CHAPTER TWENTY-THREE

THE GREEK BIBLICAL TEXTS FROM THE JUDEAN DESERT

I. The Evidence


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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sites</th>
<th>Total Number of Texts (Leather, Papyrus)</th>
<th>Greek Texts</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Texts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wadi Daliyeh</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jericho</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17+</td>
<td>56+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qumran</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wadi Nar</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wadi Ghweir</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wadi Murabba’at</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wadi Sdeir</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nahal Hever²</td>
<td>157+</td>
<td>55+</td>
<td>35+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nahal Mishmar</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nahal Se’elim</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masada</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>11+</td>
<td>23+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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), Nahal 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/Se² 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 Nahal 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?”), Nahal Se’elim (2), Nahal Mishmar (1), and Masada (remains of probably 11 texts [a few in either Greek or Latin] and several fragments). The largest groups of Greek texts thus derive from Murabba’at and Nahal Hever, originally wrongly denoted as “Seiyal,” and involving two archives in Greek and Aramaic from Nahal Hever (the archive of Salome Komai’se 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 (5/6Hev 19), 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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sites (North to South)</th>
<th>Total No.</th>
<th>Doc. Texts</th>
<th>Percentage of Total No.</th>
<th>Non-doc. Texts</th>
<th>Percentage of Total No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wadi Daliyeh</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jericho</td>
<td>17+</td>
<td>17+</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qumran</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wadi Nar</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wadi Ghweir</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wadi Murabba’at</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wadi Sdeir</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nahal Hever</td>
<td>55+</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>98+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nahal Mishmar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nahal Se’elim</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masada</td>
<td>11+</td>
<td>9+</td>
<td>82+</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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]), and one from Nahal Hever (8HevXII gr), but none from the other localities of Wadi Gweir, Wadi Nar, Wadi Sdeir, Nahal Mishmar, and Nahal Se’elim. The best preserved of these literary texts was found in Nahal 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., 4Q19–122, 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 papyrus 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 frg. 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 Nahal 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 Nahal Hever, 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 Nahal Hever 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.” Its orthography and morphology suggest that

---

1 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, 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, 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. 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.

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), by Elephantine papyri, 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.”

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

2. 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.

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

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

C5 (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 Nahal Hever.

1. 4QLXXLev6 (4Q119; Rahlfs 801)


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)


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 Ιαω, 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)


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)


---

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)**


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)**


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)**


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; Rahlfis 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)**


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:


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


*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.\(^\text{16}\)

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,\(^\text{17}\) while the material of \(8\text{HevXII gr}\) has not been incorporated in that series, since the first edition of that volume appeared before that text was published.\(^\text{18}\) Even though \(8\text{HevXII gr}\), 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 \(8\text{HevXII gr}\) 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.

\(\text{a. 4QLXXLev}\)\(^\text{19}\)

1. \(4\text{QLXXLev}\) 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 göttingensis editum*, vol. II.2 (Göttingen: Vandenhoek & Ruprecht, 1986); idem, *Numeri, Septuaginta, etc.*, vol. III.1 (Göttingen: Vandenhoek & Ruprecht, 1982).

\(^{18}\) J. Ziegler, *Duodecim prophetae, Septuaginta, etc.*, vol. XIII (Göttingen: Vandenhoek & 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 [\(\alpha\xi\pi\nu\varphi\)] (LXX: \(\delta\alpha\omega\theta\epsilon\omicron;\varphi;\) MT: \(\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\)); v 12 [\(\theta\epsilon\omicron\delta\epsilon\)] = LXX (MT \(\tau\tau\tau\tau\);) v 15 [\(\alpha\nu\tau\sigma\omicron\zeta\)] = LXX (MT: \(\tau\tau\tau\tau\)); v 15 \(\alpha\nu\lambda\lambda\) (not in MT).
Lev 26:5 (ὁ) σπόρος = τριζ. MT SP (κράτοι). This equivalent recurs elsewhere only 6 times in the LXX, while the usual LXX equivalent is σπέρμα.

