

The Essene manuscripts, biblical and non-biblical, contribute new data to several areas of Old Testament study: the history of the Hebrew canon,<sup>1</sup> the development of Hebrew (and Aramaic) dialects, scripts, orthographies, and scribal procedures, and—the fields which will be selected arbitrarily for treatment here—the historical criticism of the Old Testament, and the history of the Old Testament text.

<sup>1</sup> The subject of canon is briefly touched upon by the writer in "Qumrân Cave I," pp. 122 f., and by H. L. Ginsberg in his excellent article, "The Dead Sea Manuscript Finds: New Light on *Eretz Yisrael* in the Greco-Roman Period," from *Israel: Its Role in Civilization*, ed. Moshe Davis (New York, 1956), pp. 45-49.

### 1. *The Scrolls and Historical Criticism*

While the most fruitful fields of study lie elsewhere, the new manuscripts are not without interest for the historian of Old Testament literature. Almost certainly we must cease to date any biblical work belonging to the Former or Latter Prophets (not to mention the Torah), or any extensive pericope within these books, later than the early second century B.C. To be sure, this *terminus ad quem* is exceedingly late and merely confirms recent trends in the analysis of the latest materials in prophetic literature. It is none the less a gain to have manuscripts, albeit fragmentary and incomplete, of the books of the Pentateuch, the Prophets, especially the Twelve, dating from the second century B.C.,<sup>2</sup> which rule out categorically speculations about extremely late additions to prophetic works.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>2</sup> The oldest MSS from Qumrân IV include the following (all of which antedate the oldest of the Cave I MSS, 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>): 4QEx<sup>f</sup> and 4QSam<sup>b</sup> from the third century B.C.; 4QEx<sup>e</sup>; 4QDeut<sup>a</sup>; 4QIsa<sup>a</sup>; 4QJer<sup>a</sup>; 4QXII<sup>a</sup>; 4QXII<sup>c</sup>; 4QJob<sup>a</sup>; 4QPsa<sup>a</sup>; 4QQoh<sup>a</sup> from the second century B.C. A fairly large group of biblical MSS belongs to the late second century or early first century B.C., none of which are listed here. For illustrations of the script of certain of the unpublished MSS listed above, and a discussion of the typological sequence of the Qumrân texts, see the writer, "The Oldest Manuscripts from Qumrân," pp. 147-65.

<sup>3</sup> For example, Dupont-Sommer, as late as 1950, speculated about the possibility of bringing such materials as the Servant Passages of Isa., Dan. 9, Zech. 12, etc., down into the first century B.C. (*The Dead Sea Scrolls*, p. 96), on the grounds that the Essene Righteous Teacher might be reflected in them. Such speculations were not to be taken seriously by Old Testament specialists for several reasons. But the appearance of second-century copies of each of the

Indeed it is probable that no canonical work postdates the Maccabean age. An exception, at least theoretically, may be made in the case of the Book of Esther, missing at Qumrân. More likely, however, Esther was rejected by the sectaries, as suggested by H. L. Ginsberg,<sup>4</sup> or is missing purely by chance. Ecclesiastes, sometimes dated in the second, or even in the first century B.C., by older scholars, appears in one exemplar from Cave IV (4QQoh<sup>a</sup>) which dates ca. 175-150 B.C.<sup>5</sup> Since the text of the manuscript reveals textual development, it is demonstrably not the autograph, and hence the date of composition must be pushed back into the third century. A second-century B.C. copy of the canonical Psalter (4QPsa<sup>a</sup>), though fragmentary, indicates that the collection of canonical psalms was fixed by Maccabean times, bearing out the current tendency to date the latest canonical psalms in the Persian period.<sup>6</sup>

Psalm studies will be strongly affected also by the appearance in Essene circles of collections of hymns of Maccabean and Hasmonaean date. They include many categories of material of which the Thanksgiving Hymns (1Q and 4QH) are but a

above-mentioned passages provides the *coup de grâce* to any such aberrant theories. Here, as elsewhere, the further study of Essene materials themselves disproves earlier hypotheses based on undisciplined examination of Essene literature.

<sup>4</sup> "The Dead Sea Manuscript Finds . . ." pp. 39-57, especially p. 52.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. J. Muilenburg, "A Qoheleth Scroll from Qumrân," *BASOR* 135 (October 1954), pp. 20-28; cf. Cross, "The Oldest Manuscripts from Qumrân," pp. 153, 162.

<sup>6</sup> Other grounds for a Persian dating of the Psalter are given below. Cf. the writer's earlier discussion in *BA* 17 (1954), p. 3; and P. Hyatt, "The Dead Sea Discoveries: Retrospect and Challenge," *JBL* 76 (1957), p. 5.

single type.<sup>7</sup> Analysis of the literary types, the prosody, and the language and theological motifs of these documents will greatly expand our knowledge of the development of late Old Testament psalmody on the one hand, and will illuminate on the other hand difficult problems in the study of the literary types and prosodic canons of New Testament psalms (especially in the prologue of Luke) and poetry. Preliminary study already indicates that the psalms of the Maccabean period are much developed beyond the latest of Old Testament psalms; their language is neoclassical, not classical; sapiential forms and language have profoundly influenced hymnic style. Older patterns of symmetry (meter) and many classical forms of thought rhyme (*parallelismus membrorum*) have largely broken down or been lost.<sup>8</sup> The hymns are archaistic. They imitate biblical psalms to such an extent that most Essene hymns are patchworks of phrases from the Psalter, and, notably, from the Prophets; yet the mood and theological structure differ strikingly from canonical psalms. For suitable parallels one must look to the hymns, especially the apocalyptic hymns, of the Apocrypha and New Testament.

In one rather striking instance, a Qumrân document promises to throw light on oral, or possibly literary, sources lying behind the fixed edition of an Old Testament book. In 1956 J. T. Milik identified and published a few fragments of a Cave IV document, designated the "Prayer of Nabonidus,"

<sup>7</sup> Provisionally, see J. Strugnell, "Travail . . ." p. 65.

<sup>8</sup> These tendencies are already at work, of course, in late Old Testament poetry. The failure of New Testament scholars to recognize this development has hindered advances in the analysis of poetic materials embedded in the New Testament, notably in the Gospels.

after its first line: "The words of the prayer which Nabonidus, king of Assyria and Babylon, the great king, prayed . . ."<sup>9</sup> The prayer relates how Nabonidus came down with a "dread disease by the decree of the Most High God," was "set apart from men" for a seven-year period in the Arabian oasis of Teima. A Jewish diviner, presumably Daniel—the broken text does not reveal his name—intervenes, speaks of the king's worship of "gods of gold, bronze, iron, wood, stone, silver . . ." (Cf. Dan. 5:4.)

