b		XHev/SeNum ^b
29:16–18		4QNum ^b	4QRP ^d	
Num 30:1– [Deut 16:13–14]		4QNum ^b	4QRP ^d	
32:23–30, 35–39, 41– 42	4QLev–Num ^a	4QNum ^b		
33:31–32	4QLev–Num ^a		4QRP ^b	
33:45–53	2QNum ^b	4QLev–Num ^a	4QNum ^b	4QRP ^b
(27:11; 36:1–2)		4QNum ^b	4QRP ^c	this is an overlap in a broader sense

Table 2.2: Numbers Passages with Overlapping Preserved Text

[18]manuscripts only, comparing them to MT SP LXX, and has treated the bulk of evidence mostly in an abstract statistical manner. At the same time, the variety of cases attested in the few preserved overlaps impressively mirrors the breadth of material and textual phenomena which constitute the variant textuality in the third cent. BCE to the first cent. CE. Starting off with the preserved overlaps should be the most basic and natural thing to do when analyzing the evidence. In Numbers research, however, it is an unconventional way to approach the material. This can be explained by the unsatisfying evidence. Albeit, it is an important step in order to paint a realistic and detailed picture and to not bury what we really know under abstract statistics and deductions.

The texts are given in full scale synopsis for three reasons: 1) The editions do not explicitly highlight the overlaps in the text. 2) The variant lists in the editions are often incomplete due to the chronology of publication. 3) No synoptic edition including all the texts was published up until now. The physically preserved textual overlaps are highlighted in **bold**. Reconstructions (grey) follow the DJD editions and thus display the choice of the editor where to reconstruct with SP or MT. They have to be used with extra caution, because they are often produced on the sole basis of the general textual character and cannot always be anchored in a presumed length of the line and letter count. Consequently, reconstructions will only be discussed in selected cases. Moreover, the list will display and discuss only the variants in the preserved overlaps exhaustively (excluding morphological differences), not all extant variants in the respective frags.⁹ Since only the overlapping parts of the respective frags. are the focus of the list, larger frags. are not necessarily cited with the whole preserved text but only the overlapping passages. The texts are given in an

⁹ All DSS texts taken from DJD. The sigla used in the comparison refer to the following editions: MT: BHS; SP: Tal, *Samaritan Pentateuch*; LXX: Wevers, *Numeri*.

approximate depiction of the (reconstructed) shape of the frags. so that the material dimension is discernible as detailed as possible in the presentation.¹⁰ Num 27:2–10; 32:23–30, 35–39, 41–42 are not part of the synopsis for reasons of limited space. The material evidence of *vacats*, margins, scribal habits etc. will be discussed in selected cases, see also § 3.

¹⁰ The data is compiled based on the (re-)editions listed in the bibliography at the end of the article, Ulrich, *Biblical Qumran Scrolls* (hereafter: BQS), and Perrin, “Variants.”

[19]2. A Synoptic Analysis of the Preserved Overlaps between the MSS

Num 1:1–5a

4QLev–Num ^a frag. 27 (8 words)	4QRP ^c frag. 26a–b (9 words)
	1 [כול בני יש[ראל]
	2 [לשב[]ם כאשר ב[
	3 [] <i>vacat</i> []
24 ¹ וידבר יהוה אל משה במדבר סיני באהל מועד באחד לחדש השני בשנה השנית	4 ¹ וידבר יהוה אל משה ב[מדבר סיני באהל מועד באה[ד לחדש השני]
25 לצאתם מארץ[מצרים לאמר ² שאו את ראש כל עדת בני ישראל למשפחתם לבית אבתם]	5 ¹ בשנה השנית לצאתם מ[אצ[ר מצרים לאמר ² שא את ר[א]ש עדת ב[ני ישראל]
26 במספר שמות כ[ל זכר לגלגלתם ³ מבן עשרים שנה ומעלה כל יצא צבא בישראל תפקדו]	6 ¹ למשפחתם לבית אבות[ם במספר כתב שמות לגולגלותם ³ מבן עשר[ים שנה ומעלה]
27 אתם לצבא[תם אתה ואהרן ⁴ ואתכם יהיו איש איש למטה איש ראש לבית אבתיו]	7 ¹ [כול יוצא צבא ב[י] שראל תפקד אותם לצבאותם אתה ואהרון ⁴ וא[תכם]
28 הוא ⁵ ואל[ה שמות האנשים אשר יעמדו אתכם לראובן אליצור בן שדיאור ⁶ לשמעון]	8 ¹ [יהיו איש איש] למטה איש רואש לבית אבותו יה[י] ו[וא] ⁵ ל[ה שמות]

[20]V. 1: 4QLev–Num^a l. 25 מארץ MT SP LXX vs. 4QRP^c l. 5 אצ[ר]

A scribal error by metathesis, which was corrected since cancellation dots above and under the *resh* are discernible. The *tsade* should also have them, but is too fragmentary, cf. DJD 13, 299.

V. 2: 4QLev–Num^a l. 26 במספר שמות כ[ל זכר לגלגלתם MT SP vs. 4QRP^c l. 6 במספר כתב שמות לגולגלותם vs. LXX κατὰ ἀριθμὸν ἐξ ὀνόματος αὐτῶν, κατὰ κεφαλὴν αὐτῶν 3 πᾶς ἄρσην ...

The + כתב in 4QRP^c cannot be traced back to a harmonization with another verse in the census. Rather, a larger contextual and hermeneutical logic seems to motivate it. The results of the census are documented in the following verses. Thus, Moses has not only taken the census, but has also written down the results (as he has written down the words of YHWH, cf. Exod 24:4; 34:27, and the words of the תורה, cf. Deut 31:9, 24, see also v. 19, 22). At the same time, כל זכר is absent in 4QRP^c. It is plausible that 4QLev–Num^a had the same text as MT SP, like the reconstruction suggests, since the scroll often (but by no means always) reads like MT. Nevertheless, faced with only the preserved *kaph* in l. 26, we cannot be sure and exclude the reading במספר שמות כתב לגולגלותם or something entirely different. The reading becomes even more suspicious in light of LXX, where כל זכר is only present at the beginning of v. 3 and seems out of order, too (cf. its likely absence in VL). The text of LXX has further peculiarities of its own with the preposition κατὰ for כ, the additional preposition ἐξ which has no counterpart in the Hebrew witnesses, the sg. ὀνόματος in the place of the pl. שמות, and the additional possessive pronoun αὐτῶν not displayed in MT SP. While the κατὰ and the αὐτῶν seem to reflect stylistic choices of the translator, cf. Wevers, *Notes*, 2–3, the sg. ὀνόματος and the ἐξ seem to hint to a variance in the *Vorlage* or a reworking of the text in Greek. In all other cases in Num 1, the phrase is translated as κατὰ ἀριθμὸν ὀνομάτων αὐτῶν, cf. Num 1:18, 20, 22, 24[36^{LXX}] etc. (but see Num 3:40, 43 LXX for ἐξ ὀνόματος). In the text known from MT SP [4QLev–Num^a], however, the כל זכר is itself likely to be a harmonizing addition which is

9 [των υιων Ισρα]ηλ⁴² και επ[εσκεψατο Μωυσης]

10 [ον τροπον ενε]τειλατ[ο -- αυτωι]

11 [παν πρωτοτοκον εν το]ις υιοις Ισρα

12 [ηλ] [⁴³ και εγενετο παν πρωτο]τοκο[ν α]ρσεν

13 [κατα αριθμον εξ ονοματος απ]ο μη[νιαιου]

Two partly overlapping words. No variants in the overlapping text of the two scrolls, so that the peculiarities of the 4QLXX frags. for 3:40–43 cannot be contrasted with an ancient Hebrew text witness, but see the next overlap and also below § 3.

4QLev-Num ^a frags. 32 ii, 34 i-36 (13 words and 14 words)	2QNum ^a frag. 2 (13 words)	4QLXXNum frags. 6, 7-14, 12 ii, 15-22 (14 words)
		6, 1 [πε]ντε σικ[λους] (v. 50?)
	⁵¹ ויתן משה את כסף הפדים	2 [αρ]γυρι[ον] (v. 51?)
5] לאהרן ו[לבניו	1] לאהרן ו[לבניו על פי יהוה כאשר צוה]	
6] על פי יהוה כאשר צוה י[הוה אֱלֹהֵי מֹשֶׁה] vacat	2] יהוה אֱת מֹשֶׁה	7,1 [4:1 Μωυσην και Αγαρων ² λαβε το κεφα]
7 ^{4:1} וַיִּזְבֹּרְיָ יהוה אֱלֹהֵי מֹשֶׁה וְלֹא אֶהְרֹן לֵאמֹר לבית	3] וידב[ר יהוה אֱלֹהֵי מֹשֶׁה וְלֹא אֶהְרֹן לֵאמֹר	[lines 2-9 missing]
8 אבתם ³ מִבֵּן שְׁלֹשִׁים [שנה ומע] לֵה וְעַד בֶּן ח[מ]שִׁים שנה כל] ב[א לְצִבְאָ ל]ע[שות מלאכה באהל מועד	4 ²] נשא אֱת רֹאשׁ בני קהת מתוך בני לוי	
9 ⁴] זא[ת עבדת] בני קהת בְּאֶהֱל מ[ועד ק]דֵשׁ [הק]דֵשִׁים ⁵ וְב[א אהרן ובנ]יֹו בנסע[המחנה והורדו]	5] למשפ[חַתם לבית] אבתם ³ מִבֵּן שְׁלֹשִׁים	10 [] ° [] ° []
10 אֵת פרכת ה[מסך וכסו] בֵּה את ארון העדות ⁶ ונתנו עליו כסוי עור ת[חש ופר]שו בגד כליל תכלת	6] שג[ה ומעל]ה ועד בן חמשים שנה	11 [υιοι αυτου οταν εξαιρεη η παρεμβολη]
11 מלמעלה [ושמו בדיו] ⁷ ועל שלחן [הפנ]ים יפ[ר]שו בגד תכלת ונתנו עליו אֵת ה[קערת ואת הכפת]	7] כ[ל בא] לצבא לעשות מלאכה באהל מועד	12 [και καθ]ελου[σι]ν το[καταπε]ασμα τ[ο]
12 ואת המנ[י] ואת ק[שות הנסך ולה]ם התמיד עליו יהיה ⁸ ופרשו ע[לֵיהֶם בְּגָדִי תולעת שני]	bottom margin	13 [συσκιαζο]ν και κατακα[λυψουσιν εν αυ]
13 וְכֹסֶם אֶתוֹ בַּמִּכְסָּה עו[ר תחש ושמו אֵת בְּדִיו] ⁹ ו[לקחו בגד תכלת וכסו] אֵת מְזוֹרָתָּהּ המאור ואת נרתיה		14 [τωι την κιβω]τον το[υ μαρτυρ]ιου ⁶ κα[ι επι]
14] ואת מלקחיה ואת מחתתיה ואת כל כלי[שמנה אשר ישרתו לה] בָּהֶם ¹⁰ ונתנו אתה ואת כל כליה		15 [θησουσιν επ αυ]το [κατακαλυμμα δ]ερ[μα]
15] אל מכסה עו[ר תחש ונתנו על המז]וֹן ¹¹ ועל מזבח הזהב יפרשו [בג]ד ת[כלת וכסו את]ו במכסה עור		16 [υακινθινον και επιβαλουσιν επ αυτην]
16] תחש ושמו את בְּדִיו ¹² ו[לקחו את כל כלי השרת אשר ישרתו בם בק]דֵשׁ וְנָתַנוּ אֵלָּהּ בַּגָּד ת[כלת]		17 [ιματιον ολον υακινθινον ανωθεν]
		18 [και διεμβalousιν τους α]ργηρας ⁷ κ[αι]
		19 [επι την τραπεζαν την προ]κειμενην ε
		20 [πιβαλουσιν επ αυτην ιμ]ατιον υ[α]κινθι
		21 [νον και δωσουσιν επ α]υτην τα τ[ρ]υβλι
		22 [α και τας θυισκας και τ]ους κυαθους και

[24]V. 3: 4QLev–Num^a l. 8 שלשים 2QNum^a l. 5 [שלשים] MT SP שלשים vs. LXX εἴκοσι καὶ πέντε (harmonizing to Num 8:24).

BQS hints to 2QNum^a most likely supporting the reading in 4QLev–Num^a l. 8 MT SP, as the reconstructed length of l. 5 would not have extra space for עשרים וחמש or חמש ועשרים.

V. 7: 4QLev–Num^a l. 12 ואת קשות הנסך] MT SP ואת קשות הנסך ~ LXX καὶ τὰ σπονδεῖα, ἐν οἷς σπένδει < 4QLXXNum l. 23 [τὰ σπονδεῖα ἐν οἷς σπε]νδῖ ἐν αυτοῖς *d t n* group.

