1 The Book of Jeremiah's redaction history in light of its oldest manuscripts

Michael Langlois

The Book of Jeremiah has a complex redaction history. Few books in the Hebrew Bible exist in recensions that preserve such profound transformations.[1] When several recensions coexist, questions arise as to their relationship: is there a direct filiation? If so, which recension gave rise to the other? When? For what purpose? Why did the earlier recension survive? If there is no direct filiation, how may their kinship be qualified? How far back in time should one go to find their common ancestors?

Alas, those fascinating questions are often addressed on the sole basis of late textual witnesses, as earlier manuscript evidence is simply lacking. The discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls, however, has brought forth a wealth of ancient parchments and papyri which feature, among others, the oldest 'biblical' manuscripts.[2] Some of these scrolls date to the third and, perhaps, fourth or fifth centuries BCE (Langlois forthcoming), which brings us much closer to – and, I would say, within – the time frame of the Hebrew Bible's redaction.

What about the Book of Jeremiah? How old are its earliest manuscripts? To which recensions do they belong? What can they tell us about this book's redaction history? These are the questions addressed by the present essay. We will have a look at each of the ten alleged Dead Sea Scrolls of Jeremiah in order to assess their dates and recensions. This data will then be analyzed and synthesized in order to arrive at a conclusion regarding the Book of Jeremiah's redaction history.

2Q13 (2QJer)

Qumran cave 2Q was allegedly discovered in February 1952 by Bedouins who brought their findings to the antiquity dealer William Kando. William L. Reed and Roland de Vaux conducted excavations in March 1952, but the cave had been emptied of its precious scrolls, except for two small fragments (de Vaux 1962).[3] The traditional ascription of scrolls to Qumran cave 2Q is thus uncertain but probable. Among them is a manuscript of Jeremiah labelled 2Q13 and published by Maurice Baillet in 1962.

The scroll does not bear a colophon or a date; it was not found in a clear stratigraphical context; it was not tested for radiocarbon dating. Palaeographical analysis may, however, provide a time frame.

Palaeographical analysis

2Q13 was copied by a professional scribe using a formal script; the ductus is regular, assured, and refined. Let us have a look at each letter of the alphabet.

The left leg of א joins the diagonal at its top, creating a chevron probably traced without lifting the calamus. This ductus develops during the first century BCE. The right leg features ornamentation. ב features a straight base, very wide, protruding to the left and slightly to the right; the roof is straight, narrow, slightly pointed to the left but without ornamentation.

The shaft of ג is concave, pinched in the middle, from which starts a flat leg, almost horizontal; this trend develops in the first century BCE. The shaft is devoid of ornamentation, as opposed to more developed typologies.

ד has a square caliber, with a leg that prolongs the traverse without lifting the calamus thanks to a looped shoulder. This ductus develops in Herodian times. ה has a thick traverse, protruding and bevelled to the left. ו is narrow, straight, and its head barely marked.

ח features a horizontal traverse that joins the right leg below its top through a looped shoulder. ט has a straight, horizontal, and wide base, followed by a large angular hook. This ductus, which develops during the first century BCE, is attested here in its fullest development. The left shaft is ornamented at its top, which indicates further development.

Contrary to ו, י has a well-marked head in the shape of a triangle pointing leftward. Medial כ features a head that's usually narrower than that of ב, and its base does not protrude to the right, so the two letters are quite distinct. Final ך exhibits a large and thick traverse followed by an angular looped shoulder on top of a short, slightly concave descender. This ductus develops in Herodian times.

ל is angular, with a traverse of varying width and a hook reaching all the way back to the edge. Medial מ is likewise angular, with a protruding left arm that's as wide – if not more – than the base. The horn is penned as a single stroke, bent at the bottom to form or join the traverse. This ductus develops during the Herodian era, but ornamentations that characterize the most developed shapes are absent. Final ם is taller but barely wider than medial מ, which results from caliber homogenization taking place during the Hasmonean era. The traverse barely protrudes to the left, and tends to be lifted on the right to create an angular or pointed shoulder, which is indicative of a more developed typology.

Medial נ follows a simple, angular ductus, with a shaft that's slightly thickened rightward at the top but does not exhibit ornamentation characteristic of the most developed shapes. Final ן is quite short, concave, with a thickened head and refined descender. This shape is attested as early as the Hasmonean era. ס has a closed, rounded and regular belly, following a ductus that develops in Herodian times.

The diagonal of ע is preceded by an angular elbow supporting a short right arm, rarely developed. The left arm, on the contrary, is more often ornamented so as to create a triangle pointing leftwards. This is an unusual development, probably from the Herodian era. The shaft and base of medial פ are straight; its head is pointed and bent inwards on the left, but is not as large as the latest Herodian shapes.

Medial צ features a straight shaft, slightly slanted, and bent leftward at the bottom in order to produce a protruding straight base. Its right arm is wide, only slightly slanted, and ornamented at its right end. ק has a rather short descender, detached from the traverse, which is ornamented at the left so as to produce a spike. Its hook is angular, slightly slanted, and wide, but does not join the descender.

ר is square and exhibits a triangular head at the left end of the traverse. ש is angular, with a shaft that's slightly slanted forward and headed by a hook indicative of a developed shape. The upper diagonal is short and joins the shaft almost at its top; it is sometimes slightly bent to produce an ornamentation. The lower diagonal is wide and bent so as to produce a small vertical spike. ת is slightly slanted forward, with a slightly raised but rounded shoulder. The left leg protrudes to the top, while its bottom is rounded or bent leftward so as to produce a foot of varying width.

To sum up, the ductus matches the Herodian period quite well. Some developments might even suggest a date towards the end of this era, without reaching the level of sophistication attested by the most developed scripts. This scroll may thus have been copied around the first half of the first century CE.[4] A margin of uncertainty remains, and as indicated by the use of the preposition "around" a date in the late first century BCE is possible, as is a date in the second half of the first century CE.

Textual kinship

Let us now turn to this manuscript's text type and textual kinship. I will limit myself to variant readings that may reflect redactional phases, leaving aside orthographical variants, textual accidents, and other minor variant readings. The following list (like the ones that will be compiled below for other Jeremiah scrolls) is thus shorter than others found elsewhere in scholarly literature, as this essay focuses on redaction criticism, not textual criticism. Indeed, it is important to bear in mind that an occasional agreement between two witnesses does not mean that they belong to the same recension; for instance, confusions of ד and ר are frequent and may be shared by witnesses of varying recensions. Failure to distinguish between various types of variant readings may therefore lead to a wrong characterization of a manuscript's kinship.

In Jer 42:9, 2Q13 has the longer text preserved by $\mathfrak{M}^5$ rather than the shorter text attested by $\mathfrak{G}^6$ (Jer 49:9). But in Jer 43:9, it could be closer to the shorter text of $\mathfrak{G}$ (Jer 50:9) rather than the longer text of $\mathfrak{M}$. Things get more complicated in Jer 44:3, where this manuscript could have a text even longer than $\mathfrak{M}$, itself longer than $\mathfrak{G}$ (Jer 51:3).

Likewise, in Jer 44:12, this scroll has the long text of $\mathfrak{M}$ rather than the short text of $\mathfrak{G}$ (Jer 51:12); but in Jer 44:13 it seems to have a shorter text than the recension attested by both $\mathfrak{M}$ and $\mathfrak{G}$ (Jer 51:13).

On frag. 8, Jeremiah 47 follows Jeremiah 46 (l. 4–5), as in $\mathfrak{M}$, whereas those two chapters are not side by side in $\mathfrak{G}$ (Jeremiah 26 then 29). I insist on the fact

that this order is evidenced on a single physical unit (frag. 8), because Dead Sea Scrolls editors have usually numbered fragments according to the order in which they thought the text should run, being often influenced by a particular recension (𝔐 or 𝔊 for instance). This could easily lead to circular reasoning, hence the need to check for evidence on a single physical unit (Langlois 2014: 47, 50).

In Jer 47:4, the manuscript probably has a longer text than 𝔐, itself longer than 𝔊; likewise, in Jer 48:25, it has the expression נְאֻם יְהוָה attested by 𝔐 but absent from 𝔊 (Jer 31:25). The same phenomenon occurs in Jer 48:30 (𝔊 Jer 31:30) and Jer 48:44 (𝔊 Jer 31:44).

