

CHAPTER TWENTY-THREE

THE GREEK BIBLICAL TEXTS FROM THE JUDEAN DESERT

I. *The Evidence*

Leaney, "Greek Manuscripts"; L. Greenspoon, "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Greek Bible," in *DSS After Fifty Years*, 1:101-27; Ulrich, "Septuagint Manuscripts."

The Greek texts found in the Judean Desert constitute merely a small part of the texts found in the area, which are best known for the Hebrew and Aramaic texts, especially the texts found at Qumran. However, the Greek texts are by no means negligible, since in several sites their number equals that of the Hebrew/Aramaic texts, and in one site they even constitute the majority. Thus, while for Qumran in general the number of the Greek texts may be negligible, for cave 7 it is not, since all 19 items found in this cave constitute Greek papyri. This cave thus witnesses activity in the Greek language, but only literary activity, since probably all the fragments found in this cave are non-documentary.

Turning now to absolute numbers of texts, a word of caution is in order. Obviously we can only refer to the numbers of the texts which have survived, but as we will turn to statistics, it should be recognized that there is no reason why Greek papyrus texts should have perished into a larger or smaller degree than the other papyri. Comparative statistics of the various texts found should therefore be considered legitimate. The majority of the texts found in the Judean Desert are Semitic, mainly Hebrew, but also Aramaic. The Qumran corpus consists of remnants of some 930 compositions that were once complete. Of these some 150 are in Aramaic (including 17 Nabatean texts), 27 in Greek, and the remainder are in Hebrew (including texts written in the cryptic scripts and in paleo-Hebrew). The Greek texts in Qumran thus comprise a very small segment of the complete corpus, namely 3%. This small percentage is matched only by the finds in Wadi Daliyeh, beyond the Judean Desert, while Greek texts have been found in much larger quantities at all other sites in the Judean Desert. Because of the

fragmentary state of many texts, especially papyri, statistics for these sites can only be approximate:¹

Table 1: *Greek Texts from the Judean Desert*

Sites (North to South)	Total Number of Texts (Leather, Papyrus)	Greek Texts	Percentage of Total Texts
Wadi Daliyeh	29	0	0
Jericho	30	17+	56+
Qumran	930	27	3
Wadi Nar	4	2	50
Wadi Ghweir	2	1	50
Wadi Murabba'at	158	71	45
Wadi Sdeir	4	2	50
Naḥal Hever ²	157+	55+	35+
Naḥal Mishmar	3	1	33
Naḥal Se'elim	6	2	33
Masada	48	11+	23+

We now turn to some detailed remarks about the Greek leather and papyrus texts found in the Judean Desert, not counting ostraca. First, attention will be directed to sites other than Qumran, with the exclusion of the approximately fifty texts from Hirbet Mird because of their Byzantine date.

Greek texts, most of them documentary, have been found in various places in the Judean Desert (North to South): Wadi Daliyeh (1+ [undeciphered]), Jericho (17 and several fragments), Wadi Nar (2), Wadi Gweir (1), Wadi Murabba'at (71), Wadi Sdeir (2), Naḥal Hever (32 from cave 5/6; 2 from cave 8; 21, and many unidentified fragments from

¹ The precarious nature of statistics may be illustrated by the following: The numerous Greek fragments from what is named XHev/Se and which are grouped on two different plates (*DJD* XXVII, plates XLVIII and XLIX), are numbered XHev/Se 74–169 for the sake of convenience, and likewise Hev/Se? 1–57 are grouped on plates L–LIII in the same volume. It is hard to know how these collections should be accounted for in a statistical analysis. The author responsible for these texts (H. Cotton) did not want to imply that these items have to be counted as respectively 96 and 57 different compositions. They should probably be counted as six different ones, although both types of accounting are imprecise. Many of the fragments in these collections will have belonged to other documents from Naḥal Hever published in *DJD* XXVII, while other fragments must have belonged to different texts, not published in the volume. The collections of fragments known as 1Q69 and 1Q70 are treated similarly.

² Including Hever/Seiyal.

“XHev/Se” and “Hev/Se?”),³ Naḥal Se’elim (2), Naḥal Mishmar (1), and Masada (remains of probably 11 texts [a few in either Greek or Latin] and several fragments).⁴ The largest groups of Greek texts thus derive from Murabba’at and Naḥal Hever, originally wrongly denoted as “Seiyal,”⁵ and involving two archives in Greek and Aramaic from Naḥal Hever (the archive of Salome Komäise daughter of Levi and that of Babatha). The documentary texts found in these sites relate to such matters as marriage contracts (e.g., 5/6Hev 18, 37), receipts (5/6Hev 27; XHev/Se 12), deeds of gift (5/6Hev19), registration of land (5/6Hev 16), summons (5/6Hev 23, 25, 35), letters (5/6Hev 52), etc. The nature of the documents found in the locations outside Qumran thus shows that Greek was in active use among the persons who left these documents behind. That Greek was in active use beyond Qumran can also be seen from the percentage of the documentary Greek texts among the Greek texts found at the individual sites. In all sites other than Qumran this percentage is relatively high.

Table 2: *Documentary and Non-documentary Greek Texts Found in the Judean Desert*

Sites (North to South)	Total No.	Doc. Texts	Percentage of Total No.	Non- doc. Texts	Percentage of Total No.
Wadi Daliyeh	0		—		—
Jericho	17+	17+	100	0	0
Qumran	27	1	3	26	97
Wadi Nar	2	2	100	0	0
Wadi Ghweir	1	1	100	0	0
Wadi Murabba’at	71	66	93	5	7
Wadi Sdeir	2	2	100	0	0
Naḥal Hever	55+	54	98+	1	2
Naḥal Mishmar	1	1	100	0	0
Naḥal Se’elim	2	2	100	0	0
Masada	11+	9+	82+	2	18

Beyond the documentary texts, a few sometimes ill-defined *literary* Greek texts have been found in various sites outside Qumran, and they

³ See N. Lewis, *The Documents from the Bar Kochba Period in the Cave of Letters—Greek Papyri* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, the Hebrew University, and the Shrine of the Book, 1989).

⁴ See *DJD XXVII*, 134–5; Cotton and Geiger, *Masada II*; Tov–Pfann, *Companion Volume*.

⁵ See Cotton and Yardeni, *DJD XXVII*, 1–6.

are included among the statistics in Table 2: five papyri from Wadi Murabba‘at, mostly of undetermined nature (*DJD* II, 108–12), probably two from Masada (Mas 743 [Mas woodTablet gr] from 73 or 74 CE; Mas 739 [Mas papLiterary Text? gr]),⁶ and one from Naḥal Hever (8HevXII gr), but none from the other localities of Wadi Gweir, Wadi Nar, Wadi Sdeir, Naḥal Mishmar, and Naḥal Se‘elim. The best preserved of these literary texts was found in Naḥal Hever, viz., the Greek Minor Prophets Scroll, 8HevXII gr (publication: *DJD* VIII).

In striking contrast to the texts found beyond Qumran, all but one of the twenty-seven Greek texts found at Qumran are literary, although admittedly it is difficult to be certain in the case of small papyrus fragments, viz., 4Q119–122, 126–127; 7Q1–19 (all the preserved texts of cave 7 are Greek papyri); altogether there are five texts on leather and three on papyrus from cave 4, and 19 papyri from cave 7. Almost all of these texts contain Greek Scripture texts in the wide sense of the word (including 7QpapEpJer gr). This characterization includes the literary papyri 7Q4–18, which are too fragmentary for a precise identification of their contents. The one non-literary item among the Qumran Greek texts is the documentary text 4Q350 (4QAccount gr, written on the verso of frag. 9 of a Hebrew text, 4QNarrative Work and Prayer [4Q460]), the nature and date of which cannot be determined easily (*DJD* XXXVI). Likewise, the nature of 4QpapUnidentified Fragment gr (4Q361) remains unclear (see *DJD* XXVII, plate LXI, without transcription).

The picture emerging from an analysis of the Greek texts found in the Judean Desert is that the situation at Qumran differs totally from that of the other sites. In most sites, all the Greek texts (and in Wadi Murabba‘at and Masada, the great majority) are documentary, showing that Greek was actively used among the persons who deposited the texts. These texts include documents showing that the administration was conducted in Greek in the Roman provinces of Syria, Arabia, and Judaea, and that letters were written in that language (see, i.a., Greek letters written by Bar Kokhba’s followers, found in the Cave of Letters in Naḥal Hever). On the other hand, there is no proof that Greek was a language in active use by the inhabitants of Qumran. It is possible that at least some of them knew Greek, since fragments of Greek Scripture were found in caves 4 and 7. However, cave 4 probably served as a depository of some kind (not a library) in which the Qumranites placed all their written texts (mainly Hebrew and Aramaic literary works, but also *tefillin* and *mezuzot*). This depository in cave 4 contained eight Greek texts, which may signify that the person(s) who brought these texts to Qumran had

⁶ See Cotton and Geiger, *Masada II*, 90.

used them prior to their arrival, thus implying knowledge of Greek. However, it is not impossible that these texts came directly from an archive. Furthermore, the small number of Greek texts found at Qumran is also in striking contrast with the other sites in the Judean Desert. The difference is partly chronological (most of the sites in the Judean Desert are from a later period than Qumran), but more so in content: the Qumran corpus is mainly religious, which at that time would involve only Greek Scripture texts, and not other compositions.

The evidence does not suggest that the Greek texts from cave 4 were written, read or consulted at Qumran. Cave 7 is a different issue. The contents of that cave which was probably used for lodging (thus R. de Vaux, *DJD* III, 30) or as a workplace, consisted solely of Greek literary papyri, probably all Greek Scripture, and possibly all of these were brought directly to the cave from an archive outside Qumran or from a specific site within the Qumran compound. No relation between the Greek texts of caves 4 and 7 need to be assumed, and there is no reason to believe that any of these texts was found at Qumran.

Since the documentary texts found in Naḥal Ḥever, which included a Scripture scroll, show that Greek was used actively by the persons who left the texts behind, some or much use of that scroll by the persons who deposited the texts in Naḥal Ḥever may be assumed. Indeed, that Minor Prophets scroll contains a Jewish revision of the OG (see below), and as a version of this type would have suited the freedom fighters of Bar Kochba, they probably used it.

