CHAPTER TEN

THE BIBLICAL TEXTS FROM THE JUDEAN DESERT—AN OVERVIEW AND ANALYSIS

1. *Introduction and Statistics*

In many ways, the newly discovered texts have revolutionized the study of the text of Hebrew Scripture, as well as that of Greek Scripture. Many aspects of the transmission of the biblical text can now be illustrated by the Judean Desert texts, and occasionally this applies also to the last stages of the literary growth of the biblical books. In the scholarly jargon it may sound a little bombastic to speak of "revolutionizing" the field, but this term probably describes the finds from the Judean Desert correctly, especially the ones from Qumran. Some may claim that the texts found outside Qumran in Wadi Murabbaʿat, Wadi Sdeir (Naḥal David), Naḥal Ḥever, Naḥal Ṣeʾelim, and Masada are uninteresting, as they "merely" confirm the medieval MT, but these texts, too, are in many ways remarkable.[1] The novel aspects relating to all these texts from the Judean Desert pertain not only to the new data, but also to a better understanding of the sources known prior to the Qumran finds.[2]

---

[1] Information concerning the provenance of the biblical texts is usually rather stable. At the same time, 4QPs^{q} may derive from Naḥal Ḥever (see P. W. Skehan, E. Ulrich and P. W. Flint, *DJD* XVI, 145). The provenance of XLev, XJosh, XJudg, and XMinor Prophets as well as that of all the texts mentioned in n. 7 is equally unclear.

[2] For my own summaries, see: "A Modern Textual Outlook Based on the Qumran Scrolls," *HUCA* 53 (1982) 11–27; "Hebrew Biblical Manuscripts from the Judaean Desert: Their Contribution to Textual Criticism," *JJS* 39 (1988) 1–37; "The Significance of the Texts from the Judean Desert for the History of the Text of the Hebrew Bible—A New Synthesis," in *Qumran between the Old and the New Testament* (ed. F. H. Cryer and T. L. Thompson; Copenhagen International Seminar 6; JSOTSup 290; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998) 277–309; *TCHB,* 100–21. For additional summaries, in chronological order, see: Skehan, "Qumran, Littérature de Qumran"; F. García Martínez, "Lista de MSS procedentes de Qumrán," *Henoch* 11 (1989) 149–232; E. C. Ulrich, "The Biblical Scrolls from Qumran Cave 4: An Overview and a Progress Report on Their Publication," *RevQ* 14 (1989–1990) 207–28; A. S. van der Woude, "Fünfzehn Jahre Qumranforschung (1974–1988)," *TRu* 55 (1990) 245–307, esp. 274–307; 57 (1992) 1–57; G. J. Brooke, "Torah in the Qumran Scrolls," in *Bibel in jüdischer und christlicher Tradition. Festschrift für Johann Maier zum 60. Geburtstag* (ed. H. Merklein et al.; BBB 88; Bonn, 1993) 97–120; E. C. Ulrich, "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Biblical Text," in *DSS After Fifty Years*, 1:79–100; idem, "The Qumran Biblical Scrolls–The

The analysis of these texts would have been different had the texts from cave 4 been published prior to or simultaneously with those from cave 1. As it happened, the texts that have been most researched are the ones that became known first, that is, 1QIsa^{a} (1951) and subsequently the texts published by Sukenik (Jerusalem 1954)[3] and the ones published in *DJD* I (1955). The only texts from cave 4 that were known in the early 1950s were two columns of 4QSam^{a} (1953), one column of 4QSam^{b} (1955), and 4QQoh^{a} (1954). It is therefore not surprising that in the minds of many scholars, consciously or not, the special characteristics of the large Isaiah scroll were considered to be the norm for the textual nature and scribal features of all the Qumran texts. On the influence of 1QIsa^{a} on the research of the other scrolls, see chapter 5*, § 2.

The present survey of the biblical texts covers all the Judean Desert sites, including Qumran, Wadi Murabbaʿat, Wadi Sdeir (Naḥal David), Naḥal Ḥever, Naḥal Ṣeʾelim, and Masada. The survey includes indirect evidence embedded in nonbiblical Qumran texts.

Now that all the known Hebrew/Aramaic biblical texts from the Judean Desert have been published, we can easily assess their evidence. The biblical texts have been published in several large-size volumes (see the beginning of chapter 16*). These volumes are joined by the editions of 1QIsa^{b} by Sukenik,[4] of 1QIsa^{a} by Parry-Qimron, *Isaiah*, and of 11QpaleoLev^{a} by Freedman-Mathews.[5] The *DJD* edition of the Isaiah scrolls from cave 1 will follow suit (vol. XXXII). The *tefillin* and *mezuzot* were published in various additional editions.[6]

Scriptures of Late Second Temple Judaism," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Their Historical Context* (ed. T. Lim et al.; Edinburgh: T § T Clark, 2000) 67–87; idem, "The Qumran Scrolls and the Biblical Text," in Schiffman, *Dead Sea Scrolls*, 51–9; É. Puech, "Qumrân et le texte de l'Ancien Testament," in *Congress Volume Oslo 1998* (ed. A. Lemaire and M. Saebø; Leiden/Boston/Cologne: E. J. Brill, 2000) 437–64; E. Ulrich, "The Bible in the Making: The Scriptures Found at Qumran," in *The Bible at Qumran—Text, Shape, and Interpretation* (ed. P. W. Flint; Grand Rapids, Mich./Cambridge, U. K.: Eerdmans, 2001) 51–66.

[3] Sukenik, *ʿwsr hmgylwt hgnwzwt*.

[4] Sukenik, *ʿwsr hmgylwt hgnwzwt*.

[5] D. N. Freedman and K. A. Mathews, *The Paleo-Hebrew Leviticus Scroll (11QpaleoLev)* (Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1985). Three texts were published elsewhere: 4QGen^{n} (*DJD* XXV); 4Qpap cryptA Lev^{h} (*DJD* XXXVI); MurGen$^{(a)}$ (É. Puech, "Fragment d'un rouleau de la Genèse provenant du Désert de Juda," *RevQ* 10 [1979–1981] 163–6). See further the texts mentioned in n. 7.

[6] *DJD* I, II, III, VI, XXXVIII; Y. Yadin, *Tefillin from Qumran* (Jerusalem: IES and the Shrine of the Book, 1969). Since the same sections are contained in both *tefillin* and *mezuzot*, it is hard to distinguish between the two in fragmentary texts (note especially 4QPhyl S and U and 4QMez G), the main criterion for the distinction being their physical features (see J. T. Milik, *DJD* VI, 35–7).

The final count of the biblical scrolls recorded in *DJD* XXXIX amounts to 200–201 fragmentary scrolls from Qumran (representing 205–206 biblical books) of the Hebrew/Aramaic Bible and 23 fragmentary scrolls from other sites in the Judean Desert. The slight fluctuation for Qumran pertains to 4QGen^{h1} and 4QGen^{h2} , which may or may not reflect one scroll according to its editor, J. Davila. But also beyond this scroll many doubts remain in matters of detail. For example, do the various fragments of Mur 1 (Genesis, Exodus, Numbers) reflect one, two, or three manuscripts? Further, it is often unclear whether the separation of several groups of fragments into different manuscripts or their combination into one manuscript is correct. Are 4QJer^{b,d,e} indeed three manuscripts as was claimed in *DJD* XV, and are the Deuteronomy and Exodus segments of 4QDeut^{j} indeed part of the same manuscript as was claimed by J. A. Duncan in *DJD* XIV? As a result of these and similar problems, the totals for the manuscripts of the biblical books are approximate only. After the publication of the list of 200–201 fragmentary scrolls in *DJD* XXXIX, several additional fragmentary texts have been published or have become known.[7]

In the analysis of the biblical texts from the Judean Desert, the definition of the scope of the biblical corpus is unclear since we are uncertain regarding the canonical conceptions of the persons who left

[7] In chronological order: É. Puech, "Un nouveau manuscrit de la Genèse de la grotte 4: *4Q483 = pap4Genèse*," *RevQ* 19 (1999) 259–60; idem, "Un nouveau fragment du manuscrit^{b} de l'Ecclesiaste (4QQohelet^{b} ou 4Q110)," *RevQ* 19 (2000) 607–16; idem, "Identification de nouveaux manuscrits bibliques: Deutéronome et Proverbes dans les débris de la grotte 4," *RevQ* 20 (2001) 121–7; U. Dahmen, "Neu identifizierte Fragmente in den Deuteronomium-Handschriften vom Toten Meer," *RevQ* 20 (2002) 571–81; É. Puech, "Un autre manuscrit du Levitique," *RevQ* 21 (2003) 275–80; idem, E. Puech, "Notes sur le manuscrit des Juges 4Q50a," *RQ* 21 (2003) 315–319; H. Eshel, "A Second Fragment of XJudges," *JJS* 54 (2003) 139–41; E. Eshel and H. Eshel, "New Fragments from Qumran: 4QGen^{f}, 4QIsa^{b}, 4Q226, 8QGen, and XQpapEnoch," *DSD* 12 (2005) 134–57; H. Eshel et al., "Fragments of a Leviticus Scroll (ArugLev) Found in the Judean Desert in 2004," *DSD* 13 (2006) 55–60; É. Puech, "Les manuscrits 4QJuges^{c} (= 4Q50^{A}) et 1QJuges (= 1Q6)," in *Studies in the Hebrew Bible, Qumran, and the Septuagint Presented to Eugene Ulrich* (ed. P. W. Flint et al; VTSup 101; Leiden/Boston: E. J. Brill, 2006) 184–202; Y. Baruch and H. Eshel, "Another Fragment of SdeirGenesis," *JJS* 57 (2006) 136–8; E. Eshel, H. Eshel, and M. Broshi, "A New Fragment of XJudges," *DSD* 14 (2007) 407-410; E. Eshel and H. Eshel, "A Preliminary Report on Seven New Fragments from Qumran," in *Meghillot, Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls* V-VI, *A Festschrift for Devorah Dimant* (ed. M. Bar-Asher and E. Tov; Heb. with Engl. summ.; Haifa/Jerusalem: University of Haifa, The Publication Project of the Qumran Scrolls/The Bialik Institute, 2007) 271–78 (4QExod^{c}; 4QDeut^{f}; 4QJer^{c}; 11QPs^{c}). T. Elgvin informs me (February 2007) of additional fragments in the Schøyen collection from the following books: Exodus, Leviticus, Deuteronomy, Samuel, Joel, Psalms. All these fragments are small and their provenance is unknown (probably Qumran cave 4). All these texts are *not* included in the statistics below.

these texts behind.[8] Our analysis refers only to the books contained in the traditional canon of the Hebrew/Aramaic Bible.

