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4Q167 Pesher Hosea\(^b\) (4QpHos\(^b\)) is the surviving remains of an ancient commentary on several chapters of Hosea, one of over a dozen “continuous pesharim” among the Qumran text finds. Although a line quoted from this text was disclosed in 1956 (= 4QpHos\(^b\) 2:3),\(^1\) the complete fragments were not brought to light until the publication in 1968 of Discoveries in the Judaean Desert V (DJD 5), edited by John Allegro with the collaboration of Arnold Anderson.\(^2\) Further text-critical work on 4QpHos\(^b\) was published by J. Strugnell in 1970,\(^3\) M. Horgan in 1979,\(^4\) the present author in 2001,\(^5\) and R. Vielhauer in 2001.\(^6\)

Editions and discussions of 4QpHos\(^b\) from 1979 to 1999, plus the new Volume 6B: Pesharim, Other Commentaries, and Related Documents, of the Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project (hereafter referred to as Volume 6B),\(^7\) have drawn from the early work of
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Dead Sea Discoveries 10, 3
Allegro, Strugnell, and Horgan without corrections or further developments of fragment joins, readings, or reconstructions. The presentation of 4QpHos\textsuperscript{b} in Volume 6\textit{B} was done by Horgan, essentially unchanged from Horgan’s 1979 study (which itself, although it contained original work, largely followed Allegro and Strugnell). On the other hand Vielhauer’s 2001 study represents substantial independent and original work, and is currently the most important and reliable existing comprehensive study of 4QpHos\textsuperscript{b}. The points of comparison with which the present discussion will engage are from Volume 6\textit{B} and Vielhauer.

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

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

---

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


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

\textsuperscript{10} Doudna, \textit{4Q Pesher Nahum}, 564–65. My reasons for rejecting Strugnell’s join of frag. 10a were: (a) the line of letters in frag. 10a after the join produces an odd vertical spacing interval; (b) the line of letters in frag. 10a after the join is not parallel to the lines below it; and (c) the identification by Strugnell and other editions of לֵאֵל, “to