The document is closely related in language, style and genre to the cycle of tales collected and edited in Daniel 1–6 (so-called Daniel A). It is strongly reminiscent of Daniel 4, the story of Nebuchadnezzar's being driven from men for seven years, during which he learns that the "Most High rules the kingdom of men . . ." ending with the snatch of poetry in which the king "blesses the Most High and praises and honors Him who lives forever." In fact there is every reason to believe that the new document preserves a more primitive form of the tale. It is well known that Nabonidus gave over the regency of his realm to his son Belshazzar in order to spend long periods of time in Teima; while Nebuchadnezzar, to judge from extrabiblical data, did not give up his throne. Moreover, in the following legend of Belshazzar's feast, the substitution of Nebuchadnezzar for Nabonidus as the father of Belshazzar (Dan. 5:2) is most suggestive. Evidently in an older stage of tradition, the cycle included stories of Nebuchadnezzar (cf. Dan. 1–3), Nabonidus (Dan. 4), and Belshazzar (Dan. 5).<sup>10</sup> The change of

<sup>9</sup> "Prière de Nabonide' et autres écrits d'un cycle de Daniel," *RB* 63 (1956), pp. 407–15; cf. David Noel Freedman, "The Prayer of Nabonidus," *BASOR* 145 (February 1957), pp. 31 f.

<sup>10</sup> This suggests that in the riddle of Dan. 5:25–28, the

names, as well as the development of the elaborate details of Nebuchadnezzar's theriomania, is best attributed to the refracting tendencies of oral transmission, in this case the shift of a legend from a lesser to a greater name. It is not necessary to think of the Prayer of Nabonidus as a literary source of the canonical Daniel, or even to give the prayer priority in terms of its written composition. The prayer may simply derive from a parallel, but more conservative line of orally transmitted material.<sup>11</sup>

## 2. *The Archaic Text of the Old Testament*

The most direct and obvious contribution of the Qumrân scrolls is in the field of Old Testament textual studies.<sup>12</sup> At the outset we may remark

kings referred to originally as a mina, shekel, and half shekel, were Nebuchadnezzar, *Nabonidus*, and Belshazzar respectively, as pointed out by Freedman, *ibid.* Cf. H. L. Ginsberg's discussion, *Studies in Daniel* (New York, 1948), pp. 24-26.

<sup>11</sup> With the publication of the Habakkuk Commentary, scholars duly noted that the work treated only the first two chapters of Habakkuk. Since it is generally accepted that the psalm of Chap. 3 was not composed by the prophet, a number of scholars jumped to the conclusion that prophecy and psalm had not yet been wedded when the commentary was composed. This position cannot hold. The Qumrân commentaries often treat short pericopes, a psalm, a section of chapters, and only rarely the whole of a short prophetic book.

<sup>12</sup> This discussion of the text of the Old Testament at Qumrân is a revised and expanded form of material published in the writer's article, "The Dead Sea Scrolls," in Vol. XII of *The Interpreter's Bible* (New York-Nashville, 1957), copyrighted by the Abingdon Press in 1957. Copyrighted material is used here by permission.

that the new scrolls give evidence of the antiquity of the type of textual tradition which has survived in the form of the traditional Hebrew Bible.<sup>12a</sup> Again the scrolls preserve many new readings, some of which are superior to received readings, some of which are inferior. Nevertheless, the textual scholar finds the chief interest of the scrolls neither in their testimony to the age of our received text (which has never been seriously doubted), nor merely in individual readings as such. The real importance of the biblical scrolls lies in the data they yield for the reconstruction of the textual history of the Old Testament.

To make this point clear, perhaps it will be useful to glance backward at the state of textual studies before the coming of the Qumrân and Murabba'ât scrolls.

The eighteenth and nineteenth centuries witnessed the assiduous collection and study of extant Hebrew manuscripts, together with the ancient versions into which the Hebrew had been translated. These studies led to the first systematic reconstructions of the history of the Old Testament text. The culmination of this stage of study is found in the works of Paul de Lagarde, who stated categorically that all medieval Hebrew manuscripts were descended from a common ancestor, a single master scroll. This official text, according to Lagarde, could be dated no earlier than the first century of the Christian era. That is, these studies seemed to establish that about A.D. 100, in the days of Aqiba, the rabbis had fixed an authoritative Hebrew text,

<sup>12a</sup> That is to say, a proto-Masoretic recension for certain books is present at Qumrân. As we shall see, this tradition was chosen by the rabbis, who, after further recensional activity, established the base of the *textus receptus*, the traditional consonantal text. See below.

chosen arbitrarily from the more or less fluid textual traditions alive in the pre-Christian period, and that this official text in effect destroyed all variant lines of tradition in normative Judaism.<sup>13</sup> Old Testa-

<sup>13</sup> See Lagarde, *Anmerkungen zur griechischen Übersetzung der Proverbien* (Leipzig, 1863). Cf. Reider, *Prolegomena to a Greek-Hebrew and Hebrew-Greek Index to Aquila* (Philadelphia, 1916), pp. 81 ff.; H. M. Orlinsky, *On the Present State of Proto-Septuagint Studies* (AOS Offprint Series 13) (New Haven, 1941), pp. 81-91; especially p. 84 and references; R. H. Pfeiffer, *Introduction to the Old Testament* (New York, 1941), pp. 78, 79; B. J. Roberts, *The Old Testament Text and Versions* (Cardiff, 1951), pp. 23-29.

Attacks on Lagarde's position show at most that he overstates his case. All medieval manuscripts stem from a single, narrow, recensional base. This is evidenced not only by the early, pre-Tiberian manuscripts from the Cairo Genizah, but decisively now by the appearance of the Murabba'ât fragments, especially the great Minor Prophets scroll (not to be confused with the Greek recension of the Minor Prophets). Medieval variants, whether in biblical manuscripts, or in rabbinic texts (see Aptowitzer, *Das Schriftwort in der rabbinischen Literatur* [Sitzungsberichte der kais. Akad. der Wiss. in Wien. Phil.-Hist. Klasse Bd. 153:6, 1906; 160:7, 1908], and H. L. Strack, *Prolegomena critica in Vetus Testamentum hebraicum*, Leipzig, 1873) are for the most part merely orthographic, or secondary, a witness to subsequent development of variant readings which for a number of reasons may coincide with older witnesses, the Septuagint, etc. In the Targums, Aquila, and Jerome, some genuine survivals of readings which predate the official recension of ca. A.D. 100 are expected, since in each case older materials were used alongside the new standard text.

Part of the difficulty arises from differing presuppositions as to the state of the Hebrew text in the pre-Christian period. For those who presume an extremely conservative development of the Hebrew textual tradition, the variants of the post-Aqiba period loom large. For those who suppose that the pre-Christian period was marked by a Hebrew

text which exhibited widely different recensional traditions, the medieval variants appear to be negligible. As we shall see, the pre-Christian Hebrew text exhibits *recensional* variation which differs *toto caelo* from the variation exhibited after the promulgation of the official Hebrew (consonantal) text.

