

Some Thoughts about the Diffusion of Biblical Manuscripts in Antiquity

Emanuel Tov

The purpose of this paper is to offer some thoughts on the diffusion of biblical manuscripts in antiquity and to find out whether our knowledge of the Dead Sea Scrolls aids us in understanding the state of affairs in the period when the scrolls were written as well as in earlier periods. The available evidence is limited, but nevertheless we will be able to obtain some valuable insights.

When speaking of the diffusion of the biblical scrolls, we refer to the number of copies that were circulating, their origin and possible patterns of distribution.

1. *The number of Scripture scrolls present at Qumran*

The number of Scripture texts circulating in Israel as a whole when the Dead Sea Scrolls were written is unknown, but the Judean Desert sites at least provide some clues for that region. Some 230 fragmentary biblical scrolls were found at Qumran alone and some 25 at other sites, totaling 255 scrolls. On the one hand, I would deduct around fifty from the list of Qumran texts that, in my view, are not biblical;¹ on the other hand, we would have to add an unknown number of texts that have perished since 68 CE. We therefore retain the number of 230 texts for Qumran.

In the last centuries BCE and the first century CE, Scripture books circulated separately, and while 230 sounds like a large number, these scrolls represent only individual books and not collections (complete Bibles, in modern parlance). This number equals approximately ten complete copies of the Bible if we calculate according to the traditional reckoning of twenty-four books in the Bible. This would be a very rough calculation since the biblical books are represented in the Judean Desert in different quantities. For example, the Torah is represented more frequently in the Judean Desert

¹ For example, I consider most of the Qumran Psalms texts to be liturgical and not biblical. By the same token, I would disregard scrolls containing only part of a book such as 4QDeut⁹ probably containing only the Song in Deuteronomy 32, and three scrolls containing only Psalm 119 (4QPs^g, 4QPs^h, 5QPs). All these are not Scripture scrolls in the usual sense of the word.

finds than the other books.² Further, some books are represented at Qumran by many copies,³ while others are only infrequently seen among the Qumran scrolls.⁴

The number of 230 biblical scrolls represents the sum total of the manuscripts found at Qumran when the community was destroyed in 68 CE. Since the material of the scrolls was preserved for many centuries in the dry climate of Qumran, the 230 items represent scrolls taken to Qumran during the whole period of its occupation as well as those written on site. This calculation pertains to the six or seven generations of settlement at Qumran, from 100–50 BCE onwards, according to the revised chronology of Magness,⁵ until 68 CE.

We now turn to some speculations regarding the scrolls found at Qumran. These speculations are interesting in their own right, and also have a bearing on scroll production in ancient Israel as a whole.

The dates assigned to the Qumran scrolls,⁶ summarized in Table 1, reveal the presence of differing numbers of scrolls in the various time periods, which may be interpreted in different ways.

Table 1
Number of dated biblical scrolls found at Qumran

250–200 BCE	3
199–150 BCE	12
149–100 BCE	16
99–50 BCE	40
49–1 BCE	46
1–50 CE	51
51–68 CE	5
Sum total	173

² Within the biblical corpus, a special interest in the Torah is visible at all the sites in the Judean Desert: 87 texts or 43.5 percent of the Qumran biblical corpus represent the books of the Torah. At sites other than Qumran this percentage is even greater: fifteen of the twenty-five biblical texts or 60.0 percent represent the Torah.

³ For example, Deuteronomy is represented by 30 copies and Isaiah by 21 copies,

⁴ For example, only two copies of Joshua and three copies of Judges were preserved at Qumran.

⁵ J. Magness, *The Archeology of Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002) 65. At an earlier stage of the research, the occupation of Qumran was usually accepted as being from 130 BCE following the chronology of R. de Vaux, *Archaeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Schweich Lectures, British Academy, 1959; London: Oxford University Press, 1973).

⁶ The numbers are based on the list of B. Webster, “Chronological Index of the Texts Found in the Judaean Desert,” in *The Texts from the Judaean Desert: Indices and an Introduction to the Discoveries in the Judaean Desert Series* (ed. E. Tov; DJD XXXIX; Oxford: Clarendon, 2002) 351–446.

Starting with the earliest scrolls found at Qumran, dating to 250–200 BCE, an increasingly larger number of scrolls was found for each subsequent period. The peak years of scroll production, at least for those found at Qumran, were between 100 BCE and 50 CE, again in ever-increasing numbers. These numbers reflect the copying of scrolls at Qumran and elsewhere and they refer only to the production date of the scrolls and not to the date of their introduction to the Qumran community. Nevertheless, there is a striking correlation between the peak years of Qumran scroll production and the dates of Qumran settlement (that is, in their most comprehensive understanding, between 100 BCE and 50 CE). In other words, the greatest number of scrolls was produced, at Qumran and elsewhere, while Qumran was inhabited. This situation implies that most scrolls were used and read close to the date of their production. The presence of older dated scrolls before the assumed occupancy at Qumran (100–50 BCE) requires a special explanation. The inhabitants must have taken these scrolls there. The relatively small number of early scrolls dating to the period before the beginning of settlement at Qumran (31 biblical scrolls) does not necessarily indicate that fewer scrolls were available in earlier centuries in ancient Israel. The evidence only shows that the inhabitants took with them a small number of such early scrolls. However, it is likely that fewer scrolls were indeed available in the century prior to habitation at Qumran. The equally small number of scrolls written after 50 CE may be due to the political turmoil in the country and the sudden destruction of the Qumran community. It is likely that fewer scrolls were produced in Palestine as a whole in those turbulent years.

