

TEN

A DIDACTIC APPROACH
TO THE BIBLICAL DEAD SEA SCROLLS¹

Emanuel Tov

RÉSUMÉ

*Une approche didactique concernant
les manuscrits bibliques de la mer Morte*

Cette étude propose une présentation graphique et didactique des différences entre les divers groupes de manuscrits bibliques de la mer Morte selon leur rapport avec le Texte Massorétique (TM), le Pentateuque Samaritain (SP) et d'autres sources. Les exemples prennent le TM médiéval comme point de référence, non seulement parce que c'est le texte le plus connu, mais aussi parce qu'il s'agit d'une façon de procéder couramment admise en critique textuelle. Dans les illustrations accompagnant l'article, la couleur noire indique un texte indentique au TM, tandis que le rouge, le bleu, le vert et le rose signalent différents types de divergences par rapport au TM. Les exemples comportent des textes du groupe TM; des textes ayant des différences orthographiques ou morphologiques; des textes écrits en écriture paléo-hébraïque; des textes apparentés à la Septante (LXX); des manuscrits pré-samaritains; des textes «non-alignés». Ce dispositif permet principalement de présenter une typologie où l'on s'éloigne de plus en plus du noir du TM pour aller vers des textes multicolores. Il s'agit d'un outil didactique qui dépeint d'abord graphiquement la relation entre les sources textuelles existantes. Je crois aussi que cet exercice correspond plus ou moins à ce qui s'est produit dans la réalité. Plusieurs textes se sont éloignés graduellement de l'ancêtre du TM. Ce processus de développement fut toutefois beaucoup complexe, puisque plusieurs des textes préservés ont précédé le TM.

1. Thanks are due to Professors Flint and Ulrich for kindly providing me with electronic versions of some of the texts provided below as samples. **Samples 1, 5, 11, 16, 25, 28, 32, and 38** are in the appendix to the printed form of this paper. For all 38 samples see the book-page for this volume on the SBL website, at www.XXXXSBL website

book-page for
this volume
on the SBL
website, at
www.XXXXSBL
website--to
come

I. INTRODUCTION

The biblical Dead Sea Scrolls present a world of their own and it is now time to develop a didactic approach to them. I am thinking especially about the question of how best to present these scrolls to scholars, students, and the public at large in introductory treatises. Most introductions do not gradually introduce concepts and types of literatures but rather follow an internally logical sequence of presentation. Thus, an *Introduction to Hebrew Scripture* may start with concepts that are difficult for the novice reader, and, as a result, it is often recommended not to read an *Introduction to Hebrew Scripture* in the first year of one's study but rather at a more advanced stage.² By the same token, introductions to the text of the Hebrew Bible, including my own,³ are not didactic in their approach.⁴

The Dead Sea Scrolls feature prominently in all introductory analyses of textual criticism. They not only provide a wealth of information on the text of the Bible during the last three centuries B.C.E. and the first two centuries C.E., but they also show what texts looked like in this early period. In order to realize fully the impact of the scrolls, they should be presented in conjunction with the other biblical texts from antiquity and the Middle Ages. Such a procedure would be much more powerful than an analysis of the scrolls together with the nonbiblical Judean Desert texts. After all, the Qumran biblical scrolls have more in common with the biblical texts from the other Judean Desert sites and the medieval MT (Masoretic Text) than with the nonbiblical texts from Qumran. Further, presumably only a third of the scrolls were copied at Qumran. True, some Qumran scribes copied both biblical and nonbiblical scrolls,⁵ but the biblical scrolls themselves do not contain sectarian readings.⁶

2. At that point, one can better appreciate the sophistication of, for example, Otto Eissfeldt's discussion of "The Pre-literary Stage: The Smallest Units and their Setting in Life," in his *The Old Testament: An Introduction* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1965), 9. The reader of this book will have a better understanding of the Deuteronomist and of the complex literary development of Jeremiah after being exposed to other, less complicated books.

3. Emanuel Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (3rd ed., revised and expanded; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2012) (*TCHB*), including a brief "didactic guide."

4. After an introductory chapter, *TCHB* presents the various textual witnesses and describes the history of the biblical text in a theoretical chapter. There are additional chapters on the transmission history, the evaluation of readings, textual and literary criticism, conjectural emendation, and critical editions. P. Kyle McCarter provides a more inductive and didactic approach in *Textual Criticism: Recovering the Text of the Hebrew Bible* (GBS; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986).

5. For an example, see Eugene Ulrich, "4QSam^c: A Fragmentary Manuscript of 2 Samuel 14–15 from the Scribe of the *Serek Hayyahad* (1QS)," *BASOR* 235 (1979): 1–25. For additional examples, see my monograph *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert* (STDJ 54; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 23.

6. See Eugene Ulrich, "The Absence of 'Sectarian Variants' in the Jewish Scriptural Scrolls Found at Qumran," in *The Bible as Book: The Hebrew Bible and the Judaean Desert Discoveries. Proceedings of the Conference Held at Hampton Court, Herefordshire, 18–21 June*

Before the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls, the Hebrew text of the Bible was known mainly from the *medieval* manuscripts of the MT and the Samaritan Pentateuch (SP). Other sources are the medieval copies of the Septuagint (LXX), the Peshitta, the Targums, and the Vulgate. An inductive approach to the scrolls should start with the data that were available before these manuscripts were found in 1947. If starting the analysis immediately with a description of the scrolls themselves, we would not be able to sense the impact of the immense revolution created by these new finds. Further, the human mind works from the known to the unknown by linking new data to data that are already known. We have first to analyze in detail the MT, the SP, and the LXX, since otherwise we cannot point out the closeness between a scroll and, for example, the LXX. We have no alternative but to proceed in this way, not only because the LXX was known before the scrolls but also because the Greek Bible is so much better known than a few very fragmentary scrolls. In this analysis, we will start with the scrolls themselves. Proceeding in this way, we constantly think on two levels about the ancient and medieval sources. On the one hand, we compare the newly discovered ancient MT-like scrolls with the medieval MT, while, on the other hand, we are well aware that these ancient scrolls were the forerunners of the MT and that we actually need to compare the latter with the former.

A graphic presentation of selected scrolls accompanies our background description. These samples take the medieval MT as our point of reference, not only because it is the best-known text, but also because this is the accepted procedure in textual criticism. Our procedure involves a merely didactic device and does not imply the centrality of that version. A variant is any detail differing from the MT. In our scroll samples, black denotes identity with the MT, while linguistic variations are denoted by blue, orthographic variations by green, and other variations by red or pink. The main idea behind this presentation is the gradual moving away from black to multi-colored texts. It should be stressed that the indication of these colors is subjective, although this subjectivity probably does not exceed 10 per cent of the material. The purpose of these samples is to indicate graphically the relation between texts. The typological presentation is the focus of this study, and we do not suggest that the groups of texts developed in the way depicted here. Our main purpose is to elucidate the nature of the different groups.

2. FORERUNNERS OF THE MEDIEVAL MASORETIC TEXT FOUND AT JUDEAN DESERT SITES OTHER THAN QUMRAN (GROUP 1)

Quite unexpectedly, the forerunners of the MT, named “proto-Masoretic,” were already extant at the Judean Desert sites. In the centuries around the turn of the era, the proto-MT had no vowels, accents, or verse division, but the consonantal

2000 (ed. Edward D. Herbert and Emanuel Tov; London: British Library; New Castle, Del.: Oak Knoll Press, in Association with the Scriptorium Center for Christian Antiquities, 2002), 179–95.

text with its paragraph divisions already circulated. From the start of the finds of the scrolls, it was known that proto-Masoretic scrolls were found at Qumran, but only in the last decennium did it become clear that the ancestors of the medieval MT in its purest form were not found at Qumran but at the Judean Desert sites other than Qumran, namely, Wadi Murabbaʿat, Wadi Sdeir (Naḥal David), Naḥal Ḥever, Naḥal Seʿelim, and Masada.⁷ In fact, these sites contain no biblical texts other than the proto-MT.

The study of these scrolls focuses on determining the amount of agreement between them and the medieval MT. The first step in such a procedure would be a detailed comparison of these scrolls with the most complete manuscript of the Ben-Asher tradition, Codex L (that is, the Leningrad Codex). In this way one finds, for example, that MasLev^b, MasEzek, and MasPsa,⁸ which provide a reasonable amount of text, deviate only minimally from the MT.⁹ Both MasEzek and MasPs^a are luxury scrolls,¹⁰ dating to the second half of the first century B.C.E. Likewise, the Minor Prophets Scroll from Murabbaʿat (MurXII from ca. 115 C.E.)¹¹ and 5/6ḤevPs, a beautiful scroll from ca. 115 C.E. (**Sample 1**), exactly reflect the medieval text.¹²

The virtual lack of deviation of these scrolls from the medieval text indicates

7. This group comprises the following texts from five locations: Masada (Genesis, Leviticus [2], Deuteronomy, Ezekiel, Psalms [2]); Wadi Sdeir (Genesis); Naḥal Seʿelim (Numbers); Naḥal Ḥever (Numbers [2], Deuteronomy, Psalms); and Murabbaʿat (Genesis, Exodus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Isaiah, Minor Prophets).

8. See Shemaryahu Talmon, “Hebrew Fragments from Masada,” in Shemaryahu Talmon and Yigael Yadin, *Masada VI: The Yigael Yadin Excavations 1963–1965* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1999), 40–50, 59–75, 76–90. MasLev^b does not differ from Codex L in its 456 words and section divisions. MasEzek has six variants in 489 words (one difference per 81.5 words), while MasPs^a has five differences in 284 words (one variant per 56.8 words). The very few orthographic variants are not included in these calculations. The agreement between MasLev^b and Codex L pertains even to the intricacies of orthography, including details in which the orthography in one place goes against the conventions elsewhere in the book—for example, the defective form **מם** [תמי] in Lev 9:2, 3 (col. 1:11, 13) and the defective *hipʿil* form **ויקרבו** in Lev 9:9 (col. 1:21). See in detail Talmon, “Hebrew Fragments from Masada.”