To sum up, 2Q13 is generally closer to 𝔐 than to 𝔊. In particular, it seems to have the same structure, grouping the Oracles against the Nations at the end of the book. It also features the recurring expression נְאֻם יְהוָה and a few other pluses of 𝔐 compared to 𝔊. The few cases where 2Q13 has the shorter text of 𝔊 against 𝔐 may give the impression that it stands in direct filiation between 𝔊 and 𝔐, but note that it sometimes has a longer or shorter text than both of them. It is thus more appropriate to view 2Q13 and 𝔐 as sharing a common, relatively close, ancestor.[7]

4Q70 (4QJer[a])

This scroll is said to come from Qumran cave 4Q, though a vast majority of this cave's fragments were actually discovered by Bedouins and sold through Kando between 1952 and 1958 (de Vaux 1977).[8] The earliest photographs of 4Q70 were taken in June 1954[9] while the edition was later entrusted by Frank Moore Cross and Eugene Ulrich to Emanuel Tov (Tov 1997).

Palaeographical analysis

This scroll was copied by a skilled scribe with a consistent and fluid script, though the copy itself exhibits numerous corrections. The ductus is a direct heir of the Aramaic cursive from the Achaemenid and early Hellenistic periods, with a notable evolution towards harmonization of letter caliber.

א features a thick diagonal preceded by a thin, slightly concave arm and followed by a thin, slightly convex leg. The latter is usually penned below the top of the diagonal, sometimes at its top, but not with it. ב has a narrow and concave head, thus shaping two small spikes. It is followed by a straight shaft, slightly slanted, thick at the top and thin at the bottom, where it continues as a more or less rounded elbow followed by a straight horizontal base, wide and protruding to the left.

ד has a simple ductus, with a straight head slightly slanted in order to join the shaft below the top. The latter is sometimes slightly concave but more often straight. ה has two parallel vertical legs, as opposed to the ductus common at the Achaemenid period. Likewise, the traverse is horizontal and no longer slanted. ו has a narrow head, horizontal and thick, followed by a vertical shaft refined at the bottom, where it is sometimes slightly concave.

ח is particularly wide, with two distant legs connected by a horizontal traverse located under the top of the left leg and pointed at the right so as to join the right leg below its top. י tends to rotate compared to the Achaemenid ductus; its body is less full, despite the use of a bevelled calamus. In final position, one finds sometimes a wider and more rounded י reminiscent of inscriptions from the third or second centuries BCE found for instance in Maresha. כ has a straight and slanted head, followed by a concave and tall shaft turning through a rounded elbow into a less wide base. In final position, ך exhibits a rather tall descender, slightly concave, refined at the bottom.

ל is of highly variable width, with a rather short ascender and an angular elbow that's usually narrower than the traverse, unless the latter is itself narrow. In final position, ל has a very wide traverse and an embryonic hook, which is a classical ductus from the Achaemenid period. The existence of a distinct final form for ל seems to have disappeared by the Hasmonean period.

מ is quite tall and features a wide base preceded by a right-angled elbow, which is indicative of an evolution of the ductus from the Achaemenid period. In final position, ם is not really taller but exhibits a closed shape; this evolution takes place during the Hellenistic period and is well attested at the turn of the second century BCE, for instance in Maresha.

נ is penned according to a classical ductus, with a slightly slanted shaft followed by a rounded elbow and a horizontal base. ס has a wide open belly, as opposed to later shapes which have a smaller caliber and closed belly. Note, however, the presence of a wide horizontal base, which suggests further development from the shapes of the Achaemenid and early Hellenistic periods. The ductus of ע has likewise evolved from Achaemenid times, as it features a long straight diagonal and a straight oblique left arm.

פ has a pointed head followed by a slightly convex shaft. After an angular elbow comes a slightly oblique and sometimes concave base. צ is wide and composed of a convex shaft followed by a rounded elbow, a wide slightly slanted base, and a concave descender. This ductus is inherited from the Imperial Aramaic cursive with further development, but does not yet introduce a medial form. It is thus at home sometime between the Hellenistic and Hasmonaean periods.

ק has a closed triangular shape, without descender. The use of a descender is already attested in the Achaemenid period, but there are forms without descender (or with an embryonic descender only) until the beginning of the second century BCE. The closed shape, however, is quite unusual, though attested in various Aramaic documents from the fourth century BCE; it could be a development independent of, and parallel to, that of the descender.

ר is similar to ד, though its head is often slightly narrower. ש has a reduced caliber and follows a classical ductus, without real evolution compared to the Imperial Aramaic cursive. ת is wide; its left leg has a wide foot which makes it shorter than the right leg. This is a clear evolution compared to the ductus of the Achaemenid and early Hellenistic periods, but it is not yet the caliber that will become standard during the Hasmonaean period.

To sum up, most of the forms result from an evolution that can hardly be prior to the third century BCE. Some of the further developments favour the second half

of that century or even, perhaps, the very early second century BCE.[10] 4Q70 is thus one of the earliest attested uses of the Aramaic script to copy a Hebrew text.[11]

Textual kinship

The text of 4Q70 is very fragmentary and its lines have been heavily reconstructed in the *editio princeps*. I will therefore limit myself to variant readings that are actually attested in the manuscript; this is not to say that lacunae cannot be used to assess kinship, but this is a longer process which requires testing multiple hypothetical reconstructions[12] and is thus beyond the scope of the present essay, unless the analysis of intact variant readings should prove inconclusive.

In Jer 8:3, 4Q70 has the expression נְאֻם יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת attested in 𝔐 but absent from 𝔊; however, this verse and its predecessors were added later, in the margins, by another scribe. The hand is slightly different but, based on the limited evidence – not all letters are attested and their shape has to cope with the crammed space – its script can broadly be ascribed to the same period. Tov notes that the "addition was made by a scribe other than the main scribe of the scroll" (Tov 1997: 152), while Ulrich goes further and states that the "insertion is in a Hasmonaean script (ca. 100–50 BCE), so roughly a century later than the original manuscript" (Ulrich 2008: 495). Ulrich's dating in the first century BCE is too late: none of the main Hasmonaean developments may be observed – except, perhaps, a tendency to homogenize the caliber, but this may be due to the crammed space left for the addition. A larger sample of the script would be necessary to carry out a fuller analysis, but this hand can hardly be later than the first half of the second century BCE.

Tov further believes that this addition is a mere correction due to an accidental omission by the scribe, but the length of the omission weakens such a hypothesis; this addition is better explained as an editorial addition, and we will come back to this problem in due course.

In Jer 8:8, the scroll seems to have the longer text preserved by 𝔐 rather than the shorter text attested by 𝔊. Likewise, the long plus of 𝔐 in Jer 8:10–12 is attested here, whereas these verses are absent from 𝔊. At the beginning of Jer 9:12, the manuscript has the shorter text of 𝔐 without the plus of 𝔊. At the end of the verse, it has the long text of 𝔐 rather than the short text of 𝔊. Jer 10:10 is attested here and in 𝔐, but absent from 𝔊; the plus of 𝔐 at the beginning of Jer 10:13 is present here, against 𝔊.

In Jer 12:3, 4Q70 once again testifies to the long text of 𝔐 against the short version of 𝔊. In Jer 12:17, the manuscript has the final נְאֻם־יְהוָה present in 𝔐 but not in 𝔊. In Jer 13:1, the manuscript has the small plus of 𝔐 as opposed to 𝔊. The same phenomenon is found in Jer 13:3, and then again in Jer 13:4.

In Jer 17:12, the manuscript has the long text of 𝔐 against 𝔊. In Jer 22:11, it has the plus of 𝔐 against 𝔊. Likewise in Jer 22:16.

This survey is very clear: in the variant readings listed above, 4Q70 is always in agreement with 𝔐 against 𝔊. The scroll further exhibits a few variant readings of its own and numerous corrections, which are usually not the product of editorial work (except for the aforementioned major addition) but the simple rectification of scribal errors.[13]

4Q71 (4QJer^{b})

This manuscript is known from a single fragment which is said to come from Qumran cave 4Q. It first appeared on a photograph taken in June 1954[14] and was officially published by Tov in 1997.