The gradually increasing numbers of scrolls dated between 100 BCE and 50 CE show a growing scroll presence within the Qumran community, but this fact does not necessarily point to the diffusion of scrolls throughout Israel as a whole. Regardless of whether the main activity of the Qumran community was scroll production⁷ or whether the community merely produced and assembled scrolls in order to facilitate their religious activity, the fact remains that many scrolls were produced at Qumran itself. According to my own calculation, the Qumran community, either at Qumran or elsewhere, produced at

⁷ Thus H. Stegemann, *The Library of Qumran: On the Essenes, Qumran, John the Baptist, and Jesus* (Grand Rapids/Cambridge and Leiden/New York/Cologne: Eerdmans, 1998) 51–5.

least a third of the scrolls found at Qumran.⁸ If altogether some 170 biblical and non-biblical scrolls were indeed copied by the Qumran scribes, as I believe (see n. 8), this is not a large number for the 118–168 years of Qumran occupancy, averaging no more than one scroll per year.⁹

One additional factor needs to be considered for Qumran. It is natural that each subsequent generation would have possessed a greater number of scrolls, since they had not only the scrolls produced during their generation, but also those produced at earlier times. Accordingly, the scrolls left behind at Qumran in 68 CE represent the sum total of the scrolls taken to Qumran, and those produced there in earlier generations, including scrolls discarded but not destroyed during all those years. Indeed, we do not know how many of the Qumran scrolls had been discarded by the community and placed in a *genizah* at Qumran, like the two scrolls found under the floor of the synagogue at Masada.¹⁰

I now turn to the patterns of the possession of scrolls by the Judean Desert communities. At the Qumran site, which was probably inhabited between 100 BCE and 50 CE, biblical and non-biblical scrolls were found dating to the period between 250 BCE and 80 CE, while most of them are dated between 100 BCE and 50 CE. As stated above, the dates of scroll production correspond with those of the occupation of Qumran by the *yahad*. A similar assumption pertains to the later Judean Desert sites that preserve scrolls dated *later* than the Qumran scrolls. Thus, at the sites dating to the Bar Kochba revolt (132–135 CE), Wadi Murabba‘at, Wadi Sdeir, Naḥal Ḥever, Naḥal Arugot, and Naḥal Še’elim, scrolls were found that date to the period between 20 and 115 CE (see Table 2),¹¹ *averaging* to a later period than the Qumran scrolls. Table 2 also includes the Masada scrolls, for which the *terminus ante quem* is identical to that of Qumran, while the Masada scrolls have a later average date than those from Qumran.

⁸ *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert* (STDJ 54; Leiden/Boston: E. J. Brill, 2004) 263.

⁹ This point is stressed by P. S. Alexander, “Literacy among Jews in Second Temple Palestine. Reflections on the Evidence from Qumran,” in *Hamlet on a Hill. Semitic and Greek Studies Presented to Professor T. Muraoka on the Occasion of his Sixty-Fifth Birthday* (ed. M. F. J. Baasten and W. Th. van Peursen; OLA 118; Leuven: Peeters, 2003) 3–24 (6–7).

¹⁰ See my analysis “The Text of the Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek Bible Used in the Ancient Synagogues,” in my *Hebrew Bible, Greek Bible, and Qumran—Collected Essays* (TSAJ 121; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008) 171–88.

¹¹ XJudg^a is listed in the table, but not included in the calculation since its place of origin is unknown.

Table 2

Biblical scrolls found in the Judean Desert sites other than Qumran arranged by date

<i>Name</i>	<i>Dates ascribed to scrolls in the editions</i>	<i>Mid-point</i>	<i>Textual character</i>
XJudg ^a	30–1 BCE	16 BCE	MT
MurDeut	20–50 CE	35 CE	MT
MurIsa	20–84 CE	52 CE	MT
XJosh	40–68 CE	55 CE	MT
5/6HevNum ^a	50–68 CE	59 CE	MT
XHev/SeNum ^b	50–68 CE	59 CE	MT
XHev/SeDeut	50–68 CE	59 CE	MT
5/6HevPs	50–68 CE	59 CE	MT
ArugLev	50–68 CE ¹²	59 CE	MT
SdeirGen	50–100 CE	75 CE	MT
MurGen ^(a) (published as: Gen)	115 CE	115 CE	MT
MurNum	115 CE	115 CE	MT
MurXII	115 CE	115 CE	MT
MasPs ^b	50–25 BCE	37 BCE	MT
MasEzek	50–1 BCE	25 BCE	MT
MasLev ^a	30–1 BCE	16 BCE	MT
MasDeut	30–1 BCE	16 BCE	MT
MasPs ^a	30–1 BCE	16 BCE	MT
MasLev ^b	30 BCE–30 CE	1 CE	MT

The pattern emerging from Tables 1 and 2 is that the Judean Desert communities possessed both recent and older scrolls (those written 100 years or more earlier). We lack the necessary controls, and among other things we do not know which of the Judean Desert scrolls had been removed from general use (discarded) before being left behind in the first and second centuries CE. The Bar-Kochba sites contained scrolls that were no older than 100 years when they were left behind, but we also found scrolls there that had been written as little as 20 years before the revolt. It is unlikely that the Bar Kochba sites, which were inhabited by migrant communities, contained discarded scrolls, but it would not be impossible. Accordingly, these communities moved around with relatively recent

¹² See H. Eshel et al., “Fragments of a Leviticus Scroll (ArugLev) Found in the Judean Desert in 2004,” *DSD* 13 (2006) 55–60 (57).

scrolls. Likewise, the inhabitants of Masada left behind in 70 CE a group of texts that were at most 85 years old, while some were written some 30–35 years before the destruction of the community.

At Qumran, we reveal a different picture. The Qumran community preserved many scrolls that were copied prior to their habitation at Qumran, and these scrolls remained there for the duration of the settlement. According to the list in *DJD XXXIX*,¹³ no less than 86 biblical *and non-biblical* texts (34 of which are written in the Cryptic A script) have been assigned a mid-point date before 100 BCE. These scrolls could have been taken to Qumran at any point during the settlement at the site, but they were likely taken there at the beginning. Most Qumran scrolls, however, were produced during the peak years of settlement. The modern concept of the turnover of older books in favor of newer ones does not apply to these communities, since old and newer scrolls were used in conjunction with one another. In the case of Scripture, it would stand to reason that older copies would be used more often than new ones, but we have no clues as to how the different types of scrolls were used by the Qumran community. We do not know whether the *yahad* members singled out certain choice scrolls for use by the community in its religious gatherings, while using other scrolls for private reading. Or possibly the members nevertheless distinguished between the different scrolls. For example, it would make sense for the members of the *yahad* to have used the large Isaiah scroll, which in my view was produced by community scribes, rather than 1QIsa^b when composing their community writings, but it is very hard to prove that assumption.

Returning to the concept of turnover, we do not know the community's approach to the various revisions of the *Community Rule*, the *War Scroll*, and the *Damascus Document*. If scholars would agree that the cave 1 scrolls represent the older copies, it would be a convenient assumption to surmise that that cave served as an archive for older copies, while the newer ones from cave 4 were in daily use.¹⁴ However, this is not the

¹³ See n. 6.