Wevers, “Early Revision,” 236*, has initially discarded the additional ἐν αυτοῖς as “quite unnecessary,” but has later pointed to Exod 25:29(28^{LXX}), which might have motivated the translation here, cf. Wevers, *Notes*, 59. The case shows how the densification of accumulating references is also present in the so-called textual [25]history, not only in literary history. In addition, the parallel witness of the *d t n* group is important as it highlights once more that these text groups have also transmitted old readings and should not be discarded as late and irrelevant too easily. The relations of these text groups (as of the *b* group, too) to the earliest Hebrew and Greek witnesses in Qumran is not sufficiently understood, yet, see Schäfers, “Eigenart.” For 4QLXXNum, the case is typical. There is no general tendency of adding or leaving out the prepositional phrases in agreement with LXX or MT: In V. 7 l. 19–20, e.g., the reconstruction suggests that the scroll had ἐπιβαλουσιν ἐπ’ αὐτήν] LXX ἐπιβαλοῦσιν ἐπ’ αὐτήν, cf. v. 8 > MT SP יפרשו. The reconstruction in 4QLev–Num^a l. 11 יפר’ שו also has little space for an additional עליו, but since the next variant affects the same lacuna, one cannot be sure. With l. 21 καὶ δωσουσιν ἐπ’ αὐτήν] MT SP ונתנו עליו > LXX, 4QLXXNum most likely has the additional phrase as in MT, which is again missing in LXX, but was noted in Hex under an Asterisk, cf. Wevers, “Early Revision,” 235*. On the variants in v. 7, see also Kotzé, “Debated Hebrew Term,” esp. 60–66.

V. 8: 4QLev–Num^a l. 12 בָּגַדָם לְיָהִם ע] MT בָּגַד עֲלֵיהֶם 4QLXXNum l. 25–6 ἐπ’ αὐτήν ἱματῖον LXX ἐπ’ αὐτήν ἱμάτιον vs. SP בָּגַד עֲלֵיהֶם כְּסוּי בָּגַד.

V. 8 4QLev–Num^a l. 13 ושמׁו את בדיׁו MT ושמׁו את בדיׁו > SP ושמׁו בדיׁו vs. 4QLXXNum l. 27–28 καὶ [ἐμβαλουσιν δι’ αὐτῆς τοὺς] ἀρτηρας vs. LXX καὶ διεμβαλοῦσιν δι’ αὐτῆς τοὺς ἀναφορεῖς, see also v. 6, 11, but cf. v. 12 4QLXXNum.

Reconstruction suggests the additional δι’ αὐτῆς also in 4QLXXNum. The same conclusion pertains to the missing equivalent αὐτοῦ for the Hebrew ePP, which is also missing in v. 6, but is most likely there in v. 11, thus corresponding to LXX. There is an extensive debate on the inner Greek recensional character of the equivalent for בַּד in 4QLXXNum ἀρτήρ instead of LXX ἀναφορεῖς, see Wevers, “Early Recension,” 236–7*; Ulrich, “Septuagint Manuscripts,” 72–3; Petersen, “Analysis,” 488–9.

V. 11: 4QLev–Num^a l. 15 בָּגַדָם לְיָהִם ע] MT SP בָּגַד תְּכֵלֶת LXX ἱμάτιον ὑακίνθινον vs. 4QLXXNum l. 5 [ἱματῖα ὑακί]νθινα.

The alleged pl. in 4QLXXNum is unusual. Wevers “Dead Sea Scrolls,” 9 suspects and intervention by the scribe/translator.

V. 12: 4QLev–Num^a l. 16 וְנָתַנּוּ אֵלָּהּ MT SP ונתנו אל 4QLXXNum l. 10 καὶ θησουσιν εἰς vs. (?) LXX καὶ ἐμβαλοῦσιν εἰς. Wevers, “Early Revision,” 236*, thinks of a “literalism” revising towards MT, but the use of equivalents provides no clear picture, see Tov, “Biblical Greek Texts,” 359–60.

The cases impressively show how difficult it is to contextualize the readings of 4QLXXNum within a framework other than agreements with MT or LXX.

23 [τὰ σπονδεῖα ἐν οἷς σπε]νδῖ ἐν αυτοῖς

24 [καὶ οἱ ἀρτοὶ οἱ διὰ παντ]ὸς ἐπ’ αὐτῇ ἐσο

25 [νται ⁸ καὶ ἐπιβαλουσιν ἐπ’ αὐτήν ἱματῖα

26 [ὄν κοκκινόν καὶ καλυψουσιν] αὐτήν κα

27 [λῦμματι δερματινῶι ὑακίνθινῶι καὶ]

28 [ἐμβαλουσιν δι’ αὐτῆς τοὺς] ἀρτηρας

29 [⁹ καὶ ληψονται ἱματίον ὑακίνθινον καὶ]

30 [καλυψουσιν τὴν λυχνίαν τῆς] φανσεως

31 [καὶ τοὺς λυχνοὺς αὐτῆς καὶ τὰς λαβίδας] αὐ

[lines 32–34 missing]

frags. 12 ii, 15–22

[lines 1–4 missing]

5 [ἱματῖα ὑακί]νθινα καὶ καλ[υψ]ου[σιν αὐ]

6 [τὸ καλυμμα]τι δερματινῶι ὑ[ακίνθιν]ῶι]

7 καὶ ἐ[μβαλ]ουσιν τοὺς ἀρτη[ρ]α[ς] [αὐ]τοῦ]

8 ¹² καὶ ληψονται πάντα τὰ σκ[επη] τὰ λει[τ]ῶν]

9 γῆκα ὅσα λε[ι]τῶ[ν] ὀργουσιν ἐν[αὐτοῖς ἐν]

10 [τ]οῖς ἀ[γίοις] καὶ θησουσιν εἰς ἱματίον]

11 [ὑακίνθινον] καὶ καλυψουσιν[αὐτὰ καλυμ]

12 [ματι δερμ]ατινῶι ὑακίνθινῶι καὶ ἐπ[ι]

13 [θησουσιν] ἐ[π’] ἀρτηρὸς [¹³ καὶ ἐκσποδία]

4QLev–Num ^a frags. 34 ii, 46–47 (3 words)	4QRP ^c frag. 28 (3 words)
12 [47] מבן שלש[ים שְׁנָה ומעלה] ועד בן חמשים שנה כל הבא [לְ]עבד עבדת עבדה]	1 [כול] הַבָּא לְעִבּוּד עבדות עבודה[] עֲבִידָה[?] [וע]ב[] ודת משא באוהל מועד 48 ויהיו]
13 [ועבדת מש]א באהל מוֹלֵד 48 ו[יהיו פקדיהם שמנת אלפים וחמש מאות]	2 פקדיהם שמונת אלפים וחמש מאות ושישים 49 ע[ל פי יהוה פקד אותם ביד]
14 [ושמנים 49 על פ]י יהוה פקד[] אותם ביד משה איש איש על]	3 [מו]שֶׁה איש איש על עבדתו ועל משאו ופקדו אִשְׁר[] צוה יהוה את מושה]
15 [עבדתו ועל משאו ופקד]י אִשְׁר[] צוה יהוה את משה [vacat]	4 [] vacat []
16 [5:1 וידבר יהוה אל משה לא]מר 2 צו את[] בני ישראל]	5 [7:1 ויהי בי]ום כלות מושה להקים את הַמָּן[שכן וימשה אותו ויקדש אותו ואת]
<i>bottom margin</i>	
V. 49: 4QLev–Num ^a l. 15 יִי ופקדו MT SP ופקדיו vs. 4QRP ^c ופקדו LXX και ἐπεσκέπησαν.	
V. 49: 4QLev–Num ^a l. 15 אִשְׁר MT אִשְׁר vs. SP כאשר LXX(?) ὃν τρόπον.	
The variance in small elements like prepositions and ePPs is typical for 4QRP ^c and does not exhibit a clear cut tendency of reading against resp. with LXX or SP, while 4QLev–Num ^a has less variation but still, in its variants, agrees with MT as often as it disagrees with MT (and LXX), and has a considerable number of independent readings, see the discussion below in § 3.	
4QRP ^c displays an alternative sequence with Num 4:49 followed by 7:1 and not 5:1 as in 4QLev–Num ^a MT SP. The sequence is often explained as motivated by the common theme “temple service” in ch. 4 and 7, into which the laws in Num 5–6 do not seem to fit and disturb the narrative progression, cf. DJD 13, 302; Zahn, <i>Rethinking</i> , 117–118. At the same time, there is a certain logic in the placement of the laws after Num 1–4 in the composition of Numbers, since the laws secure that the possible human dangers threatening the holiness and purity of the sanctuary in the middle of the camp are contained <i>rite et recte</i> , cf. Frevel, “Unvollkommenheit.” This is why pointing to a narrative logic is not completely convincing. However, another, formal aspect may have also played a role for combining Num 7[:1] with 4:49: the genre of lists dominating Num 1–4; 7. Due to the fragmentary state of 4QRP ^c there is no way to tell whether the sequence exhibits a rearrangement of the chapters or omission, while no signs for an insertion with a repetition of material from elsewhere are discernible, cf. <i>Rethinking</i> , 118–120.	
The scribal correction supra 4QRP ^c frag. 28 l. 1 is one of 31 in the MS, cf. the list in DJD 13, 258–9. The error most likely occurred due to haplography from homoioarcton in the fourfold repetition of the root עבד.	

4QLev–Num ^a frag. 51 (1 word)	4QRP ^c frag. 30 (1 word)
<i>top margin</i>	
4 בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל את ידי[ה]ם על הלויים ¹¹ והניף אהרן את הלויים תנופה לפני יהוה מאת בני]	1 [תנופה לפני יהוה מאת בני ישראל והיו לעבוד את]
5 [ישראל]ל והיו לעבד [את] עבדת ¹² יהוה והלויים יסמכו את ידיהם על ראש הפרים ועשה את]	[עבודת]

2 את	[יהוה ¹² והלויים יסמכו את ידיהם על רואש הפרים וע]שה	6 [האחד ח]טאת ואת האף[ד]	[
---------	--	--------------------------	---

No variants between in the allegedly overlapping word of the two fragments.

Num 12:3–11

4QLev–Num ^a frags. 60–61 (11 words)	4QNum ^b Col. I frags. 1–4 (11 words)
1] 3 והאיש משה ענו מא[דה] מכל האדם אשר על פני האדמה]	9 יהו[ה] ויחר אפו ³ והאיש [מושה] ענו מואדה מכול האדם אש[ר] על פני האדמה
2] 4 ויאמר יהוה פתאם אל משה ואל אהרן ואל מ[רי]ם[] צאו שלש[תכם אל אהל מ]ועד ויצאו]	10 וי[ואמר יהוה פתאום אל מושה ואל אהרן ואל מרים] צאו שלושתכם אל
3] 5 וירד יהוה בעמוד ענן [וי]עמ[ד פ]תח האהל ויק[רא אהרן] וזמרים ויצאו	11 [אוהל מועד ויצאו שלושתם אל אוהל מועד ⁵ וירד יהוה] בעמוד ענן ויעמוד
4] 6 ושניהם ⁶ ויאמר שמעו נא [דברי אם יהיה נביאכם יהוה ב[מראה א]ל[י] ואתודע	12 [פתח אוהל מועד ויקרא אהרן ומרים ויצאו שניהם ⁶ וי[ואמר יהוה אליהם
5] 7 לא כן עבדי [משה בלל ביתי נאמן הוא ⁸ פה א[ל פה א]דבר ב[ו ובמראה	13 [שמעו נא דברי אם יהיה נביאכם במראה אליו אתודע ובחלו]ם אדבר בו
6] 8 ולא בחידת ותמנת יהוה יביט ומדו]ע לא יראתם לדבר [בעבד]י במשה ⁹ ויהי	14] 7 לוא כן עבדי מושה בכול ביתי נאמן הוא ⁸ פה אל פה אדבר [בו במראה ולוא
7] 9 אף יהוה במ וילך ¹⁰ והענן סר מעל האהל [והנה מרים מצרעת כשל]ג ויפן אהרן]	15 [בחידות ותמנות יהוה יביט ומדוע לוא יראתם לדבר בעבד]י ⁹ במושה ויחר אף
8] 10 ויאמר אהרן אל משה בי א[דני אל נא תלש]ת עלינו חטאת]	16 [יהוה במ וילך ¹⁰ והענן סר מעל האהל והנה מרים מצרעת כ[שלג ויפן אהרן אל
9] 11 ויאמר אהרן אל מושה בי אדוני אל נא תשת ע[ל]ינו]	17 [מרים והנה מצורעת ¹¹ ויאמר אהרן אל מושה בי אדוני אל נא תשת ע[ל]ינו]

[29]The preserved overlaps do not concern variants proper.

V. 6: 4QNum^b l. 12 יהוה אליהם וי[ואמר יהוה אליהם] LXX^{MSS} > LXX καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς > MT SP ויאמר.

4QNum^b has one of its text plus shared with LXX here, while additionally reading יהוה. 4QNum–Lev^a l. 4 has not preserved the introduction of the speech. The editor reconstructs the text in l. 4 according to MT, but the manuscript is very fragmentary at this point. The integration of the fragments into col. XXXII or XXXIII, which themselves can be reconstructed only tentatively, is difficult, cf. DJD 12, 153, 169–70. The long reading in 4QNum^b is shared with several MSS from the LXX tradition: Ra 58 and 376, the *b* group, Ra 44 from the *d* group, the *f* group without MS 129, the *n* group and the Latin Ps-AU spe 31, cf. καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς κα̅ in V d⁴⁴ t Cyr II 592. Again, it must be noted that the text historical status of the *b* group and the *d*, *t*, *n* group, which sometimes share readings with Qumran MSS, needs further research, cf. Schäfers, “Eigenart.”

V. 6: 4QLev–Num^a l. 4 נביאכם יהוה MT SP vs. LXX προφήτης ὑμῶν κυρίῳ [ליהוה] ?].

The Hebrew syntax is difficult here. A common proposal is to read נביא בכם (see, e.g., BHS), cf. Vulg. *inter vos propheta Domini* VL *propheta inter vos Domino(!)*. Among others, Ashley assumes a so-called “broken construct chain,” cf. Ashley, *Book of Numbers*, 220–21 note 7. Against MT, LXX VL translate the following יהוה, which is only loosely integrated into the syntax as a dative object, corresponding to ליהוה, cf. BHS. For the reconstruction without יהוה in l. 13 at that position in 4QNum^b, cf. Jastram, “Text,” 186–87.

