

distinct group bearing a recognizably unique character. *ms* relates to them in the same way as the pre-Samaritan texts relate to each other, even though *ms* is somewhat removed from them on account of the ideological corrections and phonological variants inserted at a later stage.

Little can be said with certainty on the supposed relation between the various pre-Samaritan texts. Their agreement in important and idiosyncratic features would indicate one common text which was subsequently developed in various ways in the different manuscripts. An alternative model would necessitate the assumption that there was no common pre-Samaritan text, and that various scribes independently produced copies of the biblical text reflecting certain editorial-scribal tendencies. The large degree of agreement between the various pre-Samaritan texts, however, does not support such an assumption.

It is difficult to know why the community which in due course became known as the Samaritans chose a text now called pre-Samaritan as the basis for its special Holy Writings. In all probability there was no special reason for this choice, since texts such as these must have been current in ancient Israel. However, it should be noted that the proto-Masoretic text, usually associated with the temple circles, was not chosen for this purpose. It is also noteworthy that all five books of the Samaritan Pentateuch bear the same character.

### C. The Biblical Texts Found in Qumran

C. Burchard, *Bibliographie zu den Handschriften vom Toten Meer* (BZAW 76, 89; Berlin 1957; 2d ed. 1959; 1965); A. Catastini, "Da Qumran al testo masoretico dell'Antico Testamento—Spunti metodologici per la valutazione delle varianti," *RQ* 15 (1991) 303-313; Fitzmyer, *Dead Sea Scrolls*; F. García Martínez, "Lista de MSS procedentes de Qumran," *Henoah* 11 (1989) 149-232; idem, "Estudios Qumránicos 1975-1985—Panorama crítico (VI)," *EstBib* 47 (1989) 225-266; B. Jongeling, *A Classified Bibliography of the Finds in the Desert of Judah, 1958-1969* (Leiden 1971); L. Rosso Ubigli, "Indice italiano-inglese dei testi di Qumran/Italian-English Index of Qumran Texts," *Henoah* 11 (1989) 233-270; A.S. van der Woude, "Fünfzehn Jahre Qumran-forschung (1974-1988)," *TRu* 55 (1990) 274-307; 57 (1992) 1-57.

Cross, *ALQ*; Cross-Talmon, *QHBT*; P.W. Skehan, "The Biblical Scrolls from Qumran and the Text of the OT," *BA* 28 (1965) 87-100; idem, "The Scrolls and the OT Text," in: D.N. Freedman and J.C. Greenfield, eds., *New Directions in Biblical Archaeology* (New York 1971) 99-112; idem, "Qumran, Littérature de Qumran, A. Textes bibliques," *DBSup*, vol. IX (Paris 1979) 805-822; Y. Sussmann, "The History of *Halakha* and the Dead Sea Scrolls—Preliminary Observations on *Miqsat Ma'ase Ha-Torah* (4QMMT)," *Tarbiz* 59 (1989-1990) 11-76; E. Tov, ed., *The Hebrew and Greek Texts of Samuel* (Jerusalem 1980); idem, "A Modern Textual Outlook Based on the Qumran Scrolls," *HUCA* 53 (1982) 11-27; idem, "The Orthography and Language of the Hebrew Scrolls Found at Qumran and the Origin of These Scrolls," *Textus* 13 (1986) 31-57; idem, "Hebrew Biblical Manuscripts from the Judaean Desert: Their Contribution to Textual Criticism," *JJS* 39 (1988) 5-37; idem, "Groups of Biblical Texts

Found at Qumran," in press; G. Vermes, *The Dead Sea Scrolls—Qumran in Perspective* (2d ed.; London 1982).

### 1. Background

Some of the Qumran texts have already been discussed above in the sections dealing with the proto-Masoretic and pre-Samaritan texts (A and B above). Those sections treated important textual witnesses (*m*, *ms*) attested not only in medieval sources but also in early texts now found in Qumran. In this section all the evidence that has been discovered in Qumran is presented, and, for this reason, there is a certain disproportion in the description of the Hebrew witnesses. While in the preceding sections, relatively late textual traditions were presented together with their first representatives found in Qumran, in the present section the latter texts will be discussed again, though briefly, together with all the other evidence from Qumran. These texts provide an overview of the condition of the biblical text in the Second Temple period, as seen from the Qumran finds, including texts from which *m* and *ms* developed at a later period.

The hundreds of fragments found near Hīrbet-Qumran, some 15 km south of Jericho near the Dead Sea, were deposited there, as it seems, by the group of people who dwelled there. Even though this assumption appears to be the most plausible of various options, it remains problematic (see below p. 102). Any explanation of the Qumran finds will have to account for two types of data: the enormous quantity of texts found at the spot (fragments of more than 800 scrolls once complete) and the wide textual variety reflected in the biblical texts (see pp. 112-117). Supposedly the original scrolls comprised a collection of texts, possibly a library, deposited by the Qumranites, but we possess no information regarding the role of these texts in the sect, or their use, if at all, in the daily life of the sect over a period of more than two hundred years. The term *library* is applicable to this collection, especially in regard to the texts found in cave 4, only if defined in the limited sense of a collection of books maintained by a certain community and if it is not assumed that all the books contained in this library received the same amount of credence, authority, and use. In this connection it is relevant to note that the individual caves contain different collections of texts, but these collections cannot be characterized in any special way.