¹⁴ D. Stoeckl ben Ezra, "Old Caves and Young Caves—A Statistical Reevaluation of a Qumran Consensus," *DSD* 14 (2007) 313–33 takes a different approach when studying "the average scroll age" of each individual cave. In his analysis, both caves 1 and 4 are "old caves" because he looks at the average age of all the scrolls found in a specific cave.

case, since scholars approach the relation between the cave 1 and cave 4 copies of these compositions in different ways.¹⁵

The Judean Desert communities possessed different types of biblical scrolls, making it even more difficult to describe the diffusion of scrolls in ancient Israel as a whole. However, the finds at Qumran illustrate certain aspects of scroll circulation; some types of scrolls were in greater circulation because the community or communities using them copied them more frequently than, or to the exclusion of, other scrolls.

The differing textual character of the manuscripts found at Qumran and at the other Judean Desert sites can be recognized best by contrasting the scrolls that are dated to exactly the same period from Qumran to those from the other sites, from 35 BCE (mid-point) until 70 CE. For this period, the communities at the Bar-Kochba sites and Masada possessed only proto-Masoretic texts (Table 2), while Qumran displays only a minority of proto-Masoretic texts (Table 3). Thus, the differences between Qumran and the other sites are not chronological, as is often claimed,¹⁶ but socio-religious. We have voiced this assumption also in the past (see n. 16), but have not shown its validity by contrasting manuscript finds from exactly the same period.

Table 3

The scrolls found at Qumran dating to the same period as scrolls from other sites in the Judean Desert¹⁷

<i>Qumran manuscript</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Mid-point</i>	<i>Textual character</i>
4QRP ^b	40–10 BCE	26 BCE	QSP + SP/ind
4QRP ^c	40–10 BCE	26 BCE	QSP + ind

¹⁵ For some references to these views, see my study “The Writing of Early Scrolls. Implications for the Literary Analysis of Hebrew Scripture,” *Hebrew Bible, Greek Bible, and Qumran* (2008) 206–20 (212–3).

¹⁶ The claim that as time progresses there is a growing acceptance of the proto-MT text, often expressed in the literature with the term “stabilization,” is not supported by the Masada evidence that is contemporary with that of Qumran (for an example of the use of this term, see M. Greenberg, “The Stabilization of the Text of the Hebrew Bible Reviewed in the Light of the Biblical Materials from the Judean Desert,” *JAOS* 76 [1956] 157–67). Rather, it shows a predominance of texts identical to the medieval MT in contrast to the virtual lack of such texts at Qumran. On the other hand, Qumran preserves a great number of proto-MT texts that are *close* to the medieval text (see Table 3). For the distinction between the two types of text, see my studies “The Text of the Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek Bible” (n. 10 above) and “The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Textual History of the Masoretic Bible” (forthcoming).

¹⁷ The scrolls are arranged chronologically according to their mid-point. The following characterizations are used: MT, LXX, ind(ependent), — (insufficient data). In this table, “MT” refers to texts that are close to the medieval MT, while the MT texts in Table 2 are identical to that text.

4QRP ^d	40–10 BCE	26 BCE	ind
4QNum ^b	50–1 BCE	25 BCE	QSP + SP/LXX
4QIsa ^g	50–1 BCE	25 BCE	„MT“/LXX
4QDeut ^h	50–1 BCE	25 BCE	ind
4QDeut ^m	50–1 BCE	25 BCE	QSP + ind
4QPs ^l	50–1 BCE	25 BCE	ind?
4QJob ^b	50–1 BCE	25 BCE	—
4QDeut ^q	50 BCE–10 CE	20 BCE	LXX
4QXII ^g	35–1 BCE	18 BCE	QSP? + ind
2QNum ^b	30–1 BCE	15 BCE	QSP?
4QDeut ^{k1}	30–1 BCE	15 BCE	QSP + ind
4QDeut ^{k2}	30–1 BCE	15 BCE	QSP + ind
4QDeut ⁿ	30–1 BCE	15 BCE	ind
4QJudg ^b	30–1 BCE	15 BCE	„MT“
4QPs ^o	30–1 BCE	15 BCE	QSP?
4QLam	30 BCE–1 CE	15 BCE	QSP + ind
4QIsa ^e	30–1 BCE	15 BCE	„MT“/LXX
4QJer ^c	30–1 BCE	15 BCE	„MT“
11QPs ^b	30–1 BCE	15 BCE	QSP + ind
4QCant ^b	15 BCE	15 BCE	ind
4QDan ^d	25–1 BCE	13 BCE	ind?
4QProv ^a	50 BCE–30 CE	10 BCE	„MT“
4Q[Gen-]Exod ^b	30 BCE–20 CE	5 BCE	QSP + ind/LXX
4QPs ^q	30 BCE–30 CE	1 BCE	ind
4QProv ^b	30 BCE–50 CE	10 CE	“MT”
4QRuth ^b	30 BCE–50 CE	10 CE	„MT“/LXX
11QEzek	10 BCE–30 CE	10 CE	„MT“
4QGen ^k	1–30 CE	15 CE	ind
4QExod ^j	1–30 CE	15 CE	—
4QDeut ^g	1–25 CE	15 CE	„MT“/SP
4QEzek ^b	1–30 CE	15 CE	„MT“?
2QGen	30 BCE–68 CE	20 CE	—
8QGen	30 BCE–68 CE	20 CE	—
2QExod ^a	30 BCE–68 CE	20 CE	—
2QExod ^b	30 BCE–68 CE	20 CE	QSP?/ind?
2QNum ^c	30 BCE–68 CE	20 CE	—
2QDeut ^b	30 BCE–68 CE	20 CE	—
2QJer	30 BCE–68 CE	20 CE	QSP/ind
3QEzek	30 BCE–68 CE	20 CE	—
2QPs	30 BCE–68 CE	20 CE	—
4QPs ^h	30 BCE–70 CE	20 CE	—
2QJob	30 BCE–68 CE	20 CE	—
3QLam	30 BCE–68 CE	20 CE	—
4QPs ^p	30 BCE–68 CE	20 CE	—
4QPs ^r	30 BCE–68 CE	20 CE	ind
4QpapGen or papJub ⁱ ?	30 BCE–68 CE	20 CE	—
11QpaleoLev ^a	1–50 CE	25 CE	ind