Although the notion of what exactly constitutes a fragment of a biblical text as opposed to a parabiblical text or *pesher* is sometimes unclear, our figures are based on the views of the scholars publishing these texts. We regard texts that have been given names of the biblical books, such as 1QIsa^{a}, as being biblical. Phylacteries and *mezuzot*, although containing segments of Hebrew Scripture, are excluded from the statistics, since they are not biblical texts in the usual sense of the word. By the same token, one could exclude other texts that may have served liturgical purposes, such as scrolls containing both biblical Psalms and other Hymnic material, but as these scrolls have been given biblical names, they are included in our statistics. This pertains, for example, to the collections of texts included in 4QPs^{f}, 11QPs^{a}, and 11QPs^{b} (see below as well as chapters 4* and 6*). Qumran compositions that contain anthologies of biblical texts (especially 4QTest [4Q175]) are excluded from the statistics, as they do not represent biblical scrolls in the regular sense of the word, but they are analyzed below as evidence for the biblical text (see chapter 4*).

Because of this procedure, the overall number of the biblical scrolls includes different types of biblical texts. Most texts represent regular biblical scrolls, but some biblical texts may represent liturgical texts or abbreviated or excerpted compositions. For all these, see below.[9]

Within the Qumran corpus of some 930 texts, the 200 biblical texts constitute 22 percent (not counting the *tefillin* and *mezuzot*), while in the Masada corpus the biblical texts constitute a larger percentage, 46.6 or 43.75 percent depending on a calculation of either fifteen or sixteen literary texts at Masada. Within the biblical corpus, a special interest in

---

[8] For a recent analysis, see A. Lange, "The Status of the Biblical Texts in the Qumran Corpus and the Canonical Process," in *The Bible as Book*, 21–30.

[9] Two aspects remain problematical:

1. Some of the very fragmentary texts which have been named biblical may actually have been part of compositions which included among other things long stretches of Bible texts, such as *pesharim*, other commentaries, or rewritten Bible compositions. For example, the text that has been published as 4QpapIsa^{p} (4Q69) contains only a few words, and could therefore also have represented a *pesher* like 4Qpap pIsa^{c}. By the same token, the list includes a minute fragment inscribed in the cryptic A script, described by Pfann (*DJD* XXXVI) as a fragment of the book of Leviticus: (pap cryptA Lev^{h}?), but more likely it reflects only a quotation from that book. Likewise, the "biblical" 2QExod^{b} may actually contain a rewritten Bible text.

2. The manuscripts of 4QReworked Pentateuch$^{a–e}$ (4Q158, 4Q364–367) have been published as nonbiblical texts in *DJD* V and XIII, but need to be reclassified as biblical manuscripts. These texts would add four additional biblical manuscripts to the list. See the end of chapter 10* and my study "The Many Forms." See also § 4Bc ϵ below.

the Torah is visible at all the sites in the Judean Desert: 87 texts or 43.5 percent of the Qumran biblical corpus represent the books of the Torah. At sites other than Qumran this percentage is even greater: fifteen of the twenty-five biblical texts or 62.5 percent represent the Torah.

The number of copies of individual books shows the differing levels of interest in them. The exceptionally large number of copies of Deuteronomy (30), Isaiah (21), and Psalms (36) probably reflects the interest of the Qumran covenanters in these books.

The beginnings, or parts thereof, of a number of texts from Qumran (fifty-one or 5.5 percent of all the preserved scrolls) and the other sites in the Judean Desert (two scrolls) have been preserved, while the ends of a smaller number of scrolls have been preserved (twenty-nine from Qumran [3.1 percent of the total scrolls from that site]) and two from Masada.[10] The extremities of these scrolls are recognizable because of conventions practiced by scribes and scroll manufacturers (uninscribed areas, handle sheets), while often segments of the first or last columns have been preserved. In any event, no differences are recognizable between the biblical and nonbiblical scrolls with regard to the practices used at the beginnings and ends of scrolls. Some have large uninscribed areas at the beginning or end, while others have handle sheets at one of the extremities, while rarely these two conventions were used at the same time.

2. *External Data on the Biblical Scrolls*

1QIsa^{a} is the only scroll that has been preserved in its entirety, 54 columns in 17 sheets. Substantial remains have been preserved of 1QIsa^{b}, 4QpaleoExod^{m}, 4QNum^{b}, 4QSam^{a}, 4QIsa^{c}, 4QJer^{a}, 11QpaleoLev^{a}, 11QPs^{a}, MurXII, and 11QtgJob, while the preserved remains of all other scrolls are fragmentary, even very fragmentary. Sometimes a tiny inscribed piece is the only evidence for a biblical scroll identified by its content, and/or script.

If two or more biblical books were contained in a single scroll, these books were part of a larger unit. However, evidence for scrolls containing such a large unit is scanty, while there is evidence for single books within those larger units that were demonstrably *not* part of such larger units. Of course, scrolls starting with Genesis (4QGen^{b,g,k}), Joshua (XJosh), Kings (5QKgs), Isaiah (1QIsa^{a} and MurIsa), or the Minor Prophets (4QXII^{d}) preceded by a handle sheet or a large uninscribed area

[10] See *Scribal Practices*, 108–18. See further chapter 9* § 4 regarding the special status of the texts from cave 11.

should cause no surprise. Nor should it be surprising that MasDeut, MasPs^{b}, and 11QPs^{a} ended with a final handle sheet or an uninscribed surface. At the same time, there is some evidence for scrolls that contain a single biblical book and are not part of a larger unit.

Thus the inclusion in one scroll of more than one biblical book is evidenced for 4, 5, or 6 Torah scrolls: 4QGen-Exod^{a} (36 lines; evidence unclear), 4QpaleoGen-Exod^{l} (55–60 lines), 4QExod^{b} (= 4Q[Gen-]Exod^{b}; *c.* 50 lines), and possibly also 4QExod-Lev^{f} (*c.* 60 lines), 4QLev-Num^{a} (43 lines), and Mur 1 (*c.* 60 lines), the latter possibly containing Genesis, Exodus, and Numbers (see *DJD* II, 75–8). In all these cases, the spaces between the two books have been preserved together with some letters or words of the adjacent book, but in no instance has the full evidence been preserved. The large column size of several of these scrolls confirms the assumption that they indeed contained two or more books, since a large number of lines per column usually implies that the scroll was long. On the basis of the large parameters of these scrolls, it may be presumed that other Torah scrolls likewise contained two or more books: 4QGen^{e} (*c.* 50 lines), 4QExod^{e} (*c.* 43), MasDeut (42), SdeirGen (*c.* 40), 4QGen^{b} (40). On the length of the Torah scrolls, see chapter 9* § 4.

The books of the Minor Prophets were included in one scroll in MurXII, 4QXII^{b} and 4QXII^{g}: a space of three lines was left between various books in MurXII, as evidenced by the transitions Jonah/Micah, Micah/Nahum, and Zephaniah/Haggai (see *DJD* III, 182, 192, 197, 200, 202, 205). This practice follows the tradition, also known from *b. B. Bat.* 13b, for combining these books as one unit, while in 4QXII^{b} frg. 3 5 only one line is left between Zephaniah and Haggai and in 4QXII^{g} frgs. 70–75 one-and-a-half lines were left between Amos and Obadiah.

While most of the Qumran copies of the Five Scrolls were probably contained in separate scrolls (note their small dimensions), there may be indirect evidence for one scroll containing all five *Megillot* or at least one additional book beyond Lamentations. The first preserved column of 4QLam starts at the top with Lam 1:1b היתה כאלמנה רבתי בגוים שרתי במדינות היתה למס, and since the column length of the scroll is known (10–11 lines), the preceding column would have contained at least the first line of the book, a few empty lines, and the end of the book preceding Lamentations.

At the same time, there is some evidence for scrolls that contain a single biblical book and are not part of a larger unit: 11QpaleoLev^{a},

4QLev^{c}, 4QDeut^{h}, 6QDeut? (6Q20), 1QIsa^{a}, and most extant Qumran copies of the Five Scrolls.[11]

Some general conclusions on the scope of the biblical scrolls written in leather scrolls can be formulated, although many details remain uncertain, especially since some biblical scrolls probably contained only selections.

Torah: The average scroll of a single book of the Torah probably contained 20–30 lines per column. Scrolls of a smaller size would not have contained the complete books, and the longer ones (40–60 lines) could have contained two or more books. Thus in Genesis five long copies (4QGen^{b,e}, SdeirGen, MurGen-Num, 4QExod^{b} [= 4Q[Gen-]Exod^{b}]) contain 40–50 lines, while the smaller ones, 4QGen^{d,g,f}, contain 11, 14, and 17 lines. Medium-length copies contain 24 and 25 lines. 4QGen^{d}, with merely 11 lines and 4QExod^{e} with 8 lines definitely did not contain the complete books. Likewise, 4QDeut^{j,n} probably contained liturgical excerpts.

Major Prophets: Average copies of a single scroll contained 30–40 lines in the cases of Isaiah and Ezekiel and 20–30 lines in the case of Jeremiah. 4QEzek^{b} with 11 lines is an exception, and according to J. E. Sanderson, *DJD* XV, 216 it is unlikely that this scroll contained the entire text of Ezekiel as it would have been an improbable 32 meters long with 280 columns. A single scroll of Isaiah is also mentioned in Luke 4:16-21.[12]

Psalms: The smaller scrolls were of a limited size, containing only Psalm 119 (1QPs^{a}, 4QPs^{g}, 4QPs^{h}, 5QPs [for the latter two and 1QPs^{a}, no measurements can be made]), Psalm 104 (4QPs^{l}), or a small anthology of psalms, while the longer ones contained all or most biblical Psalms. At the same time, we lack specific data on the contents of many of the Psalms scrolls that are known in a variety of sizes, from 8 to 60+ lines.

