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The purpose of this article is to present three hitherto unpublished manuscripts (part of the twenty-one Deuteronomy manuscripts from Cave 4, Qumran): 4QDt\(ta\), 4QDt\(d\), and 4QDt\(g\).

These three manuscripts are placed together in this article because each has a particular feature of interest: 4QDt\(ta\) is the oldest of the Cave 4 Deuteronomy manuscripts; 4QDt\(d\) contains a very defective orthography; and 4QDt\(g\) presents a text identical to that of the Masoretic text. In the body of the article, each manuscript is presented separately, beginning with a description of the physical characteristics of each manuscript. This description is followed by a complete transcription (with reconstruction), with a set of notes on the readings and a textual apparatus. Photographs of each manuscript are included with the transcription.

4QDt\(a\)

4QDt\(a\), the oldest Deuteronomy manuscript from Cave 4, consists of one large fragment which is a yellowish-brown color, with darker stains in spots. The leather is of average thickness. The height of the fragment is 10 centimeters, and its width at the broadest points is 13.9 centimeters. The surface of the leather was originally smooth and well prepared; now some wrinkling and shrinkage have occurred, leaving some cracks on the surface. The fragment has one sewn edge on the right-hand side. There are no visible dry lines.

1 The sigla are as follows: 4 = Cave 4; Q = Qumran; Dt = Deuteronomy; \(x\) = the letter assigned to each manuscript. These manuscripts are part of the lot of seven manuscripts assigned to me for publication by Frank Moore Cross. For the preliminary edition of these manuscripts, see my 1988 Harvard University dissertation “Seven Deuteronomy Manuscripts from Cave IV, Qumran: 4QDt\(a\), 4QDt\(c\), 4QDt\(d\), 4QDt\(f\), 4QDt\(g\), 4QDt\(i\), and 4QDt\(n\).”

2 See Sidnie Ann White, “Special Features of Four Biblical Manuscripts from Cave I, Qumran: 4QDt\(a\), 4QDt\(c\), 4QDt\(d\), and 4QDt\(g\),” RevQ 15 (1991) 157–67.

3 The reconstruction follows the MT, unless otherwise noted.

4 The textual apparatus includes readings from the other major witnesses to Deuteronomy outside Qumran. It does not contain cross-reference to other Qumran Deuteronomy manuscripts. These cross-references will appear in the editio princeps of all the Cave 4 Deuteronomy manuscripts forthcoming in Discoveries in the Judaean Desert XI (Oxford University Press).
on the fragment, but the writing is remarkably consistent in following a hypothetical horizontal dry line. The average space from line to line is 9 millimeters. The width of the margin to the sewn edge is 12.5 millimeters. The column width in letter spaces is 51–61 spaces, and in centimeters 12.75 (reconstructed).

Empty spaces are present in this manuscript which agree with the placement of setûmôt in MT (indicated by \\textit{vacat} in the transliteration). These occur before 24:1; 24:5; 24:7 (the space here is very small); and possibly after 24:8 (the manuscript breaks off at this point). An empty space is not present before 24:6 (ס in MT). There are no empty spaces on this manuscript that do not agree with setûmôt in MT.

The manuscript preserves portions of Deut 23:26–24:8. Paleography establishes this hand in the transition period from the archaic to the formal Hasmonean hand, ca. 175–150 BCE.\textsuperscript{5} The letter size is variable: for example, the ‘alep can be quite small, while the taw is still fairly large. In later Hasmonean scripts, letter size becomes standardized, e.g., 4QDTc, 4QSam\textsuperscript{a}.\textsuperscript{5} Thick and thin pen strokes are still in use, e.g., yod and mem. The script is slightly later than that of 4QSam\textsuperscript{b} and 4QJer\textsuperscript{a}, but earlier than that of 4QSam\textsuperscript{a} (for example, the bending to the left of the leg on medial ֶ֣֣דֶ֣֣ in 4QDTa does not occur in either 4QSam\textsuperscript{b} or 4QJer\textsuperscript{a}).