The general reaction against Lagardian positions, therefore, represented today especially by the Kahle-Sperber school (cf. Kahle, "Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Pentateuchtextes," TSK 88 [1915], pp. 432-39), has gone much too far. The text established about A.D. 100 appears to be the culmination of rabbinic recensional activity which began perhaps a century or more earlier, to judge from the Qumrân texts (cf. Cross, "A New Qumrân Biblical Fragment Related to the Original Hebrew Underlying the Septuagint," BASOR 132 [December 1953], p. 24, n. 36). Barthélemy's Greek recension of the Septuagint is evidence of this early trend. There is no doubt that our copy dates at the latest from the first century A.D., and preferably about the turn of the Christian era, and represents an early attempt to revise the LXX into conformity with the proto-Masoretic text. (On the dating see Barthélemy, *op. cit.*, p. 19; and C. H. Roberts quoted by P. Kahle, ". . . Die im August 1952 entdeckte Lederrolle . . ." TLZ 79 [1954], col. 81.) It may be noted that in his article devoted precisely to this new recension, Kahle fails to deal with this point, that the scroll is a Jewish revision, *not* translation, which takes the pre-Christian Septuagint as its base. The failure is most curious, since this is easily the most significant characteristic of the text, as well as most damaging evidence against Kahle's theories of Septuagint origins.

The Murabba'ât texts certify that the consonantal base of the *textus receptus* had been fixed finally by the days of the Second Revolt, and that Lagarde was, after all, right in principle. Indeed the evidence from Murabba'ât indicates that even the principles of orthographic practice (use of vowel letters, *matres lectionis*) became fixed at this time. While minor orthographic variations appear, as well as a few variants of other types, they are no more significant than variants in Tiberian Masoretic manuscripts; the relatively fluid orthographic practice of the Hasmonaean and

ment textual criticism found itself at an impasse.

There were only a few hints of the state of the text in the era sealed off by the promulgation of a standard text. The Pentateuch of the Samaritans, having been transmitted along different channels, preserved an alternate form of the text for the Torah.<sup>14</sup> Actually, however, the Samaritan provided little help toward reconstructing the early history of the Hebrew text. This was due not only to its restricted scope, but to certain confusions which attended its early study. Generally it was presumed to be an extremely early branch of tradition separating from the main Jewish line at the time of the early Samaritan rift (fifth century B.C.). In fact its text is a relatively late branch, going back at earliest to Hasmonaean times.<sup>15</sup> That this was the case has long been likely on historical grounds. It is now clear both on paleographical grounds—the Samaritan script is a derivative of the Paleo-Hebrew script which was revived or became resurgent in the Maccabean era of nationalistic archaism—and on orthographic grounds.<sup>16</sup> The text type found in

Herodian periods known from Qumrân has vanished, once for all.

<sup>14</sup> A non-Masoretic text type also appears in some of the Apocryphal and Pseudepigraphical works, which being rejected by rabbinical Judaism, did not undergo revision. Cf. Kahle, "Untersuchungen . . ." pp. 399–410; *The Cairo Genizah* [The Schweich Lectures 1941] (London, 1947), pp. 147–58.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. the writer's remarks in "A Report on the Biblical Fragments of Cave Four . . ." p. 12, n. 5a. Contrast Kahle, "Untersuchungen . . ."; Roberts, *The Old Testament Text and Versions*, pp. 188–96; and M. Greenberg, "The Stabilization of the Text of the Hebrew Bible, Reviewed in the Light of the Biblical Materials from the Judean Desert," *JAOS* 76 (1956), 161–63.

<sup>16</sup> That is, Samaritan orthography reflects neither the

the Samaritan is difficult to categorize. On the one hand it stands very close to the proto-Masoretic text. Yet it has a large number of readings in agreement with the Septuagint. Again, it is replete with inferior readings: expansion, transposition, insertion of parallels from other passages or books, readings of a type which must have been introduced at a fairly early date when the text was relatively fluid. They are not the result of specifically Samaritan recensional activity in all probability.<sup>17</sup> In any case the Samaritan Pentateuch has been only of limited use in the task of recovering a more primitive form of the Hebrew text of the Old Testament.

The best hope for a break-through into the unknown era before the promulgation of the official textual recension of the rabbis lay in the Septuagint, the standard Greek Old Testament of the early Church, which according to tradition traced its lineage to an Alexandrian translation of the third-second centuries B.C. Perhaps by reconstructing the Hebrew underlying this antique version, the textual critic might gain detailed knowledge of the development of the early text, enabling him thereby to reconstruct a more nearly original form of the Hebrew Bible.

This was not an easy path to the pre-rabbinic Bible. Two difficult and complex problems required resolution before the Septuagint could be used confidently to reconstruct an old Hebrew text type. In the first place, Septuagint scholars had to estab-

restricted use of *matres lectionis* characteristic of the third century and earlier, nor the revised spelling principles of the rabbinic text. Rather it exhibits the characteristic full orthography of the Maccabean and especially Hasmonaean eras. Cf. Cross, "The Oldest Manuscripts from Qumrân," p. 165.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. Kahle, "Untersuchungen . . ." pp. 399–410. (See below.)

lish the original form of the Old Greek translation (the proto-Septuagint) out of a maze of manuscripts belonging to Christian recensions of the Old Greek, and its daughter versions. This required the grouping of the manuscripts, the versions, and citations in ancient authors into families and then the establishment of the text types belonging to the recensions of the Septuagint known, especially, from Jerome: the Hesychian (Egyptian), Lucianic (Syrian), and Hexaplaric (Palestinian), as well as unknown recensions to be detected by inductive critical procedures. The task was further involved by the presence of contamination of the transmission of the Septuagint by later Jewish Greek texts which had been successively revised back into conformity with the developing Hebrew text. Such recensions include the Greek text of the Minor Prophets partially published by Barthélemy,<sup>18</sup> probably identical with the Quinta of the Hexapla, which revises the Septuagint by a late pre-Christian Hebrew text (closely allied with the proto-Masoretic tradition), and especially Theodotion and Aquila, both of which appear to be based on the earlier Jewish recension, revising it to conform to the authoritative Hebrew text which emerged about A.D. 100.<sup>19</sup>

<sup>18</sup> Bibliography on the Barthélemy recension is listed in notes 33 and 35 of Chap. I.

<sup>19</sup> The above description is, of course, oversimple. The number of Jewish revisions of the Septuagint may be larger than the present evidence suggests, and the detailed relationships between such and the "Three," Theodotion, Aquila, and Symmachus, may be more complex than is suggested by first study. The problems of proto-Lucian, proto-Theodotion, Rahlfs' and Katz's "R" recension, etc., will require complete re-examination in light of the new texts of the LXX from Qumrân, and the new Greek data from the "undesignated provenience," as well as the Hebrew texts

The task of supplying the materials from which the proto-Septuagint text can be recovered is by no means completed. Progress has been made in the seventy-five years since Lagarde initiated his program, despite pauses to solve unexpected complexities, and occasional loss of faith by some in the very existence of a proto-Septuagint which consisted of more than a congeries of distinct and competing Greek translations. The still incomplete edition of the Larger Cambridge Septuagint, the continuing publication of the great Göttingen edition of the Septuagint, recently at an increased tempo, and the publication of individual studies of which Margolis' *The Book of Joshua in Greek* is the outstanding ex-

---

from these finds and from Murabba'ât. (On these texts, see Chap. I, especially n. 21, 23, and 33-35.)