Five Scrolls: All known copies of the Five Scrolls (with the exception of 4QQoh^{a}) are small. With the exception of 4QLam, which probably was preceded by another book, probably all preserved specimens of the Five Scrolls contained a single book only.

Daniel: 4QDan^{a,b,c} contained 16–22 lines, while 4QDan^{e} was smaller (9 lines). According to E. Ulrich, *DJD* XVI, 287, the latter scroll probably contained only a segment of the book, as 120 columns would have been needed to contain the complete book.

3. *Scribal Features*

[11] For details, see *Scribal Practices*, 79.

[12] Prior to reading, Jesus unrolled this scroll and then rerolled it (πτύσσω and ἀναπτύσσω in vv 17 and 20) once he had finished.

The data known regarding the Qumran texts show that sacred and nonsacred literary texts share all the main scribal features relating to writing, horizontal and vertical ruling, stitching of sheets, size and shape of columns, correction systems, scribal signs, length of scrolls, number of columns per sheet, height of columns, margins, paragraphing, repair-stitching, patching, initial and final handle sheets, and use of guide dots/strokes. Although further research is required, the leather used for biblical texts was seemingly not of a superior quality to that used for nonbiblical compositions.

As with the nonbiblical scrolls, the Hebrew biblical scrolls from Qumran show no evidence of verse division as in the later MT.

All the sub-systems used for paragraphing are shared by biblical and nonbiblical manuscripts, relating to small and large spaces within the line and at the end of the line, completely empty lines, and indentations. At the same time, the *paragraphos* signs are rarely used in biblical texts.

Poor tanning, scar tissue, and stitching forced scribes to leave certain areas uninscribed in both types of scrolls. Inscribed (4QUnclassified frags. [4Q51a]) and uninscribed papyrus strips were attached in antiquity to the back of the leather of 4QSam^{a} for support. It is unclear how many words in the Judean Desert texts were re-inked in antiquity when the ink had become faint.

Use of scribal marks in biblical scrolls was more limited than in nonbiblical scrolls, but the data do not suffice for drawing a distinction between the two types of texts. For a detailed analysis, see *Scribal Practices*, 178–218.

Only a few distinctions between biblical and nonbiblical literary manuscripts are visible. For a detailed analysis, see chapter 9*, § 5 and *Scribal Practices*, 252.

This summary shows that the rules for the writing of sacred texts recorded in *Massekhet Soferim* and in earlier rabbinic sources are somewhat misleading when detached from the writing of nonsacred texts, since most details recorded there pertain to writing practices employed in an identical way in nonsacred texts during the Second Temple period. For example, *Sof.* 1.15 states that texts that deviate from the norm regarding the indication of open and closed sections cannot be used as sacred writings. However, this practice, which is basically a paragraphing system, was followed in most compositions written in the Qumran period, biblical and nonbiblical. Thus, the practice itself was not sacred, but rather the tradition of indicating a specific type of paragraphing in a given instance. Likewise, the practice of leaving larger bottom margins than top margins in manuscripts (*Sof.* 2.5; *y. Meg.* 1.71d)

was the norm in most texts, and not only in Torah scrolls. In other cases, criteria were instituted for regulating precision when copying scrolls, but these criteria were also in vogue for any well-written scroll from the Judean Desert; in the case of sacred scrolls, these criteria were formulated in such a way that the scrolls could not be used if they fell below a certain standard of precision: a scroll of Scripture in which a complete line was erased (*Sof.* 3.9), scrolls containing more than a certain number of mistakes (3.10), scrolls with mixed medial and final letters (2.20), or scrolls displaying letters written beyond the vertical left-hand margin (2.3) could not be used for sacred purposes.

Large *de luxe* editions, especially of MT, and especially in scrolls from later periods, seem to be specific to biblical scrolls, see *Scribal Practices*, 125–9. *De luxe* rolls are characterized by wide top and bottom margins, a large writing block, adherence to the medieval text of MT, and a limited amount of scribal intervention. It is not impossible that these scrolls are the corrected copies mentioned in *b. Pes.* 112a: "when you teach your son, teach him from a corrected copy (ספר מוגה)."

4. *Textual Character*

A. *Sites Other Than Qumran*

All the twenty-three texts found outside Qumran reflect the medieval consonantal text of MT, more so than the proto-Masoretic Qumran texts. This grouping comprises the following sites and texts: Masada (Genesis, Leviticus [2], Deuteronomy, Ezekiel, and Psalms [2]),[13] Wadi Sdeir (Genesis), Naḥal Ṣe'elim (Numbers), Naḥal Ḥever (Numbers [2], Deuteronomy, Psalms) and Murabba'at (Genesis, Exodus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Isaiah, Minor Prophets).[14] See also the texts from three unknown sites: XJosh, XJudg, and XBiblical Text?.[15] The only differences with the medieval text pertain to orthography, a few minute variants, paragraphing, and the layout of individual Psalms. All these variations

[13] For the publication and an analysis, see Talmon, *Masada VI*. For subsequent analyses, see E. Tov, "A Qumran Origin for the Masada Nonbiblical Texts?" *DSD* 7 (2000) 57–73; E. Ulrich, "Two Perspectives on Two Pentateuchal Manuscripts from Masada," in Paul, *Emanuel*, 543–64.

[14] For the first three sites, see the texts published by P. W. Flint, M. Morgenstern, and C. Murphy in *DJD* XXXVIII. For the last site, see the texts published by J. T. Milik in *DJD* II.

[15] The texts were published in *DJD* XXVIII and XXXVIII.

resemble the internal differences between the medieval manuscripts of MT themselves.[16]

B. *Qumran*

The main sources for our knowledge of the biblical text at Qumran are those containing a running biblical text, but our information is supplemented by other sources of limited value, viz., quotations in the nonbiblical compositions as well as excerpted and abbreviated biblical manuscripts.[17]

a. *The Biblical Text Reflected in the Nonbiblical Compositions*

A full analysis of the biblical text at Qumran ought to include the quotations from the Bible in the nonbiblical documents, which add to our knowledge of the variety of biblical texts in the period under investigation. The perusal of these nonbiblical texts is complicated, since it is often difficult to extract from them reliable information about the biblical text quoted. These difficulties are caused by the fact that biblical quotations are found in a variety of compositions, each of which requires a different type of analysis. Thus the evaluation of the textual deviations reflected in the biblical quotations in these compositions differs not only from one category of compositions to the other, but also from one composition to the next:[18]

α. *Quotations and Allusions in Nonbiblical Compositions*. Several nonbiblical compositions, both sectarian and non-sectarian, freely quote from and allude to passages in the Bible. Indeed, the sectarian *Hodayot* and *Rules*, as well as non-Qumranic compositions such as 4QNon-Canonical Psalms A–B (4Q380–81) abound with biblical quotations. Most of these quotations are free, involving changes in the biblical text, which accordingly cannot be utilized easily within the context of a text-critical

[16] See, further, chapter 12*. For detailed statistics and an analysis, see I. Young, "The Stabilization of the Biblical Text in the Light of Qumran and Masada: A Challenge for Conventional Qumran Chronology?" *DSD* 9 (2002) 364–90. Barthélemy, *Critique textuelle 3*, cxiii considers MurXII a characteristic sample of the textual standardization which took place between the two revolts and which is therefore more properly proto-Masoretic, so to speak, than the earlier Qumran texts of the Minor Prophets and of other books.

[17] Greenstein suggested that when encountering variations in the biblical and nonbiblical texts, one's first inclination should be to assume the scribe's faulty memory: E. L. Greenstein, "Misquotation of Scripture in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *The Frank Talmage Memorial Volume* (ed. B. Walfish; Haifa: Haifa University Press, 1993) 71–83. A similar theory had been advanced previously for 1QIsa[a] by H. M. Orlinsky, "Studies in the St. Mark's Isaiah Scroll," *JBL* 69 (1950) 149–66 (165). In our view, this approach would be valid in only a few instances.

[18] Excerpted and abbreviated biblical manuscripts are analyzed below as a subgroup of biblical manuscripts.

discussion. The textual background of some compositions has been studied, but few solid conclusions have been reached.[19] We agree with Lange's conclusion that no specific text group (in his words, "text type") is preferred in the biblical quotations in the nonbiblical Qumran compositions.[20]

β. Pesharim *and Other Commentaries*. *Pesharim* are composed of quotations from the biblical text (lemmas) and their exposition (*pesher*). These lemmas in the eighteen running *pesharim* on biblical books or parts of them from caves 1 and 4 contain long stretches of biblical text, which, when combined, would amount to running biblical manuscripts, were it not that they often have been preserved only fragmentarily. However, in 1QpHab, 4QpNah, 4QpPs, and some *pesharim* on Isaiah, such running texts may be reconstructed. In addition, the exposition in the *pesher* itself sometimes also reflects a few additional readings differing from the biblical text on which the *pesher* comments.

Different views have been voiced regarding the text-critical value of the biblical text contained in and reflected by these *pesharim*. A positive position was taken by the editors of textual editions that incorporated readings from these *pesharim* (mainly from the lemmas) in their textual apparatuses (*BHS* for 1QpHab, *HUBP* for the *pesharim* on Isaiah, and *Biblia Qumranica* for the Minor Prophets; see chapter 16*). Some scholars cautioned that many so-called deviations from MT in the *pesharim* and commentaries[21] were due to contextual exegesis. However, although

[19] M. H. Goshen-Gottstein, "Bible Quotations in the Sectarian Dead Sea Scrolls," *VT* 3 (1953) 79–82; J. Carmignac, "Les citations de l'Ancien Testament dans 'La Guerre des Fils de la Lumière contre Les Fils des Ténèbres'," *RB* 63 (1956) 234–61, 375–91; M. Mansoor, "The Thanksgiving Hymns and the Masoretic Text (II)," *RevQ* 3 (1961) 387–94; J. de Waard, *A Comparative Study of the Old Testament in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the New Testament* (STDJ 4; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1965); G. Vermes, "Biblical Proof Texts in Qumran Literature," *JSS* 34 (1989) 493–508; J. G. Campbell, *The Use of Scripture in the Damascus Document 1–8, 19–20* (BZAW 228; Berlin/New York: W. de Gruyter, 1995); J. Elwolde, "Distinguishing the Linguistic and the Exegetical: The Biblical Book of Numbers in the Damascus Document," *DSD* 7 (2000) 1–25; M. Riska, *The Temple Scroll and the Biblical Traditions—A Study of Columns 1–13:9* (Publications of the Finnish Exegetical Society 81; Helsinki: The Finnish Exegetical Society, 2001); S. Metso, "Biblical Quotations in the Community Rule," in *The Bible as Book*, 81–92; E. Tigchelaar, "The Cave 4 Damascus Document Manuscripts and the Text of the Bible," ibid., 93–111; J. Høgenhaven, "Biblical Quotations and Allusions in 4QApocryphal Lamentations (4Q179)," ibid., 113–20.