The situation was completely different for the Scripture finds at Qumran, which attest to an earlier period, up till 70 CE. In the period that is attested by the settlement at Qumran, the *kaige*-Th revision of the OG, such as reflected in 8HevXII gr, already existed. But neither this revision nor similar ones, found their way to Qumran, probably not because the Qumran covenanters disagreed with the concept behind these revisions, but because they did not turn to Scripture in Greek. For them Scripture existed mainly in the source languages, and among the 220 biblical texts found at Qumran, Greek and Aramaic translations (4QtgLev, 4QtgJob, and 11QtgJob) form a small minority.

In light of this, special attention should be paid to an opisthograph, the recto of which formed fragment 9 of a Hebrew text named 4QNarrative Work and Prayer, while the verso contained a Greek documentary text, 4QAccount gr (4Q350 [see H. Cotton, *DJD* XXXVI]). It is hard to characterize that Hebrew composition, which was described by its editor, E. Larson, as “somewhat akin to the *Hodayot*.”⁷ Its orthography and morphology suggest that

⁷ E. Larson, *DJD* XXXVI, 372: “It is difficult to discern the overall character of the work in its present state of preservation. The major part of the extant fragments is given over to

it was copied (not necessarily authored) by a sectarian scribe,⁸ while the verso contains a documentary Greek text. Parallels to the Greek Account from Qumran are found in various sites in the Judean Desert: Mur 8–10A, 89–102, 118–125; 1Mish 2; 34Se 5. While the evidence implies that Greek was not in active use among the Qumranites, as no documentary Greek texts have been found on the spot,⁹ the Greek 4Q350 may indicate an exception, and may imply that Greek was nevertheless in use in Qumran at some stage prior to 70 CE, or that this document did not derive from Qumran.

With regard to the first possibility that Greek was in use at Qumran, and that there once was a small corpus of administrative documentary texts in Greek, attention should be directed to the documentary texts 4Q342–360 in Aramaic and Hebrew. If documentary texts were written in Qumran in Hebrew and Aramaic, they could have been written in Greek as well. However, serious doubts regarding the Qumranic origin of 4Q342–360 have been raised by A. Yardeni, *DJD XXVII*, 283–317.¹⁰ Some of these texts may have derived from other, later, sites, and may have been sold to scholars as “Qumran” in order to enhance their price.¹¹

We therefore resort to the assumption that 4Q350 was written on the verso of frg. 9 of the Hebrew text 4Q460 after the occupation of the site by the Qumranites when some of the documents were still laying around, and were re-used due to the scarcity of writing material. This is suggested by the following arguments: (1) Only the verso of frg. 9 of 4Q460 was inscribed, which necessarily points to a period in which that manuscript had already been torn into pieces or had partially disintegrated. (2) The writing of a documentary text on the back of a literary text is paralleled by many Greek papyri from Hellenistic Egypt (see the analysis by Gallo),¹² by Elephantine papyri,¹³ and by 4QCal. Doc.

prayer, exhortation, and admonition. It is possible, therefore, that 4Q460 is a collection of psalms somewhat akin to the *Hodayot*. This may be suggested by the paragraphing of material which is clear on frg. 9 and is supported by the fact that the material before the *vacat* is addressed to God while that occurring after the *vacat* is addressed to Israel with little or no intervening narrative to explain the change. If this understanding of the nature of the manuscript is correct, then the person speaking in the first singular in frg. 9 i 2 is some unknown psalmist.”

⁸ See the arguments developed in *Scribal Practices*, 261–71.

⁹ The same argument cannot be used for Hebrew and Aramaic. For the Qumran community, Hebrew was the central language, even if they left very few documentary texts in that language (the main text showing use of this language within the community, beyond the many literary texts, is 4QRebukes Reported by the Overseer [4Q477]). No Aramaic community texts have been preserved, although the influence of the Aramaic language on the community scribes is evident in many writings.

¹⁰ In some instances Yardeni points to joins between Qumran texts and texts that definitely derived from Naḥal Ḥever (note especially XḤev/Se papDeed F ar [= XḤev/Se 32] which forms one document together with 4Q347). Furthermore, carbon-14 examinations point to a late date of some documents.

¹¹ This assumption has been rejected by J. Strugnell (February 2000) who stated that the Beḏouin were questioned very thoroughly regarding the origin of the texts.

¹² I. Gallo, *Greek and Latin Papyrology* (Classical Handbook 1; London: Institute of Classical Studies, University of London, 1986) 10 i; M. Manfredi, “Opistografo,” *Parola del Passato* 38 (1983) 44–54.

C^c (4Q324)—a documentary/literary text—which has on the verso 4QAccount C ar or heb (4Q355). Likewise, Mur papLiterary Text (Mur 112) has on its verso Mur papProceedings of Lawsuit gr (Mur 113). (3) As a rule, writing on the flesh side (the verso) of the leather (4Q350 in this case), is subsequent to that on the recto (4Q460). At the same time, it remains difficult to understand the realia of the writing on 4Q350 and 4Q460: if frg. 9 was hidden in cave 4 by the Qumran community, how could it have been re-used by those who were to occupy the site after the Qumran community?

The writing of the Greek text 4Q350 on the verso of the Hebrew text 4Q460, frg. 9 must have been later than the writing of the recto (4Q460), but the Greek writing could in principle have been performed within the period of the occupation of Qumran by the Qumran covenanters themselves, which seems to be a possible alternative. However, E. Larson argues that the Qumran sectarians would not have reused a scroll that contained the Tetragrammaton on the recto (4Q460 frg. 9 i 10) for such a profane use as recording a list of cereals in Greek (*DJD* XXXVI, 369). Larson adds: “If not, then this list could become evidence of a later occupation of the Qumran caves in the wake of the destruction of the settlement in 68 CE.” If this explanation is accepted, it may imply that this text is irrelevant to our analysis of the use of Greek within the Qumran community. Cotton and Larson strengthened their position on the secondary nature of the Greek text on the verso of 4Q460 9 with additional arguments in their study “4Q460/4Q350 and Tampering with Qumran texts in Antiquity” in Paul, *Emanuel*, 113–25.

Beyond the enigmatic Greek 4Q350, the Qumran corpus bears a clearly religious character with regard to both the Hebrew/Aramaic texts and the Greek documents. Alongside the Hebrew biblical texts, the following Greek literary texts have been found, mainly containing Greek Scripture. One such text was found in Naḥal Ḥever.

1. 4QLXXLev^a (4Q119; *Rahlfs* 801)

Publication: P. W. Skehan, E. Ulrich, and J. E. Sanderson, *DJD* IX, 161–5. Bibliography: Skehan, “Qumran Manuscripts,” 157–60; P. Kahle, “The Greek Bible and the Gospels: Fragments from the Judaean Desert,” *SE* 1 (TU 73; Berlin, 1959) 613–21, esp. 615–8; idem, *Cairo Geniza*, 223–6; Ulrich, “Greek Manuscripts”; Metso–Ulrich, “Leviticus.”

Only one major fragment (frg. 1) containing Lev 26:2-16 and a small unidentified fragment (frg. 2) have been preserved of this scroll (publication: *DJD* IX). Frg. 1 represents the beginning of a sheet, as the stitching on the left has been preserved. The text is written in the *scriptio continua* with occasional spaces left between the words. There are no occurrences of the divine name in this fragment. The writing was dated by Kahle, *Cairo Geniza*, 223, to the end of the second century BCE, on the authority of C. H. Roberts. P. J. Parsons, *DJD* IX, 10 suggests similarly:

¹³ See B. Porten and A. Yardeni, *Textbook of Aramaic Documents from Ancient Egypt*, vol. 3 (Jerusalem: Akademon, 1993). Occasionally even a biblical text was re-used, as the Greek P.Leipzig 39 of Psalms (4 CE) has a list on the reverse.

“unlikely to be later than the first century BCE, or much earlier.” Skehan, “Manuscripts,” 157 dated this text to the first century CE.

This fragment probably reflects a much earlier version of the Greek translation of Leviticus than the other Greek witnesses (see § II).

2. *4QpapLXXLev^b* (4Q120; *Rahlfs* 802)

Publication: Skehan, Ulrich, Sanderson, *DJD* IX, 167–80. Bibliography: see 4QLXXLev^a.

Several small fragments of Leviticus 1–5 have been preserved from this scroll (publication: *DJD* IX). The more substantial ones contain 2:3–5, 3:9–13, 4:6–8, 10–11, 18–19, 26–28, 5:8–10, 16–17, 5:18–6:5. There are also a large number of unidentified fragments. The writing was dated by Skehan, “Manuscripts,” 148 to the first century BCE, and by C. H. Roberts to the late 1st century BCE or the beginning of the first century CE.¹⁴ P. J. Parsons, *DJD* IX, 11 suggested likewise: “... could reasonably be assigned to the first century BCE.”

This papyrus represents an early version of Greek Scripture, as shown by several unusual renderings, including the transliteration of the Tetragrammaton as *Iaω*, instead of its translation as κύριος in the later Christian manuscripts of the Septuagint. *4QpapLXXLev^b* probably reflects a version antedating the text of the main manuscript tradition of the LXX.

3. *4QLXXNum* (4Q121; *Rahlfs* 803)

Publication: P. W. Skehan, E. Ulrich, J. E. Sanderson, *DJD* IX, 181–94. Bibliography: see 4QLXXLev^a and Skehan, “Qumran Manuscripts,” 155–7; idem, “4QLXXNum: A Pre-Christian Reworking of the Septuagint,” *HTR* 70 (1977) 39–50; Wevers, “Early Revision.”

Several fragments have been preserved of this scroll, of which the most substantial are of Num 3:40–43 and 4:5–9, 11–16 (publication: *DJD* IX). The writing was dated by Skehan, “Qumran Manuscripts,” 155 to the first century BCE, and by Kahle, *Cairo Geniza*, 223, to the beginning of the first century CE, on the authority of C. H. Roberts. P. J. Parsons, *DJD* IX, 11 agreed to the latter dating.

This scroll may reflect a version of the LXX antedating the text of the manuscript tradition of Numbers, but the evidence is not clear-cut.

