

THE POST-2002 FRAGMENTS’ DEPENDENCY ON MODERN EDITIONS OF THE HEBREW BIBLE (1)

Abstract

This article presents the results of a systematic analysis of 27 unprovenanced post-2002 “Dead Sea Scrolls” fragments, the goal of which has been to test a hypothesis of textual correspondence between fragments and modern editions of the Hebrew Bible. The hypothesis is twofold: (1) There is a line-to-line layout correspondence between some fragments and modern editions of the Hebrew Bible; (2) readings suggested in the critical apparatus by the editors of the modern editions often appear to have been imported onto the fragments. The analysis confirms that six of ten fragments which were known to be modern forgeries at the time this analysis was conducted, as well as five of the remaining seventeen fragments, exhibit this feature. The article therefore illustrates that textual correspondence is in some cases a characteristic of modern forgery, and that some forgeries attest to a banal use of modern editions of the Hebrew Bible in the forgers’ fragment production.

INTRODUCTION

OVER the past several years, the authenticity of several unprovenanced fragments purported to be both ancient and from the area around the Dead Sea has been called into question. (2)

(1) This article is based on research completed as part of a MA thesis at MF Norwegian School of Theology, Religion and Society, Oslo. Thanks are due to Matthew Monger, Årstein Justnes and Torleif Elgvin for their guidance and feedback. I am also grateful for the feedback and comments from the three anonymous reviewers.

(2) Kipp Davis, Ira Rabin, Ines Feldman, Myriam Krutzsch, Hasia Rimon, Årstein Justnes, Torleif Elgvin, and Michael Langlois, “Nine Dubious ‘Dead Sea Scrolls’ Fragments from the Twenty-First Century,” *Dead Sea Discoveries* 24 (2017): 189–228, doi:10.1163/15685179–12341428; “Museum of the Bible Releases Research Findings on Fragments in Its Dead Sea Scrolls Collection,” *Museumofthebible.org*, 22 October

It is important to mention that when dealing with unprovenanced material, one should first and foremost address provenance issues. (3) Dennis Mizzi and Jodi Magness rightly argue that scholars should not publish unprovenanced material, and further specify that even after primary publication, one should only research unprovenanced fragments if the goal is “to highlight the fact that an already published fragment is a fake or else lacks the necessary information to prove whether or not it is licit.” (4) This article aims to illustrate the post-2002 fragments’ dependency on modern editions of the Hebrew Bible, and thus aligns with the aforementioned goal.

Physical and paleographic features of some of the post-2002 “Dead Sea Scrolls” (“DSS”) fragments have been evaluated in order to ascertain their authenticity. (5) Another feature which is allegedly found in post-2002 fragments concerns the text and layout of the fragments. (6) In this article, I will present and evaluate the hypothesis that some post-2002 “DSS” fragments show significant textual correspondence to modern editions of the Hebrew Bible and discuss what this could entail. This builds on Christian Askeland’s work on “the Gospel of Jesus’ Wife” (7) as well as studies by Kipp Davis, Eibert Tigchelaar, Årstein Justnes, and Torleif Elgvin. (8) It is my hope that this article can contribute with insights into the forgery production of DSS.

2018, https://www.museumofthebible.org/press/press-releases/museum-of-the-bible-releases-research-findings-on-fragments-in-its-dead-sea-scrolls-collection?fbclid=IwAR0abWh-Q125hQ-yRPM1fTit3sLMmET80Ku338_xXJYpVxGcLfa7N5qdT0k0.

(3) For a succinct and well-presented argument of this, see Dennis Mizzi and Jodi Magness, “Provenance vs. Authenticity: An Archeological Perspective on the Post-2002 ‘Dead Sea Scrolls-like’ fragments,” *Dead Sea Discoveries* 26 (2019): 135–169, doi:10.1163/15685179–12341503.

(4) Mizzi and Magness, “Provenance vs. Authenticity,” 159.

(5) Davis et al., “Nine Dubious”; Torleif Elgvin and Michael Langlois, “Looking back,” *Revue de Qumran* 31 (2019): 111–133, doi: 10.2143/RQ.31.1.3286506; Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, “Gleanings from the Caves? Really? On the Likelihood of Dead Sea Scrolls Forgeries in the Schøyen Collection,” *Revue de Qumran* 29 (2017) 314–322.

(6) See for example Justnes and Elgvin’s useful insights regarding textual correspondence between fragments and modern text editions: Årstein Justnes and Torleif Elgvin, “A Private Part of Enoch: A Forged Fragment of 1 Enoch 8:4–9:3,” in *Wisdom Poured Out Like Water: Studies on Jewish and Christian Antiquity in Honor of Gabriele Boccacini*, edited by J. Harold Eddens et al. (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2018), 195–203. See especially pp. 200–203.

(7) Christian Askeland, “A Fake Coptic John and its implications for the ‘Gospel of Jesus’s Wife’,” *Tyndale Bulletin* 65 no. 1 (2014): 1–10.

(8) See for example Davis et al., “Nine Dubious”; Kipp Davis, “Caves of Dispute: Patterns of Correspondence and Suspicion in the Post-2002 ‘Dead Sea Scrolls’ Fragments,” *Dead Sea Discoveries* 24 (2017): 229–270, doi:10.1163/15685179–12341441; Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, “A Provisional List of Unprovenanced, Twenty-First Century,

The hypothesis of textual correspondence is twofold: 1) It argues that there is a correspondence in line to line layout between certain fragments and modern editions of the Hebrew Bible; (9) and 2) that there is a tendency to import readings suggested in the critical apparatus by the editors of the modern editions. (10) The hypothesis is thus that potential forgers were in some cases very reliant on the texts of modern editions of the Hebrew Bible for the production of forgeries. For the layout of the fragments this seems to be a practical question, but when it comes to the textual variants, the motivation for, and importance of, the use of the text-critical apparatus of a modern edition is more complicated. The presence of variants which are not known from Hebrew manuscripts, but are found in other ancient translations, or even only as suggestions by the editors of a modern edition, may have contributed to scholars' fascination with these fragments.

SELECTED FRAGMENTS

In the following, I will present the results of a systematic analysis of twenty-seven fragments from The Schøyen Collection and the Museum of the Bible Collection (MOTB). (11) Ten of these fragments were already known to be modern forgeries at the time this analysis was conducted (12). As was the case for "the Gospel of Jesus' Wife," (13) six of these ten fragments confirm the hypothesis of textual correspondence.

Dead Sea Scrolls-like Fragments," *Dead Sea Discoveries* 24 (2017): 173–188; Justnes and Elgvin, "A Private Part of Enoch."

(9) Torleif Elgvin, "Texts and Artefacts from the Judaean Desert in The Schøyen Collection: An Overview," in *Gleanings from the Caves: Dead Sea Scrolls and Artefacts from The Schøyen Collection*, ed. Torleif Elgvin, Kipp Davis, and Michael Langlois, LSTS 71 (London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2016), 53. See also Askeland, "A Fake Coptic John," where Askeland argues convincingly for the inauthenticity of a (fake) Coptic John fragment, and by extension The Gospel of Jesus' Wife, based on its "textual affinity with the 1924 edition of the 'Qau codex'."