9. Ian Young (“The Stabilization of the Biblical Text in the Light of Qumran and Masada: A Challenge for Conventional Qumran Chronology?” *DSD* 9 [2002]: 364–90) provides detailed statistics for the deviations from the MT in all the Masada manuscripts.

10. See Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 125–29.

11. According to the statistics of Young (“Stabilization”) this scroll deviates seventeen times from Codex L in 3,774 words (one variant per 222 words), together with twenty-six differences in orthography. Similar statistics for this scroll (0.9 percent in words and 0.5 percent in orthography) are provided by Martin G. Abegg, Jr., “1QIsa^a and 1QIsa^b: A Rematch,” in Herbert and Tov, *Bible as Book*, 221–28, esp. 223. These statistics stand in striking contrast to those for the Qumran scrolls (see below).

12. This text differs three times from the MT in 605 words, in Ps 15:3 involving four words (one variant per 201.7 words).

that they belong to the exact same tradition as the medieval MT manuscripts.¹³ If the scrolls deviate at all from L, their deviations are similar in nature and number to the differences among the medieval MT manuscripts themselves.¹⁴ In our terminology, the scrolls from the sites other than Qumran belong to the “inner circle” of proto-rabbinic texts,¹⁵ which contained the consonantal framework of the MT one thousand years or more before the time of the Masorah codices.

The first stage in the presentation of the Judean Desert texts involves a demonstration that several texts from antiquity reflect the very same text as the MT, a text that the general public considers to be “*the* text of the Bible.” **Sample 1** reflects a text that is completely identical to the MT.

The historical explanation of this identity is that the people who left the Hebrew scrolls behind in the Judean Desert possessed biblical scrolls that closely reflected the instructions of the Jerusalem spiritual center for the writing of Scripture scrolls. This characterization applies to the rebels of Masada and the freedom fighters of Bar Kokhba.¹⁶ To find biblical texts at Judean Desert sites other than Qumran that are identical to the medieval text requires explanation. In my view, these texts are the copies mentioned in rabbinic literature as “corrected texts,” that is, texts corrected from the temple copies;¹⁷ but whether or not this view is correct, we are faced with a reality that requires explanation. The biblical quotations in rabbinic literature reflect the medieval MT, but before 1947 no one could have guessed that one day we would actually find ancient scrolls identical to Codex L.

Moving away from the MT, which is known from all Hebrew editions and modern translations, we now turn to the proto-Masoretic scrolls from Qumran that are one step removed from the MT.

13. Young (“Stabilization”) provides statistics that highlight the high level of agreement between the medieval manuscripts of the MT and the Masada manuscripts, as opposed to a lower level of such agreement with the proto-MT scrolls from Qumran.

14. Some medieval manuscripts are almost identical to one another in their consonantal text, such as L and the Aleppo Codex, while other codices from Leningrad and elsewhere are more widely divergent from these two choice manuscripts.

15. See my paper “The Text of the Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek Bible Used in the Ancient Synagogues,” in *The Ancient Synagogue: From Its Origins until 200 c.e. Papers Presented at an International Conference at Lund University, October 14–17, 2001* (ed. Birger Olsson and Magnus Zetterholm; ConBNT 39; Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 2003), 237–59.

16. This assumption was formulated in 1956 by Moshe Greenberg, “The Stabilization of the Text of the Hebrew Bible,” *JAOS* 76 (1956): 157–67, esp. 165, for the texts from Murabbaʿat on the basis of the scanty evidence then available: “. . . since the spiritual leaders of this Second Revolt against Rome (132–135) were some of the most eminent Rabbis, there is no question as to the orthodoxy of this group.”

17. See my paper “Text of the Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek Bible.”

3. MT-LIKE QUMRAN SCROLLS (GROUP 2)

A large group of Qumran scrolls is very close to the MT, close enough to be considered part of the same family. One of these, 4QGen^b (**Sample 2**),¹⁸ with no variation from Codex L, is similar in nature to those from the other Judean Desert sites, while 4QGen⁸¹⁹ (**Sample 3**) and 4QProv^{b20} are very close to the MT.²¹ At the same time, most MT-like texts differ more widely from Codex L, while they always agree with L against greatly deviating texts such as those mentioned below, for example, the LXX.²²

The nature of other scrolls typical of this group can be analyzed equally well because of their relatively well-preserved scope. Among the longer scrolls belonging to this group are 4QpaleoGen-Exod¹, 4QExod^c, 4QSam^b, 4QJer^a, and 4QJer^c,²³ exemplified by 1QIsa^b (**Sample 4**). The number of variations between 1QIsa^b and Codex L is more substantial than those in Group 1, but clearly the two reflect the same family.²⁴ The closeness between the two is visible when they are contrasted with the manifold deviations from the MT of the “vulgar” text of

18. 4QGen^b contains no variants in 361 words.

19. The preserved fragments of 4QGen⁸ contain three differences in 145 words (one variant per 48 words) and nine orthographic variants. As mentioned earlier, the color codes used from here onward indicate linguistic variations (blue), orthographic variations (green), and all other variations (red or pink).

20. 4QProv^b displays two differences in 125 words (one variant per 62.5 words).

21. Young (“Stabilization” 373) shows that in the case of the Minor Prophets scrolls from Cave 4 at Qumran, the divergence from the MT is between one variant per 6.4 words and one per 41 words (mainly around twenty words), to be contrasted with the lack of deviation in six small Murabba‘at fragments and one variant in 222 words in the Minor Prophets scroll. Likewise, in Leviticus, the Qumran manuscripts range between one variant per 4.5 to one per 50 words, as opposed to MasLev^b with no variants (ibid., 374). The latter scroll is of a size equal to that of some of the Qumran scrolls, so that the statistics are meaningful. These numbers are supported by additional tabulations for Deuteronomy, Ezekiel, and Psalms—in each case contrasted with scrolls from other sites in the Judean Desert (ibid., 375–78). Young’s statistics are less meaningful for Psalms, since all the Qumran Psalms scrolls are probably liturgical as opposed to the nonliturgical character of the Psalms scrolls from Masada and Naḥal Hever.

22. The fifty-seven texts of the MT family comprise 52 percent of the Qumran biblical corpus in the Torah (twenty-four of the forty-six texts) and 44 percent in the other books (thirty-three of the seventy-five texts). These percentages are quite significant—and telling regarding the preferences of the Qumran community—but they are remote from the other sites in the Judean Desert, where all the texts belong to the inner circle of the medieval MT textual form.

23. Most Torah manuscripts cannot be taken into consideration, since the opposition between the MT and the SP is not strong enough. The same pertains to the lack of opposition between the MT and the LXX in Isaiah and Ruth.

24. Col. 21 presented in **Sample 4** (Isa 48:17–49:15) involves ten variations in content, five in orthography, and one in language. The close relation between this scroll and the MT was noticed by B. J. Roberts, “The Second Isaiah Scroll from Qumrân (1QIs^b),” *BJRL* 42 (1959): 132–44; Dominique Barthélemy, *Critique textuelle de l’Ancien Testament*, tome 3, *Ézéchiel*,

1QIsa^a. While the variation between 1QIsa^a (see Group 3 below) and L ranges between 9.9 and 18.5 percent in variants and in *addition* between 8.6 and 18.8 percent in orthographic variants, in 1QIsa^b the discrepancy amounts to only 4.3 percent in variants and 3.7 percent in orthographic variants.²⁵ These figures, provided by Martin Abegg,²⁶ should be contrasted with the aforementioned minute deviations from the MT in MurXII, with 0.9 percent in words and 0.5 percent in orthographic variants.

The combined differences between the MT and 1QIsa^b tabulated for all the preserved fragments can also be expressed in terms of different groups of details,²⁷ using green for orthography and red for the other differences, in the same proportions as those in a single column in **Sample 4**.

*Deviations of 1QIsa^b from the MT in the Entire Scroll*²⁸

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----|
| Orthography | 107 |
| Addition of conjunctive <i>wāw</i> | 16 |
| Lack of conjunctive <i>wāw</i> | 13 |
| Article | 4 |
| Differences in letters | 10 |
| Missing letters | 5 |
| Differences in number | 14 |
| Differences in pronouns ²⁹ | 6 |
| Different grammatical forms | 24 |
| Different prepositions | 9 |
| Different words | 11 |

Daniel et les 12 Prophètes (OBO 50/3; Fribourg: Universitätsverlag; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1992), cii–cxvi; G. Garbini, “1QIsa^b et le texte d’Isaïe,” *Hen* 6 (1984): 17–21.

25. The close relationship between the medieval representative of the MT, namely, L, and 1QIsa^b is matched by almost all the texts of Isaiah from Cave 4. In the sections in which 1QIsa^b overlaps with 4QIsa^b and 4QIsa^d, all are close to Codex L. This also pertains to the following texts, which are close to the MT and secondarily also to the LXX: 4QIsa^a, 4QIsa^e, 4QIsa^f, and 4QIsa^g (of these, 4QIsa^e, ^f probably differed most from the medieval manuscripts). It also pertains to the following texts, although they are too short for a clear judgment to be pronounced: 4QIsa^h, 4QIsaⁱ, 4QIsa^j, 4QIsa^k, 4QIsa^l, 4QIsa^m, 4QIsaⁿ, 4QIsa^b, 4QpapIsaP, 4QIsa^q, and 4QIsa^r.

26. Abegg, “1QIsa^a,” 222–23.

27. Thus M. Cohen, “*h’ydy’h bdbbr qdwsht hnwsh l’wtywyw wbyqwrw htkst*,” *Deoth* 47 (1978): 83–101; reprinted in *HaMiqrā’ vaAnahnu* [The Bible and Us] (ed. Uriel Simon; Tel Aviv: Devir, 1979), 42–69. See also my *TCHB*, 31–33.

