

INTERLINEAR ADDITIONS AND LITERARY DEVELOPMENT IN 4Q163/PESHER ISAIAH C, 4Q169/PESHER NAHUM, AND 4Q171/PESHER PSALMS A

The Qumran Pesharim are traditionally understood as compilations of exegetical material that derives from the Teacher of Righteousness and was recorded by his followers. An important impetus for this view is *Peshar Habakkuk's* claim that it contains the insights of the Teacher in “all the mysteries of the words of [God’s] servants, the prophets” (1QpHab VII 5; cf. 1QpHab II 8–9). Two developments in the study of the scrolls have, however, challenged this traditional image. To begin with, the Teacher of Righteousness increasingly tends to be taken as an individual to be remembered, (1) a prototype of communal identity, (2) or an authoritative “voice,” (3) rather than a historical

Research for this contribution was carried out during my stay as Dirk Smilde Scholar at the Qumran Institute in Groningen. I thank Mladen Popović for his hospitality and the Smilde family and the Ubbo Emmius Fund for their support of my research.

(1) Loren T. Stuckenbruck, “The Teacher of Righteousness Remembered: From Fragmentary Sources to Collective Memory in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *Memory in the Bible and Antiquity: The Fifth Durham-Tübingen Research Symposium (Durham, September 2004)* (ed. Stephen C. Barton, idem, and Benjamin G. Wold; WUNT 212; Tübingen: Mohr, 2007), 75–94; idem, “The Legacy of the Teacher of Righteousness in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *New Perspectives on Old Texts: Proceedings of the Tenth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 9–11 January, 2005* (ed. Esther G. Chazon, Betsy Halpern-Amaru, and Ruth A. Clements; STDJ 88; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 23–49.

(2) Jutta Jokiranta, “The Prototypical Teacher in the Qumran Pesharim: A Social Identity Approach,” in *Ancient Israel: The Old Testament in Its Social Context* (ed. Philip F. Esler; Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress, 2006), 254–63; eadem, *Social Identity and Sectarianism in the Qumran Movement* (STDJ 105; Leiden: Brill, 2013), 175–77.

(3) Florentino García Martínez, “Beyond the Sectarian Divide: The ‘Voice of the Teacher’ as an Authority-Conferring Strategy in some Qumran Texts,” in *The*

individual. (4) The idea of a historical Teacher inaugurating a corpus of scriptural interpretations does not sit well with this shift in approach: the Peshar commentators may portray the Teacher as an exegete (turning him into the *implied* commentator in the Pesharim) to accrue his status for themselves, (5) but this does not mean that the Pesharim and their contents go back to the Teacher. The Peshar commentators determine the image of the Teacher; the Teacher does not determine the contents of the Pesharim.

Secondly, the Pesharim are no unified compositions, but reflect a literary development. The *locus classicus* is 1QpHab II 5–10, which a range of scholars has argued to be a secondary addition to *Peshar Habakkuk*. (6) Other passages, like 1QpHab IX 3–7 (7) or 4Q169 3–4 I 6–8, (8) have also been suggested to be additions to an existing Peshar. These processes of literary development demonstrate that the Pesharim contain no closed collection of scriptural interpretations. Instead, they partake in *living exegetical traditions*, and expositions in the Pesharim are prone to ongoing alteration, addition, and subtraction. Scriptural interpretations in the Pesharim are echoes of lives lived forwards. (9) It is not the Teacher who determines their contents: the

Dead Sea Scrolls: Transmission of Traditions and Production of Texts (ed. Sarianna Metso, Hindy Najman, and Eileen M. Schuller; STDJ 92; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 227–44.

(4) On this shift see now George J. Brooke, “Brian as a Teacher of Righteousness,” in *Jesus and Brian: Exploring the Historical Jesus and His Times via Monty Python’s Life of Brian* (ed. Joan E. Taylor; London: Bloomsbury, 2015), 127–40.

(5) See Pieter B. Hartog, “Peshar as Commentary,” in *Proceedings of the Eighth Meeting of the International Organization of Qumran Studies: Munich, 4–7 August, 2013* (ed. George J. Brooke et al.; STDJ; Leiden: Brill, forthcoming).