Palaeographical analysis

4Q71 was copied by a skilled scribe demonstrating confidence and regularity. The calamus does not seem bevelled and the strokes are of an even thickness. Palaeographical analysis is limited by the size of this manuscript, preserved by a single fragment.

The left leg of א is not drawn together with the diagonal, which it joins below its top, sometimes at mid-height, rarely at the top as can be seen on later scrolls from Herodian times. ב adopts a rather square caliber, with a wide concave head, a vertical shaft, and a horizontal base drawn after an angular elbow. The base protrudes to the left, but barely to the right, as opposed to the ductus that develops in the Herodian era.

ג has a slightly slanted shaft and an almost horizontal left leg that joins it below its top or at mid-height. The tendency to lower the joint and to raise the leg fits well the evolution that takes place between the Hasmonaean and Herodian periods.

ד has a concave head, with a spike at its left end and a raised rounded shoulder at its right end. The shaft is straight and vertical. ה features a wide protruding traverse, slightly slanted downward to the right so as to join the right leg below its top. The latter is straight, slightly slanted, whereas the left leg is slanted in the oppose direction and is usually somewhat shorter.

ו is narrow, straight or rarely concave, with a small hooked head that tends to disappear when the scribe does not take time to draw it fully. י also features a hooked head, contrary to the older ductus, but it is much better marked than that of ו. Moreover, י is usually shorter, though it sometimes tends to lengthen. This phenomenon takes place during the first century BCE and results to the confusion of ו and י in certain scripts, which is not the case here.

כ seems to have a narrow head and a wide, straight, and protruding base. In final position, its head is wider and followed by a tall convex descender, according of a more conservative ductus. ל is rather narrow, with a long ascender sometimes headed by a spike; if this ornament is added on purpose, it reveals a development that's more important than the one usually observed in Hasmonean times.

מ follows a square ductus, with an angular elbow and a straight base, rarely convex. The head is concave and features an arm drawn afterwards, contrary to the popular Herodian ductus. In final position, ם is of variable height, sometimes keeping a traditional and impressive caliber, other times adopting a more reduced caliber.

Final ן has a well-marked head and a rather short descender that's straight or slightly concave. ע is narrow, with a straight diagonal upon which rests a slightly slanted arm. No development of a right elbow has been observed here, as opposed to the tendency in the Herodian period. פ has a small hooked head followed by a straight shaft, not or barely slanted. Then comes a barely rounded elbow and a wide, straight, horizontal base.

Final ץ features a concave descender preceded by an arm that's also concave but apparently not angled and devoid of Herodian developments. ק has a wide traverse curved upward to the left, slanted upward to the right, and prolonged by an angular hook that's rather long. The descender, by comparison, is rather short; it is drawn to the right of the end of the traverse, thus making it protrude.

ר is similar to ד, so that the two are easily confused. ש adopts a classical ductus, without ornamentations popular in Herodian times. ת is quite tall, with two legs of equal height; though the right leg is sometimes slightly taller.

To sum up, most of the forms attested on this single fragment are common in the first century BCE. A few additional developments suggest that this manuscript may have been copied around the middle of the century. Note that according to Tov, "this fragment is dated to the first half of the second century BCE" (Tov 1997a).[15] Elsewhere he states that this date was suggested by Ada Yardeni in a personal communication (Tov 1989: 197; 1992: 533), but it is too early and I wonder whether this is a simple misunderstanding; in any case, his date is way too early and must be moved by a century.[16]

Textual kinship

The limited size of this single fragment precludes a precise description of its text type. As stated above, I will leave aside variant readings which may not be indicative of the manuscript's recension, including minor agreements with 𝔊 or 𝔐.[17] The only variant reading relevant to our study is the seeming absence of Jer 10:6–8.10, in agreement with the short recension represented by 𝔊 against the long recension represented by 𝔐. There may have been other places where 4Q71 was closer to the long recension, and it may also have featured developments of its own. For now, the only evidence at our disposal indicates a closer relationship to the shorter recension.[18]

4Q72 (4QJer^{c})

4Q72 allegedly comes from Qumran cave 4Q. Its numerous fragments appear on photographs taken from May 1953 onward.[19] The official publication was entrusted to Tov (Tov 1997b).

Palaeographical analysis

This manuscript was penned by a skilled and confident scribe writing quite fast, sometimes carelessly, and exhibiting cursive tendencies.

The left leg of א is usually convex, sometimes straight; it joins the diagonal at mid-height or slightly above, but not at its top, contrary to the tendency in Herodian times. The right arm is short and slightly concave. ב is wide, with a concave or even pointed head, a raised shoulder, and a base that protrudes to the left but not to the right, except in a few cases, following a trend that develops during the Herodian era.

ד is square, angular, with a slightly slanted shaft and a horned head. ה has a thick traverse, protruding and bevelled on the left, according to a ductus popular in the first century BCE, before the Herodian period. The head of ו is quite irregular, sometimes with a hook, other times with simple thickening at the top. ז exhibits similar thickening, but backwards.

ח is quite narrow, with a thick traverse connecting two straight parallel legs. ט is wide, with a pointed base, two symmetric diagonals, and double elbow on the right. Though the hook is quite impressive, it has not flattened the right diagonal yet as can be observed in the Herodian period. י is penned in a similar way as ו, with a hooked head, but its shaft is often a little shorter. The two letters may be confused, which is quite common at the end of the Hasmonaean era and at the beginning of the Herodian period.

כ is of variable width, with a head usually shorter than the base; this differentiates it from ב, though the two may sometimes be confused. In final position, ך exhibits a wide and flat head, slightly curved upwards to the left, and followed to the right by a straight vertical shaft. The traverse of ל is of variable width and tilt, rather straight and slightly slanted so as to produce a raised shoulder. The diagonal is sometimes almost vertical, more often oblique. The ascender is very tall, often thickened frontwards at the top.

מ is of variable size and keeps a classical ductus, with a straight, horizontal base that does not protrude, and an arm of variable length. The new ductus that becomes popular in Herodian times has not yet been adopted here. In final position, ם is more impressive, with a rectangular closed belly and largely protruding traverse.

נ features a classical ductus, with a head devoid of ornamentation or barely thickened. In final position, the head of ן is more marked, with a double curve or even an angular recess; these two shapes are well attested from before the Hasmonaean era and until the Herodian period. ס has a thick protruding traverse followed by a round belly connected to a straight shaft at its bottom. This closed shape develops throughout the first century BCE and becomes popular at the beginning of the Herodian period.

ע is tall, with a flattened diagonal bent at its right end, thus producing a right arm almost parallel to the left arm. This ductus seems to appear at the very end of the Hasmonaean era and spreads during Herodian times. פ has a small, triangular, solid head, followed by a slanted shaft, an angular elbow, and a straight horizontal base. צ features a wide, straight traverse, barely slanted, bent at its end to shape a spike. The shaft is also slightly slanted or convex, and bent at the bottom to produce a leg.

ק has a wide traverse, curved upwards at its left end, and curved downwards at its right end so at to produce an angular hook. The latter spreads to half of the letter

width and produces an open belly before the descender, which is recessed from the protruding head. This ductus is classical and remains until the Herodian period.

ר follows a ductus close to that of ד, with which it may easily be confused, though the shoulder of ר is, in theory, less raised than that of ד. ש features a developed form, with a flattened diagonal bent at its right end; this ductus is rarely seen before the Herodian era. The left stroke slightly protrudes at the bottom, as is observed elsewhere in semi-cursive scripts from the first century BCE. ת also occasionally adopts a cursive ductus, with a looped left leg, but this influence remains unusual; more often, it follows a classical ductus with a well-marked horizontal leg.

In conclusion, most of the forms suggest that 4Q72 was copied around the second half of the first century BCE, preferably towards the end of the century. The date arrived at here is thus close to "the latter part of the first century BCE" as proposed by Tov, who also refers to Cross's dating "no earlier than the end of the first century B.C." (Tov 1997b: 182). I would not exclude a slightly earlier period, however, as recent research (including unpublished radiocarbon dating) leads to moving back in time palaeographical features once thought to be Herodian.

Textual kinship

Here is a list of variant readings that are attested in the text preserved by this fragmentary scroll and that may help determine its text type. In Jer 9:2, the manuscript seems to have the final expression נְאֻם־יְהוָה attested by 𝔐 but not by 𝔊; in Jer 20:4, 4Q72 does not have the plus of 𝔊, just like 𝔐. In Jer 22:25, the scroll has the plus of 𝔐 against the shorter text of 𝔊; likewise in Jer 22:28.