(10) Elgvin, "Texts and Artefacts," 53; Davis et al., "Nine Dubious," 201.

(11) The selection of the material here is influenced by access to research on the fragments in The Schøyen Collection and the MOTB.

(12) Davis et al., "Nine Dubious"; "Museum of the Bible Releases Research Findings." Elgvin and Langlois recently published an article ("Looking back") presenting their current position on the authenticity of the fragments and artefacts in the 2016 publication of The Schøyen Collection, deeming many of them modern forgeries. Note that "Looking back" was published after this article was written. It was therefore not possible to incorporate their designations in this article.

(13) Askeland, "A Fake Coptic John."

To avoid confusion of the different numbering systems in the two collections, Tigchelaar's numeric system will be used. (14) However, because the fragments' status as DSS fragments is so dubious, the initial "DSS" in Tigchelaar's system will be excluded. Furthermore, only fragments which contain biblical texts which are a part of the traditional Hebrew canon have been included in the analysis. (15) This means that books such as Tobit and 1 Enoch are left out of this particular analysis – as are fragments in other collections. The only exception from the selection above is F.193 which, due to its lack of concrete identification, was too difficult to analyze in the scope of this article. (16) For the sake of testing the assumption of this article empirically, an equal number of "pre-2002" fragments have also been analyzed using the same criteria, and the results have been compared. (17) These results will not be presented in detail, but will be mentioned briefly, so as to verify the criteria used in this analysis.

SELECTED EDITIONS

In this analysis, Kittel's second edition of *Biblia Hebraica* (18) (BHK) and *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (19) (BHS) will be consulted. This selection has been made because Torleif Elgvin and Kipp Davis have named these editions as possible bases for some of the fragments in question. (20) Furthermore, BHK and BHS are the most common tools in the field, (21) and cover the two main textual bases for modern

(14) Tigchelaar, "A Provisional List," 178–184.

(15) A complete list of all the post-2002 fragments analyzed for this article is found in the appendix.

(16) *Ibid.*, 182.

(17) The fragments are of roughly the same size as the post-2002 fragments in question and have been chosen to cover most of the books from the Hebrew Bible (as the post-2002 fragments do), but otherwise at random. The following "pre-2002" fragments were analyzed: 1QGen frg 1, 1QGen frg 2, 1QExod frg 1, 1QDeut frg 9, 4QLev^c frg 1, 4QLev^c frg 3, 4QDeut^c frg 1, 4QDeut^c frg 5, 4QJosh^a frg 17–18, 4QJudg^b frg 1, 4QKgs frg 1, 4QKgs frg 3–4, 4QIsa^a frg 6, 4QIsa^a frg 9, 4QJer^a col 6 part 1, 4QJer^a col 9 part 2, 4QJer^b, 4QEzek^a frg 3 col 2, 4QPs^a frg 2, 4QPs^b frg 5 col 2, 4QJob^b frg 1, 4QJob^b frg 4, 4QProv^b frg 1, 4QRuth^b frg 4, 4QLam col 1 frg 1, 4QDan^a frg 7, and 4QEzra frg 2.

(18) Rudolf Kittel, ed., *Biblia Hebraica*, 2nd edition, volume I-II (Stuttgart: Privileg. Württ. Bibelanstalt, 1925).

(19) K. Elliger and W. Rudolph, ed., *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1997).

(20) Elgvin, "Texts and Artefacts," 53; Davis, "Caves of Dispute," 259.

(21) The Hebrew University Bible (HUB) is too late for the fragments in this analysis, but *Biblia Hebraica Quinta* (BHQ) should be consulted in future analyses.

editions of the Hebrew Bible, namely the second Rabbinic Bible (RB2) and the Leningrad Codex (L). (22) In short, BHK and BHS allow for a thorough analysis covering the two likely groups of editions which potential forgers may have turned to. For a later analysis, DJD should also be consulted. (23)

STRUCTURE OF ANALYSIS

In this article, the fragments have been divided into three categories: First, fragments which were known to be modern forgeries at the time this article was written (see below) will be addressed. Secondly, fragments about which concerns were raised in the official publications of The Schøyen Collection (*Gleanings from the Caves: Dead Sea Scrolls and Artefacts from The Schøyen Collection [Gleanings]*) (24) and the MOTB Collection (*Dead Sea Scrolls Fragments in the Museum Collection [DSSFMC]*) (25), will be analyzed. Lastly, the remaining fragments in The Schøyen Collection and the MOTB Collection will be analyzed. (26) The two first categories are explained more thoroughly below. Only for fragments exhibiting clear signs of textual correspondence will the individual analyses be presented in this article.

Fragments known to be modern forgeries

The article “Nine Dubious “Dead Sea Scrolls” Fragments from the 21st Century” (*Nine Dubious*) provides “evidence that nine of these Dead Sea Scrolls-like fragments are modern forgeries.” (27) It contains an analysis of the following fragments: F.103 (Exod), F.104 (Exod), F.105 (Exod), F.112 (1 Sam), and F.122 (Neh) in addition to three Enoch fragments and one Tobit fragment. These were, due to their dubious nature, “withheld from *Gleanings from the Caves*, the official

(22) Emanuel Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 3rd edition (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2012), 70–73.

(23) Justnes and Elgvin, “A Private Part of Enoch,” 201–202; Davis et al., “Nine Dubious,” 203.

(24) Elgvin, Davis, and Langlois, ed., *Gleanings*.

(25) Emanuel Tov, Kipp Davis, and Robert Duke, ed., *DSSFMC*, Publications of Museum of the Bible 1 (Leiden: Brill, 2016).

(26) Photographs of all MOTB fragments in question can be found in *DSSFMC*. Photographs of all Schøyen fragments in question, except those that were withheld from the official publication, can be found in *Gleanings*. Photographs of the five fragments which were withheld from *Gleanings* can be found in Davis et al., “Nine Dubious.”

(27) Davis et al., “Nine Dubious,” 190.

publication of scrolls and artifacts in The Schøyen Collection.” (28) The article argues strongly that these fragments are modern forgeries.