For a detailed discussion of V. 6 and the text plus shared by 4QNum^b LXX, see Schäfers, *Textentstehung*, 207–9; Schäfers, “Evidence,” 194–6. On the text plus in 4QNum^b, see also below § 3.

[30]Num 13:12–24[13–25^{LXX}]

4QNum ^b Col. II, frags. 3 ii, 5 (64 words)	4QRP ^c frag. 32 (63 words)
3 סודי ¹¹ לְמִטָּה יוסף למטי מנשה גדי בן סוסי ¹² למטי דן עמיאל בן גמלי ¹³ למי אשר	1 [סוסי ¹² למטה [דן] עמיאל בן] גמלי ¹⁴ למט[ה] נפתלי נחבי בן ופסי ¹⁵ למטה גד]
4 סתור[] בן מיכאל ¹⁴ למטי נפתלי נחבי בן ופסי ¹⁵ למטי גד גו[אל] בן מיכא ¹⁶ אלה [שמות]	2 [ג(א)ואל בן] מיכ ¹³ למטה אשר סתור בן מיכאל ¹⁶ אלה שמות האנשים אשר שלח]
5 האנשים אשר[] שלח מושה לתור את ארץ כנען ויקרא מ[ושה] להושע בן נון [יהושע]	3 [מושה לת[]ר את הארץ ויקרא מושה ל(י)הושע בן נון יהושע ¹⁷ וישלח אותם]
6 ¹⁷ וישלח אותמה מושה לתור את ארץ כנען ויואמר אליהם [עלו זה בנגב ועליהם את]	4 [מושה] לתור את ארץ כנען ויומר אליהם [עלו זה בנגב] ועליהם את]
7 ההר ¹⁸ וראיתם את[] ארץ כנען מה היא ואת העם היושב עליה החזק הוא [הוא]	5 [ההר ¹⁸ וראיתם] אֵת הארץ מה היא ואת העם היושב עליה החזק הוא [הוא]
8 רפה ה[ו]א המע[ט]ט הוא ואם רב הוא ¹⁹ ומה הארץ א[שר] הוא יושב [ב]ה	6 [יה]א או רפה המעטט הוא ואם רב ¹⁹ ומה הארץ אשר הוא יושב ²⁰ הטובה
9 הטובה [היא] ואם רעה היא ומה הערים א[שר] הוא [הוא] יושב בהנה הב[ו]חנים	7 [ה]א ואם רעה ומה הערים אשר הוא יושב בהן המחנים אם במבצרי[ם]
10 ואם במבצ[ר]ים ²⁰ ומה הארץ השמנה היא ו[אם] רזה היא היש בה [עץ] ואם אין	8 [ומ ²⁰] הארץ השמנה אם רזה היש בה עץ אם אין בה והתחזקתמה ולקחתם
11 והתחזקתמה ולקחתמה [בידכמה מפרי ה]ארץ והימים ימי בכורות [ענבים]	9 [בי]דכם מפרי הארץ והימים ימי בכורות ענבים vacat
12 ²¹ וילכו ויבואו ויתורו את [הארץ ממד]בר צין עד רחוב לבוא ה[מתה] ויעלו בנגב	10 [ומ ²¹ ?] ויתורו את הארץ ממדבר צין עד רחוב לבו חמת ²² ועלו לנגב ויבואו
13 ויבוא עד חברון ושמה אחימן [ששי ו]תול[מי] ילדי ענק וחברון שבע שנים	11 [ע]ד חברון ושמה אחימן וששי ותלמי ילדי הענק וחברון ש[בע]
14 נבנתה לפני צען מצרים ²³ ויבן[ו] עד נחל אשכול וירגלו אותה ויכרתו משם	12 [שנים נבנ]תה לפני צען מצרים vacat ²³ ויבואו עד נחל אשכול וירגלו אותה
15 זמורה ואשכול ענבים אחד בה [וישאו במוט ומן הרמונים ומן התאנים ²⁴ למקום]	13 [ויכרתו מש]ם זמורה ואשכול ענבים אחד בה וישאו במוט בשני[ם]
16 ההוא קראו נחל אשכול על אדות ה[אשכול אשר כרתו משם בני ישראל ²⁵ וישבו]	14 [ומן הרמונים ומן ה]תאנים ²⁴ למקום ההוא קראו נחל אשכול [ע]ל אודות]
	15 [האשכול אשר כרתו משמה בני י]שראל ²⁵ וישבו מתור]

Num 13:21: 4QLev–Num^a frag. 62 (2 words)

1 [ומ²¹] ויעלו ויתרו את הארץ ממדבר צן עד רחב [לבא ה[מת]]

[32]One of the major preserved overlaps with many variant readings.

V. 12–16: 4QRP^c l. 1–3 v. 12, 14, 15, 13, 16 (cf. Gen 35:23–26; Exod 1:4; Deut 33:20–24) vs. 4QNum^b l. 3–5 MT SP v. 12–16. The different sequence with v. 13 moved before v. 16 is not easy to explain. Either it witnesses an alternative tradition of the order of the tribes or it harmonizes with those passages naming Asher last. The motivation of such harmonization must lie in the special dignity of Gen 35:23–26; Deut 33:20–24 as there are other references for Asher being not named last, cf. DJD 13, 205; Zahn, *Rethinking*, 115.

V. 22: 4QNum^b l. 13 MT ויבא vs. 4QRP^c l. 10 SP ויבאו LXX και ἤλθον. One of only four significant variants in 4QNum^b reading with MT against SP LXX, see on this below in § 3. All other ancient version except for Tg^o also read pl.; sg. in 4QNum^b error through metathesis?

V. 22: 4QNum^b l. 13 MT SP עד חברון LXX ἕως Χεβρών < 4QRP^c l. 11 [ע]ד ? [ומ²¹] Unknown text plus in 4QRP^c?

V. 15: 4QNum^b 1.4 מיכא; LXX Μακάρι MT מְכִי; 4QRP^c 1. 2 מיכי SP מיכי (biforms?). V. 17: 4QNum^b 1. 6 מוֹשֶׁה [4QRP^c 1. 4] MT LXX > SP. V. 18: 4QNum^b 1. 7–8 רפה ה[ה] אֶה vs. 4QRP^c 1. 6 רפה > MT הרפה SP הרפה LXX ἡ ἀσθενής; on the reconstruction in 4QNum^b aligning with v. 19, cf. Jastram, <i>Book of Numbers</i>, 119. One of 19 unique text pluses in 4QNum^b, cf. also v. 20 and see below § 3. V. 19: 4QNum^b 1. 8 הוּא יוֹשֵׁב vs. 4QRP^c 1. 6 הוּא יוֹשֵׁב MT SP הוּא יוֹשֵׁב vs. LXX οὗτοι ἐγκάθηνται. LXX pl. referring back to εἰ ὀλίγοι εἰσὶν ἢ πολλοί in v. 18[19^{LXX}], stylistic. V. 19: 4QNum^b 1. 9 יוֹשֵׁב [4QRP^c 1. 7 הוּא יוֹשֵׁב MT הוּא יוֹשֵׁב SP הוּא יוֹשֵׁב vs. LXX οὗτοι κατοικοῦσιν. Dito, see the preceding case. V. 19: 4QNum^b 1. 9–10 יָמַי > MT > הבמהנים אם במבצרים [הבמהנים] ואם במבצ[ר]ים vs. 4QRP^c 1. 7 יָמַי vs. SP המבצרים אם במבצרי[ם] vs. LXX εἰ ἐν τειχήρεσιν ἢ ἐν ἀτειχίστοις (switched order). V. 20: 4QNum^b 1. 10 הַשְׁמָנָה הִיא אִם רֹזָה vs. SP > השמנה היא אם רזה vs. MT הַשְׁמָנָה הִיא אִם רֹזָה vs. 4QRP^c 1. 8 הַשְׁמָנָה אִם רֹזָה vs. LXX εἰ πῖον ἢ παρειμένῃ. One of 19 unique text pluses in 4QNum^b, cf. also v. 18 and see below § 3. V. 20: 4QRP^c 1. 8 אֵין בָּהּ vs. MT SP אֵין LXX > 4QNum^b 1. 10 אֵין is inconclusive, cf. also v. 23. V. 20: 4QRP^c 1. 9 מִפְּרִי הָאָרֶץ [בִּי] דְּכֶמֶה מִפְּרִי הָאָרֶץ 4QNum^b 1. 11 מִפְּרִי הָאָרֶץ [בִּי] דְּכֶמֶה מִפְּרִי הָאָרֶץ vs. MT SP מִפְּרִי הָאָרֶץ vs. LXX ἀπὸ τῶν καρπῶν τῆς γῆς. Reconstruction in 4QNum^b based on the estimated length of the lacuna, cf. Jastram, <i>Book of Numbers</i>, 185–86. V. 20: 4QNum^b 1. 11 בְּכֹרִית SP בְּכֹרִית vs. MT בְּכֹרִית; LXX πρόδρομοι is more likely based on the fem. and not the masc. as in MT, cf. Jastram, <i>Book of Numbers</i>, 120–21. V. 21: 4QNum^b 1. 12 וַיִּלְכוּ וַיִּבְאוּ וַיִּתְּרוּ LXX וַיִּעֲלוּ וַיִּתְּרוּ vs. MT > v. 26 vs. 4QRP^c 1. 10: the lacuna might not have enough space for two verbs, cf. DJD 13, 306. Frag. 62 in 4QLev–Num^a is too isolated for any conclusions. One of four potentially significant pluses shared by 4QNum^b SP, cf. Schäfers, “Evidence,” 229. The text plus is most likely harmonizing with v. 26, but further analysis is needed because the phrasing is crucial for the literary critical division of P- and non-P passages in Num 13.	[33]V. 22: 4QRP^c 1. 10 וַיִּעֲלוּ בְּגִבּ vs. MT SP וַיִּעֲלוּ בְּגִבּ LXX αἱ ἀνέβησαν κατὰ τὴν ἔρημον; 4QNum^b 1. 12 וַיִּעֲלוּ בְּגִבּ not preserved. V. 22: 4QNum^b 1. 13 וַיִּשְׁמָה vs. 4QRP^c 1. 11 וַיִּשְׁמָה vs. MT SP וַיִּשְׁמָה LXX καὶ ἐκεῖ; the use of the <i>he locale</i> often varies, cf. Num 34:5 (4QNum^b הִי MT הִי vs. SP הִי LXX ἡ θάλασσα; Num 35:5 (4QNum^b SP יָמָה LXX τὸ πρὸς θάλασσαν vs. MT יָמָה). V. 22: 4QNum^b 1. 13 [שִׁשִׁי] וַיִּתְּנוּ לָמִי vs. MT SP וַיִּתְּנוּ לָמִי vs. 4QRP^c 1. 11 וַיִּתְּנוּ לָמִי vs. Ἀχιμὸν καὶ Σεσὶ καὶ Θελαμίν. On the variations in the LXX^{MSS}, see LXX^{Göt} ad loc. V. 22: 4QRP^c 1. 11 MT עֵנָק vs. SP עֵנָק LXX Ἐνάκ. V. 23: 4QRP^c 1. 12 וַיִּרְגְּלוּ אוֹתָהּ LXX καὶ κατεσκέψαντο αὐτήν [4QNum^b reconstructed based on space calculation], cf. Deut 1:24 > MT SP LXX. V. 23: 4QNum^b 1. 15 אַחַד בָּהּ 4QRP^c 1. 13 אַחַד בָּהּ LXX ἓνα ἐπ’ αὐτοῦ > MT SP אַחַד. One of 18 text pluses shared by 4QNum^b LXX vs. MT SP occurring in one of the rare overlaps with 4QRP^c. V. 23: 4QRP^c 1. 13 SP וַיִּשְׁאֹל [4QNum^b reconstructed based only on assumptions about pre-SP text type] vs. MT וַיִּשְׁאֹל LXX καὶ ἦρָא αὐτὸν. Intransitive use is more common in Hebrew, transitive more common in Greek. V. 23: 4QRP^c 1. 13 בְּמוֹט בְּשֵׁנִי [MT SP בְּמוֹט בְּשֵׁנִי] > LXX ἐπ’ ἀναφορεῦσιν [4QNum^b reconstructed from the average length of lines (and assumptions about agreements with LXX?); inconclusive]. V. 24: 4QNum^b 1. 16 4QRP^c 1. 14 SP קָרָא vs. MT קָרָא. Pl. instead of impersonal use of sg. in MT is a common phenomenon, see below Num 19:3. For a detailed discussion of the readings in v. 23, cf. Schäfers, <i>Textentstehung</i>, 211–13; Schäfers, “Evidence,” 198–200. For evaluations of the readings in 4QNum^b, cf. Jastram, <i>Book of Numbers</i>, 118–22.
---	---

4QNum ^b Col. X frag. 12 (8 words)	5/6HevNum ^a frags. 1–2 (8 words)
11 ¹ וידבר יהוה אלמֹשֶׁה ואל אהרֹן לאמֹר ² וְ[נ] את חוקת[התורה אשר צוה]	1 [אליך פרה אדמה תמימה אשר] אֵין בְּ[ה מום אשר]
12 יהוה לאמֹר דבר אל בני ישראל ויקחו אליהם פֶּרֶה[אדומה תמימה אשר אין]	2 [לא עלה עליה על ³ ונתתם] אֹתָהּ אל אלע[זר הכהן מחוץ]
13 בה מום אשר לוא עלה עליה עול ³ ונתתה אותה אל[אלעזר הכהן והוציאו]	3 [למחנה ושחט] אֹתָהּ לפניו ⁴ ולקח אל[עזר הכהן מדמה]
14 אותה [א]ל מחוץ למחנה ושחטו אותה [ל]פְּנֵי ⁴ ולקח אל[עזר הכהן מדמה]	4 [באצבעו והזה אל נכח פני אה]ל [מועד מדמה שבע פעמים]
15 באצבעו והזה[אל נכח פתח אוהל] מועד מדמה שבע פעמים ⁵ ושרף[	

[34]V. 3: 4QNum^b l. 13–14 למחנה [א]ל מחוץ למחנה MT SP הוציא אתה אל מחוץ למחנה LXX και ἐξάξουσιν αὐτὴν ἔξω τῆς παρεμβολῆς εἰς τόπον καθαρὸν (במקום טהור) cf. v. 9) < 5/6HevNum^a l. 2–3 [מחוץ למחנה].