In the caves of Qumran, which are numbered 1-11 according to the order of their discovery from 1947 onwards, many hundreds of

fragments of leather scrolls and a few of papyrus have been found; among these are biblical scrolls and compositions in which the biblical text was quoted. Although the identification of the community is relevant to an understanding of its writings, for the present discussion of the text of the Bible it is of limited importance, since some of the biblical scrolls found in Qumran were apparently brought from other places in Palestine. Besides, the biblical scrolls copied in Qumran or elsewhere in Palestine do not show evidence of any sectarian views of Essenes or other groups (cf. n. 37 on p. 266). In any event, it appears that Qumran was inhabited by Essenes (possibly identical with the Boethusians mentioned in rabbinic literature), whose halakhic practice may have derived from that of the Sadduceans, as suggested by an analysis of 4QMMT (see Sussmann\*).

The number of the texts found in Qumran is extremely large (probably some 800). It is not impossible that the covenanters were actively involved in the copying of existing texts and the writing of new ones, and possibly the room in which this activity took place, the so-called scriptorium, can even be identified.<sup>72</sup>

The biblical texts found in Qumran not only contribute to our understanding of the transmission of the biblical text. They also provide extensive information on the text of the Bible and the relation between the textual witnesses. It is therefore very important to clarify the place of origin of the texts found in Qumran. Some were apparently written in Qumran, while others were brought there from outside. Tov\*, 1986, 1988, suggested three criteria for distinguishing between these two groups referring to orthography, morphology, and scribal practice. It appears that all the special writings of the Qumran covenanters were

<sup>72</sup> Many scholars believe that the room in Hīrbet Qumran now named scriptorium (scribes' room) was indeed the room where the copying of the scrolls took place. In this room archeologists found a 5 meter long table, small tables, and two inkwells. However, several scholars have raised doubts with regard to this identification: Golb has claimed that the height of the table, 40 cm, was too low for writing and, according to him, the fact that no remnants of scrolls were found in the room also proves that it was not used for the purposes of writing. See N. Golb, "The Problem of Origin and Identification of the Dead Sea Scrolls," *Proc. Am. Phil. Soc.* 124 (1980) 1-24; idem, "Who Hid the Dead Sea Scrolls?" *BA* 48 (1985) 68-82; idem, "Khirbet Qumran and the Manuscripts of the Judean Wilderness—Observations on the Logic of Their Investigation," *JNES* 49 (1990) 103-114. Similar doubts, though in less detail, had been voiced earlier by H.E. del Medico, *L'énigme des manuscrits de la Mer Morte* (Paris 1957); K.H. Rengstorf, *Hirbet Qumrân und die Bibliothek vom Toten Meer* (Studia Delitzschiana 5; Stuttgart 1960). The theory of Golb has been refuted in detail by F. García Martínez and A.S. van der Woude, "A 'Groningen' Hypothesis of Qumran Origins and Early History," *RQ* 14 (1990) 521-541.

written according to the same system of orthography, morphology, and scribal practice which is named here the Qumran practice or Qumran scribal school (below 5). It is assumed that all the biblical and non-biblical texts written according to this practice derived from the same scribal school, whereas the texts lacking these characteristics came from elsewhere. According to this assumption, the collection of texts found in Qumran thus reflects the textual situation of the Bible not only in Qumran, but also elsewhere in Palestine.

## 2. The Evidence

Between 1947 and 1956 fragments of more than 190 biblical scrolls were found in the eleven caves of Qumran.<sup>73</sup> Most of the fragments are small, containing no more than one-tenth of a biblical book (for the system of notation, see n. 74). However, the complete text of a long book, viz., Isaiah in 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>, has also been found. The script of the texts serves as the main criterion for distinguishing between the supposedly different copies even when only tiny fragments have been preserved. Therefore, one has to be cautious when making an estimate of the number of the scrolls on the basis of small fragments. If a particular scroll was written by more than one scribe, any two fragments of a biblical book written in different scripts could have belonged to that scroll.

Fragments<sup>74</sup> have been found of all the biblical books except Esther<sup>75</sup> and Nehemiah (however, Ezra–Nehemiah formed one book represented in Qumran by a fragment of Ezra), as well as of the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, of previously unknown books, and of the special writings of the Qumran covenanters (see Fitzmyer\*<sup>76</sup>). Although most of the scrolls contain only one biblical book, three Torah scrolls contain two consecutive books (see Table 19). Likewise, the

<sup>73</sup> See the data in n. 80.

<sup>74</sup> The texts from the Judean Desert are indicated as follows: Number of the cave (1-11 for Qumran), identification of the site (Q = Qumran, Mas = Masada, Mur = Murabba'at, Hev = Hever), name of the biblical book (e.g., Gen = Genesis) and number of the copy (the first copy found in the excavations is called "a", the second copy "b", etc.). Papyrus fragments are indicated "pap," and fragments written in the paleo-Hebrew script are indicated "paleo" (e.g., 4QpaleoExod<sup>m</sup>).

<sup>75</sup> It seems probable that it was only by chance that fragments of this relatively small book were not preserved. For example, only a tiny fragment was preserved from the lengthy book of Chronicles (4QChr).

<sup>76</sup> It is difficult to know whether the finds from the caves at Qumran reflect any canonical conception of the Qumranites, since there is little evidence concerning the position of these writings in the Qumran community.

individual books of the Minor Prophets were considered as one book contained in one scroll (thus the Minor Prophets Scroll from Wadi Murabba'at, MurXII). At the same time, some scrolls contained mere sections of books. Thus 4QDeut<sup>9</sup> probably contained only the poem in Deuteronomy 32 and some of the Psalms scrolls only contained selections of the book of Psalms (see pp. 203–205).

