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 identique 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 progressivement de l'ancêtre du TM. Ce processus de développement fut toutefois beaucoup plus complexe, puisque plusieurs des textes préservés ont précédé le TM.
1. 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. By the same token, introductions to the text of the Hebrew Bible, including my own, are not didactic in their approach.

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, but the biblical scrolls themselves do not contain sectarian readings.

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.


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).


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

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 Murabba'at, Wadi Sdeir (Naḥal David), Naḥal Hever, Naḥal Se'elim, and Masada. 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 MasLevb, MasEzek, and MasPs8,8 which provide a reasonable amount of text, deviate only minimally from the MT.9 Both MasEzek and MasPs8 are luxury scrolls,10 dating to the second half of the first century B.C.E. Likewise, the Minor Prophets Scroll from Murabba'at (MurXII from ca. 115 c.e.)11 and 5/6H евPs, 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 Se'elim (Numbers); Naḥal Hever (Numbers [2], Deuteronomy, Psalms); and Murabba'at (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. MasLevb 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 MasPs8 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 MasLevb 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 מימוי in Lev 9:2, 3 (col. 1:11, 13) and the defective הָיִל form in Lev 9:9 (col. 1:21). See in detail Talmon, "Hebrew Fragments from Masada."


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 and 1QIsaab: 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. If
the scrolls deviate at all from L, their deviations are similar in nature and num-
ber to the differences among the medieval MT manuscripts themselves. In our
terminology, the scrolls from the sites other than Qumran belong to the “inner
circle” of proto-rabbinic texts, 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 dem-
stration 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. 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 “cor-
rected texts,” that is, texts corrected from the temple copies; 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 Murabba’at
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.”
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, 4QGenb (Sample 2), with no variation from Codex L, is similar in nature to those from the other Judean Desert sites, while 4QGenb (Sample 3) and 4QProvb are very close to the MT. 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.

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-Exod, 4QExod, 4QSamb, 4QJer, and 4QJer, exemplified by 1QIsab (Sample 4). The number of variations between 1QIsab and Codex L is more substantial than those in Group 1, but clearly the two reflect the same family. The closeness between the two is visible when they are contrasted with the manifold deviations from the MT of the "vulgar" text of

18. 4QGenb contains no variants in 361 words.
19. The preserved fragments of 4QGenb 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. 4QProvb 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 MasLevb with no variants (ibid., 374). The latter scroll is of a size equal to that of some of the Qumran scrolls, so 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 Nahal 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 (1QIsab)," BJRL 42 (1959): 132–44; Dominique Barthélemy, Critique textuelle de l’Ancien Testament, tome 3, Ézéchiel,
1QIsa\textsuperscript{a}. While the variation between 1QIsa\textsuperscript{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\textsuperscript{b} the discrepancy amounts to only 4.3 percent in variants and 3.7 percent in orthographic variants.\textsuperscript{25} These figures, provided by Martin Abegg,\textsuperscript{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\textsuperscript{b} tabulated for all the preserved fragments can also be expressed in terms of different groups of details,\textsuperscript{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\textsuperscript{b} from the MT in the Entire Scroll\textsuperscript{28}**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orthography</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addition of conjunctive wāw</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of conjunctive wāw</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differences in letters</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing letters</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differences in number</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differences in pronouns\textsuperscript{29}</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different grammatical forms</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different prepositions</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different words</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{25} The close relationship between the medieval representative of the MT, namely, L, and 1QIsa\textsuperscript{b} is matched by almost all the texts of Isaiah from Cave 4. In the sections in which 1QIsa\textsuperscript{b} overlaps with 4QIsa\textsuperscript{b} and 4QIsa\textsuperscript{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\textsuperscript{a}, 4QIsa\textsuperscript{s}, 4QIsa\textsuperscript{f}, and 4QIsa\textsuperscript{g} (of these, 4QIsa\textsuperscript{e} 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\textsuperscript{b}, 4QIsa\textsuperscript{i}, 4QIsa\textsuperscript{j}, 4QIsa\textsuperscript{m}, 4QIsa\textsuperscript{p}, 4QIsa\textsuperscript{q}, 4Qpapls\textsuperscript{a}, 4QIsa\textsuperscript{t}, and 4QIsa\textsuperscript{v}.