Lev 26:5 ᾧμητος = LXX^A,B,121 etc ἀλόχνος LXX (= editions of Rahlf's and Wevers) – τριζ. MT SP. Strictly speaking this is not a case of agreement as the reading of 4QLXXLev^4 is found in some of the manuscripts of the LXX. ᾧμητος (harvest, reaping) probably reflects the original reading, and ἀλόχνος a later revision approximating to MT. Alternatively, the equivalent ᾧμητος may reflect an ancient corruption common to 4QLXXLev^4 and the tradition of LXX^A,B,121 etc based on an early interchange of מ/ל. In that case the reading ἀλόχνος should be considered original as it reflects the general LXX vocabulary.²⁰ Although the equivalent ἀλόχνος – τριζ. occurs only here in the LXX, and the word itself occurs also in Amos 9:13 (MT ἄλοχος), the verb ἄλοχω occurs elsewhere four times for τριζ., so that the equivalent is well supported. The same interchange occurs also in Amos 9:13 MT ἄλοχος – ἀλόχνος (LXX^W^B^Q^198 etc ᾧμητος). The phrase used there (καὶ καταλημφεται ὁ ἀλόχνος τῶν τρέφουσιν) is identical to Lev-LXX. The first explanation is preferable, as the graphical resemblance is not convincing.²¹

Lev 26:6 καὶ ἄμπολω = πτήσαντο 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 κατασταόμενος.

Lev 26:6 πολεμός = τραίνεται 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 ἰσχύς (probably also occurring in v 8).

Lev 26:6 φώνη = κατηχήτωος MT SP. This unusual equivalent recurs elsewhere only in Exod 5:3 and Deut 28:22.

Lev 26:8 διεξομένως μυριάδος = ναοῦς τασσόμενος ST MT SP. The two Greek texts share the reversed sequence.

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

Lev 26:13 μετὰ παραστάσεις = παραστάσεις ST MT SP (παραστάτων). The Hebrew hapax word (“with head held high”) is rendered by a LXX hapax (“openly”).

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

Lev 26:16 φώνη = πτήσαντων ST 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,” BIOSCS 38 (2005) 1–24 (3) as opposed to his earlier text edition (see n. 17), in which ἀλόχνος is adopted.
Lev 26:16 καὶ τὴν ὕποπληξίαν ἔκτηκοσαν – τὸ ὑπόπληξιν MT SP (ἐκτῆκον). 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. 4QLXXLevʰ 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. 4QLXXLevʰ represents an unusual rendering or equivalent

Lev 26:4 τῶν ὑπόπληξιν τῆς γῆς ἀπέκτεινεν LXX – ἀπέκτεινεν MT SP. The deviating translation of 4QLXXLevʰ could have been influenced by the phrase occurring in the list of covenant blessings in Deut 28:12, 24 δοῦναι τῶν ἔκτηκων τῆς γῆς σου - (the same exegesis may also be behind ἀρνήσασθαι τῆς γῆς σου). At the same time, a variant like δοῦναι τῷ ἐκτήκῳ τῆς γῆς σου is not impossible. LXX reflects an approximation to MT, while ἀπέκτεινεν reflects the pronominal suffix freely.²²

Lev 26:8 ἐπενεχὼ ἀπέκτεινεν LXX – ἐπενεχὼ ἀπέκτεινεν MT SP.

The unusual sequence of 4QLXXLevʰ, presenting a better construction in Greek, probably represents the original translation, for which cf. ἄρα ἀνεβαίνει καὶ ἐκτάνυ ήμών in the immediate context. LXX reflects an approximation to MT.

Lev 26:9 καὶ ἐσταίμι μολων ἡ διαθήκη ἐν ἡμῖν LXX – διαθήκη εἶναι τῷ χρόνῳ MT SP. It is unlikely that 4QLXXLevʰ reflects a variant such as διετηθηκόντοι τῆς εὐλογίας τῆς λοιπῆς ἡμερίας (cf. Ezek 37:26 πᾶσα ημέρα τῆς διαθήκης τῶν οὐρανῶν). 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 ἐσταίμι], one may also reconstruct καὶ στὰ καταβαίνων, which should also be considered a free rendering. Note the Greek literary sequence μολων ἡ διαθήκη, for which cf. the preceding and following entries.