5/6HevNum^a l. 3 is reconstructed only tentatively with a shorter text than MT, because the letter count of the assumed length of the lines does not fit well, cf. DJD 38, 139. On this basis, the calculated length of the line would not also support the extra two words from LXX. Thus, the notation in BQS, 149, only hinting to the likely absence of the LXX plus in XHev/SeNum^a, i.e. 5/6HevNum^a frags. 1–2, see above note v to table 2.1, is somewhat misleading.

In light of this problem, it should be noted that the overall reconstruction of 5/6HevNum^a frags. 1–2 according to MT is not supported by any further material or textual circumstantial evidence. This case highlights the limits of textual comparison for fragments without any further material hints as, e.g., margins or fully preserved lines. This should be noted esp. in view of the many small variants preserved in 4QNum^b displaying different patterns of agreements. The following readings are evaluated based on Jastram, *Book of Numbers*, 129–30.

V. 2: 4QNum^b l. 13 MT vs. SP ואשר LXX καὶ ἦ. One of only four significant variants in 4QNum^b reading with MT against SP LXX, see on this below in § 3.

V. 3: 4QNum^b l. 13 ונתתה LXX καὶ δώσεις vs. MT SP ונתתם. One of 4QNum^b's many agreements with LXX vs. MT SP. MT SP seem to harmonize to the pl. addressees of the speech in v. 1, while the 2nd pers. sg. in 4QNum^b LXX corresponds to the sg. in v. 2.

V. 3: 4QNum^b l. 14 ושחטו LXX καὶ σφάξουσιν vs. MT SP ושחט, see also the reconstruction of the pl. והוציאו in 4QNum^b l. 13 with LXX. Here, the situation is reverse to the preceding case with 4QNum^b LXX now having the pl. referring back to the בני ישראל from v. 2, thus preventing the sg. from ושחט referring back to ונתתה and to be understood as designating Eleazar as the subject, cf. also the pl. in V. 5. The two readings seem to be motivated by clarifying the subjects of the actions, with LXX and 4QNum^b displaying a different way than MT SP.

V. 4: 4QNum^b l. 15 באצבעו MT SP > LXX. Text loss by haplography/parablepsis (Jastram), or purity concerns by LXX, cf. v. 3 LXX εἰς τόπον καθαρὸν > 4QNum^b MT SP.

V. 4: 4QNum^b l. 15 פתח vs. SP MT פני LXX τοῦ προσώπου. 4QNum^b has a more precise prescription to which part of the 'ohel mo'ed the blood has to be sprinkled, while SP MT LXX seem to implicate that the blood will not necessarily touch any part of the 'ohel mo'ed but will rather be sprinkled *before* it. For אל פני אהל מועד see only Lev 9:5; Num 17:8.

2	[אחד חטאת] מלבד עולת התמיד (ו)מנחתה ונסכה <i>vacat</i>]	28 [<i>vacat</i> ¹⁷ וביום השני פרים]בני בקר שנ]ים עשר אילים שנים כבשים בני שנה ארבעה]
3	[¹⁷ וביום השני פרים שנים כבשים בני שנה ארבעה עשר תמימים]	29 [עשר תמימים ¹⁸ ומנחתם ונסכיהם]ל[פרים לאילים ולכבשים במספרם כמשפט ¹⁹ ושעיר]
4	[¹⁸ ומנחתם ונסכיהם לפרים ולא]לם ולכבשים במספרם כמשפט ¹⁹ ושעיר עזים אחד חטאת]	

V. 17: 4QNum^b l. 28 בקר MT SP > 4QRP^d l. 3 פרים 11QT^a LXX μόσχους, cf. Num 18:17, but see Num 15:24; 28:11, 19, 27; 29:2, 8, 13. Variance in the specification of the animal, possibly due to formulaic language?

4QNum^b exhibits a text plus known from SP and MT, which is not present in 4QRP^d LXX and the parallel text in 11QT^a. There are 15 text pluses shared by 4QNum^b MT SP against LXX. This suggests different stages or points of contact between the forerunners/base text of 4QRP^d and LXX vis-à-vis the forerunners/base text of 4QNum^b and LXX because, on the other hand, 4QNum^b and LXX share 18 exclusive text pluses, cf. Schäfers, "Evidence."

[37]Num 30:1–3[Deut 16:13–14]

4QNum ^b Col. XXIV frags. 51–54 (4 words)	4QRP ^d frag. 4 i (4 words)
21 [ולנסכיכמה ולשלמיכמה <i>va</i>] <i>ca</i> [<i>t</i>	7 [ונסכה ³⁹ אלה תעשו ליהוה במועדיכם לבד מגד]יכם ונדבותיכם לעלתיכם ולמנחתיכם]
22 [ויאמר מושה אל בני ישראל כ]כול אשר צוה יהוה את מושה ² וידבר מושה]	8 [ולנסכיכמה ולשלמיכמה <i>vacat</i> ^{30:1} ויאמר משה] אל בני ישראל ככל אשר צוה יהוה]
23 [אל ראשי המטות לבני ישראל לאמור] זה הדבר אשר צוה יהוה ³ איש]	9 [את משה <i>vac[at</i>
24 [איש כיא ידור נדר ליהוה או השבע ש]בועה לאסור א]סר על נפשו לוא]	10 [הג הסכות תעשה לך שבעת ימים באספק מגרנ]ך ומיקבך ¹⁴ ושמחת בחגך אתה ובנך]
	<i>bottom margin</i>

4QRP^d exhibits a different sequence after Num 30:1. Set apart with a likely almost full blank line, Deut 16:13–14 follows, combining the laws about the offerings for Sukkot in Num 29 with the short passage on Sukkot in Deut 16:13–14 (originally also v. 15?). Due to the fragmentary state of 4QRP^d we cannot know the original location of the frag. in the MS, cf. DJD 13, 341. Crawford now suspects 4QRP^d to be an excerpted manuscript and not a Pentateuch scroll, see below § 3.

[38]Num 33:31–32

4QLev–Num ^a frag 68 ii (2 words)	4QRP ^b frag. 19a–b (2 words)
4 ³¹ ויסעו מ]מ[סרות ויה]נו בבני יעקן ³² ויסעו מבני יעקן ויחנו בחר הגדגד ³³ ויסעו מחר הגדגד]	1 [³¹ ויסעו מ]מ[סרות ו]יחנו בבני יעקן ³² ויסעו מבני יעקן]
5 ויחנו ביטבתה ³⁴ ויסעו]	2 [בחור הגדגד]ה ³³ ויסעו] מחר הגדגדה ויחנו ביוט(י)בתה ³⁴
<i>bottom margin</i>	[ויסעו]

No variants in the preserved overlap.

Num 33:45–53

4QLev–Num ^a frag. 72–73	4QNum ^b Col. XXIX frag 72–74	4QRP ^b frag. 19a–b	2QNum ^b
		10 [מפוננו ויחנו באובות ⁴⁴ ויסעו מאובות וי]חנו בעי הע[ברים]	
	18] ⁴⁵ ויסעו מעיים ויחנו בד[י]בון[11 [בגבול מואב ⁴⁵ ויסעו מעי העברי]מ ויחנו בדיבון ג[ד] ⁴⁶ ויסעו]		
	19 [גד ⁴⁶ ויסעו מדיבון גד ויחנו בעלמון דבלתימה ⁴⁷ ויסעו מעלמון דבלתימה [ויחנו]	12 [מדיבון גד ויחנו בעלמון דבל]תימ ⁴⁷ ויסעו מעל[מון דבלתימ]	
	20 [בהרי העברים לפני נבו ⁴⁸ ויסעו מהרי העברים ויחנו בערבו]ת מ[ואב] [line 21 missing]	13 [ויחנו בהרי העברים לפני]י נבאו ⁴⁸ ויסעו מה[רי העברים]	1 [דבלתימה ויחנו בה]רי העב[רים לפני נבו ⁴⁸ ויסעו מהרי העברים ויחנו בערבות מואב על ירדן]
	22] ⁵⁰ vacat וידבר יהוה אל מושה בערבות מואב על ירדן י[רחו לא]מ[ור ⁵¹ דבר]	14 [ויחנו בערבות מואב על יר]דן יריחו ⁴⁹ ויחנו על ה[ירדן]	2 [ירחו ⁴⁹ ויחנו על ה]הירדן מבי[ת] ה[י]שמות עד אבל השטים בערבות מואב
	23 [אל בני ישראל ואמרתה אליהם כיא אתמה עוברים את הירדן]אל ארץ[כנען]	15 [מבית הישמות עד אבל הש]טים בערבות [מ]וא[ב] vacat]	3 [] vacat [⁵⁰ וידבר יהוה אל מושה בערבות מואב על ירדן ירחו]
	24] ⁵² והורשתם את כול יושבי הארץ מפניכמה ואבדתם את כול משכיות[ם] ואת כול[	16] vacat? []	4 [לאמור ⁵¹ ד]בר אל בני ישראל וא[מרתה אליהמה כי אתמה עוברים את הירדן אל ארץ כנען]
1] ⁵² והורש[תם] את כל ישבי הארץ מפניכם ואבדתם את[			5] ⁵² והורשתמ[ה את יושבי האר]ץ מפניכמה ואבדתמה את כול משכיותמה ואת כול צלמי מסכותמה]
2 [כל משכיתם ואת כל] צלמי מ[ס]כת[ם תאב]דו ואת כל במתם תשמידו ⁵³ והורשתם]			6 [תאבדו]ואת כול במוותמה ת[שמידו ⁵³ והורשתמה את הארץ וישבתמה בה כי לכמה נתתי]
3 [את הארץ וישבתם ב]ה כי לכם נ[תת]י את ה[ארץ לרשת אתה] ⁵⁴ והתנחלתם את[			7 [את הארץ]ל[רשת אותה]
4 [הארץ בגורל למשפח]תים לרב ת[בו] את נחל[תו ולמעט תמעט את נחלתו אל]			
5 [אשר יצא לו שמה הג]ורל לו]			

[40]No preserved overlaps except for the *yod* in Dibon Gad in 4QNum^b l. 18 and RP^b l. 11 (v. 45) and the *he* before *Yarden* in RP^b l. 14 and 2QNum^b l. 2 (v. 49).

V. 52: 2QNum^b נָחַם אֶת יוֹשְׁבֵי הָאָרֶץ Ra 125 < MT SP LXX πάντας τοὺς κατοικοῦντας ἐν τῇ γῇ . The fragmentary texts of 4QLev–Num^a and 4QNum^b do not allow for any judgement.

[41](Num 27:11; 36:1–2)

4QNum^b XXXI frags. 80–84 Num 36:1–2; 27:1–11*; 36:3–4; 36:1–2*; 36:5–7 [...] 4QRP^c frag. 36 Num 27:11; 36:1–2

On the basis of the preserved frags. and the calculated spatia and lines, Jastram reconstructs a compilation of Num 36:1–2; 27:1–11*; 36:3–4; 36:1–2*; 36:5–7 [...], cf. DJD 12, 260–64; Jastram, *Book of Numbers*, 219–23; Jastram, “Text,” 190–97.

- 1 אין אחים לאביו ונתתם את נחלתו לשארו הקרוב אליו ממשפחתו
- 2 וירש און[תה והיתה לבני ישראל לחוקת משפט כאשר צוה יהוה את]
- 3 מושה¹ ויקרב[ן ראשי האבות למשפח(ו)ת בני גלעד בן מכיר בן מנשה ממשפחות]
- 4 בני יהוספ לפני[מושה ולפני הנשיאים ראשי אבות לבני]
- 5 ישראל² ויואמר[ן את אדוני צוה יהוה לתת את הארץ בנחלה]
- 6 בגורל ל[בני ישראל]

These two different juxtapositions of the texts concerning the daughters of Zelophehad in Num 36 and 27 can be counted as an overlap in a broader sense of the word.

The sequence in 4QRP^c is 27:11→36:1–2; the original location in the MS is unknown, cf. DJD 13, 310. Other than in 4QRP^c, the [reconstructed] sequence in 4QNum^b conflates and slightly alters the text in order to make it fit the new context, see the further analysis in Zahn, *Rethinking*, 117–20; Crawford, „Pentateuch,” 124–5; Crawford, “Qumran Pentateuch Scrolls,” 127–8; Crawford, “Scribal Traditions,” 177–8; Crawford, “Interpreting,” 74–6.; Crawford, “Jewish and Samaritan Pentateuchs,” 327–31. Zahn, *Rethinking*, 154 n. 43, builds a convincing case for the technique resembling the one used in 4QRP^a (4Q158) frag 1–2 l. 16, cf. also the helpful edition of 4Q158 *ibid.*, 245–60.