11QPs ^a	1–50 CE	25 CE	ind
11QPs ^c	1–50 CE	25 CE	ind
5QIsa	15 BCE –70 CE	27 CE	—
2QDeut ^c	1–68 CE	35 CE	QSP?
4QDan ^b	20–50 CE	35 CE	ind?
4QGen ^c	20–68 CE	44 CE	„MT“/SP
5QAmos (= 5QXII)	1–100 CE	50 CE	—
3QPs	1–100 CE	50 CE	—
5QPs	1–100 CE	50 CE	—
8QPs	1–100 CE	50 CE	—
2QNum ^a	30–68 CE	50 CE	—
4QIsa ^c	30–68 CE	50 CE	QSP/ind
4QIsa ^d	30–68 CE	50 CE	„MT“/LXX
4QPs ^b	30–68 CE	50 CE	ind
4QPs ^e	30–68 CE	50 CE	ind
11QPs ^d	30–68 CE	50 CE	QSP?/ind
11QLev ^b	50 CE	50 CE	ind?
11QDeut	50 CE	50 CE	—
4QDeut ^j	50 CE	50 CE	QSP/ind
4QDeut ^{k3}	50 CE	50 CE	—
4QPs ^g	50 CE	50 CE	MT
4QPs ^j	50 CE	50 CE	—
4QPs ^u	50 CE	50 CE	—
6QpapPs?	50 CE	50 CE	—
2QRuth ^a	50 CE	50 CE	„MT“/LXX
6QCant	50 CE	50 CE	ind
5QLam ^a	50 CE	50 CE	—
6QpapDan	50 CE	50 CE	ind
4QPs ^c	50–68 CE	59 CE	„MT“
4QPs ^s	50–68 CE	59 CE	—
4QPs ^t	50–68 CE	59 CE	—
4QGen ^b	30–100 CE	65 CE	„MT“
4QExod ^k	30–135 CE	82 CE ¹⁸	—

A comparison of Tables 2 and 3 enables us to determine that:

1. The Bar Kochba sites (Table 2), which are later than Qumran, naturally include a number of texts that are later than the Qumran texts;
2. Qumran contains a wide range of biblical texts of different textual nature, unlike the other Judean Desert sites that contain only proto-Masoretic texts;

¹⁸ In *DJD* XII (1994) 151, J. E. Sanderson asserts: “...is not impossible . . . that this is a stray piece from one of the caves of the Second Revolt.”

3. During the period that Qumran was inhabited by the *yahad*, more scrolls were produced locally and taken to Qumran than before or afterwards. This point is further corroborated by the data in Table 4, which records the texts written in the Qumran Scribal Practice (QSP). This table presents the remarkable chronological distribution of the biblical scrolls written in the QSP.¹⁹

Table 4
The chronological distribution of the biblical scrolls written
*in the Qumran Scribal Practice*²⁰

<i>Qumran manuscript</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Mid-point</i>	<i>Textual character</i>
4QQoh ^a	175–150 BCE	162 BCE	QSP + ind
1QIsa ^a	150–100 BCE	125 BCE	QSP + ind
4QSam ^c	100–75 BCE	87 BCE	QSP + ind
4QIsa ^c	85 BCE	85 BCE	QSP + ind
4QXII ^c	75 BCE	75 BCE	QSP + ind
4QXII ^e	75–50 BCE	62 BCE	QSP + ind
4QNum ^b	50–1 BCE	25 BCE	QSP + SP/LXX
4QDeut ^m	50–1 BCE	25 BCE	QSP + ind
4QXII ^g	35–1 BCE	18 BCE	QSP? + ind
2QNum ^b	30–1 BCE	15 BCE	QSP?
4QDeut ^{k1}	30–1 BCE	15 BCE	QSP + ind
4QDeut ^{k2}	30–1 BCE	15 BCE	QSP + ind
4QPs ^o	30–1 BCE	15 BCE	QSP?
4QLam	30 BCE–1 CE	15 BCE	QSP + ind
11QPs ^b	30–1 BCE	15 BCE	QSP + ind
4Q[Gen-]Exod ^b	30 BCE–20 CE	5 BCE	QSP + ind/LXX
2QExod ^b	30 BCE–68 CE	20 CE	QSP? + ind?
2QJer	30 BCE–68 CE	20 CE	QSP + ind
11QPs ^c	1–50 CE	25 CE	QSP? + ind
11QPs ^a	1–50 CE	25 CE	QSP + ind
2QDeut ^c	1–68 CE	35 CE	QSP?
4QIsa ^c	30–68 CE	50 CE	QSP + ind
4QDeut ^j	50 CE	50 CE	QSP + ind
11QPs ^d	30–68 CE	50 CE	QSP? + ind
1QDeut ^a	—		QSP

¹⁹ These data were not included in my analysis in *Scribal Practices*, 261–73.

²⁰ The assumption that a scroll is written in the QSP is recorded in this table (sometimes with “?”) together with an indication of its textual character (“ind”, “LXX”).

4QPhyl A	200 BCE–50 CE	75 BCE	QSP
4QPhyl B	200 BCE–50 CE	75 BCE	QSP
4QPhyl G-I	200 BCE–50 CE	75 BCE	QSP?
4QPhyl J-K	200 BCE–50 CE	75 BCE	QSP
4QPhyl L-N	200 BCE–50 CE	75 BCE	QSP
4QPhyl O	200 BCE–50 CE	75 BCE	QSP
4QPhyl P	200 BCE–50 CE	75 BCE	QSP
4QPhyl Q	200 BCE–50 CE	75 BCE	QSP

When taking 100 BCE–68 CE as the period of settlement at Qumran, the great majority of the scrolls written in the QSP were written within that period (22 texts). Only two scrolls were written earlier (1QIsa^a and 4QQoh^a).²¹ If the scrolls designated as QSP were indeed copied by the Qumran community, their assigned dates corroborate that assumption. A similar picture obtains for the non-biblical Qumran scrolls (see the Appendix).

Remarkably, only four of the 134 *non*-biblical texts written in the QSP (see the Appendix) fall outside the chronological framework of the settlement at Qumran, viz. 4QDibHam^a, 4QT^b, 4QVisSam, and 4QSap-Hymn Work A.²² Circular reasoning in matters paleographical needs to be considered a possibility if indeed scholars were hesitant to date texts to before or after the assumed period of settlement. However, all the texts were dated before the publication of Magness's revised chronology (see n. 5), when scholars were still ascribing the beginning of the settlement to 150–130 BCE. At that time, very few scrolls were ascribed to 150–100 BCE (the fifty additional years of assumed settlement), which probably implies that no circular reasoning was involved.