(6) See already Florentino García Martínez, “El peshar: Interpretación profética de la Escritura,” *Salmanticensis* 26 (1979): 125–39 (137; see also n. 45); also H. Gregory Snyder, “Naughts and Crosses: Peshar Manuscripts and Their Significance for Reading Practices at Qumran,” *DSD* 7 (2000): 26–48 (39–40); Jokiranta, *Social Identity and Sectarianism*, 154; George J. Brooke, “Physicality, Paratextuality, and Peshar Habakkuk,” in *On the Fringe of Commentary: Metatextuality in Ancient Near Eastern and Ancient Mediterranean Cultures* (ed. Sidney H. Aufrère, Philip S. Alexander, and Zlatko Pleše; OLA 232; Leuven: Peeters, 2014), 175–93 (186).

(7) Jokiranta, *Social Identity and Sectarianism*, 165.

(8) Shani Berrin (Tzoref), *The Peshar Nahum Scroll from Qumran: An Exegetical Study of 4Q169* (STDJ 53; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 214.

(9) Cf. Hindy Najman, “Configuring the Text in Biblical Studies,” in *A Teacher for All Generations: Essays in Honor of James C. VanderKam* (ed. Eric F. Mason et al.; JSJSup 153; Leiden: Brill, 2012), 3–22; eadem, “The Vitality of Scripture Within and Beyond the ‘Canon’,” *JSJ* 43 (2012): 497–518 (esp. 515–18). On the basis of a diary entry by Søren Kierkegaard, Najman argues that philology must attempt to understand texts “forwards” as well as “backwards.” Understanding forwards, for Najman, has to

Pesher commentators themselves are the major players in these exegetical processes.

In this short note, I intend to adduce further evidence for the Pesharim as expressions of living and ongoing exegetical traditions. Also, I wish to illuminate the material procedures involved in the literary development of the Pesharim. To this end I present three examples of interlinear additions, in 4Q163/*Pesher Isaiah C*, 4Q169/*Pesher Nahum*, and 4Q171/*Pesher Psalms A*. Whereas these additions have often been understood as scribal corrections, I argue that they are additions—either by the scribe of the manuscript or by a different scribe or exegete—to an existing Pesher.

4Q163 23 ii 3–14 (10)

These lines quote and interpret Isa 30:15–18:

[כי] א [כ]ן ה' אמר ה' קדוש ישראל בשובה ונ[ח]ת [תושעון בה] שקט ובטח תהיה גבורתכמה ולוא אביתמה ות[ואמר] לוא כיא על סוס נגוס על כן תנוסון ועל קל נרכב על כן יקלו רודפיכמה אלף אחד מפני גערת אחד מפני גערת חמשה תנוסון עד אם נותרתמה כתרן על רואש הר וכנס על גבעה לכן יחכה אדוני לחנ[גכ]מה ולכן ירום לרחמכמה כיא אלוהי משפט ה' אשרי כול חוכי לו פשר הדבר לאחריית הימים על עדת ד[ורשי] החלקות אשר בירושלים ה[...]. בתורה ולוא יה[...]. לב כיא לדוש [...] התורה מאסו

[“Fo]r th[us] said the Lord, the Holy One of Israel: ‘In returning and r[es]t [you shall be saved, in qui]etness and trust shall be your strength! But you did not want this and [said:] “No! For we shall flee on horseback”—therefore, you shall flee! and “We shall ride on the swift”—therefore, your pursuers shall be swifter! One thousand (shall flee) from the rebuke of one, from the rebuke of five you shall flee, until you remain as a flagpole upon a mountain top and like a sign upon a hill.’ Therefore, the Lord shall wait to show favo[ur] towards you. And therefore he shall rise to comfort you, for the Lord is a god of justice—happy are all those who wait for him” (Isa 30:15–18). The interpretation of the matter with regard to the latter days concerns the congregation of the S[ee]kers of Smooth Things, who are in Jerusalem [...] in the Torah and not [...] heart, for to tread [...] they despised the Torah.

do in large part with issues of literary formation and authorship. By focusing on the literary development of the Pesharim and the vitality of exegetical traditions, this note offers a modest attempt to understand these Qumran commentaries forwards.

(10) References to and quotations from the Pesharim follow Maurya Horgan’s edition in PTSDSSP 6B. Translations are my own.