[20] A. Lange, "The Status of the Biblical Texts in the Qumran Corpus and the Canonical Process," in *The Bible as Book*, 21–30 (27).

[21] E.g., G. Molin, "Der Habakkukkomentar von 'En Feṣḥa in der alttestamentlichen Wissenschaft," *TZ* 8 (1952) 340–57; G. J. Brooke, "The Biblical Texts in the Qumran Commentaries: Scribal Errors or Exegetical Variants?" in *Early Jewish and Christian Exegesis: Studies in Memory of William Hugh Brownlee* (ed. C. A. Evans and W. F. Stinespring; Atlanta:

such exegesis is found in the *pesharim,* including a few cases of sectarian exegesis,[22] many, if not most, deviations in the lemmas probably reflect variants found in the biblical manuscripts used by the commentator.[23] The Qumran commentaries probably reflect fewer variants than the *pesharim*.[24] At the same time, it remains difficult to determine the level of manuscript variation. A maximalistic approach underlies the lists of presumed variant readings for 1QpHab by Brownlee (see n. 21) and for all the *pesharim* by Lim.[25] Thus, according to Lim,[26] 17 percent of all the words of the MT of Nahum differ from the corresponding preserved segments of 4QpNah. The number of 4QpNah readings that, according to Lim, differ from MT is substantial, but they include morphological variations and a large number of contextual changes, both of which cannot be evaluated easily. If, according to a minimalist approach, these elements were inserted by the authors of the *pesharim*, the underlying biblical text was probably not very different from MT. On the other hand, if this *Vorlage* already included the morphological variations and contextual changes, it resembled 1QIsa[a] and similar texts. Believing this to be the case, several scholars[27] characterized the underlying texts of the *pesharim* as "vulgar" texts.[28]

Scholars Press, 1987) 85–100 with references to earlier studies; idem, "Some Remarks on 4Q252 and the Text of Genesis," *Textus* 19 (1998) 1–25.

[22] The most clear-cut examples are 1QpHab VIII 3 (Hab 2:5) הון (MT: היין); 1QpHab XI 3 (Hab 2:15) מועדיהן (MT: מעוריהן). For an analysis, see W. H. Brownlee, *The Text of Habakkuk in the Ancient Commentary from Qumran* (JBL Monograph Series XI; Philadelphia, 1959) 113–8.

[23] L. Novakovic *apud* J. H. Charlesworth, *The Pesharim and Qumran History—Chaos or Consensus?* (Grand Rapids, Mich./Cambridge, U. K.: Eerdmans, 2002) 129–58 lists all the variants that according to her are reflected in the "pesharim, other commentaries, and related documents." See also I. Goldberg, "Variant Readings in the Pesher Habakkuk," *Textus* 17 (1994) ט-כד (Heb.); G. J. Brooke, "Isaiah in the Pesharim and Other Qumran Texts," in *Writing & Reading the Scroll of Isaiah: Studies of an Interpretive Tradition* (ed. C. C. Broyles and C. A. Evans; VTSup 70, 1–2; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1997) 609–32; idem, "The Qumran Pesharim and the Text of Isaiah in the Cave 4 Manuscripts," in *Biblical Hebrew, Biblical Texts: Essays in Memory of Michael P. Weitzman* (ed. A. Rapoport-Albert and G. Greenberg; JSOTSup 333; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001) 304–20.

[24] In the words of Brooke, "The Biblical Texts," 87 (see n. 21) "... that in more cases than are usually recognized the variants in the biblical texts in the Qumran commentaries have been deliberately caused by the desire of the Qumran commentator to make this text conform with his exegetical understanding."

[25] T. H. Lim, *Holy Scripture in the Qumran Commentaries and Pauline Texts* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1997), chapter IV; idem, "Biblical Quotations in the Pesharim and the Text of the Bible–Methodological Considerations," *The Bible as Book,* 71–9.

[26] Lim, *Holy Scripture*, 90.

[27] J. van der Ploeg, "Le rouleau d'Habacuc de la grotte de 'Ain Feshha," *BO* 8 (1951) 2–11, esp. 4; K. Elliger, *Studien zum Habakuk-Kommentar vom Toten Meer* (BHT 15, Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1953) 48; P. Kahle in a review of Elliger in *TLZ* 79 (1954) 478–9; S. Segert, "Zur Habakuk-Rolle aus dem Funde vom Toten Meer VI," *ArOr* 23 (1955) 575–619

The *pesharim* from caves 1 and 4 at Qumran often differ from the Masoretic tradition regarding the scope of the units in the biblical text quoted in the lemmas. Thus, while the lemmas quoting the biblical text in 1QpHab sometimes conform to what is now a verse in the Masoretic tradition of Habakkuk, more frequently they comprise half-verses or even smaller segments. For details, see *Scribal Practices*, Appendix 7.

γ. *Rewritten Bible Compositions*. A group of rewritten Bible compositions, including compositions whose names contain the elements "Ps(eudo)" and "Apocr," provides substantial information relevant to our knowledge of the biblical text.[29] These rewritten Bible compositions reformulate the content of Hebrew Scripture, adding and omitting minor and major details, as well as changing many a word. Each composition was a unicum, inserting a different number of changes in the biblical text. Some compositions were very close to the Scripture text, such as the Temple Scroll, which contains long stretches that run parallel to the biblical text, especially in cols. LI–LXVI[30]. At the same time, because of the difficulty in distinguishing between the biblical text and the more substantial added layer of exegesis and rewriting in these compositions, it would be hard to incorporate their deviations from MT in a text-critical analysis.

Although the amount of information on the biblical text reflected in the nonbiblical compositions from Qumran is limited, these sources need to be further explored for textcritical purposes. Among other things, an attempt should be made to examine possible links between the biblical quotations in the nonbiblical Qumran texts, especially the sectarian ones, and the biblical texts found at Qumran. Characteristic readings of the biblical texts need to be isolated in the quotations, and this is possible only when the differences between the manuscripts themselves are

(608). These scholars probably go too far when describing the biblical quotations in the *pesharim* as reflecting a distinct textual recension deviating from the other textual sources. A similar conclusion was reached by M. Collin, mainly on the basis of an analysis of 1QpMic, which was characterized by him as reflecting a third recension of the biblical book, alongside the MT and LXX: "Recherches sur l'histoire textuelle du prophète Michée," *VT* 21 (1971) 281–97. This characterization was rejected by L. A. Sinclair, "Hebrew Texts of the Qumran Micah Pesher and Textual Traditions of the Minor Prophets," *RevQ* 11 (1983) 253–63.

[28] For a discussion of what many scholars name "vulgar texts", see *TCHB*, 193–7.

[29] See J. C. VanderKam, "The Wording of Biblical Citations in Some Rewritten Scriptural Works," *The Bible as Book*, 41–56.

[30] That composition does not show a close textual relation to any of the known textual witnesses of the Bible, and its text should probably be characterized as reflecting an independent textual tradition. See the present author in "The Temple Scroll and Old Testament Textual Criticism," *ErIsr* 16 (Heb. with Eng. summ.; Jerusalem, 1982) 100–11.

sufficiently distinctive. For example, in Isaiah the differences between 1QIsa[a] (sometimes agreeing with 4QIsa[c]) on the one hand and on the other hand the proto-Masoretic 1QIsa[b] and most of the Isaiah manuscripts from cave 4 are quite distinct, as are the differences in Jeremiah between (1) 4QJer[b,d] and the LXX on the one hand, (2) and the Masoretic 4QJer[a,c], and (3) the idiosyncratic 2QJer. At the same time, it remains difficult to determine close affinities between brief quotations from these two books in nonbiblical compositions and specific Qumran biblical manuscripts. A few special links between such quotations and Qumran manuscripts have been noticed, but research of this type is still insufficiently developed.[31]

b. *Biblical Manuscripts*

α. *Excerpted and Abbreviated Texts*. Due to the fragmentary nature of excerpted biblical texts,[32] their essence is not always clear, nor is the background of the excerpting. Most excerpted texts were probably made for liturgical purposes: all the *tefillin*, several manuscripts of Exodus and Deuteronomy, and a long list of Psalm texts from caves 4 and 11 as well as texts from other books and 4QTestimonia (4Q175). Other manuscripts of Exodus, Canticles, Deuteronomy, etc. contain an abbreviated text (see chapter 4*). If the characterization of these scrolls as excerpted and abbreviated texts is correct, their major omissions and transpositions should be disregarded in the textcritical analysis, but other deviations from MT should be taken into consideration, for example in the case of the *tefillin*.[33] The textual character of some excerpted texts is clearly recognizable. Thus, the harmonizing readings of 4QDeut[n] are conspicuous.[34] Likewise, while the first biblical quotation in 4QTest is close to SP,[35] the third one, from Deut 33:8-11, is very close to 4QDeut[h],

[31] See the discussion of the quotation from Deut 33:8-11 in 4QTest below. See further the examples listed by Tov, "Hebrew Biblical Manuscripts," 34. G. Vermes, "Biblical Proof Texts" mentions a few cases of difference between MT and the text quoted in Qumran compositions, e.g. 1QS V 17 לכן agreeing with MT Isa 2:22 and differing from לכמה in 1QIsa[a].

[32] See chapter 4*.