On October 22nd 2018, MOTB published a press release announcing that five of its fragments are modern forgeries: “Utilizing leading-edge technology, the German-based Bundesanstalt für Materialforschung und -prüfung (BAM) has performed a battery of tests and concluded that the five fragments show characteristics inconsistent with ancient origin and therefore will no longer be displayed at the museum.” (29) The press release did not mention the problematic aspects of unprovenanced material in and of itself, but focused on the question of authenticity. Although official reports on the fragments have not been published, David Bradnick named the five fragments which the press release concerns in a response to a Twitter post by *Biblical Archeology Review* (BAR). They are F.191 (Gen), F.194 (Num), F.197 (Jon), F.201 (Neh), and F.203 (Lev). (30)

It is clear that the fragments mentioned above are modern forgeries. The ten fragments will therefore be addressed as *Fragments known to be modern forgeries*. Elgvin and Langlois have in their recent assessment categorized all Schøyen fragments in this analysis, except F.114 (2 Sam), as fake. (31) However, as “Looking back” was published after this article was written, only the fragments that were withheld from publication, or were later announced by their current collector to be fake, will be included under *Fragments known to be modern forgeries*.

Fragments about which concerns were raised in The Schøyen Collection and the Museum of the Bible Collection

In addition to fragments that were withheld from the publication of *Gleanings*, and the five fragments figuring in MOTB’s press release, there are several fragments about which concerns were raised in the official publications of the two collections. What this entails is that the editors of the official publications have voiced concerns regarding the fragments’ authenticity but decided to publish the fragments in question. (32)

(28) Ibid.

(29) “Museum of the Bible Releases Research Findings.”

(30) David Bradnick, “Five Museum of the Bible Dead Sea Scrolls Are Fake,” Twitter, 28 October 2018, https://twitter.com/d_bradnick/status/1056767332268367872.

(31) Elgvin and Langlois, “Looking back,” pp. 130–132.

(32) Note, however, that for the following fourteen fragments, Michael Langlois has described the hand as hesitant, inconsistent or otherwise irregular: F.101 (Gen), F.103 (Exod), F.104 (Exod), F.105 (Exod), F.107 (Num) F.108 (Deut), F.112 (1 Sam),

Criteria for Analysis

Because this type of systematic analysis on “DSS” fragments has never been published before, no formal criteria determining textual correspondence have been established. For the sake of consistency in the analysis, these needed to be formed. When determining whether a fragment’s layout corresponds to modern editions, four categories have been utilized. These four categories are:

- Close match: This term is used when there is a striking resemblance between the layout of a fragment and the layout in one or more of the modern editions. This entails that words and letters are in approximately the same relative position to each other on the fragment as they are in the modern editions.
- Consistent shift: This term is used when each line begins one line below the point at which the previous line ended.
- Some correspondence: This term is used when there is a less obvious, but still visible, correspondence between the layout of a fragment and the layout in one or more of the modern editions.
- No correspondence: This term is used when there is no visible correspondence between the layout of a fragment and the layout in any of the modern editions.

As for variants, the goal of mapping their presence or absence in the critical apparatus is to test the hypothesis of imported readings. There is no infallible way of determining whether readings are suspicious or not, but the arguments presented in “Caves of Dispute” (33) and “Nine Dubious” (34) are very convincing. In light of this, the following categories will be used when analyzing variants:

- Notable: This term is used when hitherto unwitnessed readings which have been suggested in the critical apparatus are found on the fragment.
- Potentially notable: This term is used when I felt that the evidence was ambiguous. This may for example relate to a short text which includes a great number and variety of variants.

F.113 (1 Sam), F.115 (1 Kgs), F.116 (Jer), F.118 (Ps), F.119 (Prov), F.120 (Ruth), and F.122 (Neh). Certain fragments, e.g. F.101 (Gen), also seem to contain text which mixes older and younger palaeographical features. See Langlois, “Paleographical Analysis of the Dead Sea Scrolls in The Schøyen Collection,” pages 79–128 in *Gleanings*. And Davis et al., “Nine Dubious.”

(33) Davis, “Caves of Dispute.”

(34) Davis et al., “Nine Dubious.”

- Not considered notable: This term is used when there is nothing which indicates imported readings. The term will also be used when the results are inconclusive, e.g. when the text is too fragmentary to determine variants.

The results of the analysis of “pre-2002” fragments indicate that *some layout correspondence* and the presence of *potentially notable variants* can be coincidental, as these elements are also present in several pre-2002 fragments. (35) Therefore, only fragments exhibiting a close match, a consistent shift and/or notable variants will be referred to as exhibiting textual correspondence to modern editions, and thus be presented in detail below.

It is my opinion that when a fragment exhibits a close match in layout or a notable variant, this could indicate that the forger who produced the fragments simply copied the text from modern editions, sometimes importing readings from the critical apparatus, without editing the layout of the text, thus not differentiating it from the modern edition in question. (36) One can speculate that more sophisticated forgers may have made changes to the texts’ readings and layout prior to inscribing the fragment, in order not to raise suspicions about the fragments’ authenticity.

ANALYSIS OF FRAGMENTS KNOWN TO BE MODERN FORGERIES

Ten fragments in this analysis are known to be modern forgeries. Five of these belong to the MOTB Collection (F.191 [Gen], F.194 [Num], F.197 [Jon], F.201 [Neh], and F.203 [Lev]), and five are part

(35) Of the 27 pre-2002 fragments which were analyzed (see footnote 17 for list of pre-2002 fragments), three exhibit a close match (4QDeut^e frg. 5, 4QJer^a col. 6 part 1, and 4QProv^b frg. 1), five exhibit some correspondence (1QExod frg. 1, 4QLev^c frg. 3, 4QJudg^b frg. 1, 4QPs^b frg. 5 col. 2, and 4QJob^b frg. 1), none exhibit a consistent shift, and in 19 there is no layout correspondence. This means that where 66,6 % of the post-2002 fragments known to be modern forgeries exhibit a close match or a consistent shift in layout, and 33,3 of all the 27 post-2002 fragments analyzed do the same, this is only found in 11,1 % of the 27 pre-2002 fragments. In other words, the occurrence of a consistent shift or a close match is much more frequent in the post-2002 than the pre-2002 fragments. None of the pre-2002 fragments contained notable variants, two were hesitantly categorized as potentially notable (4QPs^b frg. 5 col. 2 and 4QEzra frg. 2), and 25 contained no notable variants. The presence of notable variants is in other words of interest, as it is only found in the post-2002 fragments in this analysis.