These few facts about the Judean Desert scrolls represent the extent of our knowledge about the communities who left the scrolls in the Judean Desert. We do not know whether the Essenes took *all* their scrolls to Qumran for safekeeping at a certain point, in which case the total number of Qumran scrolls would give us an indication of the number of scrolls owned by that community.

An even bigger question is how the number of scrolls found at Qumran and the other sites in the Judean Desert relates to the total number of scrolls throughout Israel. Would

²¹ One scroll was not dated, and the eight *tefillin* are not taken into consideration.

²² Ten texts included in the Appendix have not been dated.

these scrolls be a multiplication by a factor of two or ten of the number of the Judean Desert scrolls? We have no information with which to answer this major question.

Next, we turn to the question of the ownership of scrolls. In the last centuries BCE, with limited literacy, which was even more pronounced in earlier times, individuals would not have owned private scrolls.²³ Individuals did not have their own pre-Samaritan scrolls at home, or a copy such as 4QRP. I presume that Scripture scrolls were only found in intellectual centers such as the Qumran community, the Temple, houses of learning, and houses of religious gathering (synagogues). In these places, MT must have held a dominant position, and it must have been as dominant in certain circles as it was in the Judean Desert sites beyond Qumran. Even at Qumran a large number of scrolls were close to MT, although they were one stage removed from the text that was to become the medieval MT text. We do believe that there was a correlation between the strength and influence of the communities that produced and circulated the scrolls and the extent of their circulation. Thus, the stronger the influence of the Pharisees, the more scrolls of their assumed making were circulated in Israel. At the same time, we admit that we do not have a clue as to the absolute number of scrolls circulating in Israel beyond Qumran when that site was occupied by the *yahad*.

One might ask from which sources did the *yahad* members take the scrolls that scholars ascribe to an extra-Qumranic provenance. Did they derive from a center of learning, an archive, or specific scribes? I believe that the cave 7 scrolls came from a special archive, since that cave contained only Greek texts. At the same time, we know nothing of the origin of the Hebrew biblical and non-biblical texts taken to Qumran.

2. *The number of scrolls circulating before the settlement at Qumran*

In the first part of this study, we pointed out that the Qumran evidence provides some clues regarding the diffusion of manuscripts in the last centuries BCE and the first century CE. In the second part of this study, I turn to the number of scrolls circulating in ancient Israel in the centuries before the “Qumran era.” I submit that the Qumran scrolls may

²³ On the other hand, the evidence of 1 Macc 1:56-57 may indicate that at least some individuals did own private copies. In the religious persecutions of 166 BCE, copies of “the books of the Law” were burned (v 56) and individuals who owned the “Book of the Covenant” were killed.

mislead our thinking about the diffusion of manuscripts in ancient Israel. The Dead Sea Scrolls attest to an abundance of texts in the last two centuries BCE and the first century CE, but the reality of earlier centuries (seventh to third) must have been a far cry from that in the Qumran era. If the first part of this study was speculative, the second part is even more so.

The only facts available regarding the diffusion of scrolls for the period before the settlement at Qumran is the presence at that site of three biblical manuscripts dating to 250–200 BCE and twelve that date to 199–150 BCE. Altogether, 86 biblical and non-biblical texts (34 of which are written in the Cryptic A script) that have been assigned a mid-point date before 100 BCE were found at Qumran. There would have been many more manuscripts throughout ancient Israel in those early centuries, but how many? The further back we go in time, the fewer copies there would have been in circulation. We turn to some speculations regarding the number of biblical scrolls extant in ancient Israel in pre-exilic, exilic, and post-exilic times. This issue is usually not discussed in the literature, but one receives the impression that scholars conceive of a sizable number of texts. Any thoughts in this direction subsequent to 1947 were unconsciously influenced by the large number of scrolls found on the shores of the Dead Sea, and prior to that year scholars were easily misled by the abundance of manuscripts of the medieval MT and of the ancient translations. Actually, very little attention has been devoted to the number of copies circulating in antiquity, since this issue is clearly beyond our textual horizon.

Exceptions to this trend are studies by Lohfink and Haran, whose main thesis of a minimal number of scrolls I accept. In an impressive study of the “deuteronomistic movement,”²⁴ Lohfink suggested that writing and book culture were not advanced in the *pre-exilic period*, and that in that era possibly only single copies of each Scripture book were available for long periods of time;²⁵ they were written and deposited in the Temple, and possibly further rewritten there.²⁶ 2 Kings 22:8 indeed states that Hilkiyah said: “I

²⁴ N. Lohfink, “Gab es eine deuteronomistische Bewegung?,” in *Jeremia und die “deuteronomistische Bewegung”* (ed. W. Gross; BBB 98; Weinheim: Beltz Athenäum, 1995) 313–82 (335–47) = id., *Studien zum Deuteronomium und zur deuteronomistischen Literatur III* (SBAB 20; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1955) 65–142 (91–104).

²⁵ Thus already C. Steuernagel, *Lehrbuch der Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1912) 101. This suggestion was first made by Eichhorn, *Einleitung 1* (4th ed.; 1823) 19.

²⁶ “Es ist leicht vorstellbar, das sie <die Texte> bisweilen ergänzt und überarbeitet wurden, vor allem, wenn man sie etwa in der Tempelschule im Unterricht brauchte” (Lohfink, “Bewegung,” 338).

found *sepher hattorah*,” “the book of the law.”²⁷ This formulation may imply that the book existed in a single copy. In any event, there is no evidence, literary or archeological, for privately owned copies at that time.

Lohfink’s point of departure is the deuteronomistic composition Deuteronomy–2 Kings, but he turns also to the Books of the Prophets, which in his view also existed only in single copies, preserved by the students of the prophets.²⁸ This assumption thus precludes the circulation of the biblical books in the pre-exilic period, as suggested previously by Haran, who believed that distribution started only with the official acceptance of these books as authoritative.²⁹

There is no solid evidence in favor of the idea that in early centuries there were very few or no copies of the biblical books in the private domain and that such copies were found only in the Temple, but we consider the following arguments to be reasonably convincing.

a. In early centuries, the literacy rate was very low, and this assumption makes it unlikely that there would have been more than a few copies of the biblical books among the public in those centuries (thus Millard³⁰ and Haran³¹). In the words of Millard, “While the number of ancient Israelites who regularly read and wrote may have been very small and mostly professional scribes, the number who possessed marginal literacy was larger, and still more would likely have been able to recognize and write their names.”³²

b. The story of the discovery of a scroll in the Temple during the reign of Josiah (2 Kgs 22:8; 23:2, 24; 2 Chr 34:15, 30) must be taken at face value. The book of Deuteronomy was kept in the Temple and was not known to the outside world.