All the new evidence seems to suggest that these problems will be solved in the general framework of the proto-Septuagint hypothesis formulated by Lagarde and developed by Rahlfs, Montgomery, Margolis, and in the present generation by Orlinsky, Katz, and especially Ziegler. That is to say, the remnants of Greek texts at variance with the standard Septuagint and which appear to be pre-Hexaplaric in date, are now most easily explained as surviving from Jewish revision(s) of the Septuagint. Not only do we now possess such a recension, but we possess the various Hebrew text types reflected by it, by the "Three" and, indeed, by the proto-Septuagint itself.

For recent discussions of the proto-Septuagint question, see Orlinsky, *On the Present State of Proto-Septuagint Studies* (cf. "The Septuagint—Its Use in Textual Criticism," *BA* 9 [1946], pp. 21-34); "Current Progress and Problems in Septuagint Research," in *The Study of the Bible Today and Tomorrow*, ed., H. R. Willoughby (Chicago, 1947); P. Katz, "Septuagintal Studies in the Mid-Century . . ."; "Das Problem des Urtextes der Septuaginta," *ThZ* 5 (1949), pp. 1-24; J. W. Wevers, "Septuaginta Forschungen . . ."; P. Kahle, *The Cairo Genizah*, Chap. II:2; Roberts, *Old Testament Text* . . . pp. 104-19.

ample, are major advances. Nevertheless the determination of the text of the Septuagint in a given Old Testament passage is one of the most exacting tasks of the biblical scholar, and in some portions of the Old Testament, fortunately decreasing steadily in extent, remains a precarious task at best.

If we can presume that we know what the text of the Septuagint is, a second formidable difficulty appears when the Septuagint comes to be used as a witness to the archaic Hebrew text. Does the Septuagint in a given passage witness to an ancient Hebrew text at variance with the *textus receptus*, or are its divergent readings to be explained away as due to translation procedures? Does the Septuagint reflect in distorted form the *Hebraica veritas* as assumed by Origen and Jerome as well as ancient Jewish scholars, or does it often testify in faithful fashion to a different Hebrew text from the one we have always known?

These questions gave rise to sharp debate in the nineteenth century. The issue was joined between supporters of the antiquity and fidelity of the Masoretic tradition who would explain away the apparently divergent readings of the Septuagint, and those who insisted on laying their Septuagint side by side with the traditional Hebrew Bible—as if the two were variant manuscripts which by comparison could be forced to yield a text superior to both. On the side of the medieval Hebrew text stood such figures as Fränkel and Löhr; in support of the importance of the Old Greek for textual criticism stood Thenius, Lagarde, and the master, Julius Wellhausen. The debate persists into the twentieth century. Indeed the polemic against the trustworthiness of the Septuagint translators and the usefulness of their version as a witness to the pre-Masoretic text had come close to winning the day. How can the critic be sure, said this school of

thought, that when the Greek translator departs radically from the received text, the Hebrew manuscript from which he translated also deviates? Could not these deviations be caused by bad translation techniques? Was the Greek a literal and faithful translation of its *Vorlage*? Or was it full of error, paraphrasing, and arbitrary changes? Increasingly scholars have looked upon the Septuagint with a jaundiced eye, and, following the lead especially of H. S. Nyberg, a new conservative respect for the medieval Hebrew text has gained sway.<sup>20</sup>

Then with the discovery of the Qumrân scrolls we were suddenly catapulted over the alleged barrier into the forbidden land. The great Isaiah scroll of Cave I was published first. It proved rather an anticlimax. While it conserved thousands of variant readings, few of its readings were significant, and even fewer superior to the traditional readings. It seemed that the defenders of the traditional Hebrew Bible were vindicated, and that the work of the rabbis in preparing the official text current in the second century A.D. had had negligible effect on the history of textual transmission. Certainly it was true that the text of Isaiah preserved in the Masora was based on an extremely early textual type, already at home in Palestine in the late second century B.C.<sup>21</sup>

<sup>20</sup> Cf. H. S. Nyberg, "Das textkritische Problem des Alten Testaments am Hoseabuche demonstriert," *ZAW* 52 (NF 11), 1934, pp. 241-54; *Studien zum Hoseabuche* (Uppsala, 1935); P. A. H. De Boer, *Research into the Text of I Samuel I-XVI* (Amsterdam, 1938), and sequent studies in *Oudtestamentische Studien I* (1942) and *VI* (1949). Cf. the literature, especially that of the Gehman school discussed by Wevers, "Septuaginta-Forschungen, II. Die Septuaginta als Übersetzungsurkunde," *ThR* 22 (1954), pp. 171-90.

<sup>21</sup> The literature on the Isaiah scroll (1QIsa<sup>a</sup>) is quite extensive. A general discussion may be found in M. Burrows,

There was one ambiguity in this construction of the evidence. Isaiah in the Septuagint is not one of those books where traditional renderings and those of the Greek translation clash. Isaiah in Greek appears to have been translated from a manuscript quite close to the proto-Masoretic tradition. However, it was difficult to be certain, since the translation of Isaiah is among the poorest in the Greek Bible.<sup>22</sup> What was needed was a group of manuscripts from other biblical books where the Septuagint translation was good, where it was extremely

*The Dead Sea Scrolls*, pp. 301-15, and full bibliographic notes for textual studies of the early finds may be found in his bibliography, pp. 420-35; of the older studies, noteworthy are the contributions of Baumgartner, Beegle, Hempel, Kahle, Loewinger, Milik, and Orlinsky. The most recent discussions dealing with the text of Isaiah at Qumrân are those of W. F. Albright, "New Light on Early Recensions of the Hebrew Bible," *BASOR* 140 (1955), pp. 27-33; P. W. Skehan, "The Text of Isaias at Qumrân," *CBQ* 8 (1955), pp. 38-43; and "The Qumrân Manuscripts and Textual Criticism," *Supplement to VT* 4 (1957), pp. 148-60; and "Some Textual Problems in Isaia," *CBQ* 22 (1960), pp. 47-55; M. Greenberg, "The Stabilization of the Text of the Hebrew Bible . . ." pp. 163 f.; and H. M. Orlinsky, "Notes on the Present State of the Textual Criticism of the Judean Biblical Cave Scrolls," in *A Stubborn Faith* (Papers on Old Testament and Related Subjects Presented to Honor William Andrew Irwin), ed. E. C. Hobbs (Dallas, 1956), pp. 117-31. See now H. M. Orlinsky, "Qumrân and the Present State of Old Testament Text Studies: The Septuagint Text," *JBL* 78 (1959), pp. 26-33; J. Ziegler, "Die Vorlage der Isaias-Septuaginta (LXX) und die erste Isaias-Rolle von Qumrân (1QIs<sup>a</sup>)," *JBL* 78 (1959), pp. 34-59; and especially E. Y. Kutscher, *The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll* [in Hebrew] (Jerusalem, 1959).