Lev 26:10 ἐξοίσετε λείτου τῶν νεῶν LXX – ἐξοίσετε λείτου τῶν νεῶν MT SP. ἐκ προσώπου τῶν νεῶν ἐξοίσετε LXX – ἐκ προσώπου τῶν νεῶν ἐξοίσετε MT SP. ἐκ προσώπου of the LXX reflects a stereotyped rendering replacing the better Greek μετά 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 4QLXXLevʰ, however, “you shall eat the old together with the new.” Note further the sequence of the

²²This rendering of the LXX was probably influenced by the same factor influencing the addition of τῆς γῆς in 4QLXXLevʰ, viz., the unusual phrase ὑπόπληξιν τῆς γῆς σου - “I [God] gave their rains.” For the addition of the pronoun, cf. Jer 5:24 (K) δεῖ ναὶ τις ἀναπληρώσει - τῶν διδόντα ήμῖν ἑκτῶν πρόμον and Ezek 34:26 ἀναπληρώσει τοῖς ἔκτηκοι τῆς γῆς as well as later in our chapter, Lev 26:20: ἡ ἀναπληρώσει πρὸς τοῖς ἔκτηκοι τῆς γῆς ήμῖν.
words in 4QLXXLev⁴ (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 μοι ἐθνὸς LXX (ἐνθν ἢ MT SP). This remarkable lexical discrepancy probably best characterizes the relation between the two texts. In the vocabulary of the LXX λαὸς usually refers to Israel (reflecting זא), while ἐθνὸς pertains to peoples other than Israel (also in profane Greek ἐθνός 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 λαὸς refers to Israel as the chosen people, while the ἐθνὸς are the gentiles. 4QLXXLev⁴ 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 τοῦ/ἐθνὸς refers to Israel in the phrase τοῦ ἐθνὸς τῆς δικαίας (cf. also Lev 19:16)—in this case the Hebrew is זא, and not זא as in Lev 26:12. It stands to reason that in Lev 26:12 also the original lexical choice preserved in 4QLXXLev⁴ was changed in the majority tradition to accord with the vocabulary elsewhere in the LXX. In another detail, however, 4QLXXLev⁴ equals the majority LXX tradition: neither text renders the lamed of λαὸς which is not needed in Greek.

Lev 26:13 τῶν γυνῶν τοῦ δεσμοῦ = LXX (τῶν γυνῶν τοῦ δεσμοῦ LXXmaj. text cf. MT SP). Probably the equivalent of the earlier tradition as reflected in 4QLXXLev⁴ an LXX Maj. text was adapted in the majority manuscript tradition of the LXX to the regular equivalent of λαὸς in the LXX, viz., γυνῶς. The earlier translation does not constitute a precise representation of MT. The two translations have in common the understanding that γυναῖκα is a singular form, probably reflecting a reading γυναῖκα. This understanding, although deviating from Ezek 34:27, may be supported by such verses as Jer 28:10, 12.

Lev 26:15 προστάγματα μου J κρίματι μου LXX, χειρὶ MT SP. The regular equivalent of χειρὶ in the LXX is κρίμα, while προστάγμα (4QLXXLev⁴) usually reflects רצון and פה (and only 3 times χειρὶ 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 (κρίμα – χειρὶ, προστάγμα – פה). The context in which χειρὶ, פה, and προστάγμα appear may have contributed to this unusual equivalent in the scroll which probably reflects the original translation. Less likely is the assumption that προστάγματα reflects a variant χειρὶ, for which cf. v 14. Wevers, Notes, 445 considers the reading of the scroll a “careless mistake.”

2b. 4QLXXLev⁴ probably reflects a Hebrew variant

Lev 26:4 τῶν ἔξωμος καρπῶν τῶν πεσώσαντος (ἀπόδοσις τῶν καρπῶν αὐτῶν) LXX – γὰρ (ὑπὲρ τοῦ τέλους) τῶν καρπῶν αὐτῶν LXX – γὰρ (ὑπὲρ τοῦ τέλους) τῶν καρπῶν αὐτῶν MT SP. The last word before the lacuna in 4QLXXLev⁴ cannot be read easily. It is not impossible that it represents καρπῶν, in which case the scroll reflects a different reading or a change in the sequence of words. 4QLXXLev⁴ could reflect τῶν καρπῶν αὐτῶν, although τῶν καρπῶν would have been expected (for the reconstructed τῶν καρπῶν αὐτῶν cf. Gen 1:11). The phrase ὁ ἔξωμος καρπῶν of 4QLXXLev⁴ is frequently used in secular Greek (cf. LSJ, p. 1191) and may therefore reflect a free rendering. The ancient character of 4QLXXLev⁴ is supported by the unusual equivalent: ἔξωμος is used in the LXX for γὰρ, not only as an
adjective, but also as a neuter noun (cf., e.g., Deut 28:42 πῶντα τὰ ξύλινα σω (ἐν) and 1 Macc 10:30). In any event, the main manuscripts of the LXX equal MT, with the exception of the representation of γν in the plural.