\textsuperscript{26} Abegg, “1QIsa\textsuperscript{a},” 222–23.

\textsuperscript{27} Thus M. Cohen, “h’y’d’y’h bdbr qdweh hwnsh l’wtwytwyw whyqwrt htkst,” Deoth 47 (1978): 83–101; reprinted in HaMiqra’ vaAnahnu [The Bible and Us] (ed. Uriel Simon; Tel Aviv: Devir, 1979), 42–69. See also my TCHB, 31–33.

\textsuperscript{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.

\textsuperscript{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\textsuperscript{a} and other texts.
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, 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.

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. 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
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 1QIsa, 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, 1QIsa was probably copied from a text close to the MT.

In the case of 1QIsa, 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 1QH. 35

33. Morphological variations relate to words that are pronounced differently, such as the מַלְיִם in the majority tradition of the Hebrew text and מַלְיִם 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.

The features of this scribal school are visible also in overlapping sections (Sample 9) written by similar scribes, 4QIsac frgs. 9 ii, 11, 12 i, 52 (Isa 23:8–24:15) //1Qlsa a cols. 18–19. 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: 4QIsac), in which the orthographic divergences from the MT common to 4QIsac and 1Qlsa 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. In terms of contents, these do not form a special group since 4QpaleoGen-Exod1 and 4QpaleoDeutr are close to the MT, 39 4QpaleoExodm 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, 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-Exodm forms the link with the next category.


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 10:4–12I//4QSd 4Q258; 9:1–13). Although there are differences in matters of orthography and morphology, more often than not the two agree.


39. The orthography of 4QpaleoGen-Exod1 (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). 4QpaleoDeutr is of a similar nature; see Skehan, Ulrich, and Sanderson, *Palaeo-Hebrew and Greek Manuscripts* (DJD 9), 133–35.


41. Ibid., 246–48.
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 4QpaleoExodm, 4QNumb, 4QExod-Levf, and secondarily 4QLevd. 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 4QpaleoExodm, shown in Sample 10, shows a few small changes from the MT in red, green, and blue, 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. 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 4QpaleoExodm 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\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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\textsuperscript{b}. This scroll displays the same type of large and small deviations from the MT as 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{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\textsuperscript{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\textsuperscript{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\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{45} Also close to the LXX, though not to the same extent, are 4QDeut\textsuperscript{q} (Sample 22), 4QSam\textsuperscript{q} (close to the main tradition of the LXX and LXXLuc: Samples 23–24 and 25–26),\textsuperscript{46} and 4QSam\textsuperscript{b}; and secondarily also 4QNum\textsuperscript{b} (for which Samples 19–21 indicate extra-Masoretic agreements with the SP and the LXX).

\textsuperscript{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).

\textsuperscript{45} See TCHB, 286–94.

\textsuperscript{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\textsuperscript{q} [4Q51],” DSD 13 [2006]: 46–60) describe this scroll as follows:
Sample 22 presents the disagreements of 4QDeut with the MT, together with its agreements with the LXX. 4QDeut and the LXX contain a few extra lines beyond the MT at the end of the Song of Moses (Deut 32:43); 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 4QSama, 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 1QIsaa (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 4QSama 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 (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 (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 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 does not necessarily display a different sequence.

4QSama, 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

4QSama 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), and later reclassified as a Bible text, exhibits long stretches of uninterrupted Scripture text such as found in either the MT or SP Groups. 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\textsuperscript{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). 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. 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. 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.* 


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.

scripts of Exodus and Deuteronomy), while other texts were written for sundry literary purposes (4QCant, 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 from the MT in small details (Sample 32) as well as its long omissions. 4QCant 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 4QExodd, 4QDeutj, 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 4QPsa, 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


57. See the following scholars reacting on the nature of the Psalms scroll from Cave 11: Shemaryahu Talmon, “Piqṣāq Be‘emsā‘ Pasuq and 11QPs,” 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 elabo-

rates on the biblical text and often abbreviates it. Sample 37 shows that the great majority of the words in 11QT 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 that are parallel to the MT, though not necessarily identical to them. Sample 38 shows the many differences between 11QT 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.
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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.
Sample 1. 5/6 HеvPs, a beautiful scroll from circa 115 C.E.
1QIsa\textsuperscript{a} (DJD XXXII) Col. I  Isa 1:1–26

