A recently published Qumran text, 4Q252, can probably best be described as a sort of commentary on the book of Genesis. The opening lines of this text, which revolve around Gen 6:3, furnish an instructive paradigm for the evaluation of a characteristic type of textual/exegetical biblical material from the classical period. The question which it poses is a familiar one: when is the reflection of a biblical text which does not conform to MT, and which appears in a “non-textual” source, to be viewed as a variant text, and when may treat it as a paraphrastic interpretation of an underlying text which may have resembled MT?
After the description of the $bnei 'Elohim$’s consorting with the daughters of man, the Lord asserts, according to Gen 6:3 (MT),  

לא ידון רוחי באדם

inasmuch as he is flesh, and his days shall be one hundred and twenty years.” This passage is a well-known crux interpretum, both lexically and exegetically, as is admitted by most commentators to Genesis regardless of their ultimate solution to its difficulties, with the two difficulties from a lexical standpoint being the terms ידוּן and בֶּשְגָּם.

4Q252 begins its first column:

שנת ארבע מאות ושמונים לחיי נוח בא קצם לנוח ואלוהים

In the four hundred eightieth year of Noah’s life, their time came to Noah, seeing that God had said, “my spirit shall not dwell forever in man, and their days shall be determined at one hundred and twenty years until the time of the waters of the flood.”

The most striking “variant” in the Qumran text is, of course, ידור for MT’s hapax legomenon ידוּן. In fact, this reading had already been considered as an emendation of MT ידוּן long before the discovery of 4Q252.

I believe that Lim is alone to date among scholars who have addressed 4Q252 in insisting that ידור (MT ידוּן) is a variant attested by the LXX (οὐ μὴ καταμείνει τὸ πνεῦμά μου),” but his minority conclusion is not without

(2) The transcriptions in Wacholder-Abegg, PE, 213, have been checked against the photocopies which Dr. Brooke provided and against the plates in FE.

6 For my exegesis of this passage and 4Q252 generally, see my JJS article (above, n. 2). In this note, I am concerned only with the text-critical value of ידור.

7 Lim, 292.