[33] See D. Nakman, "The Contents and Order of the Biblical Sections in the *Tefillin* from Qumran and Rabbinic Halakhah: Similarity, Difference, and Some Historical Conclusions," *Cathedra* 112 (2004) 19–44 (Heb.); D. Rothstein, *From Bible to Murabba'at: Studies in the Literary, Scribal and Textual Features of Phylacteries and Mezuzot in Ancient Israel and Early Judaism,* unpubl. Ph.D. diss., University of California, 1992.

[34] See chapter 4*, n. 26.

[35] See chapter 4*, n. 14.

and may have been based on that scroll or a similar one.[36] These two quotations show that the author of 4QTest quoted from at least two biblical scrolls of a different character, one of the pre-Samaritan texts and 4QDeut^{h}, a textually independent text. This unintentional mixture must have resulted from the author's use of these particular scrolls, and probably neither he nor the other authors took notice of the different textual character of the scrolls consulted.

Another feature of the excerpted and abbreviated texts is that none of these texts, with the exception of the non-Qumranic *tefillin* and *mezuzot*, is close to MT (see chapter 4*). This feature indicates a certain milieu for these anthologies, whose purpose differed from that of the writing of regular Scripture texts.

β. *Regular Biblical Texts*

(1) *Background*. The great majority of the 200 Hebrew biblical texts comes from cave 4, while smaller quantities were found in caves 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, and 11.[37] How uncertain we are regarding the number of texts originally deposited in the caves is shown by the 68 reinforcing leather tabs found in cave 8.[38] Each reinforcing tab was probably attached to a single scroll, and although this cave probably contained a leather workshop or depository, it is not impossible that many scrolls decayed in this cave and that the reinforcing tabs evidence the existence at one time of many scrolls, much more than the remains of four manuscripts would indicate.

The main depository of texts is cave 4, which contains copies of all the books of the Hebrew Bible, with the exception of Esther.[39] It is significant that virtually all the so-called canonical books were represented in this cave, which probably implies that an effort was made to collect at Qumran all the books which were considered authoritative at that stage, at least in certain Jewish circles, and which became authoritative at a later stage for all of Judaism. On the other hand, only a few books of the

[36] See E. Tov, "The Contribution of the Qumran Scrolls to the Understanding of the LXX," in *Manchester Symposium*, 11–47, esp. 31–5; J. A. Duncan, "New Readings for the 'Blessing of Moses' from Qumran," *JBL* 114 (1995) 273–90.

[37] Over the years, the number of the biblical texts has changed reflecting new insights gained into the nature of the fragments, in particular due to the separation of groups of fragments. Thus, P. W. Skehan listed 172 different scrolls in 1965: "The Biblical Scrolls from Qumran and the Text of the Old Testament," *BA* 28 (1965) 87–100. Subsequently, the first edition of Tov–Pfann, *Companion Volume* (1993) listed 189 biblical texts, while the second edition added four items. The contents of the different fragments of biblical texts have been listed by Ulrich, *DJD* XXXIX, 185–201.

[38] See J. Carswell, "Fastenings on the Qumran Manuscripts," *DJD* VI, 23–8 (24).

[39] The absence of this book should probably be ascribed to coincidence (decaying of the material) rather than to any other factor.

Apocrypha, and the so-called Pseudepigrapha, were represented in cave 4 (*Tobit, Jubilees, Levi ar, TJud ar, TNaph*). Cave 4 probably served as a central depository for the written material owned by the Qumran community, including some *tefillin*, *mezuzot*, and Greek texts. It is probably not coincidental that most Qumran copies of the biblical books which are considered to be significant for the textual analysis of the Hebrew Bible were found in cave 4. While a text like 1QIsa^{a} may be important to our understanding of the textual transmission of the Bible, it contains so many secondary features that its importance for the reconstruction of the original text of Hebrew Scripture is limited.

(2) *Texts in the Paleo-Hebrew Script*. The great majority of the texts from Qumran and the other sites in the Judean Desert are written in the square script,[40] and they reflect a textual variety. A similar variety, though on a smaller scale, is reflected in the texts written in the paleo-Hebrew script, so that the textual character of these texts cannot serve as a key for unscrambling the riddle of the writing in this script. The twelve biblical texts written in the paleo-Hebrew script differ from the texts written in the square script with regard to the scribal characteristics inherent with the writing in that script, with regard to the almost complete lack of scribal intervention in them, and in additional scribal features.[41]

At Qumran, fragments of twelve biblical texts written in the paleo-Hebrew script have been found as well as a few paleo-Hebrew texts of uncertain nature:[42] 1QpaleoLev, 1QpaleoNum (same scroll as 1QpaleoLev?); 2QpaleoLev; 4QpaleoGen-Exod^{l}, 4QpaleoGen^{m}, 4QpaleoExod^{m}, 4QpaleoDeut^{r,s}, 4QpaleoJob^{c}; 6QpaleoGen, 6QpaleoLev; 11QpaleoLev^{a}. Three texts (4Q124–125; 11Q22) are unidentified. 4QpaleoParaJosh, probably not a biblical text, contains parts of Joshua 21. Beyond Qumran, two nonbiblical texts, Mas 1o (Mas pap paleoText of Sam. Origin [recto] and Mas pap paleoUnidentified Text [verso]) are also written in paleo-Hebrew characters.[43]

The writing in the paleo-Hebrew script must have been preserved for the most ancient biblical books, the Torah and Job—note that the latter is traditionally ascribed to Moses (cf. *b. B. Bat.* 14b–15a; cf. also manuscripts

---

[40] According to S. Pfann, one of the minute fragments inscribed in the cryptic A script contained a copy of the book of Leviticus: pap cryptA Lev^{h} (*DJD* XXXVI), but more likely it reflects a quote from that book.

[41] See *Scribal Practices*, 246–8.

[42] See M. D. McLean, *The Use and Development of Palaeo-Hebrew in the Hellenistic and Roman Periods*, Ph.D. diss., Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass., 1982, 41–7 (University Microfilms); P. W. Skehan and E. Ulrich, *DJD* IX.

[43] S. Talmon, *Masada VI*, 138–47.

and editions of the Peshitta in which Job follows the Torah). Note also that only for one of the books of the Torah (Leviticus) and Job Targumim were found at Qumran. The longest preserved texts written in the paleo-Hebrew script are 4QpaleoExod^{m} and 11QpaleoLev^{a}.

These texts, rather than preceding writing in the square script, were actually written at a relatively late period, probably as a natural continuation of the tradition of writing in the "early" Hebrew script, and were concurrent with the use of the square script. This can be demonstrated by a paleographical examination of the paleo-Hebrew script,[44] and of their orthography which is *not* more archaic than that of the texts written in the square script. While it is tacitly assumed by most scholars that with the revival of the paleo-Hebrew script in the Hasmonean period, texts were transformed from the square to the paleo-Hebrew script,[45] it would be more natural to assume that the habit of writing in the paleo-Hebrew script had never ceased through the centuries. Possibly the paleo-Hebrew texts from Qumran derived from the circles of the Sadducees; the major argument for this assumption is the fact that most paleo-Hebrew texts reflect MT,[46] although writing in this script was forbidden by the Pharisees.[47] One of the special characteristics of the paleo-Hebrew texts is that they display virtually no scribal intervention. It is possible that the Qumran scribes were influenced by this Sadducean tradition when writing the Tetragrammaton and other divine names in paleo-Hebrew characters in biblical and nonbiblical texts, in order that these words, whose sanctity was determined by the writing in this script, would not be erased. For the analysis of the biblical texts the idiosyncrasy of these texts indicates that not only the contents, but also the external features of the texts need to be taken into consideration.

(3) *Textual Variety.* In view of the differences between the MT, LXX, and SP known before the discoveries in the Judean Desert textual variety among these documents was expected. The description of the Qumran manuscripts as reflecting textual variety is now an established

---

[44] See R. S. Hanson, "Paleo-Hebrew Scripts in the Hasmonean Age," *BASOR* 175 (1964) 26–42.

[45] Thus K. A. Mathews: "The Background of the Paleo-Hebrew Texts at Qumran," in *The Word of the Lord Shall Go Forth, Essays in Honor of David Noel Freedman in Celebration of His Sixtieth Birthday* (ed. C. L. Meyers and M. O'Connor; Winona Lake, Ind., 1983) 549–68.

[46] See *Scribal Practices,* Appendix 8.

[47] See *m. Yad.* 4.5; *b. Sanh.* 21b; cf. *b. Meg.* 9a; *t. Sanh.* 5.7; *y. Meg.* 1.71b–c. For details, see *Scribal Practices,* 246–8.

assumption among scholars.[48] It is probably an equally accepted assumption of many scholars that these texts derived from different places in ancient Israel, not only from Qumran. Presently scholars are not as naive as the first generation of Qumran scholars who ascribed all the texts found at Qumran to the Qumran community, while some of them even tried to locate in them the characteristic ideas of that community (see n. 56). At the same time, we do not have to go as far as Golb, who denied any connection between the scrolls found in the caves and the Qumran community living in Khirbet Qumran very close to cave 4.[49] We prefer a middle course according to which some of the Qumran texts (probably not more than thirty percent) were copied by the scribes of the Qumran community, while the remainder were brought to Qumran from outside. We believe that there are criteria in the realm of orthography, morphology, and scribal practices for distinguishing between the two groups (below, α). In that case, it is justifiable to look for sectarian readings, for example, in 1QIsa[a] (although I have not been able to locate them),[50] but it is not justifiable to look for them in any text whose connection with the Qumranites has not been established, such as 4QSam[a], for example.

c. *Classification of the Texts According to Textual Character*

The classification of the Qumran texts remains a difficult assignment. Preferably the Qumran biblical texts should be classified according to objective criteria, but there hardly is such a criterion.[51] For one thing, the contents of each of the caves are not homogeneous, with the exception of caves 7 and 11.[52] The texts should not be classified by date, or by palaeographical or codicological criteria, since none of these criteria is

---

[48] For recent discussions, see E. Ulrich, "Pluriformity in the Biblical Text, Text Groups, and Questions of Canon," in Trebolle, *Madrid Qumran Congress,* 1:23–41; idem, "The Dead Sea Scrolls."