4. *4QLXXDeut* (4Q122; *Rahlfs* 819)

Publication: P. W. Skehan, E. Ulrich, and J. E. Sanderson, *DJD* IX, 195–7. Bibliography: Ulrich, “Greek Manuscripts.”

¹⁴ C. H. Roberts, *Manuscript, Society and Belief in Early Christian Egypt* (The Schweich Lectures 1977; London/Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979) 30, n. 1.

Little is known about this scroll of which only five small fragments have been preserved (publication: *DJD IX*). P. J. Parsons, *DJD IX*, 12 dated the fragments to the "... earlier second century BCE ... mid second century BCE."

5. *4QUnidentified Text gr (4Q126)*

Publication: P. W. Skehan, E. Ulrich, and J. E. Sanderson, *DJD IX*, 219–21.

The nature of this text is unclear. It is dated by P. J. Parsons, *DJD IX*, 12 to the "first century BCE or possibly the early first century CE."

6. *4QpapParaExod gr (4Q127)*

Publication: P. W. Skehan, E. Ulrich, and J. E. Sanderson, *DJD IX*, 223–42. Bibliography: D. Dimant, "An Unknown Jewish Apocryphal Work?" in *Pomegranates and Golden Bells—Studies in Biblical, Jewish, and Near Eastern Ritual, Law, and Literature in Honor of Jacob Milgrom* (ed. D. P. Wright et al.; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1995) 805–14.

This text, dated by P. J. Parsons, *DJD IX*, 12 to the "first century BCE or possibly the early first century CE" was based on Greek Scripture.

7. *7QpapLXXExod (7Q1)*

Publication: M. Baillet, *DJD III*, 142–3.

This text contains small fragments of Exod 28:4–6, 7. The material is too fragmentary in order to pronounce a judgment on its content or dating. In some details 7QpapLXXExod is closer to MT than the main LXX tradition, while in other instances it is further removed from it.

8. *7QpapEpJer gr (7Q2; Rahlfs 804)*

Publication: M. Baillet, *DJD III*, 142.

This small fragment contains vv 43–44 of the Epistle of Jeremiah (publication: *DJD III*). Too little has survived of this scroll in order to pronounce a judgment on its nature or dating.

9. *7QpapBiblical Texts? gr (7Q3–5) and 7QpapUnclassified Texts gr (7Q6–19)*

Publication: M. Baillet, *DJD III*, 142–6. Bibliography: M. V. Spottorno, "Nota sobre los papiros de la cueva 7 de Qumrân," *Estudios Clásicos* 15 (1971) 261–3; J. O'Callaghan, "¿Papiros neotestamentarios en la cueva 7 de Qumran?, *Bib* 53 (1972) 91–100, translated by W. L. Holladay, *Supplement to JBL* 91 (1972) 2.1–14; idem, "Notas sobre 7Q tomadas en el Rockefeller Museum," *Bib* 53 (1972) 517–33; idem, "I Tim 3, 16: 4, 1.3 en 7Q4?," *Bib* 53 (1972) 362–7; idem, "Tres probables papiros neotestamentarios en la cueva 7 de Qumrân," *StudPap* 11 (1972) 83–9; C. H. Roberts, "On Some Presumed Papyrus Fragments of the NT from Qumran," *JTS NS* 23 (1972) 446; P. Benoit, "Note sur les fragments grecs de la grotte 7 de Qumran," *RB* 79 (1972) 321–4; idem, "Nouvelle note sur les fragments grecs de la grotte 7 de Qumran," *RB* 80 (1973) 5–12; A. C. Urbán, "Observaciones sobre ciertos papiros de la cueva 7 de Qumran," *RevQ* 8 (1973) 233–51 (Num 14:23–24); idem, "La identificación de 7Q4 con Num 14, 23–24 y la restauración de textos antiguos," *EstBib* 33 (1974) 219–44; J.

O'Callaghan, "Sobre la identificación de 7Q4," *StudPap* 13 (1974) 45–55; idem, *Los papiros griegos de la cueva 7 de Qumrán* (BAC 353; Madrid 1974); K. Aland, "Neue Neutestamentliche Papyri III," *NTS* 20 (1974) 357–581; C. P. Thiede, *Die älteste Evangelien-Handschrift? Das Markus-Fragment von Qumran und die Anfänge der schriftlichen Überlieferung des Neuen Testaments* (Wuppertal: Brockhaus, 1986) = *The Earliest Gospel Manuscript? The Qumran Fragment 7Q5 and Its Significance for New Testament Studies* (Exeter: Paternoster, 1992); G. W. Nebe, "7Q4–Möglichkeit und Grenze einer Identifikation," *RevQ* 13 (1988) 629–33; S. R. Pickering and R. R. E. Cook, *Has a Fragment of the Gospel of Mark Been Found at Qumran?* (Papyrological and Historical Perspectives 1; The Ancient History Documentary Research Centre, Macquarie University, Sydney 1989); M. V. Spottorno, "Una nueva posible identificación de 7Q5," *Sefarad* 52 (1992) 541–3 [Zach 7:4-5]; *Christen und Christliches in Qumran?* (ed. S. Mayer; Eichstätter Studien 32; Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 1992) [this volume contains ten essays dedicated to the fragments from cave 7]; E. A. Muro, Jr., "The Greek Fragments of Enoch from Qumran Cave 7 (7Q4, 7Q8, & 7Q12 = 7QEn gr = Enoch 103:3–4, 7–9)," *RevQ* 18 (1997) 307–12; E. Puech, "Sept fragments grecs de la Lettre d'Hénoch (1 Hén 100, 103 et 105) dans la grotte 7 de Qumrán (= 7QHéng)," *RevQ* 18 (1997) 313–23; G. W. E. Nickelsburg, "The Greek Fragments of 1 Enoch from Qumran: An Unproven Identification," *RevQ* 21 (2004) 631–34.

Three of the unidentified papyri (7Q3–5) were designated by Baillet, *DJD* III as "biblical texts?," while the other ones (7Q4–19) were described as too small for identification. Among these fragments, 7Q3–5 are slightly more substantial, but they, too, are very minute. These fragments were republished by O'Callaghan, *Los papiros griegos* as fragments of books of the New Testament, while other scholars recognize in them fragments of the LXX:

- 7Q1 = Mark 4:28
- 7Q5 = Mark 6:52-53
- 7Q8 = James 1:23-24.

The following suggestions by O'Callaghan, *Los papiros griegos* were made more hesitantly:

- 7Q4 = 1 Tim 3:16–4:1,3
- 7Q6 = Acts 27:38
- 7Q7 = Mark 12:17
- 7Q9 = Rom 5:11-12
- 7Q10 = 2 Peter 1:15
- 7Q15 = Mark 6:48.

7Q5 has been identified also as representing the following texts:

- Exod 36:10-11 (P. Garnet, *EvQ* 45 [1973] 8–9)
- Num 22:38 (G. Fee, "Some Dissenting Notes on 7Q5 = Mark 6:52-53," *JBL* 92 [1973] 109–12)
- 2 Kgs 5:13-14 (C. H. Roberts, *JTS* 23 [1972] 446)
- Matt 1:2-3 (P. Parker, *Erbe und Auftrag* 48 [1972] 467–9)

C. H. Roberts, *JTS* 23 (1972) 447 suggested the following alternative identifications from the LXX for the other texts:

7Q4 = Num 14: 23-24

7Q6.1 = Ps 34:28; Prov 7:12-13

7Q6.2 = Isa 18:2

7Q8 = Zech 8:8; Isa 1:29-30; Ps 18:14-15; Dan 2:43; Qoh 6:8

The problematic aspects of O'Callaghan's identifications are: (1) The texts are too small for a solid identification. (2) O'Callaghan had to amend the text of the New Testament in order to maintain the identification of 7Q5 with the New Testament. (3) Some of the compositions identified (Acts, 2 Peter) were written after the dates assigned to the Qumran fragments—thus Benoit, "Note." (4) In "Nouvelle note," Benoit expressed serious doubts about some of the readings, asserting that in order to make such a major claim as finding fragments of the New Testament at Qumran, more solid evidence (such as fragments with personal names) are required. (5) The papyrologists Pickering and Cook, *Fragment* read some of the key letters of 7Q5 in such a way that it cannot be identified as the text of Mark.

As a result of these doubts, Aland, "Papyri" did not include these documents in his list of New Testament papyri.¹⁵

G. W. Nebe, *RevQ* 13 (1988) 629–33 suggested 1 Enoch 103:3–4 for 7Q4,1 and 1 Enoch 98:11 for 7Q4,2. This suggestion was further developed by E. A. Muro and E. Puech, who suggested to identify fragments 4, 8, 11–14 with 1 Enoch 100, 103, and 105, and to name this text 7QEn gr. This identification was not accepted by Nickelsburg, "Greek Fragments."

In the wake of the existence in caves 4 and 7 of texts of the Greek Torah, the most likely assumption is that 7Q3–7 contain fragments of either the LXX of the Torah or Enoch.

10. 8HevXII gr (published as: 8HevXIIgr)

Publication: E. Tov with the collaboration of R. A. Kraft, *DJD* VIII. Bibliography: E. Puech, "Les fragments non identifiés de 8KhXIIgr et le manuscrit grec des Douze Petits Prophètes," *RB* 98 (1991) 161–9; idem, "Notes en marge de 8KhXIIgr," *RevQ* 98 (1991) 583–93; Barthélemy, *Critique textuelle*, 50/3, cxi–cxliv.

8HevXII gr contains remnants of 25 columns of a Greek Minor Prophets scroll, in two different scribal hands (Jon 1:14–Zech 9:5; publication: *DJD* VIII) reflecting an early Jewish revision of the LXX. The date of the revision cannot be determined, but the scroll itself was copied between

¹⁵ In his review of O'Callaghan's book (*JBL* 95 [1976] 459), J. Fitzmyer, S.J. summarized the evidence appropriately: "So far the evidence brought forth for the identification remains too problematic and disputed, and the fragments themselves are so small and contain so few Greek letters or words that no certainty can really be arrived at about the identification of them. And so, thus far at least the proposal is unconvincing."