(36) This, in turn, obviously entails that the text on said fragments must have been inscribed after the publication of these modern editions, and not in the times they are purported to have originated.

of The Schøyen Collection (F.103 [Exod], F.104 [Exod], F.105 [Exod], F.112 [1 Sam], and F.122 [Neh]). (37)

F.103 (Schøyen, MS4612/2a, Exod3, Exod 3:13/14–15) (38)

Layout correspondence: close match with 4QExod^b

Transcription (39)

BHK, Exodus 3:13–15 (40)

<p>א[1</p> <p>ר[לבני ישראל] 2</p> <p>ר[עוד אלהים א[3</p> <p>הם ואלהי י[4</p>	<p>14 נִיאָמַר אֱלֹהִים אֵל</p> <p>15 נִיאָמַר כֹּה תֹאמַר לְבְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל אֱהִיָּהּ</p> <p>16 וְנִיאָמַר עוֹד אֱלֹהִים אֶל־מֹשֶׁה כֹּה תֹאמַר אֱלֹהֵי אֲבֹתֵיכֶם אֱלֹהֵי אַבְרָהָם אֱלֹהֵי יִצְחָק וְאֱלֹהֵי יַעֲקֹב וְנָתַן זִכְרִי לְדָר דָּר: 16 לְךָ וְ</p>
---	---

The text on the fragment almost exclusively contains words, or parts of words, which are important in the Hebrew Bible. לבני ישראל (to Israel's sons), אלהים (God), אברהם (Abraham's), and אלהי יצחק (and Isaac's God) can most certainly be characterized as such. It may at first glance seem as though the forgers have chosen the most important terms in the middle of the page in BHK. However, I was made aware by Davis et al. that the layout of the fragment closely matches that of 4QExod^b. (41) It therefore seems that the forger has copied the text from a fragment published in DJD rather than from BHK or BHS. The fragment is categorized as a close match although it matches a DJD publication rather than a modern edition. (42)

(37) For an overview of the acquisition history, see Årstein Justnes and Ludvik A. Kjeldsberg, "The Post-2002 Dead Sea Scrolls Fragments: A Tentative Timeline of Acquisitions," *The Lying Pen of Scribes: Manuscript Forgeries and Counterfeiting Scripture in the Twenty-First Century*, 24 November 2018, <https://lyingpen.com/>.

(38) A photo of the fragment can be found in Davis et al., "Nine Dubious," 203.

(39) Thanks are due to Torleif Elgvin and Årstein Justnes for giving me access to their transcription from May 2013 (unpublished).

(40) Kittel ed., *Biblia Hebraica*, Exodus 3:13–15.

(41) Davis et al., "Nine Dubious," 203; Justnes and Elgvin, "A Private Part of Enoch," 201–202. For comparison, see Eugene Ulrich, Frank Moore Cross, James R. Davila, Nathan Jastram, Judith E. Sanderson, Emanuel Tov, and John Strugnell, *Qumran Cave 4 VII, Discoveries in the Judean Desert 12* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994), 90.

(42) This correspondence to 4QExod^b should urge scholars to conduct an analysis of textual correspondence between all post-2002 fragments and DJD publications.

F.112 (Schøyen, MS4612/10, Sam1, 1 Sam 2:11–14) (43)

Layout correspondence: consistent shift

Transcription (44)	BHK, 1 Samuel 2:11–14 (45)
[○○○]	1 דְּאַלְמָנָה הִרְמְתָה עַל־בֵּיתָו וְהִזְעַר הָיָה מִשְׁרַת אֶת־יְהוָה
] לי בני בליעל לא [2 יְיָ עַל־יְהוָה: 2 וּבְכַנִּי עָלַי בְּגַנִּי בְּלִיעֵל לֹא יָדָעוּ אֶת־יְהוָה:
]א נער הכהו [○	3 פֶּטַח הַכְּהֹנִים אֶת־הָעַם כָּל־אִישׁ זָבַח וְזָבַח וְכָא נָעַר הַכְּהֹן
]או בקלחת או בפרור או[4 הַבָּשָׂר וְיִהְיוּ לֶגְשָׁלֶשׁ הַשָּׁנִים בְּיָדוֹ: 14 וְיִהְיֶה כַּפִּיֹר אוֹ כִּיֹּד
	וְלַחַת אוֹ בַּפְּרוֹר כֹּל אֲשֶׁר־יַעֲלֶה הַמִּזְבֵּחַ יִקַּח הַכְּהֹן בְּיָדוֹ בְּקָדֶה
	לְכַל־יִשְׂרָאֵל הַבָּאִים שָׁם בְּשָׁלָה: 15 גַּם בְּטָרֶם יִקְטְרוּן אֶת־

F.122 (Schøyen, MS5426, Neh1, Neh 3:14–15) (46)

Layout correspondence: close match

Transcription (47)	BHK, Nehemiah 3:14–15 (48)
<i>] Top margin</i>	
נ	וְיִשְׂרָאֵל וְיִשְׂרָאֵל וְיִשְׂרָאֵל וְיִשְׂרָאֵל וְיִשְׂרָאֵל וְיִשְׂרָאֵל וְיִשְׂרָאֵל וְיִשְׂרָאֵל וְיִשְׂרָאֵל וְיִשְׂרָאֵל
] ובניו ויעמיד דלתתיו ב	1 הוּא יִבְנֶנּוּ וְיַעֲמִיד דְּלַתְתֵּיֹו מִנְעָלָיו וְכָרַ
] שלום בן כל חזה שר חצ	2 הַחֲזִיק שְׁלוֹן בֶּן־כַּלְחֹזֶה שֶׁר פִּלְדָּה הַמְצִי
] דלתתיו מנעולו [○	3 וְיַעֲמִידוּ דְּלַתְתֵּיֹו מִנְעָלָיו וּבְרִיתָיו וְאֵת ז
]המל[4 הַמִּלָּךְ וְעַד־הַמְעָלוֹת הַיְוֹדוֹת מַעִיר יְוִיד:
	בֶּן־עֲזַבּוּק שֶׁר חָצִי פִלְדָּה בֵּית־צֹר עַד־נֶגֶד

(43) A photo of the fragment can be found in Davis et al., “Nine Dubious,” 214.

(44) Thanks are due to Torleif Elgvin for giving me access to his transcription from January 2015 (unpublished).

(45) The first line is a tentative guess as only traces of three indiscernible letters are visible. See Kittel ed., *Biblia Hebraica*, 1 Samuel 2:11–14.

(46) A photo of the fragment can be found in Davis et al., “Nine Dubious,” 222.

(47) Thanks are due to Torleif Elgvin for giving me access to his transcription from April 2014 (unpublished).

(48) Kittel, ed., *Biblia Hebraica*, Nehemiah 3:14–15.

Each line on the fragment starts by the right margin, whereas the lines shift ever so slightly towards the left in BHK due to the presence of one word (two on the last line) before the starting word on each line. One cannot deny, however, that the layout correspondence is a close match.

Notable variants

וּבְנָיו (*and his sons*) differs from מְבַנֵּי which reads יִבְנֶנּוּ (*he builds it*), but corresponds to ט which reads καὶ οὐ τοῖς αὐτοῦ. If the transcription is correct, the correction of the supralinear *nun* results in וּבְנָנוּ (*and our sons*). This does not correspond with any reported textual witnesses. Visually, it admittedly brings the text closer to מְבַנֵּי. It is also conceivable that an initial *waw* could later have been confused with a *yod*. In this respect, the text on the fragment can be understood as a textual link between ט and מְבַנֵּי. This may be the theory behind Charlesworth's suggestion that the supralinear *nun* has been inserted to make the text "more in line with the so-called MT". (49) Such corrections are, after all, a well-known practice. However, as this fragment is a modern forgery, it must not be mistaken as a genuine stage in the history of the text. On the contrary, it prompts an important question: *Are theories created based on observations of the fragments, or are the fragments created based on theories about the origin of variant readings and development of texts?* (50)

The reading of the name שְׁלֹמֹם (*Shallum*), matches a few ט manuscripts, but differs from מְבַנֵּי. The most interesting variant is the likely presence of חֲצִי (*half*) between שָׂר (*leader/commander*) and פְּלִיךָ (*district*), which corresponds to a suggestion made in the critical apparatus of BHS, but which is not found in any known textual witnesses. Lastly, the fragment contains the hitherto unwitnessed singular form מְנַעֲוֹלוֹ (*his lock*), as opposed to the plural form in מְנַעֲוֹלוֹת.