One should take special note of the books of which many copies were found (see Table 19). These were apparently the books that were especially popular among the Qumranites, that is, Deuteronomy, Isaiah, and Psalms, and secondarily also Genesis and Exodus. A close affinity with the first three books is also manifest in the writings of the Qumran covenanters.<sup>77</sup>

Table 19

The Number of Copies of the Biblical Texts Found in Qumran as Summarized in 1992<sup>78</sup>

Book	Assyrian "Square" Script	Paleo- Hebrew Script	Notes
Genesis	16-17	3	2 include Exodus: 4QGen-Exod <sup>a</sup> and 4QpaleoGen-Exod <sup>1</sup>
Exodus	13	1	see Genesis
Leviticus	5	4	1 includes Numbers: 4QLev-Num <sup>a</sup>
Numbers	5	1?	see Leviticus
Deuteronomy	25	2	
Joshua	2		
Judges	3		
Samuel	4		
Kings	3		

<sup>77</sup> The Qumranites wrote several prose compositions in the style of Deuteronomy as well as poetical works influenced by the biblical book of Psalms. Likewise the writings of the sect often quote from Isaiah, which held a unique place in their thinking. All three books are often quoted in 1QH, see P. Wernberg-Møller, "The Contribution of the *Hodayot* to Biblical Textual Criticism," *Textus* 4 (1964) 133-175.

<sup>78</sup> The numbers are based on Fitzmyer, *Dead Sea Scrolls* and E. Tov, "The Unpublished Qumran Texts from Caves 4 and 11," *JJS* 43 (1992) 101-136. For earlier lists, see Skehan\*, *Supplément* (1979) 806; E. Ulrich, "The Biblical Scrolls from Qumran Cave 4—An Overview and a Progress Report on Their Publication," in: F. García Martínez, ed., *The Texts of Qumran and the History of the Community* = RQ 14 (1989) 207-228.

Isaiah	20-24	
Jeremiah	6	
Ezekiel	6	
Dodekapropheton	8	
Psalms	34	
Job	3	1
Proverbs	2	
Ruth	4	
Canticles	4	
Lamentations	4	
Qoheleth	2	
Daniel	8	
Ezra-Nehemiah	1	
Chronicles	1	

The background and nature of the texts written in the paleo-Hebrew script need to be clarified further. Fragments of some 11-14 biblical scrolls in the paleo-Hebrew script have been found at Qumran.<sup>79</sup> These fragments contain only texts of the Torah and Job, both of which are traditionally ascribed to Moses (cf. manuscripts and editions of *š* in which Job follows the Torah). The longest texts written in the paleo-Hebrew script are 11QpaleoLev<sup>a</sup> (see Freedman-Mathews, *Leviticus*) and the pre-Samaritan 4Qpaleo-Exod<sup>m</sup> (see p. 97).

### 3. Chronological Background

G. Bonani, M. Broshi, I. Carmi, S. Ivy, J. Strugnell, W. Wöflfi, "Radiocarbon Dating of the Dead Sea Scrolls," *Atiqot* 20 (1991) 27-32.

The texts are dated in various ways. A new version of the radiocarbon (carbon 14) dating (see Bonani\*) examining the radioactivity of minute segments of material has determined that the fragments are approximately two thousand years old, and that the presumed dates of the individual texts are close to the dates previously assigned to them on

<sup>79</sup> 1QpaleoLev, 1QpaleoNum (?); 2QpaleoLev; 4QpaleoGen-Exod<sup>1</sup>, 4QpaleoGen<sup>m</sup>, 4QpaleoExod<sup>m</sup>, 4QpaleoDeut<sup>r,s</sup>, 4QpaleoJob<sup>c</sup>; 6QpaleoGen, 6QpaleoLev; 11QpaleoLev<sup>a</sup>. Two fragments (4Q124-125) are unidentified. 4QpaleoJoshpara, probably not a biblical text, contains parts of Joshua 21. See M.D. McLean, *The Use and Development of Palaeo-Hebrew in the Hellenistic and Roman Periods*, unpubl. diss., Harvard University, Cambridge, MA 1982, 41-47 (University Microfilms); E. Ulrich, "The Palaeo-Hebrew Biblical Manuscripts from Qumran Cave 4," in press.

the basis of their paleographical analysis. For example, with the aid of the carbon 14 test, 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> is now dated between 202 and 107 BCE (paleographical date: 125-100 BCE) and 11QTemple between 97 BCE and 1 CE (paleographical date: late first century BCE to early first century CE).

The mentioned paleographical method, which has been improved in recent years, and which allows for absolute dating on the basis of a comparison of the shape and stance of the letters with external sources such as dated coins and inscriptions, has established itself as a relatively reliable method. Dates have been suggested for individual texts, and the earliest ones have been ascribed to the middle of the third century BCE.<sup>80</sup>

Less valuable for the dating of the individual texts than the carbon 14 test and the paleographical analysis are the archeological data. They merely point to the upper and lower limits of the period of residence in Hīrbet-Qumran: beginning from the middle of the second century BCE, or a little later, until 68 CE.<sup>81</sup> However, some of the texts found in the caves are older. Apparently they were brought there from other places by the residents of Qumran.