50 BCE and 50 CE according to the dating of its two scribal hands. The nature of the revision, belonging to the *kaige*-Th group, and reflecting distinctly Jewish hermeneutical principles, has been amply described.¹⁶ As a Jewish revision, this text represented the Tetragrammaton in paleo-Hebrew characters, paralleled by other Jewish revisions.

II. *Comparison of the Fragments from Qumran and Nahal Hever with the Manuscript Tradition of the LXX*

Data from the preliminary editions of the Greek texts from the Judean Desert (prior to the publication of *DJD* IX) were included in the critical editions of the Greek Pentateuch in the Göttingen Septuagint series,¹⁷ while the material of 8HēvXII gr has not been incorporated in that series, since the first edition of that volume appeared before that text was published.¹⁸ Even though 8HēvXII gr, as an early revision of the OG, is not part of the manuscript tradition of the LXX itself, under normal circumstances it would have been included in one of the apparatuses of the Göttingen edition.

The following analysis describes the special features of the texts from the Judean Desert (the description of 8HēvXII gr is shorter than that of the other texts, as it has been described in detail in *DJD* VIII, 99–158). The elements which each text has in common with the manuscripts of the LXX are reviewed first. These common elements preclude the assumption that the manuscripts from the Judean Desert contain independent Greek versions. They are probably different forms (a revision and a more original form) of the same translation.

*a. 4QLXXLev^a*¹⁹

1. 4QLXXLev^a and the OG have a common background

The two texts share several unusual renderings, establishing their common translation tradition:

¹⁶ See Barthélemy, *Devanciers*; Tov, *DJD* VIII; Dogniez, *Bibliography*.

¹⁷ J. W. Wevers, *Leviticus, Septuaginta, Vetus Testamentum graecum auctoritate academiae scientiarum gottlingensis editum*, vol. II.2 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986); idem, *Numeri, Septuaginta, etc.*, vol. III.1 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982).

¹⁸ J. Ziegler, *Duodecim prophetae, Septuaginta, etc.*, vol. XIII (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1943; 2d ed.: 1967).

¹⁹ The text has been preserved very fragmentarily. As a rule, the reconstructions of Skehan and Ulrich in *DJD* IX are acceptable, but the following ones are in our view questionable: v 11 [σκηνην] (LXX: διαθήκη; MT: יְהוָה); v 12 [θεός] = LXX (MT: אֱלֹהִים); v 15 [αὐτοῖς] = LXX (MT: יָרְדָּן); v 15 ἀ[λλά] (not in MT).

Lev 26:5 (ὁ) σπόρος = שֶׁרֶץ MT SP (הֶרֶץ). This equivalent recurs elsewhere only 6 times in the LXX, while the usual LXX equivalent is σπέρμα.

Lev 26:5 ἄμητος = LXX^{A,B*} 121 etc J ἀλόητος LXX (= editions of Rahlfs and Wevers) – שִׁי MT SP. Strictly speaking this is not a case of agreement as the reading of 4QLXXLev^a is found in some of the manuscripts of the LXX. ἄμητος (harvest, reaping) probably reflects the original reading, and ἀλόητος a later revision approximating to MT. Alternatively, the equivalent ἄμητος may reflect an ancient corruption common to 4QLXXLev^a and the tradition of LXX^{A,B*} 121 etc based on an early interchange of M/ΛO. In that case the reading ἀλόητος should be considered original as it reflects the general LXX vocabulary.²⁰ Although the equivalent ἀλόητος – שִׁי occurs only here in the LXX, and the word itself occurs also in Amos 9:13 (MT שִׁי), the verb ἀλοάω occurs elsewhere four times for שִׁי, so that the equivalent is well supported. The same interchange occurs also in Amos 9:13 MT שִׁי – ἀλόητος (LXX^W B-239 Q^a-198 etc. ἄμητος). The phrase used there (καὶ καταλήμψεται ὁ ἀλόητος τὸν τρύγητον) is identical to Lev-LXX. The first explanation is preferable, as the graphical resemblance is not convincing.²¹

Lev 26:6 καὶ ἀ]πολω – וְשָׁבַח MT SP. This equivalent is unique in the Torah, while it occurs elsewhere in Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel. The regular equivalent in the Torah is καταπαύω.

Lev 26:6 πολέμος – חַרַב MT SP. Elsewhere this equivalent recurs in Lev 26:36,37; Num 14:3; 20:18; Josh 10:11; Job 5:15. The main LXX equivalents are μάχαιρα and ρομφαία (probably also occurring in v 8).

Lev 26:6 φόνω – לַחַרַב MT SP. This unusual equivalent occurs elsewhere only in Exod 5:3 and Deut 28:22.

Lev 26:8 διώξονται μυριάδας – רַבְּבָה יִרְדְּפוּ MT SP. The two Greek texts share the reversed sequence.

Lev 26:11 βδελύξεται – תִּנְעַל MT SP. This equivalence occurs only here in the LXX. The Greek verb usually reflects תִּנְעַל, while תִּנְעַל is more frequently rendered by προσοχθίζω (4 x; including once in v 15) and ἀποθέω (2 x).

Lev 26:13 μετὰ παρρησίας – קִנְיִיחָה MT SP (קִנְיִיחָה). The Hebrew *hapax* word (“with head held high”) is rendered by a LXX *hapax* (“openly”).

Lev 26:15 ἀλλά – וְיֵאָחַז MT SP. The frequency of this unusual equivalent cannot be examined in the extant tools.

Lev 26:16 ψώρα – שִׁחִיבָה MT SP. The Hebrew recurs elsewhere only in Deut 28:27, where it is rendered by the same Greek word (“itch”).

²⁰ Thus Walters, *Text*, 226.

²¹ Thus J. W. Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Leviticus* (SBLSCS 44; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997) 439 and idem, “The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Septuagint,” *BIOCS* 38 (2005) 1–24 (3) as opposed to his earlier text edition (see n. 17), in which ἀλόητος is adopted.

Lev 26:16 καὶ τὴν ψυ[χ]ὴν ἐκτῆκουσαν – ומדיבה נפש – MT SP (ומדיבה). Even though the reconstruction is problematical, the syntax of the two Greek versions is similar or identical, as opposed to MT SP (note the sequence of the words).

2. 4QLXXLev^a reflects the OG, while the main LXX tradition probably reflects a revision

Evidence presented in this category reveals the main characteristics of the Qumran text, pointing to its pre-revisional status.

2a. 4QLXXLev^a represents an unusual rendering or equivalent

Lev 26:4 [τὸν ἕτερον τ]ῆι γῆι ὑμῶν] τὸν ἕτερον ὑμῖν LXX – נשמיכם MT SP. The deviating translation of 4QLXXLev^a could have been influenced by the phrase occurring in the list of covenant blessings in Deut 28:12, 24 δοῦναι τὸν ἕτερον τῆ γῆ σου – לתת מטר ארצך – (the same exegesis may also be behind T¹ [מישריא דארעבון]). At the same time, a variant like מטר ארצכם/נשם is not impossible. LXX reflects an approximation to MT, while ὑμῖν reflects the pronominal suffix freely.²²

Lev 26:8 πέντε ὑμῶν] ἐξ ὑμῶν πέντε LXX – מכם חמישה MT SP.

The unusual sequence of 4QLXXLev^a, presenting a better construction in Greek, probably represents the original translation, for which cf. καὶ ἕκατον ὑμῶν in the immediate context. LXX reflects an approximation to MT.

Lev 26:9 [καὶ ἔσται μο]υ ἡ διαθήκη ἐν ὑμῖν[] καὶ στήσω τὴν διαθήκην μου μεθ' ὑμῶν LXX – ויהיה אתה בריתי אתכם ויהיה אתכם בריתי ברוחכם (cf. Ezek 37:26 יהיה אתם). Rather, it reflects the original free rendering (for which cf. Num 25:13; 1 Kgs 8:21; Mal 2:4, 5), adapted to MT in the main manuscript tradition of the LXX. Instead of the aforementioned reconstruction in *DJD IX* [καὶ ἔσται], one may also reconstruct [καὶ στήσεται], which should also be considered a free rendering. Note the Greek literary sequence μο]υ ἡ διαθήκη, for which cf. the preceding and following entries.

Lev 26:10 ἐξοίσετε]ε μετὰ τῶν νέων] ἐκ προσώπου τῶν νέων ἐξοίσετε LXX – מפני חדש תוציא – MT SP. ἐκ προσώπου of the LXX reflects a stereotyped rendering replacing the better Greek μετὰ of the scroll. That word reflects a more elegant Greek expression, but is probably based on a misunderstanding of the Hebrew. According to MT SP, “you shall eat the old and then clear out (replace) the old to make room for the new.” According to 4QLXXLev^a, however, “you shall eat the old together with the new.” Note further the sequence of the

²² This rendering of the LXX was probably influenced by the same factor influencing the addition of τῆ γῆ in 4QLXXLev^a, viz., the unusual phrase נשמיכם, “and I [God] gave their rains.” For the addition of the pronoun, cf. Jer 5:24 (K) הנתן נשם ויורה – τὸν δίδουσα ἡμῖν ἕτερον πρόμιον and Ezek 34:26 והורדתי הנשם – καὶ δώσω τὸν ἕτερον ὑμῖν as well as later in our chapter, Lev 26:20: יען הארץ – καὶ τὸ ξύλον τοῦ ἀγροῦ ὑμῶν.

words in 4QLXXLev^a (cf. the previous entries), which is more elegant in Greek. This sequence was corrected in the main text of the LXX to MT.