(49) Charlesworth, "Unpublished Dead Sea Scrolls Nehemiah."

(50) According to Elgvin (personal communication), F.122 was probably written to appear as if it belonged to 4QEzra. However, the fragment differed enough from 4QEzra that Elgvin determined it could not have belonged to the same scroll. Furthermore, F.122 is a more independent text than the relatively מְבַנֵּי-like 4QEzra. See Eugene Ulrich, Frank Moore Cross, Joseph A. Fitzmyer, Peter W. Flint, Sarianna Metso, Catherine M. Murphy, Curt Niccum, Patrick W. Skehan, Emanuel Tov, and Julio Trebolle Barrera, *Qumran Cave 4 XI: Psalms to Chronicles*, Discoveries in the Judean Desert 16 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000), 291–293.

F.194 (MOTB, SCR.003173, Num2, Num 8:3–5) (51)*Layout correspondence: close match*

Transcription (52)

BHS, Numbers 8:3–5 (53)

1	[] שֶׁר צוּהַ]	3	וַיַּעַשׂ כֵּן אֱהֲרֹן אֶל־מוֹלַד פְּנֵי הַמִּזְבֵּחַ הַזֶּה לְהַעֲלֹה נִרְתִּיבָה בְּאֶשֶׁר
2	יִרְכִּיבָה וְעַד פְּרָחִין]	4	צִוְּתָה יְהוָה אֶת־מִשְׁחָה: וְזֶה מַעֲשֵׂה הַמִּנְחָה מִקִּשְׁתָּה זָקֵב עַד־יִרְכָבֶיךָ:
3	מִשָּׁה כֵּן עֲשֵׂה אֵת הַמֶּן]	5	עֲשֵׂה אֶת־הַמִּנְחָה: ב
4	וַיְדַבֵּר יְהוָה אֶל מֹשֶׁה]	6	וַיְדַבֵּר יְהוָה אֶל־מֹשֶׁה לֵאמֹר: עֲלֶיךָ אֶת־הַלֵּלִים מִהַיּוֹד בְּנֵי־
		7	יִשְׂרָאֵל וְשִׁמְרָתָם אֲתָם: וְכֹה־תַעֲשֶׂה לָהֶם לְשִׁמְרָתָם הַזֶּה עֲלֵיהֶם מִן־

The text is “split” in the modern editions so that line 1, 2, and 3 on the fragment start on the left side of the page and continue on the next line, on the right side of the page. However, each line begins almost precisely below the previous one. The exception is line 4, which represents the beginning of v. 5. This verse begins on a new line in BHS. Interestingly, the layout matches better with this newline in BHS than with the *vacat* in BHK.

F.197 (MOTB, SCR.003171, Jon1, Jon 4:2–5) (54)*Layout correspondence: close match*

Transcription (55)

BHS, Jonah 4:2–5 (56)

1	[עַל הָרַעֲבָה וְעִתָּה]	3	אֲפִלָּם וְרַב־חֶסֶד וְנֶחֱם עַל־הַרְעָה: וְעִתָּה יְהוָה קָדְנָא אֶת־נַפְשִׁי
2	[וְתִי מַחֲיִי]	4	מִמֶּנִּי כִּי טוֹב מוֹתִי מַחֲיִי: ב
3	[כֹּה וַיֵּצֵא יוֹנָה מִן הָעִיר וַיּוֹשֶׁב]	5	וַיֵּצֵא יוֹנָה מִן־הָעִיר וַיֵּשֶׁב מִקְדָּם לְעִיר וַיַּעַשׂ לֹו שָׂם סִבָּה וַיֵּשֶׁב
4	[וַיֵּשֶׁב] [הַ בְּצַל עַד אֲשֶׁר]	6	וַיִּחַסְדָּהּ בְּצַל עַד אֲשֶׁר יִרְאֶה מִה־יְהוָה בְּעִיר: וַיִּמְנַן יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים
		7	קִקְלֹוץ וַיַּעַל מִעַל לְיִוְנָה לְהַזִּיחַ צֶלַע עַל־רֹאשׁוֹ לְהַצִּילָה לֹו מִקְּרָעוֹתָיו

The gradual shift to the right of both the second and third lines is more prominent in the modern editions, and the fourth line appears farther to the left on the fragment than in the modern editions. Still, the layouts are quite similar.

(51) A photo of the fragment can be found in Timothy D. Finlay with Nathan McAleese, and Andrew J. Zimmermann, “Numbers 8:3–5 (Inv. MOTB.SCR.003173),” in *DSSFCM*, 139.

(52) *Ibid*, 132.

(53) Elliger and Rudolph ed., *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*, Numbers 8:3–5.

(54) A photo of the fragment can be found in Catherine McDowell and Thomas Hill, “Jonah 4:2–5 (Inv. MOTB.SCR.003171),” in *DSSFCM*, 176.

(55) *Ibid*, 170.

(56) Elliger and Rudolph ed., *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*, Jonah 4:2–5.

F.201 (MOTB, SCR.003175, Neh2, Neh 2:13–16) (57)

Layout correspondence: close match

Transcription (58)	BHK, 3rd edition Nehemiah 2: 13–16 (59)
<p>1 [וְרִים וְשׁ] 1</p> <p>2 [לְךָ וְאִין מְקוּם לְבַהֲמָה לְעֵבֶב] 2</p> <p>3 [שְׁבַר בַּחֹמָה וְאָשׁוּב וְאָבֹן] 3</p> <p>4 [נָה הַלְכַתְּ] 4</p>	<p>1 הַאֲשָׁפֶת וְאֵהִי שֶׁבַר בְּחֹמַתִּי וְיִשְׁלַם אֲשֶׁר־יִהְיֶה מִפְּרוּצֵי וְשַׁעֲרֵיהָ</p> <p>2 אֶלְלוּ בְּאֵשׁ: 14 וְאֶעֱבֹר אֶל־שַׁעַר הַעִין וְאֶל־בְּרֵכַת הַמַּלְךְ וְאֶיִּדְמָקוּם</p> <p>3 לְבַהֲמָה לְעֵבֶב מִחֶמְתִּי: 15 וְאֵהִי עֹלָה בְּנֹחַל לְיָלֵה וְאֵהִי שֶׁבַר בַּחֹמָה</p> <p>4 וְאָשׁוּב וְאָבֹן: 16 בְּשַׁעַר הַגִּיָּא וְאָשׁוּב: 16 וְהַסְגִּים לֹא יָדְעוּ אֵת הַלְכַתִּי וְמָה אֲנִי עֹשֶׂה וְלִהְיוּדִים וְלִכְהֻנִּים וְלַחֲרָים וְלַסְגִּים וְלִיָּהֵר</p>

The only obvious difference between BHK and the fragment is that the text is again “split” in the modern editions, as illustrated above. Had the page been cut in half and glued together by its outer edges, it would be plain to see that the line to line layout of the fragment is virtually identical to BHK.