Paleographical analysis suggests that the texts written in the paleo-Hebrew script do not belong to the earliest group of the Qumran scrolls (cf. n. 79 and R.S. Hanson *apud* Freedman–Mathews, *Leviticus*, 20-23 who suggests “a date around 100 B.C.E.”—*ibid.*, 23). Nevertheless, these scrolls reflect ancient traditions, since they were probably copied from texts which were also written in that script, rather than from scrolls written in the later Assyrian (“square”) script.

Two texts of Daniel, 4QDan<sup>c,e</sup>, containing portions of the second part of the book, were probably copied between 125 and 100 BCE, not more than sixty years after the completion of the final stage of the editing of that book.

<sup>80</sup> According to this analysis, the oldest biblical scrolls, starting with the most ancient one, are: 4QSam<sup>b</sup>, 4QExod<sup>f</sup>, 4QQoh<sup>a</sup>, 4QXII<sup>a</sup>, and 4QJer<sup>a</sup>, as described in the following articles: F.M. Cross, Jr., “The Oldest Manuscripts from Qumran,” *JBL* 74 (1955) 147-172; D.N. Freedman, “The Masoretic Text and the Qumran Scrolls—A Study in Orthography,” *Textus* 2 (1962) 87-102; A. Yardeni, “The Palaeography of 4QJer<sup>a</sup>—A Comparative Study,” *Textus* 15 (1990) 233-268.

<sup>81</sup> See R. de Vaux, *Archaeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (London 1973); E.M. Laperrousaz, *Qumrân, L'établissement essénien des bords de la Mer Morte. Histoire et archéologie du site* (Paris 1976).

#### 4. Publication of the Texts

All texts are published in the official publication of these finds: *DJD = Discoveries in the Judaean Desert (of Jordan)*, I– (Oxford 1955– ) and often also, preliminarily, elsewhere. Full bibliographical details concerning the published texts have been collected by Fitzmyer\*, García Martínez\*, and Ubigli\*, the first one until 1990 and the latter two until 1989. On the unpublished texts see the article by Tov\* 1992 mentioned in n. 78.

The publication of a text contains photographic plates, sometimes based on infrared photographs, a transcription which also denotes doubtful letters (see examples in Table 7 on p. 231; Tables 2 and 5 on pp. 325 and 342; and plates 5\* and 8a\*), an external description of the text (referring to the material on which the text is written, the script, measurements of the scroll, columns, lines, and margins), sometimes a full reconstruction of the text beyond the fragments actually preserved, and critical apparatuses containing paleographical and textual notes (for an example, see Table 7 on p. 231).

#### 5. Characterization of the Texts Written in the Qumran Practice

The fragments of the more than 190 biblical texts found in Qumran do not share any major textual, linguistic, or scribal characteristics. Since they were written in different periods and at different places, they reflect a textual variety to be described below. For this reason a comprehensive description of the character of all of the Qumran texts cannot be given. The Qumran texts are therefore subdivided into different groups which are briefly described on pp. 114–117. The two main groups of texts found at Qumran, the proto-Masoretic and pre-Samaritan texts have been described in detail on pp. 29–33 and 97–100 respectively. This section refers only to the one group of Qumran texts which ought to be described in this section, viz., group (1) on p. 114. The texts belonging to this group bear a unique character among the biblical texts found at Qumran. They display a scribal practice which is described here as the Qumran practice. It appears that the texts belonging to this group were copied by the Qumran covenanters themselves.

The special characteristics recognizable in the biblical scrolls written according to the Qumran practice are visible in *all* the texts written and copied by the Qumran covenanters (non-biblical, especially sectarian, and biblical texts), and it seems that all these scrolls were copied by the same school of scribes who wrote in their distinctive orthography and morphology, while utilizing scribal practices different from those

reflected in the other Qumran texts (see below *d* on p. 111 and see Tov\*, 1986, 1988). From the great liberties which these scribes took it is evident that they do not reflect a tradition of precise and conservative copying, but rather a popular or vulgar one (see pp. 193–195).

It must be conceded that the term *Qumran practice*, used here, is somewhat misleading, but no better term suggests itself. In many ways this was a Palestinian scribal system, but it would be equally, if not more, misleading, to call these texts Palestinian, since the use of such terminology would imply that there are no other Palestinian texts. The name *Qumran practice* merely indicates that as a scribal system it is known mainly from a number of Qumran scrolls, without implying that this orthography was not used elsewhere in Palestine.

#### a. Orthography

Cross, "Some Notes"; Kutscher, *Language*; E. Qimron, *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (HSS 29; Atlanta, GA 1986); Freedman–Mathews, *Leviticus*, 51–82; Martin, *Scribal Character*.

Many Qumran texts are characterized by a distinctive orthography which has no equal among the known documents from other places and which, for want of a better name, has been called the Qumran practice (Tov\*, 1986, 1988). This Qumran orthography is very full, but in addition, it has some special features, which occur in conjunction with a series of morphological and scribal features (see below). Cross, "Some Notes" describes the orthography of these texts as a "baroque style" and he includes the morphological features described below under the heading of orthography.

The orthography of the Qumran practice has been described in various studies, especially in the detailed description of 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> by Kutscher\*, in an analysis of all the Qumran texts by Qimron\*, and in Tov\*, 1986, 1988.

It is characterized by the addition of many *matres lectionis* whose purpose it is to facilitate the reading (cf. pp. 220–230). Below are several examples which should be viewed in conjunction with plates 3\*–5\* and Table 21 on pp. 112–113.