28. In our system, blue denotes linguistic differences, but only when such differences are characteristic of the scribe. Since this feature cannot be determined for this scroll without an overall analysis, some of the differences indicated with red may have to be blue.

29. Some categories are undoubtedly linguistic, but we only classify variations as linguistic that are proven to characterize the scribe or period of the scribe, such as the lengthened pronominal suffixes (category 3) or the addition of the article in 1QIsa^a and other texts.

| | |
|--------------------|---|
| Minuses of words | 5 |
| Pluses of words | 6 |
| Different sequence | 4 |

Likewise, 4QJer^a and 4QJer^c are both firm MT-like Qumran texts further removed from the medieval MT than 1QIsa^b. These two texts always follow the MT against the LXX, yet differ in many small details from the MT. 4QJer^a usually reflects the orthography of the MT, even in unusual spellings,³⁰ differing in thirty-two instances in 160 partially preserved lines. Moreover, the orthography of 4QJer^c is very close to that of the medieval Masoretic tradition.³¹

The presence of a moderate number of deviations from the MT in the MT-like texts at Qumran and not in the other Judean Desert texts shows that the Qumran scrolls are one stage removed from the “inner circle” texts represented at these other sites. The combined evidence of these two groups reveals the evidence relating to the frequency of MT-like fragments, which does not necessarily imply its textual preeminence.

4. TEXTS DIFFERING FROM THE MASORETIC TEXT MAINLY IN ORTHOGRAPHY AND MORPHOLOGY (GROUP 3)

Moving a small step away from the medieval MT, we now turn to the least meaningful type of deviations, namely, in orthography (spelling). Orthography is the realization in writing of the spoken word and, accordingly, specific words may be written in different ways.³² In Hebrew, such differences mainly refer to *defective* as opposed to *full (plene)* orthography, but they also include phonetic spellings.

A great number of the aforementioned variations between the texts within the MT family (Groups 1 and 2) refer to matters of spelling. Similar differences are also found between the MT and other manuscripts. Thus, the pre-Samaritan manuscripts (Group 5) are usually fuller than those of the MT family. In another group of texts, presumably produced by a scribal school that was active at Qumran and other places, personal preferences of scribes are clearly visible. The scribes involved were probably sectarian, since virtually all the sectarian

30. See Emanuel Tov, “Jeremiah,” in Eugene Ulrich et al., *Qumran Cave 4.X: The Prophets* (DJD 15; Oxford: Clarendon, 1997), 145–208, esp. 150.

31. In sixteen instances, 4QJer^c is fuller than the MT, while in six cases the MT is more full. Most instances involve the addition of a *wāw* in 4QJer^c. Specifically, 4QJer^c adds *wāw* fifteen times and *yōd* once; and the MT adds *wāw* five times and *yōd* once. Of special interest is the unusual *plene* spelling in 4QJer^c of *עקוב*; see my “Jeremiah” (DJD 15), 183.

32. In fact, many words are written in different ways within the same language, at different periods, or in concurrent dialects without any difference in meaning. For example, many English words are spelled differently in Great Britain (e.g., *favou*r, *specialise*) and in the United States (*favor*, *specialize*) without difference in meaning. Similarly, in Hebrew, there is no difference between *לֹא* and *לוֹא*, nor between *שִׁמְרִים* and *שׁוּמְרִים*.

manuscripts are written in a specific practice of orthography, morphology, and scribal habits. This practice is idiosyncratic, involving extremely full and often unusual spellings, combined with morphological idiosyncrasies.³³ The longest text that displays these features is IQIsa^a, as exemplified in **Sample 5**, covering the first column of that scroll. This column contains no fewer than forty-seven orthographic deviations from the MT (green), nineteen deviations in linguistic details—mainly morphology (blue)—and twenty-six differences in other details (red). As mentioned above, the distinction between the various categories is subjective, although the percentage of disagreement probably does not exceed 10 percent. The graphic picture of this column is one of total deviation from the MT. However, when one realizes that the scribe inserted most of the green and blue details himself, it is possible that his source did not differ so much from the MT. If these elements are removed, the resulting text, with differences from the MT indicated in red only (**Sample 6**), shows the text that *may* have been used by the scribe of this scroll. The differences pertain to small details in content, such as the addition or omission of a conjunction. That text, with its twenty-six differences in red, differs more from the MT than the texts in Groups 1 and 2, so that we are seemingly confronted with a different type of text. However, many, if not most, of the red details ought to be ascribed to the freedom of this scribe. Alongside his freedom in matters of orthography and morphology, he changed small details in the text, mainly in small contextual and linguistic harmonizations. As a result, IQIsa^a was probably copied from a text close to the MT.

In the case of IQIsa^a, the evidence is actually complex, since a first scribe (A) copied cols. 1–27 and a second scribe (B) cols. 28–54. Scribal differences between the two halves of that scroll point to different features in each segment. Scribe B has a fuller orthography and has more outspoken morphological preferences than scribe A, and he left out several small sections by mistake. Thus, in col. 50 from scribe B (**Sample 7**) the number of linguistic deviations from the MT is larger than that in col. 1, while in col. 51, also from scribe B (**Sample 8**), the number of orthographic differences is much higher than in col. 1.³⁴ The same type of differences is recognizable between scribes A and C of IQHa.³⁵

33. Morphological variations relate to words that are pronounced differently, such as the הוּא in the majority tradition of the Hebrew text and הוּאָה in some Qumran texts. However, other scholars extend the discussion of orthography to include these forms as well. See Frank M. Cross, Jr., “Some Notes on a Generation of Qumran Studies,” in *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid, 18-21 March, 1991* (ed. Julio Trebolle Barrera and Luis Vegas Montaner; 2 vols.; STDJ 11; Leiden: Brill; Madrid: Editorial Complutense, 1992), 1:1–14.

34. Col. 1: red 26, blue 19, green 47; col. 50: red 42, blue 34, green 52; col. 51: red 51, blue 22; green 97.

35. See Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 21–22.

The features of this scribal school are visible also in overlapping sections (**Sample 9**) written by similar scribes, 4QIsa^c frgs. 9 ii, 11, 12 i, 52 (Isa 23:8–24:15)//1QIsa^a cols. 18–19.³⁶ In this column, the two scribes agree twenty times against the MT in their fuller orthography, and three times in linguistic variations. At the same time, they disagree with each other fourteen times in matters of orthography, and twice in linguistic variations. The details are summarized in **Sample 9** (lead text: 4QIsa^c), in which the orthographic divergences from the MT common to 4QIsa^c and 1QIsa^a are indicated in a regular font, while differences between the two manuscripts are indicated in a smaller font. In this sample, content differences (in red) are not indicated.³⁷

5. SCROLLS WRITTEN IN THE PALEO-HEBREW SCRIPT (GROUP 4)

Moving away in a different direction from the medieval MT, we encounter scrolls written in a special script. The scrolls described so far are written in the regular Hebrew script, also named Aramaic or square. These form the majority of the biblical scrolls. However, eleven to twelve scrolls are written in the ancient Hebrew or paleo-Hebrew script.³⁸ In terms of contents, these do not form a special group since 4QpaleoGen-Exod^l and 4QpaleoDeut^r are close to the MT,³⁹ 4QpaleoExod^m is close to the SP, and 11QpaleoLev^a is textually nonaligned. The other texts are too small for analysis.

In many ways, these texts remain enigmatic, since those sharing the same scribal traditions,⁴⁰ including almost total lack of scribal intervention, are of a different textual background. There is no reason to assume that the Qumranites themselves wrote complete texts in paleo-Hebrew characters; it has been suggested cautiously that Sadducees wrote these texts.⁴¹ The MT-like paleo-Hebrew texts resemble the proto-Masoretic texts from Qumran (above, Group 2), while the pre-Samaritan nature of 4Qpaleo-Exod^m forms the link with the next category.

36. Patrick W. Skehan and Eugene Ulrich, "Isaiah," in Ulrich et al., *Qumran Cave 4.X: The Prophets* (DJD 15), 7–144, esp. 55–56.

37. The closeness between two other Qumran scribes writing in the same practice is also visible in two parallel texts of the *Community Rule* (1QS 10:4–12//4QS^d (4Q258; 9:1–13)). Although there are differences in matters of orthography and morphology, more often than not the two agree.

38. See Tov, *TCHB*, 96–97.

39. The orthography of 4QpaleoGen-Exod^l (210 lines) is often fuller than the MT (twenty-nine times), although it is not excessively full. For details, see Patrick W. Skehan, Eugene Ulrich, and Judith Sanderson, *Qumran Cave 4.IX: Palaeo-Hebrew and Greek Manuscripts* (DJD 9; Oxford: Clarendon, 1992). 4QpaleoDeut^r is of a similar nature; see Skehan, Ulrich, and Sanderson, *Palaeo-Hebrew and Greek Manuscripts* (DJD 9), 133–35.

40. For details, see Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 254–56.

41. *Ibid.*, 246–48.

6. "PRE-SAMARITAN" SCROLLS AND
THE SAMARITAN PENTATEUCH (GROUP 5)

The deviations from the MT discussed so far pertain to small inner-Masoretic variations and major differences in orthography and morphology. All these differences are not important with respect to contents. Moving further away from the MT, we now turn to a group of texts that inserted content changes (red) in the underlying text. In this group, we can trace the MT or a similar text as the origin of the texts discussed here, while in the next groups we are less certain. The colors indicated in the texts are mainly red for content changes, but there is also some green and blue for orthographic and linguistic differences.