Notable variants

The first three legible letters on the fragment, רים, do not correspond to any known textual witnesses. The critical apparatus informs of a *Ketiv/Qere* tradition in \aleph , *Ketiv* reading \aleph *המפורצים* and *Qere* reading \aleph *הם פרוצים*. This is a reading which is considered “a long-standing textual mystery in MT.” (60) It is possible that this variant was created in order to excite scholars who have been hoping for a solution to the difficult reading of \aleph in v. 13.

Furthermore, although the editors’ transcription of the text renders the end of line 3 as a *waw*, it much closer resembles “an annotation – a superscripted Greek letter α – that appears in the printed text of Kittel’s third edition of *Biblia Hebraica*.” (61) This surely is a very suspicious variant.

(57) A photo of the fragment can be found in Martin G. Abegg Jr. with Ryan Blackwelder, Joshua A. Matson, Ryan D. Schroeder, and Joseph Kyle Stewart, “Nehemiah 2:13–16 (Inv. MOTB.SCR.003175),” in *DSSFCM*, 220.

(58) *Ibid.*, 213.

(59) The text starts on the bottom of p. 1302 and continues at the top of p. 1303. For the sake of the illustration, the bottom of p. 1302 has been attached to the top of p. 1303. See Rudolf Kittel ed., *Biblia Hebraica*, 3rd edition (Stuttgart: Privilegierte Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1937), Nehemiah 2:13–16.

(60) Abegg Jr. et al., “Nehemiah 2:13–16,” 216.

(61) Kipp Davis, “Paleographical and Physical Features of the Dead Sea Scrolls in the Museum of the Bible Collection: A synopsis,” in *DSSFCM*, 27. See also Davis, “Caves of Dispute,” 260–261.

Summary of findings for fragments known to be modern forgeries

Six of the ten fragments show textual correspondence to modern editions of the Hebrew Bible. These six fragments are F.103 (Exod), F.112 (1 Sam), F.122 (Neh), F.194 (Num), F.197 (Jon), and F.201 (Neh). Five exhibit a close match in layout and one corresponds by a consistent shift. Two fragments contain notable variants. Of the six fragments which confirm the hypothesis, three belong to The Schøyen Collection and three are part of the MOTB Collection.

In short, more than half of the fragments known to be modern forgeries confirm the hypothesis of textual correspondence. This indicates that textual correspondence between the fragments and modern editions of the Hebrew Bible is in some cases a characteristic of modern forgery.

The analysis also illustrates, however, that some modern forgeries do not correspond to modern editions. One possible explanation is that some forgers have been more sophisticated when producing fragments, for example making sure that the layout will not match that of the edition they are copying from. Other fragments may have been copied from other sources, such as DJD.

ANALYSIS OF FRAGMENTS ABOUT WHICH CONCERNS WERE RAISED IN *GLEANINGS* AND *DSSFC*

There is a total of six fragments about which concerns were raised in the official publications of the MOTB Collection (F.195, F.198, and F.200) and The Schøyen Collection (F.113, F.116, and F.119), all of which were acquired by their current owners in 2009 or 2010. (62)

F.116 (Schøyen, MS4612/9, Jer1, Jer 3:15–19) (63)

Notable variants

רעה (*shepherd*) differs from מן but corresponds to the critical apparatus' suggested translation of ט. (6464) The fragment does not, however, exhibit the added אי (*how*) prior to ארון (*Ark of Covenant*), as suggested by the editors of BHS. (65)

(62) Justnes and Kjeldsberg, "The Post-2002 Dead Sea Scrolls Fragments."

(63) A photo of the fragment can be found in Michael Langlois, "Paleographical Analysis of the Dead Sea Scrolls in the Schøyen Collection," in *Gleanings*, 87. The transcription is found in Torleif Elgvin and Kipp Davis, "MS 4612/9. 4Q(?)Jer (Jer 3.15–19)," in *Gleanings*, 215.

(64) The graphic similarities between *resh* and *dalet* may, of course, lead to misinterpretation. It is therefore possible that the fragment corresponds to מן which reads דעה.

(65) Elgvin and Davis, "MS 4612/9. 4Q(?)Jer (Jer 3.15–19)," in *Gleanings*, 219.

The most interesting variant on the fragment is אמן יהוה כי (*let it be so, Lord*) on the sixth line (Jer 3:19) which differs from \mathfrak{M} , but corresponds to a suggested translation from \mathfrak{C} found in the critical apparatus of BHS. It is quite extraordinary that the fragment matches the suggested translation completely.

F.198 (MOTB, SCR.003183, Mic1, Mic 1:4–6) (66)

Notable variants

ובהטות does not correspond with any known textual witnesses and may be a misspelling of either \mathfrak{M} , ובהטאות (*and in sins*), or the Hebrew equivalent of the singular form in \mathfrak{C} , και διὰ ἁμαρτίαν (*and through sin*). Furthermore, בית יהודה (*house of Judah*) differs from \mathfrak{M} but corresponds with a suggested reading offered by the editors of BHS, making this a notable variant.

In three instances where the apparatus lists variant readings, the fragment corresponds with \mathfrak{M} : מי (*who, whom*) on line two differs from ומה (*and what*) in a DSS manuscript. במות יהודה הלוא ירושלם (*the high place of Judah? Is it not Jerusalem?*) differs from the editors of BHS's suggestion that this may be a later addition. Lastly, the fragment corresponds with \mathfrak{M} in reading במות (*high place*), and thus differs from \mathfrak{C} which reads ἡ ἁμαρτία (*the sin*).