In the orthography of the Qumran practice /o/ and /u/ are almost always represented by a *waw*. The *waw* is also used to indicate the short *holem* (e.g., חושך, פיה, מושה), the *qames hatuf* (כול, חוכמה, חוכמה), and the *hatef qames* (אוויה). Because of the inconsistency of scribes, many words appear in the same text with different spellings, e.g., /וֹת/ /וֹתָת/ /וֹתָתָת/ and /רוֹשׁ/ /רוֹשׁוֹשׁ/ /רוֹשׁוֹשׁוֹשׁ/ in 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>. *Yod* represents not only /i/ (usually: not short i), but also *šere*: אבילים (1QIsa<sup>a</sup> 61:2), מית (38:1). Unique for certain lexemes is the representation of /i/ in final position by *š*-, especially in

כִּי־, and sometimes also in מִי־ (less frequent: וְקִי־, 49:7; פִּי־, 40:5), apparently by analogy to לֵהִיבִי־ *et sim.* in which the *aleph* belongs to the root. *He* as a *mater lectionis* for /a/ is very frequent at the end of words, such as in *qllth* (e.g., שמרתה) and the pronominal suffix of the second person singular, e.g., מלככה, *mlkkh*, etc. On the other hand, if the parallel form of such words originally was *malkak*, rather than *malk<sup>e</sup>kah* as in מ (see pp. 48–49), the difference between the two forms should be considered morphological rather than orthographical, on which see p. 110. *He* as a *mater lectionis* in final position for /e/ occurs in an unusual fashion also in חוטה in 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> 1:4 (חוטה) and קורה in 6:4 (קורה). *Aleph* as a *mater lectionis* denotes /a/ in final position: עליה (34:11), בניה (66:8), and even in medial position: יתחם (1:17), יתכה (30:31).

The orthography of a complete section is exemplified in Table 21.

The scribes working within this scribal school wrote according to certain rules, but at the same time, each scribe also maintained a certain amount of independence. Sound evidence for the Qumran practice exists with regard to the following texts: 1QDeut<sup>a</sup>, 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>, 2QExod<sup>a,b</sup>, 2QJer, 3QLam, 4QNum<sup>b</sup>, 4QDeut<sup>h,j,k,m</sup>, 4QSam<sup>c</sup>, 4QIsa<sup>c\*</sup>, 4QXII<sup>c,e</sup>, 4QLam, 4QQoh<sup>a</sup>, 11QLev<sup>b</sup>; 4QPhyl A,B,J,K-Q. To this group also belong *all* the sectarian compositions written by the Qumran covenanters (such as 1QH, 1QM, 1QS, and the *pesharim*) and the following biblical paraphrases and anthologies: 4Q158, 4Q364, 4Q365 (all three containing 4QPP), 11QTemple, 11QPs<sup>a,b</sup>. Although there is no characteristic representative of this group, 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>,<sup>82</sup> which contains the longest Qumran text of a biblical book and whose practice is described thoroughly by Kutscher\*, is often referred to (incorrectly) as if it were the main text written in the Qumran practice.

#### b. Morphology

See the bibliography in the preceding section on p. 108 and also:

M.H. Goshen-Gottstein, *Text and Language in Bible and Qumran* (Jerusalem/Tel Aviv 1960); S. Morag, "Qumran Hebrew—Some Typological Observations," VT 38 (1988) 148–164.

The biblical and non-biblical texts written in the orthography of the Qumran practice also reflect distinctive morphological features whose most striking characteristics are:

<sup>82</sup> In this scroll, more than in other texts, Aramaic influence and the weakening of the gutturals is recognizable. See Kutscher, *Language*, 91–95 and 505–511 and see Table 21 on p. 113 (under "Language").

- (1) Lengthened independent pronouns: *hu'ah*, *hi'ah*, *'atemah*, *'atenah*, *hemah* and *henah* (the latter two forms are also found elsewhere);
- (2) lengthened pronominal suffixes for the second and third persons plural, e.g., *bmh*, *bhmbh*, *mlkmh*;
- (3) words which serve in **𐤎** as pausal forms, such as *(w)tqtwlw*, *(w)yqṭwlw*, occurring in these texts as free forms;
- (4) lengthened future forms: *(w<sup>e</sup>)eqṭolah*;
- (5) verbal forms with pronominal suffixes construed as *y<sup>e</sup>quṭlenu*;<sup>83</sup>
- (6) the form *q<sup>e</sup>ṭaltemah* for the second person plural;
- (7) מוֹאֲדָה, מוֹאֲדָה, מוֹאֲדָה containing an adverbial ending *-ah*;<sup>84</sup>
- (8) the long Qumran forms of the second person singular pronominal suffix (e.g., מלככה, *mlkckh*) differing from the short ones in **𐤎** (*mlkk*) possibly reflect morphological rather than orthographical differences (cf. p. 109).

The distinctive morphological features reflected in these scrolls have been described in detail by Kutscher\* and Qimron\*. Some of these features may be based on analogy with other forms in the language, while others may be dialectical. Certain forms are described as archaic by Kutscher\*, 52, 434-440; Qimron\*, 57; and Cross\*. Although the evidence known to date does not provide a good parallel to the combined morphological and orthographical features of the Qumran practice, certain of these features are also known from the Samaritan reading tradition.<sup>85</sup>

### c. Contextual Adaptations

More than other scribes, the scribes of the texts written in the Qumran practice adapted seemingly irregular forms to the context. These changes reflect a free approach to the biblical text, as exemplified in Table 20 below (a similar phenomenon in **𐤎** is exemplified in Table 13 on p. 91).

