

4Q PESHER HOSEA^B:
RECONSTRUCTION OF FRAGMENTS 4, 5, 18, AND 24*

GREGORY L. DOUDNA

The Danish Institute for Advanced Studies in the Humanities, Copenhagen

4Q167 Peshar Hosea^b (4QpHos^b) is the surviving remains of an ancient commentary on several chapters of Hosea, one of over a dozen "continuous pesharim" among the Qumran text finds. Although a line quoted from this text was disclosed in 1956 (= 4QpHos^b 2:3),¹ the complete fragments were not brought to light until the publication in 1968 of *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert V* (DJD 5), edited by John Allegro with the collaboration of Arnold Anderson.² Further text-critical work on 4QpHos^b was published by J. Strugnell in 1970,³ M. Horgan in 1979,⁴ the present author in 2001,⁵ and R. Vielhauer in 2001.⁶

Editions and discussions of 4QpHos^b from 1979 to 1999, plus the new *Volume 6B: Pesharim, Other Commentaries, and Related Documents*, of the Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project (hereafter referred to as *Volume 6B*),⁷ have drawn from the early work of

* I would like to thank the Statens Forskningsråd Humanistiske of Denmark, the Institute for Biblical Exegesis of the Theology Faculty of the University of Copenhagen, and the Danish Institute for Advanced Studies in the Humanities (Copenhagen) for the generous support that made this study possible.

¹ J.M. Allegro, "Further Light on the History of the Qumran Sect," *JBL* 75 (1956) 93.

² J.M. Allegro (ed.) with the collaboration of A.A. Anderson, *Qumran Cave 4: I* (DJD 5; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968) 32–36.

³ J. Strugnell, "Notes du Volume V des 'Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan'," *RevQ* 7 (1970) 201–3.

⁴ M. Horgan, *Pesharim: Qumran Interpretation of Biblical Books* (Wash., D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1979) 148–58.

⁵ G. Doudna, *4Q Pesher Nahum: A Critical Edition* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001) 557–73.

⁶ R. Vielhauer, "Materielle Rekonstruktion und Historische Einordnung der Beiden Pescharim zum Hoseabuch (4QpHos^a und 4QpHos^b)," *RevQ* 20 (2001) 39–82.

⁷ J.H. Charlesworth (ed.), *Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations. Volume 6B. Pesharim, Other Commentaries, and Related Documents* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2002) 119–31. The 4QpHos^b edition is by M. Horgan.

Allegro, Strugnell, and Horgan without corrections or further developments of fragment joins, readings, or reconstructions.⁸ The presentation of 4QpHos^b in *Volume 6B* was done by Horgan, essentially unchanged from Horgan's 1979 study (which itself, although it contained original work, largely followed Allegro and Strugnell). On the other hand Vielhauer's 2001 study represents substantial independent and original work, and is currently the most important and reliable existing comprehensive study of 4QpHos^b. The points of comparison with which the present discussion will engage are from *Volume 6B* and Vielhauer.

4QpHos^b (4Q167) consists of about three dozen small fragments presented in DJD 5, with some adjustments in the inventory made by Strugnell.⁹ The extent of writing on the fragments ranges from two letters each in, e.g., frags 29 and 37, to parts of seven lines in frag. 2 (the largest fragment). 4QpHos^b has received relatively little attention except for frag. 2, which has been of interest because of readings in that fragment of כפיר החרון, the "Angry Lion" or "Lion of Wrath," a sobriquet that also appears in 4QpNah, and הַכֹּהֵן הַחֲרֹן, the "Last Priest," a sobriquet not attested in any other Qumran text. Frag. 2 preserves quotations and *peshers* on Hos. 5:13b–15.

In an analysis of 4QpHos^b published in 2001 I showed that joining frag. 10a to frag. 4, as was done by Strugnell in 1970 in his review of Allegro's DJD 5, was incorrect.¹⁰ Strugnell had joined frag. 10a above

Line numbers for 4QpHos^b in the present article follow that of *Volume 6B* of 2002 (which are the same as those in Horgan, *Pesharim*).

⁸ Editions of Qumran texts with 4QpHos^b include J. Carmignac, É. Cothenet, and H. Lignée, *Les Textes de Qumran. Traduits et Annotés* (Paris, 1963) 77–81; R. Amusin, *Teksty Kumrana* (Moscow, 1971); F. García Martínez, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated. The Qumran Texts in English* (trans. W.G.E. Watson; Leiden: Brill, 1994) 192–93; G. Vermes, *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English* (4th edn; New York: Penguin, 1995) 334; J. Maier (ed.), *Die Qumran-Essener: Die Texte vom Toten Meer* (Munich and Basel: Reinhardt, 1995) 2. 84–87; M.O. Wise, M. Abegg, and E. Cook, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Translation* (New York: Harper Collins, 1996) 215; and F. García Martínez and E.J.C. Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (Leiden: Brill, 1997) 2. 331–33. See also M. Bernstein, "Peshar Hosea," *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (eds L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000) 2.650–51.

⁹ Strugnell identified fragments 9 and 36 of 4Q167 pHos^b in DJD 5 as belonging instead to 4Q168 pMic, and also expressed doubts that fragments 27, 28, 30, and 31 were from 4QpHos^b (Strugnell, "Notes," 203).

¹⁰ Doudna, *4Q Peshar Nahum*, 564–65. My reasons for rejecting Strugnell's join of frag. 10a were: (a) the line of letters in frag. 10a after the join produces an odd vertical spacing interval; (b) the line of letters in frag. 10a after the join is not parallel to the lines below it; and (c) the identification by Strugnell and other editions of לנו, "to

frag. 4, and frags 18 and 24 below frag. 4, making four joined fragments in all (PAM 44.189). Strugnell's join of frag. 10a changed the reconstructed positioning of all of these fragments with respect to frag. 2. Whereas DJD 5 had identified frag. 4 as the remains of a quotation from Hos. 6:2–3 (only two verses after Hos. 5:13b–15 of frag. 2), Strugnell's frag. 10a made this impossible. Strugnell identified his new cluster (Frag. 10a, 4, 18, 24) as the remains of a quotation and *peshet* on Hos. 6:11. However, while Strugnell's joins of frags 18 and 24 were correct, his join of fragment 10a was a mistake, and in this case a mistake with far-reaching consequences. In fact frag. 4, and all fragments correctly joined or positioned in association with frag. 4, are from a quotation and *peshet* on Hos. 6:2–3 as DJD 5 had originally surmised.

Strugnell's mistaken join of frag. 10a has been followed by subsequent editions of 4QpHos^b, including *Volume 6B*, but the error is recognized by Vielhauer.¹¹ The present article focuses on frag. 4 and other fragments in relation to it: frags 18 and 24 (correctly joined below frag. 4 by Strugnell); frag. 5 (not joined to any fragment); frags 7–8 (also not joined to any others or to each other); and frag. 2. As will be demonstrated, all of the fragments just named were located on the same column of the original scroll. This in turn has important implications for correcting errors in published reconstructions of frag. 2. For the sake of convenience, the cluster of frags 4, 5, 18, and 24 is hereafter referred to as "frags 4+."

Reconstruction of Frags 4+

Below are the reconstructed placements and partially restored lines of frags 4, 5, 18, and 24. Frags 4, 18, and 24 are at the left ends of lines 1–6 below, and are joined with respect to each other. Frag. 5 is toward the right ends of lines 6, 7, and 8 below, and is unjoined to

us," of frag. 4 as from a *peshet* is impossible, since *pesharim* are never written in other than the 3rd person. Therefore לנ can only be from a quotation. There is only one occurrence of לנ in Hosea, and that is at Hos 6:3. All letters of frag. 4—four certain letter readings, two *waw/yods*, and two uncertain letter readings—correspond exactly to Hos. 6:2–3. Strugnell's identification of frags 10a, 4, 18, and 24 as being associated with each other and with Hos. 6:11 was therefore incorrect. The DJD 5 identification of frag. 4 with Hos. 6:2–3 was correct.