Lev 26:12 $\mu\omicron\iota \xi\theta\nu[\omicron\varsigma] \mu\omicron\upsilon \lambda\alpha\omicron\varsigma$ LXX ($\text{ע} \text{ל} \rightarrow$ MT SP). This remarkable lexical discrepancy probably best characterizes the relation between the two texts. In the vocabulary of the LXX $\lambda\alpha\omicron\varsigma$ usually refers to Israel (reflecting $\text{ע} \text{ל}$), while $\xi\theta\nu\omicron\varsigma$ pertains to peoples other than Israel (also in profane Greek $\xi\theta\nu\eta$ denoted “foreign nations” prior to the time of the LXX [thus LSJ]). These equivalents created the post-Septuagintal exegetical tradition (i.a. in the New Testament) that $\lambda\alpha\omicron\varsigma$ refers to Israel as the chosen people, while the $\xi\theta\nu\eta$ are the gentiles. 4QLXXLev^a does not reflect this later standard vocabulary and therefore probably reflects the OG translation. Its lexical choice is paralleled by a few verses in the LXX, such as Exod 19:6, a central verse, where $\eta\iota/\text{ע} \text{ל} - \xi\theta\nu\omicron\varsigma$ refers to Israel in the phrase $\text{וַיִּי קָדַשׁ וַיִּי כְהִנִּיּוּם וַיִּי קָדַשׁ}$ (cf. also Lev 19:16)—in this case the Hebrew is $\eta\iota$, and not $\text{ע} \text{ל}$ as in Lev 26:12. It stands to reason that in Lev 26:12 also the original lexical choice preserved in 4QLXXLev^a was changed in the majority tradition to accord with the vocabulary elsewhere in the LXX. In another detail, however, 4QLXXLev^a equals the majority LXX tradition: neither text renders the *lamed* of $\text{ע} \text{ל}$ which is not needed in Greek.

Lev 26:13 $\tau\omicron\nu \zeta\upsilon\gamma\omicron\nu \tau\omicron[\upsilon \delta\epsilon\sigma\mu\omicron\upsilon = \text{LXX}^{\text{MSS}}] \tau\omicron\nu \delta\epsilon\sigma\mu\omicron\nu \tau\omicron\upsilon \zeta\upsilon\gamma\omicron\upsilon$ LXX^{maj. text} cf. MT SP מִשָּׁה עֲלֶיכֶם (SP מִשָּׁה עֲלֵיכֶם). Probably the equivalent of the earlier tradition as reflected in 4QLXXLev^a and LXX^{MSS} was adapted in the majority manuscript tradition of the LXX to the regular equivalent of $\text{ע} \text{ל}$ in the LXX, viz., $\zeta\upsilon\gamma\omicron\varsigma$. The earlier translation does not constitute a precise representation of MT. The two translations have in common the understanding that מִשָּׁה is a singular form, probably reflecting a reading מִשָּׁה . This understanding, although deviating from Ezek 34:27, may be supported by such verses as Jer 28:10, 12.

Lev 26:15 $\text{προστά}[\gamma\mu\alpha\sigma\iota \mu\omicron\upsilon] \kappa\rho\acute{\iota}\mu\alpha\sigma\acute{\iota}\nu \mu\omicron\upsilon$ LXX, מִשְׁפָּטִי MT SP. The regular equivalent of מִשְׁפָּט in the LXX is $\kappa\rho\acute{\iota}\mu\alpha$, while πρόσταγμα (4QLXXLev^a) usually reflects דָּבָר and קָה (and only 3 times מִשְׁפָּט in Lev 18:26; 19:37; 26:46). The rendering of the LXX should be understood as a correction to the regular vocabulary of the LXX ($\kappa\rho\acute{\iota}\mu\alpha - \text{מִשְׁפָּט}, \text{πρόσταγμα} - (\text{קָה})$). The context in which מִצִּיָּה , קָה , and מִשְׁפָּט appear may have contributed to this unusual equivalent in the scroll which probably reflects the original translation. Less likely is the assumption that $\text{προστά}[\gamma\mu\alpha\sigma\iota$ reflects a variant מִצִּיָּה , for which cf. v 14. Wevers, *Notes*, 445 considers the reading of the scroll a “careless mistake.”

2b. 4QLXXLev^a probably reflects a Hebrew variant

Lev 26:4 $\tau\omicron\nu \xi\upsilon\lambda\iota\nu\omicron\nu \kappa\alpha\rho\text{[}] \tau\acute{\alpha} \xi\upsilon\lambda\alpha \tau\omicron\nu \text{πεδίων (ἀποδώσει τὸν καρπὸν αὐτῶν)}$ LXX – $\text{ע} \text{ן}$ (י) (יהן פרי) MT SP. The last word before the lacuna in 4QLXXLev^a cannot be read easily. It is not impossible that it represents $\kappa\alpha\rho\pi[\omicron\nu$, in which case the scroll reflects a different reading or a change in the sequence of words. 4QLXXLev^a could reflect $\text{ע} \text{ן (ה)פרי}$, although τὸν καρπὸν would have been expected (for the reconstructed $\text{וַיִּי יִהְיֶה פְרִי}$ cf. Gen 1:11). The phrase $\acute{\omicron} \xi\upsilon\lambda\iota\nu\omicron\varsigma \kappa\alpha\rho\pi[\omicron\varsigma$ of 4QLXXLev^a is frequently used in secular Greek (cf. LSJ, p. 1191) and may therefore reflect a free rendering. The ancient character of 4QLXXLev^a is supported by the unusual equivalent: $\xi\upsilon\lambda\iota\nu\omicron\varsigma$ is used in the LXX for $\text{ע} \text{ן}$, not only as an

adjective, but also as a neuter noun (cf., e.g., Deut 28:42 πάντα τὰ ξύλινα σου (כל עצך) and 1 Macc 10:30). In any event, the main manuscripts of the LXX equal MT, with the exception of the representation of $\gamma\epsilon$ in the plural.

Lev 26:11 βδελύξομαι = LXX^{MS 126} (βδελύζομαι) Arab] βδελύξεται ἡ ψυχὴ μου LXX – MT SP תגעל נפש. The reading of the scroll (note the agreement with the main LXX tradition in the choice of the verb) may reflect an early variant אגעל, which could be original, in which case the reading of MT SP = LXX could reflect a euphemistic anti-anthropomorphic correction (for which cf. T בוּמַרִי), such as elsewhere in T. In these cases the correction adds an intermediary entity (נפש) in MT, avoiding the direct mentioning of God himself. In T *ad loc.* אַמְרָא reflects נפש, but elsewhere it is added as an additional entity (like the addition in T of אַמְרָא and אַמְרָא). Alternatively, MT SP could also represent a harmonistic change to other occurrences of this phrase in this chapter (vv 15, 43).

Lev 26:12 καὶ ἔσομαι []] καὶ ἐμπεριπατήσω ἐν ὑμῖν καὶ ἔσομαι ὑμῶν θεός LXX – וההלכתִי – MT SP. There is no room in the lacuna in the Qumran scroll for a rendering of וההלכתִי בהוככם, and these words were probably lacking in its *Vorlage*, possibly by way of *parablepsis*. Alternatively, the scroll could reflect a different sequence of the phrases.

Lev 26:14 τὰ / πάντα τὰ] προστάγματα μου] + ταῦτα LXX – אה כל המצות האלה MT SP. The addition of ταῦτα in the LXX probably represents an approximation to MT, as אה may have been lacking in the *Vorlage* of the scroll. At the same time, it is unclear whether the scroll reflects אה כל מצותי or אה כל המצות.

3. 4QLXXLev^a represents the Hebrew more closely than the “LXX”

Lev 26:6 καὶ πόλεμος οὐ δι[ελε]ύσεται[αι διὰ τῆς γῆς ὑμῶν. In 4QLXXLev^a this phrase occurs at the end of v 6 as in MT SP לא העבר בארצכם, while the LXX has the phrase at the beginning of the verse. Both sequences may be defended. In a way, the phrase follows לבטח בארצכם in a natural way in the LXX. Alternatively, also in MT SP and 4QLXXLev^a the phrase comes appropriately at the end of v 6 before אה איביכם. It is not impossible that one of the two sequences may have been created by a textual mishap. Note, for example, that like the phrase under consideration, v 5 ends with בארצכם.

Lev 26:12 [καὶ πάλαια] = MT SP] καὶ πάλαια παλαιῶν LXX (ןשן MT SP). In a conventional reconstruction there is no room in the scroll for παλαιῶν of the LXX, but it could have been added in the scroll above the line. The LXX may represent a doublet.

Lev 26:12 μοι ἔθν[ος] μου λαός LXX – לִי לְעַם MT SP. לִי is more precisely rendered by μοι in 4QLXXLev^a than by μου in the LXX.

4. Indecisive evidence

Lev 26:6 [ὁ] ἐκφόβων ὑμᾶς] ὑμᾶς ὁ ἐκφόβων LXX – ואין בהרִיד MT. In this phrase MT usually does not have an object, while the LXX occasionally adds one, e.g., Jer 46 (26):27 ואין בהרִיד – καὶ οὐκ ἔσται ὁ παρενοχλῶν αὐτόν (thus also Zeph 3:13 and Ezek 34:28). The sequence of

the words in 4QLXXLev^a more closely represents the usual sequence of the Hebrew (and the LXX), although MT SP *ad loc.* do not have an added אהכב. The LXX is more elegant.²³

5. Analysis

4QLXXLev^a and the LXX reflect the same textual tradition of the Greek Leviticus (§ 1), so that the differences between the two highlight their different backgrounds. There is ample evidence in favor of the assumption that 4QLXXLev^a reflects an earlier text (§ 2),²⁴ and that the other witnesses were corrected towards MT. As elsewhere in the history of the LXX revisions, the revisional activity reflected in the majority manuscript tradition of the LXX was neither consistent nor thorough.²⁵ There is very little evidence for the alternative suggestion (see n. 25) that 4QLXXLev^a reflects an early revision (§ 3).

β. 4QpapLXXLev^{b26}

1. 4QpapLXXLev^b and the OG have a common background

The two texts share several unusual renderings, demonstrating their common translation tradition:

Lev 3:9 σὺν ταῖς ψόαις – לעמה העצה – MT SP

Lev 3:11 ὄσμη]ήν[εὐωδίας cf. LXX ὄσμη εὐωδίας – לחם – MT SP

Lev 4:7 παρὰ τ[ήν] βάλανον – אל יסוד – MT SP (note the preposition)

Lev 4:7 παρὰ τὰς θύρας – (אהל מועד) פתח – MT SP

²³ Likewise, Greek enclitic pronouns, when reflecting Hebrew prepositions, such as לְ, usually occur after the nouns, and only rarely before them. Cf. A. Wifstrand, "Die Stellung der enklitischen Personalpronomina bei den Septuaginta," *Bulletin de la Société Royale des Lettres de Lund 1949–1950* (Lund 1950) 44–70.