The group discussed here, one of the surprises of the Qumran discoveries, involves a small number of texts that are amazingly close to the medieval SP, which supposedly had ancient origins. This ancient origin has now been confirmed because of the almost complete identity of the SP with a group of Qumran texts. These texts are therefore named "pre-Samaritan," and their major representatives are 4QpaleoExod^m, 4QNum^b, 4QExod-Lev^f, and secondarily 4QLev^d. All these texts, together with the SP, are named the "SP Group." The two subgroups of the SP Group are not identical, since the SP inserted a very thin layer of sectarian changes into the earlier texts. Column 1 of 4QpaleoExod^m, shown in **Sample 10**, shows a few small changes from the MT in red, green, and blue,⁴² while major changes vis-à-vis the MT involving several lines of text are indicated in cols. 5 (**Sample 11**) and 38 (**Sample 12**). These changes involve the addition of verses on the basis of other contexts, added at a relatively late stage in the development of Hebrew Scripture.⁴³ Thus, in col. 5 in **Sample 11**, in Exod 9:1-5 Moses is told to approach Pharaoh and inform him of the plague of pestilence. However, the text does not specify that Moses indeed performed this command. The Qumran scroll (first lines of col. 5) adds several lines of text after Exod 9:5 specifying exactly what Moses did; this goal was reached by repeating the text of 9:1-5 in a slightly altered version. The same addition is found in the SP. Similar additions were made to the story of all the ten plagues in Exodus 7-11; see col. 5:28-32 (= 9:19b SP,

42. The orthography of the earlier text was changed in small details in 4QpaleoExod^m to a more user-friendly form so as to facilitate the reading of unvocalized texts. Further, difficult linguistic forms were eliminated, and the text was internally harmonized (the same words being used in immediate and sometimes remote contexts).

43. The editing involved is meant to impart a more perfect and internally consistent structure to the text. The editing is inconsistent; that is, certain details were changed while others of a similar nature were left untouched. The editor was attentive to what he considered imperfections within and between units. What disturbed him especially was the incongruence—according to a formalistic view of Scripture—of details within and between specific stories. In order to reduce such incongruence, details were repeated or added. In this regard, special attention was paid to the presentation of the spoken word, especially by God, which was added to the text when the reviser was able to add the details from a similar context.

before the plague of hail) also in **Sample 11**. Column 38 1–2 (= Exod 32:10b SP) in **Sample 12** adds a segment to Moses' speech from the parallel section in Deut 9:13. The texts in **Samples 10–12** display the relation between 4QpaleoExod^m and the MT in three colors. Since the Qumran scrolls are compared with the MT, they do not show their closeness to the SP, which is shown by the comparison of the scrolls with the SP in **Samples 13–15**.⁴⁴ These samples show that the Qumran scroll reflects the same text as the SP, including the large editorial additions. Most of the text of the scroll is now black, with a sprinkling of orthographic, linguistic, and other differences from the SP. Thus, the large editorial additions (in red) of the scroll to the MT disappear when compared with the SP.

Somewhat more complex are **Samples 16–18**, displaying the text of another pre-Samaritan text, 4QNum^b. This scroll displays the same type of large and small deviations from the MT as 4QpaleoExod^m (Num 20:13b = Deut 3:23–27; Num 21:11b = Deut 2:9; Num 21:12b = Deut 2:17–19; Num 21:20b = Deut 2:24–25; Num 27:23b = Deut 3:21). In all these long pluses, 4QNum^b agrees with the SP, as indicated in **Samples 19–21**, in which the scroll is compared with the SP. However, the analysis of this scroll is more complicated, since some of its readings that deviate from the MT are shared with the LXX, especially in small harmonizing changes, as indicated in the next category. In **Samples 19–21**, these agreements are indicated in italics.

7. TEXTS CLOSE TO THE PRESUMED HEBREW SOURCE OF THE LXX (GROUP 6)

With each new category, we move further away from the MT. The LXX differs much from the MT, and one of the great surprises of the Qumran caves was the discovery of Hebrew scrolls that are very close to the LXX, translated between 250 and 100 B.C.E.

While 4QJer^b is almost identical to the reconstructed *Vorlage* of the LXX, a few other scrolls are very close to that version, sometimes in its characteristic features. 4QJer^{b, d} bear a strong resemblance to the LXX in characteristic details, with regard both to the arrangement of the verses and to their shorter text.⁴⁵ Also close to the LXX, though not to the same extent, are 4QDeut^q (**Sample 22**), 4QSam^a (close to the main tradition of the LXX and LXX^{Luc}: **Samples 23–24** and **25–26**),⁴⁶ and 4QSam^b; and secondarily also 4QNum^b (for which **Samples 19–21** indicate extra-Masoretic agreements with the SP and the LXX).

44. The comparison is based on the edition of Abraham Tal, *The Samaritan Pentateuch, Edited According to MS 6 (C) of the Shekhem Synagogue* (in Hebrew; Texts and Studies in the Hebrew Language and Related Subjects 8; Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University Press, 1994).

45. See *TCHB*, 286–94.

46. For an analysis, see my study “The Qumran Biblical Texts and the Septuagint—An Overview,” forthcoming; Frank M. Cross and Richard J. Saley (“A Statistical Analysis of the Textual Character of 4QSamuel^a [4Q51],” *DSD* 13 [2006]: 46–60) describe this scroll as follows:

Sample 22 presents the disagreements of 4QDeut^d with the MT, together with its agreements with the LXX. 4QDeut^d and the LXX contain a few extra lines beyond the MT at the end of the Song of Moses (Deut 32:43);⁴⁷ it seems that the MT removed these expressions of polytheistic beliefs. The Qumran scroll and the LXX thus agree in very important details.

Samples 23–26 show the differences between the MT and 4QSam^a, almost all in matters of content (red). A mere glance at this column shows the extent to which these samples differ from the types of divergence in 1QIsa^a (**Samples 5–8**), which pertain mainly to orthography and language. Many of the differences in red pertain to significantly divergent literary strata in the book. **Samples 23–24** display the relation between 4QSam^a and the MT, while **Samples 25–26** show the same discrepancies, this time with an indication in italics of scroll readings agreeing with the LXX.

8. “NONALIGNED” (“INDEPENDENT”) SCROLLS (GROUP 7)

The last group of texts, and the most difficult to evaluate, consists of “nonaligned” or “independent” sources—that is, scrolls that are not close to the MT, the SP, or the LXX. In some cases, the relation is determined mainly on the basis of statistical data when independent scrolls agree sometimes with the MT against the other texts in small details, and sometimes with the SP and/or the LXX against the remainder. However, the most manifestly nonaligned texts are those that contain (groups of) readings that diverge significantly from the other texts in major content features, such as the sequence differences in 4QJosh^a (**Sample 27**). The point at which the sequence deviates from the MT is indicated with a single line in pink, but one could also present in pink the remainder of the context in 4QJosh^a (**Sample 28**) or in the MT. As for the background of this scroll, according to the sequence of the MT the Israelites did not erect an altar immediately upon traversing the Jordan, as instructed in Deuteronomy 27, but only after several activities connected with the conquest had taken place, in 8:30–35. On the other hand, in 4QJosh^a this altar was seemingly built immediately after the crossing of the Jordan, recorded in the beginning of the document (recorded by Ulrich as Josh “8:34-35; X; 5:2-7”). However, Tov (2012b; see bibliography) suggests that 4QJosh^a does not necessarily display a different sequence.

4QSam^a, closely related to the *Vorlage* of the LXX, reflects independent features as well. 4QReworked Pentateuch (4QRP = 4Q158, 4Q364–367), which differs more from the MT than the other Qumran texts (**Samples 29–31**), presents a

⁴⁷4QSam^a stands firmly rooted in the Hebrew textual tradition reflected in the Old Greek” (p. 54).

47. The polytheistic content of the scroll and the LXX has all the marks of originality, as similar references to the pantheon of gods are found elsewhere in the Bible, and often in earlier West Semitic literature, for example, in the cuneiform texts found at Ugarit, in present-day Syria, dating to around 1200 B.C.E.

truly nonaligned group of texts. This composition, published as nonbiblical (DJD 13),⁴⁸ and later reclassified as a Bible text,⁴⁹ exhibits long stretches of uninterrupted Scripture text such as found in either the MT or SP Groups.⁵⁰ At the same time, this text is nonaligned; it rearranges some Torah pericopes, and it contains a small number of extensive exegetical additions. In these pluses, 4QRP typologically resembles the Hebrew compositions behind the Greek 1 Kings, Esther, and Daniel. **Sample 29** shows how 4QRP^c frg. 12a–b displays several small variations in orthography and content, while **Sample 30** shows a large addition in frg. 23. This addition lists nonbiblical festivals after Lev 24:2. Another such large addition is 4Q365 frg. 6a ii and 6c 1–7 (the “Song of Miriam”) before Exod 15:22 (**Sample 31**).⁵¹ There are not many such truly nonaligned texts at Qumran.

Within the framework of nonaligned biblical texts, we now turn to three subgroups that differ much from the MT and the other biblical texts. If these texts are considered biblical, some of them should probably be presented as mostly red or pink.⁵² In my view, however, it is most likely that these are not Scripture texts in the usual sense of the word and therefore should not be presented together with the other texts. This aspect of my presentation is more subjective than the other groups.

8.1 EXCERPTED TEXTS

The common denominator of excerpted texts is that they present large or small segments of the biblical text in a sequence different from the MT.⁵³ Some excerpted texts were probably made for liturgical purposes (*tefillin*, some manu-

48. Emanuel Tov and Sidnie White, “B. Reworked Pentateuch,” in Harold W. Attridge et al., in consultation with James C. VanderKam, *Qumran Cave 4.VIII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 1* (DJD 13; Oxford: Clarendon, 1994), 187–352 + pls. xiii–xxxvi

49. See my paper “The Many Forms of Scripture: Reflections in Light of the LXX and 4QReworked Pentateuch,” in *From Qumran to Aleppo: A Discussion with Emanuel Tov about the Textual History of Jewish Scriptures in Honor of His 65th Birthday* (ed. Armin Lange, Matthias Weigold, and Jozsef Zsengellér; FRLANT 230; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2009), 11–28.