Between lines 13 and 14, (11) the commentary adds a quotation of Hos 6:9aa, (12) with variants vis-à-vis MT: (13)

כִּיחֲכָה אִישׁ גִּדּוּדִים חֲבֵר כּוֹהֲנִים

Just as the troop member, the band of priests, lies in wait. (14)

The connection between Hos 6:9 and Isa 30:18 is the root כִּיחֲכָה. This root serves a central purpose in the Isaianic verse, where it describes God's refraining from showing favour ("the Lord shall wait

(11) There has been some debate on which line is the insertion. This debate finds its origins in John M. Allegro's *editio princeps*, where he presents the הַתּוֹרָה מֵאִסּוּ as line 14a, thus suggesting that these words are the insertion. This contradicts Allegro's earlier conviction that the Hosea quotation is the insertion ("More Isaiah Commentary from Qumran's Fourth Cave," *JBL* 77 [1958]: 215–221 [219]) as well as his comment that "L. 14a has been inserted above l. 14 by the same hand" (DJD 5:25).

John Strugnell points out that "la note de J.M. Allegro contredit son texte à ce propos," but he does not abandon the suggestion that הַתּוֹרָה מֵאִסּוּ is the insertion: "Matériellement on attendrait que "כִּיחֲכָה וְג' soit la ligne additionnelle—mais noter que la ligne avec הַתּוֹרָה commence avec un retrait" ("Notes en marge du volume V des «Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan», " *RevQ* 7/26 [1970]: 163–276 [193]).

Eibert Tigchelaar points out to me (personal communication d.d. 3 March, 2016) that Allegro's line numbering is probably based on a mistake in the proofs of DJD 5, which found its way into the final publication. Placing "14a" one line up (in front of the Hosea quotation) would restore the original numbering. This is not the only case of flawed line numbering in DJD 5. Note also that "a-lines" are usually presented before, not after, the line to which they belong. Having line 14a precede line 15 is, therefore, a mistake. Tigchelaar's suggestion resolves the ambiguity in Allegro's edition and implies that Allegro still considered the Hosea edition to be the addition. On the basis of the distance between the lines in 4Q163 23 I agree with him and take the Hosea quotation to be the addition (so also Horgan, *Pesharim: Qumran Interpretations of Biblical Books* [CBQMS 8; Washington, DC: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1979], 120; *DSSSE* 1:324; Elisha Qimron, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: The Hebrew Writings* [2 vols.; Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi, 2010, 2013], 2:271).

(12) The quotation may have been longer, but this is uncertain.

(13) On these variants see Russell Fuller, "Textual Traditions in the Book of Hosea and the Minor Prophets," in *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid 18–21 March 1991* (ed. Julio Trebolle Barrera and Luis Vegas Montaner; STDJ 11; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 247–56 (252).

(14) Qimron, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 2:271 reads כּוֹהֲכָה instead of כִּיחֲכָה, basing himself on LXX (ἡ ἰσχυρὸς σὺς). His suggestion is problematic on the basis of the hermeneutics of this passage, which implies the root כִּיחֲכָה as the connecting factor between Isa 30:18 and Hos 6:9 (see below).

While I follow Horgan's reading כִּיחֲכָה, I find her understanding of the syntax of the passage difficult. It seems to me that אִישׁ cannot be the object of כִּיחֲכָה, as this would result in גִּדּוּדִים (in the plural) being the subject of a verb in the singular. Better is to take אִישׁ גִּדּוּדִים as a construct state with אִישׁ as its *nomen regens*. Hence my translation "the troop member" (cf. *DSSSE* 1:325; contrast Horgan's "as the raiders lie in wait for a man").

to show favour towards you”) as well as the desired attitude of God’s people (“happy are all those who wait for him”). This final part of the Isaiah passage stands in a contrastive relationship with the individuals mentioned in its interpretation in the Peshet: the “Seekers of Smooth Things” did *not* wait for the Lord. Therefore, the interpretation implies, God will have no mercy on the Seekers of Smooth Things.