¹¹ Vielhauer, "Rekonstruktion," 57. Vielhauer cites two reasons for rejecting Strugnell's join of frag. 10a: (a) frag. 10a exhibits a brighter leather color than the fragment combination 4, 18, and 24; and (b) the vertical line spacing between frags 4 and 10a created by Strugnell's join is unusual (cf. (a) in n. 10).

the other fragments. Its position is established by argument in the discussion that follows.¹²

- | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|
| 1 |] | 1 | ... יחינו מיומים [ביום] |
| 2 | | 2 | [השלישי יקמנו ונחיה לפניו ונדעה נרדפה לדעת אח יחוח כשחר נכון מוצאו ויבוא כנש]ם לנו |
| 3 | > | 3 | [כמלקוש יורה הארץ ...] |
| 4 | | 4 | [פשרו על/אשר ...] |
| 5 | | 5 | [...?] כשחר נכון מוצאו ויבוא כנשם לנו כמלקוש יורה הארץ <vacat> פשרו |
| 6 | | 6 | [אנשי] ... |
| 7 | | 7 | [בדר]ך מוריהם] ... |
| 8 | | 8 | [מה]אעשה לכה [אפרים מה אעשה לכה יהודה] ... |
- 1 [...] (Hos. 6:2-3) He will make us live after two days; in the] day
 2 [the third he will raise us up, and we shall live in his sight. And we shall know, if we press on to know YAHWEH, as certain as the daybreak will be his going forth, and he shall come as the rain] to us,
 3 [as the spring rains pouring out on the earth. <LONG VACAT>
 4 [Its interpretation is that/concerns _____ his [_____]h/t. And concer[ning]
 5 [(...?) AS CERTAIN AS THE DAYBREAK WILL BE HIS GOING FORTH, AND HE SHALL COME AS THE RAIN TO US, AS THE SPRING RAINS POURING OUT (ON) THE EARTH. <VACAT> Its interpretation (concerns _____ who will)/(is that he/they will)yš(y/w)b{(w?)]
 6 [all(?) the men of [_____] their [_____] and they will [wa][k]
 7 [in the way of the[ir] teachers (or, their Teacher) [. . . <LONG VACAT?>]
 8 (Hos. 6:4a) [WHAT SHALL I] DO WITH YOU, [EPHRAIM? WHAT SHALL I DO WITH YOU, JUDAH? . . .]

Lines 1, 2, and 3

Line 1. ה: A foot to the left could be the remains of *taw*, *bet*, or *nun*. It is difficult to tell whether this base stroke goes underneath a short following *waw/yod* or whether the *waw/yod* goes down beyond the end of the foot. י: Restored as *yod* based on correspondence with the quotation. ו: Restored as *waw* based on correspondence with the quotation. *Line 2.* ה: A tick from the left of a letter could be compatible with *dalet*, *resh*, *yod* or final *mem*; restored as final *mem* based on correspondence with the quotation. *Line 3.* The line visibly ends with the end of a *vacat*.

The endings of lines 1-2 correspond to a quotation from Hos. 6:2-3. The correctness of the identification is confirmed by the word לנו of line 2, which must be from a quotation (pescharim never use the 1st or 2nd person, outside of quotations). Furthermore, לנו occurs in Hosea

¹² Caret (e.g., ה) indicates uncertain letter identification on the basis of visible ink alone—i.e., the letter's identity has been restored on the basis of other information. Overlining, used only with ambiguous *waw/yod* (e.g., ו) indicates that the letter is identified as *waw* or *yod* on the basis of other information (e.g., expected spelling). Square brackets ([ב]) indicate that there is no ink visible—i.e. the letter has been restored on the basis of other information and analysis.

only in Hos. 6:3. The restoration of the quotation in lines 1–2 establishes the lengths of lines in this column as *ca.* 80. If ידוה of the quotation in line 2 was written in paleo-Hebrew letters, that would add *ca.* 1–2 spaces to the letters line-length, but it is impossible to determine whether or not this was the case, since there is no attestation of ידוה elsewhere in 4QpHos^b.¹³ This space estimate agrees with the line-length estimate of *ca.* 78 spaces for frag. 2, line 5, higher in the same column.¹⁴ The final three words of Hos. 6:3 will have appeared at the beginning of line 3, accounting for the first 16 spaces of line 3. From the visible end of a *vacat* at the end of line 3 it can be inferred that a lengthy *vacat* extended from the last word of the quotation to the end of line 3. The phenomenon of a lengthy *vacat* covering the rest of a line following the end of a quotation has an exact parallel at 11–13:8–9.¹⁵ Similarly in frag. 2, line 4, and by restoration in frags 4+, line 7, lengthy *vacats* extend from the ends of *peshers* to the ends of those lines.¹⁶

(Vielhauer restores פשר following the last word of the quotation of frags 4+, line 3, on the assumption that a *pesher* continued and then ended in the lacuna before the *vacat* visible at the end of line 3. But that is incorrect, since ואשר at the end of line 4 introduces a requotation. That means that the words of line 4 prior to ואשר must be from a *pesher*. Therefore another *pesher* will not have ended before the *vacat* ending line 3.)

¹³ ידוה is written in paleo-Hebrew in some of the *pesharim* (1QpHab, 1QpZeph, 1QpMic, 4QpIsa^a, and the original scribe of 4QpPs^a) but not in others (4QpIsa^b, 4QpIsa^c, 4QpNah, 4QpZeph, 4QpPs^b, and an interlinear correction in 4QpPs^a [1–10 iii 5a]).

¹⁴ The *ca.* 78 figure in fragment 2 is based on a restoration of a quotation in line 5 of that fragment as discussed in Doudna, *4Q Pesher Nahum*, 557–66 (summarized earlier in G. Doudna, *Redating the Dead Sea Scrolls Found at Qumran* [Qumran Chronicle 8/4; Cracow: Enigma Press, 1999] 11–14); and Vielhauer, "Rekonstruktion," 63, 69. On p. 70 Vielhauer states that the length of the line corresponding to frag. 2, line 5 is 80 spaces, although in Vielhauer's transcription (= his column X, line 10) the spacing is 77. On p. 69 Vielhauer states that the width of this column (consisting of frags 2 and 4+) is 78 spaces, based on the line corresponding to Frags 4+, line 2, although Vielhauer's transcription of that line actually contains 80 spaces.

¹⁵ Vielhauer does not accept the example at 11–13:8–9. The example of 11–13:8–9 requires that the placement of frag. 11 in relation to frags 12–13 as given in DJD 5 and *Volume 6B* is correct. Vielhauer questions this positioning of frag. 11 since there is no material join, and since he considers a full-line ending *vacat* in line 8 implausible ("Rekonstruktion," 57). But the analogies of frags 4+, line 3 (also rejected by Vielhauer, but wrongly; see below) and frag. 2, line 4, show that the full-line ending *vacat* of frags 11–13:8 is very plausible. This in turn makes it likely that the positioning of frag. 11 in relation to frags 12–13 as given in DJD 5 and *Volume 6B* is correct (although, strictly speaking, this is not quite proven).

¹⁶ The lengthy, line-ending *vacat* in frag. 2, line 4 is visible and uncontroversial (all editions have it). The case in frags 4+, line 7 is restored in the present study and differs from *Volume 6B* and Vielhauer, "Rekonstruktion".