There is a text plus in Num 36:1 4QNum^b מושה ולפני אל[עזר הכוהן LXX Μωϋσῆς καὶ ἔναντι Ἐλεαζάρ τοῦ ἱερέως < MT SP משה. It is not possible to determine whether 4QRP^c l. 4 also reads the longer text. The lines are too fragmentary. The average letter count speaks against its presence, but the preceding line has also been reconstructed significantly longer, cf. DJD 13, 310. For a detailed discussion of the text plus, see Schäfers, *Textentstehung*, 217–8; Schäfers, “Evidence,” 204–5.

3. Aspects of Materiality and Textuality in the Preserved Overlaps and beyond

The synoptic analysis of the preserved overlaps impressively reveals the material restraints when attempting to critically reconstruct the shape(s) of [42]the book of Numbers in the Judean desert MSS. This chapter will take up the insights into material and textual features of the scrolls gained in the synopsis and will contextualize them in view of the whole evidence by commenting on selected aspects of the material and textual analysis.¹¹

Reconstructing fragments as scrolls, compositions and books

For some fragments, it is unclear whether they give evidence to a former Numbers scroll containing the whole composition in the sense of the “recognizable shape” of Numbers by the end of the 4th/the beginning of the 3rd cent. BCE.¹² Or, if they give witness to a scroll that was originally containing considerable parts of the book, to an excerpted text, possibly in a collection of excerpts, or if they are remnants of a citation. The fragments of 2QNum^c (2Q8) and 2QNum^{d?} (2Q9) are considered too small to come to a substantiated judgment.¹³ In fact, the classification as fragments of a former complete Numbers scroll must stay hypothetical for at least 2QNum^a; 2QNum^b; 5/6HēvNum^a (5/6Hēv1a); XHēv/SeNum^b (XHēv/Se2); 34ŠeNum (34Še2), too. Even though there are preserved top and bottom margins and the lengths of lines and column height can be reconstructed tentatively, all of which speak to a scroll format, we will never know for certain which text was written in the lost parts of these very scrolls. The material evidence speaking to a scroll format and the assumptions about the contents do not operate on the same level of liability.¹⁴ For the above mentioned scrolls, their classification as “Numbers” scrolls is mostly based on the fact that the over 200 fragmentary Qumran scrolls from books that we know as biblical give witness to the phenomenon “one scroll—one book” more often than to collections of excerpts, anthologies, and also multiple books in one scroll (see below). From a material perspective, a “book” wise transmission is a little bit more likely for 4QLXXNum where text [43]from three successive columns is preserved.¹⁵ The transmission

¹¹ Due to restrictions of space, scribal habits in orthography and morphology, namely the Qumran Scribal Practice (QSP), the question of de-luxe editions and the evidence for delimitation marker systems will be excluded. For an assessment of their socio-religious dimensions and for a contextualization in Ancient Near Eastern, Egyptian, and Greek as well as Rabbinic scribal cultures, see Tov, *Scribal Practices*; Tov, *Textual Criticism*, 4th ed. (with reference to the recent literature); Oesch, “Gliederungshermeneutik;” Carr, “Background.”

¹² For the concept of the recognizable shape that allows to include textual variance and ongoing redactional processes while at the same time assuming a relatively stable shape of what a composition looked like as a whole, cf. Crawford, “Understanding,” 65–6.

¹³ Cf. Lange, *Handschriften*, 79–80.

¹⁴ Cf., however, Lange, *Handschriften*, 83, who, based on the calculated large measurements of the scroll with ca. 39.5 cm in height, speculates whether the scroll might have included more books than Numbers or even the whole Pentateuch.

¹⁵ See the descriptions in the editions, Lange, *Handschriften*, 79–80, 82–3, 110, and the discussion below.

of the whole recognizable shape of Numbers in one scroll is evidenced materially in those scrolls whose fragments cover a larger range of chapters and have more evidence of margins, joins etc. to calculate with.

Single transmission

A separate transmission is evidenced by 4QNum^b. From the 105 frags., frags. 1–84 have been identified preserving parts of Num 11:31–36:7 and it is likely that the scroll originally comprised the whole text range of Num 1–36.¹⁶ The beginning and cols. III–V; IX, which likely have contained Num 14:1–15:31; 18:6–24, are missing. Sewing marks before col. I indicate the existence of at least one preceding sheet.¹⁷ Even beyond that, the condition of the scroll is often fragmentary, but still good enough so that, in addition to about 1520 words and word remnants, column margins, top and bottom margins, seams and auxiliary lines have been preserved. On the basis of the best-preserved column, col. XV, Jastram concludes that the average column was 31 lines high, measuring about 24.8 cm, with each line ca. 0.8 cm high. He calculates that the average line length was 58–64 signs/spatia, with each sign 2.5 mm high and up to 2.5 mm wide (including spaces). However, upward (69 signs in col. XV; 75 signs in col. XXVIII) and downward (49 signs in col. XXII) deviations do occur, making the column width varying between 9.7–14.7 cm. Overall, Jastram reconstructs a height of 30 cm and a length of 6.8 m for the scroll, comprising about 48 columns. It was composed of 12 pieces of leather with an average length of 56 cm, the first four of which are lost.¹⁸

Multi-“book” units

The remaining scrolls from the corpus are considered to have covered larger text units where Numbers was transmitted together with Leviticus (1Q3 and [44]4QLev–Num^a), with Genesis and Exodus (MurGen–Ex.Num^a), or even among all five books of the Pentateuch (4QRP^{b-d}).

¹⁶ One alternative to this deduction must be noted, though: Given the special compositional situation in Numbers, with Num 1:1–10:10 continuing Israel’s stay at the Sinai from Exod and Lev, thus linking the first part of Numbers closely to the preceding book(s) and with Num 10:11–36 as the point of departure, cf. Frevel, “Compositional Relief,” a beginning of the scroll somewhere in Num 10 can be imagined though never proven.

¹⁷ Cf. DJD 12, 206.

¹⁸ Cf. DJD 12, 206–8, where further information on the physical condition of the manuscript can also be found; cf. also Jastram, *Book of Numbers*, 5–11; Lange, *Handschriften*, 80, Tov, *Scribal Practices*, esp. 129 et passim. On the use of red ink in 4QNum^b, cf. DJD 12, 210–1; Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 54, 148–9.

However, the evidence is mostly circumstantial. The conclusion must stay hypothetical for the extremely fragmentary evidence of 1Q3¹⁹ and MurGen–Ex.Num^{a20}.

4QRP^d with only five preserved frags. is also a questionable candidate. While Lange speculates about the original scroll having covered the whole Pentateuch or at least Exod–Deut, an alternative hypothesis cannot be ruled out.

4QRP^d as a questionable case

In a reexamination of the evidence against the background of the excerpted texts from Qumran, Crawford has come to the conclusion that it is “unlikely that the manuscript ever contained any complete book of the Pentateuch.”²¹ Rather, she characterizes the frags. as remnants from a collection of excerpted texts, thus labeled Reworked Pentateuch D; with a capital D, designating an individual composition, not with a superscript ^d, which would designate a copy of the same work.²² With regard to the *editio princeps*, she recollects that the order of the other frags. was decided on deliberately in canonical order by her and Tov. Since no top and bottom margins or any other hints are preserved, it is not possible to reconstruct the measurements of the scroll. Only for frags. 3 and 4 ii which contain the successive texts of Num 29:14, 16–24 (frag. 3) and Num 29:32–39; 30:1+Deut 16:13–14 (frag. 4i, see above § 2) it is relatively sure that they belong in that order. She lists two observations, one more textual one more material, that speak for assessing the scroll as a collection of excerpted texts: 1) All extant fragments exhibit legal passages that share a common topic or concern and were likely juxtaposed for this reason.²³

[45]Frag. 1: Exod 21:35–22:5 restitution laws for damage resulting from the behavior or incorrect handling of livestock; textual base is the expanded form also known from 4Q158; 4QpaleoExod^m, SP and LXX.

Frag. 2: Lev 24:20–22 (*lex talionis*) and 25:39–43 (manumission of debt slaves); probably juxtaposed because of the key words תושב/נר and/or the comparable order of laws in Exod 21:23–25, 26–28.

Frag. 3 and 4i: Num 29:14, 16–24 (frag. 3) and Num 29:32–39; 30:1 (offerings for Sukkot) Deut 16:13–14 (laws of Sukkot). The text breaks up after Deut 16:14, so that we cannot know whether Lev 23:33–43 originally also followed (cf. 4QRP^c frag. 23 where a large addition follows Lev 23:42–24:2).

Frag. 4ii: not identified.

¹⁹ According to Lange, *Handschriften*, 67, the column height of 30 cm in 1Q3 may point to the scroll having originally another third book besides Leviticus and Numbers in it. In view of the complicated sorting of the fragments, cf. note i for table 1, and only eight words allegedly from Numbers, there is not much to base the Numbers portion on.

²⁰ On the discussion of how to assign the seven fragments, see above note vi to table 1. The reconstructed height of the writing block (46.5 cm and c. 50 lines/column) makes the alleged scroll one of the largest found in the Judean Desert, cf. Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 77, 89, 92, 95, 98, 102, 126. This is why Lange assumes that it has contained a large amount of text, cf. Lange, *Handschriften*, 55.

²¹ Crawford, “Excerpted Manuscripts,” 274.

²² The same pertains to 4QRP^c. For the following paragraph, cf. Crawford, “Excerpted Manuscripts,” 274–6.

²³ For a detailed analysis and further literature, see also Zahn, *Rethinking*, 122–6.

Frag. 5: Deut 14:14–21 (lists of pure and impure animals).

2) Second, frag. 2 and 4i exhibit a special layout in the presentation of the texts that can be found in other excerpted texts as well.²⁴ The juxtaposed passages are set apart from each other by a *vacat* of likely almost a full blank line (for frag. 4i, see above § 2).

Additionally, Crawford points to the different text types underlying base texts of the frags. which can be discerned from the variants in the passages.

However, the two categories listed by Crawford as arguments for a collection of excerpted texts in 4QRP^d cannot settle the question for good. The use of a line blank to set apart the juxtaposed passages can also be found in Num 4QRP^c frag. 28 for the different sequence of Num 4:47–7:1 instead of Num 4:47–5:1, see above § 2.²⁵ The fact that the one example is called juxtaposition and the other is called omission resp. change of sequence is not grounded in any conditions found in the frags. themselves but is suggested by the contextual evidence from the rest of the frags. These are missing in 4QRP^d while they are not in 4QRP^c. Another contradictory observation can be gained from the selection of passages: In 4QRP^d frag. 4i, the introductory [46]verse in Num 30:1 is used as a recollecting subscript and link to Deut 16:13. This is comparable to the technique used in 4QRP^c frag. 23. After Lev 23:42–43, the subscript of Lev 23:44 (set apart by two *vacats* of almost half a line blank before and a smaller one after the verse) and the introduction in Lev 24:1–2a are used as link and introductory verses for the new material on the legislation for the festivals of Fresh Oil and Wood which is added directly afterwards.²⁶ Again, the designation of one fragment to a Reworked Pentateuch MS and the other to a collection of excerpts is very much influenced contextually by the rest of the preserved evidence for the respective scroll. The example of 4QRP^d illustrates how neatly physical and textual features intertwine in the characterization of a scroll as a Pentateuch MS or not and how the fragmentary state of the evidence limits this endeavor.

Book joins

This leaves us with 4QRP^b and 4QRP^c as more sure cases with fragments from all books (except for Lev in 4QRP^b) and extraordinarily large reconstructed measurements²⁷ which suggest that

²⁴ Cf., e.g., 4QTest (4Q175).

²⁵ Cf. also the *vacat* in the combination of Num 20:17–18 with Deut 2:8 in 4QRP^b frag. 23a–b i, see Crawford, “Qumran Pentateuch Scrolls,” 129–30; Zahn, *Rethinking*, 84. It must be noted, though, that there is no line blank between the combination of Num 27:11 and Num 36:1–2 in 4QRP^c frag. 36, see above § 2.

²⁶ On this passage, which was also used in the Temple Scroll, see DJD 13, 290–6; Zahn, *Rethinking*, 102–8; Crawford, “Three Fragments;” Crawford, “A Note on 4Q365,” and the literature cited there.