The interlinear Hosea quotation accentuates the contrast between “those who wait for the Lord” in Isaiah and the Seekers of Smooth Things. The latter do not wait for the Lord, but “lie in wait” to harm other human beings. Thus, the Hosea quotation ties in well with this interpretation of Isa 30:18. However, from what remains of the context of this Hosea quotation in *Peshet Isaiah C* (which is, admittedly, not very much) we obtain no clues that the Hosea passage was left out due to some scribal mistake and later inserted between the lines. The absence of such clues lends support to Maurya Horgan’s position, who classified the addition of Hos 6:9aα as “an interlinear gloss on the commentary.” (15)

George Brooke has argued that the addition of the Hosea passage served to draw a parallel between this interpretation of Isa 30 in 4Q163/*Peshet Isaiah C* and the interpretation of Isa 5 in 4Q162/*Peshet Isaiah B*. Both commentaries use the expression “they despised the Torah,” and Brooke writes:

In 4QpIsa^b ii 7–10 those who reject the law in Isa 5:24 are explicitly identified as the Scoffers in Jerusalem. If the Scoffers are priests, then it is not surprising to find that the writer of 4QpIsa^c glosses the interpretation of Isa 30:15–18 with Hos 6:9 with its band of priests (חבר כוהנים), so as to make it refer to both the Seekers-After-Smooth-Things and to the priests.... Since it seems as if the supralinear addition is in the same hand as that of the body of the fragment what emerges is a conscious adjustment by the scribe of his exegetical tradition to take account of parallel Isaiah interpretations, even though he has to use Hosea to help make the connections. (16)

Brooke’s explanation of the Hosea addition in 4Q163 seems to imply that the interpretation of Isa 5 as it occurs in *Peshet Isaiah B* had existed in some form before 4Q162 was produced. (17) This is certainly possible

(15) *Pesharim*, 120.

(16) “Isaiah in the Pesharim and Other Qumran Texts,” in *Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah: Studies of an Interpretive Tradition* (ed. Craig C. Broyles and Craig A. Evans; VTSup 70; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 609–32 (628).

(17) 4Q163 is palaeographically dated to 100–75 BCE (Brian Webster, DJD 39:372, 390), which makes it the palaeographically oldest manuscript of a continuous Peshet. The palaeographical date of 4Q162 lies between 50–25 BCE (Webster, DJD 39:373,

(especially because none of the Peshet manuscripts are autographs), but it is difficult to prove. Even if the connection with the interpretation of Isa 5 in *Peshet Isaiah B* is lost, however, the interlinear addition in 4Q163 23 ii testifies to the interests of the Peshet exegete and the literary development of *Peshet Isaiah C*.

4Q169 1–2 ii 3–5

These lines quote and interpret Nah 1:4a α , followed by a quotation of Nah 1:4a β –b:

גוע[ר] בים ויוב[י]שו פ[פ] שרו הים הם כל הכ[תיים] [...] לעש[ות] בהם משפט ולכלותם מעל פני הארץ וכל הנהרות החריב אמלל בשן] וכרמל ופרח לבנן אמלל
 “He parch[es] the sea and dri[ed] it up” (Nah 1:4a α) Its [in]terpretation: the sea—it is all the Ki[ttim ...] to execu[te] judgement on them and to eradicate them from the face of [the earth. “And all the rivers he dried up. Withered is Basan] and Karmel, and the blossom of Lebanon has withered” (Nah 1:4a β –b).

The passage continues with an interpretation of Nah 1:4a β –b, introduced by a *pēšer*-formula (4Q169 1–2 ii 5–9).

Between lines 4 and 5, some words from the final part of an interpretation section are added:

עם [כול מו]שליהם אשר תתם ממשלתם

with [all] their [ru]lers, whose rule will end.

As all letters visible in line 4 belong to the interpretation of Nah 1:4a α , the interpretation section to which this interlinear addition belongs must be concerned with Nah 1:4a β . This passage was probably quoted at the end of line 4, which has not been preserved (cf. Horgan’s reconstruction above). Where, however, did the interpretation section start? At least three words (including a *pēšer*-formula) must have preceded the interlinear addition, which starts with עם “with.” Two suggestions have been made. Shani Tzoref, following André Dupont-Sommer, reconstructs the beginning of the interpretation in line 4, after the quotation

403). So, if the scribe of 4Q163 inserted the Hosea passage to draw a parallel with the interpretation of Isa 5 as it occurs in *Peshet Isaiah B*, this interpretation must have existed in some form before 4Q162 was produced. Cf. Brooke’s own comment that his suggestion “somewhat undermines Stegemann’s proposal that the composition reflected in 4QpIsa^c is earlier than that reflected in 4QpIsa^b” (“Isaiah in the Pesharim and Other Qumran Texts,” 628 [n. 81]).

of Nah 1:4aβ. The interlinear addition, in her view, is a direct continuation of the interpretation in line 4: (18)