т: Only the left side of the letter is preserved but it is clearly readable as *taw*.

¹⁷ 4QpHos^b 11–13:4 has]פ.שר'ו[אשר חיו בעמ'ם]. 4QpHos^b 16:1 has]פ.שרו[אשר]

¹⁹ Frag. 17, line 1 reads על מצרים [פשרו]. *Volume 6B* and Vielhauer both restore פשרו [Frag. 17, line 1 reads על מצרים]. *Volume 6B* having frag. 17 unpositioned, whereas Vielhauer positions it in association with frag. 37 as a *peshar* on a requotation of Hos. 7:11b. (Vielhauer, "Rekonstruktion," 61: "Zu beiden Fragmenten [13, 38] finden sich fernerhin sehr ähnliche Beschädigungsspuren an Frag. 17. So deckt sich die rechte Seite von Frag. 17 ziemlich genau mit dem rechts herausstehenden Stück von Frag. 13,6–7 und die linke Bruchform mit der von Frag. 38,6–7.") A simple geographical term by itself as a subject of a *peshar* is unparalleled in the *peshar* literature. 4QpIsa^c has subject terms in the form "X of Babylon" (cf. 6–7 ii 4; 8–10:1; 25:1), and 4QpNah attests "the city of Ephraim" or "the city of [the leaders-astroy of] Ephraim" at 3–4 ii 2, but there is no known case in a Qumran text of "Its interpretation concerns <geographical term>." In any case, it is not certain that the word preceding על מצרים in 17:1 was פשרו. Are Vielhauer's fragment shape comparisons maybe a coincidence and frag. 17 may instead belong to a different text quoting from Isa. 36:9, וחבסה לכוה על מצרים, "you rely on Egypt..."? On the other hand, Vielhauer could be right.

²⁰ See the discussion of frag. 6 below, as well as n. 25.

The words of the *peshet* in line 4 are unknown, except for that which can be learned from the final two visible letters, חו[. These letters could be the ending of e.g. אנשי עצ[חו, "his men of counsel", עד[חו, "his congregation", ב[חו, "his house," or any construct sequence in which the final noun ends in ח- or ח-. As suggested correctly by Strugnell, ואשר at the end of line 4 introduces a requotation of a portion of the previous quotation (cf. similarly ואשר at 10:1).²¹ ואשר in 4QpHos^b 10:1 and frags 4+, line 4 is apparently a variant of the formula ואשר אמר, used to introduce requotations in 1QpHab (6:2-3; 7:3-4; 9:2-4; 10:1-3; 12:6-7) and 4QpIsa^c (6-7 ii 7; 22:4; 24:2), ואשר כחוב in 4QpIsa^c (1-2:2; 6:2), and כאשר לחוב in 4QpIsa^c (6-7 ii 18; 47:2).

Line 5

א A tiny speck from the upper left of a letter could be compatible with many letters. (א/): The letter is short like a *yod*, but *yods* and *waws* are not easily distinguishable in 4QpHos^b. ב: The surviving mark seems readable only as *bet*. The angle seems too sharp to be compatible with *nun*, *pe*, or *mem*.

Line 5 will have started with the first words of the requotation from Hos. 6:2-3 introduced by ואשר at the end of line 4. Following the requotation, one expects a *peshet* introductory formula and then (depending on the introductory formula) possibly a naming of a subject term, followed by the visible אשר. Further analysis of line 5 will be taken up below.

Positioning of frag. 5 (lines 6, 7, 8)

Several letters from Hos. 6:4a are visible in the third of the three lines of frag. 5. The first two lines of frag. 5 have words from a *peshet* preceding Hos. 6:4a. The *peshet* that preceded Hos. 6:4a in frag. 5 is therefore the same *peshet* that followed the requotation from Hos. 6:3 (of frags 4, 18, and 24). The only question is the exact positioning of frag. 5 in relation to the other fragments. The letters of one or both of the first two lines of frag. 5 either followed or are different parts of lines 6 and 7 of frags 4, 18, and 24 (which contain a *peshet* on Hos. 6:3).

Volume 6B proposes no exact position for frag. 5. Vielhauer situates frag. 5 toward the left side of the column, in lines 7-9 of frags 4+. It seems, however, that frag. 5 should be positioned on the right side of the column, preserving parts of lines 6-8 of frags 4+, a few

²¹ Vielhauer restores ואשר אמר in lines 4-5 of frags 4+ (but reads ואשר only in 10:1).

spaces to the left of the column's right margin, with the quotation of Hos. 6:4a starting at the column's right margin in line 8. The following correlations support this positioning.

- (1) If the quotation of Hos. 6:4a starts at the beginning of line 8 (= frag. 5, line 3), the lacuna beginning the line above, line 7, will occupy about 3 spaces. A visible horizontal mark in an upper left position following this 3-space lacuna at the beginning of line 7 can be read as the roof of a final *kaph* and is difficult to read as any other letter. This in turn suggests a restoration of כַּדְרָן in a sequence that correlates both sets of fragments: וְהָחֵלְכוּ at the end of line 6 (from the joined cluster of frags 4, 18, 24) followed by מוֹרִיָּהּ כַּדְרָן starting line 7 (from frag. 5), "and they will [wa]ll[k in the way] of the[ir] teacher(s) . . ."²² The idiom of "walking in the way" of a righteous person is common in Biblical Hebrew.²³
- (2) Quotations starting at the beginnings of lines (right margins of columns) are common in the *pesherim*.²⁴ A restoration of the quotation of Hos. 6:4a starting at the beginning of line 8, מִן אֵשֶׁה [מִן אֵשֶׁה], is in agreement with this common pattern and gives perfect agreement in spacing with the restoration in line 7.
- (3) After this restoration, יְהוָה near the end of line 6 (from frag. 24) is followed by יְהוָה near the start of line 7 (from frag. 5). The two identical suffix endings follow in the same sentence.

The restoration of the quotation at the beginning of line 8 gives a natural, idiomatic restoration in line 7 of wording that connects both clusters of fragments. This is verified by the natural sense given for lines 6–7. The specific fit of these line restorations establishes the exact position of frag. 5.

²² Compare the similarity of the mark in 4QpHos^b frag. 5 with the final *kaph* of the similar-appearing formal hand of 4Q184 (e.g., חוֹשֶׁךְ in 1:4; חוֹשֶׁךְ in 1:6; and בְּרוּךְ in 1:7), in which there is an upturn at the left end of the roof, instead of a descent and added *kereia*. The mark in 4QpHos^b frag. 5 is not in agreement with the final *kaph* of כִּסְכֵּן in 4QpHos^b, frag. 3, line 3 (which has a low left end of the roof with added *kereia*), the only case of a visible final *kaph* in a fragment attributed to 4QpHos^b. On independent grounds, however, frag. 3 is almost certainly misidentified and does not stem from the same scribe or text as the other 4QpHos^b fragments (see n. 43). With frag. 3 removed from 4QpHos^b, there is no attestation of final *kaph* in a verified 4QpHos^b fragment, and therefore nothing to prevent one from reading the mark of the second line of frag. 5 in light of the expectation on contextual grounds that the word was כַּדְרָן.

²³ E.g., 1 Kgs 22:43: "And he walked in all the way בְּכָל-דֶּרֶךְ of Asa his father. He did not turn aside from it, doing what was right in the sight of Yahweh"; 2 Kgs 22:2, "And he did what was right in the eyes of the Lord, and walked in all the way בְּכָל-דֶּרֶךְ of David his father."