Lev 26:11 βδελυγμαί = LXX MS 126 (βδελυγμαί) Arab 1 βδελυγμαῖται ἡ φυλή μου LXX – MT SP. The reading of the scroll (note the agreement with the main LXX tradition in the choice of the verb) may reflect an early variant παρῆλθε, which could be original, in which case the reading of MT SP = LXX could reflect a euphemistic anti-anthropomorphic correction (for which cf. T Tyrmym), such as elsewhere in T. In these cases the correction adds an intermediary entity (παρῆλθε) in MT, avoiding the direct mentioning of God himself. In T ad loc. αὐτῷ reflects παρῆλθε, but elsewhere it is added as an additional entity (like the addition in T of ἐκαθάρισε and ἀφε endif). 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 ἐσορά [αι] καὶ ἐπερφατήσω ἐν ἐμῖν καὶ ἐσοράθη θεός LXX – MT SP. There is no room in the lacuna in the Qumran scroll for a rendering of ἐπερφατήσω· ἐν ἐμῖν, 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/ πῶντα τὰ] προστάγματα μου ] + ταῦτα LXX – MT SP. The addition of ταῦτα in the LXX probably represents an approximation to MT, as διὰ ταῦτα may have been lacking in the Vorlage of the scroll. At the same time, it is unclear whether the scroll reflects διὰ ταῦτα or διὰ ταʼ.

3. 4QLXXLev⁴ represents the Hebrew more closely than the “LXX”

Lev 26:6 καὶ παλαίων οὐ διὰ κόσμου εἰς τῆς γῆς ἐμῖων. In 4QLXXLev⁴ this phrase occurs at the end of v 6 as in MT SP ἀλλὰ ἐν τῷ πολεμῷ οὐ εἰς τῆς γῆς ἐμῖων, while the LXX has the phrase at the beginning of the verse. Both sequences may be defended. In a way, the phrase follows naturally in a natural way in the LXX. Alternatively, also in MT SP and 4QLXXLev⁴ the phrase comes appropriately at the end of v 6 before διὰ τὰ πολεμῶν. It is not impossible that one of the two sequences may have been created by a textual misstep. Note, for example, that like the phrase under consideration, v 5 ends with τοῖς θεράμασιν.

Lev 26:12 καὶ πάλαια τὰ = MT SP καὶ πάλαια παλαιῶν (πῶντα) LXX (ἐν) 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 θεράμας] μου λαοῖς LXX – ἐν] ἐν μοὶ LXX. ἐν is more precisely rendered by μοι in 4QLXXLev⁴ than by μου in the LXX.

4. Indecisive evidence

Lev 26:6 [δὲ] ἐκφόβοι μη ἐκφόβοι LXX – ἐκφόβοι μη MT. In this phrase MT usually does not have an object, while the LXX occasionally adds one, e.g., Jer 46 (26):27 καὶ ἀντιεἰς τὸ παρενοχλητὸν αὐτῶν (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 תֵּבִּֽה. The LXX is more elegant.\textsuperscript{23}

5. \textit{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),\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{25} There is very little evidence for the alternative suggestion (see n. 25) that 4QLXXLev$^a$ reflects an early revision (§ 3).

\beta. 4QpapLXXLev$^b$\textsuperscript{26}

1. \textit{4QpapLXXLev$^b$ and the OG have a common background}

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

\begin{itemize}
  \item Lev 3:9 σὺν ταῖς [βοῶμεν] - MT SP
  \item Lev 3:11 ὁσμῇ [η] ἐκσκίδοντος cf. LXX ὁσμῇ ἐκσκίδοντος - ἄνεντα MT SP
  \item Lev 4:7 παρα τῷ [ήν] βάσιν - ἀντὶ ἀνέντα MT SP (note the preposition)
  \item Lev 4:7 παρα ταῖς [θύρας] - (ἦν ἀνεντα) MT SP
\end{itemize}

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

\textsuperscript{24} Thus also Metso–Ulrich, “Leviticus,” 265.