50. The pre-Samaritan text is clearly the underlying text of 4Q158 and 4Q364, and possibly so in the case of 4Q365 (see Emanuel Tov, “364–367. 4QReworked Pentateuch b–e: Introduction,” in Attridge et al., *Qumran Parabiblical Texts, Part 1* [DJD 13], 187–96, esp. 192–96). Angela Kim (“The Textual Alignment of the Tabernacle Sections of 4Q365 [Fragments 8a–b, 9a–b i, 9b ii, 12a i, 12b iii],” *Textus* 21 [2002]: 45–69) shows that 4Q365 is not close to SP.

51. Fragment 23 may have belonged to a different manuscript from 4Q365, close to the *Temple Scroll*, and is sometimes named 4Q365a. For discussion, see Tov and White, “B. Reworked Pentateuch,” in Attridge et al., *Parabiblical Texts, Part 1* (DJD 13), 187–352, esp. 292–95. Such a solution may not be invoked in the case of frg. 6, which remains problematical.

52. Indeed, all these texts are listed everywhere as being biblical, and they have been given names of biblical texts.

53. For an analysis, see my study “Excerpted and Abbreviated Biblical Texts from Qumran,” *RevQ* 16 (1995): 581–600.

scripts of Exodus and Deuteronomy), while other texts were written for sundry literary purposes (4QCant^{a, b}, 4QTestimonia [4Q175]). If the characterization of these scrolls as excerpted and abbreviated texts is correct, their major omissions and transpositions should be disregarded in the text-critical analysis, but other deviations from the MT may be taken into consideration, for example, in the case of the *tefillin*.⁵⁴

Samples 32–34 display the deviations of 4QCant^b from the MT in small details (**Sample 32**) as well as its long omissions. 4QCant^a presents a similar text.⁵⁵ The long omissions referred to in the headers of the fragments are indicated in pink in the text. **Sample 33** presents a single line in pink, while **Sample 34** presents the remainder of the context in pink without indicating the smaller differences. In this scroll, Cant 3:6–8 and 4:4–7 are lacking. However, we believe that this text represents an ancient excerpted text, so that it should probably not be discussed here.

8.2 LITURGICAL TEXTS

Another subgroup contains nonaligned texts that are “liturgical,” such as 4QExod^d, 4QDeut^{b, n}, and most of the Psalms scrolls from Caves 4 and 11. The question of whether several of the Psalms scrolls from Qumran reflect a biblical text parallel to the MT but deviating from it or liturgical anthologies has preoccupied scholars for some time. **Sample 35** records a segment of 4QPs^a, one of the independent Psalters from Qumran. The unusual sequence of Psalm 38 followed by Psalm 71 is indicated with a single pink line. The full extent of deviation of Psalm 71 is indicated with pink without entering into detail regarding the smaller differences (**Sample 36**). If this is a regular Psalms manuscript, as suggested by P. Flint,⁵⁶ both its small and large deviations should be taken into consideration. On the other hand, if this Psalter, as well as most other Qumran Psalters, is taken as a liturgical collection, at least the large deviations should not be presented within this framework.⁵⁷

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

55. Eugene Ulrich describes these texts as earlier than or parallel with the MT: “The Qumran Biblical Scrolls and the Biblical Text,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Fifty Years after Their Discovery. Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20–25, 1997* (ed. Lawrence H. Schiffman, Emanuel Tov, James C. VanderKam, and Galen Marquis; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society and the Shrine of the Book, 2000), 51–59, esp. 57–58.

56. Peter W. Flint, *The Dead Sea Psalms Scroll and the Book of Psalms* (STDJ 17; Leiden: Brill, 1997).

57. See the following scholars reacting on the nature of the Psalms scroll from Cave 11: Shemaryahu Talmon, “Pisqah Be‘emsa‘ Pasuq and 11QPs^a,” *Textus* 5 (1966): 11–21; Moshe

8.3 REWRITTEN BIBLE COMPOSITIONS

These compositions are of limited relevance in the textual analysis because of the uncertainty regarding the text that lay before the author, especially because of the author's tendencies. They are most certainly not biblical texts. 11QT^a elaborates on the biblical text and often abbreviates it. **Sample 37** shows that the great majority of the words in 11QT^a 53:2–8 present Deut 12:20–25 of the MT, with several inversions and omissions of phrases occurring twice in the MT (for example, vv. 21, 22 in Deuteronomy 12). The sky-blue color in **Sample 37** indicates the elements in 11QT^a that are parallel to the MT, though not necessarily identical to them. **Sample 38** shows the many differences between 11QT^a and the MT, mainly in orthography and language. The differences in red in that sample do not pertain to textual analysis, since they involve either stylistic changes (inversions, shortening, addition of routine phrases) or the author's tendencies (change from third to first person singular with regard to God).

9. EPILOGUE

It has been the purpose of our analysis to offer a graphic and didactic presentation of the differences between the various groups of the biblical Dead Sea Scrolls in their relation to the MT, SP, and other sources. The samples took the medieval MT as point of reference, not only because it is the best-known text but also because this is the accepted procedure in textual criticism. In these samples, black denotes identity with the MT, while red, blue, green, and pink denote different types of deviations from the MT. The main idea behind the presentation is to indicate the typology of the gradual moving away from the black of the MT to multi-colored texts. This is a didactic device that in the first place graphically depicts the relationship between the extant textual sources. We suggest that this exercise in method more or less resembles what happened in reality. Many texts gradually moved away from the *ancestor* of the MT. However, the process of the development of the biblical text was much more complex, since several preserved texts preceded the MT. Our analysis is no more objective than others, but by graphically indicating the relationship between texts we hope to have succeeded in providing a better picture of the complicated web of relations between the texts.

H. Goshen-Gottstein, "The Psalms Scroll (11QPs^a): A Problem of Canon and Text," *Textus* 5 (1966): 22–33; Patrick W. Skehan, "A Liturgical Complex in 11QPs^a," *CBQ* 35 (1973): 195–205; Menahem Haran, "11QPs^a and the Canonical Book of Psalms," in *Minḥah le-Naḥum: Biblical and Other Studies Presented to Nahum M. Sarna in Honour of His 70th Birthday* (ed. Marc Brettler and Michael Fishbane; JSOTSup 154; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993), 193–201.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abegg, Martin G., Jr. "1QIsa^a and 1QIsa^b: A Rematch." Pages 221–28 in *The Bible as Book: The Hebrew Bible and the Judaean Desert Discoveries. Proceedings of the Conference Held at Hampton Court, Herefordshire, 18–21 June 2000*. Edited by Edward Herbert and Emanuel Tov. London: British Library; New Castle, Del.: Oak Knoll Press, in Association with the Scriptorium Center for Christian Antiquities, 2002.
- Cross, Frank Moore, Jr. "Some Notes on a Generation of Qumran Studies." Pages 1–14 in *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid, 18–21 March, 1991*. Edited by Julio Trebolle Barrera and Luis Vegas Montaner. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 11. Leiden: Brill; Madrid: Editorial Complutense, 1992.
- . "The Fixation of the Text and Canon of the Hebrew Bible." Pages 205–18 in his *From Epic to Canaan: History and Literature in Ancient Israel*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998.
- Cross, Frank Moore, Jr., and Shemaryahu Talmon. *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1975.
- Flint, Peter W. *The Dead Sea Psalms Scroll & the Book of Psalms*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 17. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- Lange, Armin. *Handbuch der Textfunde vom Toten Meer*, vol. 1, *Die Handschriften biblischer Bücher von Qumran und den anderen Fundorten*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009.
- Talmon, Shemaryahu. "The Old Testament Text." Pages 159–99 in vol. 1 of *The Cambridge History of the Bible*. Edited by P. R. Ackroyd and C. F. Evans. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970.
- Tov, Emanuel. *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*. 3rd ed., revised and expanded. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2012 [= TCHB; = 2012a].
- . "The Biblical Texts from the Judaean Desert: An Overview and Analysis of the Published Texts." Pages 128–54 in idem, *Hebrew Bible, Greek Bible, and Qumran: Collected Essays*. Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum 121. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.
- . "Literary Development of the Book of Joshua as Reflected in 4QJosh^a." In *The Book of Joshua and the Land of Israel*. Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium. Leuven: Peeters, 2012 [= 2012b].
- Tov, Emanuel, and Edward D. Herbert, eds. *The Bible as Book: The Hebrew Bible and the Judaean Desert Discoveries. Proceedings of the Conference Held at Hampton Court, Herefordshire, 18–21 June 2000*. London: British Library; New Castle, Del.: Oak Knoll Press, in Association with the Scriptorium Center for Christian Antiquities, 2002.
- Ulrich, Eugene. *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible*. Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans; Leiden: Brill, 1999.

- . “The Qumran Biblical Scrolls and the Biblical Text.” Pages 51–59 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Fifty Years after Their Discovery. Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20–25, 1997*. Edited by Lawrence H. Schiffman, Emanuel Tov, James C. VanderKam, and Galen Marquis. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society and the Shrine of the Book, 2000.
- . “The Absence of ‘Sectarian Variants’ in the Jewish Scriptural Scrolls Found at Qumran.” Pages 175–95 in *The Bible as Book: The Hebrew Bible and the Judaean Desert Discoveries. Proceedings of the Conference Held at Hampton Court, Herefordshire, 18–21 June 2000*. Edited by Edward Herbert and Emanuel Tov. London: British Library; New Castle, Del.: Oak Knoll Press, in Association with the Scriptorium Center for Christian Antiquities, 2002.
- Young, Ian. “The Stabilization of the Biblical Text in the Light of Qumran and Masada: A Challenge for Conventional Qumran Chronology?” *Dead Sea Discoveries* 9 (2002): 364–90.