²⁴ Quotations start at the beginnings of lines in 4QpNah in 1–2 ii 2; ii 5; 3–4 ii 3; ii 7; iii 10 (as well as 3–4 iii 5, reconstructed at an earlier stage [Doudna, *Pesher Nahum*, 514–15]). That is, five (six at an earlier stage) quotations start at the beginnings of lines, compared to 17 quotations in the surviving fragments of 4QpNah that did not start at the starts of lines, which is an incidence higher than would be expected if the starts were purely random. Compare the restart of the quotation at the right margin of 4QpHos^b frag. 2, line 5, following a visible lengthy *vacat* in the end of the previous line.

Frag. 6, preserving four letters from two lines, is associated with Hos. 6:4 and placed close to frag. 5 in all editions, including *Volume 6B* and Veilhauer. While this association is possible, it is probably incorrect. Frag. 6 reads]על[in its upper line and]מה[in the line below. All editions have assumed that]מה[is from Hos. 6:4 where the word מה appears twice. Indeed, in chapters 5–8 of Hosea, from which all known quotations in the 4QpHos^b fragments are derived, מה occurs only in Hos. 6:4. But the flaw in this argument is the assumption that frag. 6 contains the word מה. What is visible is a letter string]מה[with no evidence of blank space on either side. The string -מה- can come from any word that has those two consecutive letters. If from a quotation, it could reflect מהם in Hos. 5:6 or 9:12, והמה in 6:7, זמה in 6:9, והמה in 7:13, קמה in 8:7, המה in 8:13, משממה in 9:8, and so on.

In fact, frag. 6 makes very good sense identified with קמה in Hos. 8:7 and positioned in relation to frags 11–13. If]מה[of frag. 6 is situated in the position of קמה in Hos. 8:7 in the lacuna of line 6 of frags 11–13, the]על[directly above it would then be in the position where a *pesher* introductory formula is expected. The על would be the על of פשרו על <VACAT> restored in this position. Therefore, frag. 6 is not included as part of the present restoration of frags 4+, since there is no positive basis for such an association, whereas there is an excellent basis for the placement of the fragment together with frags 11–13.²⁵

Line 6. הִי: The letters הִ of הִי are not visible in the DJD 5 photograph of frag. 24 but can be seen in PAM 42.052 in the Brill microfiche edition. *Second הִ:* Only a speck from the upper right corner of a letter is visible; it could easily be *bet*, *mem*, *tsade*, *yod*, *pe*, etc., but is reconstructed here as *he*. Compare the shape of the upper right corner of the *he* in line 2 of frag. 15. *ל:* Only a part of the ascender is visible, but it is sufficient to identify the letter. Its position almost certainly rules out an intervening letter between the preceding *he* and the *lamed*

²⁵ The restoration of lines 5–6 of frags 11–13 after the placement of frag. 6 would be as below (see the earlier suggestion in Doudna, *4Q Pesher Nahum*, 556–67 n. 664). On the *ca.* 3 letter spaces occupied by the *vacat*, see n. 28.

... [כִּי שׁוֹכְבִּים הָיָה עֵנָל שְׁמֶרֶן] <vacat> [פָּשְׂרוּ] עַל ...
 ... [אֵל] כִּי [רוּחַ יִזְרֶה סוּפוּתָה]ן [יִקְצְרוּ קַמְהַן] אֵין לֹוא צִמָּה ...
 ...] FOR SHATTERED WAS THE CALF OF SAMARIA. <vacat> [Its interpretation] concerns
 [...
 ...] God. [(Hos. 8:7) FOR] THEY SOW THE WIND, AND [THEY WILL REAP] THE WHIRLWIND.
 THE STANDING GRAIN [HAS NO SPROUT ...

(although an intervening *waw* is possible). *Line 8.* ך of ך[בדר]: As discussed above, the mark agrees with final *kaph* and little else.

The position of frag. 5 as argued above produces a 4-space lacuna at the start of line 6. This could be restored with כול before the visible אנש[ן, giving אנש[ן אנש[ן, "[all] the men of," or alternatively with עם, yielding "[with] the men of." Or עם could be at the end of line 5 and כול at the start of line 6, yielding "[with all] the men of." (Compare 1QS 7:22, כול אנשי היחד, "all the men of the *yahad*." Other possible restorations could be "men of war," "men of truth," "men of reknown" ("men of the name"), "men of Israel," "men of Judah," etc.

At the end of line 6, the first three letters of the final visible word, ודה, indicate a *hitpa'el* verb with *waw*-consecutive.²⁶ Based on the masculine plural possessive suffix of the preceding word, ידם[(which is in agreement with מוריהם[ן which follows as the second word of line 7), this *hitpa'el* verb at the end of line 6 is likely to be masculine plural. A visible *lamed* is the second root consonant of the verb. These details combined with the context of lines 6 and 7 are sufficient to reconstruct ידם ודהל[כו, "and [they] will wal[k . . ."

Frag 7–8

Frag. 7 preserves part of a quotation from Hos. 6:7 and a visible bottom line of a column. Therefore, it is several lines below the lines of Frags 4+, and at the bottom of the same column in the original scroll (in agreement with *Volume 6B* and Vielhauer). Frag. 8, which is joined to no other fragment, also preserves part of a bottom line of a column. In agreement with DJD 5 and *Volume 6B*, the present study regards the letters of frag. 8 as being from the same line as the lower line of frag. 7, whereas Vielhauer leaves frag. 8 unplaced. The association of frag. 8 with frag. 7 is likely to be correct because both have a line of pesher at the bottom of a column and because the restoration given below (of 4QpHos^b 7–8:2) is so fitting.

... וי[עזבו את אל וני[לכו בחוקתן הנאמין <participle> לים[א]וחם בכלן

... and] they forsook God and they walked in the customs of [<the nations>, <participle>]ing them in all things [. . .

²⁶ Vielhauer reads ודה[דל(כו) with restored *bet*, as if ודה were a distinct word at the end of line 6, but proposes no translation. *Volume 6B* restores a single broken unidentified word ודה[ל, "and *hi*[[l[. . .]"

The string of readable letters ending at בחוקות] is from frag. 7. The string starting at לים[is from frag. 8. The second string of letters follows, rather than precedes, the first string in natural sequence, since an object is explicitly named first, then a pronoun refers back to it as antecedent. Note the contrast between the future “they will [wa]l[k in the way of the[ir] teachers” of lines 6–7 of frags 4+ and the past “they walked in the customs of [<the nations>” of frags 7–8 a few lines below. The position of frag. 7 in the reconstruction above corresponds to the similar position relative to the right margin indicated for frag. 5 several lines higher in the same column, possibly reflecting similar damage patterns in the column of the original scroll.

Subject term of the pesher of lines 5–7

A critical point is the identity and form of the verb at the end of line 5, יש(ו)ב, DJD 5 read the third letter of this word as *waw*, giving a *qal* form of שׁב which is used commonly in the *pesharim* and related texts. Strugnell, 1970 noted that the letter could be either *yod* or *waw*. If the letter is *yod* the verb becomes *hiph'il*. The letter itself is short like a *yod*, but the *waws* of ליום in 4:1, ליום in 25:2, and וישכן in 15:1 are short as well. Therefore, the physical reading alone is indecisive.

A second issue is whether the verb is singular or plural, i.e. ישׁב, *qal* 3rd masc. sing. (“he will repent, turn, return”), ישׁבן, *qal* 3rd masc. pl. (“they will repent, turn, return”); or ישׁב, *hiph'il* 3rd masc. sing. (“he will bring back, restore”). *Hiph'il* plural can probably be ruled out since BDB shows no case in the Bible of a masculine plural finite form of שׁב in the *hiph'il*. *Qal* singular also seems extremely unlikely. The verb could be *hiph'il* singular ישׁב, with God or a righteous figure as the subject. The other possibility, *qal* plural ישׁבן, would have a righteous group as the subject. Both *Volume 6B* and *Vielhauer* understand the verb to be a *hiph'il* singular, neither one giving reasons for excluding other possibilities. In any case, the subject term of the *pesher* in line 5 can be expected to be righteous, not wicked, based on correspondence with the quotation. Also, the expression “and they will [wa]l[k in the way of the[ir] teacher(s)” of lines 6–7 is the language of living rightly, not wickedly, and reinforces the sense of a righteous subject of the sentence.