\textsuperscript{25} We thus adhere to the view of Ulrich, \textit{DJD} IX, 163 (preceded by Skehan, “Manuscripts,” 158): “Though none of these readings is accepted into the Göttingen \textit{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.

\textsuperscript{26} The analysis refers only to the preserved part of the scroll, and not to the reconstructions in \textit{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 παραδών παράδογγ (see below); \textit{ibid.}, τῇ; 5:22 ὅτε (τοι is possible as well); 5:24 η should possibly be inserted.
Lev 4:28 εν αυτη | om MT and “the Three”; SP = ν 14 (LXX: εν αυτη). In ν 23 the same expression is likewise rendered by εν αυτη.

Lev 4:28 χειμαρνον cf. χειμαρνω LXX | + `אנה נまとめ MT SP

Lev 4:28 χειμαρνον (LXX: χειμαρνω) εξ αιγαν – χειμαρνι την μεση γη MT SP. The combination of these two nouns occurs elsewhere in Lev 4:29 (not in MT SP) and 5:6 (στηριξι χειμαρ). Note the reverse sequence in the Greek texts (= SP ad loc. and in 4:32).

Lev 4:28 περι της αμαρτιας – αμαρτα SP. The two Greek versions do not represent the pronoun.

Lev 5:8 το νου σφονδυλου – σφονδυλον 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 [το δε καταλακτον] το αμαρτας – αμαρτας MT SP. Note the representation of -ς with the Greek genitive.

Lev 5:9 αμαρτας γαρ εστιν – αμαρτας MT SP (א). Note the addition of γαρ (cf. 5:11 גאר – גאר LXX) and the case-ending of the noun.

Lev 5:19 πελεμελησιν ευνουχην | ευνουχην | ευνουχη | ευνουχη MT SP

Lev 5:23 (6:4) πελεμελησιν – ευνουχη MT SP

Lev 5:21 (6:2) και νουτας – δε το πλεονεκρον MT SP. The Hebrew (meaning unclear) and Greek words occur only here.

Lev 5:21 (6:2) πελεμελησιν ευνουχην | ευνουχην | ευνουχη | ευνουχη MT SP. Note both the translation equivalent and the preposition (ευνουχην is also often used elsewhere in the LXX with verbs of sinning; for αμαρτας see i.a. Gen 39:9 and Exod 10:16).

Lev 5:23 (6:4) ἡπικα αν – αν 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 εκ σι μειδολεως – μειδολον MT SP

Lev 2:4 οργους αζυμοις – αζυμοις MT SP (אינ)

Lev 2:4 πεφυραμενους – πεφυραμενον MT SP

Lev 2:5 μειδολης – μειδολον MT SP

Lev 2:4 και λα ρας – λα ρα MT SP
Lev 3:4 τών μηρίων – MT SP
Lev 3:10 τῶν μηρίων – MT SP

Lev 3:5 καὶ τῶν λιθῶν – MT SP (στόχευς)
Lev 3:10 καὶ τῶν λιθῶν – MT SP (στόχευς)

Lev 3:9 τῆς κοκλίας – MT SP
Lev 4:6 καταπέπεσαν – MT SP
Lev 4:27 ἀκούσαις – MT SP
Lev 5:9 καὶ ἰδεῖ – ἔστω MT SP
Lev 5:18 ἥς ἐγράφατο – ἔστω MT SP
Lev 5:23 ἀδίκημα – ἔστω MT SP (σύμπεσι). Other LXX equivalents are ἀδίκια and ἀδίκος.

2. 4QpapLXXLev\textsuperscript{b} reflects the OG, while the main LXX tradition probably reflects a revision

Lev 2:5 σεμιδάλευς πεφυραμένη – LXX σεμιδάλευς πεφυραμένη – τὴν σεμιδάλευς MT SP. The main LXX reading (nominative) probably corrected the earlier genetive.

Lev 3:4 τῶν ἁπατατός – LXX τῶν ἁπατός – ἔστω MT SP.