<sup>22</sup> See J. Ziegler, *Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta des Buches Isaias* (Münster i. W., 1934).

literal when it agreed with Masoretic readings, but where in places it branched radically from this later standard text. This was the case, for example, in the historical books, especially in Joshua and Samuel. It is also true of Jeremiah, where the Septuagint omits or changes the order of large sections of material. Ideally, of course, the scholar needs samplings from the whole Old Testament in order to reconstruct a valid history of its transmission.

The recovery of nearly a hundred biblical scrolls from Cave IV came, therefore, as incredibly good fortune. Here at last was the material for sampling the textual types extant in virtually every book of the Old Testament. Here was a substantial basis for the establishment of the archaic, pre-Masoretic history of the Hebrew Bible. Moreover, thanks to the Murabba'ât texts which extend the series from Qumrân down into the second century A.D., we have direct evidence for the first time as to just what happened to the text in the crucial era before, during, and after the time when the official text was fixed.

Initial study was directed to the historical books, especially to Samuel.<sup>23</sup> The text of Samuel contained in the three scrolls from Cave IV is widely at variance with that of the traditional Masoretic Bible; it follows systematically the rendering of the Septuagint of Samuel.<sup>24</sup> For example, in the few published fragments of the archaic Samuel text

<sup>23</sup> Cross, "A New Qumrân Biblical Fragment . . ." pp. 15-26; "The Oldest Manuscripts from Qumrân," pp. 165-72.

<sup>24</sup> The older Samuel MS (4QSam<sup>b</sup>) often preserves a text superior to both the Septuagint and Hebrew *textus receptus*. The non-specialist can find a translation of one such passage in my article, "The Oldest Manuscripts from Qumrân," p. 171.

(4QSam<sup>b</sup>), there are some thirteen readings in which the Qumrân text agrees with the Greek against the readings of the received text, four readings in which the Qumrân text agrees with the traditional text against the Septuagint. The ratio of readings in agreement with the Septuagint against the Masoretic text is even higher in the large Samuel manuscript (4QSam<sup>a</sup>).<sup>25</sup>

Other historical books (Joshua, Samuel, Kings) follow suit, in so far as they are preserved, in presenting the tradition of the Septuagint. It now becomes clear, at least in these books, that the Septuagint's divergent text was due less to "translation idiosyncrasies" than to the type of text which it translated. These manuscripts established once for all that in the historical books the Septuagint translators faithfully and with extreme literalness reproduced their Hebrew *Vorlage*.<sup>26</sup> And this means that the Septuagint of the historical books must be resurrected as a primary tool of the Old Testament critic.

<sup>25</sup> Cf. Cross, "A New Qumrân Biblical Fragment . . ."; *passim*; E. Vogt, "Textus praemasoreticus ex Qumran," *Biblica* 35 (1954), pp. 263-66; and J. Hempel, "Ein textgeschichtlich bedeutsamer Fund," *ZAW* 65 (1953), pp. 296-98.

<sup>26</sup> The literalness of the Septuagint of Samuel is not, of course, the mechanical and tortured literalness of Aquila. However, the translator reflects systematically in his translation, shifts of tense, the presence or absence of the article, and so on, so far as Greek idiom permits. Study of the method of the translator over against the Qumrân text soon teaches one his technique, so that from his translation his *Vorlage* can be predicted with high accuracy. Save for a very few poetic passages (e.g., the Song of Hannah) where the Greek text probably had a prehistory, paraphrasing is virtually absent from the Septuagint of Samuel and no evidence is to be found of conscious changes made by the translator on theological or otherwise tendentious grounds.

This is a repudiation of much of the textual theory and method developed and applied to the Hebrew text of Samuel during the last generation.<sup>27</sup>

All this does not mean that the Septuagint in the historical books presents a text which is *necessarily* superior to the Masoretic texts. The question of which witness is superior is another problem, to be decided in individual readings. It does mean that the Septuagint reflects accurately a Hebrew textual tradition at home in Egypt in the third-second centuries B.C., and that thanks to the Qumrân manuscripts we have the means to control its evidence.<sup>28</sup>

The state of the text in other books of the Old Testament is a more complicated one. Among no less than thirty Pentateuchal manuscripts from Cave IV, Qumrân, at least three sharply defined textual traditions persist.<sup>29</sup> The majority of the texts are allied closely with the proto-Masoretic tradition.

<sup>27</sup> Among the studies of the text of Samuel, for example, that which needs least revision in light of the new evidence is Wellhausen's *Der Text der Bücher Samuelis* published in 1871.

<sup>28</sup> In fact comparative studies of the text of Samuel are tending to indicate that the Masoretic text here is based on an extremely narrow and often inferior textual recension. Its text is often defective as the result of systematic revision (see below, n. 45). Textual scholars are accustomed to the fact that a *textus receptus* is normally a conflate text; the reverse is true of Samuel; it is a text characterized by frequent and extensive haplography. On the other hand the Hebrew underlying the Septuagint is a full text, sometimes conflate, frequently original. That the two texts stand at opposite poles in their textual development is a most fortunate circumstance for the critic who wishes to reconstruct their common ancestor and thereby press back to an extremely early form of the Hebrew text.

<sup>29</sup> Cf. Cross, "A Report on the Biblical Fragments of Cave Four . . ." p. 12; "*Le travail d'édition . . .*" p. 56.

However, the text type underlying the Septuagint is well represented. For example, there is the Deuteronomy manuscript of which fragments of Deuteronomy 32 were published by Monsignor Patrick Skehan. It preserves a text derivative from the Hebrew recension underlying the Septuagint in a passage where the *textus receptus* is defective, so that by comparison of the three texts, a text superior to any one of the witnesses may be reconstructed.<sup>30</sup>

<sup>30</sup> Skehan, "A Fragment of the 'Song of Moses' (Deut. 32) from Qumrân," *BASOR* 136 (December, 1954), pp. 12-15; cf. Albright, "New Light on Early Recensions of the Hebrew Bible," p. 32, n. 27.

The textual history of Deut. 32:43 in 4Q, LXX, and MT can be diagrammed as follows:

#### Original Text

hrnynw šmym 'mw	whbw 'wz (?) lw bny 'lhym
ky dm bnyw yqwm	wkpr 'dmt 'mw

Shout for joy, O heavens, before him;  
And ascribe might to him, O sons of God;  
For he avenges the blood of his children,  
And purges the people's land.

#### Proto-Masoretic Text

hrnynw [šmym 'mw  
whbw 'wz (?) lw bny 'lhym  
hrnynw] gwym 'mw  
ky dm <'bdyw> yqwm  
Etc.  
Shout for joy, [O Heavens, before him,  
And ascribe might to him, O sons of God;  
Shout for joy,] O nations <for his people>;  
For he avenges the blood of his <servants>,  
Etc.

#### Proto-4Q Deuteronomy

hrnynw šmym 'mw  
[whbw 'wz (?) lw bny 'lhym  
hrnynw gwym 'mw]  
whšthww lw kl 'lhym  
ky dm bnyw yqwm

Shout for joy, O heavens, before him,  
[And ascribe might to him, O sons of God;  
Shout for joy, O nations, before him,]  
And bow down to him, all ye divine ones;  
For he avenges the blood of his children,  
Etc.