²⁴ Thus also Metso–Ulrich, "Leviticus," 265.

²⁵ We thus adhere to the view of Ulrich, *DJD IX*, 163 (preceded by Skehan, "Manuscripts," 158): "Though none of these readings is accepted into the Göttingen *Leviticus*, it can be argued, on the basis not only of its antiquity but even more of its textual readings, that 4QLXXLev^a penetrates further behind the other witnesses to provide a more authentic witness to the Old Greek translation." On the other hand, Wevers, *Notes*, esp. 438–45 suggests that 4QLXXLev^a reflects a later text. Wevers returned to this view in "The Dead Sea Scrolls" (see n. 21) when evaluating all the Qumran Greek fragments.

²⁶ The analysis refers only to the preserved part of the scroll, and not to the reconstructions in *DJD IX*. These reconstructions show that it is often possible to fill in the majority text of the LXX, but sometimes these reconstructions are less plausible: 5:21 παριδὼν παρίδη (see below); *ibid.*, τ[ι]; 5:22 ὅστε (τοῦ is possible as well); 5:24 ἦ should possibly be inserted.

Lev 4:28 ἐν] αὐτῆ] om MT and “the Three”; SP עליה = v 14 עליה (LXX: ἐν αὐτῆ]). In v 23 בה in the same expression is likewise rendered by ἐν αὐτῆ].

Lev 4:28 χίμαιρον cf. χίμαιραν LXX] + קרבו MT SP

Lev 4:28 χίμαιρον (LXX: χίμαιραν) ἐξ αἰγῶν – שערות עיב – MT SP. The combination of these two nouns occurs elsewhere in Lev 4:29 (not in MT SP) and 5:6 (שער עיב).

Lev 4:28 θήλει[αν ἄμωμον – תמימה נקבה – MT SP. Note the reverse sequence in the Greek texts (= SP *ad loc.* and in 4:32).

Lev 4:28 περὶ τῆ[ς ἁμαρ]τίας – חטאתו – MT SP. The two Greek versions do not represent the pronoun.

Lev 5:8 τοῦ σφογδύλου – ערפו – MT SP. The Greek word occurs only here in the LXX—the only place in Scripture mentioning the neck of an animal.

Lev 5:9 [τὸ δὲ κατάλοιπον] τοῦ αἵματος – והנשאר בדם – MT SP. Note the representation of -ב with the Greek genitive.

Lev 5:9 ἁμαρτί]ας γάρ ἐστιν – הוא חטאת הוא – MT SP (היא). Note the addition of γάρ (cf. 5:11 כִּי – ὅτι LXX) and the case-ending of the noun.

Lev 5:19 πλημμέλη]σιν [ἔ]ναντι[ι Ιαω – לה' אשם MT SP

Lev 5:23 (6:4) πλημμε]λήσηי – אשאי MT SP

Lev 5:21 (6:2) κοιν[ωνίας – בהשומה יד – MT SP. The Hebrew (meaning unclear) and Greek words occur only here.

Lev 5:21 (6:2) πλημμέλη]σιν [ἔ]ναντι[ι Ιαω / κυρίου – ליהוה – אשם MT SP. Note both the translation equivalent and the preposition (ἔναντι is also often used elsewhere in the LXX with verbs of sinning; for ἁμαρτάνω see i.a. Gen 39:9 and Exod 10:16).

Lev 5:23 (6:4) ἡ[νίκα ἄν – כי – MT SP

In some instances the agreement in a particular equivalence, although occurring also elsewhere in the LXX of the Torah, cannot be coincidental.

Lev 2:4 ἐκ σε[μιδάλεως – הלה MT SP

Lev 2:4 ἄρτους ἀζύμο]υς – מצה ללה MT SP (מצות)

Lev 2:4 πεφυ[ραμένους – בלולה MT SP

Lev 2:5 πεφυραμ]ένης – בלולה MT SP

Lev 2:4 καὶ λά]γανα – ורקיקי MT SP

Lev 3:4 τῶν μηρίω[ν – הכסלים MT SP

Lev 3:10 τ[ὸ ἐπὶ τ]ῶν μηρίω[ν – על הכסלים MT SP

Lev 3:5 καὶ τὸν λ]όβον – היתרת MT SP (היותרת)

Lev 3:10 καὶ τὸν λ]όβον[– ואת היתרת – היותרת MT SP

Lev 3:9 τῆς κοιλία[ς – הקרב – MT SP

Lev 4:6 τὸ]καταπετασ[μα – פרכה – MT SP

Lev 4:27 ἀκουσίως – בשגגה – MT SP

Lev 5:9 καὶ ῥανεῖ – והזה – MT SP

Lev 5:18 ἦς ἡγ[νόσηεν – אשר שגג – MT SP

Lev 5:23 ἀδικημ[α – העשוק MT SP (העשוק). Other LXX equivalents are ἀδικία and ἄδικος.

2. 4QpapLXXLev^b reflects the OG, while the main LXX tradition probably reflects a revision

Lev 2:5 σεμιδάλεως πεφυραμ]ένης | LXX σεμίδαλις πεφυραμένη – בלולה סלה – MT SP. The main LXX reading (nominative) probably corrected the earlier genitive.

Lev 3:4 τὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ ἥπα[τος | LXX τὸν ἐπὶ τοῦ ἥπατος – על הכבד – MT SP.

Lev 3:11 ὄσμ]ῃν[εὐωδίας | LXX ὄσμῃ εὐωδίας. (אשה ליהוה) לחם – (והקשירו הכהן המזבח) לחם (והקשיר) MT SP

The two texts reflect a different understanding of the relation between the segments in the sentence. For 4QpapLXXLev^b this was one continuous sentence, with לחם as the object of the verb, while for the LXX לחם started a nominal phrase. Since the LXX reflects the Masoretic accents, possibly the scroll reflected an earlier similar understanding.

Lev 3:12 I]αω | κυρίου LXX – יהוה – MT SP

Lev 4:27 Iaω | κυρίου LXX – יהוה – MT SP

In this discrepancy between 4QpapLXXLev^b and the main Greek tradition, the most major in all the Greek Qumran scrolls, the scroll probably reflects the original text. The Qumran text transliterated the Tetragrammaton in Greek characters (preceded and followed by a space), a practice that is not known from other biblical manuscripts, where two alternative systems are known.²⁷

²⁷ For a detailed analysis, see H. Stegemann, *KΥΠΙΟΣ Ο ΘΕΟΣ ΚΥΠΙΟΣ ΙΗΣΟΥΣ—Aufkommen und Ausbreitung des religiösen Gebrauchs von ΚΥΠΙΟΣ und seine Verwendung im Neuen Testament* (Bonn: Habilitationsschrift, 1969) 110–33, 194–228.

1. The writing of the Tetragrammaton in Hebrew characters, either in the paleo-Hebrew²⁸ or in the square Aramaic script.²⁹
2. κύριος, usually without the article, especially in the nominative, and less frequently with the article.³⁰

All the texts transcribing the Tetragrammaton in Hebrew characters reflect early revisions, in which the employment of Hebrew characters was considered a sign of authenticity, even though this practice only entered the transmission of Greek Scriptures at a second stage. A parallel phenomenon took place in several Hebrew Qumran manuscripts written in the square Aramaic script, mainly nonbiblical texts, in which the Tetragrammaton was written in paleo-Hebrew characters.³¹ This practice, reflected in both Hebrew and Greek sources, indicates reverence for the ineffable name of God.³²

In the reconstruction of the history of the Greek versions, the writing of the Tetragrammaton in Hebrew characters in Greek revisional texts is a relatively late phenomenon. On the basis of the available evidence, the analysis of the original representation of the Tetragrammaton in Greek Scriptures therefore focuses on the question of whether the first translators wrote either κύριος or Ιαω. According to Pietersma, the first translators wrote κύριος, mainly without the article, considered a personal name in the Greek Torah, as “the written surrogate for the tetragram.”³³ However, the internal LXX evidence offered in support of this assumption is not convincing, as all the irregularities pertaining to the anarthrous use of κύριος can also be explained as having been created by a mechanical replacement of Ιαω with κύριος by Christian scribes. On the other hand, according to Stegemann and Skehan, Ιαω reflects the earliest attested stage in the history of the LXX translation, when the name of God was represented by its transliteration, just like any other personal name in the LXX.³⁴ Skehan, *ibid.*, p. 29 provided important early parallels for the use of Ιαω and similar forms representing the Tetragrammaton: Diodorus of Sicily I,29,2 (1st century BCE) records that Moses referred his laws to τὸν Ιαω

²⁸ The Aquila fragments of Kings and Psalms of the 5th–6th century CE published by F. C. Burkitt (Cambridge: University Press, 1897) and C. Taylor (Cambridge: University Press, 1900); the Psalms fragments of Symmachus of the 3rd–4th century CE published, among others, by G. Mercati, “Frammenti di Aquila o di Simmaco,” *RB NS* 8 (1911) 266–72; P.Oxy. 1007 of Genesis (3rd century CE; double *yod*); P.Oxy. 3522 of Job (1st century CE); and both scribes of 8HevXII gr (1st century BCE).

²⁹ P.Fouad 266b (848) of Deuteronomy (the first scribe left spaces filled in with the Tetragrammaton by a later scribe) and the Psalms fragments of the Hexapla published by G. Mercati, *Psalterii Hexapli reliquiae* (Vatican: Bibliotheca Vaticana, 1958). For a detailed analysis, see Stegemann, *KYPIOS*.

³⁰ Thus all the uncial manuscripts of the LXX as well as P.Oxy. 656 of Genesis (2nd century CE); P.Chester Beatty VI (Numbers-Deuteronomy). See W. W. von Baudissin, *Kyrios als Gottesname im Judentum* (Giessen: Topelmann, 1926–1929) and Stegemann, *KYPIOS*, 200–202.

³¹ See *Scribal Practices*, 238–46.

³² Origen recognized this feature when stating that the “most accurate exemplars” of the Greek Scripture wrote the Tetragrammaton in Hebrew characters (Migne, PG 12 1104 [B]).

³³ A. Pietersma, “Kyrios or Tetragram: A Renewed Quest for the Original LXX,” in Pietersma–Cox, *De Septuaginta*, 85–101 (98).