²⁷ Thus the *NRSV*; not “a scroll of the Teaching” as in *NJPST*.

²⁸ P. 340.

²⁹ In the words of M. Haran, “Book-Scrolls at the Beginning of the Second Temple Period. The Transition from Papyrus to Skins,” *HUCA* 54 (1983) 111–22 (113), in the pre-exilic period “... the people at large had no direct access to this literature, which was entrusted to special circles of initiates—priests, scribal schools, prophets, poets trained in the composition of psalmodic poetry and the like.”

³⁰ A. R. Millard, “Literacy, Ancient Israel,” *ABD* 4:337–40.

³¹ M. Haran, “On the Diffusion of Literacy and Schools in Ancient Israel,” *VTSup* 40 (1986) 81–95.

³² Millard, “Literacy,” 340. The evidence for writing and reading relates to seals, tax collecting, owners’ labels on jars, etc., mainly referring to the final 150 years of Judah’s history. I. Young, “Israelite Literacy: Interpreting the Evidence,” *VT* 48 (1998) 239–53, 408–22 (419) reached similar conclusions (“ancient Israelite scribes, priests and the upper class of society”).

c. One of the theoretical models for the creation of most biblical books is a “production line” in a linear fashion, stage after stage. In this model, the creation by editor/scribe 1 formed the basis for an edition by editor/scribe 2, which, in turn was the basis for a creation by editor/scribe 3.³³ The alternative model would be the assumption of parallel versions of the same biblical book. Both abstract models have their internal logic, and therefore the only way to decide between these options is to see whether one of them is supported by textual evidence. We believe that there is no evidence for the option of parallel creation, and accordingly we believe that the production line in early centuries could only have been linear.³⁴ Linear creation necessitated the accessibility of the earlier copies in a central location, and in fact a single copy sufficed for this purpose. Our description almost necessitates the assumption that all rewriting took place in one location, probably a central one, where books were written, deposited, and rewritten. Otherwise, it cannot be explained how any editor/scribe would have been able to continue the writing of his predecessor. The only such place I can think of would be the Temple. This center presumably had sufficient authority to prevent the writing of rival versions elsewhere. Besides, there is no evidence for parallel versions.

The suggestion that Scripture books were deposited in the Temple no longer needs to remain abstract, as it is supported by evidence in Scripture and elsewhere. For example, Samuel deposited a binding document in the Temple: “Samuel expounded to the people the rules of the monarchy (משפט המלוכה), and recorded them in a document that he deposited before the Lord” (1 Sam 10:25). The clearest proof for the depositing of books in the Temple is probably the story of Josiah referred to above.³⁵ Beyond Israel, the depositing of scrolls in the Temple, which runs parallel to the modern concept of

³³ See my study “The Writing of Early Scrolls.”

³⁴ The main question for discussion is whether we can detect among the early textual witnesses any proof of the existence of two or more parallel versions of a biblical book that differed in matters of content. All textual witnesses differ in details created during the course of the textual transmission, but are there differences that require the assumption of independent writing or rewriting of a text unit in different sources? In other words, is there a chapter or part of a chapter of a biblical book known in alternative formulations? It seems to me that such evidence cannot be found, and therefore all differences between the textual witnesses must have resulted from a linear development, mainly the creation of a long text from a short one or vice versa. Focusing on the largest differences among textual witnesses, it seems that the long and short texts of MT (= 4QJer^{a,c}) and the LXX (= 4QJer^{b,d}) in Jeremiah, as well as in Ezekiel, Joshua, and the story of David and Goliath, indicate a linear development from short to long or long to short versions.

³⁵ Whether or not all Scripture books were deposited in the Temple is a matter of speculation. In later times, probably all authoritative Scripture books were deposited there, but it is possible that previously only the legal and historical books Genesis–Kings were placed in the Temple.

publishing, is evidenced for Egypt as early as the third millennium BCE as well as in ancient Greece and Rome. In later times, rabbinic literature often mentions “the copy of the Torah (once: three copies) in the temple court.”³⁶

Current views on the development of the Scripture books allow for and actually require the assumption of a single copy in the Temple.

1. Only a single revision is known of the historical books and Jeremiah in the spirit of Deuteronomy. Unrevised copies have not survived, and the best supporting theory for the Dtr revision would be centralized activity in the Temple.

2. Mere knowledge of the Torah, such as in the case of Hosea and Deutero-Isaiah, does not require physical proximity to copies of the Torah since traditions circulated orally.³⁷ However, there must have been exceptions. The type of quotation from Deuteronomy made by Jeremiah,³⁸ which displays an intimate knowledge of Deuteronomy, makes it likely that the prophet in his role as a priest³⁹ consulted the books in the Temple. Likewise, Ezekiel the priest,⁴⁰ who had an intimate knowledge of Leviticus and Deuteronomy,⁴¹ would have consulted the Torah kept in a central location in exile. Indeed, when discussing Ezekiel’s dependence on other prophets and the legal literature, Zimmerli goes as far as saying that Ezekiel had scrolls in front of him containing parts of the Torah and Jeremiah.⁴² Miller had reached similar conclusions earlier with regard to Ezekiel’s use of Jeremiah.⁴³ Likewise, according to Holladay⁴⁴, Jeremiah had the Psalter in front of him and adapted the text for his own purposes. Fischer goes even further: “At

³⁶ For a detailed analysis of the evidence, see “The Writing of Early Scrolls.”

³⁷ For Deutero-Isaiah’s knowledge of Deuteronomy, Jeremiah, Isaiah son of Amotz, Psalms, and Lamentations, see the tabulations by S. M. Paul, *Isaiah 40–66, Introduction and Commentary* (Mikra LeYisrael; Heb.; Tel Aviv/Jerusalem: Am Oved/Magnes, 2008) 35–45.

³⁸ For example, Deut 24:1-4 quoted in Jer 3:1-2.

³⁹ Jer 1:1 “The words of Jeremiah son of Hilkiah, one of the priests at Anathoth in the territory of Benjamin.”

⁴⁰ Ezek 1:3 “The word of the Lord came to the priest Ezekiel son of Buzi, by the Chebar Canal, in the land of the Chaldeans.”