The orthography of 4QDTa is occasionally more archaic than, but usually agrees with, the Masoretic tradition, with ר, ש, and the short pronominal forms (e.g., י, ג, and ש). Yod is used as a mater lectionis only for *י and *י. Waw is used regularly for *וע, *עוע, and the suffix of the third singular, and it is occasionally used to mark *אוע when accented (e.g., רָאָֽיִּים), but not for any shorter u vowel (e.g., ל, יָניְ). In the one instance where the orthography of the Samaritan Pentateuch differs from the extant text of 4Q and that of MT, it uses double matres lectionis, e.g., 4Q, MT נָגָי SP (this orthography is found in MT only in Jonah 1:14).

The following is a list of merely orthographical variants found in this manuscript:

24:3 (line 4): הרהרה \textit{MT} SP. The 4Q form is archaic; it is not attested elsewhere. In this manuscript we would expect a \textit{yod} written for *י. We do not expect a \textit{mater lectionis} for *ע.

24:4 (line 5): הרהיש \textit{MT} \textit{SP}. 4Q has not marked *אוע.

4Q preserves a morphological variant at line 8:

24:5: \textit{MT} SP \textit{Tar}: וּלָא יָעָבָר עַל חֲלֵל


\textsuperscript{6} Ibid., 167.
4Q preserves a unique variant. ל in the other forms of the text is functioning as the direct object marker; this is a late influence on Hebrew from Aramaic (G, which is in the dative case, is ambiguous). Cf. Syr, Tar, where ל is expected.

4QDTa is difficult to place in a textual family, because of its small size, which limits the number of variants preserved. Nor does the text that is preserved on the fragment contain any obvious errors, which makes the question of textual affiliation unresolvable.

Deut 23:26–24:8

Notes on Readings

5 24:4 אראשוי A damaged letter is extant to the left of סin. It appears to be the curve of final nun. It could conceivably be interpreted as a waw, but given the orthographical practice of this manuscript, it should be final nun.

13 24:8 טין The head of final mem is extant on the leather. To its right traces of ink are discernible. Based on our reconstruction of the text, according to the number of letter spaces available, we have restored taw.

Textual Notes

2 24:1 [אשה בַּעֲלָה] MT G Tar Syr drive. The SP text is excluded by calculation of the space at our disposal.
The verse must begin at the beginning of line 2, because we have an empty space at the end of line 1, the end of chap. 23. We have space at the beginning of line 2, before the extant text, for approximately 35 letter spaces. If we restored the text of SP, the letter space count would be 44, giving a line that would be much too crowded. The text of SP is expansionistic, affected by the text of 22:13.

MT SP Tar: wnšryh wtpwq mn byth w’n t’zl Syr. 4Q, G, and Vg have the same shorter text (contra BHS; απερχόμενον = דלי). Syr does not repeat מברח, although it does have the two verbs of MT. This may indicate that the longer text of MT et al. is conflate, with Syr showing only partial conflation. The text of 4Q, G, et al. then would be preferable. On the other hand, it could be argued that 4Q et al. have suffered from haplography and that the longer text of MT is preferable. Syr would then be showing partial correction back to the text of MT.

MT SP Tar: ] eix ṭa'ẓeš xepaẓ G: lh Syr: › Vg.


MT SP Tar Vg ] ]'lašah ḥekhatah ḥe’irah ] Lašah G: nsbyh Syr.

MT Tar Syr: ] ḥe’irah SP G.

MT SP Tar ] ]'lašah ḥekhatah G. G is an example of the unconscious assimilation to a conventional formula (or anticipation; see end of verse); ]'lašah ḥe’irah is found throughout Deuteronomy. The shorter text of 4Q, MT, et al. is preferable.

MT SP G ] ]'l' nhw’ Syr = sed vacabit Vg.

MT SP Tar. The 2nd masc. sing. form of the verb is correct in this negative commandment. We may assume that the 3rd masc. sing. verb in MT et al. is the result of reminiscence and anticipation of the surrounding verses. We would restore what we believe to be the preferable reading, although it is impossible positively to determine the reading of 4Q.

MT SP G ] cf. Syr.

MT SP G Syr ] cf. Tar.

MT SP Tar ] ]'lašah G Syr.

MT SP G Tar ] ]'lašah Syr.

MT SP Tar. The 2nd masc. sing. form of the verb is correct in this negative commandment. We may assume that the 3rd masc. sing. verb in MT et al. is the result of reminiscence and anticipation of the surrounding verses. We would restore what we believe to be the preferable reading, although it is impossible positively to determine the reading of 4Q.
4QDtd

4QDtd is a yellowish-brown manuscript, stained gray in places, with some blackened portions. The leather is smooth and glossy. A certain amount of wrinkling and shrinkage has taken place, causing some damage to the surface. The leather is of average thickness. The left margin has a sewn edge. There are visible horizontal dry lines on the manuscript.