In Jer 25:26, the manuscript seems to have the long final of 𝔐 absent from 𝔊 (in Jer 32:26). Before Jer 27:2, 4Q72 seems to have the end of Jer 27:1, which is absent from 𝔊 (in Jer 34:1) but present in 𝔐. Likewise, Jer 27:13–14 seem attested by 4Q72, in agreement with 𝔐, while they are absent from LXX (in Jer 34:13–14).

In Jer 30:19, the manuscript has the long final text of 𝔐 against the short text of 𝔊 (in Jer 37:19). Likewise, Jer 30:22 is attested by the scroll, in accordance with 𝔐, while it is absent from 𝔊 (in Jer 37:22). In Jer 31:8, 4Q72 has the two small pluses of 𝔐 compared to 𝔊 (in Jer 38:8). At the end of Jer 31:14, the manuscript has the expression נְאֻם־יְהוָה attested by 𝔐 but absent from 𝔊 (Jer 38:14). Jer 33:16–20 seem attested by the scroll, in agreement with 𝔐, while they are absent from 𝔊 (Jer 40:16–20).

In conclusion, 4Q72 is very close to 𝔐 (Thus already Tov 1997c: 184.). Despite a few variant readings of its own, which are usually insignificant, the filiation seems almost direct.[20]

4Q72a (4QJer[d])

4Q72a consists of a single fragment that had initially been associated with 4Q71. The two fragments were later dissociated on palaeographical and codicological grounds and edited separately.[21] Were the editors right?

Palaeographical analysis

The script of 4Q72a is almost identical to that of 4Q71, which explains why the two fragments had been associated. A few differences may, however, be observed. First, the script of 4Q72a is slightly larger than that of 4Q71, by 1 or 2 microns; this may sound insignificant but is quite noticeable when the two fragments are side by side.[22] This difference is further accentuated on the palaeographical chart prepared by Yardeni (Tov 1989: 194, pl. II). It could, however, be due to the use of a thicker or worn calamus, for instance, and is therefore not sufficient to dissociate the two fragments. Accordingly, Cross and Naveh are of the opinion that these two fragments have been penned by the same hand, whereas Ada Yardeni and Émile Puech believe that they were copied by two different scribes (Tov 1989: 191).[23]

Leaving aside the difference in size and thickness, what can be said about the ductus? A few letters indeed seem to adopt a slightly different ductus: the base of final ם protrudes in 4Q72a but not, or barely, in 4Q71; ע features a more rounded ductus in 4Q72a; the belly of ק is open in 4Q71 and closed in 4Q72a; ת is more slanted and more rounded in 4Q72a, with a more pronounced foot.[24] These differences[25] could be due to the limited sample of each ductus on such small fragments; had entire columns been preserved, other forms may have been preserved that could confirm the proximity between the two hands. Moreover, these minute differences can, in great part, be accounted for by the use of a different calamus, or by the same calamus albeit worn, or by a slight evolution in the scribe's handwriting, or by a greater care in the copy of 4Q71. An alternative explanation would be that two scribes who studied together in the same school developed an almost identical handwriting; but such a scenario seems unnecessary: 4Q72a may basically have been copied by the same scribe – either at a different stage in his career or, more simply, as he was copying the same scroll and his hand or calamus became tired.

In terms of palaeographical dating, the two fragments have been copied within the same time frame; that is in the first century BCE. The attestation of some letters on 4Q72a that were absent from 4Q71 (especially ס, which is quite developed) confirms that the latter part of the Hasmonean period is to be preferred, hence a dating around the mid-first century BCE. The date mentioned by Tov, in the first half of the second century BCE on the basis of a personal communication by Yardeni (Tov 1989: 197; 1992: 533; Tov 1997c: 203), is once again off by a century.

Textual kinship

The variant readings attested on this single fragment may be too few to arrive at firm conclusions, but let us have a look at the evidence first. In Jer 43:4, the lacuna does not allow for the restitution of the patronym בֶּן־קָרֵחַ attested by 𝔐 but absent from 𝔊 (Jer 50:4). Likewise in Jer 43:5, where the same patronym is absent from 𝔊 (Jer 50:5) – as it is from this fragment – but mentioned in 𝔐. At the end of the same verse, the fragment seems to have the long text of 𝔐 against 𝔊, but then

omits the long final of 𝔐 and perhaps even the shorter final of the 𝔊. In Jer 43:6, 4Q72a omits the syntagm רַב־טַבָּחִים and the patronym בֶּן־שֶׁתֶן, both attested in 𝔐, but absent from 𝔊 (Jer 50:6). In Jer 43:9, the fragment seems to have the long text of 𝔐 against the short text of 𝔊 (Jer 50:9).

Overall, 4Q72a preserves a text that is rather close to the short recension attested by 𝔊, with a few variant readings of its own or shared by 𝔐.[26] Interestingly enough, such is also the case with 4Q71,[27] which means that the two fragments share more than palaeographical affinities. I conclude that the two fragments were most likely copied by the same scribe and may well belong to the same scroll. It is possible that, reaching the end of the scroll, the scribe's calamus was worn, or that he switched to another one, or that he became less careful. The difference in reconstructed column width (21–24 cm for 4Q71 compared to 12–14 cm for 4Q72a [Tov 1997a: 171]) is quite impressive, but not impossible, especially when the columns belong to different sheets or the border of a sheet, as is the case for both 4Q71 and 4Q72a.[28] It is, of course, possible that the same scribe copied another Jeremiah scroll, but the text type remained the same.

Acknowledging the textual affinities between the two fragments and the fact that their codicological differences can easily be explained, Tov concludes that "these two fragments of chapters 9–10 and 43 could have belonged to the same scroll, though written by two different scribes" (Tov 1989: 195). Can the two hands' striking resemblance still be a coincidence? Isn't it more likely that we have here the work of a single scribe, perhaps later in his career (which would easily explain the subtle differences in ductus) or, even more simply, later on while copying the same scroll (with a tired hand or calamus)?

4Q72b (4QJer[e])

4Q72b likewise consists of a single fragment initially associated with 4Q71. It was later dissociated and edited separately under a new siglum (Tov 1997d). The same question thus arises: were the editors right?

Palaeographical analysis

Despite the limited sample of letters preserved on this single fragment, the script is actually quite different from that of 4Q71 and 4Q72a: ב has a convex base; the legs of ה are more spaced; ל features an ascender slanted backwards, which is rather unusual; medial מ has a rounded elbow and a traverse that is much more curved upwards at its left end.

Tov believes that the script of 4Q72b is closer to 4Q72a than to 4Q71 (Tov 1997a: 171), alluding elsewhere to differences in size and elegance (Tov 1989: 193). These should not be confused with differences in ductus: environmental factors (medium, calamus, time, health . . .) lead to different shapes despite a similar ductus, or to identical shapes despite a different ductus. This is probably what led Tov to dissociate 4Q71 from both 4Q72a and 4Q72b; but the aforementioned differences in ductus show that 4Q72b stands apart from both 4Q71 and 4Q72a.[29] Moreover, the aforementioned

palaeographical differences point to a slightly earlier date, towards the turn of the first century BCE, though the limited sample precludes a more precise dating, so that an overlap with the time frame of 4Q71 and 4Q72a is entirely possible.

Textual kinship

Due to the small size of this single fragment, only two variant readings may be used to determine the textual kinship of 4Q72b. In Jer 50:4, the fragment has the expression נְאֻם־יְהוָה attested by 𝔐 but absent from 𝔊 (Jer 27:4), and in Jer 50:5, the fragment has the short text of 𝔐, without the plus of 𝔊. The few verses on this fragment thus correspond to the recension attested by 𝔐 rather than that preserved by 𝔊.[30] In that respect, 4Q72b differs from both 4Q71 and 4Q72a, which were rather close to 𝔊. This confirms the palaeographical analysis, which concluded that 4Q72b should be dissociated from the group composed of 4Q71 and 4Q72a.