The visible אשר[of line 5 may be the second word of the formula פשרו על פשרו or else the relative pronoun following פשרו and an

explicit naming of the subject. In *pesher*s that begin with **פֶּשֶׁר אֲשֶׁר** the subject of the verb is understood, from a previous *pesher*. That is, when the formula is **פֶּשֶׁר אֲשֶׁר** the subject is never named explicitly (nor is the subject ever understood from the preceding quotation).²⁷

פֶּשֶׁר אֲשֶׁר

Its interpretation is that <(pronoun) verb> . . .

Its interpretation is that he/they will . . .

In the Qumran *pesharim* there is no example of **אֵל** "God" introduced as an explicitly named subject of a **פֶּשֶׁר עַל** *pesher*; for some reason God as subject is always expressed with **פֶּשֶׁר אֲשֶׁר** forms. In the present case the *pesher* introductory formula at the end of line 5 could be **פֶּשֶׁר . . . אֲשֶׁר יֵשׁ (ל') בְּ(ו)**, which is the introductory formula restored by Vielhauer, or it could be **פֶּשֶׁר . . . אֲשֶׁר <_____> עַל** **פֶּשֶׁר . . . יֵשׁ (ל') בְּ(ו)**. In the second case, the subject term would likely be some two-word sobriquet for a masculine singular righteous figure or masculine plural righteous group.²⁸ The *pesher* introductory formula (whatever it is) will have been preceded by a *vacat* of ca. 3 spaces, since quotation/*pesher* (Q/P) transitions in 4QpHos^B always have a *vacat* of about this length in all cases in which this point can be checked.²⁹ If God was the understood subject, then God would be restoring or reviving the righteous. The *pesher* would be an image portraying the coming age of peace. On the age of peace in a similar text, compare at 4QpPs^a 1–10 ii 11–12; iii 5a–6; iii 10–11; iv 3.

²⁷ Compare at 1QpHab 4:1–2; 5:7; 7:7; 7:15; 4QpIsa^a 7–10 iii 27; 4QpHos^a 2:2–3; 2:12; 2:15–16; 4QpPs^a 1–10 iii 3; and 4QpHos^b 11–13:4. For example, 4QpHos^a 2:12–14, **פֶּשֶׁר אֲשֶׁר הִכָּם כָּרַעַב וּבְעָרִים** "Its interpretation is that he [God] smote them with famine and nakedness . . ."; 4QpPs^a 1–10 iii 3, **פֶּשֶׁר אֲשֶׁר יִחְיֶה כָּרַעַב** "Its interpretation is that he [God] will keep them alive in the famine . . .", etc. Note that 1QpHab 7:7 is not an exception, despite its rendering in *Volume 6B* ("Its interpretation is that the last period will be prolonged [*qal* יִאָּרֶךְ], and it will be greater than anything of which the prophets spoke"). Instead, that passage should be read **פֶּשֶׁר אֲשֶׁר יִאָּרֶךְ הַקֵּץ הָאֲחֵרִין**, "Its interpretation is that he (God) will extend [*hiph'il* יִאָּרֶךְ] the last time," with God as the understood subject continued from the previous *pesher* of 7:4–5. (Compare the syntax of e.g., 1 Kgs 3:14; Isa. 53:10.)

²⁸ Almost all sobriquets for personal figures or groups in the *pesharim* are two words, with a few one-word exceptions (e.g., "Manasseh" in 4QpNah). Interestingly, when named subjects in the *pesharim* are one-word sobriquets, modifying words or phrases are usually attached in the subject term.

²⁹ 4QpHos^b 2:1 has a visible Q/P *vacat* of about 3 spaces. 4QpHos^b 10:2 has a visible Q/P *vacat* of 2 or 2–1/2 spaces. 4QpHos^b 7:1 has a visible Q/P *vacat* of about 5 spaces. There is no case of a Q/P transition in a surviving 4QpHos^b fragment that is not marked by a *vacat*. The pattern appears similar to that of 4QpNah, in which Q/P transitions are systematically marked with *vacats* of 3 (±1) spaces; compare the analysis and tables in Doudna, *4QPesher Nahum*, 120, 233–52.

The starting and stopping points of the requotation in line 5 are a further issue. מוריהם of line 7 in the *pesher* seems to reflect יורה, the next-to-last word of Hos. 6:3. Therefore, the requotation in line 5 can be presumed to have gone to the end of Hos. 6:3. The real issue is the starting point. In the case of the פשרו אשר formula, the first word of the requotation might be נרדפה (this is Vielhauer's restored starting word for the requotation). If the Q/P *vacat* was 3 spaces and there were no variants from MT beyond routine spelling conventions, this would give a spacing for line 5 of *ca.* 82 or 83 spaces, which would be in approximate agreement with *ca.* 80 of line 2 (and *ca.* 78 of frag. 2, line 5, higher in the same column).³⁰ For another example of a requotation starting "mid-verse" compare Hos. 6:9bβ–6:10 in frag. 10, lines 1–2.³¹ If the introductory formula of the present line 5 was פשרו על, there was a two-word subject term occupying *ca.* 10 spaces, a Q/P *vacat* of 3 spaces, and no variants from MT beyond routine spelling conventions, then the first word of the requotation might be כשחר and the line length *ca.* 76 or 77 spaces.

Was the Teacher of Righteousness the subject of the pesher of lines 5–7?

Was the subject of the present *pesher* מורה הצדק "the Teacher of Righteousness"?³² מוריהם of line 7 in the *pesher* can be read either as singular "their teacher" (as *Volume 6B* and Vielhauer ["ihr Lehrer"]), or plural "their teachers" (as García Martínez ["their masters"]).³³ The spelling permits either rendering.³⁴

³⁰ Vielhauer reconstructs a second word for the formula introducing the requotation at the start of line 5, [. . . אמר] ואשר. This is unlikely, since 4QpHos^b 10:1 has only ואשר introducing a requotation. Vielhauer also neglects to reconstruct a *vacat* between the quotation and *pesher* in the lacuna in line 5, which is certainly mistaken (see n. 29). But these two minor points cancel each other out in terms of spacing, thereby agreeing with the present study as regards the start- and end-points of the requotation (assuming that the formula later in line 5 was פשרו אשר).

³¹ See n. 47.

³² For discussion of references in Qumran texts to the Teacher of Righteousness, see Håkan Bengtsson, *What's in a Name? A Study of Sobriquets in the Pesharim* (Uppsala: Uppsala University, 2000) 179–216.

³³ DJD 5 did not give an English rendering for מוריהם. Strugnell, "Notes" did not comment on מוריהם. The editions of Vermes and Wise-Abegg-Cook do not give renderings of frag. 5 with מוריהם. In *Die Qumran-Essener*, 85, Maier allows both singular and plural possibilities: "ihr (en/es) Anweiser(s)."

³⁴ For *yod* in singular forms with pronominal suffixes in nouns formed from III-ה roots, see Gesenius-Kautzsch-Cowley, *Hebrew GKC*, #93ss, 124k.