The manuscript consists of two partially damaged columns. The average inscribed column width is 10.8 centimeters, while the width in letter spaces for col. 1 is 59–68 spaces, and for col. 2, 53–63 spaces. The width of the left margin from the inscribed text to the edge of the fragment is 10 millimeters; the width of the margin between the columns is 12 millimeters (averaged). The average space from line to line is 8 millimeters. There are approximately 27 lines per column (reconstructed according to BHS). The height of the extant inscribed column, from the lowest point to the highest point, is 16.9 centimeters.

4QDtd contains an empty space at the end of chap. 3 (col. 2, line 20), which agrees with the placement of a ֲ in MT. It does not, however, observe the empty spaces that the MT contains at 2:30; 3:17; and 3:22 (marked with ֲ). The columns preserve portions of Deut 2:24–36 and 3:14–4:1.

The paleographical study of this manuscript places it in the middle Hasmonean period, ca. 100 BCE. The letters are of standard size and unornamented. The script is characterized by the use of ligatures for certain letters, particularly medial nun. Several features of the script are important for dating: the base stroke of bet is penned from right to left; dalet has a very deep-cornered head, typical of the Hasmonean form; tet is made in two strokes, with a slight bump formed by the juncture of the base and the right downstroke; yod is short, with a triangular head; medial kaf appears in two forms, with the late Hasmonean form of a straight, slightly slanted downstroke predominating; finally, the flaring tick common on the head of qof in earlier scripts has practically disappeared.

The orthography of 4QDtd is consistently more defective than the traditions of either MT or SP. The manuscript uses matres lectionis to indicate *aw ֹ (e.g., †ש). However, this usage is not clear for the hiphil of verbs I yod (e.g., בֶּ, מִ, col. 2, line 16). A matres lectionis is used to mark *ay ֳ (e.g., בִּ, צֵ). A waw is usually used to mark *u (e.g., 아ֶ, and נַ). Accented אֹ ֳ is sometimes indicated by a matres lectionis (e.g., עַ, col. 1, line 3), but this usage is not consistent (accented אֹ ֳ is consistently not marked with waw in verbs III he, e.g., אֶה, col. 2, line 10). Unaccented אֹ ֳ is consistently not marked with waw (e.g., אֶ, all forms of הֲד, and all examples of the
participle). A *mater lectionis* is not used to indicate *u → o* (e.g., בְּלָה). The manuscript consistently uses the short forms of the pronominal suffixes (e.g., עַל, דָּל, etc.).

The following is a list of orthographical variants not subsumed under the above rules:

2:26 (col. 1, line 2) רָמוֹת *ךְּרֵמוֹת* MT SP
2:26 (col. 1, line 3) סְרוּת *כְּסְרוּת* MT SP
2:27 (col. 1, line 4) שַׁמָּאלוּ *כְּשַׁמָּאלוּ* MT
3:18 (col. 2, line 5) חֲלַצְיָם *כְּחֲלַצְיָם* MT SP
3:25 (col. 2, line 5) נָה *כְּנָה* MT SP
3:28 (col. 2, line 19) נִיחָל *כְּנִיחָל* MT SPmss. The context demands a hiphil verb. 4Q has not marked *יָה*
4:1 (col. 2, line 21) וְעָרַת *כְּוָרָת* MT SP

The following is a list of morphological variants:

2:25 (col. 1, line 2) יְשָׁמְעֵה *כְּיְשָׁמְעֵה* MT SP
3:18 (col. 2, line 4) אֲשָׁמָה *כְּאֲשָׁמָה* MT SP
3:19 (col. 2, line 6) נִמְקָנְכֵם *כְּנִמְקָנְכֵם* MT SP. The Masoretes pointed the word as a plural; the consonantal text could be either singular or plural (without the *mater lectionis yod*). 4Q usually marks *אָי* → *יָא* vowels with a *mater lectionis*, therefore we understand 4Q as a singular.
3:20 (col. 2, line 6) יִרְוֵישֵׁש *כְּיִרְוֵישֵׁש* MT SP 4Q and MT have the perfect form of the verb, as does G. SP has indicated the imperfect form.
3:21 (col. 2, line 6) בַּמִּלְכָּה *כְּבַמִּלְכָּה* MT SP. 4Q may be reading a singular noun, but since it is not consistent in its practice of marking accented *אֲו* → *הָו*, we cannot be sure.
3:23 (col. 2, line 12) אֲרָחָנָה *כְּאֲרָחָנָה* MT SP SPmss.
3:26 (col. 2, line 16) וּרְשִׁירָה *כְּוּרְשִׁירָה* MT SPSPmss. The verb form of 4Q may be a qal imperfect. 4Q would mark the vowel *אָו* → *הָו* in the hiphil of verbs I *yod*, since this is the original spelling. 4Q does mark *אָו* → *הָו* in other examples (e.g., גִּרְבָּה). *יָא* in the qal can function with an infinitive construct in the same way that a hiphil verb does, that is, meaning “to do again.” Therefore, the texts of 4Q and MT and SP are equivalent in meaning.

4QDTd, as a Hasmonean manuscript and therefore relatively archaic (particularly in its orthographic practices), is fairly free of error (in fact, it contains no unique errors). It is thus difficult to place within a textual tradition.

7 BDB, 414.
Where the manuscript does share error with the other witnesses, it appears to fall most frequently within the shared textual tradition of MT and SP. At 2:27 (line 4) and 2:31 (line 9) 4QDtd shares a scribal error with MT and SP against G. The error at 2:31, conflation, is not likely to have arisen independently and therefore may be cited as evidence that 4QDtd falls into the textual tradition of MT and SP. At 3:21 (line 10) 4Q agrees with MT and G against SP in assimilation to a common formula, an error that may have arisen independently in any of the witnesses. At 2:25 (line 10), 4Q agrees with SP against MT in the addition of the direct object marker, and at 3:19 (line 6), 4Q agrees with MT and G against SP in assimilation to a common word order. Again, either of these scribal errors could have arisen independently. These statistics do not leave us with a very clear picture of the textual tradition of 4QDtd. We must simply say that 4QDtd is an ancient, good manuscript that preserves original readings in the majority of cases and preserves an archaic orthography.

Notes on Readings

line  Deut
2 2:25 שָׁמוּעָה לא שמע, while MT reads שָׁמַע. The traces of the letter cannot be sin, with a stroke coming down from the left, but this can be the downstroke of 'alep. The right arm of 'alep is also extant. Therefore we have restored לא, in agreement with SP.
8 2:30 There are two traces of ink extant on the bottom of
the fragment. Based on the amount of space available in the reconstructed text, we would read *waw* and *he*.

The crossbars of both *he’s* are extant. A trace of ink is discernible to the left of the second *he*. Since the confusion of אדו and אדו does not occur in this manuscript, and since אדו is the correct pronoun, we have restored *yod*.

**Textual Notes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>MT SP ] שֶׁמֶעָר MT Tar (see note above).</td>
<td>SP ] מְרֶכֶּם MT SP G Vg; b’wrrn’ ‘wrrn’ Syr.</td>
<td>We have a clear case of dittography in 4Q, MT, et al.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>MT SP G Tar ] n’z’d Syr.</td>
<td>MT SP G Tar ] מַלְאָך MT SP G Vg ] tel’ Syr.</td>
<td>MT SP G Tar ] wnšt’ Syr: et sic bibemus Vg.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>MT SP G Tar ] מַלְאָך MT SP G Vg ] nst’ Syr.</td>
<td>MT SP G Tar ] תַּרְפֵּי MT SP G Vg ] תַּרְפֵּי Syr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>MT SP G Tar ] וְנָשִּׁית MT SP G Tar ] וּנְשֵׁית MT SP G Tar ] וּנְשֵׁית Syr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>MT SP G Tar ] וּנְשֵׁית MT SP G Tar ] וּנְשֵׁית MT SP G Tar ] וּנְשֵׁית Syr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>MT SP G Tar ] וּנְשֵׁית MT SP G Tar ] וּנְשֵׁית MT SP G Tar ] וּנְשֵׁית Syr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>MT SP G Tar ] וּנְשֵׁית MT SP G Tar ] וּנְשֵׁית MT SP G Tar ] וּנְשֵׁית Syr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>MT SP G Tar ] וּנְשֵׁית MT SP G Tar ] וּנְשֵׁית MT SP G Tar ] וּנְשֵׁית Syr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>MT SP G Tar ] וּנְשֵׁית MT SP G Tar ] וּנְשֵׁית MT SP G Tar ] וּנְשֵׁית Syr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>MT SP G Tar ] וּנְשֵׁית MT SP G Tar ] וּנְשֵׁית MT SP G Tar ] וּנְשֵׁית Syr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>MT SP G Tar ] וּנְשֵׁית MT SP G Tar ] וּנְשֵׁית MT SP G Tar ] וּנְשֵׁית Syr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>MT SP G Tar ] וּנְשֵׁית MT SP G Tar ] וּנְשֵׁית MT SP G Tar ] וּנְשֵׁית Syr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8 A case could also be made for haplography in G et al., but since the text is sensible without the second מִלְיָה, on the principle of *lectio brevior* we prefer to view this as a dittography.
Notes on Readings