[49] N. Golb, "The Problem of Origin and Identification of the Dead Sea Scrolls," *APSP* 124 (1980) 1–24; idem, "Who Hid the Dead Sea Scrolls?" *BA* 48 (1985) 68–82; idem, "Khirbet Qumran and the Manuscripts of the Judaean Wilderness—Observations on the Logic of Their Investigation," *JNES* 49 (1990) 103–14; idem, *Who Wrote the Dead Sea Scrolls—The Search for the Secret of Qumran* (New York: Scribner, 1994).

[50] See note 56.

[51] Note, however, the attempt by I. Young to record the variants by objective criteria: "The Biblical Scrolls from Qumran and the Masoretic Text," in *Feasts and Fasts, A Festschrift in Honour of Alan David Crown* (ed. M. Dacy et al.; Mandelbaum Studies in Judaica 11; Sydney: University of Sydney, 2005) 81–139. Young calculated the number of variants (deviations from MT) relative to the number of words in the scrolls excluding orthographic variants, but not differentiating between small insignificant details and major content variations.

[52] See chapter 28*, n. 2.

firm. Probably the best criterion for classification is according to textual character, even though this criterion is problematic as well. But since one of our main interests is gaining insights into the textual nature of the individual texts and the collection as a whole, we nevertheless have to attempt to classify the texts according to this criterion. The first step in this classification is an attempt to determine the principles for describing five textual groups, and to fill in the details for each group. The second step is to see how these groups are distributed in the individual books of the Bible even though we should not forget that the preservation of the Qumran fragments depends to a large degree on coincidence. But even with these limitations it is relevant to examine, for example, how many texts belonging to the proto-Masoretic family have been preserved in each of the books of the Bible, and whether the various biblical books present a different textual picture (below, § d).

The principle behind this classification is the recognition that all texts can be grouped according to the degree of closeness to the MT, LXX, or SP without accepting the claim that these three texts are the central pillars (recensions, texts, text-types, etc.) of the biblical text. One of the groups in this corpus consists of texts which are not close to any of these three entities (group ϵ below). It may be unusual to classify ancient texts according to the degree of their closeness to later textual witnesses, certainly if these are medieval (MT and SP), but this comparison is necessary, since the base forms of these texts already existed in the last centuries before the turn of the era.

This classification can only be approximate, not only because the texts are fragmentary (very fragmentary texts are not included in the analysis), but also because in the stretches covered by several fragmentary texts there is insufficient opposition between MT and SP in the Torah and MT and the LXX in Isaiah and Ruth. The recognition of this aspect, as well as the coverage of all the Judean Desert texts allow us to correct statistics published earlier.[53]

In the calculation of the percentages for the various groups of texts, the numbers are based on a list of 128 biblical texts (the remaining texts are too fragmentary for textual analysis). In this calculation, the following principles are employed: (1) Questionable attributions to textual groups are counted as regular ones. (2) In accord with statistical probability, texts that are equally close to MT and SP in the Torah and to MT and the LXX in the other books are counted as MT. (3) Texts written according to the Qumran scribal practice (group α) are not included

[53] *TCHB,* 114–6.

separately in the statistics, since these texts are counted in other groups in accord with their textual affiliation. (4) Texts that are characterized as both "non-aligned" and close to the LXX or SP are counted as "non-aligned." (5) Since the texts of the SP group are not evidenced for books other than the Torah, statistics for the Torah are separated from those of the other books. All statistics are based on the data in *Scribal Practices*, Appendix 8.

In the forty-six Torah texts that are sufficiently extensive for analysis (out of a total of 51 such texts), 22 (48%) reflect 𝔪 (or are equally close to the 𝔪 and 𝔲), 19 are non-aligned (41%), 3 *exclusively* reflect 𝔲 (6.5%), and 2 𝔬 (4.5%). In the remainder of Hebrew Scripture, in the seventy-five texts that are sufficiently extensive for analysis (out of a total of 76 such texts), 33 texts (44%) reflect MT (or are equally close to the MT and LXX), 40 are non-aligned (53%), two reflect the LXX (3%). The overall preponderance of MT and non-aligned texts in the Qumran corpus is thus evident, in the Torah more MT and in the other books more the non-aligned texts. These percentages are quite significant, and they are telling about the preferences of the Qumran community, but they are remote from the other sites in the Judean Desert, where all the texts belong to the inner circle of the medieval MT (above § 4A).

α. *Texts Written in the Qumran Scribal Practice*. It has been suggested, especially by the present author, that a large group of Qumran texts stand apart from the other ones because of their common use of a distinctive orthography, morphology, and a set of scribal practices.[54] It was recognized that a whole series of scribal features occurs almost exclusively in texts that display a certain system of orthography and morphology. The fact that virtually all the sectarian texts from Qumran reflect this combined set of features has led to the suggestion that these texts had been copied by the group of people who left the texts behind in the Qumran caves, possibly written at Qumran itself, although this is not a necessary part of the hypothesis. It is not claimed that these mentioned features are characteristic of the Qumran scribal practice only. It is only assumed that within the corpus of the texts found at Qumran these

[54] *Scribal Practices*, 261–73 (with references to literature and earlier formulations of this theory). For criticisms, see J. Lübbe, "Certain Implications of the Scribal Process of *4QSam*^{c}," *RevQ* 14 (1989–1990) 255–65. Cross describes the orthography of these texts as a "baroque style" and he includes the morphological features under the heading of orthography: F. M. Cross, "Some Notes on a Generation of Qumran Studies," in Trebolle, *Madrid Qumran Congress*, 1–14. See my reply, ibid., 15–21; Dong-Hyuk Kim, "Free Orthography in a Strict Society: Reconsidering Tov's 'Qumran Orthography'," *DSD* 11 (2004) 72–81; see my reply "Reply to Dong-Hyuk Kim's Paper on 'Tov's Qumran Orthography'," *DSD* 11 (2004) 359–60.

features display a peculiar distribution. Likewise, *tefillin* that were written in the Qumran scribal practice do not reflect the rabbinic prescriptions for the contents of the *tefillin*,[55] while the *tefillin* not written in the Qumran scribal practice, do so. On the basis of these criteria it is now possible to identify a group of biblical texts reflecting the Qumran scribal practice. The great majority of these texts reflect a free approach to the biblical text which manifests itself in adaptations of unusual forms to the context, in frequent errors, in numerous corrections, and sometimes, also, in careless handwriting. This approach seemingly contradicts the strict approach of the Qumran covenanters to their Bible interpretation, but this contradiction is only apparent, as different aspects of life are involved.

The texts belonging to this group reflect different textual backgrounds. Some of them must have been copied from proto-Masoretic texts, but they cannot be identified any more, since the scribes made too many changes (thus, 1QIsa^{a} could have been copied from 1QIsa^{b} or a similar text, but because of his free approach, this assumption cannot be verified [see chapter* 5]). In other cases, the textual background of the texts can more readily be identified, as in the case of texts copied from a text close to SP (4QNum^{b}; see further group γ below). The sectarian scribe of 4QSam^{c} probably copied from a text that was both close to MT and to LXX^{Luc} in 2 Samuel 14–15, which in that section probably reflects the OG translation, and should therefore be named non-aligned. The majority of the texts written in the Qumran practice are characterized as non-aligned (group ϵ below) because of their many contextual changes.

The twenty-five texts written in the Qumran practice (not all equally convincing), often described as typical Qumran texts, comprise a sizable group among the Qumran biblical texts. Probably the base texts of most *pesharim* reflecting all the elements of the Qumran practice, belonged to this group as well. The percentage of this group within the corpus of Qumran biblical texts is *not* expressed in statistical terms in the overall statistical analysis, since they are included in the statistics of the other four categories, which together add up to 100 percent. At the same time, it is noteworthy that 21 percent of the Qumran biblical scrolls were copied by the Qumran community, a far cry from the percentage which was assumed during the first two generations of Qumran research, namely 100 percent.

---

[55] See chapter 4*, § 2 and also the supporting evidence analyzed by G. J. Brooke, "Deuteronomy 5–6 in the Phylacteries from Qumran Cave 4," in Paul, *Emanuel*, 57–70.

If indeed a large segment of the Qumran scrolls has been penned down by Qumran scribes, it is remarkable that they contain no sectarian readings.[56]

β. *Proto-Masoretic (Proto-Rabbinic) Texts*. Proto-Masoretic texts contain the consonantal framework of MT one thousand years or more before the time of the Masora codices. They do not seem to reflect any special textual characteristics beyond their basic agreement with MT. These texts are usually named proto-Masoretic, but the term "proto-rabbinic," used by F. M. Cross,[57] probably better describes their nature. [58]

The exclusive closeness of fifty-seven Qumran texts to the medieval texts (see above) is remarkable, while textual identity is spotted only for the texts from the other sites in the Judaean Desert (see § 4A).

γ. *Pre-Samaritan Texts*. The pre-Samaritan Qumran texts (4QpaleoExod^{m}, 4QExod-Lev^{f}, and 4QNum^{b}, and secondarily also 4QDeut^{n} and possibly 4QLev^{d})[59] reflect the characteristic features of the later SP with the exception of the latter's ideological readings, but they occasionally deviate from it.[60] It appears that one of the texts of this group formed the basis of SP, in which the Samaritan ideological changes and phonological features were inserted. A major characteristic feature of these texts is the content editing of the earlier texts as described in chapter 6*, and further the preponderance of contextually harmonizing readings.[61] Some scholars name this group "Palestinian," and there is much justification

---

[56] Thus G. J. Brooke, "E Pluribus Unum—Textual Variety and Definitive Interpretation in the Qumran Scrolls," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Their Historical Context* (ed. T. H. Lim et al.; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2000) 107–19; idem, "Deuteronomy 5–6 in the Phylacteries from Qumran Cave 4," in Paul, *Emanuel*, 57–70; E. Ulrich, "The Absence of 'Sectarian Variants' in the Jewish Scriptural Scrolls Found at Qumran," in *The Bible as Book*, 179–95. On the other hand, two scholars believe that such sectarian readings are embedded in the text: A. van der Kooij, *Die alten Textzeugen des Jesajabuches, Ein Beitrag zur Textgeschichte des Alten Testaments* (OBO 35; Freiburg/Göttingen: Universitätsverlag/Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981) 95–6; P. Pulikottil, *Transmission of Biblical Texts in Qumran—The Case of the Large Isaiah Scroll 1QIsa^{a}* (JSOTSup 34; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001).