4Q72 frag. 21a

In 2007, Hanan and Esther Eshel published an alleged fragment of 4Q72 (4QJer[e]) (Eshel and Eshel 2007).[31] The few letters preserved in three lines of text were identified as corresponding to Jer 24:6–7, and the fragment was thus labelled "4Q72 frag. 21a". It is now included as such in the "Dead Sea Scrolls Biblical Manuscripts" database edited by Martin Abegg.[32]

The publication does not include any photograph or drawing, but, on the basis of the fragment's description and transcription by Hanan and Esther Eshel, I realized that this is actually the same fragment as DSS F.156, which will be discussed below. I was able to confirm this identification by examining a photograph of the fragment in the exhibition catalogue referred to by Eshel and Eshel.[33] As we shall see, this fragment probably doesn't belong to 4Q72 and should not have been labelled "4Q72 frag. 21a".

MS 4612/9 (DSS F.116, DSS F.Jer1)

This fragment was acquired in January 2009 by Norwegian collector Martin Schøyen from William Kando (Schøyen 2016: 30).[34] It was published in 2016 by Torleif Elgvin and Kipp Davis as "4Q(?)Jer" but, as we shall see, it is unlikely that this fragment should come from Qumran cave 4Q (Elgvin and Davis 2016: 217–21).

Palaeographical analysis

I already published a detailed palaeographical analysis of this fragment (Langlois 2016) and will therefore limit myself here to general observations and conclusions. The script is clumsy, hesitant, inconsistent, and irregular, with a mixture of forms from the Hasmonaean and Herodian periods. As a matter of fact, the same clumsiness has been observed on several other fragments of the Schøyen collection, which led me to doubt their authenticity.

My doubts were confirmed when I examined fragments that had been written upon after the upper skin or papyrus layer had peeled off, or that had ink on top of the patina. Sometimes the letters were crammed in order to follow the edge of a fragment after it had been torn. I shared my suspicions with my colleagues and, after further investigation several manuscripts were removed from the volume and published as probable forgeries in a separate article (Davis et al. 2017: 189–228). This does not mean, however, that all those which remain in the volume are genuine. In the case of several fragments, the general editor considered that there was not enough hard evidence to prove forgery and thus decided to leave them in the volume.

In the case of MS 4612/9, there might indeed not be the kind of aforementioned physical inconsistencies; but since the script is strikingly similar to that of forged fragments, I conclude that it was penned by the same 'scribe' or 'scribal school' – that is, by the same forger or team of forgers.

Textual kinship

According to Elgvin and Davis, "the evidence tentatively shows that MS 4612/9 may be grouped with 4QJer[b,d] as a text related to the *Vorlage* of 𝔊, although preserving independent features that indicate a thus far unattested shorter text" (Elgvin and Davis 2016: 221). But, as discussed above, I believe that this fragment is a modern forgery and should not be used to reconstruct the textual and redactional history of the Book of Jeremiah.[35]

MOTB.SCR.003172 (DSS F.195, DSS F.Jer2)

This manuscript was purchased in May 2010 by Steve Green, an American collector, and published in 2016 together with other Dead Sea Scrolls in the Museum of the Bible (Tov, Davis, and Duke 2016). However, the script of these 13 fragments is strikingly similar to that of MS 4612/9 and other manuscripts in the Schøyen collection that I consider to be modern forgeries. I therefore conclude that MOTB.SCR.003172 and the 12 other fragments published in that volume are also forgeries.[36]

The Museum of the Bible has recently announced that physical analysis of five of its fragments concluded that "the five fragments show characteristics inconsistent with ancient origin and therefore will no longer be displayed at the museum".[37] MOTB.SCR.003172 is not among them, and physical testing might not reveal hard evidence of modern forgery; but, as mentioned above, it exhibits the same palaeographical irregularities and should therefore be considered a forgery as well.

For this reason, I will not discuss its textual kinship here.[38]

DSS F.156 (DSS F.Jer3)

In 2010, James Charlesworth published an online preliminary edition of a fragment given by Michael Sharpe to the Foundation on Judaism and Christian Origins in Pasadena, California (Charlesworth 2010).[39] He identified this manuscript as a Dead Sea Scroll of the Book of Jeremiah from Qumran. The three lines of this single fragment are said to correspond to Jer 48:29–31a.

In his report, James Charlesworth seems unaware of the publication, three years earlier in a Hebrew journal, of the same fragment.[40] The authors, Hanan and Esther Eshel, also identified it as a fragment of Jeremiah, but ascribed it to another passage, Jer 24:6–7. They even ascribed it to a known scroll of Jeremiah, 4Q72 (4QJer[c]), and thus labelled it frag. 21a. Were they right?

Palaeographical analysis

There are only 11 letters or parts of letters preserved on this tiny fragment, but the script is rather crude and hesitant. It is quite different from that of 4Q72, which is penned by a confident scribe exhibiting a fluid script with cursive tendencies. It is therefore highly unlikely that this fragment should belong to 4Q72, as was suggested by Hanan and Esther Eshel. But that's not the only problem.

According to James Charlesworth, "there is ample reason to assume that this piece of leather and the ink is genuine and from Qumran".[41] I believe, on the contrary, that caution is advised. Though there are only 11 letters, a few issues may be observed. Line 1, מ is clumsy and the copyist seems to have struggled to draw the head and the base;[42] line 2, ר is too low, as though the copyist tried to fit the head at the edge of an already damaged fragment;[43] line 3, ו and א are hesitant.[44] I conclude that this fragment is probably a modern forgery. Its inclusion in a database such as Abegg's "Dead Sea Scrolls Biblical Manuscripts" is thus highly problematic, especially as it is included as "4Q72 frag. 21a", which will not alert the user as to its suspicious origin and identification.

I also find it striking that both editions of this fragment ascribe it to the Book of Jeremiah, albeit to different passages. Not only is the fragment really small, but both attempts at ascribing it to a specific passage in the Book of Jeremiah are problematic. They both suppose decipherments and/or variant readings that seem imposed on the fragment, as though the editors really wanted the fragment to come from the Book of Jeremiah. And this happened not only once but twice, with the same fragment, in two supposedly independent editions. This cannot be a coincidence.[45]

As with MS 4612/9 and MOTB.SCR.003172, I have decided not to discuss the textual kinship of this fragment.[46]

General analysis

Having studied each of the ten alleged Dead Sea Scrolls of the Book of Jeremiah, let me point out a few observations.

1 In my opinion, there are only five manuscripts of Jeremiah, and not ten: four (MS 4612/9, MOTB.SCR.003172, and DSS F.156 published twice) are modern forgeries, and one (4Q72a) actually belongs to another scroll (4Q71). The Book of Jeremiah suddenly loses half of its scrolls, which is quite a hard fall in the polls.

This phenomenon is actually symptomatic of the sudden proliferation of forgeries in the last two decades. Unfortunately, a number of scholars have unknowingly incorporated forgeries in their work (see e.g. Lange 2018), to the point that the results of their research may have been corrupted. It is urgent that all possible forgeries be flagged as such in resources and databases.[47]

With only five copies, Jeremiah is now closer to Ezekiel (seven manuscripts), far from the 12, Daniel or Enoch (a dozen scrolls each), and much farther from Isaiah (two dozen scrolls). Though the number of copies is not the sole indicator of a book's popularity or authority (see Langlois 2014), the paucity of manuscripts and their fragmentary state remain a hindrance for the study of redactional and textual history.

Positive evidence may, however, be used to confirm the existence of a passage or text type at a certain period. For instance, 4Q70 testifies to the existence of at least part of the Book of Jeremiah in the third (or very early second) century BCE, which is earlier than what has sometimes been suggested for its first redaction.[48]

2 Of the five remaining scrolls, none preserves a recension that is independent from those attested by 𝔐 and 𝔊. There are, here and there, a few variant readings; but they are minimal and insufficient to postulate the existence of another recension. The most independent witness is 2Q13 (2QJer), yet its degree of independence is far from that of some Torah scrolls. It seems, therefore, that the redaction history of the Book of Jeremiah is less complex than that of the Pentateuch. This might be due to a limited interest in the Book of Jeremiah, with fewer redactors working on it, which would also explain the limited number of copies.