..... ולכלותם מעל פני [האדמה וכול הנהרות החריב פשרו על הכתיים]	4
... עם [מו]שליהם ...	5a
... אמלל	5

John Strugnell, in contrast, has suggested that the addition between lines 4 and 5 continues an earlier addition between lines 3 and 4: (19)

פשרו על הכתיים]	4a
... ולכלותם מעל פני [הארץ וכל נהרות החריב]	4
עם [כל מו]שליהם אשר תתם ממשלתם]	5a
"אמלל וג"	5

Of these two options Strugnell's is the more plausible one. Gregory Doudna has shown that there is insufficient space in line 4 for the insertion of פשרו על הכתיים or a similar formula. (20) Furthermore, it is problematic to assume that the scribe began to write this interpretation of Nah 1:4aβ, but omitted only its final part. Thus, the entire interpretation of Nah 1:4aβ must be an interlinear addition. (21)

Though this suggestion is not exactly novel, its implications have not yet been clearly spelled out. Neither the remaining context of this interpretation nor the reconstructed quotation of Nah 1:4aβ suggest that this interpretation section was left out by accident and later supplied by the scribe of 4Q169. (22) Instead, this interpretation of Nah 1:4aβ appears to be an addition to an existing Peshier. In an earlier stage of its literary development, *Peshier Nahum* presumably contained a quotation and interpretation of Nah 1:4aβ–b in its entirety. The scribe responsible for 4Q169, however, added an interpretation of Nah 1:4aβ

(18) *The Peshier Nahum Scroll from Qumran*, 41.

(19) "Notes en marge," 206.

(20) *4Q Peshier Nahum: A Critical Edition* (JSPSup 35; CIS 8; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), 282–283 (esp. n. 310).

(21) So also Horgan, *Peshierim*, 168; eadem, *PTSDSSP 6B*: 146 (n. 7); *DSSSE 1*:336; Qimron, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 2:282.

(22) Shani Tzoref suggests that the interlinear addition occurred "presumably to correct the omission of a citation and interpretation of the second half of Nah 1:4" ("Peshier Nahum," in *Outside the Bible: Ancient Jewish Writings Related to Scripture* [ed. Louis H. Feldman, James L. Kugel, and Lawrence H. Schiffman; 3 vols.; Philadelphia, Pa.: The Jewish Publication Society, 2012], 1:623–35 [627]). However, a citation of Nah 1:4aβ was never absent from *Peshier Nahum*, and the interlinear addition need not be a "correction" (its context in 4Q169 exhibits no indications of parablepsis or any other mistake the scribe could have made).

between the lines of this manuscript. (23) By so doing, this scribe altered the structure of *Pesher Nahum*: Nah 1:4aβ was isolated from Nah 1:4b and came to serve as the lemma for the interpretation added between lines 3–4 and 4–5 of 4Q169 1–2 ii.

The reasons for this addition cannot be gauged with certainty. However, the phraseology of this interpretation of Nah 1:4aβ parallels other passages in the Pesharim. Though the Kittim are not explicitly mentioned in what remains of the interlinear addition, they are the most likely subject of this interpretation of Nah 1:4aβ. References to the Kittim occur in various Pesharim; (24) their rulers are mentioned in 4Q163 3–4 i 1–3, 1QpHab IV 5, 10, and perhaps 1Q16 9 1–2; and 1QpHab II 13–14 refers to “the dominion of the Kittim” (ממשלת הכתיאים). The directions of these intertextual connections cannot always be reconstructed, but some of these references to the Kittim and their rulers may well have inspired the scribe of 4Q169 as he added this interpretation of Nah 1:4aβ between the lines of this manuscript. Like the addition in 4Q163/*Pesher Isaiah C*, this addition points to the ongoing literary and exegetical development of the Pesharim.