<sup>83</sup> See I. Yeivin, "The Verbal Forms יקטלו, יקטלו in DSS in Comparison to the Babylonian Vocalization," in: B. Uffenheimer, ed., *Bible and Jewish History* (Tel Aviv 1971) 256-276 (Heb. with Eng. summ.).

<sup>84</sup> Cf. P. Wernberg-Møller, "Two Biblical Hebrew Adverbs in the Dialect of the Dead Sea Scrolls," in: P.R. Davies and R.T. White, eds., *A Tribute to Geza Vermes, Essays on Jewish and Christian Literature and History* (JSOTSup 100; Sheffield 1990) 21-35.

<sup>85</sup> See n. 68 above.

**Table 20**  
Contextual Changes<sup>3</sup> in 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>

Isa 1:23	<b>𐤎</b>	... שחד ורדף ...	(שריך סוררים וחברי גנבים) כלו אהב שחד ורדף ...
	1QIsa <sup>a</sup>	... כולם אהבי שחד ורדפי ...	(cf. 𐤎)
Isa 14:30	<b>𐤎</b>	והמתי ברעב ושרשך ושאריתך יהרג	(I will kill your stock by famine) and it shall slay (the very last of you).
	1QIsa <sup>a</sup>	והרוג	I shall slay
Isa 46:11	<b>𐤎</b>	דברתי אף אביאנה יצרתי אף אעשנה	(I have spoken, so I will bring it to pass;) I have designed <it>, so I will complete it.
	1QIsa <sup>a</sup>	יצרתי אף אעשנה	I have designed it, so I will complete it.
Isa 51:19	<b>𐤎</b>	מי ינחמך	מי ינחמך
	1QIsa <sup>a</sup>	מי ינחמך	(cf. 𐤎)

### d. Scribal Practices

The texts written in the Qumran practice also reflect several scribal practices which set them apart from the other Qumran texts, while at the same time they are rather unique among the known textual witnesses of the Bible in the frequency of their characteristic phenomena (see p. 107 and Tov\*, 1986, 1988). These features are: (1) The occurrence of scribal marks, such as described on pp. 213-216, in large frequency; (2) the use of initial-medial letters in final position (cf. p. 210); and (3) the writing of the divine names יהוה (ים), אלהים, and אל, sometimes in conjunction with another divine appellation and together with their prefixes, in paleo-Hebrew characters in texts written in the Assyrian ("square") script (cf. pp. 216, 220).

### 6. Variants in the Qumran Texts

There are many differences in readings between the individual Qumran texts, or, phrased differently, these texts reflect many variants vis-à-vis **𐤎**. Many such variants are quoted in this book (see the index of ancient sources). The more significant deviations from **𐤎** in the Qumran texts are described in chapter 7B, sections 1,10,11 as well as in the next pages. Phrased again differently, the Qumran texts, as well as differing from one another, relate to **𐤎**, 𐤎, **𐤎**, and the other texts in a ramified system of agreements and disagreements. Therefore, one should describe the relation of the Qumran texts to the combined

evidence of all the other texts, although on a formal level they are often compared only with *m*, *6*, or *ss*.

On the basis of several types of variants in the Qumran texts, different groups of Qumran texts are recognized. These groups are briefly described on pp. 114–116. The two main groups of texts found at Qumran, the proto-Masoretic and pre-Samaritan texts have been described in detail on pp. 29–33 and 97–100. The tables adduced in this section exemplify some of the more characteristic types of variants found in the Qumran texts, without exhausting the evidence. The Tables exemplify, among other things, the readings found in texts written in the Qumran practice (section 5 above), represented in Table 21 by 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> and elsewhere by 4QJer<sup>c</sup> (Table 7 on p. 231). Two of the five groups of texts listed on pp. 115–116, viz., groups 4 and 5, are exemplified in Table 22 by 4QSam<sup>a</sup>.

The texts exemplified in Table 21 display a much greater number of differences in orthography and morphology than in other types of differences, whereas in the texts exemplified in Table 22 the relation is reversed: differences in morphology and orthography are few, if any, in contrast with a large number of other types of differences; some of these are in minor details, others in major ones. Most of the variants listed for 4QSam<sup>a</sup> in Table 22 are substantial.

Table 21

Classified Differences between *m* and 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> in Isa 1:1-8

## 1. Orthography (cf. pp. 108–109)

	<i>m</i>	1QIsa <sup>a</sup>	
2	כי	כִּי־	
3	קִנְהוּ	קִנְוֹהוּ	(supralinear letter)
	לא	לוא (2x)	
4	חטט	חוטט	
	עוֹן	עוֹן	
5	כל	כול	
	ראש	רואש	
	לתִּלִּי	לתולִּי	
	וכל	[ו]כול	
6	ראש	רואש	
	לא	לוא	
	חבשו	חובשו	
	ולא	ולוא (2x)	
7	שרפות	שרופות	

	אכלים	אוכלים
	אתה	אותה
8	כסכה	כסוכה

## 2. Language, Including Phonology (cf. pp. 109–110)

1	ישעיהו	ישִׁיעִהוּ	(Supralinear letter; omission of <i>ayin</i> indicates the weakening of laryngeals and pharyngeals)
	וירושלם	וירושלִּים	(Supralinear letter)
	בימי	בימִי	(Supralinear letter; addition of <i>waw</i> is probably due to Aramaic influence)
	עוזיהו	עוזיה	(Short theophoric names are more frequent in the Second Temple period)
	חזקיהו	חזקיה	(Supralinear letter; see further the previous item)
2	והם	והמֵה	(see p. 109)
7	כמהפכת	כמֵפכת	(Supralinear letter; the addition of <i>aleph</i> is probably influenced by the parallel Aramaic root)
8	ונותרה	ונותר	(The variant probably reflects an Aramaic verbal form for the third person feminine singular)

Notes 1. The supralinear letters (cf. p. 215) concern details that were not included in the first writing.