In the singular reading the righteous would “walk in the way of their Teacher,” in accordance with the well attested Biblical Hebrew idiom “they will walk in the way of <righteous person>.”³⁵ The Teacher is known by the stand-alone term מורה in CD 20:27–28. The possessive form מוריהם would be in keeping with the Biblical Hebrew pattern in which leaders and rulers are spoken of with possessive pronouns indicating those whom they lead, e.g., “the Lord is my shepherd,” “their rulers,” “their king,” etc. Compare CD 1:11, ויקם להם מורה צדק God “raised up to them the Teacher of Righteousness” (= God raised up *their* Teacher). The notion of walking in the way of the Teacher would be in keeping with 1QpHab 8:1–3, in which the righteous remain faithful to the Teacher, or CD 20:27–28, in which the righteous come and go according to the law, having listened to the Teacher’s voice. The sense would be in contrast to 4QpHos^a 2:4–6, “they listened to the ones leading them astray.”

According to this reading, the quotation in line 4 and again in the requotation in line 5 might have yielded, by correspondence with the *lemma* and also through a wordplay on יורה, a *peshar* focusing on מורה הצדק. The Teacher of Righteousness could be the subject in line 5, either referred to explicitly (with פשרו על), or else understood from the *peshar* of line 4 (with פשרו אשר in line 5). Yahweh likened in the quotation/requotation to יורה “spring rain”, pouring out on the earth, might have evoked the human figure מורה הצדק, “the Teacher of Righteousness”. Similarly, Yahweh being likened to a violent lion at Hos. 5:14a was interpreted as referring to a human figure, the “Lion of Wrath” of 4QpHos^b 2:2–4.³⁶ A use of ישיב in the *hiph’il* in frags 4+, line 5 with reference to the Teacher’s activity might be part of an idiom of turning people to God.³⁷

Curiously, a fragment identified in DJD 5 as possibly belonging to 4QpHos^b preserves a clear reading of מורה הצדק. This is 4Q172, frag. 7. As DJD 5 explained, 4Q172 consists of miscellaneous “fragments whose script is reminiscent of pIsa^a (161), pHos^{a,b} (166, 167) and pPss^a (171).” The scribal hand of 4Q172 frag. 7 is not that of the scribe of 4QpIsa^a, 4QpHos^a, or 4QpPs^a (these three were all copied by the same scribe), leaving only 4QpHos^b in the list of suggested associations for

³⁵ See n. 23.

³⁶ For analysis establishing that the Lion of Wrath is the subject term of the *peshar* in 4QpHos^b 2:2–4 see Doudna, *4Q Peshar Nahum*, 557–73.

³⁷ E.g. II Chron. 19:4, “Jehoshaphat . . . brought them back to Yahweh (וַיָּשִׁיבֵם אֶל־יְהוָה)”; 24:19, “Yet he sent prophets among them to bring them back to Yahweh (לְהָשִׁיבֵם אֶל־יְהוָה).”

4Q172, frag. 7. If that fragment is from 4QpHos^b then the Teacher is present somewhere in 4QpHos^b explicitly, and might therefore be in the present lines as well. But 4Q172 frag. 7 is not identified with a quotation from Hosea or confirmed in relationship to a verified 4QpHos^b fragment. Therefore, the suggestion is insubstantial.

There is a fundamental objection to the idea of the Teacher of Righteousness being spoken of in the present *peshet*, however. Elsewhere in the *pesharim*, the Teacher's activity is portrayed as having started in the recent past and continuing in the present.³⁸ No text portrays the activity of the Teacher of Righteousness as continuing into the coming age of peace, which seems to be the setting of the present *peshet*.³⁹ Imperfect verbs are used in 4QpPs^a 1–10 ii 18–20 and iv 8–10 of the Teacher in foretelling his survival despite attempts by the Wicked Priest to kill him (and thereby implying that the Teacher is alive in the world of the text), but those are the only two known uses of imperfects in the *pesharim* which have the Teacher of Righteousness as the verb's subject or object. This observation suggests that the Teacher of Righteousness will not have been the subject term of the *peshet* of 4QpHos^b frags 4+, attached to the imperfect verb יש(ל)ב of line 5. It could be argued that there were notions of the Teacher's role in the coming age of peace in these texts that simply failed to be preserved in any surviving fragment (except possibly this one), but the comparative parallels seem to give greater weight to the negative argument.

³⁸ There is no clear proof for the common notion that the Teacher is dead at the time of writing of the *pesharim*. The medieval "B" copy of CD alludes to either an imminently anticipated or recent death of the Teacher at CD 19:35–20:1 and 20:13–15, האסוף (מ/ו) ורדה היחיד. Presumably the absence of CD 19:35–20:1 and 20:13–15 among the Qumran finds is accidental. But the date of production of CD "B" relative to the dates of composition of the *pesharim* has not been established. In any case CD "B" gives no information establishing a past death of the Teacher in the *pesharim*. In fact all of the sobriquet-bearing personal figures of the *pesharim* are likely contemporary with the authors of those texts. (That is why they are given sobriquets.) Figures from the past are referred to by proper names. See Doudna, *4QPeshet Nahum*, 615–25, 43, for further discussion of these points.

³⁹ CD 6:11, which reads "until the rise of the Teacher of Righteousness at the end of days," is not an exception. In the late Qumran texts the expression אחרית הימים, "the last days" or "end of days," is always an idiom for the present age, never having the sense of "future." See A. Steudel, "אחרית הימים in the Texts from Qumran," *RevQ* 16 (1993) 225–45; Doudna, *4Q Peshet Nahum*, 63–66. For an argument that the medieval copy of CD 6:11 also reflects a scribal copying error, see Doudna, *4QPeshet Nahum*, 686–89.

Furthermore, it seems that מוריהם of line 7 is plural, "their teachers," rather than "their teacher," because the plural reading agrees with a preceding plural noun ending in -יהם near the end of line 6. For the notion of plural, righteous teachers in the coming era, compare in 4QpIsa^a 8–10 iii 28–29:

[וכאשר יורוהו כן ישפוט ועל פיהם] [עמו יצא אחד מכותני השם ובירו בני]

] and according to their teaching him (the Branch of David), so shall he judge (the nations). And according to their word [] With him will go out one of the priests of the name (or, priests of renown), and in his hand the garments of []

The identity of the ones who teach the Branch of David of 4QpIsa^a—the subject of the verb יורוהו—is not visible due to a lacuna, but from the context appears to be righteous priests. The sense is parallel to the relationship in 11QT^a 56:20–57:15 between a council of 12 princes, 12 priests, and 12 Levites, and the king ("he shall not turn his heart from them or do anything of any plan outside of them"). Similar language in 11QT^a 56:5–8 instructs the citizens of the ideal Israel to be taught by priests and judges:

ושמרתה לעשות ככול אשר יורוכה ועל פי המשפט אשר יאמרו לכה חששה

Be careful to do all that they teach you and according to the judgement that they tell you, do that. Do not stray from the law which they proclaim to you to the right or left.

Other possibilities for the subject of the pesher of lines 5–7

Perhaps the subject of the *pesher* of lines 5–7 was some other righteous figure known from the Qumran yahad texts, such as דורש החורה "the Interpreter of the Law", נשיא העדה "the Prince of the Congregation", or צמח דוד "the Branch of David". The second and third of these, נשיא העדה and צמח דוד, seem to be two names for the same figure (cf. 4Q285 5:1–6). The Interpreter of the Law may be another name for the Teacher of Righteousness (though this is never attested directly).⁴⁰ The Prince/Branch is always—without exception—portrayed with imperfect verbs, his activity set in the future. In the world

⁴⁰ The identification of these two figures with each other is suggested in Bengtsson, *What's in a Name?*, 193, 216. Similarly Bengtsson suggests that מליץ דעה "the Interpreter of Knowledge" of 4QpPs^a 1–10 i 27 is also to be identified with the Teacher of Righteousness (pp. 207–8). For CD 6:7–11 not being grounds for a distinction between the Interpreter of the Law and the Teacher of Righteousness see Doudna, *4Q Pesher Nahum*, 686–89.

of the texts, he is destined to lead Israel in a future war of victory over the major powers of the world, and then to rule Israel in an era of peace to come.⁴¹ In the idiom of עמד as the beginning of his public activity, the Teacher of Righteousness has “stood” and is “standing,” whereas the Prince/Branch’s “standing” has not yet happened.⁴²

The subject of line 5 of Frags 4+ could also be a masculine plural righteous group returning to God or the law. In this case the verb would be ישובו and the restoration of the words opening line 6 might be [עם] אנשי, “they will return [with] the men of [.]” Could it be that “their teachers” of line 7 refers to the subject term (some masculine plural righteous group) by another name?