Lev 3:11 ἀσμάτων – LXX ἀσμάτων, τῆς αἰματείρας (τῆς αἰματείρας)
MT SP (τῆς αἰματείρας). The two texts reflect a different understanding of the relation between the segments in the sentence. For 4QpapLXXLev\textsuperscript{b} this was one continuous sentence, with τὴν as the object of the verb, while for the LXX τὴν started a nominal phrase. Since the LXX reflects the Masoretic accents, possibly the scroll reflected an earlier similar understanding.

Lev 3:12 οἰκίου LXX – ἔστω MT SP
Lev 4:27 οἰκίου LXX – ἔστω MT SP

In this discrepancy between 4QpapLXXLev\textsuperscript{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:\textsuperscript{27}

\textsuperscript{27} For a detailed analysis, see H. Stegemann, \textit{ΚΥΡΙΟΣ Ο ΘΕΟΣ ΚΥΡΙΟΣ ΙΗΣΟΥΣ—Aufkommen und Ausbreitung des religiösen Gebrauchs von KΥΡΙΟΣ 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-Hebrew or in the square Aramaic script.

2. κύριος, usually without the article, especially in the nominative, and less frequently with the article.

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. This practice, reflected in both Hebrew and Greek sources, indicates reverence for the ineffable name of God.

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 Ια. 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." 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 Ια by κύριος by Christian scribes. On the other hand, according to Stegemann and Skehan, Ια reflects the earliest attested stage in the history of the LXX transition, when the name of God was represented by its transliteration, just like any other personal name in the LXX. Skehan, ibid., p. 29 provided important early parallels for the use of Ια and similar forms representing the Tetragrammaton: Diodorus of Sicily I.29.2 (1st century BCE) records that Moses referred his laws to τὸν Ια

---

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 81Hev XII 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, KYPIOΣ.

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, KYPIOΣ, 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]).


34 Stegemann, KYPIOΣ, 197; P. W. Skehan, “The Divine Name at Qumran, in the Masada Scroll, and in the Septuagint,” BIOSCS 13 (1980) 14–44.
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\[ \text{ἐπικαλούμενον θεόν; likewise, in his commentary on Ps 2:2, Origen speaks about Ιαχ (PG 12:1104) and Ιαω (GCS, Origenes 4:53); and two onomastica used Ιαω as an explanation of Hebrew theophoric names (for full details, see Skehan). The later magical papyri likewise invoke Ιαω. In a similar vein, Stegemann gives a long list of arguments in favor of the assumption of the priority of the transliteration.} \]

This transliteration reflects an unusual pronunciation of the Tetragrammaton for which cf. the form in the Elephantine papyri (\( \text{why} \)).

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

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Lev 4:7} & \quad \text{τῆς [καρπηθείς = ἀρπάξας MT SP] LXX τῶν ἀρπαξάντων} \\
\text{Lev 4:10} & \quad \text{[τῆς καρπηθείς = LXX; πᾶν MT SP]} \\
\text{Lev 4:18} & \quad \text{καρπηθεῖσα \( \epsilon \\) LXX, \( \eta \) πᾶν MT SP}
\end{align*}
\]

The regular LXX equivalent for \( \text{ḥlên} \) is \( \text{oJlokautwma} \) (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 \( 4Q\text{papLXXLev}^b \)), subsequently replaced in most manuscripts with the standard LXX equivalent ἀρπαξάντων.

3. Indecisive evidence

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Lev 4:4} & \quad \text{καὶ εἰσάει \( \epsilon \) καὶ προσάει LXX – ἀνάπτυχε MT SP} \\
\text{Lev 4:27} & \quad \text{οὐ \( \text{πνεύματα} \) \( \epsilon \\) \( \eta \) LXX – πνεῦμα ἀλλ' ῥα \\ \text{MT SP. Without \( \eta \), probably omitted by mistake in \( 4Q\text{papLXXLev}^b \) 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.}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Lev 5:21 (6:2)} & \quad \text{καὶ \( \tau \{\text{Ο} \\text{ῳ} \) (παράδον παράδος) τὰς \( \text{κιντολάς κυρίου} \) LXX – \text{τὰς ἐν τῇ ἀρχῇ τῶν \( \text{LXX} \) – \( \text{καὶ Μὴ} \) \( \text{τὰς \( \text{κιντολάς} \) κυρίου} \) MT SP. The two Greek texts differ regarding the preposition and probably also the verbs. There is no room for the added \( \text{κιντολάς} \) of the LXX in the lacuna in \( 4Q\text{papLXXLev}^b \). The papyrus probably did not read παράδον παράδος in the lacuna, as reconstructed in \( \text{DJD IX, 176} \), and not occurring in the LXX with \( \epsilon \), but rather \( \text{ἀρπαξάντω} \) (used with this preposition as an equivalent of \( \text{τὰς \( \text{κιντολάς} \) κυρίου} \) in 1 Chron 2:7 and Ezek 39:23).}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Lev 5:21} & \quad \text{ἡδηκησθεῖν \( \eta \) \( \text{ἐδικησθεῖν} \) LXX – \( \piσσά} \ MT SP}
\end{align*}
\]