Compared with MT

\begin{verbatim}
1  יַזְחָק יִשְׁנָא בַּאֲמַרְנֵי אֶבֶר הַזֹּאת נַעֲלֹתָם מְשַׁמֵּרָן אֵדֹ֥ר
2   יִתְּנוּ לְבָכָּה יִתְּנִֽהוּ בַּנִּים נְתֵנֵיֿוּ לוֹ חֲנֵנִיֿוּוּ וָאֵדֹ֥ר
3   לְצַפְּנָיִֽוּ הַבֵּית הַבֵּית הַבֵּית
4   יִתְּנִֽהוּ בַּנִּים נְתֵנֵיֿוּ לוֹ חֲנֵנִיֿוּוּ וָאֵדֹ֥ר
5   לְצַפְּנָיִֽוּ הַבֵּית הַבֵּית
6   מָאֵר יִשְׁנָא מִצְרֵיִֽוּ בַּנִּים נְתֵנֵיֿוּ לוֹ חֲנֵנִיֿוּוּוּ וָאֵדֹ֥ר
7   לְצַפְּנָיִֽוּ הַבֵּית הַבֵּית
8   מָאֵר יִשְׁנָא מִצְרֵיִֽוּ בַּנִּים נְתֵנֵיֿוּ לוֹ חֲנֵנִיֿוּוּוּ וָאֵדֹ֥ר
9   לְצַפְּנָיִֽוּ הַבֵּית הַבֵּית
10  יִתְּנִֽהוּ בַּנִּים נְתֵנֵיֿוּ לוֹ חֲנֵנִיֿוּוּוּ וָאֵדֹ֥ר

11  יִתְּנִֽהוּ בַּנִּים נְתֵנֵיֿוּ לוֹ חֲנֵנִיֿוּוּוּ וָאֵדֹ֥ר
12  יִתְּנִֽהוּ בַּנִּים נְתֵנֵיֿוּ לוֹ חֲנֵנִיֿוּוּוּ וָאֵדֹ֥ר
13  יִתְּנִֽהוּ בַּנִּים נְתֵנֵיֿוּ לוֹ חֲנֵנִיֿוּוּוּ וָאֵדֹ֥ר
14  יִתְּנִֽהוּ בַּנִּים נְתֵנֵיֿוּ לוֹ חֲנֵנִיֿוּוּוּ וָאֵדֹ֥ר
15  יִתְּנִֽהוּ בַּנִּים נְתֵנֵיֿוּ לוֹ חֲנֵנִיֿוּוּוּ וָאֵדֹ֥ר
16  יִתְּנִֽהוּ בַּנִּים נְתֵנֵיֿוּ לוֹ חֲנֵנִיֿוּוּוּ וָאֵדֹ֥ר
17  יִתְּנִֽהוּ בַּנִּים נְתֵנֵיֿוּ לוֹ חֲנֵנִיֿוּוּוּ וָאֵדֹ֥ר
18  יִתְּנִֽהוּ בַּנִּים נְתֵנֵיֿוּ לוֹ חֲנֵנִיֿוּוּוּ וָאֵדֹ֥ר
19  יִתְּנִֽהוּ בַּנִּים נְתֵנֵיֿוּ לוֹ חֲנֵנִיֿוּוּוּ וָאֵדֹ֥ר
20  יִתְּנִֽהוּ בַּנִּים נְתֵנֵיֿוּ לוֹ חֲנֵנִיֿוּוּוּ וָאֵדֹ֥ר
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Sample 5. 1QIsa\textsuperscript{a} Column 1
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\end{verbatim}
Compared with MT

Sample 11. 4QpaleoExod\textsuperscript{m} Column 5
4QNum<sup>b</sup> (*DJD* XII) Col. XI: Frgs. 13 i–14
Num 20:12–13<sup>b</sup> [= MT Deut 3:24–27]

*Compared with MT*

(lines 1–23 missing)

4QNum<sup>b</sup> (*DJD* XII) Col. XIII: Frgs. 17 ii–18
Num 21:11<sup>a</sup> [=MT Deut 2:9]–12<sup>b</sup> [=MT Deut 2:18–19], 20<sup>a</sup>–b

[lines 18–25 missing]