In the end, there seem to be three basic possibilities for line 5. First, a *qal* plural verb with stated or unstated righteous plural subject. Second, a *hiph’il* singular verb with God as the unstated subject. And third, a *hiph’il* singular verb with the Prince/Branch as the stated or unstated subject. The present study is unable to express any conclusion on this point.

Frag. 2 and 4+ on the same column

Only one verse of Hosea—Hos. 6:1, quoted and interpreted—separates the end of frag. 2 from the beginning of frags 4+. In DJD 5, frag. 3 was associated with a position between Frags 2 and 4+. That proposed positioning was incorrect and it is doubtful that frag. 3 is from 4QpHos^b.⁴³ Frag. 14 was associated by Strugnell with a position in

⁴¹ According to 4QpIsa^a 8–10 iii 23 God will support (יסמכו) the Branch of David. In 4QpIsa^a 8–10 iii 25 the Branch of David will rule over (ימשלו) the nations and Magog. In 4QpIsa^a 8–10 iii 26 the Branch’s sword will judge (ישפוט) all peoples. In 4QpIsa^a 8–10 iii 28 he will judge (ישפוט). In 4QFlor (4Q MidrEschat) 1:11–13 the Branch of David is the one standing (דעומד) with the Interpreter of the Law who will [<verb>] in Zion in the last days; he will stand (יעמוד) to save Israel. In 4Q285 5:3 the Branch of David will go into battle; the Prince/Branch will kill (ודמיו) the [king of the Kittim]. In CD 7:20–21 when the Prince of the Congregation stands he will destroy (יקרקר) the sons of Seth. 1QM features a victorious war led by the Prince of the Congregation against the Kittim and other nations, entirely set in the future. (An inserted hymn in 1QM 14 alludes to God’s wonderful deeds of the past, but the singing of the hymn itself is set in the future.) From the perspective of the War Scroll the righteous have not yet returned to the wilderness of Judea; they are presently still in the wilderness of the nations anticipating such a return (1QM 1:1–3).

⁴² The identity of the anticipated Prince/Branch could be known “in secret” to the authors of the texts but not yet revealed publicly, with the texts foretelling this figure’s “standing”.

⁴³ DJD 5 suggested that frag. 3 was related to Hos. 5:14, 15, or 6:1, based on what

between frags 2 and 4+.⁴⁴ That proposed positioning was also incorrect.⁴⁵

As Vielhauer has correctly recognized, Frags 2 and 4+ are from the same column. A column width or line length of *ca.* 80 spaces for frags 4+ is quite close to the independent outcome of *ca.* 78 for frag. 2 (based on restoration of a quotation from Hos. 5:14b-15 in frag. 2, line 5).⁴⁶ The suggestion that the line lengths of frag. 2 and frags 4+ reflect the same column is reinforced when considered in comparison to the shorter line lengths of other columns from the same scroll: *ca.* 57 spaces of frag. 10 (with Hos. 6:9bβ-6:10), from the column to the right of the column represented by frags 2 and 4+,⁴⁷ *ca.* 57 spaces in

was claimed to be a similarity between a reading of לִילֵה לְשׁוֹן in the fragment's second line, and יְשׁוּרְנֵי of Hos. 5:15, and also between בְּסֶרֶן of the fragment's third line and אֶסְרֵה of Hos. 5:14 or שָׂרֵה of Hos. 6:1. (*Volume 6B* proposes no placement for frag. 3. Vielhauer suggests a possible association with Hos. 7:6, which is unconvincing.) First of all, the reading of DJD 5 and all other editions (including *Volume 6B* and Vielhauer) of לְשׁוֹן in line 2 of the fragment is probably wrong. The stroke which has been read as the visible remnant of ל seems instead to be the right arm of the *shin*, slightly displaced by a tear (the *lamed* does not exist). The correct reading is שֵׁן and the letters after ש could be nearly anything. Second, none of the readings gives an exact match with words from Hosea. Third, the string בְּסֶרֶן is not associated with any word common in *peshers*, nor do *peshers* ever have 2nd person forms. And fourth, in the fragment's line 3, לְנִרְנָה "to the threshing floor[s]" does not seem like a word which would be used in a *pesher*. But this word is not found in Hos. 5:15-6:1 in any form (or anywhere in Hosea in that form). In short, there is no basis for an association of frag. 3 with Hos. 6:1. The scribal hand of frag. 3 also appears to be different from the other fragments of 4QpHos^B and there is no known association of frag. 3 with another fragment of 4QpHos^B. These observations make it doubtful that frag. 3 belongs to 4QpHos^B.

⁴⁴ Strugnell, "Notes," 203.

⁴⁵ Frag. 14 is a tiny piece bearing only three readable letters: חשכ or חשכ. Criticizing the suggestion of DJD 5 that frag. 14 is from Hos. 8:12, Strugnell remarked that frag. 14 might instead be from Hos. 6:1: "vu l'état matériel du cuir, on songera peut-être à *Osée* 6, 1 plutôt qu'à *Osée* 8, 12" (Strugnell "Notes," 203). He did not clarify what about the condition of the skin suggested that fragment 14 was associated with Hos. 6:1. And unless Strugnell was proposing that frag. 14 contains a variant from the known text of Hos. 6:1 at the only point at which a contact with Hos. 6:1 is claimed, the letter readings in frag. 14 exclude Hos. 6:1; there is no string חשכ or חשכ in Hos. 6:1 in either MT or any known variant. Therefore the suggestion in DJD 5 that frag. 14 is associated with Hos. 8:12 (which has חשכו) is reasonable, although Vielhauer notes that חשכו of Hos. 7:15 would be another good possibility.

⁴⁶ Given a margin of error of $\pm 4-6$ spaces at the same ending position for lines of the same *ca.* 80 space length, plus uneven endpoints at left margins giving at least an additional ± 2 , reconstructed line lengths of *ca.* 78 and *ca.* 80 spaces are indistinguishable. The statement in *Volume 6B*, 120, n. 4, that "there is not enough room" for routine restoration of the expected quotation from Hos. 5:14b at the beginning of line 5 of frag. 2 of 4QpHos^B is without basis.