SBL website
to come

APPENDIX

Samples 1, 5, 11, 16, 25, 28, 32, and 38 are presented on the following pages. For all 38 Samples, see the bookpage on the SBL website, at: www.XXXXSBL.

5/6 HevPs (DJD XXXVIII) Col. IX (Frgs. 6 + 7) Ps 18:17–43
 Compared with MT

| | | |
|--|------|-----|
| [14]וירעם בשמים יהוה ועליון יתן קלו ברד וגחלי אש] | (1) | |
| [15]וישלח חציו ויפיצם וברקים רב ויהמם] | (2) | |
| [16]ויראו אפיקי מים ויגלו מוסדות תבל] | (3) | |
| [מגעתך יהוה מנשמת רוח אפך [17]ישלח מִמְרוֹןִים יקחני] | 4 | f.6 |
| וימשני ממים רבים [18]יצילני מאיבי עז | 5 | |
| [ומשנאי כי אמצו ממני [19]יקדמוני [ביום אידי | 6 | |
| [ויהי יהוה למשען לי [20]ויציאֲנִי לְמִרְחֹב יחלצני כי חפץ בי | 7 | |
| [21]יגמלני יהוה כצדקי כבר ידי ישיב לי | 8 | |
| [22]כי שמרתי דרכי יהוה [ולא רשעתי מאלהי [23]כי כל משפטיו לנגדני] | 9 | |
| [וחקתיו לא אסיר מני [24]ואנהי תמים עמו ואשתמר מעוני | 10 | |
| [25]וישב יהוה לי כצדקי כבר ידי לנגד עיניו | 11 | |
| [26]עם חסיד תתחסד עם גבר תמים תתם | 12 | |
| [27]עם נבר תתברר ועם עקש תתפתל | 13 | |
| [28]כי אֶתֶּה עם עני תושיע ועיניִם רמות תשפיל | 14 | |
| [29]כי אֶתֶּה תאירן גרי יהוה אנהי יגיה חשכִי [30]כי | 15 | |
| בך ארץ גד[וד] ובאלהי אדלג שׁור [31]האל תמים ד[רכו] | 16 | |
| אמרת יהוה צ[רו]פה מן הוא לְכֹל החסיןִם בן | 17 | |
| [32]כי מי אלוהִן [מבלעדי יהוה ומי צור זולתִי [אלהיִנִּי] | 18 | |
| [33]האל המאזרני [חיל ויתן תמים דרכי [34]משוֹהֵן רגלי כאילות | 19 | |
| ועל במותי יעמִי[דני] [35]מלמד ידי לְ[מלחמה] | 20 | |
| [ונחֶתֶה קשת נחושה זרועתי [36]ותתן לי מִגֵּן ישעך] | 21 | |
| [וימינך תסעדני וענותך תרבני [37]תרחיב צעדי תחת] | (22) | |
| [ולא מעדו קרסלי [38]ארדוף אויבי ואֲנִישִׁינִם] | 23 | f.7 |
| [ולא אשׁוּב עד כלותם [39]אמהצם ולא יכלו קום | 24 | |
| [יפלו תחת רגלי [40]ותאזרני [חיל למלחמה תכריע קמי תחתי | 25 | |
| [41]ואיבי נִתְתֶּה לי עֶרְף וּמִשְׁנָאִי אֲצִמִיתֵם | 26 | |
| [42]ישועו ואין מושיע על יהוה ולא ענם | 27 | |
| [43]ואשחקם כעפר על פני רוח כשיט חוצות אריקם] | 28 | |

bottom margin

Sample 1. 5/6HevPs, a beautiful scroll from circa 115 c.E.

1QIsa^a (DJD XXXII) Col. I Isa 1:1–26
Compared with MT

| | |
|----|--|
| 1 | חזון ישׁהוּ בן אמוץ אשר חזה על יהודה וירושלם בלמי עזיה |
| 2 | יותם אחז חֻקיה מלכי יהודה ^{2 vac} שמעו שמים והאזינו הארץ |
| 3 | כִּי־א יהוה דבר בנים גדלתי ורומתִי ³ והמה פשעו בי ³ ידע שור קונהו |
| 4 | וחמור אבוס בעליו ישראל לוא ידע ועמי לוא הִתְנַבְּוּנִי ⁴ הוי גוי חושה |
| 5 | עמ כבד עוון זרע מרעים בנים משחיתים עזבו את יהוה נאצו את |
| 6 | קדוש ישראל נזרו אחר ⁵ על מה תכו עוד תוסיפו סרה כול ראוש לחולי |
| 7 | זכול לבב דוה ⁶ מכפ רגל ועד רואש אין בו מתם פצע וחבורה ומכה טריה |
| 8 | לוא זרו ולוא חובשו ולוא רככה בששן ⁷ ארצכם שממה עריכם שרופות |
| 9 | אש אדמתכם לנגדכם זרים אוכלים אותה ושממו עליה כמפכת זרים |
| 10 | ⁸ ונתרת בת ציון כסוכה בכרם וכמלונה במקשה כעיר נצורה ⁹ ללולי יהוה |
| 11 | צבאות הותיר לנו שריד כמעט כסודם היינו לעומרה דמינו vacat |
| 12 | ¹⁰ שמעו דבר יהוה קציני סודם ואזינו תורת אלוהינו עמ עומרה ¹¹ למה לי |
| 13 | רוב זבחיכם יואמר יהוה שבעתי עולות אילים וחלב מריאים ודמ |
| 14 | פרים וכבשים ועתודים לוא חפצתי ¹² כִּי־א תבאו לראות פני מי בקש זות |
| 15 | מידכם לרמוס חצרי ¹³ לוא תוסיפו להביא מנחת שוא קטרת תועבה היא |
| 16 | לי חודש ושבת קרא מקרא לוא אוכל און ועצרתה ¹⁴ חודשיכם ומועדיכם |
| 17 | שנאה נפשי היו עלי לטרח גלאיתי נשוא ¹⁵ ובפרשכם כפיכם אעלים עיני |
| 18 | מכם גם כי הרבו תפלה אינני שומע ידיכמה דמים מלאו אצבעותיכם |
| 19 | בעאון ¹⁶ רחצו והזכו והסירו רוע מעלליכם מנגד עיני חדלו הרע ¹⁷ למדו |
| 20 | היטיב דרושו משפט אשרו חמוץ שפטו יאתום ריבו אלמנה |
| 21 | ¹⁸ לכו נא ונוכחה יואמר יהוה אמ יהיו חטאיכם כשני כשלג ילבינו |
| 22 | אמ ידומו כתולעת ¹⁹ כצמר יהיו ¹⁹ אמ תאבו ושמעתם טוב הארץ תאכלו |
| 23 | ²⁰ ואמ תמאנו ומריתם בחרב תאכלו כִּי־א פי יהוה דבר vac |
| 24 | ²¹ היכה הייתה לונה קריה נאמנה מלאתי משפט צדק ילין בה ועתה |
| 25 | מלצחים ²² כספך היו לסוגים סבאך מהול במים ²³ שריכי סנוררים וחברין |
| 26 | גנבים כולם אוהבי שוחד רודפי שלמונים יאתום לוא ישפטו וריב |
| 27 | אלמנה לוא יבוא אליהם ²⁴ לכן נאום האדון יהוה צבאות [אביר ישראל] |
| 28 | הוה אנחם מצריו ואנקם מאיבו ²⁵ והשיב ידי עליך ואצנרף כבר |
| 29 | סוגך ואסיר כול בדיליך ²⁶ ואשיבה שופטיך כבראישונתן ויעציך |

Sample 5. 1QIsa^a Column 1

4QpaleoExod^m (DJD IX) Col. V Exod 9:5^b-16 . . . 19^b-21
 Compared with MT

top margin

| | | | |
|-----------------------|--|-----|-----------------------|
| [| ובנמל ^{ים} · בבקר · ובצאן · דבר · כבד · מאד · והנפלא |] | 1 |
| [| מקנה מצריים · ולא · ימות · מכלן |] | 2 |
| [| יה ^ה · ה ^ה · הדבר · ה ^ה · בארץ · ⁶ ויעש · יהונה |] | 3 |
| [| מקנה מצריים · וממקנה · בני · ישראל · לא] | (7) | 4 |
| [| פרעה · והנה · לא · מת · ממקנה · בני · ישראל · עד · אחד · ויכבדן |] | 5 |
| [| · העם |] | 6 |
| [| vacat [⁸ ו] |] | 6 |
| [| יאומר יהוה א ^ל משה · ואל · אהרון · לאמור · קחו · לכם · מלא · חפנכם · פִּינח |] | 7 |
| [| · השננים · לעיני · פרעה · ויהיה לאבק · על · ארץ · מצרים |] | 8 |
| [| הבה ^ה · מ ^ה · ל ^ש · חִיִּן · פֹּרַח אֲבֻבֹת · בכל · ארץ · מצרים |] | 9 |
| [| · ויעמדו · לִפְנֵי פרעה · ויזרק · אֹתוֹ · מִן שֵׁה |] | 10 |
| [| · ובבהמ ^ה · ¹¹ ולא · יכלו] |] | 11 |
| [| · בהרטומים |] | 12 |
| [| דבר · יהוה |] | (12) 13 |
| [| |] | (13) 14 |
| [| יהוה · אלנהי |] | 15 |
| [| שולח · את ·] |] | (14) 16 |
| [| הארץ · ¹⁵ כני |] | 17 |
| [| · אולם ¹⁶ |] | 18 |
| [lines 19-26 missing] | | | |
| ° [] °° [] °° [| |] | (19 ^b) 27 |
| [| בעמ ^ה · לבלתי · שלהם · הנני |] | 28 |
| [| במצרים · למן · היום |] | 29 |
| [| אשר · לך · בשדה · כל האדם |] | 30 |
| [| עליהם · הברד |] | 31 |
| [| את עבדיו · ואת · מקנהן · אל |] | 20 32 |
| [| מקנהו בשדה |] | (21) 33 |

bottom margin

4QNum^b (DJD XII) Col. XI: Frg. 13 i-14
 Num 20:12-13^b [= MT Deut 3:24-27]
 Compared with MT