²⁷ 4QRP^c with columns of 30.1–32.25 cm in height, a letter count per line varying from 49–88 (average 62) and relatively moderate margins around 1–2 cm. 4QRP^b is more damaged so that calculations much more depend on the reconstructions of portions which go with MT. Column height from 31.2–32.8 cm with around 40 lines per

the whole Pentateuch or a considerable part thereof was covered. 4QRP^c contains the only frag. that is (most likely) preserving a physical transition from a preceding book to Numbers. 4QRP^c frag. 26a–b l. 1–2 (see § 2) exhibits an unidentified preceding text which may have continued and ended Lev 27 from frag. 25a–c. The following beginning of Num 1:1–5 is set apart by a *vacat* of assumingly a full line blank. This is the only book join preserved for Numbers so that there is no physical evidence for the transition to Deuteronomy.²⁸

In 4QLev–Num^a is a representative for a scroll likely containing two “books.” Here again, the transition from Leviticus to Numbers is not physically preserved and can only be deduced from the similarities of the leather and the script on the fragments. Notably, in Qumran, two “books” in one scroll is a phenomenon which is only evidenced for the Pentateuch. Apart from the examples [47]discussed here, two books can be found in 4QGen–Exod^a, 4QExod^b = 4QGen–Exod^b, 4QpaleoGen–Exod^l, 4QExod–Lev^f.²⁹

From this overview, it has becomes clear that not only analogies and deductions from the other “biblical” scrolls at Qumran guide the estimations, but also our “book” shaped canonical perception of Numbers and the Pentateuch.³⁰ At the same time, it is remarkable to see that there certainly is a material cohesion of the books of the Pentateuch which is mirrored in the physical evidence. Thus, as scarce and fragmentary as the evidence is, it should prevent us from jumping to conclusions into neither a nihilist nor a maximalist position. This is further corroborated by phenomena of cohesion and densification which are more bound to textual features, without being detached from a material dimension. These mirror the inner compositional and thematic cohesion of the book of Numbers and its links to Exod, Lev and Deut.³¹

column, an average letter count of 48 per line and relatively moderate margins around 1–2 cm. Given these measurements and under the presupposition that the whole Pentateuch was covered by the scroll, Tov and White (Crawford) have estimated a length between 22 m and 27 m for 4QRP^c, cf. DJD 13, 192, 198–200, 255–8; Lange, *Handschriften*, 38–40. To compare, the Great Isaiah Scroll 1QIsa^a has 7.34 m.

²⁸ Together with 4QpaleoGen–Exod^l, this one of only two “real” book joins in Qumran, cf. the list in Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 75.

²⁹ Cf. Tov, *Textual Criticism*, 4th ed., 278 n. 6. Recently, Carr, “Background,” has argued for the five scrolls structure being the older and common form of the Pentateuch, while the means for producing larger scrolls were developed in the later Greco-Roman period.

³⁰ Cf. the insights from the “Rewritten Bible” debate, which circled around questions of authority and the dominance of the biblical lens, cf., e.g., Crawford, “Rewritten Bible,” 133–34; Crawford, *Rewriting*, esp. 1–15, 146–49; Zsengellér, *Rewritten Bible*; Ulrich, *Dead Sea Scrolls*, 187–99, 201–13; Zahn, *Genres*. More recently, a number of new publications have further deepened this understanding from the material and textual point of view of new philology, emphasizing how it is veiled by textual presuppositions, cf., e.g., Nati, *Textual Criticism*; Lied, *Invisible Manuscripts*; Mroczek, *Literary Imagination*.

³¹ Cf. the small cases of densification discussed in the synoptic analysis (ch. 2), as well as larger phenomena of juxtaposition and combination of remote passages. On the compositional shape of Numbers, cf. Frevel, “Compositional Relief.”

The materiality has given first insights into how presuppositions about the textuality influences the evaluation of materiality, and how material analysis is bound to textual evaluation.

As is the case with most Pentateuch MSS, there is still the problem that the editions were prepared 70–30 years ago and only few reevaluations of the evidence have taken place.³² This is not only a problem with regard to the physical examination of the material³³ but also with regard to integrating new insights from textual history and textual theory. Both aspects constitute a major desideratum.

[48] *Statistics and text types*

When evaluating the Numbers manuscripts we face the same statistical obstacles as with all Pentateuch MSS.³⁴ In 1Q3; 2QNum^{a-d}; 5/6HevNum^a (5/6Hev1a); 34SeNum (34Se2), textual damage is too severe to get a good glimpse on their textual features.³⁵ The number of Hebrew MSS deemed analyzable in terms of length of the frags., paleography and text type varies between scholars as is displayed in table 2.3.³⁶

While the paleographically oldest—and very fragmentary—manuscript available, 4QLev–Num^a, is labeled “independent” in Lange’s classification, as are the 4QRP-texts, Tov’s assignments of the manuscripts paint a different picture, in which the oldest manuscripts are MT-like instead. The 4QRP-texts are considered later branches deriving from an LXX-SP group. This overall picture is as diverging as can be and it is dependent on the general tendencies in the text-historical models of the two scholars. For reconstructing the textual history of Numbers as such and in the context of the transmission of the Pentateuch, these categorizations are of little help.

The table shows that for Numbers the independent/MT-like and Pre-Samaritan texts are the major problem zone.³⁷ 4QLev–Num^a is heavily understudied and its integration into a textual

³² Cf. the list of (re-)editions in the bibliography at the end of the article.

³³ New color and infrared photos from the 2010s are available for most manuscripts in LLDSSDL. New research has been conducted esp. on Exodus and Isaiah.

³⁴ For an overview of the debate incl. alternative approaches, the statistics for the whole Pentateuch and a detailed comment, see Schäfers *Textentstehung*, 141–76; Schäfers “Evidence,” 173–88, 231–6. See also Lange, “1.2.2 Ancient and Late Ancient Hebrew and Aramaic Jewish Texts,” 125; Lange, “2.2.1 “Manuscript Evidence,” 22–3; Crawford, “Interpreting,” 64–8.

³⁵ Cf. the discussion on Num 19:2–4 in the synopsis above as an example.

³⁶ The data is compiled from Lange, *Handschriften*, 153–56, esp. 155, see also *ibid.*, 6–8, 16–20; Tov, “Biblical Texts,” (2008); Tov, *Textual Criticism*, 3rd ed., 108–9, (2012); Tov, “Development,” (2016); Tov, *Textual Criticism*, 4th ed., esp. 135–38, 370–74, 379–82, (2022). Because the two are the only scholars to have published typologies for the entire material, I limit myself to these two propositions.

³⁷ Note also the diverging categorization of MSS as “pre-Samaritan,” with a consensus only on 4QpaleoExod^m and 4QNum^b, cf. Lange, *Handschriften*, 18: 4QpaleoExod^m and 4QNum^b; Tov, “Biblical Texts,” 147: + 4QExod–Lev^f, 4QDeutⁿ (secondarily), 4QLev^d (unsure); Tov, *Textual Criticism*, 3rd ed., 108: + 4QExod–Lev^f, 4QRP^a, 4QRP^b; Tov, *Textual Criticism*, 4th ed., 175: “4QpaleoExod^m, 4QExod–Lev^f, 4QNum^b (which is secondarily also

history of Numbers remains a desideratum.³⁸ The relatively uncontested label “pre-Samaritan” is too vague to account for a genetically informed description of 4QNum^b. It is mainly based [49]

Date	Manuscript	Categorization by Lange 2009	Categorization by Tov 2008/2012	Categorization by Tov 2016/2022
150–100 BCE	1QpaleoLev–Num ^a (1Q3)	not categorizable	outer circle; M-like ⁱⁱⁱ	MT-like or pre-Samaritan ^v
	4QLev–Num ^a	independent	outer circle; M-like	[no longer part of the MT-like texts] ^{vi}
75–50 BCE	4QRP ^b	independent ⁱ	[not included ^{iv}]	block II: “closely related to the SP group” ^{vii}
	4QRP ^c	independent ⁱⁱ		
	4QRP ^d	independent		
30 BCE–20 CE	4QNum ^b	pre-Samaritan	pre-Samaritan	block II: SP group
50–100 CE	XH _{ev} /SeNum ^b (XH _{ev} /Se2)	proto-Masoretic	inner circle; proto-Masoretic	block I: MT group
100–135 CE	MurGen–Ex.Num ^a (Mur 1)	proto-Masoretic	inner circle; proto-Masoretic	block I: MT group

Table 2.3: Classification of the Hebrew Numbers Mss According to Lange and Tov

Notes for table 2.3:

ⁱ, ⁱⁱ Statistically counted as independent, but going back to a reworking of a pre-Samaritan witness, cf. Lange, *Handschriften*, 39, 41.

ⁱⁱⁱ Tov has differentiated his terminology for the proto-Masoretic texts in several steps, cf. the overview in Schäfers, “Evidence,” 180–81 n. 57, and the statement in Tov, “Proto-Masoretic.”

^{iv} Tov has not always included the 4QRP texts in his statistics but has emphasized the closeness to SP for 4QRP^c; ^d, see above note iv for table 1. Since these texts are now included in the tentative stemma for the new two-block model, cf. Tov, *Textual Criticism*, 4th ed., 380–2, I have included them into the table, too.

^v Cf. Tov, *Textual Criticism*, 4th ed., 136 with n. 64. The independent and/or MT-like texts are a major point of dissent between Lange and Tov which is closely related to the alleged preponderance of proto-MT and the question of stabilization, cf. Lange “Plurality,” Lange, “Dead Sea Scrolls,” Tov, “Myth,” Tov, “Enigma,” and the critique i.a. by Crawford, “Understanding,” 64–9; Ulrich, *Dead Sea Scrolls*, 25–6, 314–5; Pajunen, “Textual Plurality.” In his recent two-block model, Tov has developed new statistics with now 21 non-aligned texts (naming only 4Q[Gen–]Exod^b; 11QpaleoLev^a; 4QDeut^c; ^h) whose place in the stemma remains unsure and 18 “indecisive texts that are either MT-like or pre-Samaritan,” namely 4QGen^c; ^d; ^e; ^f; ^g; ^j; 1QExod; 1QpaleoLev–Num^a; 4QLev^b; ^c; ^e; 2QDeut^c; 4QDeut^d; ^e; ^f; ^g; ⁱ; ^o. In the stemma, the group “1b. MT-like traditions” emerges secondarily from the proto-MT branch, cf. Tov, *Textual Criticism*, 4th ed., 136 with n. 64, 382. For a detailed analysis of the matter, see Schäfers, *Textentstehung*, 147–57, esp. n. 156–57.

^{vi} Tov, *Textual Criticism*, 4th ed., 136 n. 63, informs that 4QLev–Num^a and 4QpaleoDeut^f are now excluded from this group.

close to LXX), and possibly also 4QLev^d. The biblical scrolls 4QRP^a (4Q158) and 4QRP^b (4Q364) are either part of the SP group or close to it.”

³⁸ See the scarce introduction in DJD 12, 153–5, which seems to be guided by the general policy of leaving “less interesting” MSS largely uncommented, cf. *ibid.*, 3. For an overall counting of the patterns in the variant readings of the MS, see Lange, *Handschriften*, 69, cf. also the assessment by Fabry, “Levitikus.”

^{vii} Tov, *Textual Criticism*, 4th ed., 380: “Closely related to the SP group are its congeners 4QRP^{a,b} (4Q158, 4Q364), slightly removed from SP since these texts added a layer of exegesis to the SP, and 4QRP^{c,d}, a little more removed from SP.”

[50]on the large scale expansions shared with SP³⁹ which have been in the center of scholarly engagement with 4QNum^b.⁴⁰ Apart from these expansions, 4QNum^b has only a few exclusive agreements with SP (as with MT) but shares 18 significant text pluses with LXX that speak for a point of contact in the forerunners of the scroll and the LXX *Vorlage*.⁴¹ The 19 unique text pluses in 4QNum^b have similar characteristics as the ones shared with LXX.⁴² Consequently, these unique pluses, too, do not speak for a continuation of “special” SP-style characteristics.⁴³ This leaves us with only 4QpaleoExod^m as a witness consensually described with that label. This scroll does not have as many exclusive agreements with LXX as 4QNum^b.⁴⁴ For the 4QRP texts, scribal techniques have been exhaustively studied, but their interrelation with the other MSS is still not sufficiently understood.⁴⁵ Regarding the Greek MS 4QLXXNum, which is not included in the table above, analogous problems exist with regard to the question “Old Greek or recension?”. Here, too, recent scholarship has urged for the need to move beyond this dichotomy.⁴⁶ In sum, the study of the Numbers MSS will greatly benefit from a shift in perspective in the spirit advocated for by Crawford:

“By changing the direction of our text-critical study from a focus on the three canonical collections that resulted from the process of textual transmission to a focus on the beginnings of that transmission process, we can [51]free ourselves from the tyranny of the Masoretic Text, the Septuagint, and the Samaritan Pentateuch.”⁴⁷

³⁹ See the [reconstructed] evidence for Num [12:16b]; 20:13b; 21:11b, 12b, 20b, [22b, 23b]; 27:23b; [31:20b]. For Num 4:14b (with LXX); 10:10b; 13:33b; 14:40b, 45b the manuscript is too fragmentary or missing completely.

⁴⁰ Cf. e.g., Ziemer, *Kritik*, 638–56; Ben-Dov, “Text Duplications;” van der Meer, “Exclusion;” Schorch, “Fortschreibungen;” Hjelm, “Deuteronomic Addenda;” Ulrich, *Dead Sea Scrolls*, 36–39; Zahn, *Rethinking*, 135–77; Zahn, “Samaritan Pentateuch;” Kartveit, *Origin*, 266–88; Tov, “Rewritten Bible Compositions,” esp. 60–68; Jastram, “Text.” Small scale harmonizations were addressed as a major feature in pre-SP texts and LXX SP, but have not been studied systematically for in 4QNum^b, cf. Zahn, *Rethinking*, 135–77, esp. 136–37; Tov, “Samaritan Pentateuch;” Tov, “Textual Harmonization;” Tov, “Septuagint of Numbers;” Tov, “Popular Jewish LXX-SP Texts;” Tov, “Palestinian Source.”

⁴¹ Num 12:6; 13:23; 18:30; 22:9, 10, 11(2x), 17, 18; 23:3; 25:16; 26:33; 30:9(2x); 31:48; 32:30; 35:21; 36:1, cf. the detailed analysis in Schäfers, *Textentstehung*, 195–254; Schäfers, “Evidence.”