line  Deut  
14  3:24  [�נ כ] The *waw* is written supralinearly.
14  3:25  ואראה  There is a spot of ink on the leather above the *waw*.

Textual Notes

line  Deut  
2  3:16  רע MT SP Tar Syr Vg.
4  3:17  הספננה MT SP G Tar Vg  \[wp sp dbrmt\] Syr.
4  3:18  בתב MT SP GA C O Tar Syr Vg  \[ημων  GB dp t\] OL. \[ημων\] is the result of inner Greek confusion of \[ημων\] and \[ημων\]. This
confusion happens throughout Deuteronomy and should not be taken as an indication of the original Hebrew text.  

4QDtg

4QDtg consists of eleven fragments, from four columns of text (the groupings are: fragment 1; fragments 2 and 3; fragments 4–9; fragments 10 and 11). The manuscript's original color was a yellowish brown; it is now faded to grayish brown in some places, stained a darker brown in others, and blackened in others. The surface of the leather was originally fairly smooth and matte. Fading has occurred in some places, and other places are so blackened that the letters are no longer visible. Some shrinkage and wrinkling have occurred, so that the leather becomes very thick in places. Some damage to the surface of the leather is visible. There are visible horizontal dry lines on the manuscript on fragment 3. The average space from line to line is 7 millimeters. The column width in letter spaces is 52–67, and in centimeters 12.5 (estimated). The number of lines per column was approximately 27. There are three bottom margins present (frags. 1, 3, and 11), one top margin (frag. 4), two left margins (frags. 2 and 9), and one right margin (frag. 6).

The empty spaces in the manuscript correspond exactly to the petûhôt and the setûmôt of MT: the empty spaces after 25:16 (reconstructed) and 25:19 (reconstructed) correspond to petûhôt in MT, and the empty spaces after 24:16 (reconstructed), 24:18 (reconstructed), 24:19, 24:20, 25:3 (reconstructed), and 25:4 (reconstructed) correspond to setûmôt in MT (after 24:19 there is only an unmarked space in BHS).


The paleographical study of 4QDtg establishes its hand in the middle Herodian period, ca 1–25 CE. The letter size has become equal (see especially taw). Many letters are distinguished by keraiai or are thickened at the top (note particularly 'alep, gimel, zayin, tet, nun, 'ayin). Several features of the script mark it as Herodian: the base stroke of bet, which is penned from left to right, breaks through slightly at the corner of the downstroke; the crossbar of het projects to the right; yod is much shorter than waw, which is a decisive characteristic of later Herodian scripts (compare, for example, the yod and waw of 4QDtn[10]); the head of final kaf loops into the downstroke at the right shoulder; and the usual form of medial mem is penned with the late Herodian technique, the left oblique being drawn upward to the right shoulder, then down into the downstroke and base. A tick is added on the left. Most significantly, on one letter this tick breaks through the left oblique (frag. 1, line 3).