⁴¹ For detailed evidence of Ezekiel’s knowledge of these books, see R. Kasher, *Ezekiel, Introduction and Commentary* (Mikra LeYisrael; Heb.; Tel Aviv/Jerusalem: Am Oved/Magnes, 2004) 54–65.

⁴² W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel I* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1969) 44–52 (44, 45).

⁴³ J. W. Miller, *Das Verhältnis Jeremias und Hesekiels sprachlich und theologisch untersucht* (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1955) 118.

⁴⁴ W. L. Holladay, “Indications of Jeremiah’s Psalter,” *JBL* 121 (2002) 254–61. On p. 261, Holladay asserts: “... the general outline of Books I-III of our present Psalter were in existence in Jeremiah’s time (excluding any intrusive psalms, such as Ps 8 seems to be), and that scattered psalms outside these three books (exemplified for us by Pss 122 and 139) were in use as well.”

this point, it is possible to answer the remaining questions posed at the outset: Jeremiah shows literary rather than oral dependence on a good half of what would later become the Old Testament ...”⁴⁵ In my view, Jeremiah and Ezekiel are exceptions.

In short, it is probable that in early centuries only single copies of the books were extant in the Temple and some of them were rewritten there. At an unknown point, books started to circulate beyond the Temple, possibly when they were accepted as Scripture.⁴⁶ These developments must have taken place in the post-exilic period before the third century, because at that time several copies were already circulating. Undoubtedly, the exiles must have taken Scripture copies with them, but we do not know how many copies left Israel and how many new ones were created in exile.

In sharp contrast, we note the relatively large number of copies found among the Judean Desert scrolls that relate to the last two centuries BCE and the first centuries CE. However, that number does not necessarily reflect the numbers available in earlier centuries when far fewer copies circulated in Israel. However, there are no hard facts about the period between the return from the exile and the third century BCE. We only know that a copy of the Torah was taken to Egypt in approximately 280 BCE for the translation of the Torah (according to the *Epistle of Aristeas*). Further details about the distribution in those early centuries are lacking.

Appendix

The chronological distribution of the non-biblical scrolls written in the Qumran Scribal Practice

<i>Qumran manuscript</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Mid-point</i>	<i>Textual character</i>
4Q504 DibHam ^a	150 BCE	150 BCE	QSP
4Q524 4QT ^b	150–125 BCE	137 BCE	QSP
4Q160 4QVisSam	150–75 BCE	112 BCE	QSP
4Q426 4QSap-Hymn Work A	150–75 BCE	112 BCE	QSP?
4Q175 4QTest	125–75 BCE	100 BCE	QSP
4Q422 4QParaGen-Exod	150–50 BCE	100 BCE	QSP
1Q28b 1QSb	125–75/85 BCE	100/85 BCE	QSP
4Q176 4QTanh	150–30 BCE	90 BCE	QSP

⁴⁵ G. Fischer, “Il libro di Geremia, specchio della cultura scritta e letta in Israele,” *RivB* 56 (2008) 393–417 (417). See also, by the same author, *Jeremia, Der Stand der theologischen Diskussion* (Darmstadt: WBG, 2007) 134–43. The name of the analysis (“Was Jeremia vorausliegen dürfte”) implies a written form.

⁴⁶ Possibly more advanced technologies in the preparation of leather as writing material also played a role.

4Q257 4QpapS ^c	100–75 BCE	87 BCE	QSP
4Q428 4QH ^b	125–50 BCE	87 BCE	QSP
4Q443 Pers Prayer	100–75 BCE	87 BCE	QSP
4Q503 papPrQuot	100–70 BCE	85 BCE	QSP
4Q512 papRitPurB	85 BCE	85 BCE	QSP
4Q163 4Qpap pIsa ^c	85 BCE	85 BCE	QSP
4Q502 papRitMar	85 BCE	85 BCE	QSP
4Q219 4QJub ^d	110–50 BCE	86 BCE	QSP?
1Q28 1QS	100–50 BCE	75 BCE	QSP
1Q28a 1QSa	100–50 BCE	75 BCE	QSP
4Q266 4QD ^a	100–50 BCE	75 BCE	QSP
4Q377 apocPent B	100–50 BCE	75 BCE	QSP
4Q382 pap para Kgs	75 BCE	75 BCE	QSP
4Q433a papH-like	75 BCE	75 BCE	QSP
4Q505 4QpapDibHam ^b	70–60 BCE	65 BCE	QSP?
4Q509 4QpapPrFêt ^c	70–60 BCE	65 BCE	QSP
4Q223–224 4QpapJub ^h	75–50 BCE	62 BCE	QSP?
4Q400 ShirShabb ^a	75–50 BCE	62 BCE	QSP
4Q405 ShirShabb ^f	75–50 BCE	62 BCE	QSP
4Q222 4QJub ^g	75–50 BCE	62 BCE	QSP?
4Q419 4QInstr-like Comp A	80–40 BCE	60 BCE	QSP?
4Q496 4QpapM ^f	55 BCE	55 BCE	QSP
4Q513 4QOrd ^b	55 BCE	55 BCE	QSP
1Q26 1QInstr	100–1 BCE	50 BCE	QSP?
4Q280 4QCurses	50 BCE	50 BCE	QSP?
11Q13 11QMelch	75–25 BCE	50 BCE	QSP
4Q522 Proph Josh	65–30 BCE	47 BCE	QSP?
4Q271 4QD ^f	50–30 BCE	40 BCE	QSP
4Q429 4QH ^c	40 BCE	40 BCE	QSP?
4Q221 4QJub ^f	50–25 BCE	37 BCE	QSP
4Q259 4QS ^e	50–25 BCE	37 BCE	QSP
4Q375 apocrMos ^a	50–25 BCE	37 BCE	QSP?
4Q416 4QInstr ^b	50–25 BCE	37 BCE	QSP
4Q427 4QH ^a	75–1 BCE	37 BCE	QSP
4Q438 4QBN ^e	50–25 BCE	37 BCE	QSP?
4Q460 Narr Work	75–1 BCE	37 BCE	QSP
4Q462 4QNarr C	50–25 BCE	37 BCE	QSP
4Q501 apocrLamB	50–25 BCE	37 BCE	QSP
4Q292 4QWork Cont. Prayers B	30 BCE	30 BCE	QSP
4Q418 4QInstr ^d	40–20 BCE	30 BCE	QSP
4Q364 4QRP ^b	40–10 BCE	26 BCE	QSP
4Q365 4QRP ^c	40–10 BCE	26 BCE	QSP
4Q365a 4QT ^{a?}	40–10 BCE	26 BCE	QSP
4Q303 MedCrea A	50–1 BCE	25 BCE	QSP?
4Q398 papMMT ^e	50–1 BCE	25 BCE	QSP?
4Q401 ShirShabb ^b	25 BCE	25 BCE	QSP
4Q402 ShirShabb ^c	25 BCE	25 BCE	QSP
4Q418a 4QInstr ^e	50–1 BCE	25 BCE	QSP
4Q525 Beatitudes	50–1 BCE	25 BCE	QSP
4Q158 4QRP ^a	40–1 BCE	20 BCE	QSP
1Q33 1QM	30–1 BCE	15 BCE	QSP