4QNum<sup>b</sup> (*DJD* XII) Col. XV: Frgs. 20–22
Num 22:7–21, 31–34

*Compared with MT*

bottom margin

Sample 16. The Pre-Samaritan Text 4QNum<sup>b</sup>
Compared with MT (Agreements of the Scroll with the LXX Indicated by Italics top margin)

| Sample 25. 4QSam² | }

1. וֹזַחְתָּ נַאְלֶתָה (וֹזַחְתָּ נַאְלֶתָה יָפִיתי) אָשְׁאַר (וֹזַחְתָּ נַאְלֶתָה יָפִיים) אָשְׁאַר (וֹזַחְתָּ נַאְלֶתָה יָפִיים) אָשְׁאַר (וֹזַחְתָּ נַאְלֶתָה יָפִיים) אָשְׁאַר (וֹזַחְתָּ נַאְלֶתָה יָפִיים) אָשְׁאַר
Compared with MT (with Indication of Sequence Difference)

4QJosh\textsuperscript{a} (DJD XIV) Col. I: Frgs. 1–2 Josh 8:34–35; 5:X, 2–7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample 28. 4QJosh\textsuperscript{a}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-196-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4QCanṭb (DJD XVI) Col. I: Frg. 1 Cant 2:9–3:2  Compared with MT

top margin

1 (אֵלֶּה נִנְיָ֣ה וּמַחְּלָ֣תָה) וַיַּלְבָּ֣שֶׂ הָאָ֣דָם אֶת־לֻ֚כָּהּ
2 (וַיִּשָּׂ֣א הָאָ֣דָם אֶת־לֻ֚כָּהּ וַיַּלְבָּ֣שֶׂ הָאָ֣דָם אֶת־לֻ֚כָּהּ)
3 (וַיַּלְבָּ֣שֶׂ הָאָ֣דָם אֶת־לֻ֚כָּהּ)
4 (וַיַּלְבָּ֣שֶׂ הָאָ֣דָם אֶת־לֻ֚כָּהּ)
5 (וַיַּלְבָּ֣שֶׂ הָאָ֣דָם אֶת־לֻ֚כָּהּ)
6 (וַיַּלְבָּ֣שֶׂ הָאָ֣דָם אֶת־לֻ֚כָּהּ)
7 (וַיַּלְבָּ֣שֶׂ הָאָ֣דָם אֶת־לֻ֚כָּהּ)
8 (וַיַּלְבָּ֣שֶׂ הָאָ֣דָם אֶת־לֻ֚כָּהּ)
9 (וַיַּלְבָּ֣שֶׂ הָאָ֣דָם אֶת־לֻ֚כָּהּ)
10 (וַיַּלְבָּ֣שֶׂ הָאָ֣דָם אֶת־לֻ֚כָּהּ)
11 (וַיַּלְבָּ֣שֶׂ הָאָ֣דָם אֶת־לֻ֚כָּהּ)
12 (וַיַּלְבָּ֣שֶׂ הָאָ֣דָם אֶת־לֻ֚כָּהּ)

v a ca

[197]

bottom margin

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

[197]

v a ca

[197]

v a ca

[197]

v a ca

[197]

v a ca

[197]

Sample 32. 4QCanṭb
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Sample 38. Differences between 11QT$^a$ and the MT

11QT$^a$ LIII 2–8

Compared with MT

11QT$^a$ LIII 2–8

MT

20. כָּלֵא אַחֲדָּה לְאמֹלָל נָעָר
בְּכֵלָא אַחֲדָּה לְאמֹלָל נָעָר

21. בְּכֵלָא נַעֲמָא אָמֶר יִשְׁרָאֵל
וּבָּהָה נַעֲמָא אָמֶר יִשְׁרָאֵל

22. זְכֵר לָאָרֶף אַשְׁרָא אָרֶף אָרֶף
אַשְׁרָא אָרֶף אַשְׁרָא אָרֶף

23. כְּדָה וְנוֹדֵהּ לְחַזְכּוֹר אָמֹלָל
לְחַזְכּוֹר אָמֹלָל

24. נִלְכְּדָא יֵשֶׁבּ אֵל תֶּל אָרֶף

25. צָוָּא יַשְּפָה לְמַחְּלֵק אָחָיוֹד
לְמַחְּלֵק אָחָיוֹד