The following points may be observed in v. 43a. The corruption of the MT is best explained on the basis of a text in which one doublet, *hrnynw šmym 'mw* and *hrnynw gwym 'mw*, but only this doublet, appears. As pointed out to me by John Strugnell, LXX μετὰ τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτοῦ is merely a double rendering of 'mw (a familiar phenomenon in the LXX). The shifts to *gwym* here, and to 'bdyw in the next bicolon are secondary though perhaps early variants which modernize the primitive diction of the passage. In both cases, therefore, LXX and 4Q are superior to MT.

The text of 4Q presumes a double conflation. Not only is there the doublet underlying the haplography of MT, but a second doublet appears. *whšthww lw kl 'lhym*, taken from Ps. 97:7 (or its source), no doubt because of its strong resemblance to the original *whbw 'wz lw bny 'lhym* (cf. Ps. 29). On the Greek rendering ἀγγελοι θεοῦ for *bny 'lhym*, cf. Deut. 32:8 LXX, and the text referred to by Skehan, p. 12.

The doubly conflated text presumed by the reconstruction above actually appears, though in a slightly different order, in the LXX.

In v. 43b the loss of *wlmsn'yw yšlm* is best explained as haplography in a (hemi-)stichometric manuscript. However, the entire bicolon *wnqm yšyb lšryw wlmsn'yw yšlm* is intrusive from Deut. 32:41, two verses earlier, where it is surely original. Here it constitutes not poetic parallelism, but mere tautology. Its introduction may have been oc-

One Exodus manuscript (4QEx<sup>a</sup>) belongs systematically to the Egyptian textual tradition reflected in the Septuagint; though at points it appears to offer a more consistent form of that tradition than the Septuagint itself. For example, in the first five verses of this manuscript, partially preserved on a single fragment, no fewer than six certain variants are to be found, four on the preserved leather, two fixed by reconstruction of the fragment.<sup>31</sup> Four readings are in agreement with the

casioned by the combination *yqwm-wnqm*, as suggested by John Strugnell. Cf. P. W. Skehan, "The Structure of the Song of Moses in Deuteronomy," *CBQ* 13 (1951), pp. 153-63.

<sup>31</sup> The first fragment of 4QEx<sup>a</sup> reads as follows (Ex. 1:1-5):

1. ]t y'qwb 'byhm 'yš[ (v.1)
2. ]yšškr zbwlwn ywsp wbný[ (v.3)
3. ]ħmš wšb'ym npš wymt[ (vv.5-6)

1. ]with Jacob their father, each[
2. ]Issachar, Zebulun, Joseph and Benj[amin
3. ]seventy-five persons. And (Joseph) died[

The following variants are significant. In l.1, 4Q adds 'byhm, "their father," with LXX (τῶ πατρὶ ἀβραῶν). In l.2, 4Q adds *ywsp*, "Joseph" in his proper position as a son of Rachel (see Gen. 46:19); the reading is found neither in the Greek nor received Hebrew text. However, the phrase *wywsp hyh bmsrym* ("and Joseph was in Egypt") is omitted in l.3 (between *npš* and *wymt*). In the LXX tradition the phrase is not found at the end of v.5, but is placed following Ἀσηρ. (v.4.). A reconstruction of the text of 4Q indicates that the phrase is lacking also following 'šr, i.e., where it is inserted in the LXX.

Perhaps the easiest explanation of textual history of these readings is to suppose that the reading *ywsp* in v.3 together with the omission of the phrase *wywsp hyh bmsrym* belongs to one textual tradition, the omission of *ywsp* in v.3

Septuagint; one is unique, but probably points to an Egyptian text form superior to that used by the translators of the Septuagint; one probably agrees

together with the insertion of *wywsp hyh bmsrym* to another, surviving in the proto-Masoretic tradition. It is probable that Joseph once appeared in the list in v.3. Later the discrepancy was noticed, *ywsp* suppressed, and the phrase *wywsp hyh bmsrym* inserted. If the phrase is taken to be secondary, then the uncertain position of the phrase, inserted at one point in LXX, at another in MT, is readily explained.

In v.5, MT reads *wyhy kl npš yš'y yrk y'qb*, LXX ἦσαν δὲ πᾶσαι ψυχὰι ἐξ Ἰακωβ. In reconstructing 4Q, it becomes clear that there is insufficient room for the full reading of MT. 4Q like the LXX appears to be shorter. As for the original reading, we cannot speak with any certainty; the reading of MT may be influenced by Gen. 46:26, that of the LXX by Gen. 46:26 or 27.

In l.3 v.5, 4Q reads *ħmš wšb'ym*, "seventy-five," with LXX (πέντε καὶ ἑβδομήκοντα), against MT *šb'ym*, "seventy." The number is based on the LXX tradition which appears in Gen. 46, where (46:20, 27) five additional descendants of Joseph are listed; cf. Deut. 10:10 (LXX), and Acts 7:14. In short, 4Q here represents a recensional reading characteristic of the *Vorlage* of the Septuagint in Genesis and Deuteronomy as well as Exodus.

The LXX of Ex. 1:1-5 may be at variance with MT in three other readings: v.1 *τὰυτα* for MT *w'lh*; v.2 *Ιουδας* for *wyhwdh*; v.5 omission of *ψυχὰι* in virtually all witnesses, MT *npš*. It is impossible to be certain of 4Q readings in all but the last of these instances; in v.5, 4Q reads *npš* with MT, possibly against the tradition of the LXX.

The fragment may be reconstructed as follows:

1. [<>'lh šmw't bny yšr'l hb'ym mšrymh] 't y'qwb 'byhm 'yš [wbytw]
2. [b'w r'wbn šm'wn lwy <w>yhwdh] yšškr zbwlwn ywsp wbný[myn dn]
3. [wnptly gd w'sr wyhy kw'l npš <ly'qwb?>] ħmš wšb'ym npš wymt [ywsp]

with the Masoretic text against the Septuagint.<sup>32</sup>

There are also manuscripts from Cave IV which ally themselves with that line of tradition of which the Samaritan is a collateral witness. One of these is a Paleo-Hebrew Exodus recently published by Skehan.<sup>33</sup> Another unpublished example is a Numbers manuscript in Jewish ("square") script (4QNum<sup>b</sup>).<sup>34</sup> This latter manuscript, however, is by no means a simple or consistent witness to the Samaritan recension, or even to the proto-Samaritan recension. While it contains expansions characteristic of this recension<sup>35</sup> and regularly follows less striking Samaritan variants, its contacts with the Septuagint tradition are even more striking. To be sure, the standard Samaritan text frequently agrees with the text underlying the Greek; however, in this manuscript the agreement is far more extensive, and often its text sides with the Septuagint over against both the *textus receptus* and the Samaritan.<sup>36</sup>

The text of Jeremiah is of particular interest. In the recension underlying the Septuagint text it is

<sup>32</sup> The statistics on 4QEx<sup>a</sup> 1:1-5 listed in my *Interpreter's Bible* article, p. 655, are incorrect, owing to an unfortunate lapse in which the wrong figures were transferred from my workbook.