1Q34 1QH ^a scribe A	30–1 BCE	15 BCE	QSP
1Q34 1QH ^a scribe C	30–1 BCE	15 BCE	QSP
4Q159 4QOrdin	30–1 BCE	15 BCE	QSP
4Q165 4QpIsa ^c	30–1 BCE	15 BCE	QSP?
4Q174 4QFlor	30–1 BCE	15 BCE	QSP
4Q177 Catena A	30–1 BCE	15 BCE	QSP
4Q181 AgesCreat B	30–1 BCE	15 BCE	QSP?
4Q227 4QpsJub ^c	30–1 BCE	15 BCE	QSP
4Q251 Halakha A	30–1 BCE	15 BCE	QSP?
4Q256 4QS ^b	30–1 BCE	15 BCE	QSP
4Q260 4QS ^f	30–1 BCE	15 BCE	QSP
4Q267 4QD ^b	30–1 BCE	15 BCE	QSP
4Q269 4QD ^d	30–1 BCE	15 BCE	QSP?
4Q273 4QpapD ^h	15 BCE	15 BCE	QSP?
4Q274 4QToh A	30–1 BCE	15 BCE	QSP?
4Q277 4QToh B	30–1 BCE	15 BCE	QSP
4Q285 Sefer ha-Milhamah	30–1 BCE	15 BCE	QSP
4Q394 4QMMT ^a	30–1 BCE	15 BCE	QSP?
4Q403 ShirShabb ^d	30–1 BCE	15 BCE	QSP
4Q410 Vision Int	30–1 BCE	15 BCE	QSP?
4Q415 4QInstr ^a	30–1 BCE	15 BCE	QSP
4Q417 4QInstr ^c	30–1 BCE	15 BCE	QSP
4Q432 4QpapH ^f	30–1 BCE	15 BCE	QSP?
4Q440 H-like C	30–1 BCE	15 BCE	QSP
4Q473 Two Ways	30–1 BCE	15 BCE	QSP
4Q474 4QRachJos	30–1 BCE	15 BCE	QSP
4Q491 4QM ^a	30–1 BCE	15 BCE	QSP
4Q254 ComGen C	25–1 BCE	13 BCE	QSP
4Q200 4QTobit ^e	30 BCE–20 CE	5 BCE	QSP
4Q215 4QTNaph	30 BCE–20 CE	5 BCE	QSP
4Q225 4QpsJub ^a	30 BCE–20 CE	5 BCE	QSP
4Q393 ComCon	30 BCE–20 CE	5 BCE	QSP
4Q397 4QMMT	30 BCE–20 CE	5 BCE	QSP
4Q186 4QHorosc	30 BCE–30 CE	1 BCE	QSP
4Q396 4QMMT ^c	30 BCE–30 CE	1 BCE	QSP?
4Q511 4QShir ^b	1 BCE	1 BCE	QSP
4Q215a 4QTimes	30 BCE–20 CE	5 CE	QSP
4Q420 4QWays ^a	30 BCE–68 CE	10 CE	QSP?
4Q436 4QBN ^c	50 BCE–68 CE	10 CE	QSP
4Q268 4QD ^c	1–30 CE	15 CE	QSP
11Q19 11QT ^a	1–30 CE	15 CE	QSP
4Q166 4QpHos ^a	30 BCE–68 CE	20 CE	QSP?
4Q369 4QPrayer Enosh	30 BCE–68 CE	20 CE	QSP?
4Q414 RitPur A	30 BCE–68 CE	20 CE	QSP
4Q423 4QInstr ^g	10–50 CE	20 CE	QSP
4Q435 4QBN ^b	30 BCE–68 CE	20 CE	QSP?
4Q437 4QBN ^d	30 BCE–68 CE	20 CE	QSP
4Q464 4QExp Patr	30 BCE–68 CE	20 CE	QSP?
4Q471 WarText B	30 BCE–68 CE	20 CE	QSP
4Q477 4QRebukes	30 BCE–68 CE	20 CE	QSP?
1QpHab	1–50 CE	25 CE	

4Q421 4QWays ^b	1–50 CE	25 CE	
11Q16 11QHymns ^b	1–50 CE	25 CE	
4Q289 4QBer ^d	20–50 CE	35 CE	QSP?
4Q299 4QMyst ^a	20–50 CE	35 CE	
4Q384 4Qpap apocr Jer B?	20–50 CE	35 CE	QSP?
11Q20 11QT ^b	20–50 CE	35 CE	
11Q14 11QSefer ha-Milhamah	30–50 CE	40 CE	
4Q180 AgesCreat A	30–68 CE	50 CE	
4Q286 4QBer ^a	50 CE	50 CE	
4Q287 4QBer ^b	50 CE	50 CE	
4Q301 4QMyst ^{c?}	30–68 CE	50 CE	
4Q506 4QpapDibHam ^c	50 CE	50 CE	
5Q13 5QRule	1–100 CE	50 CE	QSP?
6Q18 papHymn	1–100 CE	50 CE	
11Q12 11QJub + XQText A	50 CE	50 CE	
11Q11 11QapocPs	50–70 CE	60 CE	
1Q14 1QpMic	—		
1Q22 1QDM	—		
1Q27 1QMyst	—		QSP?
1Q35 1QH ^b	—		QSP?
1Q36 1QHymns	—		
4Q161 4QpIsa ^a	—		
4Q171 4QpPs ^a	—		
4Q184 4QWiles	—		QSP?
4Q265 Misc Rules	—		QSP?
11Q27 11QUnid C	—		QSP?