F.200 (MOTB, SCR.003170, Dan6, Dan 10:18–20) (67)

Layout correspondence: close match

Transcription (68)	BHK, Daniel 10:18–20 (69)
<p>1 [כַּמֶּרֶ ׀ הֶ ׀ דִּם]</p> <p>2 [וְהִתְחַזַּק וּכְדַבְּרוּ עִמִּי הִתְ]׀</p> <p>3 [הִידַעַת לְמָה בָּאתִי אֵ]׀</p>	<p>וְאֲנִי מַעֲתִילָי לֹא־יַעֲמִד־בִּי כֹחַ וּנְשָׁמָה לֹא נָשָׂא וַיִּגְעִי בְּמַרְאֵה אָדָם וַיִּחַזְקֵנִי׃¹⁹ וַיֹּאמֶר אֱלֹהִים שְׁלוֹם לְךָ תִּנּוֹק וְחִזְקֵךָ וַיִּכְנַבְּרוּ עִמִּי הִתְחַזְקֵתִי וְאִמְרֵ חִזְקֵתִנִּי׃²⁰ וַיֹּאמֶר הַיְדַעַת לְמָה־בָּאתִי אֵלֶיךָ וְעַתָּה עִם־שָׂר פָּרַס וְאֲנִי יוֹצֵא וְהִנֵּה שָׂר־יָגוֹן בָּא׃ י׃²¹ הָרִשִׁים בְּכַתֵּב בְּכַתֵּב אֲמַת וְאִין אֲחִיד מִתְחַזַּק עִמִּי עַל־אֵ</p>

(66) A photo of the fragment can be found in Peter W. Flint and David R. Herbison, "Micah 1:4–6 (Inv. MOTB.SCR.003183)," in *DSSFCM*, 189. The transcription is found on p. 179.

(67) A photo of the fragment can be found in Robert Duke with Daniel Holt and Skyler Russel, "Daniel 10:18–20 (Inv. MOTB.SCR.003170)," in *DSSFCM*, 208.

(68) *Ibid.*, 203.

(69) Kittel ed., *Biblia Hebraica*, Daniel 10:18–20.

Notable variants

והתחזק (*and make yourself strong*) differs from מ. However, the critical apparatus provides two suggestions, based on a few G manuscripts. The second of these suggestions is a complete match with the reading on the fragment.

Summary of findings for fragments about which concerns were raised

Three of the six fragments show textual correspondence to modern editions of the Hebrew Bible. These are F.116 (Jer), F.198 (Mic), and F.200 (Dan). One exhibits a close match in layout, and all three contain notable variants. One of the fragments belongs to The Schøyen Collection and the remaining two are part of the MOTB Collection.

ANALYSIS OF REMAINING FRAGMENTS

There is a total of eleven remaining post-2002 fragments in The MOTB Collection (F.192 [Exod], F.196 [Ezek], and F.199 [Ps]) and The Schøyen Collection (F.101 [Gen], F.107 [Num], F.108 [Deut], F.109 [Deut], F.114 [2 Sam], F.115 [1 Kgs], F.118 [Ps], and F.120 [Ruth]), three of which were purchased by their current owners in 2003 or 2004, (70) and eight of which were acquired by their current owners in 2009 or 2010. (71)

F.108 (Schøyen, MS5214/1, Deut5, Deut 6:1–2) (72)*Layout correspondence: close match*

Transcription (73)

BHK, Deuteronomy 6:1–2 (74)

[המצוה והחוקים ו] 1	וְיִזְאֵת הַמְצְוָה הַחֲקִים וְהַמְשָׁפְטִים אֵל
[עשות באר]שׁו 2	אֲתֶכֶם לַעֲשׂוֹת בְּאֶרֶץ אֲשֶׁר אַתֶּם נ
[ל] 3	תִּירָא אֶת־יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ לְשׁמֹר אֶת־כָּל

(70) F.108 (Deut), F.114 (2 Sam), and F.118 (Ps).

(71) F.101 (Gen), F.107 (Num), F.109 (Deut), F.115 (1 Kgs), F.120 (Ruth), F.192 (Exod), F.196 (Ezek), and F.199 (Ps). Justnes and Kjeldsberg, “The Post-2002 Dead Sea Scrolls Fragments.”

(72) A photo of the fragment can be found in Torleif Elgvin, “MS 5214/1. 4Q(?) Deut1 (Deut 6.1–2),” in *Gleanings*, 173.

(73) Ibid.

(74) Kittel ed., *Biblia Hebraica*, Deuteronomy 6:1–2.

The first two lines on the fragment follow the line to line layout of BHK and BHS very closely. According to the reconstruction found in *Gleanings*, the third line does not correspond as well to the layout. However, as only the top of the lamed is visible on this line, one cannot know for sure that the reconstruction renders a correct image of which *lamed* this should represent. In the reconstruction in *Gleanings*, it is suggested that it represents the *lamed* in *לשמר* (*by keeping*). Another possibility is that it represents the *lamed* of *אלהיך* (*your God*). It is surprising that this suggestion is not mentioned in *Gleanings*, as such a reconstruction would result in a line to line layout which is almost identical to that in BHK. There is no reason not to consider this possibility, and indeed it is favored in this analysis.

F.196 (MOTB, SCR.003174, Ezek1, Ezek 28:22) (75)

Layout correspondence: close match

Transcription (76)	BHK, Ezekiel 28:22 (77)
<p>1 ואמרת כה אמר הנני עליכה צ'^א</p> <p>2 יהוה בעשותי [] ה שפטים ונקדש</p>	<p>²²ואמרת כה אמר אדני יהוה הנני עליך ציון ונקדתי בתוכך פראני יהוה בעשותי כה שפטים ונקדשתי כה: ²³ושלחתי כה דבר ודם בתוצאותי</p>

As is illustrated above, the line to line layout on the fragment is not identical to the modern editions. However, the words *יהוה אדני יהוה* (*Lord YHWH*) are absent on the fragment, with the result that *הנני עליכה צ* follows right after *ואמרת כה אמר*. In light of this, the layouts match remarkably well.

Summary of findings for remaining fragments

Two of the eleven fragments show textual correspondence to modern editions of the Hebrew Bible. These are F.108 (Deut) and F.196 (Ezek). Both exhibit a close match in layout, but none contain notable variants. One of these fragments belongs to The Schøyen Collection and the other is part of the MOTB Collection.

(75) A photo of the fragment can be found in Ishwaran Mudliar, "Ezekiel 28:22 (Inv. MOTB.SCR003174)," in *DSSFCM*, 166.

(76) *Ibid.*, 161.

(77) The verse starts on the bottom of p. 790 and continues at the top of p. 791. For the sake of the illustration, the bottom of p. 790 has been attached to the top of p. 791. See Kittel ed., *Biblia Hebraica*, Ezekiel 28:22.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

As is evident, half of the fragments about which concerns were raised match the criteria set forth in this analysis, while only two of the eleven remaining fragments do the same. This may seem a meager gain. Yet, for the biblical passages represented on those two fragments, the results may be of importance. More importantly, however, this analysis provides evidence that some forgers were very reliant upon modern critical editions of the Hebrew Bible in their fragment production, and that they in turn failed to make sufficient changes to the texts not to raise suspicions. In this respect, the results of this analysis are of great importance.

The results will now be presented separately for each collection because textual correspondence seems to be disproportionately present in MOTB fragments compared to Schøyen fragments.