4Q171 1–10 iii 2–8

A final example comes from 4Q171/*Pesher Psalms A*. 4Q171 1–10 iii 2–8 offer a quotation and interpretation of Ps 37:19b–20, divided into multiple lemmata and interpretations:

ובימי רעב יש[בע]ו כיא רשעים יובדו פשרו א[שר] יהים ברעב במועד ה[תע]נית
ורבים יובדו ברעב ובדבר כול אשר לוא יצא[ו משם] להיות [ע]ם עדת בחירו
אשר יהיו רשים ושרים ע[ל] ... צון בתוך עדריהם כלו כעשן כולו פשר על שרי
הר[ש]עה אשר הונו את עם קודשו אשר יובדו כעשן האוב[ד בר]ח

“And in days of famine they shall be sa[tisfi]ed, but the wicked shall perish” (Ps 37:19b–20aα). Its interpretation: t[hat] he shall keep them alive during famine, in the time of af[flic]tion, but many shall perish through famine and pestilence—all those who did not go [out from there] to be [wi]th the congregation of his chosen ones, who shall be chiefs and princes ov[er ...] sheep in the midst of their flocks. “All of them shall finish like smoke” (Ps 37:20b). The interpretation concerns the princes of wi[cked]ness, who oppressed his holy people, who shall perish like smoke evaporat[ing in the win]d.

(23) The interlinear addition is in the same hand as the body of the manuscript.

(24) See George J. Brooke, “The Kittim in the Qumran Pesharim,” in *Images of Empire* (ed. Loveday Alexander; JSOTSup 122; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991), 135–59.

A quotation of Ps 37:20aβγ is added between lines 4 and 5:

ואוהבי ה' כיקר כוריים פשר[ו]

“And those who love the Lord are like the splendour of lambs”
(Ps 37:20aβγ). [Its] interpretation:

This interlinear addition has generally been taken as a scribal correction. Strugnell suggested that the original text of this passage read עדת בחירו ואוהבי ה' כיקר כוריים פשרו על עדת בחירו אשר וג' and that the double occurrence of *בחיִרו* caused “une haplographie accidentelle.” (25) The omitted words were later supplied between the lines. (26)

Considering that Strugnell's scenario is based entirely on reconstruction, (27) room remains to ponder alternatives. To understand the interlinear addition of Ps 37:20aβγ it is necessary, in my view, to consider the treatment of Ps 37:20 as a whole in *Pesher Psalms A*. On a first reading, this verse portrays the enemies of the Lord in a positive light (*יקר* being an unequivocally positive term). (28) So, there is an apparent contradiction between the prediction that the enemies of the Lord shall perish and the statement that they are “like the splendour of lambs.” (29) The *Pesher* exegete seems concerned to solve this

(25) “Notes en marge,” 214.

(26) Strugnell is followed by Horgan, *Pesharim*, 215; eadem, *PTSDSSP 6B:14*; Qimron, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 2:302.

(27) Doudna has made a case for the originality of Ps 37:20aβγ in *Pesher Psalms A* on the basis of the structure of the *Pesher* and the contents of these lines. In his view, “the interlinear insertion clearly belongs in the text as originally composed. This can be reconstructed not only because otherwise part of the quotation is missing, but also because the end of the *pesher*—before the correction—assumes the existence of the missing words of the quotation” (*4Q Pesher Nahum*, 243).

In my view, the initial absence of Ps 37:20aβγ, though unparalleled in 4Q171, can be understood as a response to an exegetical problem in Ps 37:20, which the *Pesher* exegete sought to solve (see below). Moreover, the reference to “sheep in the midst of their flocks” does not require an explicit quotation of Ps 37:20aβγ, but may allude to its contents even when an explicit quotation is absent. See, e.g., 4Q174 1–2 + 21 i 10–12, which quotes parts of 2 Sam 7:11–14 and applies them to “the Shoot of David who stands with the Interpreter of the Law ... in the latter days.” This reference to the latter days is probably inspired by the use of *מליא* in combination with *יום* in 2 Sam 7:12aa (which the commentary may have read as: “your days are fulfilled”). However, 2 Sam 7:12aa is not quoted in the lemma in 4Q174. On the connection between *מלא* and references to the latter days see Berrin (Tzoref), *The Pesher Nahum Scroll from Qumran*, 156 (n. 80), 237.

(28) I am reasoning here on the basis of the MT. The quotations of Ps 37:20 in 4Q171 exhibit some variant readings, some of which are attempts to solve exegetical problems in this verse (see below).