But let us be careful not to fall into circular reasoning: it is perhaps precisely because less copies were found that we get the impression of a less complex redaction history. The discovery of more manuscripts could perhaps reveal more textual families. Be that as it may, the evidence at hand shows that the known scrolls generally belong to the family of 𝔐 or 𝔊, not in between, and not to another family. It also strongly favours the proto-Masoretic recension, with four manuscripts against one for proto-Greek recension. These numbers should be used with caution, of course, as the manuscripts are too few and too fragmentary; but they do reveal the weight of the proto-Masoretic recension.

3 The scribes' editorial activity, as visible on the manuscripts themselves, is limited. 4Q70 (4QJer[a]) is the only scroll that exhibits a large addition: in col. III, an entire section corresponding to Jer 7:30–8:3 has been added in the margins. Tov, the editor, believes that this addition is the mere correction of a *parablepsis*: "It appears that the sole reason for this omission was technical, a mere scribal error, probably with the eye of the copyist jumping from one open section to the next" (Tov 1997: 152).[49] But this so-called 'omission' is quite lengthy and represents the equivalent of a dozen lines. Skipping a word or a line is frequent; but jumping halfway through a column is hard to believe, even for a distracted scribe! Especially when, as in the present case, the 'omission' happens to be an independent section, which suggests a much more obvious explanation: the section was simply absent from the *Vorlage*.[50] Tov discards this hypothesis on the grounds that 4Q70 is elsewhere very close to 𝔐, as though the proto-Masoretic recension were a coherent unit without the possibility of inner redactional phases. This scenario

seems too simplistic, and we should not exclude the possibility that there may have been several stages that led to this recension as we know it.[51]

There is more. Another argument must be taken into account: the date of this manuscript. It is, by far, the oldest manuscript of the Book of Jeremiah, and may have been copied as early as the second half of the third century BCE. Its *Vorlage* cannot be later than the third century BCE and may even date to the fourth century BCE. Such an early period is perhaps not a coincidence, and makes it all the more possible that this section had not been incorporated yet – and perhaps not even composed yet. This ancient scroll may have been one of the few copies in circulation at the time and used by the redactors who, in Jerusalem or elsewhere, worked on the Book of Jeremiah. It is even tempting to view it as some kind of archetype or master copy used for the literary development of the book towards the proto-Masoretic recension; indeed, such a concept may be found in the Book of Jeremiah itself (especially in chapter 36) and might thus reflect the views and scribal practices of its redactors (see e.g. Schenker 2013: 22–3). This bold theory is made possible by the age and peculiar script of the manuscript, which stands apart from all other Dead Sea Scrolls.

On the other hand, the numerous 'mistakes' pointed out by Tov reflect badly on the scroll's quality and the skills of its scribe; but a closer look at the corrections reveals that, in most cases, they reflect an evolution in the pronunciation, spelling, or edition, rather than the rectification of a careless scribe's mistakes.[52] There remain, however, several corrections that seem to rectify some negligence in the copy of the scroll. But they do not necessarily disqualify the scroll from being a master or working copy used by redactors for editorial revisions of the book; they could, on the contrary, confirm that this scroll was used for such work rather than mere reading.

In any case, the major marginal addition to col. III may be regarded as a witness of the Book of Jeremiah's textual growth leading to the proto-Masoretic recension around the third century BCE. The fragmentary condition of 4Q70 precludes us, however, from knowing the extent of this recension at the time, especially regarding chapters that are not even attested in this scroll.

4 The short recension is attested by two fragments only – 4Q71 and 4Q72a – which were probably copied by the same scribe on the same scroll. They are indirect witnesses of 𝔊, but they also exhibit variant readings of their own, which complicates the dating of the proto-Greek recension, especially given the small size of these two fragments. It is noteworthy, however, that the short recension existed in Hebrew and cannot, therefore, be the mere result of a shortening of the long recension for stylistic purposes by the Greek translator.[53]

As for the manuscript composed of 4Q71 and 4Q72a, it is better seen as a cousin of 𝔊 rather than as its direct ancestor. This position in the stemma is also confirmed by its dating in the first century BCE, and not in the early second century BCE as in Tov's edition.

5 In the same period, the direct ancestor of 𝔐 seems well established with a witness such as 4Q72 (4QJer[c]), a scroll that preserves a large part of the Book of Jeremiah (chapters 4–33). This does not mean that the book's redactional activity

is completed, or that the proto-Masoretic recension alone has survived: at the same moment, or shortly afterwards, a scroll is copied with variant readings of its own (2Q13, 2QJer). This manuscript is not a simple missing link between proto-𝔊 and proto-𝔐, but rather a cousin of proto-𝔐 with its own developments. This witness shows that the redaction of the Book of Jeremiah was not linear or brutal, jumping from a short to a long recension or vice versa; redactional activity continued in parallel until, at least, the turn of the era.[54]

This complex relationship between the two recensions is shown on Table 1.1.

In conclusion, the Dead Sea Scrolls of Jeremiah challenge the priority of a recension over another:

1. On the one hand, the long recension at the origin of 𝔐, including its structure, seems quite advanced by the end of the third century BCE (at least for the chapters that are preserved) and might thus have existed prior to 𝔊. In other words, the short recension attested by 𝔊 is not necessarily older and might be due to an editorial reworking of a longer recension. I am not saying that this is the case; I am just pointing out that the limited manuscript evidence at our disposal leaves this door open.
2. However, the presence of Hebrew scrolls that preserve the shorter recension shows that, if it is secondary, it is not (or not always) merely due to stylistic reworking occasioned by the Greek translation.
3. Finally, some of the pluses in 𝔐 may on the contrary be later than 𝔊, as redactional activity seems to continue in Hebrew until (at least) the turn of the era.

Table 1.1 Chronological list of the earliest manuscripts of the Book of Jeremiah with their textual typology

Manuscript	*Chapters*	*Date*	*Kinship*	*Notes*
4Q70 (4QJer[a])	Jer 7–22(26?)	2nd half of 3rd c. or early 2nd c. BCE	>𝔐	• Minimal own variants • Numerous corrections • Editorial activity: addition of a section (Jer 7:30–8:3)
4Q72b (4QJer[e])	Jer 50	Turn of 1st c. BCE	𝔐?	• Single small fragment
4Q71 and 4Q72a (4QJer[b] and 4QJer[d])	4Q71: Jer 9–10 4Q72a: Jer 43 (𝔊 50)	Mid 1st c. BCE	≈𝔊	• Tov: 1st half of 2nd c. BCE! • Short recension (verses absent), sometimes shorter than 𝔊 • Occasional agreement with 𝔐
4Q72 (4QJer[c])	Jer 4–33	2nd half or late 1st c. BCE	𝔐	• Minimal own variants
2Q13 (2QJer)	Jer 42–49	1st half of 1st c. CE	≈𝔐	• Own variants