³⁴ Stegemann, *KYPIOS*, 197; P. W. Skehan, “The Divine Name at Qumran, in the Masada Scroll, and in the Septuagint,” *BIOSCS* 13 (1980) 14–44.

ἐπικαλούμενον θεόν; likewise, in his commentary on Ps 2:2, Origen speaks about Ιαη (PG 12:1104) and Ιαω (GCS, Origenes 4:53); and two onomastica used Ιαω as an explanation of Hebrew theophoric names (for full details, see Skehan). The later magical papyri likewise invoke Ιαω. In a similar vein, Stegemann gives a long list of arguments in favor of the assumption of the priority of the transliteration.³⁵ This transliteration reflects an unusual pronunciation of the Tetragrammaton for which cf. the form in the Elephantine papyri (יהי).

In the absence of convincing evidence in favor of any one explanation, the view of Skehan and Stegemann seems more plausible in light of the parallels provided. This argument serves as support for the view that 4QpapLXXLev^b reflects the OG, and not a later revision/translation.

Lev 4:7 τῆς [καρ]π[ώσ]εως = תְּבַעַת MT SP] LXX τῶν ὀλοκαυτωμάτων

Lev 4:10 [τῆς καρ]πώσεως = LXX; תְּבַעַת MT SP

Lev 4:18 τῶν]καρπ[ώσ]εων = LXX; תְּבַעַת MT SP

The regular LXX equivalent for תְּבַעַת is ὀλοκαύτωμα (thus Lev 4:7), but in 4:10,18 the LXX of Leviticus used κάρπωσις (this equivalent occurs elsewhere also in Job 42:8). Therefore, probably also in 4:7 the OG contained κάρπωσις (thus 4QpapLXXLev^b), subsequently replaced in most manuscripts with the standard LXX equivalent ὀλοκαύτωμα.

3. Indecisive evidence

Lev 4:4 καὶ εἰσάξ[ει] καὶ προσάξει LXX – אֵיבַח MT SP

Lev 4:27 οὐ πο[ιηθήσε]ται] ἢ οὐ ποιηθήσεται LXX – הַשֵּׁנָה לֹא תֵשֶׂה MT SP. Without ἢ, probably omitted by mistake in 4QpapLXXLev^b or its forerunner, the sentence makes little sense. The presence of this word in the main LXX tradition probably reflects the original reading, but the evidence is ambivalent.

Lev 5:21 (6:2) εἰς τ[ον Ιαω] (παριδὼν παρίδη) τὰς (ἐντολὰς κυρίου) LXX – בְּהַחֲזֵק בְּעַלְמֵי MT SP. The two Greek texts differ regarding the preposition and probably also the verbs. There is no room for the added ἐντολὰς of the LXX in the lacuna in 4QpapLXXLev^b. The papyrus probably did not read παριδὼν παρίδη in the lacuna, as reconstructed in *DJD IX*, 176, and not occurring in the LXX with εἰς, but rather ἀθετέω (used with this preposition as an equivalent of בְּעַלְמֵ in 1 Chron 2:7 and Ezek 39:23).

Lev 5:21 ἡδίκη]κεν] ἡδίκησεν LXX – פָּשַׁע MT SP

4. Analysis

³⁵ Among other things Stegemann claims that a transliteration rather than a translation or transcription in Hebrew characters is the natural representation of this proper noun. He also claims that ΙΑΩ cannot be considered a change of an original form out of reverence to the divine name, since the use of the equivalent of יהוה in Greek does not prevent the pronunciation of God's name. The fact that this system is not encountered in later manuscripts of the Greek Bible, as opposed to the other systems, is a sign of originality rather than of secondary nature.

The agreements between 4QpapLXXLev^b and the main manuscript tradition of the LXX (§ 1) suggest that the two sources represent different branches of the same translation. There is more evidence for the assumption that 4QpapLXXLev^b preceded the main manuscript tradition of the LXX (§ 2) than for the reverse assumption. The evidence is not overwhelming, but the reverse claim that 4QpapLXXLev^b reflects a revision of the LXX can probably be made only in 5:21]είς τ[ον Ιαω. Probably the most convincing case for the ancient character of the Qumran text is the presentation of the divine name as Ιαω.

γ. 4QLXXNum

1. 4QLXXNum and the OG have a common background

The two texts share several unusual renderings that demonstrate their common translation tradition:

Num 4:7 [καὶ τὰ σπονδεῖα ἐν οἷς σπέ]νδει – וְאֵת קִשּׁוֹת הַנֶּסֶךְ – MT SP. This unusual rendering (the reconstruction is plausible) displays an important agreement between the LXX and 4QLXXNum. At the same time, 4QLXXNum (probably) and some manuscripts of the LXX add ἐν αὐτοῖς.

Num 4:8 καὶ ἐπιβάλουσιν ἐπ']αψτήν – וּפְרִשׁוּ עֲלֵיהֶם – MT SP

In some instances the agreement in a particular equivalence, although sometimes also occurring elsewhere in the Torah, cannot be coincidental.

Num 4:5 τὸ [καταπέτ]ασμα = LXX – אֵת פְּרֻכַת – MT SP

Num 4:7 τὴν τράπεζαν τὴν προ]κειμένην – שֶׁלֶחַן הַפָּנִים – MT SP. This rendering occurs elsewhere in Exod 37:10 (38:9), 39:36 (17) LXX^B.

Num 4:7 τὰ τ[ρ]υβλί[α – אֵת הַקְּעָרֹת – MT SP. This equivalence occurs also in Exodus (2 x) and Numbers (5 x).

Num 4:7 τ]οὺς καθαοὺς – וְאֵת הַמְּנֻקֹּת – MT SP (הַמְּנֻקֹּת). This equivalence occurs elsewhere in Exodus (3 x) and Jer 52:19.

Num 4:8 ἐπ']αψτήν – עֲלֵיהֶם – MT SP.

Num 4:12 τὰ σκ[εῦ]η τὰ λει]τ[ουρ]γικά – כְּלֵי הַשֵּׁרָת – MT SP (הַשֵּׁרָת). This equivalence recurs only in 2 Chr 24:14.

Num 4:16 καὶ τὸ θυμίαμα τῆς συνθέ]σεω[ς – קְטֹרֶת הַסִּמִּים – MT SP.

2. 4QLXXNum reflects an earlier text

Num 3:40 ἀριθμῆσον] ἐπισκέψαι LXX – קפּ MT SP. ἐπισκέπτομαι is the standard equivalent of קפּ in the main manuscript tradition of the LXX of all the books, in which ἀριθμέω is the main equivalent of מנּ. 4QLXXNum inconsistently used for קפּ both ἀριθμέω in 3:40 and ἐπισκέπτομαι in 3:42.³⁶ The evidence suggests that 4QLXXNum reflects an earlier stage of the transmission of the translation when the equivalents of קפּ had not yet been standardized. The possibility of a change in the reverse direction, suggested by Wevers, “Early Revision,” 238*³⁷ is less likely. Note that the two verbs are used in the same context in a description of the census in 2 Samuel 24 (ἀριθμέω v 1 [מנּ]; ἐπισκέπτομαι vv 2, 4 [קפּ]), a situation which underlines their parallelism.

Num 4:6 [ἀ]ρτηῆρας] ἀναφορεῖς LXX; וידי MT SP

Num 4:8 ἀρτηῆρας] ἀναφορεῖς LXX; וידי MT SP

Num 4:11 ἀρτηῆ[ρας] ἀναφορεῖς LXX; וידי MT SP

Num 4:12 ἀρτηῆρος] ἀναφορεῖς LXX; מניח MT SP

One of the two renderings systematically replaced the other, but it is hard to determine the direction of the substitution. Possibly ἀρτηῆρ in 4QLXXNum constitutes the original reading (it occurs in the LXX only in Neh 4:11 for כבּל) and ἀναφορεῖς the correction. This assumption is supported by the fact that ἀναφορεῖς occurs in the early Greek revisions for כבּ in Exod 30:4 (Th) and 39:35 (οἱ λ') and for מניח in Num 13:23 (Aq Th). This is also the regular LXX equivalent in Exodus 25, 27, 35, Numbers 4, and 2 Chronicles 5 for כבּ. The reverse assumption that ἀναφορεῖς is the original rendering and ἀρτηῆρ the correction was suggested by Skehan, “4QNumLXX,” 46, and Wevers, “Early Revision,” 236*–7*. According to Wevers, the early reviser conceived of ἀναφορεῖς of the LXX as an agent noun, i.e. a “carrier” rather than “an instrument for carrying,” and he therefore replaced that word. However, this type of revision is evidenced less in the revisions of the LXX which usually aim at etymological clarity vis-à-vis the Hebrew and not vis-à-vis the Greek.

Num 4:12 καὶ θήσουσιν] καὶ ἐμβαλοῦσιν LXX; מניח MT SP

The equivalent of the LXX for מניח recurs in vv 10, 14, as well as elsewhere in the LXX (10 x) but not elsewhere in the LXX of Numbers (note further elsewhere in the LXX διεμβάλλω [1 x]; ἐκβάλλω [1 x]; ἐπιβάλλω [2 x]). The unusual equivalent of 4QLXXNum may point to its original character, especially since it occurs elsewhere in the LXX of the Torah (Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus); the compositum ἐπιθήσουσιν occurs also in v 10 (MT SP מניח).

3. 4QLXXNum is closer to MT SP

³⁶ In codex A ἀριθμέω occurs nine times in Numbers 2 as well as in Num 3:15, 16 for קפּ where the other codices have ἐπισκέπτομαι. For exact details, see Wevers, “Early Revision,” 237*–8*. This equivalent also occurs in all manuscripts of 1 Chr 21:6; 2 Chr 17:14; 25:5; 26:11.

³⁷ “It is a variant clarifying a Hebraic kind of Greek by a more idiomatic text.” Wevers’ text edition of the LXX accordingly included ἐπισκέπτομαι.

3a. Translation equivalents

Num 3:43 πᾶν πρωτότοκον ἄρσεν – כל בכור זכר MT SP] πάντα τὰ πρωτότοκα τὰ ἀρσενικά LXX (the singular form of this noun is found also in the first part of this verse).