⁴⁷ Frag. 10 (with Hos. 6:9bβ-6:10), from the column to the right of the column represented by frags 2 and 4+ of the original scroll, has a reconstructed line length of *ca.* 57 spaces. The first two lines of frag. 10 read:

frag. 13 (with Hos. 8:7) from several columns later in the original scroll,⁴⁸ and ca. 62 spaces in frag. 38 (with Hos. 7:10b), if Vielhauer's restoration is correct, which is possible but not certain.⁴⁹

The agreement between ca. 78 spaces (frag. 2) and ca. 80 (spaces frags 4+), in contrast to ca. 58–62 spaces line lengths for the other columns, argues that frag. 2 and frags 4+ are from the same column in the original scroll. Compare the comments of Stegemann and Tov:

[If] one can determine the average width of the columns in a scroll, about 80% of all its columns will conform closely to the average; the others may differ up to 40% in either direction.⁵⁰

In some Qumran scrolls the height and width of the columns were fairly consistently fixed, but in most cases these parameters probably varied from sheet to sheet, and also within the individual sheets, in accordance with their measurements. Thus, for instance, the width of certain individual columns in 1QM and 4QLam differs by as much as 50 percent from other columns in the same scrolls. Considerable differences between the sizes of columns are visible in 11QT* and 8HevXIIgr, while even larger ones are in evidence in 1QIsa* (cf. cols. 49 [16.3 cm] and 52 [8.8 cm]), in 1QS (cf. cols. 1 [9.7 cm], 2 [11.5 cm], and other columns measuring 16, 18, and 19 cm), and in 4QLam* (where col. 3 is almost twice as wide as cols. 1 and 2). At the same time, a certain regularity in column sizes is noticeable. In most cases the available space in a sheet was evenly divided between the columns, but the unusual sizes of the sheets did not always allow for such uniformity. Columns which are unusually wide or narrow are generally found in the beginning or end of sheets.⁵¹

1 | ואשר זמר]

2 | ישראל<vacat>פ[שרו

The visible ואשר marks the start of a requotation, just as at line 4 of frags 4+ (see n. 21), which explains the odd starting point of the quotation (the final two words of Hos. 6:9). Restoration of a single requotation from Hos. 6:9bβ (זמר עשו) without interruption to the last word of Hos. 6:10 (ישראל) gives a reconstructed line length of ca. 57 spaces. This analysis of frag. 10 is in agreement with *Volume 6B* and Vielhauer.

⁴⁸ Frag. 13 has a reconstructed line length of ca. 57 spaces, based on a quotation from Hos. 8:7 restored continuously in lines 6–8 of frags 11–13. This is exactly the same as the estimate independently arrived at for the different column represented by frag. 10 (n. 47). This analysis of frag. 13 is in agreement with *Volume 6B* and Vielhauer.

⁴⁹ Frag. 38, lines 4–5.

⁵⁰ H. Stegemann, "Methods for the Reconstruction of Scrolls from Scattered Fragments," *Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls—the New York Conference in Memory of Yigael Yadin* (ed. L.H. Schiffman Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990) 198.

⁵¹ E. Tov, "Scribal Practices Reflected in the Texts from the Judaean Desert," *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years* (eds P.W. Flint and J.C. VanderKam Leiden: Brill, 1998) 1. 403–29 [410–11].

There seems to be a visible space above the top line of frag. 2, which has a quotation from Hos. 5:13b. The top line of frag. 2 therefore seems to be the first line of the column.⁵² The bottom line of the column is visible in frags 7–8, which bear a quotation from Hos. 6:7a. This gives an estimated *ca.* 27 ($\pm 2-3$) lines per column for 4QpHos^b, which is in agreement with 27 lines per column of 4QpPs^a and similar numbers for 4QpIsa^a and 4QpIsa^c (compared to shorter 12 and 17 lines per column for 4QpNah and 1QpHab, respectively).⁵³

An exegetical implication

The reconstructed line length of *ca.* 80 of the column represented by frags 2 and 4+ established by Vielhauer and by the present author—instead of the shorter line length given in *Volume 6B*, which was inherited from errors in DJD 5 and Strugnell—makes clear that the “Last Priest” of 4QpHos^b 2:3 is not the agent who “smites Ephraim” of that line as ubiquitously assumed in current scholarly discussions. The following three quotes have been selected at random and many more could be cited:

[A] high priest currently in office ‘has dealt a heavy blow’ (4QpHos^b 2:2–4) to the evil Ephraim.⁵⁴

[Hos.] 5:14 contains a reference to a lion and lion cub who oppose Ephraim and Judah, which the *peshet* interprets as referring to the ‘latter priest’ who smites Ephraim.⁵⁵

Alexander Jannaeus is called the last priest in this *peshet* [4QpHos^b], and he punished the Pharisees.⁵⁶

None of these citations note that this interpretation is a conjectural restoration. These scholars rather speak as if it were a fact of the text. Earlier scholars were aware that that interpretation is not a fact of the text. Dupont-Sommer and Carmignac commented (referring to the same line):

Noter que . . . il n’est même pas sûr que le pronom relatif ‘qui’ se rapporte au nom qui précède immédiatement.⁵⁷

⁵² Vielhauer regards frag. 2, line 1 as the 6th line of the column.

⁵³ Vielhauer reconstructs about 30 lines per column for 4QpHos^b.

⁵⁴ H. Stegemann, *The Library of Qumran* (Leiden: Brill, 1998) 130.

⁵⁵ M. Bernstein, “Peshet Hosea,” 650.

⁵⁶ H. Eshel, “Ephraim and Manasseh,” *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls* 1.253–54.

⁵⁷ A. Dupont-Sommer, *Les écrits esséniens découverts près de la Mer Morte* (Paris, 1960) 289 n. 3.

L'antécédent de ce pronom relatif n'est pas nécessairement le 'prêtre futur' (*h'hrwn*) et ce peut être un autre terme disparu dans la lacune précédente.⁵⁸

Although Vielhauer has the longer line length of frags 2 and 4+ correctly restored, he assumes the same mistaken restoration of words in the lacuna in line 3 that is made in DJD 5, Strugnell, Horgan, and *Volume 6B*: of להכות ידו אשר ישלח ידו להכות . . .] "Its interpretation concerns the Last Priest who will stretch forth his hand to smite . . ." But Vielhauer's restoration leaves *ca.* 25 spaces in the lacuna between the last word of the quotation and the first word of the *pesher*. The lengths of all known Q/P *vacats* in 4QpHos^b, however, are only *ca.* 2–5 spaces (see n. 29). The unaccounted-for spacing in Vielhauer's restoration indicates that Vielhauer's restoration is not correct. In fact the subject inflicting violence of that *pesher* can only be the Lion of Wrath, who is a figure distinct from the Last Priest. The Last Priest is a victim of the Lion of Wrath. I concluded an analysis of this line in my 2001 study as follows:

4QpHos^b has been read as if lacunas could, in effect, be disregarded, and visible words assumed to be related syntactically simply because of the accident of their physical survival in proximity to one another. Mistakes in 4QpHos^b in turn affected perception of the Lion of Wrath of 4QpNah, and in this way fatally blocked understanding of 4QpNah. Far-reaching and erroneous interpretive consequences came about in this case because lacunas were not properly restored. 4QpHos^b frag. 2 is a showcase argument for the necessity of sound reconstruction analysis of lacunas in any critical study of a Qumran text.⁵⁹

Conclusion

DJD 5 identified the quotation in frag. 4 of 4QpHos^b as being from Hos. 6:2–3. Strugnell correctly joined two new fragments below frag. 4 (frags 18 and 24), but erred in joining frag. 10a above frag. 2 and in rejecting the correct identification in DJD 5 of frag. 4 as being from Hos. 6:2–3. Strugnell's error was followed in subsequent editions and continues uncorrected in Charlesworth's *Volume 6B*.

A corrected reconstruction of frags 4, 5, 18, and 24 has been established. Frags 4+ belong to the same column of the original scroll as fragment 2, occupying a position below the latter. The reconstructed *pesher* of frags 4+, lines 5–7 appears to deal with the righteous and an image of the age of peace to come, although the identification of the subject term and exact wording elude certain identification.

⁵⁸ J. Carmignac, "Notes sur les peshârîm," *RevQ* 3 (1962) at 535 n. 100.

⁵⁹ Doudna, *4Q Pesher Nahum*, 573.