[lines 1-23 missing]

24 בני ישראל לכן לוא תביאו את הקהל הזה אל הארץ אשר נתתי ל[ה]מה
 25 [13^a המה מי מריבה אשר רבו [בזין ישראל את יהוה ויקדש במ^{13b} [=MT 3:24] ויואמר
 26 מושה אדוני יהוה אתה ה[חלית]ה ל[ה]ראות את עבדכה את נוד[לכה ואת
 27 ידכה החזקה אשר מי אל [בשמים וב]ארץ אשר יעשה כמעשיכה וכנבורתכה
 28 [=MT 25] אעברה נא ואראה את הארץ [הטובה] הזאת אשר בעבר [הירדן] ההר
 29 [הטוב הזה והלבנון vacat [=MT 26] ויואמר יהוה אל מושה רב לכה אל תוסף
 30 [דבר אלי עוד בדבר הזה עלה אל [ה]ואש הפסנה ושא עיניכה ימה וצפונה]

bottom margin

4QNum^b (DJD XII) Col. XIII: Frg. 17 ii-18 Num 21:11^a
 [=MT Deut 2:9]-12^b [=MT Deut 2:18-19], 20^{a-b}
 [=MT Deut 2:24-25] Compared with MT

[lines 1-12 missing]

13 [מזרח השמש vacat [=MT Deut 2:9] ויואמר יהוה אל
 14 מושה אל תצר את מואב ואל התגר במ מלחמה כיא [לוא אתן מ]ארצו ירושה
 15 [כיא לבני לוש נתתי את ער ירושה 12^a משם נסעו ויחנו [בנחל זרך vacat
 16 [=MT Deut 2:18] וידבר יהוה אל מושה לאמור אתה עובר היום את] נבול [מ]ואב את
 17 [ער [=MT 19] וקרבתה מול בני עמון אל תצורם ואל התגר במ [כיא לוא אתן מארץ]

[lines 18-25 missing]

26 מואב [ה]ואש הפסנה הנשקף על פני הישימון vacat
 27 ויואמר יהוה אל מושה קומו סעו ועברו את נחל ארנון ראה נתתי בידכה
 28 [את] וסיחון מלך חשבון האמורי ואת ארצו החל רש לרשת את ארצו והתגר
 29 [בו מ]לחמך [=MT 25] היום הזה החל תת פחדכה ויראתכה על פני העמים תחת כול]

[lines 30-31 missing]

4QNum^b (DJD XII) Col. XV: Frgs. 20-22
 Num 22:7-21, 31-34
 Compared with MT

top margin

1 את דברי בלק 8 ויואמר אליהם לינו פוהן הל[ה]נה והשיבו[ה]י את[כמה] דבר כאשר
 2 ידבר יהוה אלי וישבו שרין [מ]ואב עם [ב]לעם 9 ויבוא אלוהים אל בלעם ויואמר
 3 אליו מי האנשים האלה [ע]מכה 10 ויואמר בלעם אל האלוהים בלק בן זפור מלך מואב שלח
 4 אלי לאמור 11 הנה עם יצא ממצרים ויכס את עין הארץ והואה ישבן ממולי ועתה לכה
 5 קבנה לי [אתו] אולי אוכלן [לה]לחם בו ונרשתיהו[ן] מן הארץ 12 ויואמר אלוהים אל בלעם
 6 אלן חלך עם האנשים ואל [תאמר] את העם כיא ברוך[ה] הואה 13 ויואמר בלק בן זפור ויבוא
 7 אל שרי בלק לכו אל [א]דונו[ם] כמה כיא מאן יהוה לתני להלוך עמכמה 14 ויקומו שרי מואב
 8 ויבואו אל בלק ויואמרו אליו מאן בלעם הלוך עמנו 15 ויוסף עוד בלק שלוח שרין רבים
 9 ויבואו אל בלק ויבואו אל בלעם 16 ויואמרו אליו כה אמר בלק בן זפור מלך מואב אל
 10 נא תמנע מהלוך אלי[ך] כיא כבוד אכבדה מואדה וכנול אשר תואמר אלי אעשה לכה ולכנה
 11 נא קובה לי את העום הזה 18 ויען בלעם ויואמר אל עבדי בלק אם יתן לי בלק מלוא

Sample 16. The Pre-Samaritan Text 4QNum^b

4QSam^a (DJD XVII) Col. II: Frgs. a–d 1 Sam 1:22–2:10
 Compared with MT (Agreements of the Scroll with the LXX Indicated by Italics)
top margin

| | |
|----|---|
| 1 |] וַחֲנָה לֹא עִלְתָּה עִמּוֹ כִּי אִמְרָה לְאִשָּׁה עַד אֲשֶׁר |
| 2 | [יַעֲלֶה הַנֶּעֱרַר עַד גַּמְלָתִיהוּ וְנִרְאָהָ] אֶת פִּנְיָ [יְהוָה וַיֵּשֶׁב לִפְנֵי |
| 3 | יְהוָה וַיֵּשֶׁב שָׁם עַד עוֹלָם וְנִתְּנָהּ נֹזֵר עַד עוֹלָם כּוֹל יָמָי |
| 4 | [חַיִּיו וַיֹּאמֶר לָהּ אֶלְקָנָה אִשָּׁה] עֲשֵׂי הַטּוֹב בְּעֵינֶיךָ שְׁבִי עַד |
| 5 | גַּמְלֶךְ אוֹתוֹ אֲךָ יִקָּם יְהוָה הִיא הַדְּיוּצָא מִפִּיךָ וְתִשָּׁב הָאִשָּׁה |
| 6 | וְתִינַק אֶת בְּנֵהּ עַד גַּמְלָהּ אֲנִי וְתוֹ הַתְּעַל אֹתוֹ שִׁילָה כְּאֲשֶׁר |
| 7 | [יַעֲלֶה אֶלְקָנָה לְזֹכֶר לַיהוָה כִּפְרָ בֶן] בִּקְרָ מִשְׁלֹשׁ וְלַחֵם { 〇 〇 〇 〇 } |
| 8 | [וַאֲיִפָּה אַחַת קָמָה וְנִבֵּל יַיִן וְתִבְיָאָהּ בֵּיתָהּ יְהוָה שִׁילָה וְהַנֶּעֱרַר |
| 9 | עִמָּם וַיְבִיאֻהוּ לִפְנֵי יְהוָה וַיִּשְׁחַט אֲבִיהוּ אֶת הַזֹּבֵחַ] אֲשֶׁר |
| 10 | יַעֲשֶׂה מִיָּמַיִם יְמִימָה לַיהוָה vacat זִי־שִׁחַט |
| 11 | [אֶת הַפֶּר וְתִבְוֹא חֲנָה אִם הַנֶּעֱרַר אֶל עָלִי וְתֹאמַר בְּ] אֲדֹנָי |
| 12 | [חַי נִפְשֶׁךָ אֲנִי הָאִשָּׁה הַנִּצְבֶּת עִמָּכָה בְּזֵה לְהַתְּפַלֵּל אֶל יְהוָה |
| 13 | [וְעַל הַנֶּעֱרַר הַזֶּה הַתְּפַלֵּלִי וַיִּתֵּן יְהוָה לִי אֶת שְׂאֵלֹתַי אֲשֶׁר] |
| 14 | [שְׂאֵלֹתַי מִעַמּוֹ וְגַם אֲנֹכִי הַשְּׂאֵלֹתִיהוּ לַיהוָה כּוֹל הַיָּמַיִם] |
| 15 | [אֲשֶׁר חַי הוּא שְׂאוֹל לַיהוָה vacat וְתַעֲזֹב הוּא שֵׁם וְתִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה] |
| 16 | [לַיהוָה וְתֹאמַר] vacat [] |
| 17 | [] vacat עֲלֶיךָ לְבִי בִיהוּהָ] רִמָּה קֶרְנֵי בֵּינָהּ] רַחֲבָ |
| 18 | [פִּי עַל אוֹיְבֵי שִׁמְחָתִי בִישׁוּעֶתְךָ כִּי־יָאֵ אֵינִי קְדוֹשׁ כִּי־הִנְהוּ] |
| 19 | [וַאֲיִן צְדִיק כְּאֶלֹהֵינוּ וַאֲיִן בִּלְתָךְ וַאֲיִן צוֹר כְּאֶלֹהֵינוּ] |
| 20 | [וְאֶל תִּרְבּוּ תִדְבְּרוּ נִבְהָה אֶל יִצְחָק מִפִּיכֶם כִּי אֶל דַּעַתָּה] |
| 21 | [יְהוָה וְאֶל תּוֹכֵן עֲלֵלֹתָיו וְקִשְׁתָּ גְבוּרֵי־יָדָהּ וְנִכְשָׁלִים אֲזַנְרוּ] |
| 22 | [חֵיל וְשִׁבְעִים בְּלַחֵם נִשְׁכְּרוּ וְרַעֲבִים חֲדָלְנוּ עַד עַקְרָהּ יִלְדָהּ] |
| 23 | [שִׁבְעָה וְרַבַּת בָּנִים אֲמַלְלָה וְיְהוָה מִמִּית וּמַחֲיָה מוֹרֵי־יָדָהּ] |
| 24 | [שְׂאוֹל וַיַּעַל וְיְהוָה מוֹרֵישׁ וּמַעֲשִׂיר מִשְׁפִּילָה] אֶף־ [מְרוֹמָם] |
| 25 | [וְמִקָּמָה מַעֲפָר דָּל וּמֵאֲשֵׁפוֹת יָרִים אֲבִיוֹן לְהוֹשִׁיב עִם] |
| 26 | [נְדָבָיִם וְכֹסֵא כְבוֹד יִנְחָלָם כִּי לַיהוָה מִצּוֹקֵי אֶרֶץ וַיִּשְׁתַּחֲוֶה] |
| 27 | [עֲלֵיהֶם תִּבְּלָה] וְדֹרֶךְ חֲסִידָיו יִשְׁמֹר וְרַשְׁעִים בַּחֲשֶׁךְ יִדְמוּ] |
| 28 | [נִתֵּן נְדָרָהּ] וְיִבְרַךְ שְׁנוֹת צְדִיקָהּ כִּי לֹא בִכָּה יִגְבַּר אִישׁ] |
| 29 | [וְיְהוָה יִחַת מִרְיָבוֹ מִי קְדוֹשׁ כִּי־הוּא] |