⁴² Num 11:32; 13:18, 20; 16:8; 18:30; 20:20; 22:12, 16, 19, 32; 26:10; 27:22; 29:28; 31:3, 23, 48; 32:39; 35:18, 21; for the special case Num 36:1–2, see above § 2.

⁴³ But see Tov, *Textual Criticism*, 4th ed., 175: “harmonizing additions that reflect the style of SP”.

⁴⁴ Cf. Jastram, “Comparison.”

⁴⁵ Cf. esp. Zahn, *Rethinking*, and the publications by Crawford listed in the bibliography. For a list of variants, see Perrin, “Variants.”

⁴⁶ Cf. the additional comment by Kreuzer in Dorival, “Arithmoi,” 149 n. 1 (appendix to Dorival’s article); Kotzé, “Septuagint,” esp. 159; Albrecht, “Rahlfs 803.” Note the cautious approach advocated for already by Tov, “Greek Biblical Texts,” 345–6.358–61.

⁴⁷ Crawford, “Understanding,” 69.

Bibliography

Lists of Manuscripts from the Judean Desert Sites

Tov, Emanuel, ed. *The Texts from the Judean Desert: Indices and an Introduction to the Discoveries in the Judean Desert Series*. DJD 39. Oxford: Clarendon, 2002.

Tov, Emanuel. *Revised Lists of the Texts from the Judean Desert*. Leiden: Brill, 2010.

Text editions, reeditions and additions

Databases

Leon Levy Dead Sea Scrolls Digital Library (LLDSSDL). © Israel Antiquities Authority. Online: <https://www.deadseascrolls.org.il>.

Accordance © Oaktree Software. Online: <https://www.accordancebible.com>.

Logos © Faithlife, LLC. Online: <https://www.logos.com>.

Dead Sea Scrolls Electronic Library Biblical Texts (DSSEL). Edited by Donald W. Parry. Leiden: Brill, 2015. Online: <https://scholarlyeditions.brill.com/dsbo/>.

Study Edition with the Texts from DJD Printed in the Canonical Order of MT

Ulrich, Eugene, ed. *The Biblical Qumran Scrolls: Transcriptions and Textual Variants*. VTSup 134. Leiden: Brill, 2010.

1QpaleoLev–Num^a (1Q3)

Barthélemy, Dominique, ed. “Lévitique et autres fragments en écriture ‘phénicienne.’” Pages 51–4 and plates VIII–IX in *Qumran Cave 1*. Edited by Dominique Barthélemy and Józef T. Milik. DJD 1. Oxford: Clarendon, 1955.

Ulrich, Eugene. “A Revised Edition of the ‘1QpaleoLev–Num^a’ and ‘1QpaleoLev^b’ Fragments.” *RevQ* 22 (2005–2006): 341–47.

2QNum^a (2Q6), 2QNum^b (2Q7), 2QNum^c (2Q8), 2QNum^{d?} (2Q9)

Baillet, Maurice, ed. “Nombres.” Pages 57–60 and plate X in *Les ‘Petites Grottes’ de Qumran*. Edited by Maurice Baillet, Józef T. Milik, and Roland de Vaux, 2 vols. DJD 3. Oxford: Clarendon, 1962.

Tigchelaar, Eibert J. C., ed. “A Qumran Cave 2 Fragment Preserving Part Of Numbers 23:5–7[8] (2Q29 1).” Pages 83–6 in *The Prestige of the Pagan Prophet Balaam in [52]Judaism, Early Christianity and Islam*. Edited by George H. van Kooten and Jacques van Ruiten. TBN 11. Leiden: Brill, 2008.

4QLev–Num^a (4Q23)

Ulrich, Eugene, ed. “4QLev–Num^a.” Pages 153–76 and plates XIII–XXX in *Qumran Cave 4.VII: Genesis to Numbers*. Edited by Eugene Ulrich et al. DJD 12. Oxford: Clarendon, 1994.

Tigchelaar, Eibert. “Identifying Small 4Q23 (4QLev–Num^a) Fragments.” *Text* 30 (2021): 171–78.

4QNum^b (4Q27)

Jastram, Nathan, ed. *The Book of Numbers from Qumran, Cave IV (4QNum^b)*. PhD diss., Harvard Univ., 1990.

———. “The Text of 4QNum-b.” Pages 177–98 in *Madrid Qumran Congress. Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid, 18–21 March 1991: Volume 1*. Edited by J.C.T. Barrera and L.V. Montaner. STDJ 11. Leiden: Brill, 1992.

———, ed. “4QNum^b.” Pages 205–67 and plates XXXVIII–XLIX in *Qumran Cave 4.VII: Genesis to Numbers*. Edited by Eugene Ulrich et al. DJD 12. Oxford: Clarendon, 1994.

———. “A Comparison of Two ‘Proto-Samaritan’ Texts from Qumran: 4QpaleoExod-m and 4QNum-b.” *DSD* 5 (1998): 264–89.

4QLXXNum (4Q121)

- Skehan, Patrick. "4QLXXNum: A Pre-Christian Reworking of the Septuagint." *HTR* 70 (1977): 39–50.
- Wevers, John W. "An Early Revision of the Septuagint of Numbers." *ErIsr* 16 (1982): 235*–39*.
- Quast, Udo. "Der rezensionelle Charakter einiger Wortvarianten im Buche Numeri." Pages 230–52 in *Studien zur Septuaginta – Robert Hanhart zu Ehren: Aus Anlaß seines 65. Geburtstages*. Edited by Detlef Fraenkel, Udo Quast, and John W. Wevers. MSU 20. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990.
- Ulrich, Eugene, ed. "4QLXXNumbers." Pages 187–94 and plates XLII–XLIII in *Qumran Cave 4.IV: Palaeo-Hebrew and Greek Biblical Manuscripts*. Edited by Patrick Skehan, Eugene Ulrich, and Judith Sanderson. DJD 9. Oxford: Clarendon, 1992.
- Ulrich, Eugene. "The Septuagint Manuscripts from Qumran: A Reappraisal of Their Value." Pages 49–80 in *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognat Writings: Papers Presented to the International Symposium on the Septuagint and Its Relations to the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Writings*. Edited by George J. Brooke and Barnabas Lindars. SCS 33. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1992.
- [53] Fabry, Heinz-Josef. "Die griechischen Handschriften vom Toten Meer." Pages 131–53 in *Im Brennpunkt: Die Septuaginta: Studien zur Entstehung und Bedeutung der Griechischen Bibel*. Edited by Heinz-Josef Fabry and Ulrich Offerhaus. BWANT 8. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2001.
- Wevers, John W. "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Septuagint." *BIOSCS* 38 (2005): 1–24.
- Tov, Emanuel. "The Greek Biblical Texts from the Judean Desert." Pages 339–64 in *Hebrew Bible, Greek Bible, and Qumran: Collected Essays*, by Emanuel Tov. TSAJ 121. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.
- Petersen, Nicholas. "An Analysis of Two Early LXX Manuscripts from Qumran: 4QLXXNum and 4QLXXLev^a in the Light of Previous Studies." *BBR* 19 (2009): 481–510.
- van Wyk, Koot. "A Presentation of 4QLXXNum in Comparison with the LXX and MT." *Journal of Biblical Text Research* 33 (2013): 114–38.
- Kotzé, Gideon R. "4QLXXNum and a Text-Critical Examination of a Debated Hebrew Term in Numbers 4." Pages 56–74 in *Scribal Practice, Text and Canon in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Essays in Memory of Peter W. Flint*. Edited by John J. Collins and Ananda Geyser-Fouché. STDJ 130. Leiden: Brill, 2019.
- Kotzé, Gideon R. "The Septuagint and Qumran." Pages 149–60 in *The T&T Clark Handbook of Septuagint Research*. Edited by William A. Ross and W. E. Glenny. T&T Clark Handbooks. London: Bloomsbury Publishing Plc, 2021.
- Ulrich, Eugene. "The Scrolls from the Judean Desert and the Septuagint." Pages 434–48 in *The Oxford Handbook of the Septuagint*. Edited by Alison Salvesen and Timothy M. Law. Oxford Handbooks. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2021.
- Albrecht, Felix. "Rahlfs 803 (4QLXXNum) – A Case in Point." *Göttinger Septuaginta*, August 1, 2022. Online: <https://septuaginta.uni-goettingen.de/blog/rahlfs-803-a-case-in-point/>.

4QRP

- Tov, Emanuel and Sidnie White (Crawford), eds. "4QReworked Pentateuch^{b-c} and 4QTemple?." Pages 187–96 in *Qumran Cave 4.VIII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 1*. Edited by Harold Attridge et al. DJD 13. Oxford: Clarendon, 1994 [Introduction].
- Perrin, Andrew B. "The Variants of 4Q (Reworked) Pentateuch: A Comprehensive List of the Textual Variants in 4Q158, 4Q364–7 in Biblical Sequence." *JJS* 63 (2012): 127–57.

4QRP^b (4Q364)

- Tov, Emanuel and Sidnie White (Crawford), eds. "364. Reworked Pentateuch^b." Pages 197–254 and plates XIII–XXI in *Qumran Cave 4.VIII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 1*. Edited by Harold Attridge et al. DJD 13. Oxford: Clarendon, 1994.

[54] 4QRP^c (4Q365) + 4QT? (4Q365a)

- Tov, Emanuel and Sidnie White (Crawford), eds. "365. Reworked Pentateuch^c." Pages 255–318 and plates XXII–XXXII in *Qumran Cave 4.VIII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 1*. Edited by Harold Attridge et al. DJD 13. Oxford: Clarendon, 1994.
- Tov, Emanuel and Sidnie White (Crawford), eds. "365a. 4QTemple?." Pages 319–33 and plates XXXIII–XXXIV in *Qumran Cave 4.VIII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 1*. Edited by Harold Attridge et al. DJD 13. Oxford: Clarendon, 1994.

4QRP^d (4Q366)

Tov, Emanuel and Sidnie White (Crawford), eds. “366. Reworked Pentateuch^d.” Pages 335–43 and plate XXXV in *Qumran Cave 4.VIII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 1*. Edited by Harold Attridge et al. DJD 13. Oxford: Clarendon, 1994.

MurGen–Ex.Num^a (Mur 1)

Milik, Józef T., ed. “Genèse, Exode, Nombres.” Pages 75–78 and plates XIX–XXI in *Les Grottes de Murabbaʿat*, edited by Pierre Benoit, Józef T. Milik, and Roland de Vaux, 2 vols. DJD 2. Oxford: Clarendon, 1961.

5/6HevNum^a (5/6Hev1a)

Yadin, Yigael. “Expedition D: The Cave of the Letters.” *IEJ* 12 (1962): 227–257.

Flint, Peter, ed. “5/6HevNumbers^a.” Pages 137–40 and plate XXIV in *Miscellaneous Texts from the Judaean Desert*. Edited by James Charlesworth et al. DJD 38. Oxford: Clarendon, 2000.

For a 2013 color photograph of frag. 4, cf. LLDSSDL plate 534: <https://www.deadseascrolls.org.il/explore-the-archive/image/B-371383>.

XHev/SeNum^b (XHev/Se2)

Flint, Peter, ed. “XHev/SeNumbers^b.” Pages 173–77 and plate XXIX in *Miscellaneous Texts from the Judaean Desert*. Edited by James Charlesworth et al. DJD 38. Oxford: Clarendon, 2000.

34SeNum (34Se2)

Morgenstern, Matthew, ed. “34SeNumbers.” Page 209 and plate XXXIII in *Miscellaneous Texts from the Judaean Desert*. Edited by James Charlesworth et al. DJD 38. Oxford: Clarendon, 2000.

Unprovenanced and (most likely) forged fragments

Kjeldsberg, Ludvik A., Årstein Justnes, and Hilda Deborah. “A Database of Post-2002 Dead Sea Scroll-like Fragments.” 2024. Online: doi:10.18710/JKTXN1.

Tigchelaar, Eibert. “A Provisional List of Unprovenanced, Twenty-First Century, Dead Sea Scrolls-like Fragments.” *DSD* 24 (2017): 173–88.

[55]Elgvin, Torleif, and Michael Langlois. “Looking Back: (More) Dead Sea Scrolls Forgeries in the Schøyen Collection.” *RevQ* 31 (2019): 111–33.

Thematic Studies

Ashley, Timothy R. *The Book of Numbers*. NICOT. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1993.

Ben-Dov, Jonathan. “Text Duplications between Higher and Lower Criticism: Num 20–21 and Deut 2–3.” Pages 217–42 in *The Samaritan Pentateuch and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Michael Langlois. CBET 94. Leuven: Peeters, 2019.

Carr, David M. “Background and Aims of A Scroll Approach to the Formation of the Hebrew Bible.” *Advances in Ancient Biblical and Near Eastern Research* 3, no. 2 (2023): 9–79. Online: DOI 10.35068/aabner.v3i2.1035.

Crawford, Sidnie White. “The Rewritten Bible at Qumran.” Pages 131–47 in *Scripture and the Scrolls*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. Vol. 1 of *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Second Princeton Symposium on Judaism and Christian Origins*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2006.

———. *Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times*. Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2008.

———. “The Pentateuch As Found in the Pre-Samaritan Texts and 4QReworked Pentateuch.” Pages 123–36 in *Changes in Scripture: Rewriting and Interpreting Authoritative Traditions in the Second Temple Period*. Edited by Hanne von Weissenberg, Juha Pakkala, and Marko Marttila. BZAW 419. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2011.