[57] F. M. Cross, Jr., "The History of the Biblical Text in the Light of the Discoveries in the Judaean Desert," *HTR* 57 (1964) 281–99, esp. 287–92; idem, "Some Notes" (p. 9).

[58] The Qumran proto-Masoretic group ought to be investigated with regard to possible clusters within this group regarding spelling and content, but because of the paucity of overlapping Qumran texts, this investigation will be very limited. A possible clustering of 1QIsa^{a,b} and 4QIsa^{c,d} (of which 1QIsa^{a} and 4QIsa^{c} reflect the Qumran scribal practice in their orthography), against the medieval text, is visible. See chapter 5*, § 4.

[59] This text is also quoted in 4QTestimonia; see n. 31.

[60] See chapter 6* and E. Tov, "Proto-Samaritan Texts and the Samaritan Pentateuch," in *The Samaritans* (ed. A. D. Crown; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1989) 397–407; N. Jastram, "A Comparison of Two 'Proto-Samaritan' Texts from Qumran: 4QpaleoExod^{m} and 4QNum^{b}," *DSD* 5 (1998) 264–89.

[61] As a result the group as a whole was named harmonistic by Eshel, "4QDeut^{n}."

for this characterization, since these texts are not evidenced outside Palestine. The use of this term is, however, problematic, since it may imply that no other texts or groups of texts were extant in Palestine.

The three pre-Samaritan texts comprise no more than *6.5* percent of the Qumran biblical texts of the Torah. Although this is a small group, it is very significant for our understanding of the transmission of the Hebrew Bible.

δ. *Texts Close to the Presumed Hebrew Source of the LXX*. Although no text was found at Qumran that is identical or almost identical to the presumed Hebrew source of the LXX, a few texts are very close to that translation: 4QJer^{b,d} bear a strong resemblance to the LXX in characteristic details, with regard both to the arrangement of the verses and to their shorter text.[62] Similarly close to the LXX, though not to the same extent, are 4QLev^{d} (also close to SP), 4QDeut^{q}, and secondarily also 4QSam^{a} (close to the main tradition of the LXX and LXX^{Luc}; see below, group ϵ),[63] 4QNum^{b}, and according to Cross (*DJD* XII, 84) also 4QExod^{b}. Individual agreements with the LXX are also found in additional texts, in a somewhat large proportion in 4QDeut^{c,h,j}, but these texts actually belong to group ϵ.

There is insufficient evidence for speculating on the internal relation between the texts that are close to the LXX. In any event, they should not be considered a textual group. They do not form a close-knit textual family like the Masoretic family or the pre-Samaritan group. They represent individual copies that in the putative stemma of the biblical texts happened to be close to the Hebrew text from which the LXX was translated. Since in each of the books of the LXX its *Vorlage* was a single biblical text, and not a family, recension, or revision, the recognition of Hebrew scrolls that were close to the *Vorlage* of the LXX is thus of limited importance to our understanding of the relation between these texts, but it does have bearing on our understanding of the nature of the LXX and its *Vorlage*. The four texts which are close to the LXX comprise 4.5 percent of the Qumran biblical texts in the Torah (2 texts) and 3 percent in the other books (2 texts).

ϵ. *Non-Aligned (Independent) Texts*. Many Qumran texts are not exclusively close to either the MT, LXX, or SP and are therefore considered non-aligned. That is, they agree sometimes with MT against

---

[62] See *TCHB*, 319–27.

[63] For an analysis, see Tov, "The Contribution of the Qumran Scrolls." F. M. Cross and R. J. Saley, "A Statistical Analysis of the Textual Character of 4QSamuel^{a} (4Q51)," *DSD* 13 (2006) 46–60 describe this scroll as follows: "4QSam^{a} stands firmly rooted in the Hebrew textual tradition reflected in the Old Greek …" (p. 54).

the other texts, and sometimes with SP and/or the LXX against the other texts. They furthermore contain readings not known from other texts. Usually the employment of the term "non-aligned" merely implies that the texts under consideration follow an inconsistent pattern of agreements and disagreements with the MT, LXX, and SP. These statistically independent texts are mentioned in § d below. However, the texts that are most manifestly non-aligned are texts that contain (groups of) readings that diverge significantly from the other texts, such as 4QReworked Pentateuch (4QRP = 4Q158, 4Q364–367). 4QRP exhibits long stretches of uninterrupted text that may be classified as Scripture such as found in either MT or the SP group.[64] This composition rearranges some Torah pericopes,[65] and it has a relatively small number of extensive exegetical additions.[66] In all these pluses, 4QRP resembles the Hebrew compositions behind the Greek 1 Kings, Esther, and Daniel.[67] Other independent texts are 4QJosh^{a}, and 4QJudg^{a}. 4QSam^{a} holds a special position in this regard, since it is closely related to the *Vorlage* of the LXX, while reflecting independent features as well.

Special sub-groups of non-aligned texts are scrolls written for a specific purpose, viz., "excerpted" texts, such as 4QExod^{d}, 4QDeut^{j,n}, and 4QCant^{a,b} and "liturgical" texts, such as most Psalm texts from caves 4 and 11 (see chapters 4* and 6*). These fifty-seven independent texts comprise 37 percent of the Qumran biblical texts in the Torah (17 texts) and 53 percent in the other books (40 texts). This analysis followed the customary nomenclature for the Qumran scrolls that considers the liturgical and excerpted scrolls equally biblical as all other scrolls. However, if they are excluded from the statistics, since they are no regular biblical texts, the number of biblical scrolls would have to be decreased by some forty items, and the number of independent texts would be much smaller.

Whether we assume that all the aforementioned texts were written at Qumran, or that only some were written there, while others were brought from elsewhere, the coexistence of the different categories of texts in the Qumran caves is noteworthy. The fact that all these different texts were found in the same caves probably reflects textual plurality for

---

[64] The pre-Samaritan text is clearly the underlying text of 4Q158 and 4Q364, and possibly so in the case of 4Q365 (see *DJD* XIII, 192–6). On the other hand, A. Kim, "The Textual Alignment of the Tabernacle Sections of 4Q365 (Fragments 8a–b, 9a–b i, 9b ii, 12a i, 12b iii)," *Textus* 21 (2002) 45–69 claims that 4Q365 is not close to SP.

[65] See chapter 20*, n. 115.

[66] See chapter 20*, § D.

[67] See chapter 20* and Tov, "Many Forms."

the period between the third century BCE and the first century CE.[68] Within that textual plurality the large number of proto-Masoretic texts probably indicates their importance, while the large number of independent texts underline the special condition of the transmission of the biblical text. Since there is no evidence concerning the circumstances of the depositing of the scrolls in the caves or concerning the different status of scrolls within the Qumran sect, no solid conclusions can be drawn about the approach of the Qumranites towards the biblical text. But it is safe to say that they paid no special attention to textual differences such as described here (see n. 31).

That all these different groups of texts coexisted at Qumran, and in Palestine as a whole, shows that no fixed text or textual family had been accepted as the central text for the country as a whole. However, that assumption may be misleading, since in certain milieus in Palestine one of the texts or textual families could still be the only accepted text. This, we believe, is the case for the Masoretic family which probably was the only acceptable text in temple circles and therefore very influential elsewhere. The purest form of MT, transmitted without much change into the Middle Ages, was found at Masada, as well in the somewhat later sites Wadi Sdeir (Naḥal David), Naḥal Ḥever, Wadi Murabbaʿat, and Naḥal Ṣeʾelim (period of the Bar Kochba revolt). This was the inner circle of MT as found in the temple circles, and in all these sites MT (actually, the proto-Masoretic or proto-Rabbinic text) was the sole text used (see chapter 12*). The sociological data known about Masada fit into this picture since the community that lived there would have adhered to the rabbinic text. This assumption also applies to the other sites, reflecting a reality from the time of the Second Jewish Revolt (135 CE).[69] The proto-Masoretic texts from Qumran (group β) formed a second transmission circle copied from the inner circle.

---

[68] In recent years, the terms "pluriformity" and "uniformity" have appeared frequently in the scholarly discussion. See A. van der Kooij, "The Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible before and after the Qumran Discoveries," *The Bible as Book*, 167–77 (170–71). All agree that at a certain point there was uniformity, but scholars disagree as to how this uniformity was obtained. The term itself, as well as "stabilization," may be misleading, as these terms presuppose a certain movement towards that unity, which actually did not take place. When the archeological evidence shows us that in the first century CE MT is the sole force in power, this situation does not reflect a *Kulturkampf* between different texts, but it resulted from the fact that other texts simply ceased to exist after the destruction of the Second Temple.

[69] Young, "Stabilization" (see n. 16) explains the differences between the Qumran and Masada corpora as not reflecting different sociological and chronological realities, but as reflecting different periods. In his view, the Qumran corpus as a whole (deposited in the caves in the first century BCE!) preceded that of Masada.

If the recognition of the aforementioned five groups of texts is correct, by definition some of the textual theories that have been suggested in the last century cannot be maintained, especially because of our fifth group (non-aligned texts), which is composed of texts not connected with the MT, LXX, or SP. The assumption of such a group allows for an endless number of individual texts, thus eliminating the possibility that all the Qumran texts, and in fact all ancient Hebrew texts, ultimately derived from a tripartite division of the textual sources. Elsewhere we have tried to refute that view,[70] claiming that the textual sources of the Bible cannot be reduced to three traditions and that these textual traditions are no recensions or text-types, but that they are simply "texts." It should however be conceded that my own view, like all other views, is based on certain suppositions; it is equally subjective, and like the other views, it cannot be proven. The texts themselves should remain our point of departure, but Davila's study[71] shows how difficult it is to find acceptable criteria. In the wake of others, Davila takes as his point of departure that the MT and SP of these books are text-types, rather than texts, and he suggests that they, together with the Qumran texts, belong to the same text-type, and that the LXX reflects a different text-type.[72] Most of the Qumran texts of Genesis and Exodus examined by Davila are indeed close to MT, but the material is simply too fragmentary to prove that the Qumran texts together with the MT and SP comprise one textual entity and that this entity is a text-type.