2. The linguistic variants listed above are typical of the scrolls written in the Qumran practice, while the linguistic variants included in the next category are not.

## 3. Other Differences

2	ארץ	הארץ	
3	עמי	ועמי	
5	דני	דוה	(different patterns)
7	ושממה	ושממו עליה	(cf. Lev 26:32)
8	כמלונה	וכמלונה	

Table 22

*Differences between m and 4QSam<sup>a</sup> in 1 Sam 1:22-28*

There are no differences in language and orthography. All the differences relate to matters of content (see p. 112). Square brackets indicate reconstructions.

	<i>m</i>	4QSam <sup>a</sup>	Notes
22	עד	עד אשר	(cf. Ⓞ)
	שם	לפני [יהוה ? שם]	(cf. Ⓞ)
	עולם	adds [ונת]תיהו נזיר עד עולם	
		כול ימי [חייו]	
23	את דברו	היוצא מפִיך	(= Ⓞ; cf. p. 176)
24	ותעלהו עמה	ותעל אותו	(cf. Ⓞ; see p. 305)
	—	שילה	(= Ⓞ)
	בְּפָרִים שְׁלֶשָׁה	[בפר בן] בקר משלש	(cf. Ⓞ; see p. 254)
	—	ולחם	(= Ⓞ)
	והנער נער	והנער [עמם ויבאו לפני יהוה	(= Ⓞ; cf. p. 240)
		וישחט אביו את] הוב[ח כ]אשר	
		[יעשה מימים ימימה ליהוה	
		ותבא את הנער]	
25	וישחטו	[וי]שחט	(cf. Ⓞ)
28	וישתחו שם ליהוה	[ותעזבו]הו שם ותשתחו [ליהוה]	

## 7. The Textual Status of the Qumran Texts

From the point of view of their textual status the Qumran texts belong to five different groups, four of which were unknown before the Qumran discoveries (1, 3, 4, 5)—see especially Tov\*, 1992. These groups are recognized mainly on the basis of the content of the variants, but in one case a different criterion is used, as required by the evidence, viz., the recognition of orthographical, morphological, and scribal idiosyncracies in group 1.

## (1) Texts Written in the Qumran Practice

Texts written in the Qumran practice of orthography, morphology, and scribal practice (see pp. 108–110) reflect a free approach to the biblical text which is reflected in adaptations of unusual forms to the context, in frequent errors, in numerous corrections, and sometimes, also, in negligent script. These texts were probably written by one scribal school, possibly in Qumran (see p. 111). The scribes of these texts, who copied from earlier sources, may have used proto-Masoretic texts. The

documents written in the Qumran practice, often described as typical Qumran texts, comprise some 20 percent of the Qumran biblical texts.

## (2) Proto-Masoretic Texts

In accordance with the description on pp. 22–39 these texts contain the consonantal framework of *m*, one thousand years or more before the time of the Masorah codices. These texts are exemplified by 1QIsa<sup>b</sup> in Tables 1 and 2 on pp. 31–32 and by 4QJer<sup>c</sup> in Table 7 on p. 231. They have no special textual characteristics beyond their agreement with *m*. These texts comprise some 60 percent of the Qumran biblical texts.

## (3) Pre-Samaritan Texts

Pre-Samaritan texts, such as 4QpaleoExod<sup>m</sup> and 4QNum<sup>b</sup>, are described in detail on pp. 97–100. These texts reflect the characteristic features of *m* with the exception of the latter's ideological readings, but they occasionally deviate from *m*. It appears that one of the texts of this group formed the basis of *m*, and the Samaritan ideological changes and phonological features were inserted into that text. The group comprises non-Samaritan texts which bear a common and exclusive textual character. Together with the next group, these texts comprise some 5 percent of the Qumran biblical texts.

## (4) Texts Close to the Presumed Hebrew Source of Ⓞ

Although no text has been found in Qumran that is identical or almost identical with the presumed Hebrew source of Ⓞ, a few texts are very close to Ⓞ: 4QJer<sup>b,d</sup> bear a strong resemblance to Ⓞ in characteristic details, with regard both to the arrangement of the verses and to their shorter text.<sup>86</sup> Similarly close to Ⓞ, though not to the same extent, are 4QLev<sup>d</sup> and 4QDeut<sup>q</sup> (see p. 159). Several agreements with Ⓞ and Ⓞ<sup>Luc</sup> are evidenced in 4QSam<sup>a</sup><sup>87</sup> (see further below, group 5) and agreements with Ⓞ are also found in 4QDeut<sup>c,h,j</sup>, but these texts actually belong to group 5. Texts containing a relatively small number of individual readings that are identical with the Hebrew parent text of Ⓞ should not be included in this group.

<sup>86</sup> See the discussion in chapter 7B on pp. 317–347 and Table 2 on p. 325.