<sup>33</sup> "Exodus in the Samaritan Recension from Qumrân," *JBL* 74 (1955), pp. 182-87.

<sup>34</sup> "Le travail d'édition . . ." p. 56.

<sup>35</sup> For example, Deut. 3:21 is inserted after Num. 27:23, a reading otherwise attested only in the Samaritan and Samareitikon. And after Num. 20:13, Deut. 3:23-24 is inserted; the Samaritan is likewise expanded here by the addition of Deut. 3:24.

<sup>36</sup> The following are chosen at random: in Num. 35:21, 4Q and LXX add *mw̄t ymw̄t hrw̄šh* after *hw̄'* (LXX *θανάτω θανατούσθω ὁ φονεύων*); Num. 26:33 in 4Q and LXX reads *w'lh šmw̄t bnw̄t* (καὶ τὰδρα τὰ ὄνματα τῶν θυγατέρων) versus MT and Samaritan *wšm bnw̄t*.

one eighth shorter than in the Hebrew Bible. Scholars have suggested that the translators simply abbreviated their text for their own reasons. Other scholars have maintained that two ancient recensions are responsible for the differences.<sup>37</sup> From Qumrân comes a fragmentary Hebrew manuscript, which, where preserved, follows the short text of Jeremiah found hitherto only in Greek. In Chapter 10, for example, the Septuagint omits no fewer than four verses, and shifts the order of a fifth. The Qumrân Jeremiah (4QJer<sup>b</sup>) omits the four verses and shifts the order in identical fashion.<sup>38</sup> The longer recension is also present at Qumrân.

As for the remaining books of the Old Testament, a number of books are preserved in texts which belong to the proto-Masoretic family: Isaiah as we have seen, Ezekiel, and the Book of the Twelve (Minor Prophets). It is still premature to discuss the text of the Hagiographa at Qumrân. Study has not proceeded far enough and some manuscripts appear to present complicated textual problems.<sup>39</sup>

<sup>37</sup> Cf. Orlinsky, *On the Present State of Proto-Septuagint Studies*, p. 85; W. F. Albright, "New Light on Early Recensions . . ." p. 28 and references.

<sup>38</sup> The fragment of 4QJer<sup>b</sup> cited contains the left portion of a column of text. Ends of lines are preserved with the text of Jer. 9:22-10:18. Lines 5-7 give the reading in question.

l. 5	wbzh]hb yyphw bmqbw̄t	[=MT v. 4]
l. 6	]tklt w'rgmn	[=MT v. 9]
l. 7	]y'bdw mn 'r"	[=MT v. 11]

Reconstruction demonstrates what can be seen even with a casual comparison of the text with MT and LXX, that with LXX, 4QJer<sup>b</sup> transposes v.5 after v.9, and omits vv. 6-8 and 10. It will be noted also that 4Q transposes MT *bmsmrwt wbm̄qbw̄t* to read *bm̄qbw̄t* [*w<b>msmrwt*] with LXX, *ἐν σφύραις καὶ ἡλοις*.

<sup>39</sup> For brief comments on the Daniel manuscripts, see the writer, "Le travail d'édition . . ." p. 58.

### 3. Early Recensions of the Old Testament

Sufficient materials are available now to permit first attempts to reconstruct in outline the early Hebrew recensions (or local texts) of the Pentateuch, the Historical Books, and perhaps Isaiah and Jeremiah. An excellent beginning has been made by W. F. Albright in his programmatic study, "New Light on Early Recensions of the Hebrew Bible."<sup>40</sup> However, the ground is not yet sure, and many missteps will be taken before sure results can be hoped for. The following suggestions, therefore, are provisional; they attempt to comprehend the evidence as presented above.

First of all we may inquire into the history of the Hebrew recension which underlies the Septuagint of Samuel. As in the case of the Pentateuch, so no doubt in that of Samuel, the text type was present in Egypt in the early Ptolemaic period when the Septuagint began to be translated. Albright has argued that behind the translators' Hebrew text stands a recension edited sometime in the fifth-fourth centuries B.C. in Egypt.

There is, however, other strong evidence which ties this old recension to Palestine. For example, examination of the passages of the large Samuel manuscript (4QSam<sup>a</sup>) which are paralleled in Chronicles gives direct evidence that the Chronicler often utilized an edition of Samuel closer to the tradition of the Cave IV scroll than to that which survived in the Masoretic recension.<sup>40a</sup> This suggests that

<sup>40</sup> Cf. n. 21.

<sup>40a</sup> An example of the interesting affinities between 4QSam<sup>a</sup> and Chron. on the one hand and LXX to Sam. on the other hand is found in a fragmentary column at the end of 4QSam<sup>a</sup>:

the text type underlying the Septuagint, which is closely allied to that used by the Chronicler not long after 400 B.C. in Palestine, is derived from an Old Palestinian recension.<sup>41</sup> Again, the archaic

II Sam 24:16b wml'k yhw h'hyh 'm grn h'wrnh hybsy < >  
I Chron. 21:15b wml'k yhw h'md 'm grn 'rnn hybsy  
wys' . . .

4QSam<sup>a</sup> [wml'k y]hw h'wmd '[m grn 'rw]n' hybsy wys' [  
[II Sam 24:16b + ]  
I Chron. 21:16a . . . h'rş wbyn hšmym wħrbw šlwph  
bydw . . .

4QSam<sup>a</sup> [h'rş wbyñ [hšmy]m wħr[b]w šlwph bydw]

II Sam 24:17a-MT: . . . w'nky < > h'wyty w'lh hş'n  
mh 'şw

II Sam 24:17a-LXX<sup>OL</sup> . . . w'nky hr'h hr'wty w'lh hş'n  
mh 'şw

I Chron. 21:17a . . . < > whr' hr'wty w'lh hş'n  
mh 'şw

4QSam<sup>a</sup> [w]l'ny hr'h hr'ty w'lh h[ş'n]

Several points are to be noted. 4QSam<sup>a</sup> and I Chron. 21:16 preserve a verse which has dropped out of MT by haplography (*wys' dwyd . . . wy'mr dwyd*) as well as agree against Samuel in reading 'md/'wmd for *hyh* in 24:16b = 21:15b. In II Sam 17a, 4QSam<sup>a</sup> and LXX to Sam agree against MT. Chron. (21:17a) stands closer to 4QSam<sup>a</sup> than to MT Sam. That *hr'ty* is the superior reading is evident. *Resh* and *waw* are virtually identical in the Jewish book hand of the third century B.C. The *matres lectionis waw* and *yodh*, probably introduced after the third century, were most easily confused in the late first century B.C.