Num 4:7 ἐπ' αὐτῆν – עליו MT SP] tr LXX

3b. Possibly different Vorlage

Num 4:14 SP = LXX add a large plus καὶ λήμψονται ... ἐπὶ ἀναφορεῖς lacking in MT SP 4QLXXNum.

Num 4:9 [τὴν λυχνίαν τῆς φαύσεως cf. τοῦ φωτός LXX^b] τὴν λυχνίαν τὴν φωτίζουσαν LXX (possibly reflecting an etymologizing rendering *המאיר*); MT SP: *בגרה המאור* (מורה SP). The rendering *מאור* – φαῦσις occurs elsewhere in Gen 1:14-15; Ps 73(74):16; Exod 35:8 Sym; Lev 24:1 *alius*.

4. Inconclusive evidence

Num 4:7 ὑ[α]κίνθινον] ὀλοπόρφυρον LXX; *הכלה* MT SP

The equivalent used by 4QLXXNum, ὑακίνθινος = ὑάκινθος (dark blue) usually renders *הכלה*, while ὀλοπόρφυρος (dark red or purple) of the LXX renders once *ארנבן* (Lev 4:13).³⁸ Its main component, πορφύρα, renders *ארנבן* passim in the LXX. It is unclear whether 4QLXXNum reflects an imprecise translation of *הכלה* or a variant *ארנבן* (cf. *בגד ארנבן* 4:13; *Judg 8:26*). The combination *כליל ארנבן* (= ὀλο-πόρφυρον ?) is not known from elsewhere.

Num 4:14 τὰ σπονδεῖα] τὸν καλυπτῆρα LXX; *המזרקה* MT SP (*המזרקה*). *καλυπτῆρα* (covering) is an inappropriate equivalent, while *σπονδεῖα* (cups) could reflect MT SP.³⁹

Analysis

4QLXXNum has much in common with the majority LXX tradition (§ 1), suggesting that the two entities are branches of the same translation. At the same time, the evidence is inconclusive regarding the status of the Qumran text. Some of its equivalents give the impression of not having been adapted to the majority tradition of the LXX, in which case the scroll probably reflects the OG translation (§ 2). But in a few other details 4QLXXNum reflects MT more closely. Skehan, “4QLXXNum” and Wevers, “Early Revision,” support the view that in these details the scroll reflects an early revision towards MT, described as a “pre-

³⁸ This rendering may be influenced by the phrase ὄλον ὑακίνθινον in Num 4:6 where it renders *כליל הכלה*.

³⁹ Wevers, “Early Revision,” 236 suggests a different reconstruction for the scroll.

Christian reworking” by Skehan. However, the evidence in favor of the first assumption seems to be stronger (thus Ulrich, *DJD IX*, 189).

δ. *8HevXII gr*

When discussing the nature of *8HevXII gr*, we are on much safer ground than in the analysis of the Qumran texts, since this scroll undoubtedly contains a revision of the OG. This text shares idiosyncratic elements with the main tradition of the LXX, so that it should be considered an integral part of that tradition (see *DJD VIII*, 104–6). *8HevXII gr* thus does not represent an independent translation of the LXX, or a translation that occasionally consulted the main LXX tradition. Beyond this common background, there is overwhelming evidence that this scroll reflects a revision of the OG (probably part of the *kaige*-Th group), made at an early period, before the middle of the first century BCE (when the manuscript was copied). The evidence in favor of the revisional nature of this scroll was presented in detail in *DJD VIII*, 131–42. The revisional categories may be summarized as follows:⁴⁰

1. The reviser attempted to express every element of the Hebrew with a separate Greek element, involving the addition and omission of elements vis-à-vis the OG. E.g.,

Hab 1:15 ויניל – καὶ χαρήσεται ἡ καρδία αὐτοῦ LXX
καὶ χαρεῖται *8HevXII gr*

Hab 1:17 ׀ העל – διὰ τοῦτο LXX
εἰ διὰ τοῦτο *8HevXII gr*

2. The reviser represented each word with an etymologically precise rendering, even if the free rendering of the OG was more elegant or contextually more appropriate. E.g.,

Hab 1:8 וקלי – καὶ ἐξαλούνται LXX
καὶ κουφ[ότεροι] *8HevXII gr*

Hab 2:1 ואהיבב – καὶ ἐπιβήσομαι LXX
καὶ στηλώσομαι *8HevXII gr*.

The correction is based on the equivalent וצבב – στηλή also found elsewhere in the *kaige*-Th revision.

3. The reviser adhered to a single equivalent for each Hebrew word or word-group. E.g.,

⁴⁰ In this analysis, not all differences between the LXX and the scroll are accounted for. Some corrections of the scroll are based on Hebrew readings differing from MT, either in consonants or their reading (vocalization).

Hab 1:10 לְכַדֵּךְ – καὶ κρατήσῃ αὐτοῦ LXX
καὶ συλήψεται αὐτό 8HēvXII gr

The correction was based on a distinction between the equivalences קָח – κρατ- and לְכַד – συλλαμβάνω *passim* in the LXX.

Hab 2:3 וְהָיָה – ὑστερήσῃ LXX
στραγ[γεύσῃται 8HēvXII gr

The correction was based on the understanding that ὑστερ- was reserved to the root אָחַר (cf. ὕστερος, -ον – יָחַר *passim*).

4. The reviser adhered to a system of formal equivalences between grammatical categories: a plural form in MT should be represented by a plural form in the translation, adverbs should be represented by adverbs, verbs by verbs, and so forth. E.g.,

Hab 1:9 לְהַמְסֵךְ – εἰς ἀσεβείας LXX
εἰς ἀδικίαν 8HēvXII gr
Hab 1:15 בְּמַכְמַרְהוּ – ἐν ταῖς σαγήναις αὐτοῦ LXX
ἐν τῇ] σαγήνῃ αὐτοῦ 8HēvXII gr
Hab 2:2 וְבָאֵר – καὶ σαφῶς LXX (cf. Deut 27:8 LXX)
καὶ ἐκφάν[ειν or ἐκφάν[ηθι 8HēvXII gr

III. Summary

Greek texts in the Judean Desert

The discovery of Greek biblical texts in caves 2, 4 and 7 at Qumran as well as in Naḥal Ḥever probably implies that these texts were owned by the persons who brought them to these sites. Cave 7 probably contained an archive of Greek texts. We do not know to what extent the scrolls were also used by their owners, but some comparative evidence is available regarding the use of the Greek language in the same archaeological environment. Thus, in Naḥal Ḥever many Greek documentary texts have been deposited (see *DJD* XXVII), showing that Greek was in active use at that site, and hence the find of 8HēvXII gr causes no surprise. The nature of the revision contained in this scroll fits what is otherwise known about the persons who deposited texts in Naḥal Ḥever at the time of the Second Jewish Revolt. On the other hand, active use of the Greek versions of the Pentateuch at Qumran is unlikely, as virtually no Greek documentary texts have been found there. The opisthograph 4QNarrative Work and Prayer (4Q460) in Hebrew, with a documentary Greek text 4QAccount gr (4Q350) on the verso of frg. 9 is unique, but possibly irrelevant as the Greek text may have been written

after the period of occupancy of Qumran by the Qumran community (see above, § I).

The fact that the Greek Scripture texts found in cave 4 in Qumran are from the Torah only may be relevant to our understanding of the distribution of that text and of the community's interest. The identity of many of the texts from cave 7 is unclear.

Greek was in active use in all sites in the Judean Desert, showing an administration conducted in Greek and letters written in that language, with the exception of Qumran. The percentage of Greek texts compared with Semitic texts found at these sites is much larger than that of the Greek texts found at Qumran.

The Text of the Greek Bible

If de Lagarde's theory on the history of the LXX needed any further support, it is provided by the texts from the Judean Desert. The newly found texts share important details with the manuscript tradition of the LXX known so far, so that all the known Greek texts reflect one single translation, rather than different translations, as suggested by Kahle.⁴¹ Two of the Qumran texts probably reflect the OG better than the manuscript tradition contained in the later uncial manuscripts (4QLXXLev^a, 4QpapLXXLev^b; the evidence for 4QLXXNum is less clear). By implication, these two texts should also share certain features, but the evidence is too limited.

The differences between the Greek texts from Qumran and Naḥal Ḥever are remarkable. Two of the texts from Qumran provide insights into the early history of the LXX as they are probably better representatives of the OG than the later uncials. On the other hand, 8ḤevXII gr, an early Jewish revision of the OG, belonging to the *kaige*-Th group, represents a translation which is typologically later than the uncials and early papyri of the LXX, even if the particular copy found in Naḥal Ḥever is earlier than most surviving representatives of the LXX. The differences between the types of Greek text found in the two localities reflect the different nature of the groups of people who deposited the texts there.

The status of the Greek manuscripts from the Judean Desert thus runs parallel to that of the Hebrew manuscripts from the same area. The Hebrew manuscripts from Qumran reflect a variety of textual forms,

⁴¹ The argumentation was used already by Leaney, "Greek Manuscripts," 293 and Skehan, "The Biblical Scrolls from Qumran and the Text of the Old Testament," *BA* 28 (1965) 87–100, esp. 91–2.

among them proto-Masoretic texts, while those of the later sites of Naḥal Ḥever, Wadi Sdeir, Murabba‘at, and Naḥal Ṣe‘elim (as well as the earlier site of Masada) exclusively reflect the proto-Masoretic texts (also named proto-rabbinic texts) later to be contained in MT (to be precise, the texts from the sites other than Qumran are closer to the medieval text than the Qumran proto-Masoretic texts; see chapter 12*). Similarly, at least some of the Greek Torah texts from Qumran probably reflect an earlier form of Greek Scripture, while 8ḤevXII gr reflects a later Jewish revision deriving from proto-rabbinic Jewish circles. Both the Hebrew and Greek texts from Qumran thus reflect a community that practiced openness at the textual level and was not tied down to MT, while the other sites represent Jewish nationalistic circles that adhered only to the proto-rabbinic (proto-Masoretic) text in Hebrew and the Jewish revisions of the LXX towards that Hebrew text. The difference between the texts and sites derives partly from their differing chronological background, but more so from their socio-religious background.