Schøyen

Sixteen fragments in this analysis belong to The Schøyen Collection. Six of these were purchased in 2003/2004, (78) and the remaining ten were acquired in 2009/2010. (79) All of them were sold to Schøyen by William Kando, one (F.122 [Neh]) probably via Biondi and Greatsite.com. (80)

Three of the sixteen Schøyen fragments exhibit a close match in layout to the modern editions of the Hebrew Bible or DJD, (81) and one corresponds by a consistent shift. (82) Two fragments contain notable variants. (83) This means that five of the sixteen Schøyen fragments show textual correspondence to modern editions of the Hebrew Bible. These five fragments are F.103 (Exod), F.108 (Deut), F.112 (1 Sam), F.116 (Jer), and F.122 (Neh). Two of them were purchased in 2003 or 2004, (84) while the remaining three were acquired in 2009. (85) Of these five fragments, three have already been identified as modern forgeries and concerns were voiced about one in *Gleanings*.

(78) F.103 (Exod), F.104 (Exod), F.105 (Exod), F.108 (Deut), F.114 (2 Sam), and F.118 (Ps).

(79) F.101 (Gen), F.107 (Num), F.109 (Deut), F.112 (1 Sam), F.113 (1 Sam), F.115 (1 Kgs), F.116 (Jer), F.119 (Prov), F.120 (Ruth), and F.122 (Neh).

(80) Justnes and Kjeldsberg, "The Post-2002 Dead Sea Scrolls Fragments."

(81) F.103 (Exod), F.108 (Deut) and F.122 (Neh). Note that only F.103 (Exod) was compared to DJD. In a subsequent analysis, this should be done for all post-2002 fragments.

(82) F.112 (1 Sam).

(83) F.116 (Jer) and F.122 (Neh).

(84) F.103 (Exod) and F.108 (Deut).

(85) F.112 (1 Sam), F.116 (Jer), and F.122 (Neh). Ibid.

Museum of the Bible

Eleven fragments addressed in this analysis are part of the MOTB Collection. Ten of these were purchased by their current owners in 2009/2010, and the last was acquired in 2014 or 2015. (86) Seven fragments were allegedly sold to Steve Green by William Kando, (87) one was sold by Michael Sharpe, (88) and one by Andrew Stimer. (89) The last two were sold to Green from Craig Lampe. (90)

Five of the eleven MOTB fragments exhibit a close match in layout to the modern editions of the Hebrew Bible, (91) and three fragments contain notable variants. (92) In total, six of the eleven MOTB fragments show textual correspondence to modern editions of the Hebrew Bible. These six fragments are F.194 (Num), F.196 (Ezek), F.197 (Jon), F.198 (Mic), F.200 (Dan), and F.201 (Neh). Of these fragments, three have already been identified as modern forgeries and concerns were voiced about two in *DSSFMC*.

Interestingly, all six fragments which show signs of textual correspondence were purchased in 2010 from William Kando. In other words, six of the seven fragments purchased directly from William Kando show signs of textual correspondence. The two fragments acquired from Lampe in 2009 do not exhibit this feature. Nor do the two last fragments which were obtained by the Green family in 2010 and 2014 or 2015. In short, the only three fragments which do not show any textual correspondence, and which were not known to be modern forgeries at the time this analysis was conducted, are F.195 (Jer) and the two fragments acquired from Lampe in 2009: F.192 (Exod) and F.199 (Ps).

The proportion of MOTB fragments which show a textual correspondence to modern editions of the Hebrew Bible is considerably higher than that of The Schøyen Collection (although the significance of the five Schøyen fragments should not be underestimated). (93) A different way of presenting the results is by year of acquisition. Textual correspondence to modern editions occurs more often in fragments acquired in 2009 or later than in those acquired before 2009. (94) One

(86) F.203 (Lev). Ibid.

(87) F.194 (Num), F.195 (Jer), F.196 (Ezek), F.197 (Jon), F.198 (Mic), F.200 (Dan), and F.201 (Neh).

(88) F.191 (Gen).

(89) F.203 (Lev).

(90) F.192 (Exod) and F.199 (Ps). Ibid.

(91) F.194 (Num), F.196 (Ezek), F.197 (Jon), F.200 (Dan), and F.201 (Neh).

(92) F.198 (Mic), F.200 (Dan), and F.201 (Neh).

(93) 54,5 % in MOTB fragments and 31,2 % in Schøyen fragments.

(94) 33,3 % of fragments acquired prior to 2009 and 42,9 % of fragments acquired in 2009 or later.

possible explanation is that there are several (groups of) forgers who utilize different techniques, and that one (or more) of these are quite banal in their use of modern editions of the Hebrew Bible in their fragment production. It seems that they copy the text from modern editions of the Hebrew Bible without making any emendations to the layout, whilst often importing variant readings from the critical apparatus. In these cases, the layout most often (though not always) appears to be influenced by BHK, while the variants seem to be imported from the critical apparatus in BHS.

APPENDIX

F. no	Collection	Collection no.	F. Name	Content
101	Schøyen	4612/4	Gen1	Gen 36:7–16
103	Schøyen	4612/2a	Exod3	Exod 3:13/14–15
104	Schøyen	4612/2b	Exod4	Exod 5:9–14
105	Schøyen	4612/2c	Exod5	Exod 16:10
107	Schøyen	4612/5	Num1	Num 16:2–5
108	Schøyen	5214/1	Deut5	Deut 6:1–2
109	Schøyen	5214/2	Deut6	Deut 32:5–9
112	Schøyen	4612/10	Sam1	1 Sam 2:11–14
113	Schøyen	5480/4	Sam2	1 Sam 5:10–11
114	Schøyen	5233/1	Sam3	2 Sam 20:22–24
115	Schøyen	5440	Kgs1	1 Kgs 16:23–26
116	Schøyen	4612/9	Jer1	Jer 3:15–19
118	Schøyen	5233/2	Ps2	Ps 9:10, 12–13
119	Schøyen	4612/11	Prov1	Prov 4:23–5:1
120	Schøyen	5441	Ruth1	Ruth 2:1–2
122	Schøyen	5426	Neh1	Neh 3:14–15
191	MOTB	SCR.000124	Gen2	Gen 31:23–25(?) and 32:3–6
192	MOTB	SCR.000120	Exod6	Exod 17:4–7
194	MOTB	SCR.003173	Num2	Num 8:3–5
195	MOTB	SCR.003172	Jer2	Jer 23:6–9
196	MOTB	SCR.003174	Ezek1	Ezek 28:22
197	MOTB	SCR.003171	Jon1	Jon 4:2–5

F. no	Collection	Collection no.	F. Name	Content
198	MOTB	SCR.003183	Mic1	Mic 1:4–6
199	MOTB	SCR.000121	Ps3	Ps 11:1–4
200	MOTB	SCR.003170	Dan6	Dan 10:18–20
201	MOTB	SCR.003175	Neh2	Neh 2:13–16
203	MOTB	SCR.004742	Lev6	Lev 23:24–28

Ingrid Breilid GIMSE
University of Agder