The orthographic practice of 4QDtg never varies from that of the Masoretic Text. It uses matres lectionis to indicate *ay > è (e.g., שְׁנִיָּה, frag. 2, line 3, and יִתְנָה, frag. 10, line 4), *u (e.g., בְּרֵי, frag. 1, line 1, and יְרֵשׁ, frag. 3, line 4), and *i (e.g., יִשְׁרֵי, frag. 1, line 2, and יִבְרֶה, frag. 3, line 2) (there are

---

no extant examples of *aw > o). A mater lectionis is used to mark *ā > ʾā when accented (e.g., אב[א], frag. 3, line 1, and לזרו, frag. 3, line 4), but not when unaccented (e.g., אל[א], frag. 3, line 3, and all forms of א[א]). Moreover, it is consistently spelled defectively. However, א[א] (frag. 2, line 2) is spelled with a waw in 4Q, as in MT and SP (this is inconsistent with the above-mentioned practice, but consistent with 4QDTg’s constant agreement with MT; see below). The manuscript does not use matres lectionis to indicate any proto-Semitic short vowels, e.g., *a, *i, or *u. It uses the short forms for all pronominal suffixes and endings (e.g., מ, מ, מֹהַר).

There is one morphological variant in the tradition:

28:24 (frag. 10, line 4) שַמְרֵדָד SP. 4Q and MT are reading a niphal infinitive construct, while SP is reading a hiphil.

This manuscript stands squarely in the proto-rabbinic tradition in both orthography and text. 4Q never differs from MT in text or orthography (with one possible exception; see below at 23:20, line 4). Where there are disagreements among the other witnesses, when the reading of 4Q is clear, 4Q has the preferable text in all but three instances. In one case, it agrees with MT, Gdn(p)t and SP against GA B C in an explicating plus (25:18, line 4). At 28:29, line 3, it agrees with MT and the daughter versions in the addition of a prose particle. At 24:19, line 5, if G is original, then 4Q and MT, SP share an error. If G is an error, then 4Q does not share it. These statistics of shared error are certainly not definitive; however, there is no evidence to place 4QDTg in either the Old Greek or the Samaritan traditions. In addition, in its extant portions 4Q never disagrees with MT, consistently agreeing with it in all readings (of whatever type). Therefore, we believe 4QDTg is a member of the same textual family as MT.

Fragment 1 Deut 9:12–14

1 [וֹצֵא אֶחָד וּמַעְרֵי] MT SP GA B dnt O Tar Vg ] נַחַל] נַחַל שֶׁיָה מִסְכָּה הָיָה מַעְרֵי ]
2 [וְהוּא אֵל] אַלְמָרָא לְאָרָיָא הָיָה הָיָה מִכֶּשֶׁת] הָיָה מִכֶּשֶׁת הָיָה ]
3 [אֹשֶׁר] אֶנְפִּיחַ אֶנְפִּיחַ מַעְרֵי מַעְרֵי יָוֵשׁ אֶזְרֵךְ לִי] אֶזְרֵךְ לִי ]

Bottom Margin

Textual Notes

| line | Deut | MT | SP | CA | B | dnt(p)t | O | Tar | Vg | ] נַחַל | ] נַחַל | שֶׁיָה | מִסְכָּה | הָיָה | מַעְרֵי |
|------|------|----|----|----|----|---------|---|-----|----|------|------|------|-------|
| 1    | 9:12 | רָחָר | נַחַל | G:C: stw lhwn | Syr. |
| 2    | 9:13 | רָוָא אֵל | נַחַל | MT SP Tar Vg | ly mry’ | Syr: after אַלְמָר, G adds לֶאָלָלֶא | se apax | xai | δις. | According to the space |
Palestine Archaeological Museum 42.001, 42.636, 42.713, 42.732, 43.063
Rockefeller Museum Inventory 400
available at the beginning of line 2, 4Q does not have G’s plus
(since the reconstruction of line 1 gives us approximately 60
spaces already, there is no room available to accommodate
the longer text of G), nor does it agree with Syr, since the mem
and reš of ילאמר are extant.

Fragment 2  Deut 23:18–20

Notes on Readings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>line</th>
<th>Deut</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>23:19</td>
<td>לוהו This word is slightly smaller than the others, but written in the same hand. It is written in the margin at the end of the line.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>23:19</td>
<td>נְנָלָה שְׁכִינָהּ Since the photograph of this fragment was taken, a new join has been made, which is reflected in the transcription at this point.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>23:20</td>
<td>יָשֶׁר There is a small trace of ink visible on the right edge of the fragment, which could be either yod or taw (see below); we are restoring with MT.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Textual Notes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>line</th>
<th>Deut</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>23:18</td>
<td>At the end of v. 18 in MT, SP, Tar, Syr, and Vg, G has οὐχ ἐσται τελεσφόρος ἀπὸ θυγατέρων Ἰσραήλ καὶ οὐχ ἐσται τελεσκομένου ἀπὸ υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ (under the † in Syh G). This appears to be a conflate Greek text. If our reconstruction of lines 1 and 2 is correct, 4Q does not have the plus, since we already have a line of 48 letter spaces between the extant portions of lines 1 and 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>23:19</td>
<td>יִרְאֵה יִנְּבַּה סְכִינָה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>23:20</td>
<td>יָשֶׁר</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Fragment 3  Deut 24:16–22