Notes

1 For a survey, see Römer (2013: 400–11).
2 I use 'biblical' with quotations marks here because (1) this terminology is anachronistic and (2) the authoritative status of a given book at the time must not be taken for granted; see Michael Langlois (2014).
3 In this account, De Vaux does not identify the two fragments.
4 My dating agrees with that of Tigchelaar (2017), Lange (2018).
5 𝔐 stands for the Masoretic text of the Hebrew Bible, exemplified by the Leningrad Codex.
6 𝔊 stands for the Old Greek version of Jeremiah, often exemplified by Codex Vaticanus.
7 Dominique Baillet thus ascribes 2Q13 "en gros" ('broadly') to the Masoretic recension; see Baillet 1962: 63. He is recently followed by Tigchelaar (2017: 301; Lange 2018: 281, 286).
8 According to De Vaux, about 1000 fragments were excavated by his team out of at least 15000 fragments from cave 4Q.
9 See PAM 41.140, available at www.deadseascrolls.org.il/explore-the-archive/image/B-288370, and PAM 41.168, available at www.deadseascrolls.org.il/explore-the-archive/image/B-288399.
10 The date proposed here is close to earlier assessments by Frank Moore Cross (ca. 200 BCE) and Ada Yardeni (late third or early second century BCE), except that I would not exclude a slightly earlier date in the third century BCE given the paucity of evidence from that period; see Cross (1998), Ada Yardeni (1990: 268).
11 Earlier manuscripts use the Hebrew script (also known as Old Hebrew or Palaeo-Hebrew); see Langlois (forthcoming).
12 See for instance the virtual reconstructions tested for 4Q47 frag. 17–22 in Langlois (2011).
13 My assessment thus agrees with that of Emanuel Tov, who considers this scroll to be "very close to the proto-Massoretic text"; see Tov (1997: 151). See also recently Lange (2018: 281).
14 PAM 41.146, available at www.deadseascrolls.org.il/explore-the-archive/image/B-288376.
15 Tov is followed by Lange (2018: 289).
16 In the same discussion, Emanuel Tov also refers to Émile Puech's dating in "the Hasmonaean period", which is correct albeit a bit vague; the later features mentioned above exclude the early Hasmonean period.
17 In that regard, the raw statistics provided by Lange ("4QJer[b] reads five times with and six times against MT, four times with and seven times against LXX, and is non-aligned on two occasions") are useful for textual criticism but not for redaction criticism without qualitative analysis; see Lange (2018: 290).
18 My assessment is thus somewhat more careful than that of Tov, who considers 4Q71 to be "very similar to the text from which 𝔊 was translated"; see Tov (1997a: 172).
19 The earliest photographs are: PAM 40.579. Available at: www.deadseascrolls.org.il/explore-the-archive/image/B-278383; PAM 40.598. Available at: www.deadseascrolls.org.il/explore-the-archive/image/B-278402; PAM 40.602. Available at: www.deadseascrolls.org.il/explore-the-archive/image/B-278406; PAM 40.615, Available at: www.deadseascrolls.org.il/explore-the-archive/image/B-278419; PAM 40.963. Available at: www.deadseascrolls.org.il/explore-the-archive/image/B-279109.
20 The qualification 'semi-masoretic' is ascribed to both 2Q13 and 4Q72 in Tigchelaar (2017: 301), Lange (2018: 281). But 4Q72 is much closer to 𝔐 than 2Q13.
21 Tov (1997c: 203–5, pl. XXXVII). This choice is supported by Lange (2018: 289).
22 See, for instance, PAM 43.078, available at www.deadseascrolls.org.il/explore-the-archive/image/B-284880.
23 According to Tov, Naveh "stressed that the discrepancies between them derived from the difference in time between the writing of chapters 9–10, 43 and 50 respectively".

This argument is in line with the above-mentioned possible use of a thicker or worn calamus. It would also explain the difference in 'size of the letters' pointed out by Ada Yardeni.

24 My observations are based on personal examination of photographs of the fragments, before consulting previous studies. A comparison with Ada Yardeni's palaeographical chart reveals that the latter can be misleading; for instance, on her chart of 4Q72a ב seems to protrude to the right whereas it is not the case in many occurrences; ע on 4Q71 seems to exhibit a short and straight diagonal but the two occurrences are in reality partially damaged or covered. This is a common problem with palaeographical charts, and that's why palaeographical analysis (comparative or not) must always be carried out directly and personally, without relying on another scholar's palaeographical charts.

25 Emanuel Tov lists other differences, but they are not due to a difference in ductus – even in the case of א, despite Puech's opinion referred to by Tov (1989: 193).

26 According to Armin Lange, "4QJer^{d} was probably a non-aligned manuscript"; see Lange 2018: 281, 296, 300. But one should distinguish between major variant readings, which reveal a copy's recension, and minor variant readings, which have little to do with a recension. And the list of major variant readings compiled above shows that 4QJer^{d} was much closer to the short recension. If I were to imitate Lange's terminology, I would say that 4QJer^{d} is 'semi-LXX' *Vorlage*.

27 Emanuel Tov thus acknowledges that "the links between the contents of 4QJer^{b} and 4QJer^{d} are strong" and that they share a similar text type; see Tov (1997a: 172).

28 Such is the case, for instance, with 1QIs^{a} col. XLIX and LII, the latter being half as wide as the former. A picture is available at: http://dss.collections.imj.org.il/isaiah#65:4. Emanuel Tov is aware of this (and other) instances, see e.g. Tov (1989: 193; 1992: 531).

29 Note that, when Emanuel Tov refers to Ada Yardeni's dating of the fragments, her assessment concerns 4Q71 and 4Q72a 'at least', which may indicate that she noticed that the script of 4Q72b was quite different; see Tov (1989: 197; 1992: 533).

30 According to Tov, "the textual character cannot be analyzed because the fragment is too small"; I agree that the small size of this fragment precludes a precise study, but there are more variant readings here than in 4Q71, and they seem quite conclusive. 4Q72b is thus correctly said to be 'like MT' in Tigchelaar (2017: 301).

31 This is fragment #55 in Tigchelaar (2017a: 182).

32 At least until version 3.3, released in Fall 2018. See www.accordancebible.com/store/details/?pid=DSSB-C.

33 Noah (2005: 16). Cited in Eshel and Eshel (2007: 275, n. 14).

34 The purchase date was provided to me by Torleif Elgvin in a personal communication.

35 This manuscript is, unfortunately but expectedly, included in recent studies; see e.g. Tigchelaar (2017: 289), Lange (2018: 292–4).

36 I shared my conclusions with one of the editors, Kipp Davis, as soon as I saw the volume at the Brill booth during the 2016 SBL Annual Meeting. I stated them publicly a few months later; see Langlois (2017).

37 www.museumofthebible.org/press/press-releases/museum-of-the-bible-releases-research-findings-on-fragments-in-its-dead-sea-scrolls-collection. See also Langlois (2018), https://theconversation.com/fake-scrolls-at-the-museum-of-the-bible-106012.

38 This fragment's text type is discussed in Lange (2018: 294–5).

39 This fragment has been given the inventory number DSS F.156 (F.Jer3) in Tigchelaar (2017a: 181, #26).

40 Eshel and Eshel (2007: 275–6). This fragment is thus listed twice (#26 and #55) in Tigchelaar (2017a: 181–2). In a recent publication, Eibert Tigchelaar was still not aware that this is the same fragment; see Tigchelaar (2017: 302).

41 James H. Charlesworth, "Announcing an Unknown Dead Sea Scroll: Jeremiah 48:29–31a", May 1, 2010, http://foundationjudaismchristianorigins.org/ftp/dead-sea-scrolls/unpub/DSS-jeremiah.pdf (see note 61 in the middle of page 2 in the aforementioned PDF).

42 The clumsy script led Hanan and Esther Eshel to read it as a ב; see Eshel and Eshel (2007: 275).

43 This low position led Hanan and Esther Eshel to read it as the base of a ט; see Eshel and Eshel (2007: 275).

44 The former is read י by Eshel and Eshel (2007: 276).

45 I have several scenarios in mind. One of them (somewhere between the most honourable and most evil ones) is that a collector asked an antiquities dealer for a Jeremiah scroll, which prompted a forger to produce this fragment and sell it as such; when shown to scholars, it was already labelled Jeremiah, which influenced them and led them to look for matching passages in Jeremiah.

46 This fragment's text type is discussed in Lange (2018: 300–1). Armin Lange labels it "XJer?."

47 In the case of the Book of Jeremiah, the fragment published by Hanan and Esther Eshel as 4Q72 frag. 21a should be removed altogether from Martin Abegg's "Dead Sea Scrolls Biblical Manuscripts" database.

48 For instance around 140 BCE according to Schenker (1994: 282). But Schenker's hypothesis is based on Jer 30–31 and 33, which are not found in 4Q70. The mere existence of this manuscript does not therefore necessarily preclude a later redaction for the long recension as a whole, contra Tigchelaar (2017: 291, n. 8).

49 This was already the explanation of Janzen (1973: 174). Cited in Lange (2018: 284). Lange adopts the same explanation.

50 Thus Ulrich (2008: 506) concludes that "it seems preferable to consider Jer 7:30–8:3 a passage inserted into the text of Jeremiah subsequent to the formation of the text tradition which the scribe of 4QJer^{a} inherited and copied".

51 Tov's simplistic view is also seen in his assumptions regarding the short recension, as pointed out by Tigchelaar (2017: 290).

52 For instance, what Tov reads as an erased כ in VII.1 3 is actually a ו and may be interpreted as an epenthetic nun.

53 I agree on this point with Tigchelaar (2017: 289). However, he mentions three 'different manuscripts' (4Q71, 4Q72a, and MS 4612/9) whereas, as we have seen, there is probably only one genuine manuscript in support of the short recension.