<sup>87</sup> For some details, see Table 22 above. See especially: F.M. Cross, "A New Qumran Biblical Fragment Related to the Original Hebrew Underlying the Septuagint," *BASOR* 132 (1953) 15–26; E. Ulrich, *The Qumran Text of Samuel and Josephus* (HSM 19; Missoula, MT 1978); Cross, "Some Notes"; E. Tov, "The Contribution of the Qumran Scrolls to the Understanding of the LXX," in: G.J. Brooke and B. Lindars, eds., *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings* (Manchester, 1990) (SCS 33; Atlanta, GA 1992) 11–47.



There is not enough evidence for speculating on the internal relation between the texts which are close to  $\mathfrak{G}$ . In any event, they should not be considered a group. They do not form a closely-knit textual family like the  $\mathfrak{m}$  group or the  $\mathfrak{u}$  group, nor are they texts produced by a scribal school, like the texts written in the Qumran practice. They represent individual copies that in the putative stemma of the biblical texts happened to be close to the Hebrew text from which  $\mathfrak{G}$  was translated. Since the *Vorlage* of  $\mathfrak{G}$  was a single copy of the biblical text, and not a family, recension, or revision, the recognition of Hebrew scrolls that were close to the *Vorlage* of  $\mathfrak{G}$  is of limited importance for our understanding of the textual procedure. Together with the preceding group, the texts which are close to  $\mathfrak{G}$  comprise some 5 percent of the Qumran biblical texts.

#### (5) Non-Aligned Texts

Many texts are not exclusively close to any one of the texts mentioned above and are therefore considered non-aligned. That is, they agree, sometimes significantly, with  $\mathfrak{m}$  against the other texts, or they agree with  $\mathfrak{u}$  and/or  $\mathfrak{G}$  against the other texts, but the non-aligned texts also disagree with the other texts to the same extent. They furthermore contain readings not known from one of the other texts, so that they are not exclusively close to one of the other texts or groups.<sup>88</sup> This characterization is important when one tries to determine the full range of texts current in the Second Temple period as described in chapter 3C. Usually the employment of the term *non-aligned* merely implies that the texts under consideration follow an inconsistent pattern of agreements and disagreements with  $\mathfrak{m}$ ,  $\mathfrak{u}$ , and  $\mathfrak{G}$ , as in the case of 4QDeut<sup>b,c,h,k</sup>, 4QIsa<sup>c\*</sup>, 4QXII<sup>c,e</sup>, 4QDan<sup>a</sup>, and 11QpaleoLev<sup>a</sup>. But the texts which are most manifestly non-aligned, and actually independent, are texts which contain readings that diverge significantly from the other texts, such as 4QDeut<sup>i,n</sup>, 4QJosh<sup>a\*</sup>, 4QJudg<sup>a</sup>, and 5QDeut. 4QSam<sup>a</sup> holds a special position in this regard, since it is closely related to the *Vorlage* of  $\mathfrak{G}$ , while reflecting independent features as well. See the discussion in Tov\*, 1980, 1982, 1988, 1992 and see also p. 162.

Whether we assume that all aforementioned texts have been written at Qumran, or that only some were written there while others were brought from elsewhere (thus Tov\*), the coexistence of all these different categories of texts in the Qumran caves is noteworthy. The fact that all these different texts were found in the same Qumran caves probably

<sup>88</sup> See Tov\*, 1982, 1992.

reflects a certain textual reality in the period between the third century BCE and the first century CE. In our reconstruction of the history of the biblical text in that period in pp. 187-197 this situation is described as textual plurality and variety. At the same time, the great number of the proto-Masoretic texts probably reflects their authoritative status (cf. p. 191). Since there is no evidence concerning the circumstances of the depositing of the scrolls in the caves or concerning their possibly different status in the Qumran sect, no solid conclusions can be drawn about the approach of the Qumranites towards textual variety. Probably they paid no special attention to differences of the types described here.

#### 8. The Contribution of the Qumran Texts to Biblical Research

The Qumran texts contribute much to our knowledge of the biblical text at the time of the Second Temple—a period for which there was hardly any Hebrew evidence before 1947. Until that year, scholars based their analyses mainly on manuscripts from the Middle Ages. The Qumran evidence enriches our knowledge in the following areas.

(1) Readings not known previously help us to better understand many details in the biblical text, sometimes pertaining to matters of substance (for examples, see chapters 4, 6, 7). The Qumran texts, though early, are still removed much from the original texts as defined in 3B.

(2) The textual variety reflected in the five groups of texts described above provides a good overview of the condition of the biblical text in the Second Temple period (see the discussion in chapter 3C).

(3) The scrolls provide much background information on the technical aspects of the copying of biblical texts and their transmission in the Second Temple period (see chapter 4).

(4) The reliability of the ancient translations, especially  $\mathfrak{G}$ , is strengthened by the Qumran texts.  $\mathfrak{G}$  is one of the important texts for biblical research (below, pp. 141-142), but since it is written in Greek, its Hebrew source has to be reconstructed from that language. The reconstruction of many such details is now supported by the discovery of identical Hebrew readings in Qumran scrolls. See, for example, the reconstruction of  $\mathfrak{G}$  in Deut 31:1 (p. 129), 1 Sam 1:23 (p. 176), 1 Sam 1:24 (p. 254), 2 Sam 8:7 (p. 131), and also the examples on pp. 113-114. This evidence provides support for the procedure of reconstructing the Hebrew parent text of the translations.<sup>89</sup>

<sup>89</sup> This claim was already made by G.R. Driver, "Hebrew Scrolls," *JTS* n.s. 2 (1951) 17-30, esp. 25-27.