<sup>41</sup> By "Old Palestinian" we mean the text type current in Palestine at the end of the fifth century B.C. (i.e., according to our chronology, the time of Ezra). No doubt this text was developed from materials which had passed through the hands of the Exilic, i.e., early Babylonian community. By the "Babylonian" text, however, we mean the text of the "continuing" or late Babylonian community which persisted after the Restoration, and after the return of Ezra. This "Babylonian" text diverges from the "Old Palestinian" text

Samuel manuscript (4QSam<sup>b</sup>) obviously reflects at many points a text which antedates both the proto-Masoretic recension and that underlying the Septuagint,<sup>42</sup> though its affinities are clearly with the latter. Since the manuscript itself dates from the end of the third century, and there is no strong reason to suppose that several texts imported from Egypt came to Qumrân,<sup>43</sup> we must conclude that it is a witness to a collateral line of tradition that persists in Palestine from a time antedating the divergence of the Chronicler's Palestinian text of Samuel and the Hebrew textual tradition surviving in Egypt. Perhaps it is easiest to suppose that this Old Palestinian text type derives from the fifth-century Jewish community in Palestine, and that the ancestral Egyptian textual tradition diverged from this Old Palestinian text no earlier than the fourth century, no later than the early third century B.C.<sup>44</sup>

We are left with the problem of the origin of the proto-Masoretic recension of Samuel. No exemplars of its text are found at Qumrân, but there

after the introduction of the latter into Palestine. It is questionable whether we can detect any readings derived from sources surviving in Palestine from pre-Exilic times, though such may explain some of the radical divergences of later local texts.

<sup>42</sup> Cf. Albright, ". . . Early Recensions . . ." p. 33; and Cross, "The Earliest Manuscripts from Qumrân," p. 172.

<sup>43</sup> It is not impossible, of course, that a number of the Qumrân texts came from Egypt. There are a number of lines of potential connection between the Essenes and Alexandrian Jewry. The presence of Greek Septuagint manuscripts at Qumrân as well as the manuscripts under consideration could be explained by such contacts.

<sup>44</sup> Albright's evidence for Egyptian influence on the Hebrew tradition used by the Greek translators is most convincing in the Pentateuch. The question as to whether or not the Historical Books underwent recensional work in Egypt, and if so when, perhaps should be left open.

is no reason to suppose that it did not exist in the pre-Christian period. The analogy of other books, Isaiah, Jeremiah, the Pentateuch, warn us that the proto-Masoretic tradition is regularly old, and not merely the creation of the recensional activities of the rabbis, and that the appearance of one recension at Qumrân does not exclude the presence of another. Moreover, the proto-Masoretic text of Samuel is clearly the result of systematic revision.<sup>45</sup> Can we suppose it to be a late Palestinian recension which ousted the Old Palestinian surviving both in Egypt and at Qumrân? The radical divergence of its text as well as its frequently inferior readings speak against such a conclusion. A recension in Palestine should have produced both a better text and a text closer to the Egypto-Palestinian family. We can hardly suppose the proto-Masoretic recension to be a "standard" text, while a text superior in many ways, and certainly standard in the day of the Chronicler, is reckoned a vulgar text. If, then, Egypt and Palestine are eliminated as possible localities

<sup>45</sup> Monsignor Skehan has called an excellent example to my attention. In II Sam. 4:1, 2 the *MT* reads *wyšm' bn šwl . . . hyw bn šwl . . .* The latter phrase makes no sense whatever; the former is not happy. In both the *LXX* and 4QSam<sup>a</sup> the reading is *wyšm' mpybšt bn šwl*, which grammatically makes perfect sense. However, Mephibosheth is an obvious blunder. Ishbosheth is meant in both instances. The reviser of the text did not replace the erroneous reading with the correct one; rather he excised the mistake and left the text standing. In the case of *hyw lmpybšt bn šwl*, he cut out not only *mpybšt* but also *l* and forgot to replace it before *bn šwl*, leaving nonsense. Precisely the same phenomena, the excising of a mistake and thereby the creation of a defective (and senseless) text appears in II Sam. 3:7. Here again *LXX* and (in part) 4Q preserve the full but corrupt text to which *MT* is secondary.

for the development of the proto-Masoretic text, we may look to Babylon. It is not impossible that the ancestral proto-Masoretic tradition developed independently in Babylon (after the return of the Exiles) and was reintroduced into Palestine in the Hellenistic period or later.<sup>46</sup>

The evidence for reconstructing the history of the local recensions of the Pentateuch is rapidly accumulating; however, the problems are more complicated, and the recensional distinctions less clearly cut than in the case of Samuel.

The Paleo-Hebrew text of Exodus, and especially the Numbers scroll described above, furnish materials for reconstructing the prehistory of the Samaritan recension. As we have seen, the Samaritan recension proper branches off in the early Hasmonaean period.<sup>47</sup> It differs from the "proto-Samaritan" text at Qumrân only slightly; these differences would include, no doubt, the specifically sectarian readings—by chance the passages in question are not extant at Qumrân—and closer affinities to the proto-Masoretic tradition.<sup>48</sup> There is not the slightest reason to suppose that the "proto-Samaritan" is in any sense a sectarian recension. In its textual characteristics it stands between the proto-Masoretic recension and the Egyptian recension preserved in the Septuagint as well as at Qumrân. Contrary to both the Egyptian and the proto-Masoretic traditions, however, it is characterized by free expansion, "modernizing" revisions, insertion of parallel passages, and the like, most of its changes being transparently secondary. Such a process must have

<sup>46</sup> Albright has proposed such an origin for the great Isaiah scroll (IQIsa<sup>a</sup>) on the basis of correct vocalizations of Babylonian names in its text.

<sup>47</sup> See above, n. 15, 16.

<sup>48</sup> See n. 34.

taken some time; these peculiarities are the product of traditional growth, not recensional endeavor.

Similarly, if Albright is correct, the Egyptian influences reflected in the Hebrew underlying the Septuagint suggest that the Old Egyptian recension was made no later than the fourth century.<sup>49</sup> Probably the Egyptian textual tradition and the proto-Masoretic tradition separated as early as the fifth century, and the "proto-Samaritan" cannot have diverged much later.

There can be no doubt that the proto-Samaritan text is Palestinian. If for no other reason, this can be argued from the fact that the Paleo-Hebrew script survives thanks to its transmission in texts of this type. The origin of the proto-Masoretic tradition is less than clear. It is scarcely possible that it was a text in use in official circles from the fifth century onward in Palestine, being transmitted independently, though side by side with the developing vulgar text represented in the proto-Samaritan. It is much more likely that it was a type which developed outside Palestine in the fourth and third centuries (presumably in Babylon) later being reintroduced—though in no case later than the Maccabean period. This would explain the repudiation of the traditional Paleo-Hebrew script in the rabbinic period (an unexpected development), as well as the influence of the proto-Masoretic text on the Samaritan (*sensu stricto*) recension.

These details are enough to indicate that the biblical scrolls from Qumrân begin a new period in the study of the text of the Old Testament. Perhaps it is not too much to hope that in proper time, Old Testament scholars will be able to establish a genuinely critical or eclectic text of the Old Testa-

<sup>49</sup> Albright, *op. cit.*, p. 30.

ment which would reconstruct a pre-Christian state of the Old Testament. At all events, the new finds will chart new courses by which progress will be made toward a more accurate, more intelligible Old Testament.

The Essenes  
and the  
Primitive Church