54 Contra Tigchelaar (2017: 290–1). He states that the evidence "does not attest to ongoing literary growth of the text of the Book of Jeremiah after the early second century BCE" in reference to 4Q70 but, as we have seen, 2Q13 exhibits textual growth beyond the proto-Masoretic recension.

Bibliography

Abegg, M. n.d. "Dead Sea Scrolls Biblical Manuscripts" database.

Baillet, M. 1962. "13. Jérémie". In *Les 'petites grottes' de Qumrân* (*Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan* III). M. Baillet, J.T. Milik, and R. de Vaux (eds.). Oxford: Clarendon Press: 62–9, pl. XIII.

Charlesworth, J.H. 2010. "Announcing an Unknown Dead Sea Scroll: Jeremiah 48:29–31a". May 1, 2010, http://foundationjudaismchristianorigins.org/ftp/dead-sea-scrolls/unpub/DSS-jeremiah.pdf.

Cross, F.M. 1998. "Palaeography and the Dead Sea Scrolls". In *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*. P.W. Flint and J.C. VanderKam (eds.). Vol. I. Leiden: Brill: 379–402, pl. 9–14.

Davis, K. et al. 2017. "Nine Dubious 'Dead Sea Scrolls' Fragments from the Twenty-First Century". *Dead Sea Discoveries* 24(2): 189–228.

Elgvin, T. and Davis, K. 2016. "MS 4612/9. 4Q(?)Jer (Jer 3.15–19)". In *Gleanings from the Caves. Dead Sea Scrolls and Artefacts from The Schøyen Collection*. T. Elgvin, K. Davis, and M. Langlois (eds.). Library of Second Temple Studies, 71. London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark: 210–11.

Eshel, E. and Eshel, H. 2007. "A Preliminary Report on Seven New Fragments from Qumran/שבעה קטעי מגילות מקומראן שטרם פורסמו". *Meghillot Studies. Dead Sea Scrolls מגילות מחקרים במגילות מדבר יהודה ה/ו*: 6–275.

Janzen, G.J. 1973. *Studies in the Text of Jeremiah*. Harvard Semitic Monographs, 6. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Lange, A. 2018. "Texts of Jeremiah in the Qumran Library". In *The Book of Jeremiah: Composition, Reception, and Interpretation*. J.R. Lundbom, C.A. Evans, and B.A. Anderson (eds.). Vetus Testamentum Supplements, 178. Leiden: Brill: 280–302.

Langlois, M. 2011. *Le texte de Josué 10. Approche philologique, épigraphique et diachronique Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis*, 252. Fribourg/Göttingen: Academic Press/Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

———. 2014. "Usages et mésusages de l'Écriture comme critères de proto-canonicité au tournant de notre ère". In *Usages et mésusages de l'Écriture. Approches interdisciplinaires de la référence scripturaire*. Daniel Frey, Christian Grappe, and Madeleine Wieger (eds.). Écriture et société. Strasbourg: Presses universitaires de Strasbourg: 31–50.

———. 2016. "Palaeographical Analysis of the Dead Sea Scrolls in The Schøyen Collection". In *Gleanings from the Caves. Dead Sea Scrolls and Artefacts from The Schøyen Collection*. T. Elgvin, K. Davis, and M. Langlois (eds.). Library of Second Temple Studies, 71. London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark: 87–90.

———. 2017. Assessing the Authenticity of Dead Sea Scrolls Fragments Through Palaeographical Analysis. In: *Presented at the Society of Biblical Literature 2017 International Meeting*. Berlin, August 8, 2017.

———. 2018. "Fake Scrolls at the Museum of the Bible". *The Conversation*. Available at: https://theconversation.com/fake-scrolls-at-the-museum-of-the-bible-106012 [Accessed November 4, 2018].

———. Forthcoming. "Dead Sea Scrolls Palaeography and the Samaritan Pentateuch". In *The Samaritan Pentateuch and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by M. Langlois. *Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology*. Leuven: Peeters.

Noah, W.H. 2005. *Ink & Blood: Dead Sea Scrolls to the English Bible: The Museum Exhibit of the Bible*. Murfreesboro, Tenn.: ACO.

Römer, T. 2013. "Jeremia". In *Einleitung in das Alte Testament: die Bücher der Hebräischen Bibel und die alttestamentlichen Schriften der katholischen, protestantischen und orthodoxen Kirchen*. T. Römer, J.-D. Macchi, and C. Nihan (eds.). C. Henschel, J. Hillebrand, and W. Hüllstrung (trans.). Zürich: Theologischer Verlag Zürich: 400–11.

Schenker, A. 1994. "La rédaction longue du livre de Jérémie doit-elle être datée au temps des premiers Hasmonéens? " *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 70(4): 281–93.

———. 2013. *Une Bible archétype? Les parallèles de Samuel-Rois et des Chroniques*. Edited by M. Langlois. *L'écriture de la Bible*, 3. Paris: Cerf.

Schøyen, M. 2016. "Acquisition and Ownership History: A Personal Reflection". In *Gleanings from the Caves. Dead Sea Scrolls and Artefacts from The Schøyen Collection*. T. Elgvin, K. Davis, and M. Langlois (eds.). Library of Second Temple Studies, 71. London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark: 27–32.

Tigchelaar, E.J.C. 2017a. "A Provisional List of Unprovenanced, Twenty-First Century, Dead Sea Scrolls-like Fragments". *Dead Sea Discoveries* 24(2): 182.

———. 2017b. "Jeremiah's Scriptures in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Growth of a Tradition". In *Jeremiah's Scriptures: Production, Reception, Interaction, and Transformation*. H. Najman and K. Schmid (eds.). *The Journal for the Study of Judaism Supplements*, 173. Leiden/Boston: Brill.

Tov, E. 1989. "The Jeremiah Scrolls from Qumran". *Revue de Qumrân* 14(2): 197.

———. 1992. "Three Fragments of Jeremiah from Qumran Cave 4" '. *Revue de Qumrân* 15(4): 533.

———. 1997. "70. 4QJer^{a}". In *Qumran Cave 4, X. The Prophets*. E.C. Ulrich et al. (eds.). *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert* XV. Oxford: Clarendon Press: 145–70, pl. XXIV–XXIX.

———. 1997a. "71. 4QJer^{b}". In *Qumran Cave 4, X. The Prophets*. E.C. Ulrich et al. (eds.). *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert* XV. Oxford: Clarendon Press: 171–6, pl. XXIX.

———. 1997b. "72. 4QJer^{c}". In *Qumran Cave 4, X. The Prophets*. E.C. Ulrich et al. (eds.). *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert* XV: 177–201, pl. XXX–XXXVI.

———. 1997c. "72a. 4QJer^{d}". In *Qumran Cave 4, X. The Prophets*. E.C. Ulrich et al. (eds.). *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert* XV. Oxford: Clarendon Press: 203–5, pl. XXXVII.

———. 1997d. "72b. 4QJer^{e}". In *Qumran Cave 4, X. The Prophets*. E.C. Ulrich et al. (eds.). *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert* XV. Oxford: Clarendon Press: 207, pl. XXXVII.

Tov, E., Davis, K., and Duke, R.R. (eds.). 2016. *Dead Sea Scrolls Fragments in the Museum Collection. Publications of Museum of the Bible*. Vol. 1. Leiden: Brill.

Ulrich, E.C. 2008. "Deuteronomistically Inspired Scribal Insertions into the Developing Biblical Texts: 4QJudg^{a} and 4QJer^{a}". In *Houses Full of All Good Things. Essays in Memory of Timo Veijola*. J. Pakkala and M. Nissinen (eds.). Publications of the Finnish Exegetical Society, 95. Helsinki/Göttingen: Finnish Exegetical Society/Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht: 489–506.

Vaux, R. de. 1962. "Archéologie". In *Les 'petites grottes' de Qumrân* (*Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan* III). M. Baillet, J. Tadeusz Milik, and R. de Vaux (eds.). Oxford: Clarendon Press: 3–36.

———. 1977. "Archéologie". In *Qumrân grotte 4. II*. R. de Vaux and J.T. Milik (eds.). *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert* VI. Oxford: Clarendon Press: 3–8.

Yardeni, A. 1990. "The Palaeography of 4QJer^{a} – A Comparative Study". *Textus* 15: 233–68.