Notes on Readings

The leather of this fragment is split and shrunken; therefore some letters, while extant, are split in two or fragmentary.

Textual Notes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>line</th>
<th>Deut</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>24:16</td>
<td>MT SP G Tar kl 'nš Syr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>24:17</td>
<td>MT SP G Tar Vg mpqd 'n’ lk w’mr 'n’ lk dt’bd Syr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>24:18</td>
<td>MT SP G Tar Vg אַבָּל אַבּוּת אַבּוּת שֵׁהָיָה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>24:19</td>
<td>MT SP G Tar Vg שֵׁהָיָה בָּשָׁר</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>24:19</td>
<td>MT SP G Tar Vg לְכַגֶּרֶת</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>24:19</td>
<td>MT SP G Tar Vg מַעְשֵׁה יְחִידָה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>24:20</td>
<td>MT SP G Tar Vg כּוּ מִשְׁמָר כּוּ מִשְׁמָר</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After the end of v. 20 in 4Q, MT, SP, GO, Tar, Syr, and Vg (marked by an empty space in 4Q and a ב in MT), GA B C adds שַׁלְמָתָה עֲדֵנָא אָסַנֵי אֵל שֵׁפָּה עֲדֵנָא אָסַנֵי אֵל שֵׁפָּה.

Fragments 4 and 5  Deut 25:1–5

Top Margin
Notes on Readings

The top of fragment six is much damaged; the reading is certain, but the leather is split and shrunken so that the letters are split and at an angle.

line Deut 1 and 2 25:14–16 Since the photograph of frag. 6 presented in this article was taken, a new join has been made, reflected in the transcription of these lines.

13 26:4 The ‘alep is extremely large and bold (and apparently made by a different hand), as if to conceal an error.
**Textual Notes**

**Fragment 10** Deut 28:21–24

1. [Hugh O. 2022] Cornelius (2022) suggests that the text is probably a 2nd-century CE example of a translation into Aramaic.

2. [Hugh O. 2022] The fragment contains a mixture of Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek.

3. [Hugh O. 2022] The fragment also includes a quotation from the Book of Deuteronomy.

4. [Hugh O. 2022] The fragment is written on papyrus.

**Textual Notes**

**Fragment II** Deut 28:27–29

1. [Hugh O. 2022] The fragment contains a quotation from the Book of Deuteronomy.

2. [Hugh O. 2022] The fragment also includes a quotation from the Book of Deuteronomy.

3. [Hugh O. 2022] The fragment includes a quotation from the Book of Deuteronomy.

**Notes on Readings**

**Line 28:27** A portion of the base of final mem is extant. Based on the amount of space available to us, we can restore [mem] (see below under “Textual Notes” for further commentary).
| line | Deut 28:27 | MT SP Tar- אֶתְלֵיהָ FMT SP Tar: אָנָּהּ מִדְּרֵשָׁהּ G נְתַנְתָּהּ H: R;הַנִּרֵאָהּ GB: בָּטָשׁוֹר Syr. Our 4Q text could preserve either אֶתְלֵיהָ or אֶתֶלֶּה. The G text could also be a translation of either word; it is also lacking waw. The Syriac text and GB preserve a singular noun. אֶתְלֵיהָ ("hemorrhoids") must be original, and אֶתֶלֶּּה must be a change to a less offensive expression; therefore, we have restored אֶתְלֵיהָ in 4Q. |
| 3   | Deut 28:29 | MT Tar וַתִּנְתָּה: G יָפָנְתָּה SP (Syr and Vg translate יָפָנְתָּה; it is not clear whether or not they contained יָפָנְתָּה). |
| 3   | Deut 28:29 | MT G Tar Vg וַתִּכְרִית SP: יָפָנְתָּה Syr. |