The status of the Greek manuscripts from the Judean Desert runs parallel to that of the Hebrew texts (see chapter 23*, § III).

d. *Evidence for the Individual Biblical Books*

Each Scripture book reflects a different textual pattern. The main problem inherent in this analysis is the coincidence of the textual transmission causing certain texts to be preserved, while others have perished. Thus, the Qumran evidence shows the existence of two different literary editions of Jeremiah (below, § e), but similar editorial processes may have taken place in other books as well, which coincidentally have not been preserved. The analysis, based on

---

[70] *TCHB,* 155–60.

[71] J. R. Davila, "Text-Type and Terminology: Genesis and Exodus as Test Cases," *RevQ* 16 (1993) 3–37.

[72] In our view, however, the MT and SP of Genesis and Exodus differ sufficiently in order to be considered different entities, often recensionally different. The LXX reflects yet a third text, often recensionally different, especially in the genealogies in chapters 5 and 11 and in Genesis 31. But this evidence does not suffice to prove either our view or the views of Davila (reiterating those of others).

fragments large enough for textual analysis (as listed in *Scribal Practices*, Appendix 8), pertains to the Qumran evidence only. The manuscripts from the other Judean Desert sites reflects only MT (see § 4A).

In the Torah an approach of limited scribal intervention, greater precision, and less textual diversity could have been expected. However, there is no indication that the development of divergent texts and the textual transmission of the Torah differs from that of the other Scripture books. Among other things, a number of Torah scrolls are written in the careless and inconsistent system of the Qumran scribal practice (2QExod^{b}?, 4Q[Gen-]Exod^{b}, 4QExod^{j}?, 2QNum^{b}?, 4QNum^{b}, 1QDeut$^{a,c?,j,k1,k2,m}$).

The great majority of the ten Genesis texts reflect either MT or the combined evidence of MT and SP. The LXX deviates from this often-common text in small details, large enough to recognize that the Qumran texts do not reflect that text. None of the Genesis texts is written in the Qumran scribal practice. 4QGen^{k} is non-aligned.

The nine texts of Exodus diverge substantially. Three texts reflect the Qumran scribal practice: 2QExod^{b}?, 4Q[Gen-]Exod^{b}, 4QExod^{j}?, two of them textually independent. In this book the differences between the MT, LXX, and SP are clear-cut, so that the affinities of the Qumran fragments can often be determined. 4QpaleoExod^{m} is very close to SP, without the latter's sectarian readings, and according to Cross,[73] 4QExod-Lev^{f} also belongs to this category. Two texts are close to MT. Four texts are statistically independent. 4QExod^{d} is independent in terms of content, omitting a large section.

Five of the ten manuscripts of Leviticus are equally close to MT and SP (these two texts do not differ much from each other in Leviticus): Statistically independent are 11QpaleoLev^{a} and 11QLev^{b}. On the whole the manuscripts of Leviticus are rather homogeneous, probably due to their contents.[74]

The two manuscripts of Numbers are written in the Qumran scribal practice (2QNum^{b}?, 4QNum^{b}). In its major deviations 4QNum^{b} is close to both SP and the LXX, and at the same time contains many independent readings.

---

[73] *DJD* XII, 136.

[74] For an analysis, see P. W. Flint, "The Book of Leviticus in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *The Book of Leviticus, Composition and Reception* (ed. R. Rendtorff and R. A. Kugler; Leiden/Boston: E. J. Brill, 2003) 323–41.

Of the twenty manuscripts of Deuteronomy[75] eight are equally close to MT and SP, and six are written in the Qumran scribal practice (see above). The textual nature of 4QDeut^{j,n} cannot be classified easily, since they probably represent excerpted texts, probably for liturgical purposes. Eight manuscripts are statistically independent. 4QDeut^{q} is close to the *Vorlage* of the LXX.[76]

One of the two Joshua texts is close to MT (4QJosh^{b}),[77] while 4QJosh^{a} is contentswise independent, probably reflecting a different literary edition—see § e.

One of the three texts of Judges may reflect a different literary edition (4QJudg^{a})— see § e.

Two of the four texts of Samuel are close to MT (1QSam, 4QSam^{b}), one is close to the LXX, 4QSam^{a} [78] with features of an independent text, while 4QSam^{c}, written in the Qumran scribal practice, is both close to MT and to LXX^{Luc}, and therefore textually independent.

4QKgs reflects MT. 6QpapKings is independent.

Of the fourteen Qumran manuscripts of Isaiah nine are close to MT and secondarily also to the LXX. Two texts, written in the Qumran scribal practice (1QIsa^{a} and 4QIsa^{c}) as well as 4QIsa^{k} are independent.

Two of the five Jeremiah manuscripts are close to MT (4QJer^{a,c}). 2QJer written in the Qumran practice, is statistically independent, and two are close to the LXX (4QJer^{b,d}).

Two of the three manuscripts of Ezekiel are close to MT (4QEzek^{b}, 11QEzek). 4QEzek^{a} is statistically independent.

Five of the seven manuscripts of the Minor Prophets, three of them written in the Qumran practice, are statistically independent.

Five of the thirty-one Psalm texts written in the Qumran scribal practice, are statistically independent. Most of the Psalm texts reflect a textual tradition different from MT and the other textual witnesses. At least seven collections of psalms from caves 4 and 11 contain Psalms in a sequence different from MT, sometimes with additional psalms added to the canonical ones.[79] Furthermore, a major feature of the Qumran corpus is that it contains no evidence of any scroll clearly supporting the Masoretic Psalter except for 4QPs^{c}. Outside Qumran, this collection is

---

[75] See F. García Martínez, "Les manuscrits du Désert de Juda et le Deutéronome," in *Studies in Deuteronomy in Honour of C. J. Labuschagne on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday* (ed. F. García Martínez et al.; VTSup 53; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1994) 63–82; S. A. White, "Three Deuteronomic Manuscripts from Cave 4, Qumran," *JBL* 112 (1993) 23–42.

[76] For an analysis, see Tov, "The Contribution of the Qumran Scrolls," esp. 29–30.

[77] Thus Tov, *DJD* XIV.

[78] See n. 63.

[79] See chapter 4*, § 2j.

represented in MasPs^{a,b} and 5/6HevPs. If the view suggested by Sanders, Wilson, and Flint according to which these scrolls reflect alternative biblical Psalters, carries the day, it implies that the psalm texts from caves 4 and 11 constitute the group of Qumran evidence which deviates most from MT. However, the arguments adduced in the past in favor of the assumption that 11QPs^{a} reflects a liturgical collection also hold with regard to the texts from cave 4,[80] and this view seems preferable to us. The deviations from MT pertain to both the sequence of the individual psalms and the addition and omission of psalms, among them non-canonical Psalms.

Two of the four texts of Job are close to MT, but in this book no other textual traditions are known since the greatly deviating LXX text was probably shortened by the translator himself.

Both texts of Proverbs are close to MT.

All four texts of Ruth are equally close to the MT and LXX.

All three texts of Canticles are independent, one statistically (6QCant) and two contentswise, probably reflecting excerpted texts (4QCant^{a,b}).[81]

The one text of Qohelet (4QQoh^{a}), written in the Qumran scribal practice, is textually independent.

One of the four texts of Lamentations, written in the Qumran scribal practice, 4QLam, is textually independent.

Five of the six texts of Daniel are independent, while one is close to MT. Also the other texts are closer to MT than to the LXX.

The one text of Ezra-Nehemiah (4QEzra) is close to MT.

The one text of Chronicles (4QChron) contains text beyond MT, and should probably be classified as independent, although it is too short for analysis. Possibly this fragment does not reflect the canonical book of Chronicles.[82]

e. *Textual Transmission and Literary Criticism*

The relevance of the textual witnesses for certain aspects of the literary analysis has often been discussed, especially in the last two decades. For the following Qumran scrolls their contribution to literary criticism has been noticed (for all these, see chapter 11*, § 2).

---

[80] 11QPs^{a} contains prose as well as poetry sections showing the purpose of the collection (focus on David). To one of the Psalms (Psalm 145) the scroll added liturgical antiphonal additions.

[81] See chapter 4*, § 2i.

[82] See the analysis of G. J. Brooke, "The Books of Chronicles and the Scrolls from Qumran," *Reflection and Refraction: Studies in Biblical Historiography in Honour of A. Graeme Auld* (ed. R. Rezetko et al.; VTSup 113; Leiden/Boston: E. J. Brill, 2007) 35-48.

4QPhyl A,B,J (shorter text in Deuteronomy 5, lacking Deut 5:29-30 [32-33])[83]

4QJosh^{a} (different editorial strands; occasionally a shorter text).

4QJudg^{a} (shorter text of chapter 6).

4QSam^{a} (different edition of the Song of Hannah).

1QIsa^{a} (different stages of the development of 2 Kgs 20:1-11).[84]

4QJer^{b,d} (shorter text and different arrangement).[85]

4QPs^{x} (earlier text edition).[86]

According to some scholars, the different arrangements of the various deviating Psalms scrolls (see above, § 4Bd) also are relevant to the literary criticism of the Bible, since they display texts differing recensionally from MT and the other witnesses.

[83] See the analysis of A. Rofé, "Deuteronomy 5:28–6:1: Composition and Text in the Light of Deuteronomic Style and Three *Tefillin* from Qumran (4Q 128, 129, 137)," *Henoch* 7 (1985) 1–14; idem, "Historico-Literary Aspects of the Qumran Biblical Scrolls," in Schiffman, *Dead Sea Scrolls*, 30–39. On the other hand, G. J. Brooke, "Deuteronomy 5–6 in the Phylacteries from Qumran Cave 4," in Paul, *Emanuel*, 57–70 ascribes the idiosyncrasies of these phylacteries to the Qumran scribes.

[84] See further E. Ulrich, "The Developmental Composition of the Book of Isaiah: Light from 1QIsa^{a} on Additions in the MT," *DSD* 8 (2001) 288–305.

[85] See chapter 26*, notes 65, 71, 77.

[86] Thus P. W. Skehan, E. Ulrich, and P. W. Flint, *DJD* XVI.