Sample 25. 4QSam^a

4QJosh^a (DJD XIV) Col. I: Frgs. 1–2 Josh 8:34–35; 5:X, 2–7
 Compared with MT (with Indication of Sequence Difference)

top margin

| | |
|--|-------|
| [בספר]התורה ³⁵ לא היה דבר מכל צוה משהן את יהושוע אשר לא קרא יהשע נגד כל | 1 |
| [ישראל בעברו]את הירדןן]והנשים והטף והנרן] ההולך בקרבם ^{5,x} אחר אשר נתקןן] | 2 |
| []לן]את ספר התורה אחר כן]ל] נושאי הארוןן] | 3 |
| []בעת]ההיא אמר יהוה אליהשנע ע]שנה לך חרבות צרים ^{5,2} | 4 |
| [ושוב מל את בני ישראל ^{5,3} וייעש]לןו]יהשע חןרבות צ]רנים וימל את בני ישראל אל] | 5 |
| [נבעת הערלות ⁴ וזה הדבר אשר מל יהושע כ]לן]העם הוצנא ממצרים הזכרים כל] | 6 f.2 |
| [אנשי המלחמה מתו במדבר בדרך בצאתם]ממצרים ⁵ כי מלים היו כל העם היצאים] | 7 |
| [וכל העם הילדים במדבר בדרך בצ]אתם ממצרים לא מלו ⁶ כי ארבעים שנה הלכו] | 8 |
| [בני ישראל במדבר עד תם כל הגוי]אנשי המלחמה היצאים ממצרים אשר לא שמעו] | 9 |
| [בקול יהוה אשר נשבע יהוה להם לב]לתי ראות את הןארץ אשר נשבע יהוה לאבותם] | 10 |
| []לתת לנו ארץ זבת חלב ודבש ⁷ ואת בני]הם הקנים | 11 |

4QCant^b (DJD XVI) Col. I: Frg. 1 Cant 2:9–3:2 Compared with MT

top margin

| | |
|---|----|
| אָנַחַר כַּתְּלָנוּן] מִן הַחֲלֹנוֹת מִצִּיץ מִן הַחֲרָכִים | 1 |
| [¹⁰ עֵנָה דוּדִי וְאָמַר] לִי קוּמִי לֶךְ רַעִיתִי יִפְתִּי וּלְכִי לֶךְ | 2 |
| [¹¹ כִּי הִנֵּה הִסְתּוֹ עַבְרָה הַגֶּשֶׁם חִלְףָּה לֶךְ לֹו ¹² הִנֵּה עֵת | 3 |
| [הַנִּצְנִים נִרְאוּ בְּ] אֶרֶץ עֵת הַזְּמִיר הַגִּיעַ וְקָל | 4 |
| [הַתּוֹר נִשְׁמַע בְּ] אֶרְצֵנוּ ¹³ הִנֵּה הַתְּנַאָּה חֲנֻשָּׁה | 5 |
| [פְּגִיָּה וְהַנִּפְנִים ס] מִדֶּר נִתְּנוּ רִיחַ קוּמִי לֶךְ רַעִיתִי | 6 |
| יִפְתִּי וּלְכִי לֶךְ <i>v a ca</i> [t | 7 |
| [¹⁴ יוֹנְתִי בַחֲגוּי הַ] סֹלַע בַּסֶּתֶר הַמִּדְּלָגָה הַרְאֵנִי | 8 |
| [אֵת מִרְא(י)ךְ הַשְּׁמַעִינִי אֲנִי שְׁמַעְךְ כִּי קָלֶךְ עֶרֶב | 9 |
| [וּמִרְא(י)ךְ נֹאחַ ¹⁵ אֲחֹזוּ לָנוּ שׁוֹעֲלִים קִטְנִים מִחֲבָלִים | 10 |
| [כְּרָמִים וְכִרְמִינוּ סִמְדֶּר ¹⁶ דוּדִי לִי וְאֵנִי לֹו הַרְוֵעָה | 11 |
| [בְּשׁוֹשְׁנִים ¹⁷ עַד שִׁפּוּחַ הַיּוֹם וְנִסּוּ הַטְּלָלִים סוֹב | 12 |
| [?] <i>vacat</i> [עֲלֵה הַרְרִי בַתֶּר | 13 |
| [^{3:1} עַל מִשְׁכְּבִי בַלִּי] לֹוֹת בַּלִּילוֹת בַּשְּׁקֵתִי אֵת | 14 |
| [שֶׁאֲהַבָּה נַפְשִׁי בַּשְּׁקֵתִי] הִוֹ וְלֹא מִצַּתִּיהוּ ² אֲקוּם נֹא | 15 |

bottom margin

Col. II: Frg. 2 i Cant 3:5, 9–4:1 Compared with MT

| | |
|--|----|
| [וְאִסּוּבְּבָה בַּעִיר בְּשׁוֹקִים וּבִרְחֻבוֹת אֲבַקְשָׁה אֵת שֶׁאֲהַבָּה] | 1 |
| [נַפְשִׁי בַּשְּׁקֵתִי וְלֹא מִצַּתִּיהוּ ³ מִצַּאֲוֹנֵי הַשְּׁמֵרִים הַסַּבְבִּים] | 2 |
| [בַּעִיר אֵת שֶׁאֲהַבָּה נַפְשִׁי רֵאִיתָם ⁴ כִּמְעַט שֶׁעֲבַרְתִּי מֵהֶם עַד] | 3 |
| [שֶׁמִּצַּאֲתִי אֵת שֶׁאֲהַבָּה נַפְשִׁי אֲחֹזְתִּיו וְלֹא אֶרְפְּנוּ עַד שֶׁהִבִּיאֲתִיו] | 4 |
| [אֵל בֵּית אֲמִי וְאֵל חֹדֶר הַחֹרֶתִי ⁵ הַשְּׁבַעֲתִי אֲתַכְּמָה] | 5 |
| [בְּנוֹת יְרוּשָׁלַם בְּצַבָּאוֹת אוּ בְּאֵילוֹת הַשְּׁדָה אִם תַּעֲרִינִי] | 6 |
| [וְאִם תַּעֲוֹרְרוּ אֵת הָאֲהַבָּה עַד שֶׁתַּחֲפִץ ⁹ אֶפְרָיִם] | 7 |
| [עֲשֵׂה לֹו הַמֶּלֶךְ שְׁלֹמָה מִן עֲצֵי הַלְּבָנוֹן] <i>vacat</i> | 8 |
| [¹⁰ עֲמוּדָיו עֲשֵׂה כִסֵּף רַפִּידָתוֹ זָהָב מִן רִכְבוֹ אֶרְגָּמָן] | 9 |
| [?] תּוֹכוֹ רִצּוֹף אֲהַבָּה מִן בְּנוֹת יְרוּשָׁלַם | 10 |
| [¹¹ צִאִינָה וְרֵאִינָה בְּנוֹת צִיּוֹן בַּמֶּלֶךְ שְׁלֹמֹה] | 11 |
| [בַּעֲטָרָה שֶׁעֲטָרָה לֹו אֲמוֹ בְּיוֹם חַתֻּנּוֹת] | 12 |
| [וּבְיוֹם שִׁמְחַת לְבוֹ] <i>vacat</i> | 13 |
| [^{4:1} הִנֵּךְ יִפְתִּי רַעִיתִי] <i>vacat</i> | 14 |

Sample 32. 4QCant^b

11QTemple^a (ed. Yadin) LIII 2-8
Compared with MT

| 11QTemple ^a LIII 2-8 | MT |
|---|---|
| כי א]זתה נפשכה לאכול ב]שר בכול אות נפשכה] תואכל ב]ש]ר | 20 ...כי תאווה נפשך לאכל בשר בכל אות נפשך תאכל בשר |
| ו]ב]ח]ת]ה מוצאנכה ומבקרריכה כברכתי אשר אתן לכה | 21 כי ירחק במור המקום אשר יבחר ה' אלהיך לשום שמו שם וחבחת מבקרך ומצאנך אשר נתן ה' לך כאשר צויתך ואכלת בשעריך בכל אות נפשך |
| ואכלתה בשעריכה | 22 אך כאשר יאכל את הצבי ואת האיל כן תאכלנו |
| והטהור והטמא בכה יחדיו כצבי וכאיל | הטמא והטהור יחדו יאכלנו |
| רק חזק לבלתי אכול הדם כי הדם הוא הנפש ולוא תואכל את הנפש עם הבשר | 23 רק חזק לבלתי אכל הדם כי הדם הוא הנפש ולא תאכל הנפש עם הבשר לא תאכלנו |
| על הארץ תשופכנו כמים וכסיהו בעפר (Lev 17:13) | 24 על הארץ תשפכנו כמים לא תאכלנו |
| למען ייטב (יוטב) לכה ולבניכה אחריכה עד עולם ועשיתה הישר והטוב לפני אני ה' אלוהיכה | 25 למען ייטב לך ולבניך אחריך כי תעשה הישר בעיני ה' |

Sample 38. Differences between 11QT^a and the MT