(29) Or: “the splendour of pastures” (depending on which root is considered to be behind *כריים*). I speak of an *apparent* contradiction rather than a *necessary* one. For

problem. To this end he divides Ps 37:20 up into three parts. (30) Ps 37:20 $\alpha\alpha$ is combined with Ps 37:19b, creating a lemma that describes the different fates of the righteousness and the wicked in times of famine. Ps 37:20b stands on its own and foretells the certain doom of the wicked. The enigmatic middle part of the verse (Ps 37:20 $\alpha\beta\gamma$) is isolated from the predictions of doom in Ps 37:20 $\alpha\alpha$ and b, and appears to have fallen out from the stretch of scriptural quotations in 4Q171/*Pesher Psalms A*. The succession of Ps 37:19b–20 $\alpha\alpha$ and Ps 37:20b that results from this omission offers a smooth basis for interpretation, as it yields a neat contrast between the fates of the wicked and the righteous.

If this scenario is correct, an earlier version of *Pesher Psalms A* contained only a quotation of Ps 37:19b–20 $\alpha\alpha$ with its interpretation (4Q171 1–10 iii 2–6). However, a different scribe or exegete (31) noted the absence of Ps 37:20 $\alpha\beta\gamma$ from 4Q171 and added it, with a *pēšer*-formula, between lines 4 and 5. In the process, he altered the text from “the enemies of the Lord” to “those who love the Lord”—a change which still reflects some unease with the meaning of Ps 37:20 $\alpha\beta\gamma$ in its MT-like form. (32) The quotation and the *pēšer*-formula were meant to be inserted after **בַּחִירוֹ** in line 5. This insertion split up the earlier interpretation of Ps 37:19b–20 $\alpha\alpha$: its first part (**פֶּשְׁרוֹ אֲשֶׁר ... עַדְתָּ**; **בַּחִירוֹ**; lines 3–5) remained attached to its original lemma, while its second part (**בְּתוֹךְ עַדְרֵיהֶם ... פֶּשְׁרוֹ אֲשֶׁר**; lines 5a–6) came to belong with the new lemma (Ps 37:20 $\alpha\beta\gamma$).

our purposes, it suffices to note that the Peshet commentator saw a contradiction here. Modern scholars have accounted for the meaning of Ps 37:20 by assuming that it evokes the image of either the perfect animals destined for sacrifice or the grass that would soon wither and pass away.

(30) The structure of 4Q171 may support the idea that the exegete had problems when he interpreted Ps 37:20. With the sole exception of Ps 37:9 in 4Q171 1–10 ii and Ps 45:2 in 4Q171 1–10 iv (which are both divided in two parts), all lemmata in 4Q171 coincide with Masoretic verse boundaries. The division of Ps 37:20 into three parts may express the difficulties the commentator had with this verse. Cf. Emanuel Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert* (STDJ 54; Leiden: Brill, 2004; repr., Atlanta, Ga.: Society of Biblical Literature, 2009), 325 (Appendix 7).

(31) The hand of the addition differs from that of the body of the manuscript. See Strugnell, “Notes en marge,” 214.

(32) The change from “the enemies of the Lord” to “those who love the Lord” creates a smoother connection between this part of Ps 37:20 $\alpha\beta\gamma$ and the positive reference to **יִקְרַהֲבֵם** (אויבים). Eibert Tigchelaar (personal communication d.d. 3 March, 2016) suggests that a confusion between *heh* and *waw-yod* (note the unexpected shape of the *heh* in **אֹהֲבֵי**) may have caused this alteration. For me, these explanations are not mutually exclusive: a graphical similarity between letters may have worked together with the exegetical trigger to yield the change from **אויבים** to **אֹהֲבֵי**.

Conclusion

The preceding observations lend further support to viewing the Pesharim as open-ended exegetical works, partaking in living and continuous traditions of scriptural interpretation. These three interlinear additions are physical expressions of such traditions and illustrate the shape that literary developments in the Pesharim may assume—though without claiming that this is the *only* form in which these could occur. Finally, these additions shed light on scribal practices and the inclusion of exegetical additions in ancient manuscripts. Such additions may be rare in biblical manuscripts, (33) but these three cases testify that interlinear exegetical additions did belong to the toolkit of ancient scribes.

Pieter B. HARTOG
Leuven/Groningen

(33) See Emanuel Tov, “Glosses, Interpolations, and Other Types of Scribal Additions in the Text of the Hebrew Bible,” in *Language, Theology, and the Bible: Essays in Honour of James Barr* (ed. Samuel E. Balentine and John Barton; Oxford: Clarendon, 1994), 40–66; repr. in *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint* (VTSup 72; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 53–74.