4. Analysis

\[ ^{35} \text{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 IAW cannot be considered a change of an original form out of reverence to the divine name, since the use of the equivalent of \( \text{why} \) 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\textsuperscript{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\textsuperscript{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\textsuperscript{b} reflects a revision of the LXX can probably be made only in 5:21 \( \kappa \iota \zeta \tau [o] \upsilon \lambda \omega \). Probably the most convincing case for the ancient character of the Qumran text is the presentation of the divine name as \( \lambda \omega \).

\( \gamma \). 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 \([ \kappa \alpha \iota \tau \sigma \rho \omega \delta \varepsilon \iota \alpha \nu \ \alpha \iota \nu \varsigma \varsigma ] \) – 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 \( \epsilon \nu \alpha \iota \varsigma \varsigma \).

Num 4:8 \([ \kappa \alpha \tau \beta \alpha \lambda \alpha \varsigma \varsigma \iota \nu \tau \varsigma \nu \] \) – 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 \([ \kappa \alpha \alpha \tau \alpha \tau \tau \alpha \theta \zeta \alpha \mu ] = LXX – MT SP

Num 4:7 \([ \tau \rho \alpha \tau \zeta \zeta \alpha \nu \] \) – MT SP. This rendering occurs elsewhere in Exodus 37:10 (38:9), 39:36 (17) LXX\textsuperscript{B}.

Num 4:7 \([ \tau \rho \theta \varsigma \alpha \iota \alpha \lambda ] \) – MT SP. This equivalence occurs also in Exodus (2 x) and Numbers (5 x).  
Num 4:7 \([ \tau \rho \varsigma \varsigma \theta \alpha \iota \varsigma \varsigma \varsigma ] \) – MT SP (\( \tau \varsigma \varsigma \zeta \zeta \)). This equivalence occurs elsewhere in Exodus (3 x) and Jer 52:19.

Num 4:8 \([ \iota \eta \tau \varsigma \nu \tau ] \) – MT SP.

Num 4:12 \([ \sigma \kappa \varepsilon \eta \tau \lambda \iota \] \) – MT SP (\( \tau \varsigma \zeta \varsigma \zeta \)). This equivalence recurs only in 2 Chr 24:14.

Num 4:16 \([ \kappa \alpha \tau \varepsilon \nu \mu \alpha \mu \zeta ] = LXX – MT SP.\)
2. 4QLXXNum reflects an earlier text

Num 3:40 ἀρηθμεύω LXX — ἡς MT SP. ἐπισκέπτομαι is the standard equivalent of ἡς in the main manuscript tradition of the LXX of all the books, in which ἀρηθμεύω is the main equivalent of ἡς. 4QLXXNum inconsistently used for ἡς both ἀρηθμεύω in 3:40 and ἐπισκέπτομαι in 3:42.30 The evidence suggests that 4QLXXNum reflects an earlier stage of the transmission when the equivalents of ἡς had not yet been standardized. The possibility of a change in the reverse direction, suggested by Wevers, “Early Revision,” 238* is less likely. Note that the two verbs are used in the same context in a description of the census in 2 Samuel 24 (ἀρηθμεύω v 1 [ἡς]; ἐπισκέπτομαι vv 2, 4 [ἡς]), a situation which underlines their parallelism.