———. “Understanding the Textual History of the Hebrew Bible: A New Proposal.” Pages 60–69 in *The Hebrew Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Nóra Dávid et al. FRLANT 239. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2012.

———. “Interpreting the Pentateuch through Scribal Processes: The Evidence from the Qumran Manuscripts.” Pages 59–80 in *Insights into Editing in the Hebrew Bible and the Ancient Near East: What Does Documented Evidence*

- Tell Us about the Transmission of Authoritative Texts?* Edited by Reinhard Müller and Juha Pakkala. CBET 84. Leuven: Peeters, 2017.
- . “The Jewish and Samaritan Pentateuchs: Reflections on the Difference (?) between Textual Criticism and Literary Criticism.” *HeBAI* 9 (2020): 320–33.
- . *The Text of the Pentateuch: Textual Criticism and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. BZAW 493. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2022.
- . “The Qumran Pentateuch Scrolls: Their Literary Growth and Textual History.” Pages 119–31 in *The Text of the Pentateuch*.
- . “Three Fragments from Qumran Cave 4 and Their Relationship to the Temple Scroll.” 211–22 in *The Text of the Pentateuch*.
- . “A Note on 4Q365, Fragment 23 and Nehemiah 10:33–36.” Pages 209–10 in *The Text of the Pentateuch*.
- [56]———. “The Excerpted Manuscripts from Qumran, with Special Attention to 4QReworked Pentateuch D and 4QReworked Pentateuch E.” Pages 261–78 in *The Text of the Pentateuch*.
- Dorival, Gilles. “Arithmoi / Numeri / Das vierte Buch Mose.” Pages 146–73 in *Einleitung in die Septuaginta* Edited by Siegfried Kreuzer. Vol. 1 of *Handbuch zur Septuaginta (LXX.H)*. Edited by Martin Karrer, Wolfgang Kraus, and Siegfried Kreuzer. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2016.
- Fabry, Heinz-Josef. “Das Buch Levitikus in den Qumrantexten.” Pages 309–341 in: *Levitikus als Buch*. Edited by Heinz-Josef Fabry and Hans-Winfried Jüngling. BBB 119. Berlin: Philo, 1999.
- Frevel, Christian. “Von der Unvollkommenheit des Vollkommenen: Anmerkungen zur Anthropologie der Rituale im Buch Numeri.” Pages 215–44 in *Die Erfindung des Menschen: Person und Persönlichkeit in ihren lebensweltlichen Kontexten*. Edited by Stefan Beyerle. Theologie – Kultur – Hermeneutik 21. Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2016.
- . “The Compositional Relief of Numbers Within the Five Books of the Torah.” Pages 53–81 in *Desert Transformations: Studies in the Book of Numbers*, by Christian Frevel. FAT 137. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2020.
- Hjelm, Ingrid. “So-called Deuteronomic Addenda in the Samaritan Pentateuch Numbers 10–14 and 20–27: Where Do They Belong?” Pages 19–34 in *The Samaritans in Historical, Cultural and Linguistic Perspectives*. Edited by Jan Dušek. SJ 110; Studia Samaritana 11. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2018.
- Jastram, Nathan. “Numbers, Book of.” EDSS 2. Online: <https://www.oxfordreference.com/view/10.1093/acref/9780195084504.001.0001/acref-9780195084504-e-366>.
- . “Review of *Notes on the Greek Text of Numbers*, by John William Wevers.” *JNES* 62 (2003): 64–66.
- . “2.2.4 SP and Ancient Texts Close to SP: 2.2.4.4 Numbers.” Pages 98–101 in *Pentateuch, Former and Latter Prophets*. Edited by Armin Lange and Emanuel Tov. Vol. 1B of *Textual History of the Bible (THB)*. Edited by Armin Lange. Leiden: Brill, 2017.
- Kartveit, Magnar. *The Origin of the Samaritans*. VTSup 128. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- Lange, Armin. *Die Handschriften biblischer Bücher von Qumran und den anderen Fundorten*. Vol. 1 of *Handbuch der Textfunde vom Toten Meer*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009.
- . “The Textual Plurality of Jewish Scriptures in the Second Temple Period in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls.” Pages 43–96 in *Qumran and the Bible: Studying the Jewish and Christian Scriptures in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. [57]Edited by Nóra Dávid and Armin Lange. CBET 57. Leuven: Peeters, 2010.
- . “The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Date of the Final Stage of the Pentateuch.” Pages 287–304 in *On Stone and Scroll: Essays in Honour of Graham Ivor Davies*. Edited by James K. Aitken, Katharine J. Dell, and Brian A. Mastin. BZAW 420. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2011.
- . “1.2.2 Ancient and Late Ancient Hebrew and Aramaic Jewish Texts.” Pages 112–66 in *The Hebrew Bible. Overview Articles*. Edited by Armin Lange and Emanuel Tov. Vol. 1A of *Textual History of the Bible (THB)*. Edited by Armin Lange. Leiden: Brill, 2016.
- . “2.2.1 Ancient, Late Ancient, and Early Medieval Manuscript Evidence.” Pages 22–59 in *Pentateuch, Former and Latter Prophets*. Edited by Armin Lange and Emanuel Tov. Vol. 1B of *Textual History of the Bible (THB)*. Edited by Armin Lange. Leiden: Brill, 2017.

- Lange, Armin, and Matthias Weigold. *Biblical Quotations and Allusions in Second Temple Jewish Literature*. JAJ. Sup 5. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011.
- Lied, Liv I. *Invisible Manuscripts: Textual Scholarship and the Survival of 2 Baruch*. Studien und Texte zu Antike und Christentum 128. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2021.
- Mroczek, Eva. *The Literary Imagination in Jewish Antiquity*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2016.
- Nati, James. *Textual Criticism and the Ontology of Literature in Early Judaism: An Analysis of the Serekh ha-Yahad*. JSJSup 198. Leiden: Brill, 2022.
- Oesch, Josef M. "Formale und materiale Gliederungshermeneutik der Pentateuch-Handschriften von Qumran." Pages 81–122 in *From Qumran to Aleppo: A Discussion with Emanuel Tov about the Textual History of Jewish Scripture in Honor of His 65th Birthday*. Edited by Armin Lange, Matthias Weigold and József Zsengellér. FRLANT 230. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2009.
- Pajunen, Mika S. "Textual Plurality of Scripture in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Theories of Textual Transmission." *BN* 186 (2020): 7–27.
- Pike, Dana M. "The Book of Numbers at Qumran: Texts and Context." Pages 166–93 in *Current Research and Technological Developments on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Conference on the Texts from the Judean Desert, Jerusalem, 30 April 1995*. Edited by Donald W. Parry and Stephen D. Ricks. STDJ 20. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- Rösel, Martin. "Die Textüberlieferung des Buches Numeri am Beispiel der Bileamerzählung." Pages 207–26 in *Sôfer mahîr: Essays in Honour of Adrian Schenker*. Edited by Yohanan A. P. Goldman, Arie van der Kooij, and Richard D. Weis. VTSup 110. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- Schäfers, Kirsten M. "Zur Eigenart der LXX-Manuskripte der b-Gruppe in der Genesis: Spezielle Lesarten, exegetische Textplus/-minus und Berührungen mit der samaritanischen Texttradition." *TC* 29 (2024): 117–46.
- . *Textentstehung und Texttradition im Numeribuch: Paradigmatische Erkundungen zu Non-Linearität, Varianz und Verdichtung in Num 25*. Supplements to the Textual History of the Bible 9. Leiden: Brill, 2025.
- . "4QNum^b LXX vs. MT SP: Evidence for Non-Linear Processes in the Textual Development of the Book of Numbers from a Neglected Variant Pattern." [58]Pages 167–245 in *Urtext and Variance: The Quest for the Texts of the Hebrew Bible*. Edited by Frédérique M. Rey, Stefan Schorch, and Sophie Robert-Hayek. CBET 122. Leuven: Peeters, 2025. Online: <https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.11811/13889>.
- Schorch, Stefan. "Die prä-samaritanischen Fortschreibungen." Pages 113–32 in *Schriftgelehrte Fortschreibungs- und Auslegungsprozesse: Textarbeit im Pentateuch, in Qumran, Ägypten und Mesopotamien*. Edited by Walter Bührer. FAT.II 108. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2019.
- Tal, Abraham, ed. *The Samaritan Pentateuch: Edited According to MS 6 (C) of the Shekhem Synagogue*. Texts and Studies in the Hebrew Language and Related Subjects 8. Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University, 1994.
- Tov, Emanuel. "D. the Biblical Texts from the Judaean Desert: 1. Categorized List of the Biblical Texts." Pages 165–83 in *The Texts from the Judaean Desert: Indices and an Introduction to the Discoveries in the Judaean Desert Series*. Edited by Emanuel Tov. DJD 39. Oxford: Clarendon, 2002.
- . *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert*. STDJ 54. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- . "Rewritten Bible Compositions and Biblical Manuscripts, with Special Attention Paid to the Samaritan Pentateuch." Pages 57–70 in *Hebrew Bible, Greek Bible, and Qumran: Collected Essays*, by Emanuel Tov. TSAJ 121. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.
- . "The Biblical Texts from the Judean Desert: An Overview and Analysis." Pages 128–54 in *Hebrew Bible, Greek Bible, and Qumran: Collected Essays*, by Emanuel Tov. TSAJ 121. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.
- . "The Many Forms of Hebrew Scripture: Reflections in Light of the LXX and 4QReworked Pentateuch." Pages 11–28 in *From Qumran to Aleppo: A Discussion with Emanuel Tov about the Textual History of Jewish Scripture in Honor of His 65th Birthday*. Edited by Armin Lange, Matthias Weigold, and József Zsengellér. FRLANT 230. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2009.
- . "From 4QReworked Pentateuch to 4QPentateuch (?)." Pages 73–91 in *Authoritative Scriptures in Ancient Judaism*. Edited by Mladen Popović. JSJSup 141. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- . *Revised Lists of the Texts from the Judaean Desert*. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- . *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*. 3rd ed. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 2012.

- . “The Samaritan Pentateuch and the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Proximity of the Pre-Samaritan Qumran Scrolls to the SP.” Pages 385–410 in *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible, Qumran, Septuagint: Collected Essays, Volume 3*, by Emanuel Tov. VTSup 167. Leiden: Brill, 2015.
- . “The Textual Development of the Torah.” Pages 239–49 in *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible, Qumran, Septuagint: Collected Essays, Volume 3*, by Emanuel Tov. VTSup 167. Leiden: Brill, 2015.
- [59]———. “The Development of the Text of the Torah in Two Major Text Blocks.” *Text* 26 (2016): 1–27.
- . “Textual Harmonization in the Five Books of the Torah: A Summary.” Pages 31–56 in *The Bible, Qumran, and the Samaritans*. Edited by Magnar Kartveit and Gary N. Knoppers. SJ 104; Studia Samaritana 10. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2018.
- . “The Septuagint of Numbers as a Harmonizing Text.” Pages 181–201 in *Die Septuaginta – Geschichte, Wirkung, Relevanz: 6. Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 21.–24. Juli 2016*. Edited by Martin Meiser et al. WUNT 405. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2018.
- . “From Popular Jewish LXX-SP Texts to Separate Sectarian Texts: Insights from the Dead Sea Scrolls.” Pages 19–40 in *The Samaritan Pentateuch and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Michael Langlois. CBET 94. Leuven: Peeters, 2019.
- . “‘Proto-Masoretic,’ ‘Pre-Masoretic,’ ‘Semi-Masoretic,’ and ‘Masoretic’: A Study in Terminology and Textual Theory.” Pages 195–213 in *Textual Developments: Collected Essays, Volume 4*, by Emanuel Tov. VTSup 181. Leiden: Brill, 2019.
- . “The Palestinian Source of the Greek Translation of the Torah.” Pages 18–39 in *Die Septuaginta – Themen, Manuskripte, Wirkungen: 7. Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 19.–22. Juli 2018*. Edited by Eberhard Bons, Michaela Geiger, Frank Ueberschaer, Marcus Sigismund, and Martin Meiser. WUNT 444. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2020.
- . *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*. 4th ed. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 2022.
- Ulrich, Eugene. *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Developmental Composition of the Bible*. VTSup 169. Leiden: Brill, 2015.
- van der Meer, Michaël N. “Exclusion and Expansion: Harmonisations in the Samaritan Pentateuch, Pre-Samaritan Pentateuchal Manuscripts and Non-Pentateuchal Manuscripts.” Pages 41–76 in *The Samaritan Pentateuch and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Michael Langlois. CBET 94. Leuven: Peeters, 2019.
- Wevers, John W., ed. *Numeri*. SVTG III,1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982.
- . *Notes on the Greek Text of Numbers*. SCS 46. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1998.
- Zahn, Molly M. *Rethinking Rewritten Scripture: Composition and Exegesis in the 4QRevised Pentateuch Manuscripts*. STDJ 95. Leiden: Brill, 2011.
- . “The Samaritan Pentateuch and the Scribal Culture of Second Temple Judaism.” *JSJ* 46 (2015): 285–313.
- . *Genres of Rewriting in Second Temple Judaism: Scribal Composition and Transmission*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2020.
- Ziemer, Benjamin. *Kritik des Wachstumsmodells: Die Grenzen alttestamentlicher Redaktionsgeschichte im Lichte empirischer Evidenz*. VTSup 182. Leiden: Brill, 2020.
- Zsengellér, József, ed. *Rewritten Bible after Fifty Years: Texts, Terms, or Techniques? A Last Dialogue with Geza Vermes*. JSJSup 166. Leiden: Brill, 2014.