Num 4:6 [ὁρθηρος] ἁναφορεῖς LXX; ἡς MT SP
Num 4:8 ὁρθηρος ἁναφορεῖς LXX; ἡς MT SP
Num 4:11 ὁρθηρος ἁναφορεῖς LXX; ἡς MT SP
Num 4:12 ὁρθηρος ἁναφορεῖς LXX; ἡς MT SP

One of the two renderings systematically replaced the other, but it is hard to determine the direction of the substitution. Possibly ὁρθηρο in 4QLXXNum constitutes the original reading (it occurs in the LXX only in Neh 4:11 for ἡς) and ἁναφορεῖς the correction. This assumption is supported by the fact that ἁναφορεῖς occurs in the early Greek revisions for ἡς in Exod 30:4 (Th) and 39:35 (οἱ λῆς) and for ἡς 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 ἡς. The reverse assumption that ἁναφορεῖς is the original rendering and ὁρθηρο the correction was suggested by Skehan, “4QNumLXX,” 46, and Wevers, “Early Revision,” 236–7*. According to Wevers, the early reviser conceived of ἁναφορεῖς 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 θήρουσιν καὶ ἐμβαλοῦσιν LXX; ἡς MT SP

The equivalent of the LXX for ἡς 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 δειμβάλλω [1 x]; ἐπιβάλλω [2 x]; ἔπιβαλλω [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 ἐπιθήρουσιν occurs also in v 10 (MT SP ἡς).

3. 4QLXXNum is closer to MT SP

36 In codex A ἀρηθμεύω occurs nine times in Numbers 2 as well as in Num 3:15, 16 for ἡς 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 πρωτὸν τοκοφ άραν – πᾶν πρωτόκολλον άραν MT SP | πάντα τά πρωτότοκα τά άραν LXX (the singular form of this noun is found also in the first part of this verse).

Num 4:7 επί α[ίτην – τίν SP ] τρ LXX

3b. Possibly different Vorlage

Num 4:14 SP = LXX add a large plus καὶ λήψεσαι ... επί ἀναφορέως lacking in MT SP 4QLXXNum.

Num 4:9 [τήν λειχνίαν τῇ]ς φαύσεως cf. τοῦ φωτος LXX (possibly reflecting an etymologizing rendering ῥαμάζ); MT SP: ῥαμάζ (κρίνη SP). The rendering ῥαμάζ = φαύσεως 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 επί α[ίτην – τίν SP ] ὀλοπόρφυρον LXX; τίν SP

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

Num 4:14 τά στάσεια ταν καλυπτήρα LXX; καλυπτήρα MT SP (στάσεια). καλυπτήρα (covering) is an inappropriate equivalent, while στάσεια (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 ὀλον ἀκκίνθιον in Num 4:6 where it renders ἀκραζ.

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 דַּעְתִּי – καὶ χαρῆσαι ἡ καρδία αὐτοῦ LXX  
   καὶ χαρᾶται 8HevXII gr

   Hab 1:17 מִרְאֶה – διὰ τοῦτο LXX  
   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 פִּנְי – καὶ ἐξαλοῦνται LXX  
   καὶ κοφθέρει 8HevXII gr

   Hab 2:1 נַבּוּר – καὶ ἐπιβήσομαι LXX  
   καὶ στηλάσουμαι 8HevXII gr.

   The correction is based on the equivalent נב – στήλη 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).
The correction was based on a distinction between the equivalences ἕπι — κρατ — and ἐστε — συνλαμβάνω passim in the LXX.

The correction was based on the understanding that ἔστερ — was reserved to the root ἐστ (cf. ἔστερος, ἐσφραγίζω — ἐσφραγίζω 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 σεφίζεις LXX — εἰς ἄσεβεῖς LXX
  εἰς ἀδικίαν 8HevXII gr
- Hab 1:15 μαντεῖας LXX — ἐν ταῖς σαγηναῖς αὕτων LXX
  ἐν τῇ σαγήνῃ αὕτων 8HevXII gr
- Hab 2:2 ἐν οἷς LXX (cf. Deut 27:8 LXX)
  καὶ ἐκφώνειν οὐχ ἐκφώνειν ἢ θάνοι 8HevXII 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 Nahal Hever 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 Nahal Hever 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 8HevXII 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 Nahal Hever 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, 4QpapLXXLev; 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 Nahal Hever 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, 8HevXII 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 Nahal Hever 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,
among them proto-Masoretic texts, while those of the later sites of Nahal Hever, Wadi Sdeir, Murabba‘at, and Nahal Se‘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 8HevXII 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.